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Abstract

The motif of escort features at the beginning and ending of many Lukan scenes of hospitality. It occurs in some scenes in the Gospel but is particularly frequent in the Acts of the Apostles, especially in the latter two-thirds of the work, where Paul, an emissary of Jesus, is often the subject of escorted arrival and departure. Escorted arrival is where the host ‘goes out to meet’ the guest and accompanies them to the host’s house. Escorted departure is where the host ‘sees the guest on their way’, accompanying them for some part of their onward journey. Sometimes emissaries who present a host’s invitation escort and accompany the guest to the host’s house.

This thesis aims to study the motif of escort in Luke and Acts—with a greater focus on Acts than Luke—in the light of its appearance in the Septuagint (especially in narrative scenes in the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets and Tobit), in Joseph and Aseneth, in Graeco-Roman hospitality narratives seen through the eyes of Homer, and later literature (such as Josephus’s The Jewish War) depicting the adventus ceremonies accorded to the Roman Emperor. Retrieval of this background enables the establishment of a cultural script, particularly with respect to a shared understanding of the significance of escorted arrivals and escorted departures in the context of hospitality. This is the cultural script that is assumed of the implied reader. The thesis then undertakes a narrative and synchronic reading of relevant parts of Luke and Acts from the perspective of the implied reader.
This reading shows that Luke makes substantial use of escort to demonstrate the welcome and goodwill of the hosts toward the emissaries, and also toward the Gospel itself. Similarly, the reading shows that Luke uses various characters’ failure to provide escort to demonstrate their low-regard, envy or hostility toward Jesus’ emissaries—most prominently the failure of James and the elders to come out and greet Paul upon his arrival in Jerusalem (Acts 21:17-19). The motif of escort contributes nuance to Luke’s message, particularly in regard to the unity of the church and the increasing potential for the reception of the Gospel by the Gentiles (including leaders within the Roman Empire and barbaroi).

Keywords: Luke-Acts, escort, escorted arrival, escorted departure, meeting, accompaniment, welcome, reception, travel, hospitality, farewell, Septuagint, Pentateuch, Former Prophets, Tobit, Joseph and Aseneth, Homer, the Odyssey, Josephus, adventus, ἀπάντησις, συνάντησις, ὑπάντησις, ἀπαντάω, συναντάω, υπαντάω, προπέμπω, πέμπω.
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In the final year of my undergraduate theological studies, our lecturer for 'Luke-Acts', Brendan Byrne, made a memorable comment about the failure of James and the elders (in contrast to 'the brethren'), to 'go out and meet' Paul on his arrival in Jerusalem, as told in Acts 21. His exact words were, “It was as if they didn't go out to the airport to meet Paul”. Dr Byrne's studied anachronism lodged in my mind. Ever since, I have wanted to know what Luke's depiction of this 'failure to meet' signified. Thus began a particular interest in the way that characters in the Third Gospel and Acts 'welcome guests' by 'coming out to meet' them and escorting their arrivals and departures.

With my heightened interest in escort, a re-reading of Luke and Acts revealed that the character, Paul, was the subject of many escorted arrivals and departures. Among these there are several that are striking. Some are striking because of the extravagant distances of the escort—such as the escort by the brethren from Rome who come out as far as the Forum of Appius and the Three Taverns, or the escort of Paul from Beroea to Athens. Other instances (of escorted arrivals and departures) are striking because the escorted departures function as dramatic escapes from imminent danger. I noticed that there were several other scenes where the escort of other emissaries of Jesus—messengers of the gospel—namely, Peter and Philip, features in the narrative. I also noticed that in the Third Gospel, particularly in episodes which are distinctively Lukan, escort also features prominently as a motif (e.g. 10:34; 15:20,28; 24:15).

---

As I consulted a large number of the most significant commentaries on Luke and Acts, I observed that this motif had received next to no scholarly attention (see Preliminaries I: The Motif of Escort, and its Neglect in Contemporary Scholarship—in which I present a raison d’être for this current study). No one had identified escort as a Lukan motif. I wondered, how would it change the interpretation of Acts if we posited for the implied readers an appreciation for the motif of escort and its implications in the text?

1.1 Hospitality in Luke and Acts: The Need for a Wider ‘Framing’

Over the past thirty years, the centrality of hospitality to the Lukan narratives has been clearly articulated in New Testament scholarship. In all of this, there has been a marked emphasis upon meals and lodgings.

Even earlier than these last three decades—as long ago as 1926—Henry Cadbury commented on Luke’s interest in “lodgings.” However, it is with the rise of Literary and Narrative Criticism that the detection of the centrality of hospitality, especially in regards to meals and lodging, becomes extensively commented upon. Karris argues that “food” is a pervasive literary motif in Luke’s Gospel. Similarly, Koenig writes, “When we turn to the place of meals in Luke-Acts, we find that our author has assigned them an extraordinary prominence.” Koenig also argues that “houses” are a prominent feature in Luke and Acts, writing, “…residential buildings take on a kind of spiritual significance.”

---


In some ways, these exclusive emphases upon the elements of meals, being at table, “table-fellowship”, houses, and the provision of lodging, have had, I suspect, an uninten-

---

tional narrowing effect upon an understanding of the late first- (early second-) century Mediterranean cultural script on hospitality. Focussing upon meals and lodging potentially narrows the framing of hospitality. Narratively, a focus on meals and lodging is akin to starting in media res—in the middle of things. What stands to be lost is often a clear understanding of the conventions concerning the beginning and endings of hospitality visitations. As Andrew Arterbury writes (affirming and extending the earlier observation of Steve Reece),

“Essentially, anything that takes place ‘from the moment a visitor approaches someone’s house until the moment he departs’ or even reaches his next destination is considered to be an outgrowth of either hospitality or inhospitality.”

One particular loss from a narrowed framing of hospitality—to a mere consideration of meals and lodging—is a failure to appreciate the twin hospitality conventions of escorted arrival and escorted departure. Escorted arrival is where the host ‘goes out to meet’ the guest and accompanies them to the host’s house. Escorted departure is where the host ‘sees the guest on their way’, accompanying them for some part of their onward journey. Sometimes emissaries, who present a host’s invitation, escort and accompany the guest to the host’s house—a variation upon escorted arrival, whereby the escorting is done vicariously or by delegation. Sometimes at the end of a visit, there is the host’s provision of food and other resources, including escort to the next destination, to aid the departing guest with their onward journey. Sometimes this escorted departure is extended to the point where the companion becomes like Homer’s Pisistratus or Vergil’s fidus Achates—escorting the guest for a considerable part of their onward journey and not just to the very next destination or part thereof.

Narrowing the framing of hospitality—to a consideration of just meals and lodgings—causes another loss: a failure to notice the strong intersection between hospitality and

---


In what is often dubbed Luke’s “Travel Narrative” (Luke 9:51–19:48), it is Jesus who travels (to Jerusalem); in Acts, it is the emissaries (messengers) of Jesus who travel in the ‘travel sections’, although several commentators argue that it is the ‘Word’ (λόγος) that goes ‘on the road’ in Acts, and finds either reception or rejection on its outward journey. Even those who argue that it is the Word that goes on the road note that the reception of the emissaries is the principal way in which Luke demonstrates people’s reception of the Word. Attention to escorted arrivals and escorted departures, and escort in general, creates a strong way to investigate the nexus of these two Lukan subthemes—hospitality and travel.


Why has hospitality been relatively slow to be appreciated in terms of the Lukan narratives? And why has ‘escort’ still not attracted scholarly attention? One explanation is that such narrative details may have once been regarded as incidental to the truly theologically significant parts of the narrative. For instance, in the case of Acts, speeches were once regarded as more significant than the narrative details that separated them. Therefore, for instance in 1932, Henry Cadbury could write,

Jerome speaks of persons who neglected Acts of the Apostles because it gave the impression of cold narrative—nudam historiam. [Vol. II. p. 236] It is the speeches that relieve this impression, lending a variety to the contents and interpreting the narrative. Like the choral passages in the Greek drama they explain to the reader the meaning of the events. It is the speeches which specially interest the theologically inclined, as the majority of attentive readers of Acts have usually been.

Although a commentator of Cadbury’s era could note, for instance, Luke’s interest in lodgings, it was not really until the rise of Narrative Criticism that meals and lodgings as narrative motifs began to gain significant attention.

To some degree, the continuing neglect of the twin motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure may share the same propensity to be over-looked as an incidental detail of ‘cold narrative’—just an inconsequential detail about how Luke gets characters from A to B—A and B being where the really significant incidents occur. The other reason for the neglect may be contemporary readers’ failure to carefully reconstruct in detail a cultural script appropriate to a Mediterranean reader (auditor) of the late first (early second) century, with a particular focus upon the role of escort and travel in the context of hospitality conventions. Part A of this thesis aims at just such a reconstruction.

In the Preliminaries I section of this dissertation (“The Motif of Escort in Acts and Its Neglect in Contemporary Scholarship”), I conduct a detailed survey of a wide range of contemporary biblical scholars to discuss their passing over or failure to detect or comment upon the motif of escort. I endeavour to do this by examining a set of “test” passages from Acts where escort of the emissaries of Jesus occurs particularly upon their arrival at the beginning of scenes and their departure at the end of scenes. By this survey
In order to attempt to fill this gap, I firstly establish what a late first- (early second-) century Mediterranean cultural script says about the part that escort (especially escorted arrivals and escorted departures) plays in the hospitality conventions. Establishing that cultural script is essentially the task of Part A of this dissertation; it attempts close readings of several bodies of background literature including Jewish scriptural (Septuagint), Second Temple Jewish, and Greco-Roman literatures. In the development of the cultural script, I am mindful of the implied reader of Acts. The purpose of establishing the cultural script in Part A is to then bring that cultural script as an interpretive lens to the reading of Luke and Acts in Part B—Acts being the greater focus, because of the frequency of escorts provided to the emissaries of Jesus.

Preliminaries II “Literary Methodology and Establishing the Cultural Script” sets out the literary- and narrative-critical approach I bring to both my reading of the background texts and to Luke and Acts with particular regard for hospitality and escort. Preliminaries II also explains the role of that approach to the texts in Part A in establishing the cultural script I assume for the implied reader, particularly for the reading of Acts in Part B.

Preliminaries III (“Selection of Background Literature Used to Establish the Cultural Script”) details the criteria for selection of the literature in Part B. The scope of the literature surveyed for the establishment of the cultural script is broadly representative but it is not exhaustive. This is mostly because of the close-grained, narrative method that must be brought to these texts.

Why is it important to bring a close-grained, formalist narrative methodology to the texts? I want to establish a detailed and careful picture of hospitality conventions of the time. In particular, I want to challenge what I suspect are some erroneous assumptions that are made with regard to hospitality conventions. I will examine what the cultural script says about over-detention (detention beyond an expression by the guest of their desire to leave); the significance of haste in welcoming newly arrived guests and of being
'first' to greet; reciprocity of scale in guest-gift exchanges; the identification of the guests in hospitality scenes as ἐνός—are they always “strangers” in the strictest sense? Or does the word include family or “guest-friends” (known to the hosts) and even “hosts” (as in Romans 16:23)? And most importantly, is the wider framing of hospitality—to include escorted arrival and escorted departure or extended onward escort—justified by the texts I examine?

What particular narrative approach do I bring to the texts? I bring a close-grained, formalist poetic narratological approach to the analysis of the texts that I examine. I justify this in Preliminaries II where I detail my narrative-critical methodology. I justify why it is dependent very much on the foundations established by Vladimir Propp, Seymour Chatman, Gérard Genette, and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan. Building very much on those narratologists, I also use Robert Funk's method of codification which draws heavily upon these narratologists’ methodologies and insights. I also explain why I regard some of the literary-critical models developed for the study of modern literature as unsuited to the study of Luke, Acts and much of the background literature I examine. Nevertheless, I briefly survey some of the newer (most contemporary) narrative theories to ask if there may be potential for their application to the ancient texts I examine in both parts of this thesis.

I give evidence of actually applying this rigorous methodology to the literature I examined through the inclusion of three sample codifications of texts (one of an Old Testament text, one from Luke’s Gospel, and one from Acts), including a “prose reading” of the results for one of the codifications. In so doing, I aim to be completely transparent about my narrative-critical methodology (Appendix 2).

Once I have used a narrative-critical reading of the background texts to establish a cultural script, I bring this script as an interpretive lens to a reading of Luke and Acts. The initial survey of these two Lukan works revealed that, whereas Acts contains many instances of escort particularly of Paul and some other emissaries of Jesus (namely Peter and Philip), the Gospel contains only a few instances of the motif of escort. Nevertheless,

Henry J. Cadbury is the first to really put forward the idea that Luke and Acts should be read as a Unity. He is often described as responsible for the hyphen in Luke-Acts.\(^\text{19}\) In 1927, Cadbury wrote, "[Luke and Acts] are not merely two independent writings from the same pen; they are a single continuous work. Acts is neither an appendix nor an afterthought. It is probably an integral part of the author’s original plan and purpose."\(^\text{20}\) The benefit of interpreting Luke and Acts as a narrative unity was strongly advanced in 1986 by Robert Tannehill.\(^\text{21}\)

In 1993, Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo challenged the then scholarly consensus about the unity of Luke-Acts, providing much needed nuance to the idea of unity, primarily by dividing the concept of ‘unity’ into several sub-types: authorial, canonical, generic, narrative and theological.\(^\text{22}\) As with many challenges to scholarly consensus, it sometimes takes time for the initial challenge to penetrate older cherished certitudes. However, twelve years later, the conversation was well and truly proceeding at a pace. Six essays about the unity and reception of Luke and Acts were published in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, Volume 28, no. 2 (2005). These essays were subsequently included in the Part 1 & 2 of a collection of essays edited by Andrew F. Gregory and C. Kavin

---


Rowe, *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts.*\(^{23}\) As the words additional to the older title by Parsons and Pervo—“and Reception”—suggest, these essays re-examine “unity” in light of the fact that, although Luke and Acts may have been intended to be read together, that is largely not the way they were, in fact, read; nor does any extant manuscript or list juxtapose Luke and Acts. The essays are by no means in agreement with one another. Luke Timothy Johnson makes a brief but convincing defence for the literary and theological unity of Luke-Acts, making the point that “as important as reception history is, it cannot be prescriptive for all interpretations”, and he makes the point that neither can it be a substitute for hearing the reading of what literary critics term the “intended reader” or “ideal reader” or “imagined reader”\(^{24}\)

These debates on the unity were not intended to undo the conspicuous ‘payload’ that comes from reading Luke and Acts in the light of each other (Pervo makes the point that the title was not after all *Rejecting the Unity of Luke and Acts*).\(^{25}\)

In the light of these debates about unity (of the last eighteen years) and my own initial findings about the uneven presence of escort as a literary motif in Luke and Acts, I determined that I would turn firstly and more briefly to the instances of escort in the Gospel. Regardless of one’s final conclusions about the unity of Luke and Acts, as Parsons and Pervo maintain, Luke remains the “best commentary” on Acts (“and vice versa”).\(^{26}\) And so the place of the examination of Luke’s Gospel in regards to escort, hospitality and the reception of Jesus and his emissaries, is best described as the ‘hinge point’ of this dissertation: it is the final piece of background that informs a cultural script on these matters.

---


26 Parsons and Pervo, *Rethinking,* p. 82.
as we might imagine it for an implied reader of Acts. At the same time, Luke’s Gospel is probably the first encounter with Luke’s writing for the implied reader of Acts.27

Between Luke and Acts, Acts receives the ‘lion’s share’ of attention in the application of the cultural script with regard to escort in the context of hospitality. It is in Acts where there are many scenes in which Jesus’ emissaries travel from one potential host to another, and in which people’s reception of Jesus is ‘shown’ (mimetically narrated) by the way that they receive his emissaries. This close reading of Acts is the heart of this dissertation.

Finally, in the Conclusion, I review the establishment of the cultural script in relation to hospitality and escort, and the bringing of that cultural script to a reading of Acts. I demonstrate what difference this makes to the interpretation of Acts. I also locate this reading of Acts into the context of several questions that are currently debated by Acts scholars, and point to some areas that could be further pursued.

The first exercise of location is to situate my reading in relation to the idea that Luke was in Acts portraying an idealised church which was unified and “of one mind” (Acts 1:14; 2:46; 4:24,32; 5:12; 15:25)—where internal conflicts were quickly resolved if they occurred at all. The earliest proposals that Luke was writing to ‘reconcile’ parties within the early church were made by Ferdinand C. Baur. He proposed that Acts was an attempt to reconcile the hostile parties of the Paulinists and the Judaists.28 Baur claimed that Paul preached a different gospel from that of the original Apostles—the gospel of freedom from the law, as against that of circumcision; and that the outcome of Paul’s antithesis was a struggle between two Christianities in the early church—the Pauline, and the Petrine or Apostolic—referring to the Jerusalem Apostles, i.e. Peter, John and James. Baur’s was typical of a Hegelian understanding of history. Baur wrote of, “the apologetic attempt of

27 Although authorial unity is not beyond challenge, of all the five sub-types of unity raised by Parsons and Pervo systematic taxonomy of potential “unities” for Luke and Acts—authorial, canonical, generic, narrative and theological—authorial unity is by far the least contentious and most given to scholarly consensus. Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), p. 7.

a Pauline author to orchestrate the bringing together and the reunion of the two parties face to face. Luke makes Paul appear as Petrine as possible and Peter as Pauline as possible, by throwing, as much as possible, a reconciliatory veil over the differences that, according to the unequivocal statement of Paul in his letter to the Galatians, had without a doubt separated the two apostles, and by plunging into forgetfulness what troubled the relationship between the two parties.”

The second exercise of location is to situate my reading in what others are currently saying about Luke’s attitude to the Roman Empire. Here, I attempt to locate my reading with its attention to escort on a spectrum that ranges between what could be dubbed Cassidyism—named for the position of R. J. Cassidy, who argues that Luke portrays Jesus as a subversive revolutionary with an essentially political message that was strongly directed against the establishment—and what could be dubbed Walaskayism—named for P. W. Walaskay who read the Lukan project as an apology pro imperio to counter anti-Roman sentiment in certain Christian circles.

The third exercise of location, not unrelated to the first, will to be locate my reading in relation to the idea that Luke was writing an apology pro ecclesia—to present Christianity as an innocuous movement that was no threat to Rome.

1.2 Preliminaries I: The Motif of Escort and Its Neglect in Contemporary Scholarship

In this section, I conduct an initial survey of a range of contemporary biblical scholars to discuss their passing over or failure to detect or comment upon the motif of escort in a set of “test” passages from Acts where escort of the emissaries of Jesus occurs. The com-

---

32 P. W. Walaskay, And so we came, pp. ix, 1 and 4.
mentators I chose for this initial exercise were: Lake and Cadbury; Haenchen; Conzelmann; Bruce; Johnson; Barrett; Talbert; Fitzmyer; Witherington; Jervell; Eckey; Wall; Marguerat; and Pervo.

The passages I chose for this initial exercise were Acts 10:24-27 (where Cornelius goes out to meet Peter, and then escorts him into his house); Acts 17:15 (where the brethren from Beroea escort Paul to Athens); Acts 20:38b, 21:5; 21:16 (where the elders of Ephesus, the disciples of Tyre and of Caesarea, respectively, escort the departures of Paul and his entourage as they journey to Jerusalem); Acts 21:18 (where it appears that James and the

---

46 Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Hermeneia series. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008). In Chapter Six, a considerable number of footnotes cite this commentary; in some of these citations I am in disagreement with Pervo, but in many I acknowledge his literary-critical eye for detail. It is not Pervo’s general thesis about the genre of Acts (as a Greek novel) that attracts me so often to his comments. Instead, I remain open to Acts as a *sui generis* or hybrid which borrows from several genres.
elders did not come and meet Paul upon his arrival); Acts 21:35; 23:31-33; 27:1 (where there are three instances of extravagant escort by representatives of the Roman Empire, in the context of rescuing Paul or seeing that he has access to an appeal before the emperor); and Acts 28:15 (where two groups of believers from Rome provide extravagant escorted arrival to Paul as he approaches the city). Most of these escorts attract little attention from the commentators that I examined.

1.2.1 Acts 10:24-27 (Cornelius escorts the arrival of Peter)

Most of the commentators do not discuss the fact that Cornelius came out to meet Peter, and they fail to explain how this was one of many elements of hospitality that Cornelius extends toward Peter. The D text addition to verses 24 and 25 makes this coming out to meet more conspicuous—it explains how one of the servants ran ahead to announce Peter’s arrival. Several commentators report this textual variant, but still fail to speak about the ‘coming out to meet’ as an element of hospitality. Most commentators are more interested by the obeisance that Cornelius offers and which Peter refuses (25b and 26) than in the escorted arrival. The comment about entering the house (v. 27) explicates that the greeting transpired outside, even in the conventional text which lacks the additional

---


detail in The D text. Some commentators pass over the entry of the house in verse 27 without comment.

1.2.2 Acts 17:15 (The brethren from Beroea escort Paul to Athens)

Some earlier scholars did not even discuss Acts 17:15 (where the brethren from Beroea escort Paul to Athens) in their commentaries. Many others simply mention the escort (often through a discussion of the rarer meaning of the participle καθιστάνοντες), but otherwise offer no comment on the extravagance of the gesture in terms of the great distance from Beroea to Athens (whether by land or sea), and they also fail to mention the significance in terms of the way that the extravagant ‘sending’ (of Paul) ‘on his way’ (escort) indicates the Beroeans’ great respect for Paul.

Two scholars—Pervo and Wall—hint at the extravagance of the gesture, and Barrett explicitly mentions “the total distance being 222 miles” and “The brothers who were seeing Paul on his way brought him as far as Athens… a considerable journey, whether by land or sea.” But even of these three scholars, none explicitly mention what the extravagance of the escort reveals about the Beroeans’ attitude to Paul, or how this hospitable gesture upon Paul’s departure mirrors their equally positive hospitality upon his arrival (v. 11, where the Beroeans give great reception to both the messenger and the message).

50 The D text’s emphasis ensures that the reader understands that Cornelius’s obeisance would take place in public, enhancing its dramatic quality. This addition is Lukian in style and vocabulary, and it makes some intratextual links to 1:4, 8:30 and 14:15.


54 Pervo (“all the way to Athens”, Acts, p. 422; Wall (“over two hundred miles”), “Acts,” p. 240.

1.2.3 Acts 20:38b; 21:5; 21:16 (Three escorts of Paul as he journeys to Jerusalem)

Three instances of escorted departures for Paul, as he makes his way to Jerusalem, form a series, narrated in relatively quick succession (Acts 20:38b; 21:5; 21:16). Several commentators make no reference at all to the first two of these escorts (Acts 20:38b; 21:5). When the escorts are mentioned, those references are frequently quite minimal with no comment upon their significance or how they characterise the various hosts’ responses to Paul. The third escort (of some of the disciples from Caesarea, to the house of Mnason) usually rates a mention, although sometimes only through a discussion of the textual variant of the Western Text that locates Mnason in a village between Caesarea and Jerusalem.


Jervell detects the intertextual connection of the Miletus farewell with biblical hospitality scenes. Interestingly, these biblical references are to greetings upon arrival, not...
'sending upon their way'; still, hospitality conventions upon departure often reflect hospitality conventions upon arrival. Jervell also suggests that the kissing just prior to the escorted departure (Acts 20:37) is the so-called holy kiss, which is a sign of fellowship in the communities (and one which, I would note, is often associated with hospitality scenes).  

Like many commentators, Jervell notes the internal intertextuality between Acts 20:36-38 to 21:5, but does not explain how the latter farewell ties to the anomalies regarding the Spirit’s revelation in his comments on the previous section (21:4b), Jervell does note that the disciples of Tyre stick with Paul until the end, but he does not mention that one of the most striking features of the 21:4-6 is the fact that this very positive hospitality continues despite the ongoing difference of opinion between Paul and the disciples at Tyre.

Eckey is exceptional among scholars for clearly articulating the broader framing of hospitality that I claim is part of the cultural script of Luke’s “implied reader”—a ‘framing’ of hospitality that extends to include the ritual of escorted farewell. Commenting on the farewell in Acts 20:38b, Eckey writes, “The farewell escort is part of bestowing hospitality.”

1.2.4 Acts 21:18 (James and the Elders do not come and meet Paul)

The commentators are split over the issue whether the “brothers” who “warmly welcomed” Paul and his companions are synonymous with James and the elders and the whole Jewish Christian church in Jerusalem, or that the “brothers” are a different group.
(Mnason and his associates, or Hellenistic Christians) whose warmth of reception is contrasted with the ambiguous reception of James and the elders.\textsuperscript{66} One suspects that the former view (that James and the elders warmly greeted Paul) was influenced perhaps by the idea that Luke was portraying the church as ideistically “of one mind” on all matters, even across the Jewish and Gentile diversity (a view that is not really tenable in view of the degree of internal controversy that Luke shares with his audience: e.g. Acts 6:1; 11:2; 15:2,39; 21:4,12-14).

The commentators who most clearly detect a contrast between the “warm welcome” of the “brothers” and the ambivalent reception of Paul by James and the elders include Witherington, Jervell and Pervo.\textsuperscript{67} Jervell distinguishes the sub-groups helpfully: “brothers” who welcomed warmly (as the banner, lead-story); then James and the elders who have not come out to greet, but presumably had heard of Paul’s coming; then newer converts [“believers”] from Judaism who are Torah-obedient and presumably have not heard of Paul’s arrival.\textsuperscript{68}

There are several reasons why I think Witherington, Jervell and Pervo have the correct interpretation. One reason is because of the roughness of expression that results with the

\textsuperscript{66} Haenchen challenges the idea that the warm welcome was indicative of a general acceptance that Paul received in Jerusalem, pointing out from v. 22 that “this community still knew nothing of Paul’s arrival”, \textit{Acts}, p. 607; Conzelmann points out that the “brethren” may be “Hellenist Christians around Mnason” or perhaps anticipates James and the Elders, but that the latter makes the beginning of verse 15 read very harshly, “but[!] on the following day”, \textit{Acts}, p. 180; similarly Bruce (“awkwardness” if Luke meant James and the elders), \textit{Book}, p. 404, and \textit{Acts}, p. 444; Barrett (who writes, “Luke emphasizes once more (cf. 15.4) that Paul was welcome in Jerusalem: there were no serious differences between him and the Jerusalem Christians, only false rumours (v. 21),” also mentions that Luke might mean that Paul “came first into contact with Hellenistic Jewish Christians,” \textit{Acts}, p. 2:1004-5.

\textsuperscript{67} Witherington (who writes of “the mixed reception Paul gets in the Jerusalem church,” and “we should not connect this warm reception with the meeting that follows and is referred to in the next verse,” \textit{Acts}, p. 631-2, 645-6; Jervell, \textit{Apostelgeschichte}, p. 523; Pervo (who calls Lake and Cadbury’s description of the brethren’s warm welcome as “the unofficial reception” “an excellent euphemism”, and describes the same welcome as “warm but restricted,” drawing attention to the contrast to 15:4 and the implication of 21:22, \textit{Acts}, p. 539.

\textsuperscript{68} Jervell, \textit{Apostelgeschichte}, p. 523.
beginning of verse 15, if we assume that the brethren refers to or anticipates James and the elders.\(^{69}\) The second is the contrast of the way the meeting of James and the elders is narrated as a greeting in contrast to 15:4,\(^{70}\) and the even greater contrast of 21:18 to the rapid series of hospitable actions—all of which feature escort—that leads to this much anticipated arrival (20:36-38; 21:5-6; 21:16). The implications of 21:22 are that the brothers who welcomed in a friendly-manner (whether they be Mnason and his associates or Hellenistic Christians) omitted to tell the more strictly Torah-observant Jewish Christians of Paul’s coming, perhaps in order to avoid conflict.

In this depiction of the “mixed reception” that Paul receives, Luke is not painting a utopian united church, but a reality. Where exactly James and the elders sit—somewhere between those who “warmly welcomed” and those who have not yet heard of Paul’s arrival—is unclear, but they seemed more well informed and concerned about the latter group (21:20b-24). What I believe merits more focused attention is the fact that, in contrast to the many other hospitable escorts in Acts, James and the elders appear not to have come out and met Paul and his companions upon this much-anticipated arrival in Jerusalem.

1.2.5 \textit{Acts 21:35; 23:31-33; 27:1 (Three instances of extravagant Roman escort)}

Again, in relatively quick succession, we have three escorted departures, but this time provided to Paul by agents of the Roman Empire. What I was looking for in the recent scholarship was any sense of the detection of intertextuality between these three instances of “aid from an unlikely source” with other instances of this motif in Acts (\textit{e.g.} Acts 5:34-39; 16:33-34; 18:14-17; 19:35-41). I wondered if scholars would note how, at first, Paul’s rescues were achieved through the intervention of his disciples (Acts 9:25) and other ‘brethren’ (9:30); and what a contrast these Roman ‘rescues’ and escorted departures present, and what the significance of this change of agent could perhaps be. I also won-

\(^{69}\) So too, Conzelmann, \textit{Acts}, p. 180; Bruce, \textit{Book}, p. 404, and \textit{Acts}, p. 444.

\(^{70}\) So too Pervo, \textit{Acts}, p. 539.
dered if any commentators had detected the elements of extravagance in the three Roman escorted departures.

Lake and Cadbury commented upon the use of συνέβη in conjunction with the verb for ‘carry’ or ‘bear’, and spoke about the difficulty of rendering it into English, although they arrive at “he [Paul] was actually carried”. Most commentators agree that συνέβη intensifies the ‘carrying’ in this manner.71

The incident has provoked much historic speculation among the commentators regarding why Paul was carried. Was he incapacitated by the beating that he had received (21:31-32)?72 If so, how did he recover quickly enough to be able to make the speech from the stairs (21:39–22:21)?73 Haenchen thought it was very unlikely that, amidst the violence, the soldiers would take Paul on their “shoulders” — “he is now completely exposed to every stone that is thrown.” Witherington (contra Haenchen) defends the historic plausibility, countering that Paul was not in “some open area”, but in the Court of the Gentiles where there would presumably be no loose stones available for a stoning.75

This historical conjecture (both for this incident and the ‘cavalcade’ in Acts 23:23-24) misses Luke’s point. The ironic depiction of the Empire coming to Paul’s defence with some element of extravagance, creates an almost humorous allusion to Paul being treated as a dignitary—firstly, being “chained” (in the British sense of the word: being borne on human shoulders as were emperors of the day in “triumph”); then being provided an extravagant cavalcade (23:23-24); and lastly being escorted and sailed the thousands of

---

71 Many commentators mention the intensifying function of συνέβη, and some speak about how συμβαίνω was a classical alternative to γίνομαι which had already been used earlier in the sentence with a different meaning (“he came to the steps”). Lake and Cadbury, “Commentary,” p. 273; Haenchen, Acts, p. 617; Bruce, Acts, p. 452; Barrett, Acts, p. 2:1023.
72 Haenchen (“no longer able to climb the stairs himself”), Acts, p. 618; Conzelmann (“no longer able to walk”), Acts, p. 183.
73 Barrett (“if Paul were gravely weakened,] under the pressure of great events sick men have been raised to make powerful speeches”), Acts, p. 2:1018.
74 Haenchen, Acts, p. 618.
kilometres to Rome (27:1–28:16). The irony is that Paul is the emissary of a king, but that the Empire is hardly likely to acknowledge Jesus’ kingship.

Bruce thinks the carrying of Paul is most undignified. “No more dignified a spectacle than when he escaped from Damascus (9:25)” 76 Bruce is astute to pick up the intertextuality with the earlier escape, but the syncrisis is, in fact, an invitation to the reader to contrast the agents of assistance—in the earlier incident it is Paul’s disciples; here, it is Roman soldiers. The visual allusion that Luke paints is far from undignified (or inglorious). The only reference to a person being borne on human shoulders that I can find from the late first (early second) century is to the extravagant emperors (in contrast to the more virtuous and humble emperor Trajan) who incorporated “chairing” into their royal arrival ceremonies. 77

Just as there was much historical critical response to Luke’s depiction of the soldiers carrying of Paul up the steps and Paul’s permission to address the crowd, the description of the cavalcade provided to Paul (Acts 23:23-24) has led to much historical speculation from commentators. The size of the force and the speed with which they covered the distances have both troubled many commentators of a critical bent. 78

---

76 Bruce (“no more glorious an escape…than his being let down in a basket…Paul could add it to his store of memories of situations that kept him humble”), Book, p. 411 and Acts, p. 452.

77 From the writing of Pliny the Younger in praise of the Emperor Trajan, Pliny: Letters and Panegyricus, vol. 2 (Loeb Classical Library; trans. B Radice; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1969); Panegyricus 22.1-5 (“Now…think of the day when you entered your city, so long awaited and so much desired! The very method of your entry won delight and surprise, for your predecessors chose to be borne, or carried in, not satisfied even to be drawn by four white horses in a triumphal carriage, but lifted up on human shoulders (sed umeris hominum) in their overbearing pride.” Éric Perrin-Saminadayar also notes how the more modest emperors (like Augustus and Trajan) were eulogised for foregoing these greater honours (not only more demonstrative, but frequently more expensive), partly because it imposed less of a financial burden upon the populace. Éric Perrin-Saminadayar, “La préparation des entrées royales et impériales dans les cités de l’orient hellénophone, d’Alexandre le grand aux Sèvères.” In Les Entrées Royales et Impériales: Histoire, Représentation et Diffusion d’une Cérémonie Publique de l’Orient Ancien à Byzance, edited by Agnès Bérenger and Éric Perrin-Saminadayar. De l’Archéologie à l’Histoire. (Paris: De Boccard, 2009), pp. 67-90, here pp. 80-81.

mann thought "the display of troops here is sheer fantasy". The number suggested in the conventional text is about 472 men—possibly representing half of the garrison stationed at Fortress Antonia.\footnote{It is possible that the great number of troops troubled the editor of the Western text who appears to have reduced the number somewhat, perhaps to 300. There have been others who have defended the account on historical grounds. Witherington, \textit{Acts}, p. 697; Jervell (who mentions the possibility of an historical defence on the scale of the operation related to the seriousness of desecration in the Temple which was political dynamite and had potential to result in a popular uprising), \textit{Apostelgeschichte}, p. 562, n. 168.}

The historical critical debate again misses Luke's point; Chrysostom, at this point, grasped it completely: Paul was being escorted "like some king whom his body guards escort."\footnote{Chrysostom, \textit{Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles}. Homily 50 on Acts 23:31,32,33 accessed from http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/210150.htm.} Pervo also manages to get beyond the critical concerns to Luke's point of the operation in the text: the rescue of Paul.\footnote{Pervo, \textit{Acts}, p. 583.} Pervo also discerns, from Luke's use of the verb διασῴζω (at 23:43,44; 28:1,4), an intertextual link from this episode to Paul's delivery from dangers at sea, including the shipwreck ("this adventure is a warm-up for chap. 27").\footnote{Pervo, \textit{Acts}, p. 583.} My only additional observation is that in the sea-voyage and shipwreck (27:1–28:10), Paul is again being escorted by an agent of the Roman Empire (the centurion, Julius—Acts 27:1-3 to 28:16, where the text makes the final allusion to "the centurion") who effectively "rescues" Paul at various point of that narrative (27:31-32, 42-43).

The sea voyage and shipwreck has also attracted its fair share of historical skepticism.\footnote{Haenchen ("the author has no real idea of the situation."—Haenchen particularly objects to the absurdity of Paul being able to be heard making any of his speeches in the howling gales and with the pitching of the ship, and in terms of the misinformation regarding the sailors' actions with the lifeboat), \textit{Acts}, pp. 700, 704, 709; similarly Conzelmann ("this scene is completely unreal"), \textit{Acts}, pp. 218, 219.} With such a conspicuously literary scene as this, it is unsurprising that scholars (including even those who are of a more critical bent) have begun to detect Luke's messages in the way that the story is told.\footnote{Bruce ("could draw on a well-established literary tradition"), \textit{Book}, p. 474; Johnson ("appears to be totally defined by the conventions of the genre"), \textit{Acts}, p. 451; Talbert, \textit{Reading}, p. 221; Pervo ("This account is more literary than most of Acts"), \textit{Acts}, p. 647.} What is missing is that no commentator identifies escort as a literary motif in this scene, nor the other two Roman escort (rescue) scenes that pre-
cede it. This is made all the more surprising as the escort of Paul by the centurion (Julius) covers a journey of thousands of kilometres and is punctuated by Julius’s acts of kindness and rescue toward Paul (27:3,31-32,43; 28:16).

1.2.6 Acts 28:15 (Two groups of believers escort Paul’s arrival in Rome)

There are a few commentators who surprisingly make no reference to the extravagance of the escort provided by the Roman brethren, nor discuss the connotation of the word ἀπάντησις with the escorted arrival of dignitaries. As far as I could see, Bruce appears to be the first to take findings which originated in Erik Peterson’s work on ἀπάντησις (which was in relation to its use in 1 Thess 4:17) as “a sort of technical term for the official welcome extended to a newly arrived dignitary by a deputation which went out from the city to greet him and escort him for the rest of his way” and apply it to Acts 28:15 to make the case that there was “thus deep significance in the use of this term to describe the welcome received by Paul from members of the Roman church.” Many other commentators, following Bruce, have noted the allusion to an adventus or royal welcome created by the use of the word ἀπάντησις and the great distances of the escorts to Rome from the Forum of Appius and Three Taverns (43 miles and 33 miles respectively). Most commentators note the two distances, Horace’s unfavourable comments about the innkeepers of the Forum of Appius, and Cicero’s comments about the Three Taverns. And yet not one mentions the fact that Luke gives no indication of the distances, which contrasts with the mention of the distance from Mount Olivet to Jerusalem in Acts 1:12, and perhaps hints at the implied reader’s knowledge of the former, but not the latter.

Sixteen centuries earlier, Chrysostom had grasped Luke’s point clearly—“Like an emperor that has fought a naval battle and overcome, he entered into that most imperial city.

87 Bruce, Book, p. 502, and Acts, p. 536.
(k) He was nearer now to his crown. Rome received him bound, and saw him crowned and proclaimed conqueror."99 Other commentators agree that there is an allusion to royal *adventus*.99 Witherington writes,

Paul is then depicted as some sort of dignitary, whose “epiphany” was seen as an important event, with a reception committee meeting him outside the city and returning with him into it. Though it is probably going too far to see this as an allusion to the Roman triumph here, this verse does suggest the importance of Paul to early Christianity, and that he was seen as something of a celebrity by this time…

I disagree that hearing an allusion to “Roman triumph” or royal *adventus* is “going too far”. I think the allusion makes strong links to the ironic instances of imperial escort provided to Paul by Roman agents (the “chairing” of Paul by the soldiers in Acts 21:35; the cavalcade in 23:23-24, which Chrysostom described in a similar kingly manner to this triumph of 28:15; and the centurion’s obliging escort of Paul for the thousands of kilometres to Rome by sea). I think it also takes seriously Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as king,91 and of Paul, therefore, as his majesty’s messenger—recalling that an emissary in antiquity was accorded the same respect as the person whom he represented.92 However, I do not imagine the depiction of Paul’s *adventus*, as a real “triumph” or ἀπάντησις—but rather, as ironic allusion. For Luke, Paul is the emissary of the true king of the world; but Luke also knows—and is not hiding the fact—that Paul is a prisoner (to which there are references at Acts 27:42, and only a verse after the allusion to *adventus*, *i.e.* in Acts 28:16).

---

Eckey is unique in explicitly making the connection between the reception in 28:15 and hospitality (Gastfreundschaft) extended toward a guest (Gast)—just as he explicated the connection between escort and hospitality, commenting on Acts 20:38.93 He writes, “Auf die Kunde vom Kommen des Paulus brechen alsbald zwei Gruppen stadtrömischer Christen auf und ziehen ihm wie zur feierlichen Einholung eines hohen Gastes entgegen.”94

An understanding of the escorts examined in this survey would be enhanced by a synchronic examination of all the instances of escorted arrival and escorted departure in Acts. This synchronic reading is what I attempt in Part B of this study—a reading which endeavours to hear the interpretation of Luke’s “implied reader” and which is, therefore, conducted in the light of a cultural script appropriate for a late first- (early second-) century Mediterranean reader (auditor).

It would add to our current understanding of Acts to note the use of escort as a Lukyan motif, particularly in Acts. I also believe it would pay a dividend to note, across this synchronic survey of escort in Acts, the transitioning of who is the agent (or host) of the escorts in each instance, as it may reveal something of the transitional—or successional—nature of Acts. This transitional nature—of who assists and receives the active emissaries of Jesus—may make a contribution to current debates in Acts scholarship. Those debates include: how Luke is portraying the Roman Empire and Christians’ place in that Empire; whether Luke is portraying Christianity as an innocuous presence that the Empire need not fear; how Luke is portraying the relationship between the “Twelve” and the later emissaries of Jesus (like Philip and Paul); and, thus, the old question of whether Luke idealises his portrayal of the church as unified and “all of one mind”.

93 Eckey, Apostelgeschichte, p. 479.
94 “On the news of the coming of Paul, two Roman City Christian groups soon came out and met him as if in a festive Adventus (or “triumph” or ἀπάντησις [Einholung])—as if going out to meet (entgegen) a prestigious (“high-level” or “highly-esteemed”) guest.” Eckey, Apostelgeschichte, p. 584.
1.3 Preliminaries II: Literary Methodology and Establishing the Cultural Script

This study’s approach to texts (biblical and extra-biblical ancient texts), in keeping with changes that have occurred in Western exegetical methods in the last forty years, is literary and narrative critical. The approach to texts is primarily synchronic and, as far as possible, oriented to reading whole documents (in contrast to examining pericopes or verses in an isolated or decontextualised manner). This approach will apply both to the construction of a cultural script likely to be possessed by an implied or model reader (in Part A) and in hearing the interpretation of such a reader (possessed of the cultural script) as we turn to Luke and Acts (in Part B).

A narrative approach to texts is sensitive to features such as: structure; character; the narrator’s voice; setting; rhetorical devices such as symbolism, irony, parody and humour; gaps and silences; and intertextuality (the citation of, or allusion to, one text within another).  

A literary approach represents a strong contrast to the historical-critical methodology that has dominated approaches to biblical and other ancient texts for much of the post-enlightenment (modern) period. That is not to say that the vast contributions of historical-critical are ignored; rather, the literary narrative approach is one that deliberately brackets the type of questions that historical-, source-, and redaction-critical lines of enquiry demand, in order to allow an entering into the narrative on its own terms—in its own right.

---


96 “Entering into the narrative on its own terms”, could be the sentiment heard in the language of mind-oriented narratologist, David Herman, who, using the concept of narrative worldmaking, describes interpretation of texts as “imaginative relocation to narrative worlds” (including worlds about which non-fictional accounts make claims); David Herman, James Phelan, Peter J. Rabinowitz, Brian Richardson, and Robyn
Further to a commitment to a literary, synchronic approach to the texts, and in the spirit of entering into the narrative on its own terms, I have employed a methodology that builds on the observations of Vladimir Propp, Robert Alter, Seymour Chatman, Gérard Genette, Mieke Bal and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan. I have also drawn upon the method of codification developed by Robert Funk in his *Poetics of Biblical Narrative* which draws heavily upon the work of Chatman, Genette, Bal and Rimmon-Kenan. The debt for this close-reading and codification approach is by no means owed to Funk alone, for he builds on the observations of Vladimir Propp, Robert Alter, Seymour Chatman, Gérard Genette, Mieke Bal and Shlomith Rimmon-Kenan. Nevertheless, Funk’s unique contribution is to offer a rigorous (if somewhat formal and complicated) methodology that aims to meet modern (scientific) research criteria such as objectivity and ‘reproducibility of results’. Although the methodology tends toward the pedantic and heavy, the end result approaches what one might imagine an original hearer, far more attuned to listening to stories, would have reached by intuitive paths.

I have included, in Appendix 2, a sample of three of the ten close analyses of focus passages which were segmented and encoded in the course of the preparation of this dissertation—one from the OT (1 Sam 25:2-43); one from the Gospel of Luke (Luke 15:11-32) and one from Acts (Acts 10)—in order to demonstrate precisely how the methodology is applied. I have applied this formalist, close-grained methodology—which I have supplemented with some minor modifications of my own (see Appendix-Table 2.1)—to all the texts that I have examined in *Parts A and B*, but it is beyond the scope of this project to show the analysis (segmentation and codification) of more than these three samples. Also included in Appendix 2 is one sample of how this close analysis of the narrative is worked up to a prose reading of the passage 1 Sam 25:2-43 (Appendix 2.1).

---


Over the last two decades, there has been a diverse range of advances in narrative theory. In this time, narratology has advanced in ways different to the more formalist approach I have adopted. I note two things about these developments. Firstly, some of the newer developments are narratological models developed for the study of modern literature, which, as Mikeal C. Parsons notes, “are not always suitable because they are designed for very complex narrative structures.” This is particularly true for those models developed for narratives which are avant-garde, post-modern, non-mimetical or unnatural (such as magical realism). These models may not hold much relevance to the type of analysis that will assist a close reading of Luke and Acts and the other analyses of primary literature in this thesis. Note that much of the theory of the more classical, structuralist and formalist narratology had as a strong component of its origins the analysis of folk stories, which, like biblical narratives, have narrative structures that tend to be simpler than much modern literature.

Secondly, many of the methodological advances in narratology in the last twenty years build upon and acknowledge their debt to classical formalism and structuralism. In *Narrative Theory: Core Concepts and Critical Debates*, David Hermon and a team of collaborators describe four more contemporary rubrics which build upon—and frequently acknowledge their debt to—the classical, formalist and structuralism narratology of Propp, Genette, and Chatman. The four distinct theoretical perspectives are: a rhetorical approach, a mind-oriented approach, a feminist approach and an antimimetic approach (although I note that the feminist approach also takes into account post-
colonial, womanist and queer approaches; and that the discussion of non-mimetical approaches also includes avant-garde, post-modern and unnatural approaches). 

David Herman, a proponent of narratology that explores the nexus of narrative and the mind, argues that “worldmaking is in fact the hallmark of narrative experience, the root function of stories and storytelling that should therefore constitute the starting-point for narrative enquiry and the analytical tools developed into its service.” Of the most contemporary theories of narratology, this mind-oriented model holds potential for engagement with biblical texts because of its acknowledgement of the worldmaking character of narrative.

In *Narrative Theory: Core Concepts and Critical Debates*, Herman and company acknowledge that “the four approaches [rhetorical, feminist, mind-oriented and unnatural]… do not cover the entire field,” and that “there are many theorists doing valuable work that does not fit comfortably under any one of the four rubrics we use to describe our work.” Herman *et al* acknowledge these limitations because they underscore the diversity and vitality of contemporary narrative theory. These later approaches supplement, but certainly do not replace, the earlier classical, formalist and structuralist approaches.

Many have successfully applied the principles of Feminist Narrative rubric to Luke’s writings. However, like queer, womanist, and post-colonial approaches, this is rubric that is alert to particular concerns to read in the light of contemporary understandings of

---

102 Herman *et al.* *Narrative*, p. 12: “accepting responsibility for critiquing narrative manifestations of all categories of oppression based on socially constructed identities.”

103 Herman *et al.* *Narrative*, p. 20.

104 Herman *et al.* *Narrative*, p. 14.


---
how dominant systems often marginalise groups and how this is often supported by ways of interpreting narratives. My reading aims to be more general—a recovery of a reading that an authorial audience plausibly may have made.

Rubrics such as antimimetic narratology—which critiques the dominance of rubrics that assume mimetic narrative to be ubiquitous—hold little relevance to a work such as Luke-Acts that aims at verisimilitude. It would be a misclassification to place Acts alongside *Midnight’s Children* based on those episodes that might strike modern readers as anti-mimetic.106

One feature of the more recent developments in narratology—from rhetorical narratologists, such as James Phelan and Peter J. Rabinowitz107—and mind-oriented narratologists108 has been a theoretical justification for the appropriateness of hypothesising authorial intention—contra the earlier “anti-intentionalism” and the so-called “Intentional Fallacy”—thereby retrieving permission to discuss purpose and apology. This theoretical re-engagement with appropriate speculation about authorial intention holds potential for engagement with New Testament narratives.

1.3.1 On a literary approach to the reader and the cultural script

One methodological consideration is my approach to the ‘reader’, particularly the ‘reader’ of Acts. I have wanted to hear the reading or interpretation of Luke’s “implied” or “model” reader—sometimes called the “ideal” or “intended” reader—that is, a reader who pos-

106 Although the antimimetic narratologists force me to ask what might constitute anti-mimetic elements in Luke-Acts. The supernatural elements? Probably not for the implied reader. What of those acts of imperial extravagance, like the escorted escape provided by the enormous military escort men in Acts 23:23-24 which Conzelmann describes as “sheer fantasy”. There may one day be a fruitful conversation to be had between antimimetic narratologists and those who note that there are parts of Acts that, at least to modern ears, appear to depart radically from verisimilitude. The departures from verisimilitude might include not only those parts of the narrative brought to attention by Rick Strelan [Strange Acts: Studies in the Cultural World of the Acts of the Apostles (Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 126, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2004): p. 1], but also those “over the top” acts of extravagance, like the escort of Acts 23:23-24.

107 Herman et al., Narrative Theory, pp. 3, 5, 6.

108 Herman et al., Narrative Theory, pp. 16, 47, 226-227.
sesses all of the capacities or competencies that Luke presumes of his reader. According to Schmidt, “The term ‘implied reader’… designates the image of the recipient that the author had while writing or, more accurately, the author’s image of the recipient that is fixed and objectified in the text by specific indexical signs. Alternative terms are ‘lecteur virtuel’ and ‘abstrakter Leser.’”

Luke Timothy Johnson writes of the “implied reader” (although he uses the similar terms “intended reader”, or “ideal readers”, or “imagined readers”), “[A] desire for balance accounts for the way literary critics speak of ‘intended reader’, or ‘ideal reader’, or ‘imagined readers’. They do not want to make historical claims about actual readers. But they want to respect the nature of writing as communication, and point to the kinds of characteristics and competencies required to make full sense of the author’s work.”

The “implied reader” is a hypothetical construct. I do not make any appeal to real readers or real reading habits. That is another approach—leading eventually into reception history—for another project. As Luke T. Johnson writes, “As important as reception history is, it cannot be prescriptive for all interpretation.”

One broad competency that I refer to throughout the dissertation is the implied reader’s possession of a “cultural script appropriate for a Mediterranean reader of the late first (early second) century.” The language of “cultural script” derives from semiotician Umberto Eco. Eco also described the cultural script as a “cultural encyclopedia” which is a body of shared knowledge—“the encyclopedia is akin to an immense library whose...

---


books...transmit knowledge by means of cultural conventions that guarantee their communicability and that can be used as a paradigm in the process of signification.”

Like David B. Gowler, I argue that the text’s original cultural context should bear on subsequent interpretations of Acts. Some keys to interpretation of the text are not explicated in the text. Instead, these are found in the cultural script of the day—a body of assumed or conventional knowledge on the part of both the author and the implied reader (Gowler prefers the similar term “intended reader”). I particularly focus on those parts of the cultural script that make sense of the literary conventions surrounding the depiction of escort in the context of hospitality. In the earlier Part of the thesis (Part A), I seek to establish this cultural script through close reading of a range of background literature (see the following section—Preliminary III: “Selection of Background Literature Used to Establish the Cultural Script”).

I have chosen a literary approach, rather than an anthropological one, because I am seeking to find the significance of the meaning of the motif of escort (in the context of hospitality) in the text of Acts itself, not in the (related) practice of hospitality in the first century (in the world “behind the text”). Again, an anthropological study is a valid line of enquiry—for another project.

David B. Gowler also very helpfully explicates the connection between a cultural script and characterisation. Gowler writes,

> Cultural scripts are just as important for evaluating indirect presentation of characters. Actions and speech of characters in a narrative could imply vastly different things, depending on the cultural context. Therefore, a knowledge of these culturally specific scripts is essential for a more informed reading of a narrative. The most important cultural context for the passage at hand [115] is the law of hospitality. [116]

---

115 Gowler is interpreting Luke 11:37-54 as a *chreia*.
Note that it is just after this quotation from his article on “Hospitality and Characterization in Luke 11:37-54” that Gowler and I part methodological ways.\textsuperscript{117} He goes directly to anthropologists to determine an appropriate cultural script; I go to a close literary- (narrative-) analysis of background texts.

Stephen Greenblatt helpfully explicates the connection between a close reading (along the lines of “scrupulous formal analysis”) and the establishing of a cultural script. According to Greenblatt, literary study can be “the servant of cultural understanding.”\textsuperscript{118} Greenblatt continues,

Eventually, a full cultural analysis will need to push beyond the boundaries of the text, to establish links between the text and values, institutions, and practices elsewhere in the culture. But these links cannot be a substitute for close reading. Cultural analysis has much to learn from scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts because those texts are not merely cultural by virtue of reference to the world beyond themselves, they are cultural by virtue of social values and contexts that they themselves successfully absorbed.\textsuperscript{119}

\subsection*{1.3.2 How a close reading of the background texts might change an understanding of the cultural script in relation to hospitality}

In my preliminary reading about hospitality conventions in a late first- (early second-) century Mediterranean cultural script and my own initial close readings of some of the background texts, I began to note some dissonance—between how others summarised the conventions and what a close reading of the background text revealed. I thought that these alleged conventions deserved closer examination. I believed that these points of clarification would have a significant bearing on the interpretation of Acts. These points of clarification pertained to several hospitality conventions as claimed by other writers that I thought were erroneous: that prolonged detention by a host, after the guest asked to depart, was a positive action on part of the host; that “hesitation” upon receiving a guest

\begin{footnotesize}
\end{footnotesize}
was a conventional element of positive hospitality; that the guest in hospitality was always at first a ξένος in the strict sense of a “stranger” unknown to the host.

Susan Niditch, in an exegesis of Judges 19 and 20,120 espouses the idea that prolonging a guest beyond the time when they express the desire to leave, illustrates a “model of hospitality” and “emphasises the hospitality”. Does a close reading of this passage from Judges and other texts support Niditch’s positive view of prolonging the guest’s stay? An initial reading of both Jewish and Graeco-Roman cultures seems to suggest that over-detention was considered a failing on the part of the host. In Homer, for example, it is proverbial that one speeds the departure of the guest when they desire to leave (e.g. Od 1580-81). I will give this question greater attention in Part A.

Steve Reece in his study of hospitality in Homer comes up with thirty-eight elements of a hospitality scene.121 Reece has been criticised for his “somewhat mechanical” analysis of each hospitality scene in the Odyssey in the light of this list—“which, as usual for such abstractions, never occurs in full.”122 I find Reece’s formalist poetics very reminiscent of the “scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts” from which, Greenblatt claims, “cultural analysis has much to learn.”123 Curiously, however, Reece includes among the thirty-eight elements of hospitality “Host hesitates to offer hospitality”. This derives from the occurrence of the “element” in two scenes of the Odyssey. Again, my initial reading suggests that “hesitancy” is actually a threat to (or aberration from) good quality hospitality on part of the host—on the contrary, haste in offering welcome is a hallmark or corollary of good hospitality according to a first century cultural script from both a Jewish and a Graeco-Roman perspective. I will give this question greater attention in Part A.

Julian Pitt-Rivers proposes a model of hospitality that seems to suggest that the guest at the beginning of hospitality scenes is always a ξένος in the strictest sense—a stranger—completely unknown to the host, and dangerous. Is this generalisation true of all hospitality scenes? Are there nuances in the word ξένος? Again my initial reading suggests that in many scenes that are clearly hospitality type-scenes the levels of the visitor’s strangeness (and danger) are variable. In Homer, for example, Telemachus is known by some degree (as the son of Odysseus) by all his hosts in the Telemacheia. I will give this question greater attention in Part A.

As was earlier mentioned in Preliminaries I, many scholars with an interest in ancient hospitality hold a “framing” which includes meals and lodging but neglects (or ‘leaves outside the framing’) escorted arrival and escorted departure. There are some notable exceptions. In Homeric studies, Steve Reece articulated a much wider framing and it is adopted by Andrew E. Arterbury in application to expressions of hospitality in the New Testament.

Essentially, anything that takes place “from the moment a visitor approaches someone’s house until the moment he departs” or even reaches his next destination is considered to be an outgrowth of either hospitality or inhospitality.

In the spirit of Greenblatt’s opinion that “cultural analysis has much to learn from scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts,” each of these details with regard to hospitality will be examined in Part A. This will, I hope establish an accurate and appropriate cultural script in respect to hospitality—and particularly the role of escort in hospitality. This cultural script will then be brought as an interpretive lens to the reading of Acts in Part B.

1.4 Preliminaries III: Selection of Background Literature Used to Establish the Cultural Script

This final ‘Preliminaries’ section aims to detail the criteria for selection of the literature in Part A. To some degree, this reflects what is considered relevant to developing an appropriate cultural script for a Mediterranean reader of Acts in the late first (early second) century; and (for reasons related closely to the first) to some degree, the selection takes its lead from clues within the text about the implied reader and what “capacities or competencies Luke presumes of his reader” and which are “required to make full sense of the author’s work”.

In Part A of this current study this includes: the Septuagint, particularly the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets (including a focus on 2 Samuel 15:13–16:14 and 19:8b–20:3); Tobit; Joseph and Aseneth; Homer’s Odyssey and Josephus’s The Jewish War. The list is by no means exhaustive of the range of literature that could have been used to establish a cultural script; that is because the methodology that is applied to these texts is a close reading—for reasons explicated in the previous section. Too many texts would have made the undertaking unmanageable. In addition, once the cultural script in regard to hospitality has been established, I do briefly refer to a wider corpus of literature to reinforce the extension of this cultural script into the late first (early second) century.

Below is a brief justification of why I have included the literature that I have—usually argued in terms of the “implied reader” or the establishment of a late first- (early second-) century cultural script with particular regard to hospitality and escort. For fuller justification, see the beginnings of each section of Part A for each corpus of literature.

126 Greenblatt’s “scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts,” from which “cultural analysis has much to learn.” Greenblatt, “Culture”, pp. 226-227.

Regarding the inclusion of the Septuagint in the background used in the interpretation of Luke and Acts, there is scholarly consensus. Tyson writes of the implied reader of Luke-Acts, “[The implied reader] is familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures in their Greek translation and acknowledges their authoritative status.” Kurz writes, “The heavy use of biblical Greek [in Luke-Acts] and the frequent, sometimes subtle, allusions to the Greek Bible suggest that the implied readers have a more than superficial familiarity with the Greek scripture that enables them to recognize biblical allusions without direct quotations or explicit references.” Fitzmyer dedicates a chapter of his Acts commentary’s introduction to the “Use of the Old Testament in Acts” with an extensive bibliography.

*Tobit*, which was probably written between 200 and 180 BCE, was included in the Septuagint, and includes a very high frequency of references to escort in the central travel section of the work—twenty-four in total. It therefore makes a valuable contribution to the establishment of the cultural script with regard to both hospitality and escort.

*Joseph and Aseneth (JosAs)* is a work from the Pseudepigrapha which most likely comes from a Jewish milieu similar to that from which early Christians were drawn. Therefore, JosAs stands to make an important contribution to the cultural script for the implied reader of Acts. Further JosAs makes several references to escorted arrivals in terms of hospitality, but most importantly it explicates a connection between failure to escort and envy. Christoph Burchard writes, “It is an established rule today to look to


Diaspora Judaism first when it comes to explaining the origin and growth of Christianity in the Greek-speaking world. It is natural enough to extend that look to include JosAs.”¹³²

The significance of Homer in establishing a late first- (early second-) century cultural script is argued more fully at the beginning of Chapter 3. However, to quote Loveday Alexander, “The papyri make it abundantly clear that Homer was the most widely-read Greek text in antiquity, outstripping all other literary texts by a considerable margin; actively taught in schools from the elementary level upwards, actively edited, imitated, and quoted, Homer underpins the cultural and educational system of the Greek East. This is an essential and important point for understanding the cultural worlds of the first century, and it gives a strongly persuasive force to the insistence that we must reckon with the stories of Homer as part of the cultural script of the New Testament writers and their first readers.”¹³⁴

Dennis R. MacDonald has written extensively on his theory that New Testament writers, including Luke, imitate Homer to the point of claiming literary dependence. While not necessarily taking the connection between Luke-Acts and Homer to the point of literary dependence, I think the fact that someone can make that case to the academy so comprehensively lends great support to Alexander’s comment about Homer as part of the cultural script. It adds strength to Alexander’s comment that commentators like J. B. Tyson¹³⁵ conclude that the “implied reader” of Luke-Acts is “generally a well-educated person….” What makes Homer greatly relevant to that part of the cultural script with reference to hospitality is the occurrence of twelve major hospitality scenes—as Steve Reece suggests, “…the Odyssey may be regarded as a sequence of hospitality scenes.”¹³⁶ Also

¹³³ As my Table 3.1 demonstrates there is one Homer papyrus dating from the first and second century for every papyrus of the same period for the twenty-one next most well-preserved writers.
¹³⁶ Reece: The Stranger’s Welcome, p. 191.
relevant is Ladislaus J. Bolchazy’s theory that makes the case that Homer was writing to inculcate hospitality among the inhospitable Greeks.137

J. B. Tyson says of the “implied reader” of Luke-Acts that they are “knowledgeable about public affairs...” In order to establish a cultural script with regard to first-century public affairs, I have used Josephus’s *The Jewish War* as background. As with MacDonald’s theories—which contend that Homer was a major source for Acts—some hypothesise that the strength of connection between Josephus and Luke-Acts suggests dependence—that Josephus’s writings were a source for Luke.138 While not suggesting that the strength of the connection necessarily goes as far as literary dependence, the fact that some have made this case before the academy suggests the appropriateness of using Josephus to consolidate the cultural script for the “implied reader”. Further justification for using Josephus as part of the literary background is included at the beginning of Section 4.1.

There is one further important justification for including both the focus on 2 Samuel 2:15:13–16:14 and 19:8b–20:3 and Josephus’s accounts of royal welcomes in *The Jewish War*. In Acts, when looking at hospitality scenes where the reception of Jesus’ emissaries is in view, it must be recalled that one of Luke’s portrayals of Jesus is as a king—the Davidic Messiah.139 Consequently, in interpreting the reception of both Jesus (for instance in Luke 19:28–44—Jesus’ Entry of Jerusalem) and his emissaries (for instance Paul between his entry of Jerusalem at 21:17 and his entry at Rome at 28:15-16), it is appropriate to consider, not just hospitality and the conventions of escort as part of the relevant cultural script, but also to consider what the cultural script says about the welcome and escort of kings. To be clear, I am not saying that Acts portrays Paul as a king. However, as a king’s emissary (‘King Jesus’ messenger’), the cultural script states clearly that the reception shown to Paul should reflect the same reception that would be given to the king who sent him.

---

137 Bolchazy, *Hospitality in Antiquity*, p. 3.
138 The theory that Luke used Josephus is not new, but has been long out of favour—Pervo (*Acts*, p. 12) is a contemporary reviver of the theory.
Luke’s portrayal of Jesus, not only as Messiah, but also as a *suffering* Messiah, has often led to a search of Israel’s scriptures for a precedent. Of course, the suffering servant of Isaiah 53 suggests itself, but some, including Morna D. Hooker and Joshua W. Jipp, have disputed its influence on the NT and Luke-Acts.\(^{140}\)

Jipp argues, “that Luke’s scriptural suffering Messiah is primarily indebted to the Psalms.” Jipp demonstrates how the Psalms (Pss 2; 22; 31; 69; 109; 118; and 146) are used by Luke as “foreshadowing the suffering and death of the Messiah and/or the persecution of the early Christians” and claims that “too often the psalms’ depiction of a suffering king has been ignored or subordinated to the Isaianic Servant by interpreters of Luke.”\(^{141}\)

I would like to suggest that, in addition to the Psalms, 1 and 2 Samuel are also ignored scriptural precedents that present prolonged narratives of the suffering Messiah—David. For much of 1 Samuel, David is in exile—after his anointing in 1 Sam 16:13, he is on-the-run from Saul (in 1 Sam 18:9–31:13). For a sizeable section of 2 Samuel, David, again, is an exiled and persecuted Messiah—during the *coup d’état* staged by his son Absalom (2 Sam 15:13–20:26). What makes the latter section particularly relevant to a reading that focused upon escorted departures and escorted arrivals as a way to express hospitality, is that in these narratives the escort of the king, both in his departure (2 Sam 15:13–16:15) and in his coming (2 Sam 19:8b–19:40), is prominent in the narrative and is used to characterise the potential loyal supporters of the king.

The part of the cultural script that provides a knowledge of the conventions of royal welcomes (as in 2 Sam 19:8b–19:40; *Jewish War* 7.21-22, 63-75; 7.100-111; 7.119-122) is relevant to the reading of the welcome and escort of the emissaries of Jesus in Acts because Jesus is portrayed by Luke as a king. Additionally, the collective memory of royal welcomes proves particularly resistant to the phenomenon of having their “beginnings”—the

---


conventions of going out to meet (often a great distance) and escorted arrivals—ignored or forgotten. As Eric Perrin-Saminadayar notes, the ἀπάντησις (the going out to meet and escorted arrival) was well described in the epigraphy and historiography, as it was the more public and spectacular part of the royal welcome.\textsuperscript{142}

In contrast to humbler—non-royal—welcomes, and the vast majority of biblical scholarship on hospitality, it was the ἀποδοχή—all that constituted ‘the stay’—the food and lodgings—that was not so well represented in the epigraphy and historiography of royal welcomes; in fact as Perrin-Saminadayar, in speaking of the period from 356 BCE to 235 CE notes,

Once the sovereign was in the walls, accommodation and meals had to be provided for him and his retinue, and he had to be shown all the attention he believed he deserved; that is to say that in addition to the Apantesis, when the city was present in front of the sovereign and greeted him, there was—and it was the most important moment—the apodochē, all that constituted ‘the stay’ strictly within the city. We remember that Polybius clearly distinguished the two; Plutarch also reports that when Athens received Demetrius Poliorcetes, a succession of decrees were passed to regulate various aspects of his stay, including the housekeeping issues…Unfortunately, to date, epigraphy has preserved no decree regulating the apodochē or hypodochē of a sovereign in a Hellenistic city.\textsuperscript{143}

1.4.1 \textit{On the sources of ancient texts}


\textsuperscript{143} Which is my translation of Perrin-Saminadayar’s original: “Une fois le souverain dans les murs, il fallait l’occuper, le loger et le nourrir, lui et sa suite, et lui témoigner toute l’attention qu’il estimait mériter ; c’est-à-dire qu’à côté de l’apantèsis, le moment où la cité se portait au devant du souverain et l’accueillait, il y avait – et c’était le moment le plus important – l’apodochē, tout ce qui constituait le séjour à proprement parler dans la cité. On se souvient que Polybe distinguait nettement les deux ; Plutarque signale aussi, que quand Athènes reçut Démétrios Poliorcète, une succession de décrets furent votés pour régler différents aspects de ses séjours, notamment les questions d’intendance… Malheureusement, jusqu’ici l’épigraphie ne nous a conservé aucun décret régissant l’apodochē ou l’hypodochē d’un souverain dans une cité hellénistique.”
Standard Version (NRSV)—except in cases where I use my own translation into English. For the more lexicographical enquiry I refer to all of the extant manuscripts as usefully arranged by Reuben Swanson (especially important for the compilation of Appendix 3). Because of its significance as a distinct variant text in the Book of Acts, I pay particular attention to the Bezae Codex (D).

For the Pentateuch and Former Prophets, I primarily use the Greek Septuaginta edited by Alfred Rahlfs, or my own English translation of Rahlfs' Greek edition. I have also used the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS), which is based on Rahlfs in the Former Prophets and upon the critical Göttingen editions in the Pentateuch. In translating proper nouns from the Septuagint, I have substituted the names used in the NRSV, for the pragmatic reason that the transliterated names based on the LXX are often unrecognisable, even to readers with a great degree of familiarity with the OT. Similarly I refer to the more recognisable names of biblical books ('1 Samuel') rather than the LXX titles ('1 Reigns'). For the lexicographical work I have also consulted the MT (especially for the production of Appendix 1).

For Tobit I have used the text known as GII, which is available in English through NETS and the NRSV. To approximate the Greek of GII I have used the Greek of the Codex Sinaiticus as it is available online. Hanhart's critical edition also contains GII at the bottom of the page with an apparatus.


145 Albert Pietersma and Benjamin G. Wright, A New English Translation of the Septuagint: And the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).


For *Joseph and Aseneth* I use the most recent edition of the Greek text (by Christoph Burchard, Carsten Burfeind, and Uta Barbara Fink);¹⁴⁹ and I use the Charlesworth Pseudepigrapha edition (a translation by Christoph Burchard) for a reading of the English text.¹⁵⁰

For a source of quotation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in English I use Robert Fagles’ recent translations, unless I state that it is my “own translation.”¹⁵¹ For a source of quotation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* in Greek I use The Loeb Classical Library editions.¹⁵² For a source of quotation of *The Homeric Hymns* in Greek or English I use Apostolos Athanassakis’s *The Homeric Hymns*.¹⁵³

For Josephus’ *Jewish War* I have used H. St. J. Thackeray’s Loeb edition for both English and Greek,¹⁵⁴ supported by a reading of G. A. Williamson’s English translation.

---


Part A

Establishing a Cultural Script: Background of the Lukan Motif of Escorted Arrival and Escorted Departure—Jewish, Greek and Roman contexts
CHAPTER 2


In this chapter, we explore the Jewish milieu that forms part of the context in which Luke writes. This exploration will enable the commencement of the establishment of a cultural script which will be applied to the interpretation of Luke and Acts in Part B of this study. In this chapter we consider the role that Jewish literature plays in establishing a cultural script, particularly in regard to hospitality and more specifically, in regard to escort in the context of hospitality. Included in the parameters of this study are the following: the Pentateuch and Former Prophets from the LXX (Sections 2.1 and 2.2); the Book of Tobit also from the LXX (Section 2.3); and Joseph and Aseneth from the Pseudepigrapha (2.4). Throughout, we will pay particular attention to what Luke’s implied (model) reader would bring in terms of the cultural script established by this Jewish literature, and thereby bring to their reading of Luke and Acts, particularly in regard to their understanding of meeting, escort and welcome in the ‘hospitality’ scenes.

2.1 Meeting, Escort and Welcome in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (LXX)

Section 2.1 contains a survey of the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets with particularly regard to meeting, escort and welcome in the ‘hospitality’ scenes. An extensive survey of the 64 narrative episodes that feature ‘meeting’ from the Pentateuch and Former Prophets are tabulated in Appendix 1. From this survey, I propose a classification of those scenes.
into eleven 'scene-types'. (Section 2.2 contains 'close' readings of three focus texts from the Old Testament—texts in which meeting, escort and welcome are particularly prominent features).

### 2.1.1 The influence of the LXX on Luke and Acts

The influence of the Old Testament upon the composition of Luke and Acts is patent.\(^1\) The Septuagint (LXX) in particular has influenced Luke's composition, not only in terms of the themes, styles and motifs that he employed but also in terms of vocabulary and phraseology.\(^2\) This influence is seen not only in direct quotations and direct references (without quotation), but also in simple allusions. The allusions range in their level of conspicuousness. Some allusions seem easily identified—others are more subtle to the degree that one wonders whether they are deliberate or result automatically from Luke's deep familiarity with the LXX.

It is patent that Luke assumes that his intended reader is familiar with many books of the Septuagint including those in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. Many of Luke's frequent references to the Old Testament would be futile unless the reader had familiarity with the background context of the references. This is most conspicuously the case in the Infancy Narratives of Luke's Gospel (Luke 1:5–2:52) where the readers' understanding is optimal only when they are familiar with the 'parallel' stories of Sarah, Abraham, Rebecca, Manoah, Samson's mother and Hannah from the Pentateuch and Former Prophets.

Luke also demonstrates that the Pentateuch and Former Prophets form an important part of his literary context in the way that he refers to the Old Testament. Although in one place Luke gives evidence that he held a tri-partite 'structure' of the Old Testament (when

---


\(^2\) Pervo also discusses the LXX as inspiration of various episodes in terms of model and for style. Pervo, *Acts*, pp. 7-8.
he refers to “the law of Moses, the prophets and the psalms” in Luke 24:44), by far his more common way of referring to the Old Testament (in six other instances in Luke and Acts) is as “Moses and the Prophets”.3 This section (2.1) focuses upon the ‘law of Moses’ (the Torah or Pentateuch) and the ‘Former Prophets’, which in English Bibles comprises Joshua, Judges, (not Ruth,) 1 and 2 Samuel and 1 and 2 Kings.4 These two sections of scripture (Pentateuch and Former Prophets) are arguably the sections of the LXX that are the most narrative in character.

2.1.2 Methodology for broad examination of Pentateuch and Former Prophets (LXX)

In its approach to the LXX as part of our establishment of a cultural script, this study adopts a narrative critical approach to the texts. This approach assumes that reading whole documents is presumed on the part of the implied reader. Therefore, within the LXX, each of the two sections, Pentateuch and Former Prophets, is to be read as a whole. Moreover, the two sections are read in the light of each other, allowing for a measure of intertextuality between them. (A comparison of Genesis 19 and Judges 19 will amply justify such a procedure.5

4 The ‘Former Prophets’ are often now referred to as ‘Deuteronomistic History’ but because of this study’s primarily synchronic approach it is more appropriate here to refer to ‘Former Prophets’, which has less connotation of interest in compositional history. I have decided to break with tradition in studies of the Septuagint and refer to 1–4 Reigns (or Kingdoms) by their more familiar names: 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings.
2.1.3 An exposition and classification of escorted arrival and phraseology (‘come out to meet’) in the LXX according to narrative function

The phrase ‘come out to meet’ in the LXX nearly always involves the usage of the Greek nouns, ἀπάντησις, or its synonyms συνάντησις—rarely, ὑπάντησις, is used. Εἰς ἀπάντησιν and εἰς συνάντησιν are translations of the Hebrew, לָקַר (lqraʿ, as in wattēṣēʾ lqraʿ, “and she went out to meet”). In the Pentateuch and Former Prophets this correspondence is almost perfect. These nouns are usually preceded by the preposition εἰς, and, in conjunction, the preposition and the noun function like the English infinitive ‘to meet’. Sometimes these nouns’ verbal equivalents—ἀπαντάω, συναντάω, and ὑπαντάω—are used to describe ‘meetings’.

The infinitive-like nouns and verbs that mean ‘meet’ are associated with several interrelated motifs in the LXX. There are 64 narrative episodes in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets which feature ‘meeting’. In order to structure the discussion of the large number of narratives that contain these motifs, I have classified them into four narrative categories (See Appendix 1):

A. simple positive—where the general motif of meeting (particularly ‘coming out to meet’) is in the straightforward context of hospitality, reconciling, honouring or healing;

B. simple hostile—where the general motif of meeting (particularly ‘coming out to meet’) is in the context of war, aggression or rebuke;

C. complex—where things are not really as positive as they first appear because a character has a motive, which is hidden from the other characters in the narrative but revealed to the reader by the narrator; or where there is a deliberate deception by the central character of other characters in the narrative; or where there is an failure of a character to provide escorted arrival (in the positive context) where the reader is led to anticipate a positive reception; and,
D. diagnostic—where the party ‘coming out to meet’ are seeking to determine their prospects for peace, prosperity or health by making some enquiry of the one they are ‘going out to meet’.

Beyond this broad division there is a further breakdown into more detailed categories. This results in the following classification:

A. Simple positive uses of meeting (particularly ‘coming out to meet’)
   A1. Openly welcoming hospitality extended to strangers;
       e.g. And having seen them, [Abraham] ran to meet [the three men]. (Gen 18:2)
   A2. Expressions of solidarity including reconciliations and reunions;
       e.g. And Esau ran to meet [Jacob] (his estranged brother). (Gen 33:4)
   A3. Adventus: greeting warriors after their victory;
       e.g. And there came out women dancing to meet David out of all the cities of Israel, with timbrels, and with rejoicing, and with cymbals. (1 Sam 18:6)
   A4. Healing encounters (often greeting a renowned ‘man of God’ because of the need to seek physical healing);
       e.g. Take in your hand a present and go to meet the man of God. (2 Kgs 8:8)

B. Simple hostile uses of meeting (particularly ‘coming out to meet’)
   B1. Openly hostile warfare and aggression;
       e.g. And the Allophile/Philistine [Goliath] arose and went to meet David. (1 Sam 17:48)
   B2. Rebuke or cursing;
       e.g. Then the Lord said to Elijah the Tishbite, saying: Arise and go down to meet King Ahab of Israel who is in Samaria. (2 Kgs 20:17,18)

C. Complex uses of ‘coming out to meet’
   C1. Ironic uses of ‘coming out to meet’ involving manipulation, often motivated by greed for gain;
       e.g. Laban ran out to the man, at the spring. It happened that he had seen the earrings and the bracelets on his sister’s hands. (Gen 24:30)
   C2. Ironic (including ‘parodic’) uses of ‘coming out to meet’ involving outright deceit where things are not what they appear;
       e.g. And Jael went out to meet Sisera. (Judg 4:18)
   C3. Failure or omission to provided escorted arrival (in its hospitable, reconciliatory and honouring ways, i.e., failure to provide A1, A2, or A3).
       e.g. Because they did not meet you with food and water on the way when you went out of Egypt. (Deut 23:4)

D. ‘Diagnostic’ uses of ‘coming out to meet’
D1. Where, after initial ambiguity and question, the narrative resolves the issue in an irenic manner (to A2); 

*e.g.* [Jehu] found Jehonadab on the way to meet him. And Jehu blessed him and said to him, “Is your heart right with my heart as my heart is with your heart?”…And he gave him his hand, and he brought him up to him on the chariot. (2 Kgs 10:15)

D2. Where, after initial ambiguity and question, the narrative turns toward an account of hostility, aggression and warfare (to B1 or B2); 

*e.g.* King Joram… went out to meet Jehu… Joram said “Is it peace, Jehu?” And Jehu said, “What peace? The whoresoms of Jezebel your mother and her sorceries are still many.” (2 Kgs 9:21,22)

In the rest of this chapter I review each category of the motifs in the order of this list (although I omit any further discussion of D1 and D2 as they are relatively rare and resolve by the episodes’ endings into either A2 or B1/B2). I describe the category and point to examples in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (from the LXX). I then briefly suggest how the LXX contributes to the cultural script that might be assumed of an implied (model) reader of Luke and Acts—particularly in regard to their understanding of the significance of meeting, escort and welcome. I briefly mention sections in Luke and Acts where the motifs of meeting, escort and welcome and might be detected (I offer the more detailed ‘reading’ of these Lukan sections in Part B of the dissertation—Chapters 5 and 6).

2.1.3.1 A1. Openly welcoming hospitality extended to strangers

The archetype for this category is ‘When Abraham Welcomes Three Strangers’ (Gen 18:1-16). It is ‘archetypal’ in that there is a rich intertextuality between this ‘uninterrupted’ and full example and many other narratives, for instance: ‘When Lot Welcomed Two Strangers’ (Gen 19:1-3); ‘When Jael Went out to Meet Sisera’ (Judg 4:17-22); and ‘When Saul Consulted a Medium of Endor’ (1 Sam 28:3-25).

---

6 Andrew E. Arterbury, “The Breaking of the Betrothal Bonds: Hospitality in John 4”, *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2010): p. 63-83. Arterbury suggests that ‘betrothal scenes’ should not be considered a separate category (‘type-scene’) from general hospitality narratives. I agree with many of Arterbury’s findings and his application of them to NT episodes such as ‘The Samaritan Woman’ in the Fourth Gospel. For different reasons however I have classified the two betrothal episodes found in Genesis in one of the category of ‘corrupted hospitality’ motif (C1) on account of the way that all is not as it first appears to be in these narratives, particularly because of the narrator’s portrayal of the character Laban. These two episodes are: ‘Abraham’s Servant, Rebekah, Laban and Isaac’ (Gen 24:1-67); ‘Jacob, Rachel and Laban’ (Gen 29:1-20)—note esp. Gen 24:29-31,51.
In this ‘uninterrupted’ and full example with Abraham (Gen 18:1-16), we observe many of the motifs of hospitality: escorted arrival (‘And when [Abraham] saw them, he ran forward from his tent to meet them”—Gen 18:2); haste; good detention; provision that exceeds promises; extravagance; a calf (‘tender and good’); milk; standing; polite after-dinner enquiry and exchanges of ‘news’ (announcement); and, escorted departure (“and Abraham was going along with them as he joined in escorting them”—Gen 18:16). Note how in this archetypal scene escort plays an important role at the beginning and end of the ‘visitation’ (or ‘reception’) scene.

At the beginning, Abraham ‘goes out to meet’—indeed, ‘runs out to meet’—προσέδραμεν εἰς συνάντησιν —his guests; and at the conclusion he escorts their departure—‘sending them on their way’; that is travelling with them for some part of their onward journey. The latter is so important that the LXX effectively describes it twice with two verbs—συμπορεύομαι and συμπροπέμπω (Αβρααμ δὲ συνεπορεύετο μετ᾽ αὐτῶν συμπροπέμπων αὐτοὺς).

From the perspective of narratology, this archetypal episode is straightforward. The motif serves as an indicator of Abraham’s honour, goodwill and generosity toward his guests. And as such it finds resonance in the hospitality episodes: ‘When Lot Welcomed Two Strangers’ (although that episode is seriously ‘interrupted’—sabotaged—by the men of Sodom;’ and ‘When Jethro Welcomed Moses’ (Exod 2:15b-22). Another related but ‘interrupted’ episode is ‘When the Ephraimite in Gibeah Welcomed the Levite and His Concubine’ (Judg 19:16-22a) that is also seriously ‘interrupted’ by the Benjaminites and leads to the rape and death of the concubine (and ultimately civil war). The episode ‘When Saul
Consulted the Medium of Endor’ also has a striking (though difficult to explain) resemblance to Abraham’s archetypal hospitality.  

This first category of motif evoked by the phrase ‘come out to meet’—welcoming hospitality—is one that undeniably finds resonance in the Lukan narratives. The ‘Infancy Narratives’ (Luke 1:5–2:52) are particularly rich in allusion to people ‘coming out to meet’ in the context of announcement of births, e.g. the angelic visitations and the visitation of Mary to Elizabeth—episodes often characterised by the haste or eagerness with which characters greet one another and the Christ child. As we shall see in Part B, the set of vocabulary associated in Gen 18:1-16 with escort and meeting—τρέχω, συνάντησις, συμπορεύομαι, προπέμπω—will have strong associations for the implied reader when they come to the same set of vocabulary in Luke and Acts.

2.1.3.2 A2. Expressions of solidarity including reconciliations and reunions

This category is similar to category A1, but its distinctive feature is the depiction of a reunion and sometimes reconciliation between the host and the guest. Examples include: ‘When Abimelech and Isaac Reconciled’ (Gen 26:26-33); ‘When Esau and Jacob Were Reunited and Reconciled’ (Gen 32:1-33:12—which is ‘interrupted’ or sabotaged in vv. 13-17); ‘When Jacob and Joseph Were Reunited’ (Gen 46:28-31); ‘When Moses and Aaron Were Reunited’ (Exod 4:14,27-8); ‘When Moses and Jethro Were Reunited’ (Exod 18:1-12); ‘When Saul Attempted to Find Peace with Samuel’ (1 Sam 13:10; 15:12); and ‘When Abigail Met David’—the focus text for Section 2.1.1 (1 Sam 25:2-42).

There are also two extended narrative episodes about David during and after the coup d’état of Absalom in which people demonstrate their solidarity with and loyalty to David by ‘going out to meet’ him, their escorting of him, providing safe conveyance, supplying provisions and seeing him on his way. These extended narratives, ‘When David fled Je-

---

8 In folktales, witches often use the pretence of hospitality to lure victims, but this character (a medium) seems genuinely to want Saul to revive. She wants to ‘send him on his way’—perhaps pragmatically, in order not to draw attention to herself. As she earlier reveals (1 Sam 28: 9, 21) the king has put her in a vulnerable position.
rusalem’ and ‘When David returned to Jerusalem’ are the focus texts for Sections 2.1.2 and 2.1.3, respectively. Together with ‘When Abigail Met David’ (2.1.1) these three focus texts allow us the opportunity to analyse closely three extended narratives with a degree of methodological rigour (using Robert Funk’s method for analysis narrative surface features and poetics as set out in his Poetics of Biblical Narrative).

In narratives belonging to this category—meeting in the context of reconciliations and reunions—accompaniment is evidence of good will. This understanding of the conventions pertaining to escort forms an important part of the cultural script that an implied (model) reader would bring to a reading of Luke and Acts. It will be re-called as they read episodes such as the parable of “The Father with Two Sons” (Luke 15:11-32). Kenneth Bailey identifies “fifty-one point of comparison and contrast” between the reconciliation of Esau and Jacob and this parable.9

2.1.3.3  A3. Adventus: greeting warriors after their victory

This category is similar to category A1, but its distinctive feature is that the ‘arriving guest’ is usually a military ‘victor’ (the king or a general) and the ‘hosts’ are jubilant citizens of the town who ‘come out to meet’ the ‘victor’ in an action of celebration. All the Davidic narratives from 2 Sam 19:15-40 (‘When David Returned to Jerusalem’, which I have already discussed under the previous category ‘Reconciliations and reunions’) could equally fit the category ‘adventus’. Chiefly this is because, those narratives follow directly after the defeat of Absalom’s army (Israel’s army) by David’s army. So as well as having elements of reconciliation there is also the element of the welcome of the king returning from the victorious defeat of his enemy (which demonstrates that the classifications are not necessarily mutually exclusive).

---

9 Kenneth E. Bailey, Jacob & the Prodigal: How Jesus Retold Israel’s Story (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003), 14, 216-218. The parallels between the two episodes that came to Bailey’s attention were the common elements: running to meet, embracing and kissing—see Section 5.3.1. Unlike Bailey’s earlier work which was criticised because of the assumptions that Twentieth Century Bedouin culture was culturally close enough to First Century Palestinian culture to allow the reconstruction of a cultural script for reading the parables, Jacob & the Prodigal relies on a very different methodology—an intertextual study.
Other adventus episodes include: ‘When the Kings Came out to Meet Abram after His Victory over Chedorlaomer’ (Gen 14:17) and its Davidic parallel, ‘When the Weary Came out to Meet David after His Defeat of the Amalekites’ (1 Sam 30 esp. v. 21)—both these narratives have strong post-exilic themes—Abram and David bring captives back from exile. The ‘celebration’ after the crossing of the Red Sea, particularly Miriam’s song (Exod 15:20–21) has many elements of adventus—women, musical instruments and dancing. Likewise the reception of David after the defeat of Goliath (“When the women came out of all the towns of Israel, singing and dancing, to meet David”—1 Sam 18:6 LXX) has women, musical instruments and dancing.

An implied reader, who possesses a cultural script as reflected in a reading of the LXX, will bring to Luke and Acts an understanding of the convention of adventus as portrayed in the various homecomings of David (both post-Goliath and post-Absalom), but Luke’s allusion to adventus is complicated by the fact that these biblical precedents are not the only images of adventus in his day. The biblical images of adventus are in a sense ‘competing’ with the image offered by Roman imperial culture, e.g. Titus and Vespasian’s grand adventus rituals as described by Josephus and other contemporaries (see Chapter 4). The implied reader of Luke and Acts will have a cultural script influenced by both the biblical and the Roman imperial images of adventus particularly in three episodes: ‘Jesus’ Entry of Jerusalem’ (Luke 19:28-48), ‘Paul’s Final Entry into Jerusalem’ (Acts 21:17-18) and

10 The celebration after the crossing of the Red Sea lacks of course one central element of adventus: strictly speaking, no one ‘comes out to meet’ the victorious returning party, because all involved in the celebration have been part of the defeat, which in any case is ascribed to the Lord, and not to any king or army. In terms of someone ‘coming out to greet’ victorious Israel, that element is deferred until the reception that other nations will (or won’t!) provide, for instance, Numbers 20:14-21; 21:21-32; 22:1–24:25; Deut 23:4-8. See also section C2, below.

11 This is one of the few instances where my choice to follow primarily the LXX in preference to the MT makes a substantial difference; in the MT the women are said to greet King Saul; the LXX has them greeting David. Either way the couplet that they sing (in both textual traditions) honours David more highly than Saul. The LXX greeting of David has the effect of moving this subterfuge forward a verse and intensifying it.

12 See Josephus’ The Jewish War (VII.80-86, Rome greets Vespasian; 116-118, Antioch greets Titus; and 130-136, Rome greets Titus) and Cicero’s Letter to Atticus (Att 8.16.2 and 16.16.16). See also from (Life of Flavius 17) where the multitudes of Tiberias go out to meet Josephus and escort him into Tiberias because of the danger from Josephus’s nemesis, John. See Sections 3.3.1-4.
2.1.3.4 A4. Healing encounters: most commonly, greeting a renowned ‘man of God’ because of a need to seek physical healing

This category of narratives featuring ‘meeting’ in the context of healing (or life-restoring) encounters is found mainly in 1 and 2 Kings. These narratives include: ‘When the Widow of Zarephath Met Elijah’ (1 Kings 17:8-24—“arise and go... behold, I have commanded a widow to feed you”); ‘When Elisha Ran to Meet the Shunammite Woman Whose Son Had Died’ (2 Kings 4:26-31—“run at once to meet her and say”); the extended narrative involving ‘Elisha, Naaman and Gehazi’ (2 Kings 5:1-27—in which Naaman comes a long way to seek healing; later he jumps down from his chariot to meet the scheming Gehazi who wrongly seeks remuneration for Naaman’s healing, 5:21).

Two of these narratives are directly referred to in Luke’s Gospel—the widow from Zarephath and Naaman are mentioned in Jesus’ Nazareth Sermon (Luke 4:16-30, esp. 25-27)—another piece of evidence that Luke anticipates familiarity with the LXX in his readers. Luke continues with a strong allusion to this type of motif throughout the Gospel as people with desperate needs seek out Jesus, a renowned ‘man of God’ with a reputation for his ability to heal. In Section 5.4.1, I hear the implied reader’s reading of five narratives about the escort of others to Jesus and I note subtle ways in which Luke emphasises the motif of escort in these narratives.

2.1.3.5 B1. Openly hostile warfare and aggression

A common meaning for the metaphor of the phrase ‘come out to meet’ is ‘come out to meet in war’ or ‘come out with the intention to kill.’ This is the meaning of the phrase about 37 times in the narrative sections of the OT on which I focus—9 times in the Pentateuch, mainly in narrative set during the period of ‘wandering in the wilderness’, and

---

13 I also make the case that a implied reader would note the lack of adventus in one other place where one would be strongly ‘anticipated’—Luke 19:15, when the nobleman returns having received royal authority (see Section 5.5.1.5).
28 times in the Former Prophets—e.g. “And the Allophile/Philistine [Goliath] arose and went to meet David” (1 Sam 17:48).

Although the use of the phrase ‘come out to meet’ in the context of war and violence is such a strong contrast to the other uses of the phrase (hospitable, reconciliatory, honouring), the identical wording allows for an interplay between the war-conveying and peace-conveying meanings. For instance when Esau is first mentioned as ‘coming to meet’ Jacob, the ambiguity of the phrase is employed very deliberately. (“‘We came to your brother Esau, and behold he is coming to meet you, and four hundred men are with him’. And Jacob was greatly afraid and was perplexed.’—Gen 32:6b-7). This ambiguity is also exploited when there is enquiry about whether the visitor comes in peace or not (1 Sam 16:4, 21:2; 2 Kings 9:17-18,22; 10:15; 23:29)—categories that I dubbed D1 and D2.

Luke is not unfamiliar with the war-conveying use of the phrase (‘go out to meet’), as he demonstrates in Jesus’ speech about counting the cost of discipleship, which begins, “What king, going out to meet in war [πορευόμενος… συμβαλεῖν εἰς πόλεμον] another king, will not sit down first… consider whether he is able to meet the one who comes against him [ὑπαντῆσαι… ἐρχομένῳ ἐπ᾿ αὐτόν]” (Luke 14:31-32). This is a passage which alludes to the battle between David’s army and Absalom’s (Israel’s) army (2 Sam 18:1-18—the allusion is greatly strengthened by the fact that the two battles have the same numbers of combatants on each side (20,000 vs. 10,000). Luke is also possibly alluding to the ambiguity available in the phrase ‘come out to greet’ as he juxtaposes ‘Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem’ with the way that characters eventually ‘come out to meet’ Jesus—aggressively, with “clubs and swords” in the arrest episode,

14 Interestingly, the German word entgegen has the same ambiguity—it can mean either ‘come out to meet’ or ‘come out against’.

15 Despite a wide search, I could not find any other commentator who had detected this intertextual allusion from Luke 14:31-32 to 2 Sam 18:1-18, especially vv. 3 and 7, based on the number of combatants. The LXX, the Vulgate and Symmachus’s Greek translation strengthen the allusion by more strongly asserting that there were 10,000 on David’s side. I suspect that detection of this allusion would have a tremendous effect on how the implied reader would interpret Luke 14:25-33: not as a recommendation of ‘pragmatism’ based on ‘doing the mathematics’, but more in line with the ‘faith-filled’ way of proceeding (regardless of the sums!) referred to in Luke 14:26-27 and 33. After all, David’s army, with 10,000, did go out to meet Israel’s or Absalom’s, with 20,000.
“as if” he “were a bandit”—Luke 22:52 (See Section 5.5.1.7). Luke relies on his implied reader's familiarity with the LXX, and thereby the familiarity with the wide range of possible scenarios when characters ‘come out to meet’.

2.1.3.6 B2. Rebuke or cursing

This relatively rare category includes examples where the prophet is commissioned by God to ‘go out and meet’ a king, but instead of announcing good news (as often in A1), the prophet brings a rebuke or a curse (e.g. Exod 7:15; 1 Kings 18:16-18; 2 Kings 1:3-7).

Excursus: On the Vocabulary Used in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets to Distinguish The Proposed Scene-Types

The great diversity of scene-types covered by variations of ‘going out to meet’ (from warfare to hospitality) leads naturally to a question of whether the vocabulary employed, particularly the verbs supporting the words for ‘meeting’ (operating like the infinitive “to meet”) gave the reader any clue as to what type of ‘meeting’ was being described. Table 1.1 in Appendix 1 represents an exhaustive analysis of all the meetings in the Pentateuch and the Former Prophets (LXX and MT) to determine if there were any correlation between the vocabulary used to describe meeting—including other verbs—and scene-type. The first examination was of the exact word used for “met” or “meeting”. In the LXX, the sixty-four episodes examined contain 129 instances of 16 Greek words that can be rendered fairly accurately “to meet”. Of these instances, 84% are covered by three Greek words: ἀπαντάω, συνάντησις and ἀπάντησις—which are essentially synonymous. (In the MT the same field is almost completely covered by just one compound word the Hebrew לִקְרָאת liqraʾ t as in wattēṣēʾ liqraʾt, “and she went out to meet”). When the occurrence of these Greek words was compared with the scene-types (Appendix-Table 1.2), it can be seen that among the most common words used (ἀπαντάω, συνάντησις and ἀπάντησις) there
is no correlation with any particular scene type. In that sense then the most commonly used words for ‘met’ or ‘meeting’ are ambiguous.

The second examination was of the accompanying verbs used to support ‘to meet’ or ‘in meeting’ (Appendix-Table 1.3 and 1.4). In some cases the verb supporting ‘to meet’ provides a strong clue to the nature of the events (and therefore indicates with which scene-type we are likely to be dealing). Some accompanying verbs are very clarifying, for example, “the man rejoiced to meet his son-in-law” (Judg 19:3) is clearly positive and a strong clue that the scene-type is hospitality, reconciliation (one of the ‘A’ s). If on the other hand a character (often a king) draws up battle lines (using the verb παρατάσσω) to meet another character, the scene-type is always warfare. Less predictably, if a character arises (based on the verb ἀνίστημι) to meet another, the reader will find that the scene-type is always negative (warfare or re- buke). On the other hand, if a character simply comes (based on the verb ἔρχομαι) to meet another or sends (ἀποστέλλω) to meet another or even rises (using an alternative form of “I rise”, ἔξανιστημι) to meet another, the scene-type is always one of hospitality and kindness.

However, with the most common verbs used to accompany ‘to meet’, there is a great diversity of scene type, and in that sense, they are ambiguous and do not explicate which scene-type the reader can anticipate. Thus if, as most characters do in the LXX Pentateuch and Former Prophets, one character goes out (ἐξέρχομαι) to meet another, or walks or goes (πορεύομαι) to meet another or goes up or goes down (καταβαίνω or ἀναβαίνω) to meet another—the reader cannot know from the vocabulary alone which scene-type to anticipate. In these instances, anything—from being seated at the head of the table and served the most-tender part of the fatted calf’s thigh (1 Sam 9:14,22–10:9), to being dropped by one of ‘Li’l’ David’s ‘slingèd’ stones (1 Sam 17:48)—could happen to the character being met. It is the ambiguity of a great proportion of the language used to describe ‘going out to meet’ and its variations that facilitates the ‘complex’ and ‘diagnostic’ uses of the motif (categories C and D; see below).
One particular unanticipated finding that the comparison of accompanying verbs and scene-type revealed is in the verb *run*, as in “he ran to meet”. In the MT *ran* is expressed by a single Hebrew verb (ריũ *rwṣ*) and covers several scene-types: *hospitality* in Gen 18:2 (‘When Abram ran to meet three strangers’); honouring and reconciliatory *reunion* in Gen 24:17 (‘When Abraham’s servant ran to meet Rebekah) and Gen 33:4 (‘When Esau ran to meet Jacob’); *warfare* in 1 Sam 17:48b (‘When David ran to meet the Philistine) and *manipulation* in Gen 24:29 (‘When Laban ran to meet Abraham’s slave’), Gen 29:13 (‘When Laban ran to meet Jacob’) and 2 King 4:26 (‘When unreliable Gehazi ran to meet the Shunammite woman’). Therefore, in the MT “*run to meet*” occurs in a broad range of scene-types, and in that sense is ‘ambiguous’.

However, in the Septuagint there are more verbs for *run* available to the translator, and this allows for semantic differentiation. As the Introduction to Genesis in the New English Translation of the Septuagint points out, “Such situations [of semantic differentiation] often showcase the translator’s skill or creativity in employing a variety of Greek equivalents for individual Hebrew terms or expressions in accordance with the demands of each context.”¹⁶ And in relation to *run* we find different words used for the different scene-types and situations. For commonplace activities, like running to the cows or a well, or to one’s own family, the translator of Genesis simply employs τρέχω (Gen 18:7; 24:20; 29:12). Also for a ‘questionable’ characters like Laban (who is shown by the narrator to be motivated by greed) the translator of Genesis simply employs τρέχω (Gen 24:29; 29:13) or in situations of ambiguous hospitality ἀποτρέχω (Gen 12:19; 24:51). But for the climactic “running” in the more clearly positive uses of hospitality, honouring and reconciliation, the translator uses a suffixed form of the verb ἐπιτρέχω (I run up) as in the case of Gen 24:17 (‘When Abraham’s servant ran up to meet Rebekah’) and προστρέχω (I run

forth) as in Gen 18:2 (‘When Abram ran forth to meet three strangers’) and Gen 33:44 (‘When Esau ran forth to meet Jacob’). This allows the Greek translator to forge an extra intertextual link, or echo, between Abram’s archetypal hospitality and the gracious reconciliatory behaviour of Esau toward Jacob.

In the case of the Lukan parable of ‘The Father with Two Sons’, when the father runs to meet the younger son, most texts employ τρέχω but there is the witness of one textual tradition that used the participle προσδραμών (from προστρέχω)—1071 (a miniscule from the 12th Century, kept at Mt Athos17) and it may have been acquaintance with the semantic differentiation in the Septuagint that led the copyist to consider it more appropriate that the father should ‘run forth to meet’ his son (as Abram ‘ran forth’ to the strangers and as Esau ‘ran forth’ to Jacob). According to the majority of textual witnesses, Luke also uses the compound form of τρέχω—προστρέχω—when Philip “runs up” to the Ethiopian in Acts (which is a restorative hospitality scene), and according to the D-Text, this is how Cornelius’s slave acting as a forerunner, alerts his master to Peter’s imminent arrival in Acts 10:25 (in the midst of a scene of exemplary and reconciliatory hospitality). The implied reader, familiar with the semantic differentiation of the LXX, might pick up the positive allusions in this text through Luke’s use of compound forms of τρέχω.

2.1.3.7 Cl. Ironic uses of ‘coming out to meet’ involving manipulation, often motivated by greed for gain

The next two categories deal with occurrences of the motif (‘going out to meet’) in its hospitable, reconciliatory and honouring uses where there is a ‘corruption’ of the motif, usually affected by one character’s ulterior motives (often financial) and manipulation of other characters—often selling things that ought not to be sold. These narratives include:

'When Laban Met Abraham's servant' (Gen 24:28-61); 'When Laban met Jacob' (Gen 29:1-30); 'When Leah Met Jacob' (Gen 30:14-21 —esp. v. 16, 'she went out to meet him and said, “You must come into me, for I have hired you with my son's mandrakes”'), 'When Naaman met Gehazi' (2 Kings 5:20-27 —selling healing). There is also a sense of 'inappropriateness' with the transactions that occur when Jacob 'sells' the red soup to his famished brother in exchange for Esau's birthright (Gen 25:29-34 —selling hospitality), and when Joseph sells famine relief to the Egyptian from whom he 'compulsorily acquired' it (Gen 47:13-26 —esp. v. 21 "he made slaves of them from one end of Egypt to the other").

2.1.3.8 C2. Ironic uses of ‘coming out to meet’ involving outright deceit where things are not what they appear

A stronger corruption of the motif ('going out to meet' in its hospitable, reconciliatory and honouring uses) involves outright deceit by a character who uses the pretence of the sacred custom of hospitality to achieve their purpose. Episodes in this category include: Jael ('When Jael Came out to Meet Sisera'—Judges 4:17-5:31 —after offering hospitality she drives a tent peg through his skull) and the episode with King Eglon and the judge, Ehud, is similar ("I have a message from the Lord for you, O King"—then Ehud stabs Eglon with a concealed short-sword).\(^{18}\) The kiss that Absalom gives David his father at their 'reconciliation', just prior to the coup d'état in which Absalom deposes his father illustrates another instance of the corrupted or parodic use of motifs associated with hospitable 'coming out to meet'. These narratives derive their ability to make the reader recoil by their corrupt (or parodied) use of otherwise positive motifs.\(^{19}\)

The implied reader will take from the cultural script that the LXX helps to establish an understanding that hospitality motives associated with 'coming out to meet' can be

---

\(^{18}\) Beyond the Torah and the Former Prophets, Jeremiah 41:1-17 (Jer 48:1-18 LXX) tells the story of a character called Ishmael son of Nethaniah who uses the guise of hospitality (including the welcoming gesture of 'coming out to meet'—Jer 41:6, 48:6 LXX) in order to commit a massacre.

\(^{19}\) In the section on Homer and Hospitality, I note that there are similarly corrupt or ironic uses of the motifs of hospitality in the Iliad and the Odyssey. For example, in the episode with Odysseus and the Cyclops, the gift motif from the standard Homeric hospitality scene becomes the ironic gift that the Cyclops offers Odysseus is to eat him last, after all his travelling companions (Od. 9.409-15). See Sections 3.2 and 3.3.
corrupt or parodied. The implied reader will bring this understanding to their reading of Luke and Acts particularly when Luke is heard to narrate parodies of the customs of hospitality, e.g. Judas’s kiss and the mock royal homage of the soldiers (see Sections 5.5.1.7 and 5.5.1.8).

2.1.3.9 C3. Failure or omission to provided ‘going out to meet’ (in its hospitable, reconciliatory and honouring ways)

Lastly, failure or omission to ‘come out and meet’ (failure to extend welcoming hospitality to strangers; failure to accept offer of reconciliation and reunions; failure to greet the warriors after their victory) is another use of the motif.\(^{20}\) Characters who fail to extend positive escorted arrival include: Michal who would not ‘come out to meet’ David when he brought the ark to Jerusalem but rather watched from the window with contempt, envy or hatred, before tardily ‘coming out to meet’ David when the parade is over (2 Sam 6:16-23); and, those ‘half Israel’ led by Bichri who would not accompany David’s return (2 Sam 20:1-2).

Other failures to ‘come out and meet’ with hospitality include: the failure of the men of Sodom to welcome Lot’s guests (Gen 19); the failure of the Benjaminites of Gibeah to welcome the old Ephraimite’s guests (Judg 19), leading to the rape and death of the Levite’s concubine. Another very significant failure to ‘come out and meet’ occurs when certain nations would not give hospitality and conveyance to Israel during the forty years of ‘wandering’. This failure is the basis for the temporary exclusion of groups from the assembly mentioned in the legal setting of Deut 23:4-8. This inhospitable treatment forms the basis of extended narratives in Numbers 20:14-21 (‘Edom Refuses Israel Passage’); Num 21:21-32 (‘Sihon Refuses Israel Passage’); Num 22:1-24:25 (‘Balaam Commissioned to Curse Israel’). And as we will soon see with the “Ten Concubines” who do not come out to meet David as he returns from his ‘exile’ are threatened as treacherous and placed

\(^{20}\) In the section on Homer, I note that there are also occurrences of ‘failure’ to ‘come out and meet’ in hospitable ways in places where a reader might anticipate it. The most conspicuous case is when one Penelope’s chief suitors, Antinous and Eurymachus, fail to greet the disguised stranger (Odysseus), but rather offer insults and physical violence (Od. 17:410-529; 18:391-483). See Section 3.6.
Three Close Readings from 1 and 2 Samuel

under 'house arrest' for the term of their natural lives, as is the disloyal Ziba (2 Sam 20:3; 1 Kings 2:38)

Luke includes in his narrative two very significant 'failures to meet'—the failure of the people of Jerusalem to 'come out and meet' in 'Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem' (see Sections 5.5.1.5-8); and the failure of the elders of the church in Jerusalem to 'come out and meet' Paul on his final visit to Jerusalem (see Section 6.2.10 and 6.2.11).

2.1.4 Conclusion

How does our implied reader’s familiarity with these Old Testament texts—the Pentateuch and Former Prophets of the LXX—contribute to a cultural script in the context of hospitality and meeting, particularly with regard to escort? Firstly, our implied reader would understand that ‘coming out to meet’ may have a diversity of ‘contexts’ ranging from hospitality to warfare. Within each context they would be familiar with the clues (both vocabulary and motifs) that serve to clarify the context or scene-type. In the many instances of ‘coming out to meet’ in its hospitable context, they would be familiar with elements such as escorted arrival, haste, invitation to remain (‘good detention’), extravagance in provision of food and drink, announcements after hunger has been satisfied, and escorted departure. The implied reader would also be aware of how these same elements can be corrupted or used in parody to portray hostility. The implied reader would also be attuned to the omission of any of the conventions of hospitality. Such a reader would find it particularly ‘telling’ in a ‘visitation’ narrative if the earliest conventional element in the sequence—escorted arrival—were omitted.

2.2 Three Close Readings from 1 and 2 Samuel

The purpose of the next three chapters is to examine more closely three extended OT narratives from among the sixty-four narratives that were identified by a search for ‘meetings’ in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. The three that I have chosen each have a very significant role for the motif of ‘going out to meet’, in that the motif occurs relatively
frequently within a short narrative space. The three are: 'When Abigail Met David' (1 Sam 25:2-43); 'When David Fled Jerusalem' (2 Sam 15:13-16:14) and 'When David Returned to Jerusalem' (2 Sam 19:8b-40). Another purpose of these three ‘close’ readings is to understand, with greater attention to detail, what the implied reader, whose cultural script in regard to escort in the context of hospitality, would bring to a reading of Luke and Acts in terms of welcome, meeting and escort.

The choice of 1 and 2 Samuel (the first half of the Book of Reigns in the LXX) is particularly apt, as Luke frequently alludes to 1 and 2 Samuel—13 times in the Gospel and 11 times in the Book of Acts.21 Luke is also the only gospel writer to quote from ‘Reigns’. Samuel’s announcement of God’s replacement of King Saul by David (1 Sam 13:14—a key verse in Reigns) is quoted in Paul’s first reported sermon in Acts (Acts 13:22). The following verse in Acts (in Saul/Paul’s sermon) proclaims “Of this man’s [David’s] posterity God has brought to Israel a Saviour, Jesus, as he promised.” Therefore, the quotation and Paul’s immediate comment forges a link between the way the implied reader will think about David and the way they will think about Jesus. Luke’s character Paul who is the continuity participant for the Book of Acts from 13:9 forward (the verse in which he changes name from Saul to Paul) has made a transition from a persecutor of Jesus—appropriately named ‘Saul’, just like the chief persecutor of David—to Jesus’ chief emissary—the one whose reception indicates how characters would ‘receive’ Jesus (by the principle laid out in Luke 10:16—“Whoever listens to you, listens to me”). Therefore the implied reader’s understanding of these three focus passages from 1 and 2 Samuel are of great relevance in terms of what they bring to the same reader’s interpretation of Luke and Acts.

The motifs of hospitality, solidarity and loyalty play a very important role in 1 and 2 Samuel. People demonstrate their loyalty to David, the Lord’s anointed, by ‘attending’ to him when he comes to them. For a good part of David’s story he is a fugitive. For a large part of the section from 1 Samuel 13-31, which narrates the decline and fall of Saul, David is

fleeing from Saul who seeks his life. In a significant section of 2 Samuel 13-20, David again spends much of his time again in exile during the coup d’état of his son, Absalom.

In David’s two fugitive periods, people demonstrate loyalty to him through customs of hospitality. They shelter and feed him (as in the story of Ahimelech the high priest—1 Sam 21:1-9). People who are loyal to David provide escort and safety. In many instances they ‘come out to meet’ (escorted arrival) or ‘see the king on his way’ (escorted departure) or in other ways aid his safe journey—1 Sam 19:12; 20:13,42; 21:2; 23:16.

Throughout the narratives of 1 and 2 Samuel, kings and military commanders send emissaries (or ‘forerunners’). In these narratives, characters’ responses to emissaries communicate their attitude to the sender. Honour the emissary and you honour the one who sent them. Dishonour the emissary and you dishonour the one who sent them. (This element of the cultural script will be of central importance to the implied reader’s interpretation of Luke and Acts. The principle that is set out in Luke 10:16—“whoever listens to you, listens to me”—acts as a guiding paradigm in the Book of Acts.)

Characters’ reception of the “anointed of the Lord” is also portrayed as a measure of their attitude to the Lord. Hence, rejecting “the Lord’s anointed” is equivalent to rejecting the Lord. This is expressed clearly in the narratives that describe the ‘adventus’ of the ark of God (1 Samuel 6 and 2 Samuel 6). People who rejoice to see the ark are expressing their loyalty to the Lord (1 Sam 6:13-15). They are also the ones who express loyalty to the Lord’s anointed, David. Hence, Michal, in her slight of David, when he comes dancing to accompany the procession of the ark into Jerusalem (2 Sam 6:16,20-23), slights not only David but also the Lord, and hence her judgement. Michal’s childlessness also serves to emphasise that the Davidic line is quite independent of the Saulide dynasty for its authority or legitimacy (Michal being Saul’s daughter). The authority and legitimacy of the new Davidic dynasty comes directly from the Lord.

2.2.1 When Abigail Met David: On the importance of ‘going out to meet’ in 1 Samuel 25:2-43

2.2.1.1 Summary of the episode

‘Meeting’ is of crucial significance to the episode ‘When Abigail met David’ (1 Sam 25:2-43). Hospitality, loyalty and solidarity are prominent themes throughout all three episodes, which this and the following two chapters of the thesis examine. ‘When Abigail Met David’ is situated in the concluding section of the 1 Samuel (LXX: “1 Reigns”) which narrates the exile of David due to the murderous jealousy of King Saul (1 Kings 19–31).

After the death of Samuel, David returns to the wilderness of Maon (25:1). While there, David affords protection to the shepherds of a wealthy man named Nabal. David protects these men and asks nothing in return, until he hears that Nabal is shearing his sheep. Perhaps thinking that the shepherds will give Nabal a good account of David’s protection of them, David calls in the favour and asks for provisions for himself and his band of fugitive men. David’s response reflects an important element of the cultural script regarding hospitality and welcome: if one rejects the emissary then one is dishonouring the sender of the emissary.

Nabal treats David’s emissaries dishonourably. They are met badly by Nabal; he refuses them any food or drink. The emissaries return empty handed to David. David responds to the slight by making a plan of retribution—intending to kill Nabal and all the males in his household (all those who “urinate on walls”\(^\text{23}\)).

Nabal’s calamity is avoided when Abigail, hearing of the slight, ‘comes out to meet’ David with provisions. David is well met by Abigail. Abigail’s reception of David assuages the potential hostility that David is going to visit upon her husband. Despite the reconcil-

---

23 The Greek, οὐροῦντα πρὸς τοῖχον (“one who urinates on a wall”) is the colourful colloquialism for males and comes very directly from the Hebrew, בָּקִיר מָשְׁתִּין. David Firth goes further to suggest that the phrase was deliberately crude, “the vulgarity demeaning those to be killed”, and he notes its use (always in association with group extermination) in four other places in 1 & 2 Kings. David G. Firth, 1 & 2 Samuel, Apollos Old Testament Commentary Vol. 8 (Nottingham, England: Apollos; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2009), p. 269.
iatory actions of Abigail, God judges Nabal’s lack of hospitality toward David, and Nabal
dies after hearing of his narrow escape from death due to his wife’s timely actions.

2.2.1.2 Close analysis of 1 Sam 25:1-43

The close analysis of this passage may be found in Appendix 2.1. It is contained there as it is the clearest fully-worked example of my narrative methodology which aims at what Greenblatt calls a “scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts,” from which “cultural analysis has much to learn.”

2.2.1.3 Conclusion

‘Going out to meet’ in this instance is a little more complex than simple escorted arrival—Abigail, after all, is trying to avert David’s arrival at Nabal’s household with the homicidal consequences that the reader anticipates. Still, this episode clearly establishes ‘going out to meet’ as a significant motif that continues throughout the rest of 1 and 2 Samuel. ‘Going out to meet’ continues to be a way in which characters demonstrate their good will toward David, especially in those parts of the narrative where David is a fugitive.

The episode of Abigail and Nabal not only establishes how being well met communicates goodwill, loyalty and solidarity—it also demonstrates how being well met has the power to bring about reconciliation when relations have been damaged or broken. In this dimension it resonates strongly with those episodes in the previous section which were classified as A2, especially the account of Esau’s ‘going out to meet’ (actually ‘running out to meet’) his estranged brother Jacob. The implied reader will carry this understanding of the reconciling potential of ‘coming out to meet’ and recall it in the reading of Luke and Acts—e.g. in the reading of the parable, ‘The Father with Two Sons’ (See Section 5.3.1).

2.2.2 When David Fled Jerusalem: Escorting the Farewell and Departure of David in 2 Sam 15:13–16:14

2.2.2.1 Summary of the episode

The scenes in this passage move like a procession from one ‘station’ to another. The ‘stations’ include: the city, the outskirts of the city (“last house”), crossing the Kidron, ascending the Mount of Olives, the summit, somewhere between the summit of the summit of the Mount of Olives and the Jordan, and the Jordan itself. Along the way, various parties express their loyalty to David by promising to accompany him into exile. David persuades some parties to return to the city, to act as secret allies who can send reports to David. So too, David asks the Levites (and Zadok and Abiathar) who come out of the city bearing the ark of the covenant, to return to the city with the ark. The last person mentioned as ‘coming out’ of the city offers an unusual form of accompaniment—Shimei travels alongside the procession heckling and cursing, throwing stones and dirt at the king’s procession.

2.2.2.2 An account of a close reading for one passage

David's fleeing from Jerusalem has six scenes.

In Scene 1 (15:13-18), an emissary who is faithful to David arrives and warns the king of the coup. His report that “the heart of the men of Israel has gone after Absalom” is a report of what is described in 2 Sam 15:1-6. The dialogue between the king and his servants (15:14-15) allows the first vocalised expression of loyalty for David. These are the king's loyal servants—they will go into exile with their king. The king and his household depart except for ten concubines left to guard the house (15:6). These 'ten concubines' function as an inclusio (2 Sam 15:16 and 20:3) of the 'journey out and back.' The failure of the “Ten Concubines” to escort David’s return perhaps explains why he has them kept under house arrest for the term of their natural lives (2 Sam 20:3).

In Scene 2 (15:19-23), there is a pause at the “far house” (probably meaning the last house on the outskirts of the city—15:17). Here David pauses while his many faithful
companions pass out of the city. The scene becomes more closely ‘focussed’ when David speaks to Ittai the Gittite in a way very reminiscent of the way that Naomi speaks to Orpah and Ruth (Ruth 1:8-9), encouraging him to “go back”. Like Ruth's famous pledge (Ruth 1:16-17), Ittai's pledge contains the vow that “for in the place wherever my lord may be, both if it be for death and if it be for life, for there your slave will be.” (15:21). Like Naomi with Ruth (Ruth 1:18), David relents and Ittai escorts the king's departure. They cross the Wadi Kidron (the stream in the valley which separates Mount Zion from the Mount of Olives). The mention of “the great multitude” that was escorting the departure of David, and of “all the country” weeping allows a brief concluding (achieved by participant expansion and locale expansion) before the next scene commences.

In Scene 3 (15:24-29), Zadok and all the Levites carry the ark of the covenant out of the city, as if to ‘see David and his companions on their way’ (escorted departure). But David persuades them to return the ark to the city. The departure of Zadok, Abiathar, the other Levites and the ark to Jerusalem (back to the city), provides another brief conclusion before the next scene.

Scene 4 (15:30-31), describes the ascent of the “olive groves” (the Mount of Olives)—a scene filled with pathos and images of humility (bare feet, covered heads, weeping) and the news of David’s betrayal by his counsellor, Ahithophel.

Scene 5 (15:32-37) takes place at the summit of the Mount of Olives, where Hushai comes to meet David with his tunic torn and earth on his head. Hushai is prepared to accompany the king into exile, but is also persuaded by David to return to Jerusalem (15:33-36), in order to thwart the council that Ahithophel offers to Absalom (the plan is executed in 2 Sam 17:5-23). The departure of Hushai (15:37a) provides the brief conclusion of this scene. It is merged with the brief reference that at the same time, Absalom was entering the city of Jerusalem (David has escaped ‘just in the nick of time’!).

Scene 6 (16:1-4) takes place a little beyond the summit. Here, Ziba ‘comes to meet’ David with provisions. Ziba reports to David that his master, Mephibosheth, has not ‘come out to farewell’ or accompany the king, as he is celebrating David’s misfortune as an opportunity for the monarchy to return to the Saulide dynasty (Mephibosheth is Saul's
grandson). The reader has no way of verifying Ziba’s account. The reader to this point has probably expected that Mephibosheth would be loyal to David, as David was compassionate to Mephibosheth, recalling that Mephibosheth was the only surviving son of Jonathan whom David loved (2 Sam 9:1-13). The narrator neither affirms nor denies the veracity of Ziba’s report. David, however, quickly believes Ziba’s account. This demonstrates the powerful connotation in the cultural script with a ‘failure to escort’—the perception of disloyalty. David interprets Mephibosheth’s failure to come out as a clear sign of his disloyalty and envy. Hence, he acts quickly and bestows Mephibosheth’s property upon ‘faithful’ Ziba who did come out and ‘see’ the king ‘on his way’. Mephibosheth’s action, later in 19:24, upon David’s return, suggests that Ziba’s report is in fact a malicious act of slander, for the purpose of self-promotion and gain.

Scene 7 (16:5-14), is located at Bahurim, presumably somewhere between the summit of the Mount of Olives and the Jordan crossing. This final scene is a rude contrast to accompaniment, farewell and ‘seeing the king on his way’ that precedes it. Shimei, a man of the family of the house of Saul, ‘comes out’—but this is a parody of ‘escorted departure’. Shimei only comes out in order to curse, throw stones and fling dust at the king and his companions. The final scene brings the weary king and his faithful companions to the Jordan where the king is safely away from Absalom and can refresh himself.

2.2.2.3 Conclusion

The narratives of this section make a clear connection between escorting and loyalty. Those who are loyal to David are shown as prepared to follow the king into exile. These include the servants of the king, his household, ‘every Cherethit and every Pelethite and all the Gittites, six hundred men who had come on their feet from Gath’, include Ittai (who the king is unable to dissuade from escorting him), Zadok and the Levites (who are persuaded to return with the ark to Jerusalem) and Hushai (who is persuaded to return to Jerusalem in order to undermine the council of Ahithophel).

In the very next episode (15:15-23) there is a reference back to the king’s flight from Jerusalem, which also reinforces the link between a preparedness to escort the king and
loyalty toward the king. Absalom’s first words to Hushai (16:18) are: “Is this your kindness (mercy) with your friend? Why did you not go away with your friend?” The implication of Absalom’s words are that, had Hushai accompanied the king, as so many others did that he too would have demonstrated his kindness or mercy to David.

The implied reader would take from their familiarity of the cultural script established by this episode that escort by a character of someone who is fleeing danger often correlates with that character’s loyalty, kindness and compassion for the fugitive. This interpretation would find particular application in accounts of Paul’s escorted escapes on many occasions—e.g. Acts 9:25, where Saul (= Paul) is lowered in a basket—or Acts 9:30, where the disciples take Saul by night and send him off to Tarsus. As we will see, in Acts 5, these escorted escapes are sometimes provided from ‘surprising quarters’. Increasingly, they are provided by leaders within the Roman imperial forces (Acts 16:30,34,37,39; 21:35; 23:31).

The implied reader would also interpret a character’s failure to escort a significant departure as a possible signal of their disloyalty and envy—as attested by David’s quick judgement of the failure of Mephibosheth to come out and ‘see’ the king ‘on his way’.

2.2.3 When David returned to Jerusalem: ‘Going Out to Meet’ the Returning King in 2 Samuel 19:8b–20:3

2.2.3.1 Summary of the episode

This episode (‘When David Returned to Jerusalem’) is like the ‘mirror image’ of the preceding focus-text we examined (‘When David Fled Jerusalem’). As David prepares to return, parties hurry to ‘come out to meet’ and escort the king’s arrival. Most of the action takes place at the Jordan, where the king prepares to cross before making his way to re-enter Jerusalem. The first two scenes in this episode have a connection with the last two scenes of the episode ‘When David Fled Jerusalem’—creating the sense of ‘mirroring’.

25 The LXX uses τὸ ἔλεός σου to capture the sense of the Hebrew חסד or ḥsd, which has the meaning ‘loyal-love’, or ‘steadfast-love’—this is also the word used in 15:20 where the king tries unsuccessfully to dismiss Ittai the Gittite.
The third party said to cross the Jordan is Barzillai the Gileadite. He mirrors the position of the loyal outsiders from the earlier episode (Ittai the Gittite and Hushai the Archite). Although prepared to cross the Jordan with the returning king, Barzillai persuades David to let him return to his own place. The episode’s last scene describes a dissension between the men of Judah and the men of Israel. Eventually the men of Israel show their contempt for the king by returning to their own homes and not escorting the king, and the men of Judah demonstrate their loyalty by completing the king’s escort from Jordan to Jerusalem. The end of the journey back to Jerusalem is marked by the reference to the ‘ten concubines’ who were left at David’s departure to ‘keep the house’ (creating an inclusio). Their non-escort of David appears to correlate with severe negative consequences for them (2 Sam 20:3).

2.2.3.2 Close analysis of 2 Sam 19:8b-40

In Scene One of ‘David’s Return’ (19:8b-15), all Israel, whose army of 20,000 was defeated by David’s 10,000, have fled to their ‘shelters’ (19:8b). ‘All’ the people are said to be disputing and yet they speak as one, and rehearse a conclusion with themselves. David was a good a king! Remember how he protected us from the ‘allophyles’? But then we went and anointed his son, the leader of the coup, Absalom. But he died in battle. Why are we being slow to escort the king back? (19:9b-10). Speed or delay (or “haste” and “hesitation”) prove to be very significant elements of the cultural script of hospitality—haste demonstrates high loyalty; delay, somewhat muted loyalty; absence or failure to escort demonstrates disloyalty.

David sends a word of challenge to Judah via Zadok and Abiathar, “Why are you the last to bring the king back to his house?” (19:11b). David’s message works among Judah, and unanimously they send word to the king, “Return, you and all your slaves” (19:14). David returns and comes as far as the Jordan River, and the men of Judah come to Gilgal “to go to meet [πορεύεσθαι εἰς ἀπαντήν] the king, to bring the king over the Jordan”. With David on the east bank and potential escorts on the west the scene is set for a detailed
account of David’s escorted arrival. The next few scenes do not ‘move’ in a geographical
sense; instead a series of potential ‘welcomers’ are paraded into view.

Scene Two (19:16-18a) describes two parties making haste to get to the place of the
king’s Jordan crossing. The first is Shimei whose ‘parting escort’ was to heckle and curse
the king as he departed (throwing dust and stones!). Now, he hurries[ἐτάχυνεν] down to
meet [κατέβη… εἰς ἀπαντὴν] the king. Will any amount of honouring escort of the king’s
arrival—and being the fastest and the first is highly honouring—make up for such a public
display of misplaced allegiance? In the same breath the narrator speaks of Ziba, the ser-
vant of the house of Saul. As David was departing into exile, Ziba brought a great quantity
of provisions (like Abigail), but he also slandered his master Mephibosheth, saying that
Mephibosheth was not ‘seeing the king on his way’. Ziba claimed that Mephibosheth was
happy to see the back of David and that he was ‘celebrating’ the king’s defeat, and perhaps
the resurgence of the Saulide dynasty (Mephibosheth was the grandson of Saul and the
son of Jonathan). Ziba is preparing an extravagant gesture again with food and a ferry.

Scene Three (19:18b-23) focuses more closely on Shimei. Shimei quickly confesses his
“lawlessness” and the “wrong” with which he “sinned”. He asks David not to remember
what he did on the day of the king’s departure into exile. That Shimei put a lot of store by
being the “first of all the house of Joseph to go down to meet [καταβῆναι εἰς ἀπαντὴν] my
lord the king” demonstrates clearly the link between escort and honour—but more par-
ticularly, between being the ‘first to greet’ and paying the highest honours. Shimei seems
to think that this gesture might just persuade David to forgive and forget. With a degree
of structural predictability, the same man who proposed killing Shimei (when he cursed
David) proposes it again. But David, in typical David fashion is gracious.26

Scene Two predisposes the reader to anticipate that the next party to be treated in
‘close-up’ will be Ziba, as we come to Scene Four (19:24-30). The utter surprise is that it
is Ziba’s maligned master, Mephibosheth—of whom it was alleged that he celebrated the

26 David’s non-action in the face of opposition is a motif throughout 1 & 2 Samuel (for instance, when David
has opportunity to kill Saul.
fall and exile of David—who “went down to meet [κατέβη εἰς ἀπαντήν] the king.” Mephibosheth’s failure to escort David’s departure caused David to give credence to Ziba’s tale of Mephibosheth’s treachery, envy and hostility. The narrator’s first words about Mephibosheth’s actions make it evident to the reader that the rumours against Mephibosheth were false. He has not taken care of his feet, nor pared his nails, nor made his moustache, nor washed his clothes, since the day of the king’s departure, so grieved has he been by David’s exile. David asks the obvious question. If Mephibosheth so honoured David, why did he not escort his departure? Mephibosheth’s answer seems truthful from what we know from earlier parts of the narrative. He is lame (his nurse dropped him as a baby—2 Sam 4:4; 9:3). And he was tricked by Ziba. Mephibosheth’s last words, “And what right have I any longer even to cry any longer to the king?” sound like he is about to bring up the injustice that (based on his non-appearance at the farewell procession) David gave all Mephibosheth’s property to Ziba. David’s response in this scene is unsettling. David makes it sound as if he only said that Ziba and Mephibosheth would “divide the field”. Ziba’s escort of David (even if he were a slanderous and obsequious opportunist) has rewarded him richly. Mephibosheth’s failure to escort the king’s departure (even in the face of the reader’s complete empathy) threatened to cost him everything. His effort to escort the king’s return has at least paid some ‘dividend’. Mephibosheth’s final words are the most poignant, for they reveal that he did not make the journey to the Jordan in order to gain some political or financial advantage—as Shimei and Ziba did. Mephibosheth, from the clear evidence of his appearance, had, until the king’s return, been in deep mourning. He was simply overjoyed to welcome the return of David.

Scene Five of ‘David’s Return’ (19:31-40), describes David’s escort by Barzillai the Gileadite. In the ‘mirror imaging’ between David’s departure and return, Barzillai corresponds to the positions of Hushai the Archite and Ittai the Gittite, the fiercely loyal ‘outsiders’. Barzillai, a man of great wealth had provided for David in the time of his exile—Barzillai is like an ‘new and improved’ version of Nabal. David wishes to return the favour, and although Barzillai wants to honour David by escorting his return (“send him on his way”—ἐκπέμψαι 19:32) to his kingdom, Barzillai also want to live out his last days
in his own land. David, as a perfect host, does not over-detain his guest, but relinquishes the old man. Barzillai gives David one of his slaves—Chimham—explaining that David can do all that he would have done for Barzillai vicariously to this slave. This calls to mind an important part of the cultural script—that a master’s slave or emissary was like a social extension of himself. If one wished to honour a man in his absence, one honoured his slave or emissary. If one slighted the slave or emissary, one slighted the man. (We will see this play an important role in Luke and Acts where Luke 10:16 works as a paradigm for the Book of Acts). Scene Five concludes on a high with Barzillai being farewelled and David crossing the Jordan with all the people of Judah and half the people of Israel.

The mention of ‘half’ the people of Israel is perhaps a cue that all is not as hospitable and welcoming as the ‘high’ of Scene Five suggested, and sure enough, in Scene Six (19:41–20:3) the disputes of 19:9 re-emerge. Israel wants to know why Judah has stolen the king away and “brought the king and his household over the Jordan.” The disputes centre upon who has a greater ‘share’ in David (19:41-43). The scene ‘zooms in’ as a ringleader—Sheba, a Benjaminitite, and therefore probably a pro-Saulide opponent of David—provides a catalyst for the rebellion of Israel. In this conclusion the division of the population between those who honour David, and those who have decided they have “no part in him” shows itself by way of escort. The rebellious people of Israel retreat back to their “shelters” refusing to escort the return of David, and leave, following Sheba instead. The faithful people of Judah “adhered to the king from the Jordan even to Jerusalem [ἐκολλήθη τῷ βασιλεῖ αὐτῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ιορδάνου καὶ ἕως Ιερουσαλημ]”.

The mention of the ‘ten concubines’ (whom David left to keep the house when he fled) signals that the epic journey into exile and the consequent return (the ‘there and back’) is concluded. However, the mention of these women also offers one final piece of evidence that ‘failure to escort’ communicated disloyalty and envy. These women are not mentioned as ‘coming out’ to greet the returning king. This may, in fact, explain why
David treats them so harshly\footnote{However, David does not treat the women as harshly as Odysseus treats his disloyal maid-servants—Od. 22.430–475.}—placing them under 'house arrest'\footnote{The house arrest of Ziba by Solomon (1 Kgs 2:36–38) attests the practice as appropriate treatment of treacherous characters—Ziba is suspected of gross disloyalty to the house of David.} for the 'term of their natural lives'. Presumably, their failure to escort even part of David's departure and arrival signals their disloyalty to David. Their Graeco-Roman literary 'counterparts' are the disloyal female domestics of Odysseus ("the suitors' whores"—Od. 22.464).

\subsection*{2.2.3.3 Conclusion}

The episode 'When David returned to Jerusalem' follows the death of Absalom. In this extended episode, characters \textit{demonstrate their loyalty} to David by 'going out to meet' him and escorting his return to Jerusalem. These gestures of loyalty and reconciliation include the following: Judah comes to Gilgal to meet the king to bring him over the Jordan (2 Sam 19:15); Shimei's repentance (19:16—his 'second chance'—"see I have come this day, the first of all the house of Joseph to come down to meet my lord the king"); Mephibosheth's coming out to meet the king even in the face of the earlier allegations of Ziba (19:24-30); the escort provided to David by Barzillai the Gileadite who provides food and goes a little way over the Jordan with the king (19:31-39); and, all the people of Judah and also half the people of Israel who 'bring' the king 'on his way' (19:40). Sheba, a Benjaminite, \textit{demonstrates disloyalty and rebellion} by not accompanying the returning David and by persuading Israel also not to accompany David's return (20:1-2). Lastly, the failure of David's concubines to escort even a part of his return journey correlates with their harsh judgement (house arrest: 1 Sam 20:3).

Again we see evidence that the implied reader familiar with the type of cultural script illustrated by the LXX will make strong associations between, on one hand, \textit{ escorting a guest} and \textit{honouring that guest}, and on the other hand, \textit{failure to escort a guest} and \textit{dishonouring that guest}. Another element of the cultural script that these episodes assist to establish is the idea that to hasten (to be 'first') to go out to meet the arriving guest is...
particularly honouring. Josephus shows that this element of the cultural script still had currency in the late first century (War 7.69,100). These narratives also illustrate another important element of the cultural script with regards to hospitality—that hospitality shown to the emissary or messenger reflects the attitude that the potential host has toward the one who sent them.

2.3 Meeting and Escort in Tobit

Another work from the Septuagint which will also help establish a cultural script for the implied reader of the late first (early second) century is the Book of Tobit. In this section we consider what contribution the Book of Tobit would make toward a cultural script in regard to hospitality, and particularly escort in the context of hospitality.

2.3.1 Reasons for examining Tobit

The plot of Tobit contains many instances of escort and hospitality. Because the plot revolves around Tobias’ journey from Nineveh (LXX “Nineue”) to Media and back, there are several occasions for departures and arrivals. These are often occasions of ‘sending off’ and ‘going out to meet’ (escorted arrival). Raphael, the angel, provides escort and guidance to Tobias. This accompaniment by Raphael is highlighted through the very high frequency of the description of Raphael as the one who ‘goes with’ Tobias.²⁹

Most likely, the Book of Tobit dates to between 200 and 180 BCE.³⁰ Luke demonstrates his general familiarity with other literature that constitutes the Septuagint. There is an apparent presumption that his readers are also familiar with parts of what is most fre-

²⁹ Tobit 5.3; 5.4; 5.7; 5.9; 5.10f; 5.10g; 5.15; 5.16; *implicit in* 5.16b; 5.17b, *with irony in* 5.17c; *with irony* 5.22; 6.2a; *implicit in* 6.2b; *implicit* 6.6b; *implicit in* 7.3; 10.6; *implicit in* 11.3; 11.4; 11.6; 12.1-3.

quentely included in the Septuagint (e.g. Genesis, Judges, 1 Samuel). Tobit could very well have been known to the evangelist and his intended readers.31

Of more general relevance to this study, Tobit demonstrates that in the Jewish literature of the centuries before the Common Era, hospitality and several motifs frequently associated with hospitality (including escort and escorted arrival), continued to be prominent in the plots of Jewish stories such as the story in Tobit.32 Thus Tobit serves to strengthen the establishment of a cultural script appropriate for an implied reader of the late first (early second) century.

The purpose of this reading of Tobit is to find if it can illumine late first (early second) century Jewish cultural script about hospitality and travel (including the significance of escorted arrival, detention and over-detention). This understanding will assist with hearing the implied reader’s interpretation of Luke and Acts. The two instances in Tobit when Tobit ‘goes out to meet’—when he goes out to meet Tobias (Tob 11:10 with a more explicit reference to ‘meeting’ in the Qumran version 4Q Tob5) and when he goes out to meet Sarah (Tob 11:16)—will receive particular attention.

2.3.1.1 Textual Issues

I will be basing the analysis of Tobit on the text referred to as GreekII (GII). Alexander A. Di Lella writes, “In the opinion of the vast majority of scholars today, however, GII with its highly Semitic coloring represents more accurately the original form of the book.”33

31 And yet the model of connection that I have proposed does not require Luke’s model reader to have read Tobit, but only to have been informed by the type of cultural script which is exemplified in Tobit.

32 It may be that the continuing prominence of hospitality in a later Jewish work like Tobit is to some degree due to its possible literary dependence on earlier Jewish narratives that themselves featured hospitality prominently. Irene Nowell has identified several possible Biblical sources for Tobit including the Joseph Story and several so-called ‘betrothal scenes’ (that of Rebecca in Gen 24; of Rachel and Leah in Gen 29-30; of Zipporah in Exod 2:15b-22; 4:18-20; and Ruth). Andrew E. Arterbury encourages exegetes to understand ‘betrothal-narratives’ as simply a variation of ‘hospitality-narratives’ scene-types. Irene Nowell, “The Book of Tobit”, in New Interpreter’s Bible: Volume III (Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), p. 981; Arterbury, “Breaking the Betrothal Bonds”, pp. 63-83.

This opinion is shared by the editors of the New English Translation of the Septuagint (NETS) and the New Revised Standard Version (NRSV), both of which use GII (whereas the RSV used the shorter Greek I—G I—version). The verse numbering seems to have originated with the division of English translations based upon the formerly-favoured GI (which explains some of the extraordinarily long verses in the NETS and NRSV version of Tobit, for example Tob 5:10!). Because the most commonly available Greek versions of the Septuagint (like Alfred Rahlfs’ Septuaginta) also utilised GI, I have used the GII version of Tobit found in to Robert Hanhart’s Septuaginta version (Göttingen), as well as Codex Sinaiticus.

2.3.2 An examination of escort and hospitality in Tobit

My approach to the text of Tobit is a general survey rather than a very close reading of just a few chosen passages. This choice is justified by the wide spread references to escort that are throughout the large central portion of the text as the survey below reveals.

The accompaniment of Tobias by the angel Raphael occupies most of the central section of the work, from 3:16 to 12:22. This section merits our attention because of this study’s interest in meeting, escort and welcome. In the original and more Semitic version of the tale (GII), the fact of Raphael’s accompaniment of Tobias is mentioned an extraordinary twenty-four times in this central section.34 The following list demonstrates this high frequency of references to escort in the central section of the work:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:3</td>
<td>So now, my son, find yourself a trustworthy man to go with you (πορεύσεται μετὰ σοῦ);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:4</td>
<td>So Tobias went out to look for a man to go with him (πορεύσεται μετ’ αὐτοῦ) to Media, someone who was acquainted with the way;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:7</td>
<td>Wait for me, young man, until I go in and tell my father; for I do need you to travel with me (ἵνα βαδίσῃς μετ’ ἐμοῦ);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:9</td>
<td>Call the man in, my son, so that I may learn about his family and to what tribe he belongs, and whether he is trustworthy enough to go with you (πορευθῇ μετὰ σοῦ);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34 Tobit 5:3; 5:4; 5:7; 5:9; 5:10f; 5:10g; 5:15; 5:16b; implicit in 5:16c; 5:17b; with irony in 5:17c and 5:22; 6:2a; implicit in 6:2b, 6:6b and 7:1a, b; 10:6; implicit in 11:3; 11:4; 11:6; 12:1; implicit in 12:2; 12:3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Quotation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5:10f</td>
<td>My son Tobias wishes to go to Media. <em>Can you accompany him and guide him?</em> (δυνήσῃ συνελθεῖν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγαγεῖν αὐτόν);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10g</td>
<td><em>I can go with him (Δυνήσομαι πορευθῆναι μετὰ αὐτοῦ) and I know all the roads;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:15</td>
<td>I will pay you a drachma a day as wages, as well as expenses for yourself and my son. <em>So go with my son (καὶ πορεύθητι μετὰ τοῦ υἱοῦ μου);</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:16b(17)</td>
<td><em>I will go with him (Πορεύσομαι μετὰ αὐτοῦ); so do not fear;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 5:16c</td>
<td><em>We shall leave in good health (ὑγιαίνοντες ἀπελευσόμεθα) and we shall return to you in good health (ὑγιαίνοντες ἐπιστρέφομεν), because the way is safe;</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:17b</td>
<td>Son, prepare supplies for the journey and <em>set out with your brother (ἐξῆλθεν τὸ παιδίον καὶ ἀπήγαγεν αὐτὸν);</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with irony in 5:17c</td>
<td>and may his angel, my son, accompany (συνοδεύσαι) you both for your safety [The irony derives from the fact that Raphael is an angel of the Lord and is already accompanying Tobias];</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and again, with irony in 5:22</td>
<td>For a good angel will accompany (συνελεύσεται αὐτῷ) him;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>The young man went out and the angel went with him (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν τὸ παιδίον καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος μετὰ αὐτοῦ);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 6:2a</td>
<td>the dog came out with him and went along with them (μετὰ αὐτῶν);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 6:2b</td>
<td>So they both journeyed along (καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἀμφότεροι);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 6:2b</td>
<td>And they both continued on their way together (καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἀμφότεροι Κοινῶς Sinaiticus: κοινωσεως) until they were near Media;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 7:1a,b</td>
<td>Now when they entered (ἐσῆλθεν) Ecbatana; … &quot;Brother Azariah, take me (ἀπῆγαγε μέ) straight to our brother Raguel. So he took him (ἀπῆγαγεν αὐτόν) to Raguel’s house;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:6</td>
<td>The man who went with him (ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ πορευθείς μετὰ αὐτοῦ) is trustworthy and is one of our own kin;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 11:3</td>
<td>Let us run (προδραμωμεν) ahead of your wife and prepare the house while they are still on the way;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:4</td>
<td>As they went on together (καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἀμφότεροι Κοινῶς) Raphael said to him, &quot;Have the gall ready;&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:6</td>
<td>she said to his father, &quot;Look, your son is coming, and the man who went with (καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ πορευθείς μετὰ αὐτοῦ) him!&quot;;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:1</td>
<td>Tobit called his son Tobias and said to him, &quot;My child, see to paying the wages of the man who went with you (τῷ ἄνθρωπῳ τῷ πορευθέντι μετὰ σοῦ αὐτοῦ)&quot;;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implicit in 12:2</td>
<td>It would do no harm to give him half of the possessions brought back with me (μετὰ ἐμοῦ);</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:3</td>
<td>For he has led me (μιᾷ ἀγιαίνει) back to you safely, he cured my wife, he brought (ἔγαγεν) the money back with me (μετὰ ἐμοῦ), and he healed you;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Great value is placed upon Raphael’s accompaniment of Tobias, particularly in its longer, original, Semitic form—GII. Finding a suitable companion for Tobias is Tobit’s way of trying to guarantee his son’s safe return. Tobit is willing to pay a wage for the service (a drachma a day, plus expenses), and at the journey’s end this is increased to a generous half-portion of the retrieved silver. When Anna has doubts about her son’s safety (because of his great delay), Tobit tries to reassure her that “the man who went with” Tobias is
trustworthy (10:6c). The chief way in which Raphael demonstrates his trustworthiness, faithfulness and loyalty to both the other characters and the reader is principally through his faithful *accompaniment* or *escort* of Tobias.

A reader of Homer would recognise in Raphael two archetypal characters. On one hand, Raphael is like *Pisistratus* who accompanies Odysseus’ son Telemachus on his journey ‘there and back’. On the other hand, he is like *a god sent down from Olympia*, for example Athena, sent by Zeus, to assist the journey of a hero, while adopting a disguise and a detailed false-identity.

Aside from this grand-scale accompaniment of Tobias by Raphael, there are many other smaller instances of accompaniment, especially in the context of departures and arrivals (‘seeing on their way’ and ‘going out to meet’), and nine other hospitality scenes (*The Farewell of Tobias by Tobit and Anna; The Welcome of Tobit by Raguel and Edna; The Brief Pre-Nuptial Celebration for Tobias and Sarah; The Fourteen Day Wedding Feast; The Farewell of Tobias and Sarah by Raguel and Edna; The Reception of Tobias by Anna and Tobit; The Reception of Sarah by Tobit; The Seven-Day Wedding Feast*). For a relatively short story there is certainly an abundance of hospitality scenes. Each contributes something to the establishment of a cultural script, revealing an understanding of the conventional elements of hospitality that a Jewish reader in the centuries leading up to the Common Era may have held. But for the purposes of this investigation of escort and welcome I shall confine my analysis to those scenes of farewell and welcome.

2.3.2.1 **The Farewell of Tobias by Tobit and Anna** (*Tob* 5:17b-6:1a)

The *preparation of supplies* and the *finding of an escort* seem to be Tobit’s contribution to the journey. The finding of a faithful person to escort Tobias is one of the most frequently referenced motifs of the entire ‘travel’ section of the story. There is an *invocation of God’s*...
blessing upon the journey. Tobias kisses his mother and father. His mother, Anna, weeps. Kissing and weeping are elements that are frequently associated with escorted arrivals and departures (Gen 33:4; 46:29; Luke 15:20; Acts 20:37).

There is great irony that the prayer for angelic accompaniment for the child’s journey has already been provided (the reader and the narrator know this, but the characters do not). Anna ceases her weeping after Tobit’s reassurances. The child, the angel and the dog depart.36

2.3.2.2 The Welcome of Tobit by Raguel and Edna (Tob 7:1-9b)

Raphael responds to Tobias’ request and leads him to Raguel’s house. They find Raguel sitting beside the courtyard door. This is a ‘liminal’ (‘threshold’, ‘transitional’) place—like the gate of the city—that readers of the LXX who were also familiar with Homer would associate with good hosts, watching and waiting, poised to receive strangers, and ready to ‘go out and meet’.37 Raguel continues to produce evidence of his status as good host with his enthusiastic greeting—“Many joyful greetings, brothers, and welcome in good health!”

By being ready to receive guests at the courtyard door (“by the door of the courtyard”—παρὰ τὴν θύραν τῆς αὐλῆς) Raguel has (as well as he could, without the advance notice of a forerunner) gone out to meet his guests. The next section of the verse provides the evidence for that picture, “Then he [Raguel] led them into his house [καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον]” (Tob 7:1d).

An exchange of initial reports then takes place, particularly about origins and identity.38 The irony in the scene is greatly increased with the question from Edna, “Do you

36 Readers of Homer would recognise that accompanying dogs (like Odysseus’ Argos—Od. 17.292) often form a natural part of significant departures and arrivals—although this dog who presumably follows the whole ‘there and back’ journey in the case of Tobias receives only two brief mentions.

37 Od. 17.339, 103.

38 The ‘exchange of reports’ would be a familiar element of the cultural script to readers of Homer where initial conversations typically include the questions ‘Where are you from?’ and ‘How did you get here?’.
know Tobit our kinsman?” The irony is further increased through the careful ordering of the next steps in the conversation.

And they replied, “Yes, we know him.”
Then she asked them, “Is he in good health?”
They replied, “He is alive and in good health.”
And Tobias added, “He is my father!”

This surprising revelation precipitates a flurry of further hospitable responses from Raguel, Edna and Sarah, including jumping up (7:6), kissing (7:6), weeping (7:6,8), blessing (7:7), commiseration (7:7—curiously in response to Tobit’s blindness, which no one had mentioned to this point), falling upon Tobias’s neck (7:7), the slaughtering of a ram from the flock (7:9), and what remains to be described as “a warm welcome”(7:9), presumably including the bathing, washing and reclining for dinner (which are mentioned in 7:9). These are very familiar elements of hospitality scenes in a wider reading of the LXX, and they form the conventional elements of the so-called betrothal scenes of the Pentateuch. But the first evidence for Raguel as a good host is his readiness to go out to meet the guests and his escort of them into his home. This is a key element of the cultural script established by this type of literature.

The Welcome of Tobit runs seamlessly into the next event of hospitality (The Brief Pre-Nuptial Celebration). This quick transition is effected through the urging and insistence of Tobias (7:9 and 7:11). The Brief Pre-Nuptial Celebration contains the escort of both the bride and the bridegroom to their bedroom. After the guests, including the bride and groom, began to eat and drink (7:14), Raguel instructs Edna to make ready a wedding bed and to “take her there” (καὶ ἐἰσάγαγε αὐτήν ἐκεί). Edna takes her daughter to the room (“and brought her there”—καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτήν ἐκεί). The ‘instruction followed by execution’ pattern allows for a repetition that emphasises the escort. When Tobias and Raguel are finished eating and drinking (8:1), Tobias too is escorted to the room with the wedding bed (“they took the young man and brought him into the bedroom”—καὶ ἀπῆγαγον τὸν νεανίσκον καὶ εἰσῆγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ ταμιεῖον; Sinaiticus: ταμιον).
2.3.2.3 The Farewell Extended to Tobias and Sarah by Raguel and Edna (Tob 10:7d-13)

The virtue of Raguel as a good host is established from the moment that he goes out to meet and escorts the arrival of Tobias and Raphael. However, Raguel nearly ruins his status as a good host when his desire to detain his son-in-law nearly over-rides the desire of his son-in-law to return home. This is a classic transgression of good host behaviour that would be recognisable to readers of both the LXX and Homer.39

LXX readers would recognise the phenomenon of over-detention principally in the characters of several other fathers-in-law: Laban, Jacob’s father-in-law, Jethro, Moses’ father-in-law—who in Numbers in the LXX is called “Raguel”—and the nameless father-in-law from Bethlehem (Judges 19:1-19). It seems that many fathers-in-law must overcome this potential stumbling block to good hosting of their sons-in-law—not detaining them any longer when they wish to leave with their bride. The over-detention of Jacob by his father-in-law Laban (Gen 30:25-31:1) nearly ends in calamity, but this is averted by Rachel’s lie (Gen 31:35) and through the making of a covenant between Jacob and Laban (31:43-54). The over-detention of the Levite by his Bethlehemite father-in-law precipitates the calamitous sequence of events that conclude the book of Judges (Judges 19:1-10 which introduces Judges 19–21).

Fortunately, Raguel (Sarah’s father) relents and releases his daughter and son-in-law to return to Tobit and Anna (Tob 10:9-10). This restores the sense of Raguel as a good host and father-in-law. The farewell has all the conventional elements: gift-giving (half of all Raguel’s property); bidding farewell; prayers and blessings; and the exchanging of promises.40

---

39 In Homer, a similar ‘over-detainer’ is Nestor—“too in love with his own hospitality” (Od. 15.222-225). Homer explained the danger of over-detention as the failure to keep the second of the two main strands of good hosting “Welcome those seeking to stay with you, speed the guest who desires to leave”. Other classic over-detainers familiar to Homer’s readers include Calypso, Circe, the Lotus-eaters, the Sirens, Nausicaa and Alcinous. See Section 3.4.

40 These elements have corresponding elements in the final part of Jacob’s farewell from Laban.
2.3.2.4 The Reception of Tobias by Anna and Tobit (Tob 11:1-15)

As Tobias and Sarah approach Nineveh, Raphael suggests that Tobias and he advance more quickly to make preparation for the arrival of Sarah, so that Tobias and Anna can be prepared to come out and meet their new daughter-in-law (and also to accomplish the preparations for the restoration of Tobit’s sight). The advancing of a separate party also allows for the narrative separation of the parents’ reception of Tobias from their reception of his new bride. The narrator signals the beginning of the ‘arrival’ scene by the timely mention that “the dog came along behind them”.

As Tobias expected, his delayed return has caused anxiety for his parents. This is narrated with great dramatic effect (10:1-7c) before Raguel’s attempt to over-detain Tobias (10:7d-13). Anna is again reproaching herself (10:5) and Tobit (10:7a) for letting her son go on the journey. Anna declares, “Stop trying to deceive me. My child has perished.” (10:7a) And yet she betrays her secretly held hope by waiting and watching the road for Tobias’ return (10:7b).

Anna’s watchfulness (the sign of a good host as well as an over-protective mother) is returned to in 11:5, immediately after the mention of the dog.

Now Anna sat looking intently at the road for her son. And she caught sight of him coming, and she said to his father, “Behold, your son is coming, and the man who went with him!”

It seems in the moment of her relief, Anna is prepared again to ‘share’ her child with her husband (Anna’s choice of possessive pronouns for Tobias constantly reveals her inner thoughts—when Tobias is delayed and Anna fears that he is dead, she calls him “my son”, because his death is all Tobit’s fault; whereas, when discovered to be alive, Anna says to Tobit, “Behold, your son is coming”).

Anna’s poignant reception of her son includes the conventional elements of running and falling upon his neck and weeping. She makes a short speech reminiscent of Jacob’s

---

41 Codex Sinaiticus has “And the Lord…” instead of “And the dog…”.
reunion with Joseph (Gen 46:28-30). Anna says, “I see you, my child; from now on I am ready to die” (Tob 11:9).

Tobit is told of his son’s return by Anna in 11:6. Tobit, despite his blindness, gets up and stumbles to his feet and goes out the door of the courtyard—actions which similarly mark him as a good host and not merely an over-protective father. The Qumran fragment 4Q Tob explicitly specifies that “he went out to meet” his son. Tobit’s going out to meet his son reinforces a cultural script frequently established in Jewish literature of the centuries leading up to the Common Era—good hosts go out to meet their guests whenever possible. And both of Tobit’s escorts (11:10 particularly as in 4Q Tob; and 11:16) occur in what I would argue is the climax of the tale—Tobit’s reunion with Tobias and Tobit’s welcoming of Sarah.

2.3.2.5 The Reception of Sarah by Tobit (Tob 11:16-18)

With his sight restored (Tob 11:14a), Tobit extends an even more extravagant escorted reception to his new daughter-in-law. He comes out, not just from his courtyard gate (as did Raguel in Tob 7:1), but “out to the gate of Nineveh” to meet her. G11 has Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Τωβίθ οίς ἀπάντησιν τῆς νύμφης αὐτοῦ καίρων καὶ εὐλογῶν τὸν θεόν πρὸς τὴν πύλην Νίνευ. G1 very similarly has Καὶ ἐξῆλθεν Τωβιτ εἰς συνάντησιν τῇ νύμφῃ αὐτοῦ καίρων καὶ εὐλογῶν τὸν θεόν πρὸς τὴν πύλην Νίνευ. (Note how this substantiates that ἀπάντησιν and συνάντησιν are synonymous).42 Both could be translated “Then Tobit, rejoicing and praising God, went out to meet his bride at the gate of Nineveh” (Tob 11:16).

This escorted arrival is arguably the climax of the entire book as the woman-who-would-never-be-a-wife is seen, blessed and welcomed by a man-whose-blindness-physicians-could-not-cure. The double prayers that were heard by God (in 3:16) and their ‘answer’—the fulfilment of which was proleptically narrated in 3:17—find their ‘real time’ fulfilment in the glorious reception of Tobit going out to meet his daughter-in-law Sarah (11:16-18). This places the escorting action in the very climax of the tale. The Ninevites’

42 Compare with the synonymy of the two terms established through a study of textual variants in the NT (Appendix 3).
response to this confident ‘going out to meet’ by the formerly-blind Tobit also marks this section as the climax of the entire tale—the people of Nineveh see Tobit “walking and moving along in all his strength and with no one leading him” and are “amazed”.

### 2.3.2.6 The Seven-Day Wedding Feast and Conclusion (Tob 11:16) & The Ending of Tobit

The second wedding feast draws the central travel section of the book to a close. All that essentially remains is for Raphael to divulge his true identity to Tobit and Tobias, and to explain his role to the characters—the role that readers have been aware of since 3:16-17. This is essentially the content of Chapter 12. Raphael reveals all to Tobit and Tobias and then departs by ascending to “him who sent me”.

Two elements of Chapter 12 would resonate for readers who were familiar with the LXX and Homer; and, as we shall see in Part B, these elements constitute an important element of a common cultural script assumed of Luke’s implied reader. These two elements are: the revelation of a concealed identity, including the conclusion of ‘theoxenies’ (scenes in which a heavenly guest visits as a stranger); and the departure (ascension) of a divine (or semi-divine) guest.

Readers of the LXX would be acquainted with the motif of ‘hidden identity revealed’ from their reading of the Joseph narratives. When Joseph’s brothers first encounter Joseph in Egypt they fail to recognise him. When Joseph eventually reveals his true identity to them, their initial reaction is dismay. Joseph exhorts them not to fear, and he speaks about the foreordained plan of God (Gen 45:4-5). Readers of the LXX would also be familiar with the motif in which heavenly visitors are mistaken for mortals. Abraham and Lot entertain divine guests whom they assume to be mortal (Genesis 18 and Genesis 19) and Jacob wrestles with a man at Peniel who turns out to be God—Genesis 32:22-32). In the theoxeny stories of Abraham, Lot and Jacob, the divine guests eventually reveal their true identities.

Homer’s readers are also very well acquainted with the motif of ‘hidden identity being revealed’. For most of Odysseus’ homecoming, few characters suspect that the newly
arrived ‘beggar’ is Odysseus. The gods from Olympus, especially Athena, regularly adopt disguises, and the eventual ‘revelation’ of their true identities often causes fear. Homer’s readers would also be well acquainted with the motif in which the ascent (departure) of the divine visitor leaves the hero with a feeling of encouragement or elation. For Lukan readers the similarity of Raphael’s last moments to Jesus’ revelation and departure in the Emmaus Road episode (Luke 24:13–35, especially vv. 31-32) and the episode that describes Jesus’ departure (ascension) at Bethany (Luke 24:50-53) would be clear.

2.3.3 Conclusion

The implied reader of the late first (early second) century imbued with a cultural script established in literature typical of Tobit would understand that welcome and escort demonstrate the inner virtues of characters, just as these actions demonstrate inner virtues in the characters of Tobit. A common set of virtues characterise God, his messenger (the angel, Raphael) and the hosts in Tobit (Tobit and Anna, and Raguel and Edna). These virtues are goodness, loyalty, faithfulness and mercy (or charitable deeds). The angel Raphael demonstrates these virtues principally through the most frequent epithet he bears in the tale: the “one who went with”—or escorted—Tobias, Tobit’s son.

The virtue of the human hosts in the story is sometimes seen through their charitable deeds (such as Tobit’s caring for the dead or Gabael’s faithful care of Tobit’s nest-egg). However, the most common demonstration of the virtue of hosts is in the way they welcome and receive those who are coming to visit them.

Good hosts in Tobit typically wait and watch for the arrival of guests. This is an important element of the cultural script established by literature such as Tobit. Good hosts are usually in the gate of the courtyard. They run to greet their guest with warm welcome, tears of joy, kisses and embrace. With advance notice they may even come out of the city to escort the visitor on the final leg of their arrival. They escort their guest into the house and prepare fine food (slaughter animals, bake bread). They make polite enquiry in the course of satisfying thirst and hunger. When their guest expresses the desire to return to
their home, they speed their departure. They might express an invitation to tarry, but they do not insist that the guest stay, and thereby ‘over-detain.’ Farewell is also often marked with tears, kissing, the invocation of the blessings of God, and hope of a return of the guest someday.

These conventions—including ‘going out to meet’ and escorted arrival—were no mere ornament to the story but an integral part by which the author demonstrates the character and godliness, the virtues of the men and women in the story. These conventions establish a cultural script in regard to hospitality in general, and in escort (in the context of hospitality) specifically.

### 2.4 ‘Going Out to Meet’ and Escorted Arrival in *Joseph and Aseneth*

In this section we consider how *Joseph and Aseneth* further confirms a cultural script for readers of the late first (early second) century, particularly with regard to hospitality and escort—a cultural script with which we might hear a reading of Luke and Acts in Part B of this study.

#### 2.4.1 Parallels between *Joseph and Aseneth* and Luke and Acts

Christoph Burchard and others have noted parallels between *Joseph and Aseneth* (*JosAs*) and parts of the NT. Burchard’s explanation of these parallels is that, “as a Greek Jewish writing, *Joseph and Aseneth* is part of the background of early Christianity and its literature.”43 This is another way of expressing the idea that the cultural script established by literature like *JosAs* is appropriate to bring to a reading of the New Testament.

---

Steve Delamater has compiled a scripture index to Charlesworth’s *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha (OTP)*.\(^4\) The table below examines citations in *JosAs* (and the whole of Charlesworth’s *OTP*) corresponding to the first five books of the New Testament. Examination of the last row (references from *JosAs* expressed as a percentage of those from the whole *OTP*) reveals a particular affinity between *JosAs* and Luke and Acts (see Table 2.2), suggesting that the elements of a cultural script established by *JosAs* would be particularly apt to bring to a reading of Luke’s writings.

**Table 2.2: Statistical analysis of citation of the four canonical gospels and Acts in the Pseudepigrapha (including *JosAs*).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of citations in Delamarter’s index from <em>JosAs</em></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of citations in Delamarter’s index from <em>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</em></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To add another substantial dimension to these statistics suggesting affinity between *JosAs* and Luke-Acts, we could note that there are several instances of *narrative* affinity between the two works.

The mention of food laws as a reason for maintaining separation between Jews and Gentiles, along with the particular mention of animal food products obtained by “strangulation” as an idolatrous thing to be avoided are common to both works (*JosAs* 7:1 cf. *Acts* 10-11, 15; *JosAs* 8:5 cf. *Acts* 15: 29).

The plot in *JosAs* from Chapter 10 to Chapter 19, from the appearance of the angel firstly to Aseneth, then to Joseph (implied, but not narrated directly, see *JosAs* 19:9) and then the bringing of the two characters together to ‘compare notes’ on their independent revelations, has the same narrative ‘shape’ as many Lukan narratives. Luke frequently

---

narrates incidents which begin with separate revelations to two character who then come together and speak of their related ‘revelations’—for instance, the story of Elizabeth and Mary (Luke 1:5-56), the Emmaus Road disciples and the ‘Eleven’ (Luke 24:13-35), the story of Saul and Ananias (Acts 9:1-19a), or the story of Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10).

The double naming of someone during a moment of revelation is also common to both works (JosAs 14:4, 7 cf. Luke 10:41 and Acts 9:4), as is a three-time appearance of an angel to ‘convert’ or change someone (JosAs 14:4, 7, 11; Acts 10:13-16).

The incident between Pharaoh’s son and Levi (JosAs 29) is very reminiscent of the parable of ‘The Compassionate Samaritan’ (Luke 10:25-37)—the detail of which I demonstrate in the table at the conclusion of section 2.4.5.

Christoph Burchard admits to being “under the impression that the author of JosAs, had he become a Christian, is likely to have ended up as a theologian much like the Third Evangelist.”

2.4.2 Textual considerations for Joseph and Aseneth

The textual history of JosAs is not yet fully understood. The Greek manuscripts fall into at least four groups a, b, c, and d. Burchard explains that “difficulties start with d. It is one third shorter than a. Philenenko feels that d represents the oldest attainable text of Joseph and Aseneth; it was expanded into b, which was revised into c, which was finally revised into a.” Burchard’s more careful analysis turns much of this on its head. He claims that, “d is more likely to be an epitome…, of a fuller text, which was close to the unre-

---

45 Christoph Burchard and Carsten Burfeind, Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth, Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha (Leiden; New York: E.J. Brill, 1996), p. 270. The quotation comes from Chapter Eleven in Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth which is in English and is entitled ‘The Importance of Joseph and Aseneth for the Study of the New Testament: A General Survey and a Fresh Look at the Lord’s Supper’. In many ways I think that the sentiment in the quotation is correct (regarding the author of JosAs not being far from “a theologian much like the Third Evangelist”); but I suspect that the author of the Third Gospel had a more highly developed sense of the social-justice implications of salvation including the redistribution of wealth. I think Luke would have ‘no little difficulty’ in writing such a hagiographic account of Joseph who “made slaves of [the people] from one end of Egypt to the other” (Gen 47:21).
vised archetype of a.” For the purpose of this study I use the longer text that Burchard has produced. An English translation of this is available in Charlesworth’s OTP. A full Greek critical edition with full apparatus (from the entire manuscript tradition—Greek and versional) is available in Joseph und Aseneth by Christoph Burchard et al.

2.4.3 Dating of Joseph and Aseneth

Unfortunately, when Greek and Latin versions of JosAs came to light, the noted patristic scholar, P. Battifol declared that he had discovered a Christian work emanating from 5th century Asia Minor. Although he retracted this statement a few years later, the damage was done, and JosAs was relegated to the Byzantine era. Most scholars these days would agree that the correct dating to be somewhere between 100 BCE and 100 CE and that it was written in Greek in the Egyptian Jewish Diaspora. It most likely comes from a Jewish milieu similar to that from which many early Christians were drawn. Burchard suggests that “it is an established rule today to look to Diaspora Judaism first when it comes to explaining the origin and growth of Christianity in the Greek-speaking world.” Burchard further explains that even if JosAs were composed early enough to have had an influence on first century Christianity, there is no evidence that it did. Rather we are dealing with a book that is a “witness to that Jewish heritage which helped early Christians to govern their lives, form their thought and communicate it to others, or to that which many

48 Christoph Burchard, Carsten Burfeind and Uta Barbara Fink, Joseph und Aseneth, Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2003). In terms of electronic availability, at the time of writing, Accordance software could only supply the text of d, and so I have manually copied Burchard where I have quotations from JosAs.
of them had abandoned.”50 JosAs “broadens our view of the common ground between Christianity and Judaism.”51

2.4.4 *Joseph and Aseneth and the motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure*

JosAs and Luke-Acts have much in common in the area of travel, reception and hospitality. I find it puzzling therefore that Burchard, in the introductory notes written for Charlesworth’s *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, states that he sees no evidence in JosAs of “the more popular social virtues” among which he includes hospitality.52 Contrary to Burchard’s observation, my reading of JosAs notes many passages where the focus appears to be hospitality and reception, including escorted arrival, escorted departure, and, of particular interest to the present study (*cf.* Chapters 5 and 6), an instance where the absence of escort is clearly stated to be an expression of envy and hostility (JosAs 20:11).

Below is a retelling of parts of JosAs where I believe a reader would detect instances of *escorted arrival* and *escorted farewell*—and also instances of *failure* to provide escort. These accounts of escort in JosAs—so similar, we shall see, to Lukan accounts of escort—do not necessarily result from “literary influence on either side”,53 but rather may be “due to a common Jewish heritage”. Certainly the high degree of literary similarity established in Section 2.4.1 (above) legitimates using JosAs as an aid to interpreting the significance and meaning of the escort and welcome motifs as we find them in Luke and Acts.

The plot of JosAs derives from a brief mention in Genesis that Pharaoh gave Aseneth, the daughter of Potiphera (LXX ‘Πετεφρῆς’ as in Gen 41:45), the priest of On, to Joseph to be his wife and that Aseneth became the mother of Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen 41:45,50-1). Burchard holds that JosAs is written largely to satisfy the curiosity of how it

51 Burchard and Burfeind, *Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth*, p. 266.
is that the faithful monotheist Joseph could marry the pagan daughter of the priest of a foreign religion with many gods.\textsuperscript{54} I agree with this perception of the general purpose of \textit{JosAs}, but would add a further detail to the purpose—that the narrative is a positive portrayal of Jewish engagement with a foreigner. This is a portrayal shared with many other biblical narratives such as Ruth and Jonah and narratives within the Pentateuch and Former Prophets—involving Hagar, Tamar, Moses’ unnamed Cushite wife, and Rahab. What these narratives have in common is the purpose of championing the inclusion of the outsider or the ‘foreigner’—a fulfilment of the divine promise that there would be a blessing to all nations through Abraham (Gen 12: 3b). It is a strand of scripture that runs counter to the post-exilic idea of achieving holiness through separation and exclusion (‘thoroughbred’ holiness) exemplified by Ezra’s edict to send away foreign wives and the children born of those women (Ezra 10:1-44). \textit{JosAs}, like the books of Ruth or Jonah, challenges xenophobic fears. This purpose of championing inclusion is most clearly revealed in Aseneth’s change of opinion about Joseph—whom she initially rejects as the “son of a Canaanite shepherd”. We see the change when Aseneth is prepared to marry Joseph and then when she desires to visit Jacob (later in the narrative) whom she then sees as a ‘god’. We also see the overcoming of xenophobic prejudice played out by the different responses of Joseph’s brothers—some of whom honour and accept Aseneth, while others display envy and hostility.

There are many instances of welcome and hospitality in \textit{JosAs} that do not bear directly on the focus of this current study—the motifs of \textit{escorted arrival} and \textit{escorted departure}. However, there is an interplay between all elements of hospitality, and so we will examine them all briefly, as they reveal which characters are disposed to offering hospitality and which characters are withholding their hospitality. The great number of these instances of hospitality in the narrative makes it difficult to empathise with Burchard’s judgement that the author of \textit{JosAs} is not concerned with hospitality.\textsuperscript{55}

\textsuperscript{54} Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” p. 194-5.
My approach to the text of JosAs is a broad survey rather than a very close reading of a few chosen passages. This approach is justified in JosAs by the wide spread references to escort. Also, the links, on the one hand, between escorting a guest and honouring that guest, and on the other hand, failure to escort a guest and hating (or envying) that guest, are quite explicit in the text, as the following reading reveals.

2.4.5 A Reading of Joseph and Aseneth with a focus on hospitality, welcome, meeting and escort

In the beginning of the narrative, Pentephres (JosAs like Genesis in the LXX renders Potiphera’s name as Πετεφρῆς) announces to his daughter that Joseph is going to visit, and that it is his (Pentephres’) intention to marry her off to Joseph. Aseneth immediately disapproves of the plan. Aseneth displays great xenophobic hostility towards Joseph—he is “a foreigner”, “the son of a Canaanite shepherd”. This is by no means the full extent of what Aseneth has against Joseph—she describes Joseph as “a fugitive”, “once sold as a slave”, “once thrown into prison for adultery”, and an “interpreter of dreams” (“like old Egyptian women”!). Aseneth demonstrates her contempt for Joseph by not joining the rest of Pentephres’ household who ‘went out to meet’ (ἐξῆλθον εἰς συνάντησιν) him—which is the way of honouring their very important guest. Aseneth remains in her penthouse apartment—in her tower (JosAs 5:3,4,7).

And Pentephres and his wife and all his family and house-servants went out to meet [ἐξῆλθον εἰς συνάντησιν] Joseph. And the gates of the court looking east were opened, and Joseph entered (JosAs 5:3,4)

…And Pentephres and his wife and his whole family, except their daughter Aseneth [πλὴν τῆς θυγατρὸς αὐτῶν Ἀσενὲθ], went [ἦλθε] and prostrated themselves face down [προσεκύνησαν] to the ground before Joseph (5:7).

56 According to the biblical account, Egyptians held shepherds in contempt. See Gen 46:34 where it speaks of Joseph settling Jacob in Goshen (“All shepherds are abhorrent to the Egyptians”).

57 Aseneth labels Joseph a foreigner, a fugitive, once sold as a slave, once thrown into prison for adultery, the interpreter of dreams (like old Egyptian women) as well as “the son of a Canaanite shepherd”.

When Joseph has entered Pentephres’ house he is the recipient of the traditional gestures of hospitality—foot washing and having food set before him (7:1).

When Aseneth finally consents to coming down from her penthouse tower, her father bids her to kiss Joseph. Joseph however refuses the kiss on the grounds that she is a pagan. He proclaims, “It is not fitting for a man who worships God… to kiss a strange woman who will bless with her mouth dead and dumb idols and eat from their table bread of strangulation and drink from their libation a cup of insidiousness and anoint herself with the ointment of destruction” (8:5).

Another gesture of hospitality is the offering to prolong a visit—what I have dubbed a ‘detention entreaty’. When Joseph has eaten, he makes preparation to leave (9:3). And Pentephres said to Joseph, “Let my lord lodge [αὐλίσθητω] here today, and tomorrow you will go out (on) your way.” One pitfall for hosts is the danger of over-detaining their guests—detaining them when they wish to leave. An over-extended ‘detention entreaty’ forms an important part of the narrative in the terrible tale of The Levite’s Concubine (Judges 19:4-13—which five times uses the same verb for lodge, αὐλίζομαι). In JosAs, Joseph declines the offer to stay longer but promises to return in the “eighth day”. Pentephres proves to be a good host in that he allows Joseph to leave.

Joseph’s week-long absence sets the scene for the following lengthy sections of JosAs: the first section concerning Aseneth’s private repentance (Chapters 10-13) and the second

---

58 As we have seen in the previous section, these motifs follow the archetypal precedent set by Abram (in Gen 18:1-8), and the betrothal narratives of Genesis (Gen 24 and 29).

59 As we have seen, kissing is a common element in hospitality and reconciliation scenes (as in ‘When Esau Reconciled with Jacob’—Gen 33:1-17 esp. v. 4) or ‘When Absalom Appeared to Reconcile with David’—2 Sam 14:33). Likewise (as we will see in Part B), kissing is an element associated with hospitality and reconciliation in the Lukan narratives—for example, Luke 7:38,45 (where the lack of a kiss betrays inhospitality), 15:20, 22:47-48 (where the kiss is ‘corrupt’ or a ‘parody’), Acts 20:37. See Sections 5.3.1, 5.5.1.2, 5.5.1.7 and 6.2.10.

60 In Judges 19, the father of the concubine delays (or causes) the terrible tragedy by detaining his son-in-law for five days. As we will see in Chapter 3, ‘over-detention’ is a negative element of many hospitality scenes in Homer’s Odyssey—‘over-detention’ is a threat to the element of true hospitality of seeing the guest on their way so that they can commence a safe journey home. A positive ‘detention entreaty’ is made by the disciples on the Road to Emmaus in Luke 24:29.

61 Over-detention is a fault to which fathers-in-law seem particularly vulnerable in the OT (see Section 2.3.2.3).
concerning a visitation of Aseneth by an angel—an angel with a similar appearance to Joseph, JosAs 14:9. The angel announces Aseneth’s acceptance with God. In a gesture of welcome (or awe) Aseneth falls on her face at the feet of the angel (14:10).

Aseneth says, “If I have found favour in your sight, Lord, and will know that you will do all your words that you have spoken to me, let your maidservant speak before you.” And the man said to her, “Speak (up).” And Aseneth stretched out her right hand and put it on his knees and said to him, “I beg you, Lord, sit down a little on this bed... And I will set a table before you, and bring you bread and you will eat, and bring you from my storeroom old and good wine... And after this you will go out (on) your way.” And the man said to her, “Hurry [σπεῦσον] and bring (it) quickly.” (JosAs 15:13-15)

The prefacing words constitute a very common formula of speech in hospitality scenes (“If I have found favour…”—Gen 30:27, 33:10; Esth 5:8). It seems that Aseneth is having an opportunity—a ‘second-chance’—to make up for the failure to provide hospitality to Joseph, for next she “hurried (ἔσπευσεν) and set a new table before him and went to provide bread for him.” (16:1). This has all the Abrahamic marks of hospitality: haste, bowing, and provision of food (Gen 18:1-18).

Just after the heavenly man departs, Joseph returns and Aseneth demonstrates her repentance and her preparedness to receive and welcome Joseph by providing hospitality (as she is now willing to accept marriage to him). Aseneth first hears of the arrival of Joseph because of a forerunner.

And as Aseneth was still saying these things to herself, behold, a young man from Pentephres’ servant staff rushed in and said, “Behold, Joseph the Powerful One of God is coming today. For a forerunner [ὁ γὰρ πρόδρομος] of his is standing at the gates of our court.” And Aseneth hurried [ἔσπευσεν] and called her foster-father.

62 The idea of angels being able to impersonate particular people also arises in Acts when Rhoda, who claims to have heard the imprisoned Peter at the door, is first told, “You are mad.” And then that “It must be his angel” (Acts 12:15).

63 A similar formula is used by Lydia in Acts. “If you judge me to be faithful to the Lord, come and stay at my home.” And she prevailed upon us.” (Acts 16:15).

64 The ‘second chance’ motif present in JosAs is also a very common motif in Luke and Acts, e.g. Luke 1:20,64 (Zechariah); 19:2,9 (Zacchaeus); Acts 3:14-15,19-21 (Men of Israel); 7:27,34 (Israelites); 8:3, 9:4-6 (Saul/Paul). See Section 5.6.

(steward) of her house, and said to him, “Hurry [σπεῦσον] and make the house ready and prepare a good dinner, because Joseph the Powerful One of God is coming to us today.” (18:1-3).

After Aseneth has attended to her bridal robes and her face is miraculously restored to great beauty (her countenance had fallen during her repentance), Joseph arrives.

And while they were still speaking this (way) a boy came and said to Aseneth, “Be-hold, Joseph is standing at the doors of our court.” And Aseneth hurried [ἔσπευσεν] and went down the stairs from the upper floor with the seven virgins to meet [εἰς συνάντησιν] Joseph and stood in the entrance of the house. And Joseph entered the court and the gates were closed, and all the strangers remained outside.


Again the haste and the going out of one’s way feature very prominently in this narrative of hospitality.66

After exchanging accounts of their revelations, Joseph and Aseneth agree that the divine will is that they marry (19:4-10).67 The initial dialogue between Joseph and Aseneth is presumably with some distance still between them because it is followed by another running scene.

…Joseph stretched out his hands and called Aseneth by a wink of his eyes. And Aseneth also stretched out her hands and ran up to Joseph and fell on his breast. And Joseph put his arms around her, and Aseneth (put hers) around Joseph, and they kissed each other for a long time and both came to life in their spirit. (JosAs 19:10)

As we shall see, there are many parallels here to the return of the younger son in the parable of the ‘Father with Two Son’ (Luke 15:11-32): the running, the kissing, and the

66 As we shall see, haste and ‘coming out to meet’ are also very common motifs associated with hospitality in Luke. Mary makes haste to visit Elizabeth. The shepherds make haste to visit the baby Jesus. The father runs to greet the son in the parable of Luke 15. Zacchaeus runs to the tree in order to see Jesus. With some slight textual uncertainty, Peter runs to see if he can meet the Lord at the tomb.

67 This part of the story has great similarities to the dynamic in the many Lukan narratives (‘When Mary Visits Elizabeth’, ‘When The Emmaus Road Disciples Meet the Eleven’, ‘When Ananias Visits Saul’, ‘When Cornelius Met Peter’)—where angels (or in Acts, Jesus) first independently reveal good news to separate characters who are then brought together in the narrative and can share and thus confirm their separate revelations.
being made alive again (JosAs has καὶ ἀνέζησαν ἀμφότεροι τῷ πνεύματι αὐτῶν; cf. Luke 15:24 ἀνέζησαν).\(^{68}\)

After Joseph and Aseneth “embraced each other for a long time and interlocked their hands like bonds.” (20:1), Aseneth invites Joseph to enter the house (because she has prepared it and made a great dinner—20:1-2). She leads him in and sits him on her father’s throne (20:2). And she brings water and personally washes his feet (20:3-4). There is more kissing.

Much later in the narrative,\(^\text{69}\) Aseneth says to Joseph, “I will go and see your father [Jacob]”—a “god” nonetheless—no longer “a Canaanite shepherd”! The visit of Aseneth to Jacob (JosAs 22:1-13) sets up the dynamics that allow us to see which brothers of Joseph are of good will towards Joseph and Aseneth, and which ones bear them ill will. And this is achieved through the motifs of \textit{escorted arrival} and \textit{escorted departure}. Joseph’s brothers met them (ἀπήντησαν αὐτοῖς) and prostrated themselves (προσεκύνησαν αὐτοῖς)—JosAs 22:5. After the visit of Joseph and Aseneth to Jacob, Simeon and Levi accompany Joseph and Aseneth home (καὶ συμπροέπεμπσαν αὐτοὺς Συμεὼν καὶ Λευὶς οἱ ἀδελφοὶ Ἰωσὴφ οἱ υἱοὶ Λίας μόνοι—22:11a). But (!) the sons of Bilhah and Zilpah (presumably Gad, Asher, Dan and Naphtali, although in the later part of the story, the elder two, Gad and Dan, prove the most hostile) “did not accompany” (οὐ συμπροέπεμπσαν) “them because they envied them and were hostile against them” (ὁι δὲ νιὸι Βάλλας καὶ Ζέλφας τῶν παιδισκῶν Λίας καὶ Ῥαχήλ οὐ συμπροέπεμπσαν αὐτοῖς, διότι ἐφθόνουν καὶ ἠχθραινον αὐτοῖς—22:11b).\(^{70}\)

\(^{68}\) Burchard points out that this is “the first indubitable occurrence of \textit{anazan} besides Lk 15:24 and Rom 7:9.” Burchard, “Joseph and Aseneth,” p. 233, n. l.


\(^{70}\) Burchard, Burfeind and Fink, \textit{Joseph und Aseneth}, 275. Burchard, Burfeind and Fink provide textual notes for this pericope (22,11). The longer text accepted by Burchard (\textit{contra} Philonenko and \textit{contra} Kraemer) includes this section about the failure to accompany. Some manuscripts have a shorter synonym for \textit{συμπροέπεμπσαν} (“accompany”: some have \textit{προέπεμπσαν}, some \textit{προέπεμπσαν}, some \textit{συμποέπεμπσαν}, some \textit{συνοδεύσας}.}
The connection made explicit by this sentence (22:11) from *Joseph and Aseneth* makes a very strong case for failure to escort being a serious omission. This strongly establishes the element of a cultural script which would be possessed by Luke’s implied reader—they would interpret failure to escort as *envy* (φθονέω) or *hatred* (ἐχθραίνω) toward the potential guests.

In *JosAs*, the hostility and envy that first expresses itself when Gad and Dan fail to accompany Joseph and Aseneth in their departure then finds greater expression in the rest of the story as Pharaoh’s son seeks to kill Joseph and marry Aseneth (23:1-2). Pharaoh’s son seeks co-conspirators to aid him in the assassination of his father and Joseph (23:1–24:20). In Chapter 23, Simeon and Levi whose *bona fides* has been established by their willingness to escort, refuse to join Pharaoh’s son in his evil plan, whereas—in Chapter 24—Dan and Gad, who have *failed to escort* Joseph and Aseneth, agree to assist Pharaoh’s son.

Both assassination plans are thwarted by the story’s end. Pharaoh’s assassination is thwarted because he is resting and has given instructions that he is not to be disturbed by anyone including his son. Aseneth’s assassination is thwarted because she has the advantage of an escort of 600 men and an astonishing response to her prayers—her enemies’ swords dissolve. Aseneth also has the accompaniment of young Benjamin who wounds Pharaoh’s son with a sling and stone and likewise kills his fifty accomplices (à la David with Goliath). The lives of Dan and Gad are then endangered when Levi, Simeon, Reuben, Judah, Issachar and Zebulun arrive to act as Aseneth’s aid. Aseneth becomes a model of forgiveness of her enemies as she pleads for the lives of those who have sought to kill her. Levi, similarly, becomes a model of forgiveness of enemies when Pharaoh’s son lies stricken and about to die. Benjamin has taken Pharaoh’s son’s sword and is about to slay him with it. Levi’s aid of Pharaoh’s son is narrated in a style very reminiscent of the Good Samaritan, as the following synoptic table makes clear.

---

71 There is a delicious humour in the simplicity with which Pharaoh’s assassination by his son is thwarted.
Levi raised Pharaoh’s son (from the ground)

καὶ ἀνέστησε Λευὶς τὸν υἱὸν Φαραὼ (ἐκ τῆς γῆς)

And went to him

καὶ προσελθὼν

He went to him

[kαὶ ἀπένιψε τὸ αἷμα ἀπὸ τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἔδησε τελαμῶνα εἰς τὸ τραύμα αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἔποθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ἱππόν αὐτοῦ
καὶ ἐκόμισεν ἢγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον
καὶ προσέλθει Λευὶς αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ίδιον κτήνος]

[καὶ εἰπερήκεν αὐτόν ἐπὶ τὸν ὅποιον ἱππόν
καὶ ἔπεμπε τὸν ἢγαγεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ἱππόν
καὶ ἔποθηκεν αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν ἱππόν
καὶ ἐκόμισεν ἢγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον]

[καὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ]

[kαὶ ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ]

These last two instances of graceful action towards an enemy (Aseneth’s merciful action towards Gad and Dan and Levi’s action towards Pharaoh’s son) lead some scholars to think that JosAs may have some Christian influence. However, this is to presume, incorrectly, that the extension of forgiveness to enemies is the exclusive preserve of Christianity. It is assumptions like these that made an early dating of JosAs seem unthinkable. This is to forget Christoph Burchard and Carsten Burfeind’s advice to broaden “our view of the common ground between Christianity and Judaism”.

2.5 Conclusion

Joseph and Aseneth contributes an important element to the cultural script and therefore to an understanding of the motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure as they occur in Luke and Acts. The instances of accompaniment in JosAs are strongly linked with the various characters’ attitude toward the central heroic characters of the narrative (and indirectly towards God and towards ‘inclusion of an outsider’). Pentephres and his wife are shown to be faithful to Joseph and to God’s plan that Aseneth should marry Joseph (a foreigner, the son of a Canaanite shepherd) in that they go out to meet Joseph. Aseneth is at first shown not to be receptive to Joseph or to God’s plan that she should marry him,

---

72 Burchard and Burfeind, Gesammelte Studien zu Joseph und Aseneth, p. 266.
and this is demonstrated by her failure to go out and meet him. Her conversion results in a complete reversal of this attitude. The reality of this transformation is communicated though her willingness to prepare for Joseph's arrival and then, that she goes out to meet him. The sons of Leah demonstrate their good will toward the two heroes (who by this stage are married) by going out to meet them (when Joseph and Aseneth pay a visit to Jacob) and by the escort they give them as they depart and return to their home after this visit. The sons of Bilhah and Zilpah demonstrate their envy and hostility toward Joseph and Aseneth by their refusal to escort the couple after the visit to Jacob. In the final chapters of the story Levi extends this good will to a clear enemy of Joseph and Aseneth by his washing, wound-binding, setting him on his horse and accompanying him home to his father.

The connections between good will and escort and between hostility and the failure to escort are conspicuous in Joseph and Aseneth, and establish important elements in the cultural script. They will therefore make significant contributions to the implied reader's interpretation of the narratives of Luke and Acts.
According to Loveday Alexander, “[W]e must reckon with the stories and characters of Homer as part of the cultural script of the New Testament writers and their first readers.”

This chapter seeks particularly to focus on instances of welcome, meeting, and escort in Homer’s narratives in order to establish how hospitality scenes might be viewed by the implied reader of Luke and Acts.

3.1 The Relevance of Homer to New Testament Studies

A recent development in New Testament studies is to seek to understand the Graeco-Roman milieu for the gospels and Acts by examining the writings attributed to Homer. One notable proponent of this is Dennis R. MacDonald. While not all have been impressed by MacDonald’s attempt to demonstrate Lukan literary dependence on Homer, scholars are prepared to concede that Homer’s writings do, at least, deserve inclusion as “part of the

---


Hellenistic intertexture for interpreting Luke-Acts. My own research of Homer as an intertextual partner to establish a cultural script with which to read Luke and Acts suggests that such a line of inquiry is promising. And so what follows is a brief case to explain why the recent attention of New Testament scholarship upon Homer’s writings is justified.

Firstly, the stories of Homer were well known at the time of the writing of the documents in the New Testament. One first century witness to this is the rich papyrus evidence of portions of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The Leuven Database of Ancient Books (which keeps a record of nearly all papyri that have been published) reveals that significant numbers of papyri with Homer’s writings have been dated from between the third century BCE through to the sixth century CE, with particularly high numbers in the first three centuries CE (see Figure 3.1).

Because the dating of papyri can often only be established within a range, the figures for each century represent an averaging of the most likely dates (hence the decimal points in the following table). For the first century CE (“AD01”), LDAB cites 233.4 texts for Homer and for the second century (“AD02”), 613.7 texts for Homer. To put these numbers into perspective I have listed (in Table 3.1) corresponding results for the three next-best-preserved authors together with other writers whose texts are preserved from the first and second centuries (many of whom are often cited in relation to the writing of the New Testament).

---

Figure 3.1: Numbers of preserved and published texts of Homer by centuries (Source: Leuven Database of Ancient Books, accessed in February 2014).  

Table 3.1: Ancient Western authors by number of texts preserved and published (Source: Leuven Database of Ancient Books, accessed January 2011.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>AD01</th>
<th>AD02</th>
<th>AD01 &amp; AD02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>233.4</td>
<td>613.7</td>
<td>847.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demosthenes</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hesiod</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>76.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euripides</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>73.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>53.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thucydides</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plato</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callimachus</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socrates</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isocrates</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindar</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aeschylus</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcaeus</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herodotus</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xenophon</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aristophanes</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophocles</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archilochus</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgil</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

It can be seen from Table 3.1 that one text survives for Homer for every surviving text of the twenty-one other authors combined! If one examines all the texts on LDAB where the first two centuries CE fall within the dating range, of these 5356 texts, Homer’s writings make up the lion’s share of 1529 (28.5%).

Secondly, there is evidence that Homer’s works were translated and adapted by writers of the three centuries BCE. Notably, Livius Andronicus translated (or paraphrased) the Odyssey into Latin (Odusia) thus making it accessible to Roman culture from the third century BCE. Quintius Ennius wrote Annales, covering Roman history from the fall of Troy (for which Ennius depended on Homer) down to the censorship of Cato the Elder in 184 BCE. In 19 BCE the Annales was superseded by Virgil’s Aeneid (late first century BCE c. 29-19 BCE), which was also very much influenced by Homer and extended the history of Rome from its foundation by Aeneas (a Trojan character from the Iliad) to the rule of Augustus. These various Latin translations and imitations demonstrate that Homer was considered important enough for his narratives to merit incorporation into Rome’s epic foundation myth, the Aeneid.

Thirdly, alongside Latin translations and imitations, Homer’s Greek texts occupied a central place in the curriculum of Roman schools. A sound knowledge of Homer was

---

seen as evidence of being well educated, and held as a mark of high social rank.\(^6\) Homer was also valued as a guide to correct conduct. As Joseph Farrell observes, “Snob appeal aside, Homer was more than a decorative element in Roman social life. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were revered as repositories of profound wisdom and as guides to proper behaviour… [Where] moral and ethical matters were concerned, Homer's prestige was immense.”\(^7\) (This observation has relevance to this study's enquiry into *escorted arrival* and *escorted departure* as appropriate expressions of hospitality and good will toward guests, including strangers).

Lastly, we have non-literary witnesses to Homer’s influence on Roman culture. As Farrell explains, “Homerising literature in Latin needs to be understood as part of a much broader and more pervasive Homeric presence in material culture and social practice.”\(^8\) Homer certainly shaped Roman life in literary ways (quotation, parody, colloquialism, thought and rhetoric),\(^9\) but also had an influence in ways attested by non-literary evidence, including effects on architecture and visual art. In Joseph Farrell’s survey of the non-literary presence of Homer in Rome and elsewhere in Italy, he lists artefacts that testify to Homer’s enduring influence on material culture: artefacts within burial chambers

---


7 Farrell, “Roman Homer”, p. 259, and see his citing of Horace in Horace's letter to Lollius Maximus, “[The] writer of the Trojan War [, Homer,] says more plainly and better than Chrysippus and Crantor what is fair, what is base, what is useful and what is not.” (Epist. I.2.14). Thus, Erich Auerbach (in his *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*) was incorrect to draw his sharp distinction between the purpose of the Hebrew Bible and Homer’s writings. Auerbach suggests that the Hebrew Bible was intended to plunge the reader into reality and shape the reader’s life morally and ethically (“make us fit our own life into its world”), and that Homer’s writing was primarily entertainment, written in order “make us forget our own reality for a few hours.” “Far from seeking, like Homer, merely to make us forget our own reality for a few hours, [the text of the Biblical narrative] seeks to overcome our reality: we are to fit our own life into its world, feel ourselves to be elements in its structure of universal history.” Erich Auerbach, “Odysseus’ Scar” by Erich Auerbach, in *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature*, trans. Willard R. Trask. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953, repr. 1974 and 2003, chapter one accessed from http://www.westmont.edu/~fisk/Articles/OdysseusScar.html in May 2011.)


9 Farrell also shows the way in which Homer had a pervasive influence on spoken Greek and Latin. The elite classes incorporated Homerisms into their speech as evidence of being well educated. The gauche *nouveau riche* who tried to imitate the elite classes, also incorporated Homerisms into their speech, often with less fidelity to the original Homer. Farrell, “Roman Homer”, pp. 254-69.)
(both Etruscan and Roman from the 8th to the 1st Century BCE); murals from fine houses (some from 30 BCE); the statuary in the sculpture garden at Sperlonga in Tiberius’ cave (early first century CE); small marble tablets, known as *tabulae Iliaceae* (1st century BCE–2nd century CE); frescoes from Pompeii (thus pre-79 CE). “This partial survey shows that elite Romans, like the Etruscans before them, surrounded themselves with visual Iliads and, especially, Odysseys.”

Farrell concludes, “Homer was a part of Roman culture from an early date, and he remained an important force throughout the classical period. Several other authors claimed for themselves or have had claimed for them that title of Roman Homer [referring to Livius, Ennius and Virgil], but if we consider all the available evidence, it is clear that the Roman Homer was none other than Homer himself.”

The influence of Homer on the Graeco-Roman world of the first and second century, particularly upon its writers and readers, is one reason for the recent renewed interest in Homer among NT scholars. It is also one of the reasons for examining Homer at this point of the current study. There are three further reasons: one has to do with the prominence of hospitality in both Homeric and Lukan writings. The second, which has more particular regard to this study, is the prominence of motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure common to both Homeric and Luke and Acts. The final reason has to do with a strong suggestion of Luke’s featuring of elements in his narratives that could be identified as Homerism or Homerica.

Steve Reece has already fully described the great frequency and importance that hospitality scenes play in Homer’s writings, in his monograph *The Stranger’s Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*. The works attributed to Homer, which, by convention Reece assumes to be the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey* and the *Hymns*, are

---

10 Farrell, “Roman Homer”, p. 262.
11 Farrell, “Roman Homer”, p. 271. The papyrological evidence available through LDAB would also support Farrell’s conclusion—papyri from each century of first six of the Common Era, Homer far outnumbers (about 80:1) Livius, Ennius and Virgil combined.
characterised by frequent extended references to *hospitality*. The *Odyssey* by virtue of the predominance of travel in the plot has more references to hospitality than the *Iliad* or the *Hymns*. As Reece suggests, “In a practical sense, then, the *Odyssey* may be regarded as a sequence of hospitality scenes.”\(^\text{13}\) As well as the conventional hospitality scenes, there are many scenes in the *Odyssey* that are parodies of the hospitality scene-type. The parodies are as effective as the true types in communicating, as Horace put it, “what is fair, what is base, what is useful, what is not”.

Furthermore, in Homer, there are many parts of the narrative where the nature of hospitality is reflected upon. Homer’s listeners hear characters reflect on why they have a duty to be hospitable, and they hear a diversity of reasons behind hospitable action. Some characters explain the sacred duty in terms of a necessity for travel in a dangerous world and in terms of mutuality and reciprocity (*Od.* 4.38-9F; 4.33-4L).\(^\text{14}\) Some characters speak of the possibility of entertaining the gods in disguise or of even being tested by the gods (*Od.* 17.533-7F; 17.484-487L). Other characters speak of hospitality as Zeus’ laws or precepts and their commitment to hospitality in terms of being ‘god-fearing’.\(^\text{15}\)

---


15  “[Don’t] anger me now… or… I may not spare your life [and thus] break the laws of Zeus” (*Il.* 24.669F=24.570L); “[Achilles] feared that… he might cut the old man down and break the laws of Zeus” (24.687F=24.586L); “Zeus forbid—and the other deathless gods as well—/ that you resort to your ship and put my house behind” (*Od.* 3.388-398F=3.346-355L); “What are here—violent, savage, lawless? / or friendly to strangers [hospitable] god-fearing men?” (6.132-3F=6.120-1L); “[So] we can pour out cups to Zeus who loves the lightning, / champion of suppliants—suppliants’ rights are sacred.” (*Od.* 7.195-6F=7.164-5L, which is identical to 7.214-5F=7.180-1L); ”No Phaeacian would hold you back by force. The curse of
Zeus is often spoken of as the patron (even the avenger) of strangers and suppliants (Od. 6.227F=6.208L; 9.303-5F=9.269-71L; 9.309-12F=9.275-8L). There is a proverb in *Odyssey* of fifteen words length that occurs in two very different locations: once, when Nausicaa speaks to the maidens, and again (with identical wording) when Eumaeus speaks to the beggar who is Odysseus in disguise: “All strangers and beggars are from God, and a gift though small is welcomed” (my translation, 6.227-9F=6.208-9L; 14.66-8F=14.55-61L). This important part of the cultural script survived well into the first century when we find Virgil’s near-identical phrases identifying hospitality as Jove’s (Jupiter’s) law.\(^16\)

The Phaeacian king, Alcinous, also makes a comment that has a proverbial feel to it: “Treat your guest and suppliant like a brother: / anyone with a touch of sense knows that.” (8.614-5F=8.546-7L).

Sometimes the justification for being hospitable is implicit (or presumed) and the rightness of hospitality is evident through a simple imperative, as is the case in the final hymn in Homer’s Hymns—Hymn 34, titled “To Guest-Friends/Hosts”, which is also listed as the first of Homer’s Epigrams.\(^17\)

Have respect for him who longs for your gifts and your houses,
all you who dwell in the lofty city of Hera, the lovely-faced nymph,
at the foot of towering S aidene,
drinking the divine water of the fair-flowing river,
the tawny Hermes, whom immortal Zeus sired.

(translation by Apostolos N. Athanassakis)\(^18\)

---

\(^{16}\) Virgil, *Aeneid*, 1.731.


As established in section 1.1, Luke is patently also interested in hospitality to the point where some biblical scholars describe hospitality as a major Lukan theme. It is therefore apt to compare Homeric hospitality with the depiction of hospitality in Luke and Acts, as both traditions had a very important role for hospitality in their narratives.

The final reason for turning to Homer in this study is Luke’s apparent inclusion of features that are very evocative of the Homeric world. One of the most conspicuous examples of this is in Acts in Lystra where the local inhabitants are convinced that Barnabas and Paul are Zeus and Hermes visiting them (Acts 14:8-18). A similar mistake occurs on the isle of Malta where the natives conclude that Paul must be a god (Acts 28:6). Indeed the entire storm and shipwreck scene (Acts 27:13-44), which leads to Paul washed up on the beach at Malta, is very evocative of Homer. Dennis R. McDonald has gone as far as suggesting that there are many literary parallels between the Lukan storm and shipwreck scene and the accounts of storms and shipwrecks that beset Odysseus in the Odyssey (5:288-547F=5.262-493L; 12:434-488F=12.400-450L). Of all the evangelists, Luke most seems to be writing to a readership whose reading expectations are at least partially informed by literary conventions of Graeco-Roman culture, which in turn had been shaped strongly by Homer.19

Another phenomenon contributing to a Homeric feel in Luke’s writing is a prevalence of proper nouns that a reader of Homeric would instantly recognise; many of the names in Acts evoke Homer’s world. These Homeric names fall into three categories: i) references to contemporary characters who share names with gods or other characters from the Iliad or the Odyssey, for example: Aeneas (Acts 9:33-34, Il. 2.93IF=2.820L, Hymns 5.198-200L), Dionysius (Acts 17:34, Il. 6.153-60F=6.132-135L); Apollos (Acts 18:24, Il. 1.10-6F=1.9-14L), Demetrios (Acts 19:24, Il. 2.794F=2.696L); and Jason (Acts 17:6-9, Od. 12.68F=12.73; Il. 7.541F=7.468-9L); ii) direct reference to gods who feature in the Iliad or the Odyssey, for example: Hermes, (Acts 14:12-13, Il. 2.121F=2.104L), Zeus (Acts 14:12-

---

An even stronger sense of Homer within Lukan writings comes from the many parallels to which Dennis R. MacDonald has brought attention. MacDonald has noted the following parallels: the casting of lots to replace Judas (Acts 1:12-26) with the casting of lots for someone to fight with Hector (*Iliad* 7); the visions of Cornelius and Peter (Acts 10) with the dream of Agamemnon and the portent of the serpent and the sparrows (*Iliad* 2); Peter’s escape from Herod’s prison (Acts 12:6-11) with Priam’s appearance before Achilles (*Iliad* 24 esp. 395-563F=24.334-479L); Paul’s farewell to the Ephesian elders (Acts 20:15-17; *Iliad* 2.980F=2.868L).
20:17-38) with Hector’s farewell to Andromache (Iliad 6);\(^{21}\) Eutychus’ fall from the window (Acts 20:7-12) with Elpenor’s fall from Circe’s roof (Odyssey 10-12);\(^{22}\) the storm and the shipwrecks of Paul (Acts 27:13-28:16) read against the storms and shipwrecks of the Odyssey (Od. 12.434-488F; 5.288-547F).\(^{23}\)

Dennis R. MacDonald has made a sustainable case for the use of Homeric evidence (not only for interpreting Luke and Acts, but also the Gospel of Mark, Tobit and the Acts of Andrew)—though I would not go so far (with MacDonald) as suggesting direct literary dependence. I think it is reasonable however, given the accessibility of Homer’s writings and their literary descendants in the first century, to use Homer as an intertextual lens for examining and interpreting Luke and Acts—or, in other words, to use Homer to establish the cultural script of the time in which Luke and Acts were written and first read.

### 3.2 What Hospitality in Homer Looks Like

In contrast to MacDonald’s line of inquiry, the concern here is not with every possible parallel between Homer and Luke. The focus in this study is upon reading expressions of hospitality in Luke intertextually with parallels in Homer. And furthermore, since this study focuses on *escorted arrival*, *escorted departure* and other hospitable escorts in Luke and Acts, I wish to examine closely the same motifs in the context of Homerian scenes of hospitality.

This introduces what may at first glance seem an unnecessary diversion—a brief discussion of anachrony—a term usually common only among narratologists. But the digression is justified. Anachrony—the narration of events out of strict chronological order—plays a key role in Homer’s establishing of what constitutes good hospitality. Therefore,

---


before discussing what a typical hospitality type-scene looks like in Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, I will explain briefly the important role that *anachrony* (particularly *analepsis*) plays in these two works, but particularly in the *Odyssey*.

There are two basic types of anachrony: *prolepsis* and *analepsis*. *Prolepsis* is the narration of events before they happen. Proleptic narration is essential to the narrative in the *Iliad*, which concludes at the end of its final book with the burial of Hector; the *Iliad* does not actually or fully narrate the incident with the wooden horse, the death of Achilles nor the final sacking of Troy. The ‘proleptic’ narration of these latter two ‘omitted’ events occurs subtly.

But by far the more common form of *anachrony* in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and certainly the form with a far greater impact on Homer’s depiction of hospitality, is *analepsis*—that is, the narration of events in a belated manner (at some point in the narrative order later than when it occurred in story time). The incident with the famed wooden horse (the brainchild of Odysseus which leads to the fall of Troy) is narrated fully by the blind bard Demodocus in the *Iliad’s* sequel, the *Odyssey* (Od. 8.559-584F=8.499-520L),

---


25 For instance, Calchas the prophet is recalled to have prophesied the fall of Troy in the tenth year of the war (“so we will fight in Troy that many [nine] years and then, / then in the tenth we’ll take her broad streets.”) (Il. 2.388-389F=2.328-9L); or at the beginning of *Iliad* Book 12 when the narrator summarises “While Hector still lived and Achilles raged on / and the warlord Priam’s citadel went unstormed, / so long the Achaean’s rampart stood erect. / But once the best of the Trojan captains fell, / and many Achaean’s died as well while some survived, / and Priam’s high walls were stormed in the tenth year / and the Argives set sail for the native land they loved—” (Il. 12.13-19F). Another proleptic glance at the missing ending is when Thetis tells her son Achilles: “hard on the heels of Hector’s death your death / must come at once” (Il. 18.112-4F). Hector’s dying words prophecy the death of Achilles thus, “that day when Paris and lord Apollo—if all your fighting heart—destroy you at the Scaean Gates.” These all constitute examples of *prolepsis*. For a discussion of prolepsis in Homer, see George Eckel Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil* (New York: Haskell House, 1966), pp. 28-32. Luke is familiar with this type of *prolepsis*. Acts lacks well-anticipated events like the fall of Jerusalem and the death of Paul, but these events have subtle proleptic allusions. (Luke 21:5-6; Acts 20:24-38)

26 For fuller definitions of prolepsis and analepsis, see: Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, p. 40; and Funk, *The Poetics*, pp. 188-91.

27 There is a brief analeptic report of what it was like waiting silently and patiently in the wooden horse by Menelaus at 4.297-324F (=4.265-289L).
when Odysseus enjoys the hospitality of the Phaeacians (an example of what Genette dubs a ‘completing analepsis’). The death of Agamemnon by the hand of his wife Clytemnestra and her lover Aegisthus is told in an analeptic manner twice: once, when Telemachus visits Menelaus (Od. 4.574-617F=4.512-547L) and at another time, when Odysseus visits Agamemnon in the House of the Dead (Od. 11.437-518F=11.385-456L).

There is also one particular anachrony on quite a large scale in *Odyssey*. An entire section of Odysseus’ journey from the end of the war at Troy, to the point where we first encounter him in Book 5 (after the Telemacheia) as the prisoner of Calypso on the island of Ogygia is narrated analeptically in the four books (Books 9–12) that are known as the Apologia. The Apologia contains Odysseus’ own bard-like account of his journey from Troy to his captivity on Ogygia. The Apologoi has eight tales of varying length: Odysseus’ Piratical Raiding of the Cicones; the Danger of the Lotus-eaters; the Cyclops, Polyphemus (Book 9); Aeolus, the Wind God; the Laestrygonians; Circe, the Witch (Book 10), the Kingdom of the Dead (Book 11) and the Cattle of the Sun God (Book 12). This chronological inversion of the Telemacheia and the Apologia, I dub the ‘grand anachrony’ of the Odyssey. Reece dubs it Homer’s *hysteron-proteron* (latter things-first things). Others, including narratologists (e.g. Genette), have noted the same phenomenon and refer to it as Homer’s choice to begin his story *in medias res* (in the middle of things). As we shall see, this ‘grand anachrony’ is crucial to understanding Homer’s depiction of model hospitality.

The inversion of Telemacheia and the Apologia works very well for the audience of the Odyssey for several sound reasons. As Bernard Knox explains,

---

30 The anachrony caused by the inversion of Telemacheia and the Apologia is highlighted when in the second last book of the Odyssey the whole plot is summarised as Odysseus relates his story to Penelope. This telling is described as “his story first to last” (23.351F; 23.310L πρῶτον, 23.342L δεύτατον)—that is, in chronological order. 23:354-380F=23.310L-337L summarises all told in the Apologia; 23.381-385F=23.338-341L relates the journey from Ogygia (where Calypso detained Odysseus) till the Phaeacians sent Odysseus home to Ithaca. Odysseus’ telling of his story in chronological order (πάντα κατὰ μοῖραν κατέλεξα, Murray’s “in due order” = Fagles’ “first to last”) also happens at 10.16L=10.19F (to Aeolus) and at 12.35L=12.39F (to Circe). See Genette, *Narrative Discourse*, p. 62.
The reason for this startling departure[^1] from tradition is not far to seek. If the poet had begun at the beginning and observed a strict chronology, he would have been forced to interrupt the flow of the narrative as soon as he got his hero back in Ithaca, in order to explain the extremely complicated situation he would have to deal with in his home. The Telemacheia enables him to set the stage for the hero’s return and to introduce the main participants of the final scenes...And the accounts of Telemachus’ voyages do more than chart his progress, under Athena’s guidance from provincial diffidence to princely self-confidence in his dealings with kings; they also offer us two visions of the hero’s return, so different from what awaits Odysseus—Nestor among his sons, Menelaus with his wife and daughter, [^2] both of them presiding over rich kingdoms and loyal subjects.[^3]

Reece extends Knox’s observation about the narrative role of this grand anachrony. Reece notes the significance of the grand anachrony in relation to the crucial role that hospitality scene-types play in the Odyssey. Reece observes that the grand anachrony of the Odyssey—placing the Telemacheia before the accounts of Odysseus with Calypso, then the Phaeacians, and then the strange ‘hosts’ of the Apologia—means that the audience hears five positive and straightforward (‘classic’ or ‘true’) hospitality scene-types, before they begin encountering the parodies and perversions of the hospitality scene-type offered by the episodes with the horrible hosts of the Apologia. These horrible hosts include: the lotus-eater whose drug-like lotus makes the guest forget his home; the Cyclops, Polyphemus, whose ‘feast’ is to eat his guests and whose ‘guest-gift’ offered to Odysseus is to eat him last (!); Aeolus whose limit to hospitality is a strict once-only affair (“Back so soon Odysseus!”); the Laestrygonians (who also eat their guests), and Circe, an alluring witch who uses potions and spells to turn her guests into pigs. As Reece writes in the conclusion to The Stranger’s Welcome (under the subtitle Hysteron-Proteron Homericos),

[^1]: The ‘grand anachrony’ may not be as ‘startling’ a departure from tradition as Knox suggests. After all Homer did it (at least twice), Virgil did it, and as Genette points out there have been writers using anachrony through the whole history of writing (including Milton, Balzac and D’Arthez). Genette writes, “We will thus not be so foolish as to claim that anachrony is either a rarity or a modern invention. On the contrary, it is one of the traditional resources of literary narration.” (Genette, Narrative Discourse, p. 36.) Genette goes as far as to call the practice of beginning in media res, a convention (Genette, Narrative Discourse, p. 46).

[^2]: There is a third vision of a hero’s return, also different from that which awaits Odysseus—the disturbing deception and murder of Agamemnon—a parody of hospitality and feasting.

The scenes of proper hospitality... are placed early in the epic, so that they function as paradigms with which all the subsequent scenes of hospitality may be compared or contrasted. Deviations from, or perversions of, these paradigms are presented in the Apologoi... after all, for a parody, such as the Cyclopeia [the story of Odysseus visit of Polyphemus the Cyclops], to work, acquaintance with the established norm is prerequisite.34

In other words, the 'grand anachrony' in the Odyssey, allows the early placement of the first five positive hospitality scenes.35 This, in turn, ensures that the audience knows how a good hospitality scene should unfold.

3.3 Positive Hospitality Scenes in the Odyssey

Steve Reece has broken down the positive hospitality scene into a conventional set of elements:36

I. Maiden at the well/Youth on the road
II. Arrival at the destination
III. Description of the surroundings
   a. Of the residence
   b. Of (the activities of) the person sought
   c. Of (the activities of) the others
IV. Dog at the door

34 Steve Reece, The Stranger’s Welcome, p. 205.
35 The first four are certainly straightforward and positive; the fifth (the hospitality of the Phaeacians) is more complex and certainly has some ambiguity; but on the whole it is positive. The ambiguous elements include: Nausicaa’s non-escort of Odysseus to her father’s palace (she has pragmatic reasons which are in Odysseus’ best interests); the pause when Odysseus completes his supplication (it serves the dramatic tension of the moment, and it resolves positively); Alcinous’ subtle musings about the guest’s identity before his hunger is satisfied (it is not outright questioning); and the young men’s challenging of Odysseus regarding the games of contest (it seems light-hearted even if it does strike Odysseus as a taunt and attracts one of his ‘dark looks’); also the Phaeacian’s entertainments cause grief to their guest (but they could hardly have anticipated this). Of course, calling the hospitality of the Phaeacians the ‘fifth scene’ means that I have not counted the very brief scene at Phera (5.546-553), on account of its extremely summarised form.
V. Waiting at the threshold

VI. Supplication

VII. Reception
   a. Host catches sight of the visitor
   b. Host hesitates to offer hospitality [the inclusion of which I dispute]37
   c. Host rises from his seat
   d. Host approaches the visitor
   e. Host attends to the visitor’s horses
   f. Host takes the visitor by the hand
   g. Host bids the visitor welcome
   h. Host takes the visitor’s spear
   i. Host leads the visitor in

VIII. Seat

IX. Feast
   a. Preparation
   b. Consumption
   c. Conclusion

X. After-dinner drink

XI. Identification
   a. Host questions the visitor
   b. Visitor reveals his identity

XII. Exchange of information

XIII. Entertainment

37 I use Reece’s list of the elements (or motifs) that constitute a typical Homeric hospitality scene as they provide a very helpful breakdown. However, I would strongly argue for the omission of VIIb. “Host hesitates to offer hospitality” as it is hardly ‘conventional’ and hardly hospitable, and its replacement with “host hastens to offer hospitality”: This sui generis occurs only twice in Homer’s canon (Od. 4.31-4F; 7.153-66C) and the details are strikingly different, almost symmetrical opposites. The first is when Eteoneus reasons that since his master, King Menelaus of Sparta, is already hosting two weddings that perhaps it would be wiser to send the two strangers (Telemachus and Pisistratus) onward to someone else free to host them better. The second is a pause after Odysseus makes his supplication to Arete, allowing Echeneus, the elder, an opportunity to spur (rebuke?) his king, Alcinous, into hospitable action. As a possible doublet, it is rare and hardly constitutes a conventional motif—but it does provide the perfect context for King Menelaus (in the process of rebuking his servant) to offer one explanation for the duty of hospitality (in terms of mutuality and reciprocity Od. 4.38-9F; 4.33-4L); and for Echeneus to rebuke King Alcinous, invoking at the same time the name of Zeus “who loves lightning, champion of supplicants—supplicants’ rights are sacred.” The ambiguity of the Phaeacian hospitality—including their inhospitable “hesitancy”—is correctly detected by Gilbert P. Rose, “The Unfriendly Phaeacians,” Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association 100 (1969): pp. 387-406.
XIV. Visitor pronounces a blessing on the host
XV. Visitor shares in a libation or sacrifice
XVI. Visitor asks to be allowed to sleep
XVII. Bed
XVIII. Bath
XIX. Host detains the visitor
XX. Guest-gifts
XXI. Departure meal
XXII. Departure libation
XXIII. Farewell blessing
XXIV. Departure omen and interpretation
XXV. Escort to visitor’s next destination

The first five positive hospitality scene-types in the *Odyssey* (following Reece) are:

A. Athena (disguised as Mentes) receiving hospitality from Telemachus, Odysseus’ son, in Ithaca (Od. 1.103-324 L = 1.120-373F);

B. Telemachus receiving hospitality from King Nestor in Pylos (3.4-485L=3.4-544F; 15.193-214L=15.215-238F);

C. Telemachus receiving hospitality from King Menelaus in Sparta (4.1-624L=4.1-702F; 15.1-184L=15.1-216F);

D. Hermes receiving hospitality from Calypso on Ogygia (5.55-148L=5.60-164F); and,


The ‘grand anachrony’ means that the audience hears these five examples of conventional positive hospitality, before they encounter the monstrous perversions and parodies of hospitality in the *Apologoi*. The audience is, therefore, acquainted with the conventional elements of positive hospitality and is thereby better placed to understand the irony or

---

38 See previous note.
the perversions and parodies. Together, these five positive accounts ‘tick’ nearly ‘all the boxes’ of conventional hospitality (see Table 3.2).

Table 3.2: Schematic Synopses of the First Five Positive Hospitality Scenes from the Odyssey (derived from Reece, 1993). (All references follow the Murray/Loeb edition (2nd edition 1995); shading signifies motifs associated with escorted arrival or escorted departure.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guest</td>
<td>Athena (Mentes)</td>
<td>Telemachus</td>
<td>Telemachus</td>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>Odysseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host</td>
<td>Telemachus</td>
<td>Nestor</td>
<td>Menelaus</td>
<td>Calypso</td>
<td>Alcinous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Ithaca</td>
<td>Pylos</td>
<td>Sparta (Lace-daemon)</td>
<td>Ogygia</td>
<td>Phaeacia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Maiden at the well/Youth on the road</td>
<td>6.110-322; 7.18-81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>Arrival at destination</td>
<td>3.4-5, 31, 388; 15.393</td>
<td>4.1-2</td>
<td>5.55-58</td>
<td>7.46, 81-82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>Description of surroundings</td>
<td>4.43-75, 71-75</td>
<td>5.59-61, 63-76</td>
<td>7.48-49, 84-135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Of the residence</td>
<td>1.114-17</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.3-14</td>
<td>5.57-58, 61-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Activities of person sought</td>
<td>1.106-12</td>
<td>3.5-9, 32-33</td>
<td>4.15-19</td>
<td>5.81-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Activities of others</td>
<td>1.106-12</td>
<td>3.5-9, 32-33</td>
<td>4.15-19</td>
<td>5.81-84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>Dog at the door</td>
<td>7.91-94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>Waiting at the threshold</td>
<td>7.120-22</td>
<td>5.75-76</td>
<td>7.82-83, 133-35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI.</td>
<td>Supplication [inc. prostration]</td>
<td>7.144-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII.</td>
<td>Reception</td>
<td>1.114, 118</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>4.22-23</td>
<td>5.77-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Host catches sight of visitor</td>
<td>4.24-36</td>
<td>7.153-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Host hesitates to offer hospitality [which I dispute]</td>
<td>4.24-36</td>
<td>7.153-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Host rises from seat</td>
<td>1.119-20</td>
<td>3.34, 36</td>
<td>4.37-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Host approaches visitor</td>
<td>1.119-20</td>
<td>3.34, 36</td>
<td>4.37-38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Host attends to horses</td>
<td>4.39-42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Host takes visitor by the hand</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>4.59-64</td>
<td>7.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Host bids visitor welcome</td>
<td>1.122-24</td>
<td>3.35, 41-50</td>
<td>4.59-64</td>
<td>7.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Host takes visitor’s spear</td>
<td>1.121, 127-29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Host leads visitor in</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>[5.91]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive Hospitality Scenes in the Odyssey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Lines</th>
<th>Number of References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. Consumption</td>
<td>3.66, 471-72, 4.68, 218; 15.143</td>
<td>1.149</td>
<td>7.177; 8.71, 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Conclusion</td>
<td>3.67, 473</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>8.72, 485</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X. After-dinner drink (rare in Od—only in the final books)

XI. Identification


XII. Exchange of information

| 3.102-328, 4.168-211, 311-586 | 1.194-305 | 5.105-47 | 7.240-328 |

XIII. Entertainment


XIV. Visitor pronounces a blessing


XV. Visitor shares in a libation or sacrifice


XVI. Visitor asks to sleep

| 3.396-403, 4.296-305 | 3.396-403 | 7.335-47 |

XVII. Bath


XVIII. Host detains visitor


XX. Guest gifts


XXI. Departure meal

| 3.324-6, 368-70, 474-86, 4.589; 15.64-74 | 15.76-79, 92-122 | 13.23-27 |

XXII. Departure libation

| 15.147-50 | 15.111-12, 128-29, 150-59 | 13.50-56 |

XXIII. Farewell blessing


XXIV. Departure omen and interpretation


3.4 Homeric Hospitality Simplified

While Reece’s detailed analysis (with its thirty-eight ritualistic elements) may make hospitality appear quite complex, Homer also offers a simplified statement of the essentials of good hospitality. We hear this summary of good hospitality on the lips of hospitable Menelaus when Telemachus expresses to Menelaus his desire to return home. Menelaus says, “I’d never detain you too long, Telemachus, / not if your heart is set on going home. / I’d find fault with another host, I’m sure, / too warm to his guests, too pressing or too cold. / Balance is best in all things. It’s bad either way, / spurring the stranger home who wants to linger, / holding the one who longs to leave—you know, /…” And then Menelaus appears to quote a proverbial truth—“Welcome the coming, speed (πέμπειν) the parting guest!” 40 (χρὴ ξεῖνον παρεόντα φιλεῖν, ἐθέλοντα δὲ πέμπειν. Od. 15.74F-81F; 15.68L-15.74L)

This proverbial simplification of Homeric hospitality has relevance to this study’s focus on the beginnings and endings of hospitality scenes for two reasons. Firstly, it focuses the audience’s attention on what are, according to Homer, the two most common points of failure in the provision of good hospitality: the failure to receive (welcome) a guest as they arrive; and the failure to ‘speed their departure’. We are perhaps more familiar with the first type of failure: lack of welcome (which includes the failure to escort someone’s arrival). The latter failing expresses itself most commonly as the phenomenon of over-detention—this is a common motif in Odyssey. When we first encounter Odysseus, this is the problem he is having with his host, Calypso. She will not let him leave! This is also a common failure in the perversions of hospitality in the Apologoi: the Lotus-eater’s drug causes the eater to forget his home (and this will cause a type of over-detention); Circe turns her guests into swine and puts them in her swine-pen (an unusual form of over-detention to say the least!). Even after Circe is forced to be more hospitable, she manages to

40 Alexander Pope is perhaps responsible for us thinking of this as an Homerian proverb; it featured in his Horatian Imitations (Satires II.ii.160) introducing it as “sage Homer’s rule”.
use her charms to over-detain Odysseus further. Even among the otherwise hospitable Phaeacians, the eligibility (for marriage) of the King Alcinous’ daughter, Nausicaa, carries the threat of further over-detention of Odysseus. However, it is Nausicaa’s father, Alcinous, who most succinctly describes over-detention as a breach of hospitality when he says, “No Phaeacian would hold you back by force. The curse of Father Zeus on such a thing!” (7.361-2F) or as Murray translated it, “[But] against your will shall no Phaeacian keep you; may such a thing never please father Zeus.” (7.315-6L)

In the Telemacheia, Telemachus, Odysseus’ son, has experiences which, although more pleasant than those of Odysseus, parallel his father’s experiences. Telemachus risks over-detention both at Pylos and Sparta. In Book 15, after Athena persuades Telemachus to set out for home (after a long stay at Sparta), Telemachus begs Pisistratus (a paragon of hospitable escort) to deposit him at his ship without seeing Pisistratus’ father, Nestor, because Nestor has the reputation of being an over-detainer. Thus says Telemachus to Pisistratus, “Prince, don’t drive me past my vessel, drop me there. / Your father’s old, in love with his hospitality; / I fear he’ll hold me, chafing in his palace— / I must hurry home!” Pisistratus acknowledges the accuracy of Telemachus’ perception about his father (Nestor) and says to Telemachus, “Climb aboard now fast! Muster all your men / before I get home and break the news to father. / With that man’s overbearing spirit I know it / know it all too well—he’ll never let you go, / he’ll come down here and summon you himself. / He won’t return without you, believe me—/”.

---

41 Od. 10.513F-523F; 10.465L-474L.
42 Od. 7.358F-360F; 312L-315L.
43 There is a parallel to the portrayal of over-detention as a danger in the OT story of the hospitality provided to the Levite by his concubine’s father (in Judges 19:3-10). The father’s over-detention of his son-in-law has tragic consequences (Judges 19:15-30)—the rape and death of the concubine, the subsequent near-extinction of the tribe of Benjamin, and the ensuing kidnapping of hundreds of women to save the tribe from extinction. To mention this does not detract from the thesis that Luke’s original audience could derive familiarity with over-detention via Homerica. The original readers of Luke could be familiar with the motif of dangerous over-detention through familiarity with the LXX as well as through familiarity with Homer.
44 Od. 15.222-225F=15.195-201L.
45 Od. 15.232-238F=15.209-214L.
The second reason for the relevance of the Homeric proverbial simplification (‘Welcome the coming, speed the parting guest!’) to this study is for the emphasis that it places on the beginning and ending of hospitality, not merely as places of potential failure in the provision of hospitality, but as key elements in the practice of good hospitality. As such it bears centrally upon the prime focus of this study: the motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure as expressions of welcoming the arriving and speeding the departing guest.

3.5 Escorted Arrivals And Escorted Departures In Homeric Hospitality Scenes

Firstly, the motif I have dubbed escorted arrival subsumes (or incorporates) several of Reece’s Homeric hospitality ‘elements’:

V. the guest waiting at the threshold or the gate;
VIIa. the host catching sights of the visitor;
VIIc. the host getting up or rising from their seat;
VIIId. the host approaching the visitor (‘going out to meet’—out to the gate or to the door);
VIIIf. the host taking the guest by the hand;
VIIg. the host bidding the visitor welcome;
VIIi. the host leading (or escorting) the visitor in.

By contrast, escorted departure is a simpler affair synonymous with only one of Reece’s Homeric hospitality elements: XXV. Escort to the visitor’s next destination.

Table 3.3 indicates elements of escorted arrival and escorted departure throughout all of the major hospitality scenes in the Odyssey.

Note (from Table 3.3) that the motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure are common in the first five positive hospitality scene-types of the Telemacheia and the Phaeacians (A–E). The motifs are comparatively rare in the perversions and parodies of hospitality of the Apologoi (F–I). They are prominent again in the positive hospitality scenes where Eumaeus, the loyal swineherd, welcomes first Odysseus (J) and then Telemachus (K). They are rare again in the inhospitable scenes of Odysseus’ ‘homecoming’ among the
suitors (L). There are explanations for the nine ‘exceptions’ (explaining why the shaded areas in the table are not completely blank).

Table 3.3: Elements of Escorted Arrival and Escorted Departure throughout all of the Major Hospitality Scenes in the *Odyssey* (all references are from the Murray/Loeb edition of the *Odyssey*, as in Reece, 1993).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Episode</th>
<th>Telemachia and other early positive examples of hospitality</th>
<th>Apologoi (parodies and perversions of hospitality)</th>
<th>Late examples of positive hospitality</th>
<th>Late negative hospitality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIII.</td>
<td>Hermes &amp; Calypso</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>7.168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIIg.</td>
<td>Odysseus &amp; the Phaeacians</td>
<td>1.122-24</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>41-50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

'Waiting at the threshold’ does not, of itself, constitute either hospitality or an escorted arrival unless it is followed by the host’s observation (of the waiting person) and welcoming response. There are three instances of waiting at the threshold which are followed with hostility (not hospitality): Odysseus’ second visit to Aeolus (10.62-63L=10.66-68F); Odysseus’ visit to Circe (10.220L=10.241F); and Odysseus’ visit to his own house which is occupied by the suitors (17.261L=17.286F). In 17.261L(=17.286F), Odysseus pauses at his own gate, and although he has received ‘welcome’ from his old dog and his son, he is treated with contempt by the suitors who occupy his house. Earlier, when Circe comes out to meet Odysseus’ men (10.230L=10.253-4F) her behaviour is a deliberately deceitful pretence of hospitality—“She at once came forth and opened the bright doors and invited them in; and they all, in their innocence, followed her inside. Only Eurylochus remained behind, for he suspected that this was a snare. She brought them in and made them all sit on chairs and seats, and made for them a potion of cheese and barley meal and yellow honey with Pramnian wine; but in the food she mixed evil drugs” (Od. 10:230-233L=10.253-59F). Circe’s pretence is repeated again almost word for word when Odysseus comes calling at her gates except that he has been warned and is prepared for Circe’s trickery (Od. 10:286-292L=1.317-323F). Circe seems transformed into quite the model host by Odysseus’ defeat of her trickery, although her hospitality still retains some of its potential for over-detention—Odysseus and his men remain with Circe for a whole year (10:468L, 515F). Nevertheless Circe’s reform as a good host explains her willingness to speed Odysseus’ departure (10:482-489L = 10:532-538F; 12:147-150L = 12.160-163F)—she sends a fresh wind to fill his ship’s sails.

Odysseus’ request of Aeolus to send him on his way (assist his departure and aid his journey home), is met positively only on the first visit (10.17-18 L). It is upon Odysseus’ cap-in-hand return that King Aeolus does not come out to meet him, and then proceeds to treat Odysseus harshly. The reference to Polyphemus (the Cyclops) sending Odysseus home (9:350L = 9:392F) is in the context of a lie on the lips of Odysseus that he had originally brought the wine to offer the Cyclops in the hope that he would pity Odysseus and speed him on his way.
So then, what are the implications of genuine *escorted arrival* and *escorted departure* in Homer, in terms of characterisation of the host or revealing the host's attitude toward their guest?

I propose that escorted arrival is a key way in which the narrator alerts the reader to the potential hospitality or hostility of the 'guest'. In the first five instances of positive hospitality (the four of the *Telemacheia* and of *Odysseus’* hospitality among the Phaeacians) *escorted arrivals* are prominent (see Table 3.3, above). I now want to examine in some greater detail several of these early positive hospitality scenes from the *Odyssey*.

In the first of these positive hospitality scenes (A in Table 3.3), when Telemachus sees a stranger at his outer gate (actually the goddess Athena, disguised as Mentes) he went straight to the porch (or outer-gate), mortified that a guest might still be standing at the doors. Telemachus’ haste (implied by the use of ἰθὺς meaning “immediately”) marks him as a first-class host. He meets her with the winged-words “Greetings stranger! (χαῖρε ξεῖνε) / Here in this house you’ll find a royal welcome.” He leads (ἡγεῖθ from ἁγέομαι) the way. Once in the high-roofed hall, he takes her spear (a hospitality element common in Homerica) and escorts her (ἄγων) to a throne (a high, elaborate chair of honour). This very first hospitality scene is not quite as fully developed as the four that follow, as it is interrupted by Athena’s rapid departure.

Before flying off and revealing that she is a goddess, Athena politely declines Telemachus’ offer to detain her: “Not now. Don’t hold me here. I long to be on my way” (*Od.* 1.362F-362F, 1.314L-1.315L). Her comment also has the effect of establishing that over-detention (detaining those who are ready to leave) is a fault in providing hospitality. Good hosts do not over-detain. She also negotiates a deferral in the ritual of receiving a guest-gift: “As for the gift… save it for my return so I can take it home.” (*Od.* 1.363F-1.364F, 1.316L-1.318L).

Re-negotiation of an inappropriate or inconvenient guest gift, rather than a breach of hospitality, appears to be a mark of sense and good character (as when Telemachus explains to Menelaus the unsuitability of horses to the hilly terrain in Ithaca (4.601-608L = 4.675-685F). A guest-gift cements the good will established by hospitality, so it should
be something which will create a long-lasting bond. The convention of giving a guest-gift in the cultural script is very important and endured at least to the first century as we can see by its prominence in Virgil's *Aeneid.*\(^{47}\) The bond established by the giving of a guest-gift assists in the interpretation of instances where gifts are given in Acts (*e.g.* 11:29; 24:17; 28:10). The effect of good hospitality and the reception of a good guest-gift can last generations according to the principles of Homeric hospitality. In the *Iliad*, an Achaean (Diomedes) and a Trojan (Glaucus) intent on fighting to the death, realise, mid-battle, that their grandfathers once exchanged guest-gifts. They leave aside their fighting immediately and trade pacts of friendship.\(^{48}\)

After hearing Athena postpone the reception of a guest-gift, Telemachus rejoices in his guest's successful departing—not that he plays a large role in Athena's departure. He cannot exactly escort her, because she flies away!\(^{49}\) "Off and away Athena the bright-eyed goddess flew / like a bird in soaring flight / but left [Telemachus'] spirit filled with nerve and courage, / charged with his father's memory more than ever now. / He felt his senses quicken, overwhelmed with wonder— / this was a god, he knew it well…" (*Od.* 1.319-323L, 1.367F-372F).\(^{50}\) Not unlike the departures in Luke's Emmaus Road story or the story of Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch, Homer's god-departures encourage the host and fill them with joy, amazement and praise.

In the second hospitality scene of the *Odyssey* (B in Table 3.3), Nestor and his sons (even though they are in the midst of a religious feast) are quick to *welcome the arriving* Telemachus and Athena (the latter, this time, disguised as Mentor). "As soon as they saw

\(^{47}\) *Aeneid,* 1.632.

\(^{48}\) Diomedes consoles himself with the thought, "Plenty of other Trojans for me to kill!" and he suggests to Glaucus that he console himself similarly. (*Il.* 6.138-282F=6.119-236L).

\(^{49}\) The ascension of Jesus (Luke 24:51; Acts 1:9-11) presents his followers with a similar dilemma—how do you escort the departure of one who ascends into the clouds, or who goes where you cannot follow or accompany? The escort of Jesus' second coming in 1 Thessalonians 4:17 imagines a supernatural solution to the need to honour and escort Jesus' return.

\(^{50}\) Those readers of Luke and Acts who were also familiar with Homer would recognise the "joy" of the Emmaus Road disciples (Luke 24:32-5) and of the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts 8:39). It is the joy in the face of the sudden and surprising departure of the deity or the deity's emissary.
the strangers (ὡς οὖν ξείνους ἴδον), all came crowding down, waving them on in welcome (ἡσπάζοντο from ἀσπάζομαι) urging them to sit.” (Od. 3.38F-39F, 3.34L-3.35L). Nestor’s son, Pisistratus, who will become Telemachus’ faithful escort for the round trip journey beyond Pylos, distinguishes himself (or is established by the narrator) as a quality host by the haste with which he goes out to meet Telemachus. “Nestor’s son Pisistratus, first to reach them, grasped their hands and sat them down at the feast.” (Od. 3.40F, 3.35L) The rest of this very fully developed hospitality scene includes libation, prayers and feasting, as well as the formulaic “[once] they’d put aside desire of food and drink” (Od. 3.67L, 3.75F).

The propriety of satisfying hunger before guest enquiry is explained in the speech of old Nestor, “Now’s the time, now they’ve enjoyed their meal, / to probe our guests and find out who they are. / Strangers—friends, who are you?” (Od. 3.69-71aL = 3.77-79F). Then Telemachus immediately introduces himself and asks Nestor to tell him any news of his father, Odysseus (3.79-101L = 3.87-112F). Nestor then gives quite a lengthy report (Od. 3.118-3.312L = 3.131-352F). Nestor’s report is a nostoi, a tale of return home—many of Homer’s Trojan War veterans have such tales.

At the conclusion of the lengthy report, Nestor offers his sons as Telemachus’s escort (Od. 3.325L = 3.366F), as well as the gift of horse and chariot for a land journey to Menelaus, “there’s team and chariot, my sons at your service too, and they will be an escort for you (οἵ τοι πομπῆες ἔσονται) to sunny Lacedaemon, home of the red-haired king” (3.324L-326L = 3.365-7F).

When night approaches, Athena and Telemachus “both started up to head for their ship at once”. But Nestor objects, evoking the patron of hospitality. He exclaims: “Zeus forbid!” (Od. 3.346L = 3.389F) and insists that his guest must not “resort to their ship” (Od. 3.347L = 3.390F) but allow him to provide them comfortable beds. Athena (still as Mentor) insists on returning to the ship and then recommends that Nestor assist Telemachus, saying, “But you, seeing my friend is now your guest, / speed him on his way with a chariot and your son / and give him the finest horses that you have.” (Od. 3.411-412F=3.368L-370L). With that she flies away, and amazement falls on those who now realise it was Athena.
Nestor leads Telemachus back to his palace. In the morning Nestor hastens Telemachus’s departure. ‘When they had put aside desire for food and drink, / Nestor the noble chariot-driver issued orders: / “Hurry my boys! Bring Telemachus horses, / a good full-maned team—/ hitch them to a chariot—he must be off at once.”’ They listen and respond ‘in haste’. They stow provisions for Telemachus and Pisistratus who is assigned to accompany him. “Pisistratus, / […] seized the reins, / whipped the team to a run and on the horses flew,/ holding nothing back, […] / […] / shaking the yoke across their shoulders all day long.” (Od. 3.540-5F=3.482-6L).

Not all hospitality scenes in Homer are epic. One account of Diocles’ hospitality to Pisistratus and Telemachus at Phera is narrated as a summary report and despatched in six lines, matching the theme of ‘the cracking pace’ that dominates the lines between Pylos and Sparta (3.488-493L = 3.547-552F).

In the third hospitality scene of the Odyssey (C in Table 3.3), set in Sparta, the hospitality is provided to Telemachus and Pisistratus by Menelaus, the King of Sparta (Scene C in Table 3.3). Perhaps because the king is already in the process of hosting two weddings, the king’s assistant, Eteoneus, ventures to ask the question of whether or not they should offer the two strangers hospitality, “Strangers have just arrived, your majesty, Menelaus. / Two men, but they look like the kin of mighty Zeus himself. / Tell me, should we unhitch their team for them…” Unhitching horses and caring for them is a conventional part of the Homeric hospitality routine if the guest has a horse. But Eteoneus then proposes, perhaps understandably, as they are already hosting a double wedding, “… / or send them to someone free to host them well?” The question allows for Menelaus’ interjection, which underscores the importance of hospitality according to Homer.

The red-haired king took great offense at that:
“Never a fool before, Eteoneus, son of Boéthous,
now I see you’re babbling like a child!
Just think of all the hospitality we enjoyed
at the hands of other men before we made it home,
and god save us from such hard treks in years to come.
Quick, unhitch their team. And bring them in,
strangers, guests, to share our flowing feast.” (Od. 4.35-42F=4.30-36L)
Eteoneus is redeemed and thus both he and his master are characterised as good hosts. *Haste in response to the arrivals* is prominent throughout the *Odyssey*. “Back through the halls [Eteoneus] hurried, calling out / to other brisk attendants to follow quickly. / They loosed the sweating team […] / […] / […] then ushered [led] in their guests.” (4.37-43L = 4.43-49F). The guests are bathed, clothed and fed. The quality of the hospitality is made evident by details throughout, for instance, “[Menelaus] passed them a fat rich loin with his own hands, / the choicest part, that he’d been served himself. / They reached out for the good things that lay outspread / and when they’d put aside desire for food and drink, /[…]” (4.73-6F=4.65-8L). A slight delay in enquiring after the guests’ identities (which normally comes immediately after the ‘satiated hunger formula’) allows for the irony of Menelaus offering some unsolicited information about Odysseus, which causes Telemachus to weep, which, further, causes Menelaus to suspect his identity. (There is a parallel here between father and son—Odysseus will also be made known to a king, the King of the Phaeacians, because he will weep while the blind bard Demodocus sings the Saga of the Wooden Horse.) Helen enters and also guesses that it is Odysseus’ son, based on his likeness to Odysseus, before making the astonishing revelation (itself an analepsis) that in Troy she ‘hosted’ Odysseus once when he was spying in the city. Good host that she was (if not with complex loyalty issues), she had bathed Odysseus and rubbed him down with oil.\(^{51}\)

Helen, now returned to Sparta, is still a good host. Night approaches and Telemachus expresses his desire for sleep. Immediately (“as he spoke”), Helen tells her serving-women to make beds in the porch’s shelter. The next day Menelaus hears Telemachus’ supplication for news of his father, and then Menelaus offers a lengthy report of what he knows about Odysseus. In his own lengthy *nostoi*, Menelaus relates how he encountered the Old Man of the Sea, who prophesies, “And one is alive, / held captive, somewhere, off in the

---

\(^{51}\) Helen’s confession at her first appearance in Book 4—“all you Achaeans / fought at Troy, launching your headlong battles / just for *my* sake, shameless whore that I was” (4.145L = 4.162F)—sometimes seems apt! Bruce Louden, who makes a case for Homeric parallels in the Hebrew Bible, cannot resist seeing Helen as an *ersatz* Rahab, for obvious reasons. Bruce Louden, *Homer’s Odyssey and the Near East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011), pp. 105-123.
endless seas…” (4.498L = 4.558-9F). The hearer knows (Telemachus does not) that this is an allusion to Odysseus’ captivity by Calypso. When further pressed by Menelaus, the Old Man of the Sea, explains Odysseus’ detention by Calypso, “She keeps him there by force. / He has no way to voyage home to his native land,” (4.627,4.558L). Athena will confirm that Calypso keeps Odysseus by force in Chapter 5, when she speaks with her father Zeus (5.14-17L=5.16-19F) by using these exact same words.

Menelaus’ nostoi also contains the Odyssey’s first minor account of a perversion of hospitality: the ‘reception’ and murder of Agamemnon. Agamemnon’s wife and his rival, Aegisthus, are co-conspirators in the pretence of homecoming that ends in murder. The account of the betrayal and murder is thick with references to hospitality motifs including escorted arrival.

One whole year he watched…
so the great king would not get past unseen,
his fighting power intact for self-defence.
The spy ran the news to his master’s halls
and Aegisthus quickly set his stealthy trap.
Picking the twenty best recruits from town
he packed them in ambush at one end of the house,
at the other he ordered a banquet dressed and spread
and went to welcome the conquering hero, Agamemnon,
estowed team and chariot, and a mind aswarm with evil.
Up from the shore he led the king, he ushered him in—
suspecting nothing of all his doom—he feasted him well
then cut him down as a man cuts down some ox at the trough!

(4.590-602F = 4.525-535L)

This gross and treacherous violation of sacred hospitality evokes a strong response in Menelaus when he first hears it from the Old Man of the Sea (Proteus), “So Proteus said, and his story crushed my heart. / I knelt down in the sand and wept. I’d no desire/ to go on living and see the rising light of day.” (4.605-607F = 4.538-540L)

Up till this point, Menelaus has proved himself to be an excellent host to Telemachus, but slowly the potential for ‘over-detention’ begins to emerge. Menelaus, once imagined he might live out his days exchanging stories with another Trojan War veteran. His plan for Odysseus, was to move him from Ithaca to Sparta to fulfil such a plan. Now it seems
he will settle for the next best thing—keeping his son close by. “But come, my boy, stay on in my palace now with me, at least till ten or a dozen days have passed. Then I’ll give you a princely send-off—shining gifts, three stallions and a chariot burnished bright—and I’ll add a gorgeous cup so you can pour/ libations out to the deathless gods on high/ and remember Menelaus all your days.” (4.659-666F = 4.587-592L).

Following this, Telemachus makes a very tactful attempt to reject the over-detention and inappropriate guest-gift. After Telemachus is praised by Menelaus, banqueters arrive, and we leave Telemachus rather abruptly at 4.625L (4.703F) with a “meanwhile back in Ithaca” and we never hear again from Telemachus until the opening of Book Fifteen. Before we meet Telemachus again we hear: i) the tale of Odysseus’ departure from Calypso and arrival in Phaeacia (Book 5–8); 52 ii) Odysseus’ account of his own nostoi with its many episodes of perverted hospitality (Books 9–12, sometimes called the Apologoi); iii) the tale of Odysseus’ departure from Phaeacia and his surprisingly quick arrival in Ithaca (Book 13); and iv) the tale of Odysseus’ reception from his loyal swineherd, Eumaeus (Book 14).

We return to the story of Telemachus in Book 15, where we learn that he has not departed from the over-detaining Menelaus. Athena’s spurring of the prince, in a dream, inspires him to implore Menelaus, “Menelaus, / royal son of Atreus, captain of armies, / let me go back to my own country now. / The heart inside me longs for home at last.” (15.69-72F, 15.64-66L). The audience would recall that it had been Menelaus’ own words that summarised so perfectly the Homeric essence of hospitality: “Welcome the coming speed the parting guest”. And eventually the king relents to speed the departure of Telemachus, the son of his lost comrade.

Pisistratus’ and Telemachus’ journey back from Sparta is marked by the same haste as the outward journey. The stay at Phera is narrated in an exact repeat of the same six lines of their outward stay there at 3.547-552F (15:208-213F).

---

52 Odysseus summarises his departure from Ogygia, his survival of the storm and arrival at Phaeacia at 7.283-341F (=7.244-297L) but he omits the crucial life-saving role of Ino.
Telemachus is wiser than he was when he commenced his journey. Recognising the over-detaining potential of Nestor, Telemachus persuades Pisistratus to let him go straight to his ship so that he can sail home for Ithaca. Pisistratus agrees and speeds Telemachus’ return to Ithaca. This allows the narratives of Telemachus and his father Odysseus finally to converge. With what is an enormously satisfying narrative contrivance, Telemachus sets foot on Ithaca shortly after his father has also, finally, arrived there too.

As I have illustrated from the first three positive hospitality-scene from the *Telemaechia* (Scenes A, B and C), the function of *escorted welcome* is that it serves very early in a scene to anticipate the quality of the potential host. Therefore the motif is instrumental in assisting the reader to discern the ‘good’ hosts from the ‘bad’ host—the hospitable from the hostile. Generally speaking, the action of *coming out with haste* upon catching sight of a guest to offer a welcome usually attests the *good character* of the host. There are few exceptions to this rule.53

### 3.6 Failure to Escort and Homeric Inhospitality

But now I wish to consider the more straightforward acts of inhospitality or hostility in the *Odyssey* (Episodes F, G, H, I and L from Table 3.3) to see how the motifs of escorted arrival and escorted departure function in those instances.

Blatant or transparent inhospitality lacks escorted welcome. Episode A is classified as a positive hospitality scene because of the major perspective of Athena’s reception by

---

53 One instance of exception to the principle that escort implies the good character of the host is the positive-appearing welcome of Agamemnon by Aegisthus, narrated within Episode C at 4.525-535L (= 4.590-602F) and within Episode E (while Odysseus relates to the Phaeacians the story of his visit to the Kingdom of the Dead) at 11:385-456L (= 11:436-518F). The murder of Agamemnon contains many of the motifs of hospitality: preparations, going out to meet and ushering (leading) in, invitation, seating, and banqueting—but it is all a ruse! Here Aegisthus adopts the outward signs of genuine hospitality in order to lull Agamemnon into a sense of safe arrival home, although the whole time he is planning to slaughter the returned king at his homecoming feast. Similarly, the welcome of Circe (Episode I) is a deliberate ruse—"she stepped forth, inviting them all in, and in they all went, all innocence." In a way, these exceptions only prove the rule—that escorted arrival is usually a sign to the stranger and the reader to anticipate hospitality. That is what makes escorted arrival as a prelude to treachery so chilling (this is exactly how the motif functions in the Old Testament story where Jael goes out to meet Sisera.)
Telemachus, but it has a negative strand because of the minor perspective of the suitors’ inhospitality. When Penelope’s suitors—notoriously inhospitable characters—have opportunity to welcome “Mentes” (the goddess Athena adopting a disguise), they fail to come out to meet her; worse, they fail to notice her arrival. Homer juxtaposes their failure with Telemachus’ observant nature and haste, which marks him as hospitable and a person of good character.

In Episode F, Polyphemus, the Cyclops proves to be the antithesis of hospitality. Polyphemus’ hostility is anticipated by the ‘narrator’ (Odysseus telling the tale in Phaeacian hall) as he describes the general ‘lawlessness’ of the Cyclops, before we actually encounter Polyphemus (9.125-128F=9.112-115L). But also from the point of escorted arrival as a marker, we note that, as Odysseus and his dozen finest fighters approach Polyphemus’ cave, there is no escort or welcome. And this provides a clue to the giant’s lack of hospitality. When the giant returns, his inhospitality is quickly confirmed. He enquires of his guest’s identity without first seeing to their needs. (9.284-8F=9.252-4L). Then his response to Odysseus’ formal supplication is ridicule, “‘Stranger,’ he grumbled back from his brutal heart, / ‘you must be a fool, stranger, or come from nowhere, / telling me to fear the gods or avoid their wrath! / We Cyclops never blink at Zeus and Zeus’ shield / of storm and thunder, or any other blessed god—/ we’ve got more force by far. / I’d never spare you in fear of Zeus’ hatred, / you or your companions here, unless I had the urge.” (9.306-313F=9.272-278L). Very quickly it becomes evident that Polyphemus does not remotely have ‘the urge’ to extend hospitality; within seventeen lines he has eaten two of Odysseus’ men. In a terrible parody of hospitality, first two and then later another two men, are not invited to be guests at the feast—they become the feast! Polyphemus accepts three bowls of Odysseus’ finest wine and offers Odysseus a guest-gift on the condition that Odysseus will reveal his name (9.399-400F=9.355-6L). The crafty Odysseus claims his name is “Nobody” (which sets up the conditions for Polyphemus’ vain attempt to rouse his neighbours with the humorous “Nobody’s trying to kill me.”). In exchange for the name, Polyphemus booms from his ruthless heart, “Nobody? I’ll eat Nobody last of
all his friends—/ I’ll eat the others first! That’s my [guest] gift to you!” (Od. 9.369-70L, 9.414F)

In Episode G, King Aeolus, is a host with strictly limited hospitality. The first time he welcomes Odysseus and treats him hospitably (10.16-30F=10.13-26L). However, an astute listener would note there is no escort with the welcome. After that first visit, Odysseus’ sailing companions prove to be his undoing. They release the tempestuous winds that Aeolus has helpfully bound in a bag in which they suspect Odysseus is concealing treasure. When, Odysseus comes cap-in-hand a second time, Aeolus’ hospitality has run out. This is anticipated in the narrative; in both visits, Aeolus does not come out to meet Odysseus. Aeolus sits in his palace and his first words are discouraging. As Odysseus relates, “Reaching the doorposts at the threshold, down we sat / but our hosts, amazed to see us, only shouted questions:/ ’Back again, Odysseus—why? Some blustering god attacked you? / Surely we launched you well, we sped you on your way [ἐνδυκέως ἀπεπέμπομεν, literally ‘accompanied you on your way with kindness’] / to your own land and home, or any place you pleased.’” (10.68-72F=10.64-66L). Odysseus explains how his desire for sleep and his mutinous crew were his undoing and begs assistance a second time. “So I pleaded—gentle, humble appeals—/ but our hosts turned silent, hushed… / and the father broke forth with an ultimatum: / ’Away from my island—fast—most cursed man alive! / It’s a crime to host a man or speed him on his way / when the blessed deathless gods despise him so. / Crawling back like this—/ it proves the immortals hate you! Out—get out!’” (Od. 10.70-75L, 10.76-83F).

The incident with Aeolus also highlights another strand of the portrayal of hospitality by Homer. Presumably, there is an element of truth in what Aeolus says—that it would be wrong to provide hospitality to those despised by the blessed gods, presumably the lawless who have no regard for the laws of Zeus. Is there danger in offering hospitality to the lawless? Later, the Phaeacians will suffer for speeding Odysseus home (Od. 13.160-164L,
180-187F). Odysseus is not lawless, but is held to be guilty by Poseidon for the blinding of his son Polyphemus (Polyphemus was lawless and inhospitable first).\textsuperscript{54}

In Episode H, the ‘hospitality’ of the Laestrygonians (another race of cannibalistic giants) is shorter (only 57 lines—10:89-145F=10.81-132L). It includes the ‘meeting of a maiden’ by a stream, who turns out to be a princess, who directs three of Odysseus’ crew to the palace. As supplicants, the three men first approach the queen. The lack of escorted arrival should serve to help the reader to anticipate hostility. And sure enough, when the queen summons the king of the Laestrygonians, he does not hesitate, but rather, “snatching one of [Odysseus’] men, he tore him up for dinner—” (\textit{Od.} 10.127F = 10.116L). Then all the giants attack Odysseus’ fleet and only Odysseus’ ship escapes.

In Episode L, Penelope’s suitors again provide another contrast to proper hospitality. Though no host is over-detaining the suitors, they are clearly over-stayers. They are shameless in their exploitation of their true host’s absence. Although guests, they behave like the owners of Odysseus’ home, indulging themselves in an endless and extravagant feast. Also they shamelessly disregard Zeus’ laws.\textsuperscript{55} As Odysseus returns in disguise to his own house the inhospitality of the suitors becomes a major theme. Their inhospitality escalates as they abuse Odysseus. The abuse of Odysseus makes ironic or parodical use of hospitality motifs. Normally in positive hospitality scenes the guest is led to a chair and seated before he is fed. In Episode L, one of the suitors hurls a chair at Odysseus which strikes him in the back (\textit{Od.} 17.509-514F=17.462-465L). The provision of food followed by good-natured competition is turned into a travesty, as Odysseus is challenged to fight a local beggar for the trophy of a single pork sausage.

\textsuperscript{54} In Luke and Acts, there is an instance of this type of hesitation in the hospitality that Paul receives from the Maltese (Acts 28:1-10). This is evident in the moment after the snakebite when the native people assume that justice (δίκη) must have caught up with this man who escaped the sea (Acts 28:3-4) and that he must therefore be a murderer. The Maltese resume the provision of hospitality after Paul miraculously suffers no ill-effects from the snake bite (Acts 28:7-10) and they elevate him to the status of a visiting god.

\textsuperscript{55} The suitors’ inhospitality has already been demonstrated when they neglected “Mentes” (Athena in disguise) in Episode A (\textit{Od.} 1.103-324L=1.119-373F).
From the selection of episodes on inhospitality we can see that failure to go out and escort (or lead) a guest in is a sign to the reader to anticipate hostility. Thus the negative scenes reinforce from a different perspective the same truth that the positive scenes expound. Good hosts go out to greet their guest and escort the guest into the house. They detain their guest as long as the guest is pleased to accept hospitality and remain. But when the guest longs to leave, they do not over-detain or hold by force or over-bearing persuasion. Instead, the good host speeds the departure of their guest, often providing escort for the first stage of the guest’s onward journey. We also observe that much of the cultural script on hospitality and the role of escort were conserved into the first century; Virgil preserves many of the same conventions in the *Aeneid*. For example, when Aeneas forfeits Dido’s goodwill, she refuses to escort his departure.56

### 3.7 Homer’s Intertextual Contribution to a Reading of Luke and Acts

Some of the Homeric feel or impression of Luke and Acts also derives from a common prominence given to hospitality. An understanding of the importance of ‘welcoming the coming guest’, including the important ritual of going out to escort the last stage of the guest’s arrival (and the possibility, at least in the pagan mind, that that guest could be a god in disguise), creates an important lens for interpreting many key passages in Luke and Acts. These include the ‘Emmaus Road Journey’, ‘Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch’, ‘Peter and Cornelius’, ‘Paul, Barnabas and the Lycaonians’, and ‘Paul and his Ministry on Malta’.

Familiarity with Homeric hospitality, with its special focus on welcoming the coming and speeding the departing guest, is a very useful lens for an interpretation of Luke and Acts. The intertextual lens of Homer helps any reader to become more like the implied reader—one who has the background and insights that Luke would presume in his orig-

---

56 *Aeneid*, 4.376-398.
inal audience. As we will see, a better understanding of the literary role of the motifs of *escorted arrival* and *escorted departure* in Homer has implications for the way many of Luke's first audience would have interpreted acts of *escorted arrival* and *escorted departure* in Luke's writing. What does it mean when a character *fails* to come out and meet? In Homeric, it is a signal of reservation at best, and hostility at worst. In the context of arrivals, the failure to escort the coming guest bodes poorly. Further, an understanding of the Homeric use of *escorted arrivals* and *departures* would have implication for how Luke's readers would interpret the action, or rather, the 'non-action,' of the failure to accompany. I will deal far more thoroughly with these in Part B of this current study.
CHAPTER 4

Josephus and the Narration of the Adventus Ceremonies Accorded to Roman Emperors (in The Jewish War)

In this final chapter of Part A, we prepare to hear what an implied reader would bring to Luke and Acts from their familiarity with the 'current affairs' of the day, particularly as they were narrated by Josephus. Again, as with the implied reader's other 'literary competencies,' the focus is upon incidents of welcome, meeting and escort. In particular we consider Josephus' narration of the Roman custom of adventus, and how familiarity with these narratives would bear upon the interpretation of escorted arrivals in Luke and Acts.

4.1 The Roman Adventus according to Josephus

Josephus Flavius' The History of the Jewish War is significant in that it provides one of the very few extra-biblical witnesses to many of the characters, parties and events mentioned in the New Testament. There are striking similarities between Josephus' and Luke's writings. Underlying the similarities is the general correspondence in the dating and general provenance of both writings (second half of the 1st century CE, the eastern part of the Roman Empire with a focus on Jerusalem). Both writers display evidence of being deeply steeped in the Septuagint. Both are writing history with a persuasive purpose.\(^1\) An exam-

---

\(^1\) H. Leeming & K. Leeming, *Josephus' Jewish War and its Slavonic Version: A Synoptic Comparison* (Brill: Leiden, 2003), p. 24—“Although Josephus poses as a dispassionate recorder of events, his works are biased from first to last, entirely shot through and brightly illuminated by the author's personal feelings.”
ple of one of the more striking features they have in common is the address of a patron as “most excellent” (Luke 1:1, *Contra Apion* 1.1, 2.1, 2.296, *Life* 6.430, *Antiq* 1:8).


---


3 Josephus has thirty-thousand dupes following “The Egyptian”; Luke a mere four-thousand. Josephus, however, is, in many places, suspected of wild inflation of numbers.
The similarity of the use of the word is made even more striking when, on the lips of Paul, we hear the Pharisees describes as the “strictest” sect in relation to the law (War 2.147, Acts 26:5). But, unlike Josephus, Luke omits any mention of the Essenes. In two instances, other characters in Luke’s narrative—characters who are critical of the followers of Jesus—call Christianity a “sect” (Acts 24:5; Acts 28:22). These characters seem to place Christianity in the third place that Josephus reserves for the Essenes. However, Luke resists the classification of Christianity as a mere “sect” within Judaism. Luke is placing Christianity as an alternative to the Pharisees and the Sadducees, but not as a ‘third sect’—not as some Lukan substitute for Josephus’ third sect, the Essenes. Rather the Lukan Paul describes Christians as a group of people in complete continuity with the full breadth of biblical Judaism. The Lukan Paul makes the grand claim that “the Way” (ὁ ὁδὸς)—which they (the critics) “call a sect” (ἣν λέγουσιν αἵρεσιν)—is indeed the worship of the God of Israel (“the God of my ancestors”) in continuity with “all things (πᾶσι τοῖς) laid down according to the law or written in the prophets” (Acts 24:14).

The many similarities between Jewish War and Luke-Acts have several alternative explanations. There may have been literary dependence, respectively, of Josephus upon Luke, or of Luke upon Josephus. Alternatively, there may have been dependence of both Josephus and Luke upon sources that are now unknown to us; or it may be that the common dating and common provenance are the reason behind the similarities shared between the two writers. The both certainly draw heavily upon the LXX. Whatever the details of the explanation, Josephus and Luke certainly make for mutually enlightening intertexts. Josephus certainly reflects a first-century cultural script appropriate to bring to a reading of Luke and Acts.


4.2 Task and Method

Of Josephus’ four surviving works: I will examine in detail only his earliest—Jewish War. According to G. A. Williamson, War is "the most complete record we possess of an important period in Roman history." Within this work I will focus particularly (but not exclusively) on Book VII. This is warranted because of Josephus’ lengthy descriptions of a particular type of escorted arrival—the Roman triumphant arrival or adventus, which crowds of people extend toward the newly proclaimed emperor Vespasian and to his elder son, Titus. In three sections of Book VII of Jewish War, Josephus describes in turn:

I. The adventus which the Romans show to the newly proclaimed emperor, Vespasian (War 7.21-22, 63-75);

II. The adventus which the citizens of Antioch show to Titus, after the fall of Jerusalem (War 7.100-111);

III. The adventus which the Romans show to Titus, which becomes an extravagant triumph led by Vespasian and his two sons, Titus and Domitian (War 7.119-122).

My interest from a Lukan point of view stems from a belief that these passages potentially are an intertext for ‘Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem’ (Luke 19:28-48) and for ‘Paul’s Entry into Rome’ (Acts 28:11-16), in fact, for any Lukan text in which people come out to meet a prominent character (often Jesus or his emissaries, particularly Paul).

As Jewish War was probably written between 75 and 79 CE, it is possible that Luke or Luke’s original readers had direct access to Josephus’ War. Even if Luke or his readers

6 Josephus’ Antiquities of the Jews also makes many references to escort and meeting, but these are nearly all heavily dependent upon near identical references in the LXX. An examination of the passages in Antiquities in which Josephus paraphrases the texts that were the focus for ‘close readings’ in the earlier section of this study (1 Sam 25:2-43; 2 Sam 15:13–16:14; 2 Sam 19:8b–40)—texts that had a high density of reference to meeting and escort—reveals that Josephus faithfully preserved the references to meeting and escort (Antiq 6.295–309; 7.198-7.210; and 7.258-279). At Antiq 7.276, Josephus puts words on the lips of the men of Judah (beyond what they say in 2 Sam 19:42)—they explain that it was because they loved David (στέργω) that they had been quick to ‘come out and meet’ him.

7 The Jewish War is known not to have been written before 75 CE because it describes the building of the Temple of Peace (7.158-162). Josephus’ own later writings (in Contra Apion 1:47-52) suggest that Vespasian
did not have access to War, they most likely would have been familiar with the events of the Fall of Jerusalem, the destruction of the Temple and the Roman style of elaborate triumphant arrivals or adventus rituals, as described by Josephus in War, and, more importantly, they were in possession of a similar cultural script as that to which Josephus' writings attest.

The next three sections examine the three escorted welcome scenes of Book VII of War in order to pick out the particular features that characterise a Josephan escorted arrival in the context of imperial triumph. What are the motifs? What is being implied by the action of escorted arrival? What do these texts contribute to a late first- (early second-) century cultural script?

4.2.1 Rome greets Vespasian (War 7.21-22, 63-75)

At the time when Titus Caesar was busy directing the siege of Jerusalem, Vespasian had embarked on a merchantman and crossed from Alexandria to Rhodes. From there he sailed in a fleet of triremes, calling at every city on the way and welcomed everywhere with enthusiasm [εὐκταίως αὐτὸν δεχομένας]. From Ionia he went to Greece, and from there via Corcyra to the Promontory of Iapyx, whence he continued his journey overland. (War 7.21-22 trans. by G. A. Williamson)

This two-verse prelude anticipates Vespasian's adventus as emperor; it describes Vespasian's journey to Italy. Along the way he was welcomed (ευκταίως αὐτόν δεχομένας “being received with ovations/enthusiasm”). The occasion of narrating the adventus is when Titus hears about it in Beirut.

Meanwhile, Titus Caesar, having received news of the eagerness with which all the Italian cities had greeted his father's approach, and that Rome in particular had given him an enthusiastic and splendid [προθυμίας καὶ λαμπρότητος] reception, experienced heart-felt joy and satisfaction [χαρὰν καὶ θυμηδίαν] at this most agreeable relief from anxiety on his behalf. *44*For even while Vespasian was still far off [Οὐεσπασιανὸν γὰρ ἐτι μὲν καὶ μακρὰν ἀπόντα]... (War 7.63-64, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

---

*read War and approved of its contents. Vespasian died in 79 CE. Also, I imagine clients imposed deadlines on literary works similar to those for commemorative temples and triumphal arches, which were usually completed within a few years of the events they commemorate.*
The first mention of the *adventus* is somewhat retrospective: the reader first hears that after the Italian cities including Rome had greeted Vespasian, the news reached his son Titus (in Beirut after the fall of Jerusalem) and that this news *brought heart-felt joy and satisfaction* to Titus.\(^8\)

The narrator then jumps back in time (*analepsis*) to the point where Vespasian “was still far off” (from Italy).\(^9\)

\(^{64}\)For even while Vespasian was still far off [Οὐεσπασιανὸν γὰρ ἔτι μὲν καὶ μακρὰν ἀπόντα], all the Italians were paying respect to him in their hearts as if he were already come, mistaking, in their keen desire, their expectation of him for his actual arrival and exhibiting an affection for him wholly free from constraint. (War 7.64, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

The narrator then moves forward from the anticipation of the coming of the emperor to the actual *adventus*, and, here, the ‘coming out to meet’ element of the *adventus* receives great prominence in the narrative.

\(^{68}\)Amidst such feelings of universal goodwill [ἐνόοιας ἐξ ἁπάντως—of the Senate, the people and the army toward Vespasian], those of higher rank [or distinguished status], impatient of awaiting him, hastened [ἔσπευδον] to a great distance [πορρωτάτω] from Rome to be the first [προύχους] to greet him. \(^{69}\)Nor, indeed, could any of the rest endure the delay of meeting, but all poured forth in such crowds—for to all it seemed simpler and easier to go than to remain—that the very city then for the first time experienced with satisfaction a paucity of inhabitants; for those who went outnumbered those who remained. \(^{70}\)But when he was reported to be approaching and those who had gone ahead were telling of the affability of his reception of each party, the whole remaining population, with wives and children [ἅμα γυναιξὶ καὶ παῖδις cf. Acts 21:5 σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις], were by now waiting at the road-sides to receive him; \(^{71}\)and each group as he passed, in their delight at the spectacle [τὴν ἡδονὴν τῆς θέας] and moved by the blandness of his appearance, gave vent to all manner of cries, hailing him as “benefactor,” [τὸν ἐυεργέτην] “saviour,” [σωτῆρα] and “only worthy emperor of Rome.” [καὶ μόνον άξιον ἢγεμόνα τῆς Ῥώμης] (War 7.68-71a, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

\(^8\) Paul’s Roman *‘adventus’* will likewise cause a transforming effect on Paul’s spirit moving him to thank God and take courage—Acts 28:15b. See Section 6.2.12.

\(^9\) This phrase is also one with which Lukan readers are familiar due to its central position in the Lukan Jesus’ longest parable: ‘The Father with Two Sons’—also a very significant instances of escorted arrival in Luke and Acts (Luke 15:20—Έτι δὲ αὐτοῦ μακρὰν ἀπέχοντος). See Section 5.3.1.
The spontaneous ‘going out to meet’ that the people of Rome provide for Vespasian is described as motivated by a universal goodwill. Those of greater reputation (7.68) hasten to be the first to greet the returning emperor. But even though this extravagant gesture is first performed by those of higher status, soon nearly the whole male adult population follow, with the extraordinary statement that the city became depopulated (69). The narrative pushes the climax to an even greater pitch with the development that the women and children even came out to wait along the roadsides to greet the returning emperor.

Once the emperor has been universally acknowledged by every strata of the society, the narrative (like the procession) then reaches the city.

The whole city [ἡ πόλις], moreover, was filled, like a temple [ὡς νεὼς], with garlands and incense. Having reached the palace, though with difficulty, owing to the multitude [πλῆθους] that thronged around him, he offered sacrifices of thanksgiving for his arrival to the household gods. The crowds then betook themselves to festivity and, keeping feast by tribes and families and neighbourhoods, with libations prayed God that Vespasian might himself long be spared to the Roman empire, and that the sovereignty might be preserved unchallenged for his sons and their descendants throughout successive generations. And, indeed, the city of Rome, after this cordial reception [ἐκδεξαμένη προθύμως εὐθὺς] of Vespasian, rapidly advanced to great prosperity.

This episode concludes with a ‘defocalisation’ that stretches the time from the day of the reception more broadly into the months and years that followed in which the city “rapidly advanced to great prosperity”. This is immediately followed by another anachrony—another jump back to when Vespasian was still in Alexandria and Titus was busy with the siege of Jerusalem.

Josephus certainly was not the first to mention a Roman adventus ceremony. In the first century BCE, Cicero briefly describes the adventus extended to Julius Caesar and to Augustus. These are found in Cicero’s Letters to Atticus. In the Letters to Atticus 8.16.2, Cicero writes, “Julius Caesar was greeted and worshipped as a god”—quas fieri censes

10 The emphasis on being the ‘first’ to greet the ruler is reminiscent of the haste with which some, like Ziba or Shimei, proceed with in order to be the ‘first’ (πρῶτος) to greet David as he returns from his ‘military victory’ in 2 Sam 19:20. See Section 2.2.3.

11 The presence of women and children at a significant escorted departure occurs in Acts 21:5. See Section 6.2.10.
ἀπαντήσεις ex oppidis, quos honores!—“Just imagine what a meeting/royal welcome/escort (ἀπάντησις) he is receiving from the town, what honours are paid him.”

Again from the Letters to Atticus 16.11.6 “And of Augustus”, Cicero writes, puero municipia mire favent. iter enim faciens in Samnium venit Cales, mansit Teani. mirifica ἀπάντησις et cohortatio—“The municipalities are showing the boy remarkable favour… wonderful meeting/royal welcome/escort (ἀπάντησις) and encouragement.” Cicero while writing predominantly in Latin, uses the Greek noun ἀπάντησις to describe the adventus.

### 4.2.2 Antioch greets Titus (War 7.100-111)

The people of Antioch, on hearing that Titus was at hand, through joy could not bear to remain within their walls, but hastened ἐσπευδόν to meet him δ᾽ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπάντησιν 100 and advanced to a distance of over thirty furlongs τριάκοντα σταδίων—six kilometres not only men, but a crowd of women and children also ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναικῶν πλῆθος ἅμα παισὶ—cf. Acts 21:5, streaming out from the city. 102 And when they beheld him approaching, they lined the road on either side and greeted him with extended arms, and invoking all manner of blessings upon him returned in his train; but all their acclamations were accompanied by a running petition to expel the Jews from the town. (War 7.100-103, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

The adventus extended to Titus from the people of the third largest city in the empire is also a very significant escorted arrival scene. It demonstrates two common features of escorted arrival scenes in Josephus.

The first is an association with the distance that it is appropriate to 'come out to meet' a general or emperor's son. Thirty furlongs (or stadia) is about 3½ miles. On one other occasion in War the people of Jerusalem come out seven miles (60 stadia) to welcome (δεξιουμένη) King Agrippa and the tribune Neapolitanus (War 2.336).12

---

100 The people of Antioch, on hearing that Titus was at hand, through joy could not bear to remain within their walls, but hastened [ἐσπευδόν] to meet him [δ᾽ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπάντησιν].

101 And advanced to a distance of over thirty furlongs [τριάκοντα σταδίων—six kilometres] not only men, but a crowd of women and children also [ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναικῶν πλῆθος ἅμα παισὶ—cf. Acts 21:5], streaming out from the city.

102 And when they beheld him approaching, they lined the road on either side and greeted him with extended arms, and invoking all manner of blessings upon him returned in his train;

103 but all their acclamations were accompanied by a running petition to expel the Jews from the town. (War 7.100-103, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

12 Josephus’s mention of these precise distances proves useful because it offers something with which to compare the Roman believers’ greeting of Paul (Acts 28:15) when they come out to the Forum of Appius (44 miles south of Rome) and the Three Taverns (33 miles south of Rome) to greet and escort Paul and his companions. Luke’s adventus distances far outstrip Josephus’s adventus distances. Further, Paul is not an emperor or general. If anything he is a ‘guest of his majesty’—a prisoner—in chains, on remand, awaiting a legal appeal. The implied reader would suspect that Luke was engaging in a form of literary ‘one-upmanship’, in order to subtly present the claim that the ‘dignitaries’ of the Kingdom of God are worthy of greater honour that the dignitaries of the Roman Empire.
The second feature that Josephus often associates with escorted arrival is *petition* or *supplication*. The people of Antioch come out to greet because they want Titus to grant them a request—to expel the Jews from Antioch. This feature is also present in an earlier *adventus* scene in *War*. In Book II, 2.318 the chief priest and residents of Jerusalem go out to meet (προελθόντες ὑπαντήσουσιν) and welcome (δεξιοῦσθαι) the two cohorts of Roman troops, hoping to placate Rome and avert disaster.\(^{13}\)

When the people of Jerusalem go out to greet King Agrippa and the tribune Neapolitanus they present their case against the governor Florus (who has followed on from Felix, Festus and Albinus—the first two of whom are prominent in Acts). Similarly a petition is also the context of the use of the word ἀπάντησις in the Tebtunis Papyrus (P Teb I.43.i7—BC 118). In that Papyrus, some people 'go out to meet' a newly appointed magistrate in order to persuade him that charges that have been brought against them are false.

4.2.3 *Rome greets Titus and holds a triumph for the three princes* (*War* 7.119-122)

After a voyage as favourable as he could have desired, Rome gave him such a reception and welcome as it had given to his father [Vespasian]; but with the added lustre that Titus was met and received by his father himself. [ἡ Ῥώμη περὶ τὴν ὑποδοχὴν εἶχε καὶ τὰς ὑπαντήσεις ὡσπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ πατρός λαμπρότερον δ᾿ ἦν Τίτῳ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ πατήρ ὑπαντῶν καὶ δεχόμενος]. The crowd of citizens was thus afforded an ecstasy of joy by the sight of the three princes [Domitian, Vespasian and Titus] now united. Before many days had elapsed they decided to celebrate their achievements by one triumph in common, though the senate had decreed a separate triumph to each. Previous notice having been given of the day on which the pageant of victory would take place, not a soul among that countless host in the city was left at home: all issued forth and occupied every position where it was but possible to stand, leaving only room for the necessary passage of those upon whom they were to gaze. (*War* 7.119-122, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

This scene is quite lengthy and a detailed analysis is beyond the scope of this study. I want just to note the general order of this very well developed triumph scene:

\(^{13}\) Readers of the LXX would recall the social and political advantage that motivated Ziba and Shimei (but probably *not* Mephibosheth) to hurry to meet King David upon his return (1 Sam 19:16-30). See Section 2.2.3.
7.123-131—the description of the morning of the triumph, the breakfast and the start of the pageant at the *Porta Triumfalisis*;

7.132-138—the procession, works or art, riches, rarities, images of the gods, beasts, the mob of captives (none unadorned, selected for their good-looks);

7.139-147—the floats, depicting episodes of the war, and ships;

7.148-152—the spoils, including those captured from the Temple in Jerusalem: golden table, lamp stand, a copy of the Jewish Law, images of the victory, followed by Vespasian then Titus (driving) with Domitian beside them (riding a magnificent steed);

7.153-157—the arrival at the *Dios Capitolinus*, where the procession awaited the announcement of the execution of the enemy’s general (Simon son of Gioras);

7.158-162—a defocalising ‘fast-forward’ (from 71 to 75 ce) to the completion of the ‘Temple of Peace’.

Several of these elements will be apposite for interpreting *adventus*-like escorted arrivals in Luke and Acts, particularly ‘Jesus’ Entry of Jerusalem’, ‘Paul’s Final Entry into Jerusalem’ and ‘Paul’s Entry into Rome’.¹⁴

The ‘grand finale’ of the great ‘three-prince’ triumph was arguably the original end of Book VII and the entire *War*. This is what the synopsis in the prologue of *War* (War 1.1-30) suggests would be the last part of the entire tale (War 1.29). By comparison the remaining sections of Book VII (after the triumph—7.163-453) are anticlimactic—a mopping up and a return to the horrors of war (particularly in the siege of Masada with its tragic ending—7.252-406).

¹⁴ One element that is common to ‘The Advent of the Three Princes’ and ‘Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem’ is the way that both processions find their final destination at the temple (in Rome, the *Dios Capitolinus*). See Luke 19:45-48. An element of contrast in the two narratives is that the conclusion of the three princes’ adventus makes reference to the future completion of the ‘Temple of Peace’, whereas, upon Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem, the Lukan Jesus laments the lack of recognition for the things that would have made for Peace (Luke 19:42). Furthermore, the Lukan Jesus anticipates the destruction of the Temple in the Jewish War in ways that are remarkably like Josephus’ descriptions in Book VI of *War*. 
4.2.4 The escorted arrival of Josephus at Tiberias (War 2.613-617; Life of Flavius 85-91)

Before we leave Josephus, I want to refer to one last episode from *War* which features a *refusal* to escort. In this episode, Josephus himself (as a character in the narrative, as the governor of Galilee, before his open rebellion and capture) is greeted by the people of Tiberias. Josephus’s nemesis, John of Gischala, alone, refuses to ‘come out to meet’ Josephus. Josephus explains that this was because John’s “envy” (φθόνος) of Josephus had grown; note the same motif as in the non-escorts of *JosAs* 22:11. John offers “the excuse that he was unwell and confined to bed, and so could not pay his respects.” The narrative continues, “But when Josephus had collected the citizens in the Stadium and was trying to tell them about the report he had received, John quietly sent armed men with orders to assassinate him.” (*War* 2.617, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray).

Josephus in a much later work, *Life* (c. 100 CE), describes this same incident with some minor changes. This time John does greet him but his greeting is peculiar and he quickly returns to his own house. The one apposite addition in *Life* to the episode is that Josephus names the attitude that makes John hate him and plot his assassination—envy.

---

85 But when John saw this, he *envied* [ἐφθόνησε from φθονέω] me, and wrote to me, desiring that I would give him leave to come down, and make use of the hot baths of Tiberias for the recovery of the health of his body. Accordingly, I did not hinder him, as having no suspicion of any wicked designs of his; and I wrote to those to whom I had committed the administration of the affairs of Tiberias by name, that they should provide a lodging for John, and for such as should come with him, and should procure him what necessaries soever he should stand in need of. Now at this time my abode was in a village of Galilee, which is named Cana.

86 But when John was come to the city of Tiberias, he persuaded the men to revolt from their fidelity to me, and to adhere to him; and many of them gladly received that invitation of his, as ever fond of innovations, and by nature disposed to changes, and delighting in seditions; but they were chiefly Justus and his father Pistus that were earnest for their revolt from me, and their adherence to John. But I came upon them, and prevented them; for a messenger had come to me from Silas, whom I had made governor of Tiberias, as I have said already, and had told me of the inclinations of the people of Tiberias, and advised me to make haste thither; for that, if I made any delay, the city would come under another’s jurisdiction.

87 Upon the receipt of this letter of Silas, I took two hundred men along with me, and travelled all night, having sent before a messenger [προπέμψας ἄγγελον] to let the people of Tiberias know that I was coming to them. When I came near to the city,
which was early in the morning, the multitude came out to meet me, and John came with them, and saluted me, but in a most disturbed manner, as being afraid that my coming was to call him to an account for what I was now sensible he was doing. So he, in great haste, went to his lodging. (Life 16.85-91, trans. by H. St J. Thackeray)

As in the account in War there is an assassination attempt from which Josephus escapes. The lesson that could be taken is to be wary of those who do not come out to meet and escort the arrival of the guest. As we have seen, in 2 Sam 20:1-2, when Bichri led a rebellion against David, the rebellion of the people of Israel expressed itself in their failure to escort David’s return to Jerusalem. Josephus’ appreciation of the significance of ‘going out to meet’ may be explained by his thorough knowledge of the Old Testament in the form of the LXX. It is relevant to note that in Jewish Antiquities where Josephus made a précis of nearly all the Jewish biblical narratives, the action of ‘going out to meet’ is often preserved (e.g. 6.301; 7.203, 205, 263, 267, 276). In Josephus’ account (Antiq 7.276) of the men of Judah escorting King David’s return to Judah (2 Sam 19:41-44, just prior to Bichri’s rebellion), Josephus adds the explanation that it was because the men of Judah loved David that they were the first to meet the king. “We are David’s kinsmen, and on that account we ... took care of him, and loved [στέργοντες from στέργω] him, and so came first to him”. This demonstrates that, for Josephus, a nexus existed between the ritual of ‘coming out to meet’ and love—love for the arriving party by the party who went out to meet them.

As we saw in Joseph and Aseneth the brothers of Joseph who envy him—JosAs 22:11b uses the same verb as in Life 16.85—φυονέω—are the ones who at first simply do not escort the arrival of Joseph and Aseneth when they come to visit Jacob. But later the same brothers form an alliance with Pharaoh’s son (who is covetous of Aseneth) and together the brothers and Pharaoh’s son attempt Joseph and Pharaoh’s assassination and the abduction of Aseneth.

This makes Josephus a significant witness to the continuing currency of the cultural script which we discerned in the LXX and in JosAs with regard to escort in the context of hospitality. Josephus’s writings reinforce the cultural script we have seen present in other literature earlier in this study, which suggests that readers ought to be distrustful
of characters in narratives who do not ‘go out to meet’ and escort the arrival of guests of good will. This will have particular relevance to the interpretation of parts of Luke and Acts where there is a failure to ‘go out and meet’—when arriving guests are not escorted.

4.3 Conclusion

An intertextual reading of Luke-Acts and Jewish War has much to contribute to an understanding of one way in which a late first- (early second-) century model reader would have understood the significance of escorted arrival. Josephus dedicates a great amount of space to describing the escorted arrivals with which the Romans greet Vespasian (as their new emperor) and with which the citizens of Antioch greet Titus (as a victorious general). Much text space is also dedicated to the detailed description of the Romans greeting of Titus and the triumphant procession of the ‘three princes’, which is the entire work’s true climax or ‘grand finale’.

As we shall see in the next section of this study, Luke does not allow the Imperial propaganda (exemplified by Josephus’ description of Roman adventus) to be the final word on escorted arrival. In some respects Luke’s perspective on escorted arrival is similar to Josephus’s. Loyal hosts escort the arrival of their guests—it is a reflection of their honour for the guest and, on some occasions, their love for the guest. Loyal citizens escort the arrival of their leaders. Envious or disloyal hosts are often revealed by their failure to escort the arrival of their guests.

In other ways, Luke takes up the imagery of Roman-style adventus and triumphant procession and ‘turns it upside down’. Josephus is our best source-book for a detailed depiction of a Roman adventus. Luke’s transvaluation of Roman adventus borrows the imagery but subverts the ideology behind the ceremony. In Acts we will see the Roman believers come out far further than people ever did for Titus or Vespasian, not in the greeting of an emperor, but of Paul when he is a captive—a ‘guest of his majesty’! Captives were assigned a place in a Roman triumphant procession—it was in the ‘tail’ of the procession, and the captive’s destination was often a public execution. And yet in the final
‘adventus’ of Luke and Acts, the reader sees Paul enter the imperial city with an escort more extravagant than any imperial example discussed by Josephus.¹⁵

In Acts, Luke is placing Christians as an alternative to the Pharisees and the Sadducees, as a ‘third way’, but not as members of a ‘third sect’. The Lukan Paul makes the grand claim that “the Way”—which critics of the movement call “a sect”—is indeed the worship of the God of Israel (“the God of my ancestors”) in continuity with “all things laid down according to the law or written in the prophets” (Acts 24:14).

According to Luke, it is this third group of people—the Christians—who are “turning the world upside down” (Acts 17:6, also on the lips of a critical character, but spoken ironically with truth). And in the next part of this study I will show that one way in which the followers of Jesus turn the Roman world upside down is in the way they ‘go out to meet’ and welcome guests.

An implied reader, familiar with the conventions of meeting and escort as described by Josephus, would understand that there are connections, on one hand, between escorted arrival and honour, good-will and love, and on the other hand, between a failure to escort and envy, treachery and hatred.

### 4.4 Conclusion to Part A

In Part A, I have demonstrated the importance of bringing a close-grained, formalist narrative methodology to hospitality texts in order to establish a reliable cultural script. (The cultural script will be used as an interpretive lens to my reading of Acts, in Part B.) I have attempted to establish a detailed and careful picture of hospitality conventions of the time of Luke’s writing and appropriate for Luke implied reader. I have detected some important details with regard to hospitality conventions, that challenge some previously held assumptions.

---

¹⁵ Luke uses an allusion to an imperial royal welcome as Paul enters Rome (Acts 28:15), even though, as the foreshadowing of Acts 20:25,38 suggests, Paul has probably already died a martyr’s death.
Regarding what I have dubbed “over-detention”—a host’s detention of a guest beyond the point where the guest has expressed the desire to leave—I find, contra Niditch (commenting on Judg 19:5-10 as if the host in that scene were acting in an exemplary manner), that there is a consensus in the background literature, both Jewish (e.g. Gen 18:16; 30:25-26; 31:27) and Graeco-Roman, that demonstrates that good hosts allow their guests to leave when they express the desire to do so. They do not detain them further. In Homeric literature the principle is proverbial (Od. 15.80-81, “Welcome the coming, speed the parting guest”).

The motif of haste in welcoming newly arrived guests and of being the ‘first’ to greet an arriving dignitary is ubiquitous in the cultural script whether looking at Jewish (e.g. Gen 18:2; or 2 Sam 19:11-12, 20, 43) or Graeco-Roman (e.g. Od. 1.119, 3.36) literature. Reece, who lists hesitancy and not haste as a hospitality motif, has failed to note that in both instances where the host hesitates to offer hospitality (Od. 4.24-36; 7.153-66) the hesitancy is, in fact, a threat to good hosting.

Victor Matthews suggests, in relation to guest-gift giving, that reciprocity and a balanced exchange are necessary in order to lead to good relationships; further, that uneven exchanges could lead to hostility. There are, however, many prominent instances where unreciprocated guest-gift giving, or reciprocated but wildly unbalanced exchanges of gift, leads to strong positive and enduring bonds despite the lack of reciprocity or balance (e.g. Il. 6.215-20; 235-7; Od. 1.311-13, 316-18; 4.589-619; 15.48-55, 75-76, 113-19). Matthews’ choice of Gen 32:13-21 to illustrate the unbalanced exchange of gift between Jacob and Esau seems deficient without any discussion of the opposite imbalance in Gen 25:30-34. I question the ubiquity of the principle that Matthews describes.

Julian Pitt-Rivers proposes a model of hospitality that seems to suggest that the guest at the beginning of hospitality scenes is always a ξένος in the strictest sense—a stranger—

completely unknown to the host, and dangerous.\textsuperscript{17} I think this overstates a generalisation and it ignores both the ambiguity that exists in the word ξένος,\textsuperscript{18} and the fact that, in many scenes that are clearly hospitality type-scenes, the levels of the visitor’s strange-ness (and danger) are extremely variable. In Homer, for example, Telemachus is known to some degree (as the son of Odysseus) by all his hosts in the Telemacheia. In Genesis and Tobit, hospitality scenes often occur between close relatives. Adelbert Denaux has a broader model of hospitality which fits the actual hospitality texts studied in the Background section; he writes, “The outsider can be known or unknown, a friend, a family member or a stranger.”\textsuperscript{19} It is worth keeping the cultural script open to the close literary readings of background texts rather than creating an unnecessarily narrow cultural script in which the readings from many exemplary hospitality scenes would suffer deformity.

The most significant insight that I have brought to an appreciation of the cultural script is a restoration of the true beginnings and endings of hospitality scenes. I have done this by acknowledging, with Homeric classicist, Steve Reece, and biblical scholar Andrew Arterbury, that all that happens from the moment the host detects the arrival of the guest, up to and including the guest’s departure were considered part of the host’s hospitality. The actions of “going out to meet” and escorting the arrival of the guests, and escorting their departure for some part—sometimes a large part—of their onward journey, were certainly parts of the cultural script of hospitality conventions (e.g. Gen 18:2,16; Od. 3.34, 36; 4.37-38; 3.324-6, 368-70, 474-86; 4.589; 15.64-74).

\textsuperscript{17} Pitt-Rivers, \textit{The Fate of Shechem}, pp 101-102.


Part B

The motifs of welcome and escort in a narrative reading of Luke and Acts
CHAPTER 5

Meeting, Welcome and Escort in Luke’s Gospel

5.1 Introduction—a Brief Survey

At the heart of Luke’s Gospel stands a parable which invites comparison between Jesus’ willingness to welcome sinners into the kingdom of God and the actions of a father who runs out to meet a long-lost son (Luke 15:20). In this parable, the father demands that robes, ring and sandals be brought out so that he can escort the son’s entrance to the family home in a manner that communicates welcome, reconciliation, celebration and joy (15:22). In another Lukan parable, the essential character of belonging to the kingdom is described through the story of an unlikely assistant who stops for a wounded victim and who after attending the man’s injuries, escorts him to an inn (πανδοχεῖον, literally a ‘welcome-all’) where further care is promised (10:33-35).

Characters in Luke’s Gospel, who have faith in Jesus’ ability to heal, escort others to Jesus (4:40; 5:18-19; 9:41; 18:15; 18:40); or they escort Jesus, personally (8:41-42, 49-51) or using emissaries (7:2-3), to the one in need of healing. As if anticipating the time when others will continue his ministry, the Lukan Jesus explains a connection between people’s reception of his emissaries, and their reception of himself and of the God who sent him.

“Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me.” (Luke 10:16)

Therefore reception, which often includes the actions of ‘going out to meet’ and escorted arrival, serves as a way in which characters (to some degree in Luke’s Gospel, but
particularly in The Book of Acts) demonstrate their preparedness to accept Jesus and his message, thereby placing themselves in line to receive the peace and salvation associated with the kingdom of God.

In the conclusion to Luke’s Gospel, Jesus’ willingness to continue to accompany his followers is dramatically enacted on the Road to Emmaus (24:15) and along the way to the place of Jesus’ ascension (24:36,50-51).

5.2 Chapter Structure

This chapter, which examines meeting and escort in Luke’s Gospel, serves a double purpose. On one hand, Luke’s Gospel is the most essential background reading before the examination of escort and welcome in The Book of Acts (the main focus of this dissertation). Luke may assume that a reader of Acts has a grasp of the conventions in the cultural script as established by literature of the type in Part A of this dissertation, but his comments (in the preface of Acts) suggest that a reading of Acts presumes a reading of the Third Gospel (Acts 1:1-2). On the other hand, Luke’s Gospel is our first experience of Luke’s writing. And so, if we are making the case that escort and welcome are significant literary motifs for Luke in Acts, then we might expect to find these motifs in the Gospel. Indeed among the many motifs of hospitality in Luke’s Gospel we do find some prominent featuring of motifs of welcome and escort. An examination of Luke’s Gospel is therefore important to elucidating the meaning and significance of the motifs of welcome and escort in Acts.

However, in comparison to Acts, Luke’s Gospel is more constrained by the tradition relating to the ministry and Passion of Jesus. So whereas in Acts, escort features as a common motif, in Luke’s Gospel, although present, escort features as a less common motif. Nevertheless, as the rapid survey above demonstrates, escort is prominent in some of the most important and distinctively ‘Lukan’ parts of the Third Gospel—The Compassionate Samaritan, The Prodigal Son (which I will refer to as ‘The Father with Two Sons’), and On the Way to Emmaus. The importance of these narratives to Luke is easily detected by
noting the text lengths that Luke dedicates to their telling. The Father with Two Sons and the Emmaus Road are the two longest narrative units in Luke’s Gospel.¹

The context of the ‘escorts’ in Luke’s Gospel varies considerably. Whereas the more frequent occurrence of meeting and escort in Acts justifies a synchronic survey (which is the structure of the following ‘Acts’ chapter), in this chapter I examine escort more briefly under three categories related to the context of the escort.

This chapter’s consideration of escort in Luke’s Gospel begins with an examination of Luke’s portrayal of Jesus as one who welcomes and accompanies others. Therefore, the first context for the examination of escort and welcome in Luke’s Gospel features Jesus the companion. Within this first category I include narrative episodes that demonstrate the ‘accompanying’ nature of Jesus—Jesus’ willingness to go out, meet and escort others. I consider those instances in which Jesus escorts his disciples as on the Road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35) and on the way to the place of his departure at the very end of Luke’s Gospel (24:50-53). From the Call Narratives (Luke 5:1-11, 27-28) to Jesus’ departure (24:50-51), Jesus’ time with his disciples is characterised by escort.²

I have also included under this first category two parables: The Compassionate Samaritan and The Man with Two Sons. Assigning parables to this category is not as straightforward as assigning the other narratives to this category for two reasons. One reason for the difficulty is caused by the parables’ occupying of a different ‘diegetic’ level to the other narratives.³ The parables are stories within the main story. The other reason for the difficulty is the metaphorical nature of the parables, which allows for a broader range of

² The selection of a replacement apostle in Acts makes having accompanied Jesus and the apostles a criterion for candidature—Acts 1:21.
interpretations and character identifications. Nevertheless, I shall make a case for the two parables’ inclusion within episodes that exemplify the accompanying nature of Jesus.

The second context of escort in Luke’s Gospel consists of scenes in which characters accompany others to meet Jesus, particularly those who bring others to Jesus for healing (Luke 4:40; 5:18-19; 9:41; 18:15; 18:40). This context is strongly influenced by the tradition, and yet Luke lends to his telling of these narratives distinctive features that emphasise escort.

A variation upon scenes in which characters accompany others to meet Jesus occurs when incapacity (sometimes associated with closeness to death, or even death itself) necessitates that Jesus be invited and escorted to someone’s bedside (as in Luke 7:3, the centurion’s slave, or Luke 8:41, Jairus’s daughter).

The third context of escort emerges from the reception that others extend to Jesus and to his emissaries. Of the scenes that describe the reception that others extend to Jesus the most notable are: the Nazareth Synagogue episode (Luke 4:16-30); Jesus’ Visit to the House of Simon the Pharisee (Luke 7:36-50); the Samaritan Village (9:51-56) the Reception of Martha and Mary (Luke 10:38-42) the Reception of Zacchaeus (Luke 19:1-10) and the Entry of Jerusalem (19:28-48). Note that reception scenes in Luke and Acts, as in The Odyssey, include scenes of ambiguous, ambivalent and outright negative reception (or ‘rejection’).

The rejection scenes that constitute Luke’s Passion Narratives (which are also in view proleptically at the Nazareth Synagogue episode) often feature ‘rough escort’ (Luke 22:52,54; 23:1,7,14,26). ‘Rough escort’ is just one of several motifs and elements which parody hospitality within the Passion Narrative (and the episode which recounts the violent rejection of Jesus at the Nazareth Synagogue). Other parodic motifs of hospitality in-

---

4 The reception that others extend to Jesus and his emissaries is the context of escort that most strongly resonates with what happens in Acts. Acts may be regarded as a series of potential hospitality scenes in which the constant question is ‘How do the people in each location respond to Jesus’ emissaries who bears his word or message?’ Is there reception or rejection?
clude: greeting with a kiss (22:47), mock homage (22:64; 23:11,36,37), undesired detention (22:66), enrobing (23:11) and rough sending-upon-one’s-way (23:26,32-33).


Using these three categories of escort in Luke’s Gospel—Jesus’ escort of others, the escort of others to Jesus, and the escort of Jesus and his emissaries upon their arrival as a sign of reception—I will examine each episode in sufficient detail to determine the significance and meaning of escort in Luke’s Gospel.

---

5 There is remarkably little about the reception of the ‘Twelve’ after their sending out, particularly in the light of Luke 9:4-5. Luke 9:6 and 9:10 imply some degree of positive reception—allowing the ‘Twelve’ to fulfill part of their mission. However, there are many clues that all may not have gone as well as the ‘Twelve’ would like to report. The ‘Twelve’ seem to be predisposed to several deficiencies which emerge in relatively quick succession shortly after their return from their mission and before the sending out of another ‘Seventy’: aversion to more active dimensions of ministry, e.g. healing and feeding (9:12,40); inability to engage with the death of Christ (9:40); preoccupation with importance and hierarchy (9:46); refusal to collaborate with co-workers who are ‘outsiders’ (9:49); harsh judgement when it comes to extending ‘second chances’ to those who at first resist the good news or who reject Jesus (9:54-55).

5.3 Jesus’ Escort of Others—Jesus who Accompanies and Welcomes

5.3.1 The Parable of the Father with Two Sons (Luke 15:11-32)

‘The Parable of The Father with Two Sons’ (also known by the conventional but not very adequate title ‘The Parable of the Prodigal Son’) 7 contains two instances of ‘going out’ on the father’s part ‘to meet’ his two sons. The first instance of ‘going out to meet’ (15:20) is more conspicuous in the narrative than the second (15:28b), and therefore more frequently recognised by the reader (and commentators). In the first ‘going out’, the father sees the younger (‘Prodigal’) son “while he was still far off.”

The phrase “So he set off and went to his father” serves as a ‘hinge’ between the soliloquy (15:17-19), which rehearses the younger son’s “coming to his senses” speech, and the nucleus of the parable (the homecoming and celebration, of verses 20-24). 8 The small fragment “But while he was still far off” serves both to locate the setting for the nucleus and to focus the reader’s attention on the important flurry of actions (seeing, running, embracing, kissing).

The first action of the father consists of seeing the son. Although perceptions such as sight and hearing commonly serve to heighten the focus of readers’ attention in narratives, this is no mere ‘catching sight of’;9 for the narrator adds the comment that the father

---
7 The conventional title (‘The Parable of the Prodigal Son’) and a popular alternative title, which aligns this third parable with the earlier two ‘Lost’ stories (‘The Lost Son’), are both inadequate. The first line of this parable gives prominence to the point that the father has two sons. And as I discuss, the structure of this parable is different from the early two ‘Lost’ parables, precisely because it does not terminate with the party, but rather continues to deal with the interaction between the father and the older son.
8 Robert Funk defines a narrative nucleus as a narrative segment consisting of a cluster of actions or happenings that constitute an event. Funk, Poetics, p. 23.
9 The Book of Tobit also has this motif of waiting and looking down the road. “Meanwhile Anna sat looking intently down the road by which her son would come.” (Tobit 11:5). The narrative of ‘Abraham and the Three Guests’ also contains this motif (Genesis 18:2a).
was ‘filled with compassion’. This suggests that the ‘seeing’ was anticipated and longed-for.\textsuperscript{10}

The word used for having compassion (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) is used in two other significant points in Luke’s Gospel, and its cognate noun is used once. In Zechariah’s prophecy (Luke 1:68-79) the cognate noun is used in the context of the compassionate mercy of God (σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ) through which the Messiah (the ‘rising’ from on high) will visit (ἐπισκέψεται) his people (1:78). The three uses of the verb (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) are: when Jesus has compassion upon the widow of Nain (7:13); when the Samaritan has compassion upon the wounded man lying half-dead on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho (10:33); and when the father has compassion on his returning son (15:10). These sparse but significant uses of the verb and its cognate noun make a powerful point: that a compassionate response is the response of God to the world, and it is chiefly personified in Jesus’ response to those whom he meets.

The rest of the father’s response (beyond his being filled with compassion) is ‘shown’ rather than ‘told’—or to use the technical language of narratology, it is expressed mimetically rather than diegetically. The choice to narrate the rest of the father’s response mimetically is what makes the parable so visual and memorable.

The father’s running continues the flurry of activity that ‘shows’ the compassion that the father is said to feel for his ‘lost’ son—a conspicuous instance of Luke’s use of mimetic narration to demonstrate the inner response of a character. Luke’s use of mimetic narration at climactic sections of a narrative sits firmly within the biblical tradition that forms a strong component of Luke’s literary background. There is a similar flurry of activity in Abraham’s preparations for his three guests (Gen 18:6-8) and in Abigail’s preparations to make provision for David (1 Sam 25:18-20,23-24a). The earliest part of the father’s flurry

\textsuperscript{10} Kenneth Bailey suggests that the father watches in order to make a quick response to save his son by pre-empting the response of the village mob, which is likely to be verbal or physical abuse of the son. Kenneth E. Bailey, \textit{Jacob & the Prodigal: How Jesus Retold Israel’s Story} (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 2003), pp. 181-2. This book’s methodology (intertextuality) represents a departure from the questionable methodology for which Bailey is better known (and often criticised)—using twentieth-century Middle-Eastern traditional peasant culture to approximate a first-century cultural script by which to read the Gospels (or, more specifically the parables).
the of activity (the running, embracing and kissing) is also well represented in the biblical tradition (Laban’s greeting of Jacob, Gen 29:13; Esau’s greeting of Jacob, Gen 33:4; Joseph’s greeting of Jacob, Gen 46:29).

Several commentators have noted the extravagance of the activities that constitute the ‘flurry’ of activity. Kenneth Bailey’s observation about the ‘unusual’ nature of an elder running out to greet a younger and subordinate figure, indeed, for an elder to run at all, relies too much on the relevance of twentieth-century Middle-Eastern traditional peasant culture to approximate a cultural script for a first-century reader, and takes too little notice of the rich literary precedent for good hosts running to their guests, particularly in a reconciliatory context like Genesis 33:4 or 46:29. Bailey uses a more widely accepted intertextual methodology when he notes many parallels between the parable and the account of Esau’s meeting of Jacob (Gen 32:3–33:17, particularly 33:4). Indeed, it was the running which first drew Bailey’s attention to the many similarities between the two stories. The parallels that first caught Bailey’s attention were three of the twelve ‘repeated’ elements (common to both narratives): running to meet, embracing and kissing. Beyond merely pointing out the possible parallels, Bailey goes on to suggest that the parable is a rabbinic-styled reworking of the Jacob-Esau story, which is to claim a high degree of dependence of the latter upon the former. I would like to keep open the possibility that the parallels derive from a less conscious and less deliberate process, but I would acknowledge (with Bailey) that the parable grows out of the milieu of Biblical narratives—including

11 Kenneth Bailey, Poet and Peasant and Through Peasant Eyes, combined paperback edition (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), p. 181. Bailey writes, “An Oriental nobleman with flowing robes never runs anywhere”. And yet I do not think that Bailey’s comment (with its underlying questionable methodology of using twentieth-century Middle-Eastern traditional peasant culture to approximate a first-century cultural script) takes sufficient consideration of the full force of the precedent set by the great amount of ‘running’ in the patriarchal narratives in Genesis: Abraham’s most senior servant (24:17); Laban (24:9, 29:13); matriarchs Rebekah (24:20, 28) and Rachel (29:12); ‘kingly’ Esau (33:4, 36:31); and of course the arch-patriarch himself, Abraham (18:2,7).

12 Bailey, Jacob & the Prodigal, pp. 164-176.

13 Bailey identifies fifty-one common elements (some straightforward ‘repeats’, some ‘altered’ and some ‘reversed’) between the account of Esau’s meeting of Jacob and the Parable of the Prodigal. Bailey, Jacob & the Prodigal, p. 217.
ing, but not necessarily limited to, the Jacob-Esau meeting.\textsuperscript{14} Other narratives that similarly share some of the iconic motifs of the flurry of action (running, embracing, falling upon the neck of another, tears, ceremonial ‘investing’ in special clothing and jewellery, the killing of a prized calf) include Joseph’s reuniting with his brothers (Gen 45:14-24) and his father (Gen 46:28-29), and Abram’s reception of his three stranger-guests (Gen 18:1-16). Two of these narratives (Abram’s reception and Joseph’s meeting of his father) also prominently feature the motif of ‘going out to meet’ and escorted arrival (18:2, 46:29) where the significance of the motif is the host’s \textit{honouring} of the arriving party.

The first flurry of action (Luke 15:20) is followed by the younger son’s delivery of his rehearsed speech. The proposal in this speech, however, has no place in the father’s response, and so the father interrupts the speech before it reaches what the reader knows to be the son’s prepared conclusion.\textsuperscript{15} The volley of imperatives with which the father interrupts the son’s rehearsed speech is similar to the earlier flurry of actions; although, the imperatives work in a slightly proleptic manner (the mind’s eye ‘sees’ them in slight ‘flash-forward’, while they are yet imperatives on the father’s lips.)

As if to emphasise the haste (conveying to the reader the household’s eagerness to comply with the father’s instructions), the celebration begins immediately the father finishes his instructions (v. 24c). The iterative nature of “they began to celebrate” (which describes not one action but an indefinite series of actions) provides a defocalisation of the scene by temporal expansion. And this is what the previous two parables have \textit{led} the reader to anticipate—the parables in this triptych (Lost Sheep, Lost Coin, Lost Son) are \textit{meant} to terminate with a party.

But in this parable the sense of terminal function proves to be a \textit{false} ending. This story is not over. For the man at the very introduction to the parable was said to have \textit{two} sons.

\textsuperscript{14} Bailey’s extensive examination of the similarities with the Prodigal and the Esau-Jacob story do allow one further extrapolation. Both narratives show the ‘outsider’ (the prodigal son and Esau) in a good light, and ‘Israel’ (Jacob in Genesis, the ‘older’ son in Jesus’ parable) in an ambiguous position.

\textsuperscript{15} I assume that the textual witnesses which allow the son to finish his rehearsed speech derive from a copyist who has misunderstood the \textit{function} of the shortening of the speech (to demonstrate that the speech has no place in the father’s joyful response to the son’s return). The copyist has reproduced the ending of the speech from its soliloquised version.
The elder son’s response (“he became angry and refused to go in”) provides the setting for the father’s second attempt at escorted arrival—a second ‘going out to meet’—“His father went out (ἐξελθὼν) and began to plead with him.” It is this surprise “extra” scene that makes the sharpest connection with the setting of the three ‘Lost’ parables—where the Pharisees and the scribes were grumbling and saying, “This fellow welcomes sinners and eats with them.”

And so both the climax (the younger son’s homecoming) and the “extra” scene at the end portray the father “going out to meet”. And yet, the two sub-units differ in one critical regard. Although encouraged to imagine the father’s escort of his younger son into the home, the reader does not get to see the father’s escort of the older brother, because the question of the older brother’s response is left unresolved. The scene lacks any of the conventional techniques by which a proper conclusion is reached. There is no departure of the father and the older brother to the house. The party is not mentioned again. A return to the party would have allowed for participant expansion, iterative actions or action expansion—all standard ways to finish a properly concluded story. There is no further commentary by ‘Jesus’ the narrator of the parable.¹⁶ There is no mention of a status change for the older brother, other than the suggestion by the father of the possibility that the older brother acknowledge the returnee as his “brother” (“this brother of yours”, v. 32).

The lack of resolution engages readers to imagine their own ending. In an exercise of self-examination the reader is also forced to consider where they stand in relation to welcoming sinners into the kingdom of God. The position of Jesus has already been made clear in Luke’s Gospel. It is summarised in the Pharisees’ grumbling—“This fellow welcomes sinners and eats with them.” The father in the parable and Jesus both reflect the compassion of divinity, as we saw in Luke’s use of σπλάγχνα at 1:78, Jesus’ compassion for the widow at Nain at 7:13, and the compassion (ἐσπλαγχνίσθη) of the father at 15:20. The divine initiative is characterised by hospitable preparedness, metaphorically speaking, ‘to run out to meet’ the lost. In this context, escort signifies ‘honour’. The father in the parable

¹⁶ The “Parable of the Nobleman Who Went to Seek a Royal Title” (or “of the Pounds”) similarly has no resolution or concluding statement by the intradiegetic narrator, Jesus (Luke 19:27-28).
honours his younger son and then his older son. The significance or meaning of escort is *honour* motivated by *compassion* and with a desire to bring about *conciliation* and *peace*. Receptiveness to God’s initiative must exhibit the same attitude to the welcome and reception of sinners. So also in Acts, as we shall see in the next chapter, Jesus’ emissaries are often characterised by their preparedness ‘to go out to meet’ Gentiles (*e.g.* Philip’s running to the Ethiopian’s chariot or Peter’s going to eat in the household of Cornelius the Centurion).

### 5.3.2 The Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan (Luke 10:29-37)

Like the story of the Father with Two Sons, the Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan has a central character who demonstrates Christ-like preparedness to go out to the lost (10:34a) and escort them to a place of welcome (10:34c), and the climax is marked by a flurry of action initiated by seeing and having compassion (*καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη*—Luke 10:33; *cf.* ἐϊδὲν αὐτὸν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐσπλαγχνίσθη—Luke 15:20c). The Compassionate Samaritan sees, tends, washes and accompanies the wounded man, putting him on his own beast (*ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτήνος*).

What does the parable of the Compassionate Samaritan contribute to an understanding of the significance and meaning of escort in Luke’s Gospel? As in the Parable of the Father with Two Sons, escort is part of a ‘flurry’ of actions, the *combination* of which makes the significance of the actions clearer. In the case of the Compassionate Samaritan, the sentiment behind the actions is *compassion* (*καὶ ἰδὼν ἐσπλαγχνίσθη*). Luke’s readers are already aware that mention of this compassionate heart (literally “bowels”) is used to describe the motive for the salvific action of God (Luke 1:78). The repeated use of *σπλάγχνον* and *σπλαγχνίζομαι* links the Samaritan’s action with both Jesus (7:13) and divinity (1:78). The Samaritan’s response is one of divine compassion.

The parable which attributes this quality to the Samaritan, and, as we shall see, two stories in Acts, where some of the actions of the Samaritan are repeated by Gentiles, make a similar point—sometimes the quality of divine compassion is found in those thought to
be ‘outsiders’ (Acts 16:22-23,33-34a; 23:23-24). The suggestion subverts the simplistic division of the world into ‘insider’ and ‘outsider’. In the particular context of the possibility that the Jericho-road victim is Jewish (10:30), the action also communicates a preparedness to extend regard, care and compassion beyond ‘cultural boundaries’.

The striking dynamic of the Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan is that it is the archetypal ‘outsider’ (a Samaritan) who demonstrates the enacted welcome and the reception to a man who was probably an ‘insider’ (Jewish). The wounded man, stripped, beaten and robbed, bears no signs of his entitlement or status, and, half-dead, cannot even present himself as a supplicant. Neither can the victim be asked about his origins or tested as to his character. Nevertheless, the Samaritan shows compassion and hospitality.

Like the Parable of the Father with Two Sons, the Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan is left unresolved. The final statement “when I come back” anticipates a time beyond the inner-narrative of the parable, when the Samaritan will return to repay the innkeeper whatever more he spends. But the reader never hears this last part of the story. Does the wounded man recover fully? Does he learn the identity of his rescuer? Is he appropriately thankful? Or is he shamed by the cultural identity of his saviour (an archetypical ‘outsider’ from a Jewish perspective)?

This final point touches upon the new dimension that this parable adds to the meaning and significance of escort: this is clearly the escort of the ultimate ‘stranger’. The Samaritan cannot be questioned or tested or present his supplication. The Samaritan’s escort still signifies honour—the Samaritan sees the man, the Samaritan’s actions demonstrate his valuing of the man’s life. As in other Lukan episodes, the Samaritan’s escort is motivated by compassion with a desire to bring about conciliation and peace. But now that conciliation is clearly understood to run across and bridge some serious cultural divisions.

---

17 Whether the victim is Jewish or not is left unresolved. In the narrative, the victim is stripped, beaten and left unconscious (half-dead) and so the character of the Compassionate Samaritan is in the same position as the reader—uncertain whether the man is of his ‘people’ or not. The sort of things used to distinguish people’s cultural identity—clothing, speech, carried ‘entitlements’ and ‘possessions’—have been stripped of him, rendering him ‘anyman’. The point is that the Samaritan (a member of a group regarded as ‘outsiders’ by Jews, who, in the narrative, constitute the parables original audience) assists the victim regardless of his cultural identity.
5.3.3 Jesus’ General Escort of Others in the Primary Narrative of Luke’s Gospel

From two ‘stories within stories’—or ‘Second Narratives’—we move ‘up’ a diegetic layer (or level) to consider how, in the ‘Primary Narrative’ of Luke’s Gospel, Jesus escorts others in stories narrated by Luke.\(^\text{18}\)

One component of Jesus’ escort of others almost eludes notice because of its commonness to all four canonical gospels and because of its ubiquity from the Call Narratives to the commencement of the Passion Narratives—and that is the general accompanying by the itinerant Jesus of his called disciples as they follow him. Jesus’ calling of the disciples to accompany him finds an implicit fulfilment right through to the end of Jesus’ final journey to Jerusalem, and to Jesus’ arrest at the Mount of Olives (22:39).\(^\text{19}\) Even beyond the arrest of Jesus, the disciples continue to follow Jesus, albeit at a distance (22:54b, 23:49). This type of accompaniment is not the short-termed escorted arrival or escorted departure, but the long-term and sustained escort—the type that Pisistratus provides for Telemachus (to choose a Homeric example), or that Raphael provides to Tobias (to choose an example from the LXX). It is against this general background of implicit escort—not uniquely Lukan—that the more explicit—and distinctly Lukan—accounts of escort in the Gospel find their broader setting.

In another sense, the Lukan Jesus is always accompanying his disciples, even beyond the final journey to Jerusalem and his arrest. Luke makes this explicit in two post-resurrection narratives in the Gospel—the Emmaus Road journey and the journey to the place of Jesus’ ascension, which are discussed in the very next sub-section—but also by the way in which Jesus’ presence mysteriously permeates most of the narratives of the Book of Acts—through voice, vision, angelic messengers and the work of the Holy Spirit.

This ‘continuing’ presence of Jesus is alluded to, even in the first Lukan Call Narrative (Luke 5:1-11), which internal evidence (\textit{e.g.} 5:8) and comparison with John 21: 1-11, would

---

\(^{18}\) For a systematic explanation of narrative layers of levels, see Funk, \textit{Poetics}, pp. 30-33; Genette, \textit{Narrative Discourse}, pp. 227-8; Rimmon-Kenan, \textit{Narrative Fiction}, pp. 91-5.

suggest has something of a post-resurrection sense about it. By blurring the distinctions between pre-resurrection and post-resurrection narratives, Luke establishes a permeable boundary between the times in which Jesus’ accompanied his disciples and the time of the church (after the ascension of Jesus). In Lukan theology, despite his bodily absence, Jesus still accompanies his followers as they make their outward-bound missional journey.

5.3.4 On the Road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35)

One of Luke’s longest narratives is the account of the appearance of Jesus to the two disciples on the Road to Emmaus (Luke 24:13-35). Meeting and escort feature as central motifs of this narrative. Jesus meets the despondent travellers and talks with them while walking along the way. The implied reader—familiar with the common literary conventions in ‘theoxeny’ scenes, exemplified by both Homer and the Hebrew Scriptures—would have a wealth of intertexts to bring to their reading of the Emmaus story. In these scenes, gods disguised as mortals pay visits to characters such as Odysseus or Telemachus.

Frequently, at the conclusion of Homer’s theoxeny scenes, the god makes a rapid departure, simultaneously revealing his or her true identity. Usually the character who has been host to the god is filled with encouragement at the moment of revelation and departure, which inspires the character to continue his or her endeavour (e.g. Od. 1.319-321). What would the implied reader note in the Emmaus scene? As in a typical Homeric theoxeny, Jesus’ identity is hidden for much of the scene. This allows for a particular type of dramatic irony created by the fact that the reader knows Jesus’ identity but the disciples do not. This irony that stems from failure to recognise also has a strong precedent in the Joseph narratives where Joseph’s brother’s fail to recognise his identity (Gen 42:8). The revelation of Jesus’ identity in the Emmaus scene comes not because of the departure of the divine guest (as in Homeric theoxenies) but by the breaking of bread that immediately precedes Jesus’ departure (Luke 24:30-31, 35).

A reader familiar with the Hebrew Scriptures would find in the Emmaus incident an echo of the Deuteronomic injunction to teach the Torah (the “commandments”) while
“going on the way” (πορευομένους ἐν ὁδῷ—Deut 11:19 LXX). The Torah is specifically referred to in Luke 24:27 (“Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures”).

This reference to the Emmaus disciples hearing ‘the law and the prophets’ and being moved to recognition of the one risen from the dead invites another intertextual comparison, in this instance, to the story of ‘Lazarus and the Rich Man’ (Luke 16:19-31). The rich man is identified as one who conspicuously neglected to offer hospitality to the one who lay at his gate—the rich man who would neither ‘see’ nor ‘go out to meet’ the one waiting in the traditional place of attention and greeting, a man who would not welcome the poor man in to share his perpetual extravagant feast, a man who had brothers who would not listen “even if someone rises from the dead” because they would not first listen to “Moses and the prophets”. The Emmaus road offers a redemptive and contrasting version of the narrative of judgement in the story of ‘Lazarus and the Rich Man’. And therefore it is not surprising that the Emmaus scene contains positive hospitality motifs: going out to meet, escort, exchange of news, positive detention (“Stay with us”), the blessing and breaking of bread.


²¹ Joshua W Jipp has written on the Malta scene as a ‘theoxeny’. Divine Visitation, pp. 24-25.
5.3.5  **On the Way to Jesus’ Final Departure (Luke 24:50-53)**

The brief conclusion to Luke’s Gospel (24:50-53) consists of the final narrative episode that depicts Jesus’ escort of the disciples. The word used to describe that escort, ‘he led them out’—ἐξήγαγεν from ἐξάγω, ‘I lead out’—is not without powerful connotation. The word is very evocative of the Exodus. Ἐξάγω is used 30 times in this context in the Book of Exodus. Luke, himself uses the verb in Acts, specifically to refer to the Exodus (Acts 7:36,40; 13:17). Elsewhere he uses it to refer to escorts from imprisonment (Acts 5:19; 12:17; 16:37,39). The word is just one of several prompts in the broader literary context of the conclusion of Luke’s Gospel to evoke remembrance of Moses—another great accompanying prophet. Moses is referred to in relation to traditional ascription of the authorship of the Pentateuch (Luke 24:27,44). Jesus’ ascension would also evoke in first century Jewish minds the taking of Moses’ body to heaven (e.g. Jude 9 contains an account similar to the lost Jewish pseudepigraphal work, the Testament of Moses). Similarly Jesus’ blessing would evoke recollection of Moses' blessing of Israel (Deuteronomy 33). The evocation of Moses reinforces the image of Jesus as an accompanying prophet.

There is some tension between Jesus’ command to stay in the city (Jerusalem) and his action of leading the disciples out. Both the command to stay and the allusion to leaving are repeated at the beginning of Acts (Acts 1:4,8). The key to resolving the tension in Luke’s Gospel is the command to wait—“until you have been clothed with power from on high” (Luke 24:49). This too is repeated in Acts: “…he ordered them not to leave Jerusalem, but to wait there for the promise of the Father” (Acts 1:4) which the following verse (5) identifies as the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Acts also presents this tension as finding partial resolution in the temporary nature of the period of witnessing in Jerusalem (Acts 2:4–8:1, noting 5:20,27) which then serves as a hub from which the witnesses’ message ‘radiates’ to the ‘ends of the earth’ (Acts 1:8, 8:1).

There is also some tension regarding the ongoing presence of Jesus as the one who accompanies his disciples. While the blessing, withdrawal and being carried up into heaven make the point that Jesus has departed, the promise of the Spirit (whom Luke in one place
calls the “Spirit of Jesus”—Acts 16:7) seems to hold open the possibility of the continued accompanying presence of Jesus. And in fact this is what we see throughout Acts. Jesus accompanies the disciple starting in Jerusalem and then continuing on their outward journey to witness to the ends of the earth. This continued accompanying presence of Jesus is achieved through voice, vision, angelic messages, as well as through the communication of the Holy Spirit.

5.3.6 Concluding Remarks Concerning Jesus as the One who Escorts Others

As we have seen from an examination of the Parables of the Father with Two Sons and the Compassionate Samaritan, the divine quality of compassion which in the parables motivates the father and the Samaritan to actions of approach and escort is shared by Jesus, the rising one from on high who will visit us (Luke 1:78). There are three other significant places in Luke's Gospel where Jesus’ life is compared with a visitation—ἐπισκοπή.

In Zechariah’s prophecy (Luke 1:67-79), Luke uses ἐπισκέπτομαι twice (1:68, 1:78): in the earlier occurrence it is a reference to the coming of the messiah (although its aorist tense also allows it to allude to the past salvation of the Exodus). A reference to Jesus’ ‘exodus’ (‘departure’) in Luke 9:31 suggests that Jesus’ life and ministry is a visitation. But the word ‘exodus’ may be taken to imply that what is about to be accomplished in Jerusalem (death, resurrection, ascension) is salvific—like the Exodus. Exodus is both salvation and judgement like “the time of your visitation” (Luke 19:41-44).

Meeting and escort in both the Parable of the Father with Two Sons and the Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan are given prominence—although, this is achieved in entirely different ways. In the former, the father’s running out to meet the son and the escort to the house forcefully pre-empts (and therefore ‘upstages’) the rehearsed speech that the reader has already heard in the soliloquised rehearsal. In the Compassionate Samaritan the prominence of the meeting and escort is achieved by means of a more traditional ‘folkloric triad’ (ignores, ignores, attends). The Samaritan’s actions are highlighted by their contrast to the apathy and non-action (“passing by on the other side”) of the previous
two travellers (the priest and the Levite). In sharp contrast to those who passed by on the other side, the Samaritan “went to him”. Both stories also emphasise the actions of the compassionate person by grouping them into a prolonged ‘flurry’ of action, which in biblical narrative almost always signifies ‘climax’.

5.4 The Escort of Others to Jesus and of Jesus to Others

5.4.1 The Escort of Others to Jesus

Of the three major sections of this chapter, this section is undoubtedly a less significant one, both in terms of the length of the narratives involved and the prominence given them in Luke’s Gospel. This section describes those instances in which characters accompany others to meet Jesus, usually in the context of ‘bringing’ them to Jesus for healing. The five narratives are: the healing of all in Capernaum in the context of the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law (Luke 4:40-41); the paralytic lowered through the roof (5:18-19); the father who brings his demon-possessed son (9:41b); the people who bring children to Jesus (18:15); and a blind beggar near Jericho who is brought to Jesus (18:40).

Unlike many of the narratives of the other two divisions, these narratives are not distinctively Lukan—they all have synoptic parallels. Luke, here, is perhaps more constrained by the tradition than in Book of Acts or in distinctly Lukan passages from the Third Gospel, such as the Emmaus episode, The Compassionate Samaritan and The Father with Two Sons. Nevertheless, one might still detect Luke’s convictions regarding the importance of welcome and escort, through subtle ways in which escort and welcome are given prominence in these five narratives. In this section, I will make some recourse to redaction critical ways of detecting the emphasis (through comparisons with Matthew’s and Mark’s Gospels). In this way I hope to achieve two things. First, I hope to demonstrate Luke’s persistent interest in ‘accompanying’ as a theme. Luke’s prominent featuring of escort speaks of the importance that Luke attributes to ‘accompanying’. Characters who place a high value on the salvation (or healing) of others, often demonstrate their care and
concern by escorting others to Jesus (or by escorting Jesus to others). Second, I hope to establish some preparation for the next chapter in which we will see, in the Book of Acts, the continuation of the narration of instances of characters escorting other characters in their journeys of salvific encounter with Jesus.

5.4.1.1 The Healing of All in Capernaum following the Healing of Peter’s Mother-in-Law (Luke 4:40-41)

Luke 4:40 is situated in the events of a single narrative day (a Sabbath) that stretches from verse 31 to 41. “And at the setting of the sun” provides both a temporal change but also temporal connective (or link) with the preceding event—the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law. The ‘shaping’ of this short narrative—the healing of one expanding to the healing of all—is repeated in a completely original setting by Luke when, in Acts, he recounts the healing of Publius’ father-in-law and then “the rest” of those on the island who had diseases (Acts 28:7-9). In both these healing accounts (Acts 28:7-9, Luke 4:40-41) one sees Luke’s concern for the universality of access to salvation, which leads to the frequent use of the word “all” in the context of salvation—as here (in Luke 4:40), where Luke gives prominence to the “all” (ἅπαντες) in “all those who had any who were sick with various kinds of diseases brought (ἤγαγον) them to him”. Luke uses the word ἄγω (‘bring’, ‘lead’) whereas Matthew and Mark use προσφέρω (Matt 8:16) and φέρω (Mark 1:32), respectively, which although approximately synonymous, have more the sense of ‘bear’ or ‘carry’. I suggest that Luke’s statistical preference for the word ἄγω is indicative of the higher profile of accompanying in Luke’s writing. ἄγω is the word that Luke uses in Acts for the extravagant gesture of escort that the Beroeans provide to Paul when they escort his long journey from Beroea to Athens (Acts 17:15)—a distance of about 170 miles.

5.4.1.2 The Paralytic Lowered through the Roof (Luke 5:17-26)

A similar Lukan emphasis on accompanying can be seen in the Lukan version of the paralytic lowered through the roof. The Lukan account is pleonastic and expands upon the Markan account in ways that allow the repeated use of reference to accompanying. Each synoptic gospel makes an initial reference to those who were bringing the man who
was paralysed—Luke 5:18a (φέροντες); Matt 9:2 (προσέφερον); Mark 2:3 (φέροντες). But Luke alone makes two further references to their accompanying of the man to Jesus, in quick succession—“and they sought to bring him in (εἰσενεγκεῖν from εἰσφέρω) and lay him before him, but not finding a way to bring him in (εἰσενέγκωσιν also from εἰσφέρω), because of the crowd…”.22 This represents an amplification of Mark’s use of προσενέγκαι from προσφέρω (they were not able to bring him to him—Mark 2:4).

5.4.1.3 The Father with the Demon-Possessed Son (Luke 9:37-43a)

Again, Luke shows a preference for προσάγω (in “Bring your son here”—Luke 9:41b) over Mark and Matthew’s use of φέρω (Mark 9:19 and Matthew 17:17). Further, even though Luke matches Matthew’s laconic reduction of Mark’s considerably fuller narrative, Luke uses a unique grammatical expression that achieves a significant change in emphasis. This emphasis is first hinted at in the particular form of the imperative “bring”. In Mark and Matthew it is a third person, plural imperative, as if addressed to the recalcitrant disciples. In Luke, the third person singular imperative is addressed to the father, a fact that is still discernible, even in English, because of Luke’s further substitution of “your son” (Luke 9:41b) for “him” (Mark 9:19b, Matt 17:17b). Luke’s focus upon the father remains until the narrative’s conclusion, where, alone among the synoptics, Luke has Jesus restore (ἀπέδωκεν “he gave back”) the son to his father (Luke 9:42b).

5.4.1.4 People Bring Children to Jesus (Luke 18:15-17)

Luke’s small modification of Mark in this instance has a slight but significant effect on the narrative. Whereas Mark uses a single conjunction to introduce the narrative, Luke uses two conjunctions (δὲ and καὶ) resulting in the sense that they were bringing “even” or “also” infants to Jesus. This has the effect of implying that the bringing of the children to Jesus is situated within the broader context of people bringing others—in general, not just children—to Jesus. Luke also leaves Mark’s active imperfect (“they were bringing”) in

---

22 In the place of the Lukan “not finding a way to bring him in” Mark has “they were unable to bring him to him”, Matthew is laconic as is often the case with Matthean healing narratives.
place, unlike Matthew who has instead used a passive aorist (“children were brought”). Luke and Mark, thereby place more emphasis than Matthew upon the “they” who do the bringing.

5.4.1.5 A Blind Beggar near Jericho Brought to Jesus (Luke 18:35-43)

Again a synoptic comparison reveals Luke to have the most intense interest in the “bringing” of the blind man to Jesus. In Mark, Jesus upon hearing the blind man stops and says (with a second-person plural imperative, presumably to the disciples or the crowd), “Call him”. Matthew has two ‘blind-men’ narratives. In Matthew 9:28, the blind men come to Jesus, with no mention of invitation or escort. In Matthew 20:32, Jesus stops and calls the blind men himself. Only Luke writes that “Jesus stopped and commanded him to be brought (ἀχθῆναι, a passive infinitive form of ἄγω) to him”. Thus out of the four synoptic blind men/man narratives, Luke is the only one to mention the escort of the blindman. Furthermore the choice of a verb of force (ἐκέλευσεν, “he commanded”) to complement the infinitive demonstrates the importance with which Luke holds escort.

5.4.1.6 Conclusion

While none of the redaction-critical examinations of the five narratives would make a strong case on its own, taken together there is strength in the consistency with which Luke intensifies the element of escort in each of the narratives.

5.4.2 The Escort of Jesus to Others—Bringing Jesus to the Centurion’s Slave (Luke 7:1-10) and to Jairus’s Daughter (Luke 8:40-42, 49-67)

Whereas the last section (IIa) examines narratives in which someone provides escort of others—to bring them to Jesus, this closely related section examines the escort provided to Jesus in order to bring him to visit someone in need. In these scenarios, those who need to meet Jesus cannot come to him because they are too ill or incapacitated. In these scenarios Jesus is often fetched and brought to someone’s bedside.
The story of Jairus and His Daughter (Luke 8:40-42, 49-67) is an example of this category. Jairus escorts Jesus to his daughter’s bedside.\(^{23}\) Another example is the elaborate arrangements to escort Jesus to the bedside of a Centurion’s slave (Luke 7:1-10) a visit that is prematurely terminated for reasons unique to that particular narrative.

Luke’s way of telling the episode of the cure of the Centurion’s slave differs markedly from Matthew’s in ways that throw emphasis upon escort. Whereas, in Matthew, the Centurion directly approaches Jesus (Matt 8:5-6), in Luke’s account there is a lengthy and complex sending of two sets of emissaries (the ‘Jewish elders’ and the ‘friends’). The Centurion sends the emissaries to Jesus to invite him to come and heal (literally ‘save’) his slave. The Jewish elders explain that the Centurion is *worthy* to have Jesus do this for him. Jesus (as in Matthew 8:7) demonstrates his preparedness to go to the Centurion’s house and heal the slave (Luke 7:6a). The second group of emissaries (the ‘friends’) bear another message from the Centurion saying that he is *unworthy* to have Jesus come under his roof (words that the Centurion says directly to Jesus in Matthew’s much abbreviated account). Luke alone prefaces the words about unworthiness with a short imperative—“do not trouble yourself”. This inclusion by Luke—using a relatively rare word σκύλλω (Luke 7:6, 8:49)—has the effect of linking the Jairus and the Centurion stories, and creating an invitation by Luke to compare the two stories.\(^{24}\) In both narratives, Jesus shows his preparedness to go, under escort, to someone who has need of him but who cannot come to him. In both stories this journey appears to have an accompanying entourage (7:6, 9; 8:40, 42, 45, 51).

The use of the word ‘trouble’ (σκύλλω) also says something about the nature of the preparedness to go to the person who is incapacitated. To come out to visit the incapac-

\(^{23}\) Luke “shows” this escort by painting sub-scenes along the way which demonstrate Jairus’s presence with Jesus as they make their way to Jairus’s house: 8:41 ”Just then there came a man named Jairus...he fell at Jesus’ feet and begged him to come to his house”; 8:49 ”While [Jesus] was still speaking, someone came from the leader’s house to say, ‘Your daughter is dead...’ When Jesus heard this...” Note how Jesus ability to hear what has been said to Jairus implies that Jairus has been with Jesus along the whole journey, including the delay caused by the other ‘daughter’ (8:43-48).

\(^{24}\) Daniel Marguerat and Yvan Bourquin, *How to Read Bible Stories: An Introduction to Narrative Criticism* (London: SCM Press, 1999), pp. 127-130. Marguerat and Bourquin dub this implicit invitation by the writer to compare two narratives ‘syncrisis’.
The Escort of Jesus and His Emissaries upon Their Arrival

5.5 The Escort of Jesus and His Emissaries upon Their Arrival

5.5.1 Going Out to Meet Jesus?

5.5.1.1 Introduction


One way that the hospitality in such scenes is first demonstrated to be deficient is the lack of intentional welcome extended to Jesus: characters who host Jesus invariably fail to ‘come out to meet’ him—they fail to escort Jesus’ arrival.

This last point would have the deficiency of being an ‘argument from silence’ were it not for the fact that Luke demonstrates his familiarity with the customs of ‘coming out to meet’ and escorted arrival in many other part of Luke and Acts. The reader knows of Luke’s familiarity with these conventions through their inclusion in the Parable of the Fa-

25 The importance of this nexus in the cultural script—between the provision of invitation with escorts provided and its acceptance— as a demonstration of mutual respect, re-emerges as an important theme with disciples in Lydda (who knew Dorcas, Acts 9:38,39) and Cornelius in Acts (Acts 10:5-8, 22-23).
ther with Two Sons (15:20,28b), and in the hypothetical instances of hospitality described in Jesus’ Discourse on Hospitality (Luke 14:7-24). Some of the implications of Jesus’ Discourse on Hospitality are that ‘more distinguished’ guests are escorted to their seats by the host (Luke 14:8,9) and, further, that one extravagant host even provides an emissary to compel (14:23) and escort the arrival of (‘bring in’, εἰσάγαγε, 14:21) the ‘least distinguished’ guests (Luke 14:21,23). As we will see in the next chapter of this dissertation, Luke further demonstrates his awareness of these conventions of welcome through the many instances of ‘going out to meet’ and escorted arrival (and departures) in Acts (Acts 9:27,30; 10:25-27; 17:15; 20:4; 20:38b; 21:5-6, 16; 23:23-24, 31-33; 28:15). Therefore it is appropriate to note, as significant omissions on part of the hosts, those instances when ‘going out to meet’ and escorted arrival are not extended to Jesus (particularly in longer narratives like ‘In the House of Simon the Pharisee’).

5.5.1.2 In the House of Simon the Pharisee (Luke 7:36-50)

The episode ‘In the House of Simon the Pharisee’ (Luke 7:36-50) illustrates these omissions (to ‘go out to meet’ and escort the arrival of the guest) in the context of a broader failure to welcome and extend appropriate hospitality. At the beginning of the scene, the narrative seems to hold some potential to develop as a positive hospitality scene. But as the scene continues, elements of inhospitality emerge. This narrative is complex and ambiguous in terms of the hospitality extended by Simon to Jesus. Simon extends an invitation to Jesus (7:36), but, beyond that, he appears to do nothing to give evidence of his welcome toward Jesus. The narrator’s comment that Jesus “went into the Pharisee’s house and took his place at the table”, is a great contrast to other places in Luke and Acts where the host comes out to greet the guests or provides escort to the house (Luke 7:6, 8:49,51; Acts 10:25-27, 28:2; 28:15) and escorts their arrival and in some cases shows honoured guests their place at table (Luke 14:9). Failures, on the part of Simon, to “go out and meet” Jesus, nor to show Jesus his place at table, are just the start of Simon’s many shortcomings, three of which Jesus mentions explicitly in his speech which contrasts the woman’s behaviour
with Simon’s (7:44-46). The hospitality offered by Simon to Jesus is demonstrated to be grossly inadequate by the superior hospitality of an uninvited woman.

5.5.1.3 In the House of Martha (Luke 10:38-42)

The hospitality in the house of Martha is not without some degree of ambiguity. As Luke Timothy Johnson suggests, “[Martha’s] self-preoccupation and resentment led her to break the rules of hospitality far more radically than did her sister, for she asked a stranger to intervene in a family rivalry.” Similar to the scene in the House of Simon the Pharisee, which is to a greater degree characterised by ambivalence, this scene lacks a mimetic description of any kind of ‘going out to meet’ or escorted arrival. Admittedly, in this shorter scene (of only 90 words, and therefore a quarter of the size of narratives like ‘The Parable of the Man with Two Sons’ or ‘On The Way to Emmaus’) this ‘argument from silence’ is somewhat muted. Nevertheless Martha’s hospitality is ambiguous at best, and perhaps even outright neglectful (like Simon’s). Martha’s words seeking to conscript Jesus’ intervention in a family matter breach the boundaries of hospitality. In the context of a scene of ‘compromised’ hospitality, the omission of the appropriate customs of reception (‘going out to meet’ and escorted arrival) adds in some small degree to the implied reader’s sense of ambiguous hospitality in this scene.

5.5.1.4 Jesus and Zacchaeus (Luke 19:11-19)

Another scene of ‘potential hospitality’ is the reception of Jesus by Zacchaeus. Again this scene has some very positive hospitality motifs, but by no means does it contain a full

---

28 The two types of behaviour shown by Martha and Mary are contrasted by the degree of focus or attention on the guest, Jesus. The reason that Jesus criticised Martha is not because she is ‘action-oriented’ but rather because she is “distracted by many things”. Mary, on the other hand, is said to have “chosen the better part”, presumably related to the ‘only one thing’ that is needed—Joel B. Green, The Gospel of Luke, The New International Commentary on the NT series (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), p. 435. As Joel Green concludes in his comments on this episode, “Mary and Martha (and, with them, all) must understand and act on the priority of attending to the guest before them, extending to Jesus and his emissaries the sort of welcome in which the authentic hearing of discipleship is integral.”
complement of standard hospitality motifs. As I have earlier demonstrated, 'running' is frequently a standard motif of positive hospitality (e.g. Genesis 18:2; 24:29; Luke 15:20). But Zacchaeus's running is not quite 'running out to meet' so much as 'running to see'. So although Zacchaeus's haste and enthusiasm to see Jesus are clear, Jesus in this scene has to 'invite himself' to Zacchaeus's house. Although we read of Zacchaeus's desire to see Jesus, it is Jesus who eventually 'sees' Zacchaeus and it is Jesus who takes all the initiative that leads to the point where Zacchaeus “received” Jesus “joyfully” (19:6). Like several important Lukan narratives, the Zacchaeus narrative lacks resolution. The reader is not told of the departure of Jesus and Zacchaeus to Zacchaeus's house—and so does not even receive evidence (any mimetic narrative) that the spoken-of “stay” at Zacchaeus's house took place. We can imagine that there was ‘escort’ to Zacchaeus's house but Luke does not describe it. Instead Luke's forges a strong link between the Zacchaeus incident (19:1-10) and the Parable of the Throne Claimant (19:11-27, link verse 11), and Jesus' Entry into Jerusalem (19:28-48) using temporal connectives (“As they were listening to this…”, 19:11; “After he had said this…”, 19:28).

The reader is not afforded the opportunity of a rest or break, through the enjoyment of a scene 'At the House of Zacchaeus', and so Zacchaeus's escort of Jesus to his house remains 'beyond' the reach of this narrative segment, Luke 19:1-10. Instead the narrative tempo is accelerated.\textsuperscript{29} The temporal connectives (the participles in 19:11 and 19:28) impel the readers’ attention from the hospitality of Zacchaeus to the final place where the reader anticipates reception and welcome—upon Jesus’ arrival in his last journey to Jerusalem.

5.5.1.5 The Parable of the Nobleman Who Went to Get a Royal Power (Luke 19:11-27)

The positioning of this parable immediately before Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem suggests that Luke expects the reader to make some link between the Parable and the Entry narrative. Two alternative interpretations of this parable have been proposed, and both offer a

contribution to understanding how at the Entry, Jesus is ‘met’ by people and escorted (or not escorted) into Jerusalem.

The conventional interpretation holds that the ‘nobleman’ is similar to Jesus at this point in the narrative. Under this interpretation Jesus, like the nobleman who returned having gained royal power, makes a claim to be a king (Luke 23:2 “We found this man perverting our nation, forbidding us to pay taxes to the emperor, and saying that he himself is the Messiah, a king.”). Under this conventional interpretation, the citizens of the nobleman’s country who do not want him to rule over them (19:14), including “the other” slave (the third to speak to the nobleman with royal power—Luke 19:20-21) align with the Pharisees, the chief priest, scribes and the leaders who do not accept Jesus as the Messiah but wish to see Jesus killed.

Several commentators are beginning to challenge this conventional interpretation with an alternative which allows the nobleman who “went to a distant country to get royal power for himself” to be none other than a ‘type’ of the Roman imperial vassal kings who were common in the first century, particularly among the Herodian dynasty.\(^{30}\) Under this interpretation the parable is a more realistic depiction of ‘the way things are’. The elite, like Archelaus, the tetrarch, seek greater power for themselves by petitioning the Roman Emperor for greater title and more power. The elite use money lending (usury)—which involved money lenders and debtor’s prisons—in order to achieve great rates of monetary increase at rates impossible with mere agricultural or manufacture capabilities of the day (the 1000% or 500% of Luke 19:16 and 18). Under this less ‘allegorical’ interpretation, the tyrant is just that. And it was just such powerful figures who in the Roman world received great honours such as the imperial adventus ceremony. Such adventus ceremonies were provided after a victory or triumph (be it military or political) whether the populace wanted to ‘greet’ the ruler or not. It was usually in the populace’s interest to honour the powerful. Under this interpretation, the Lukan parable contains a subtle anti-imperial

\(^{30}\) For an excellent example of this newer reading, see Richard B Vinson, Luke, Smyth & Helwys Bible Commentary series (Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2008), pp. 594-600.
'slight', in that the tyrant king receives no adventus. The comic irony reaches its height when the ruler is depicted as having to summon his most trusted slaves (19:16).

Under the conventional interpretation there remains a way to make a connection between the parable and the Entry (the nobleman was opposed by those who did not want him to be king over them—Jesus is opposed by those who do not want him to be king over them). But the link between the parable and the Entry narrative is perhaps even more compelling under the newer interpretation.

The newer interpretation would suggest that usually, in this world, great military rulers and tyrants receive adventus honours. Ordinary citizens who oppose the powerful elite will find themselves punished or slaughtered. In this Lukan parable, the omission from the narrative of any greeting for the newly arrived king suggests that the imperial persons-of-great-importance are not worthy of such honour. In the following narrative (Jesus’ Entry of Jerusalem) Jesus receives no adventus. There may be strong allusion to the adventus ceremony—which would explain the popularity of the extra-canonical sub-heading “Jesus’ Triumphant Entry” among contemporary Bible publishers. But as we will see from the close reading in the next section, the allusion to the adventus is ironic. No one actually comes out of Jerusalem to meet and escort the arrival of Jesus. Characters who are present in the Entry scene have been present with Jesus for much of the so-called Travel Section (9:51–19:40).

The newer interpretation of the parable makes for one final compelling link to its context, and that is the suggestion of the alignment of “the other” (the third) slave with the identity of Jesus. Like the third slave, Jesus confronts the imperial realities including the religious leaders who collude with the empire to maintain a hold on wealth and power. Like the third slave, Jesus names the imperial injustice: that it is a harsh system that creates wealth for the elite who do not “sow” and yet “reap” the wealth of others’ toil (Luke 19:46-48; 20:21-26; 20:46-47; 21:5).
5.5.1.6 Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem (Luke 19:28-48)

The strength of anticipation of a positive reception upon Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem, complete with escorted arrival, is in proportion to the great narrative length given to creating anticipation of this arrival (Jesus journey to Jerusalem is the context of the entire section, Luke 9:51–19:41, with reminders at 13:22, 17:11 and 18:31). At 19:28, on the threshold of Jerusalem, Luke commences an ‘Entry’ narrative which is tinged with irony and ambiguity (as in the other synoptic Gospel accounts).

Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem is a complex and ambiguous reception scene. Although the scene draws upon imperial imagery surrounding adventus or ‘triumphal entry’ there are many elements of dissimilarity to adventus, and indeed, elements of outright hostility. Brent Kinman calls this scene “a parousia gone awry”\(^\text{31}\) and writes, “When seen in the light of [celebratory welcomes in the ancient world] it is clear that Jerusalem’s response to Jesus should be characterized as an appalling insult, which, in turn, explains his remarks about the coming destruction of the city.”\(^\text{32}\)

The ‘sending’ of the two disciples ahead of his arrival (Luke 19:29) is for the purpose of fetching the colt, but it also evokes the memory of sending out as ‘forerunners’ pairs of disciples “to every town and place where he himself intended to go” (Luke 10:1). The sending of ‘forerunners’ is a common motif in hospitality scenes: the forerunners afford ‘hosts’ the opportunity to be ready for reception, to allow preparations to be made and to allow for ‘coming out to meet’ and escorted arrival. In the process of fetching the colt, the disciples are also instructed to announce the coming of ‘the Lord’ (19:31,34). The ‘Sending of the Messengers’ (Luke 19:29-35) also serves to increase readers’ anticipation of the reception of Jesus.

There is ambivalence in Luke’s narration of Jesus’ entry of the city. Do only the disciples accompany Jesus? Or does a crowd escort his arrival as in an imperial adventus?


A crowd is mentioned (in 19:39), but are they there to escort Jesus or are they part of a regular crowd of people streaming into Jerusalem for Passover?

Despite superficial resemblance to an imperial adventus (or ‘triumphant entry’) it seems likely that in the Lukan narrative, no-one comes out (of Jerusalem) to meet Jesus. Of all the characters present during the Entry, none are described as having come out from the city. The “multitude of disciples” have accompanied Jesus from Galilee according to Luke 23:5,49,55. The heckling Pharisees also appear to have been Jesus’ fairly constant companions on the journey from Galilee to Jerusalem (11:53, 15:2; 16:14). The crowd are most likely meant to be understood as those who are making their way to the city in time for the Passover (There is not much passage of narrative time between the Entry and the Passover—compare Luke 19:47-48 and 22:1-2). And most significantly, those who become Jesus’ fiercest opponents in the city (the chief priests, the scribes and the elders—19:47; 20:1; 22:2,52; 23:10) are not present in the ‘Entry’ scene. They most certainly did not come out to meet Jesus. (They will come out of the city to escort a different arrival of Jesus into the city (22:52), but this belated action is written by Luke as a hostile parody of conventional ‘coming out to meet’ and escorted arrival.)

The disciple’s acclamation and the gesture with the cloaks (Luke 19:35-36—compare with the ‘royal acclamation’ of Jehu with cloaks in 2 Kings 9:13) communicate a sense of royal welcome. The royal imagery does not elude the Pharisees who insist that the joyful acclamation by Jesus’ disciples cease. The Pharisees’ criticism of the disciple’s acclamation contributes to the ‘ambivalence’ of the welcome in the Entry narrative. 33 The negativity is heightened by the last three elements of the Entry narrative: the critical comments of the Pharisees (“Teacher, order your disciples to stop”—19:39); Jesus’ comments that accompany his weeping over the city (19:41-44); and the driving of the sellers out of the temple (19:45-46). Joseph Fitzmyer makes the point that the travel account that stretches from 9:51 to 19:46 begins and ends in the rejection of Jesus—“As at the beginning of the

---

travel account, the Samaritans rejected his entry into their villages (9:52-53), so now the Pharisees reject his entry into Jerusalem.\(^\text{34}\)

The lament that accompanies the weeping over the city has much to say about the missed opportunity for a hospitable welcome: “Would that even today you recognised the things that make for peace! But now they are hid from your eyes” (19:42). Just as seeing and recognition are frequently hospitality motifs, so not knowing and unrecognition are anti-hospitality motifs. The lament finishes with the words “because you did not know the time of your visitation” (19:44). Just as ultimate recognition will be a significant motif in the Emmaus narrative (and in the narratives of the scene-type that ‘Emmaus’ establishes), so lack of recognition communicates the inhospitable response of Jerusalem to Jesus at this point of the narrative. This lack of recognition, and lack of hospitality is further evidenced in the narrative by the city’s failure to receive Jesus—in that its people did not ‘come out to meet’ and escort the arrival of Jesus. Worse, some of the Pharisees criticised those who had escorted Jesus’ entry of the city, and who had acclaimed him, upon his arrival as the Coming One and the king.

Luke brings the Entry narrative to a conclusion at Luke 19:47-48. The conclusion is partly achieved by the ‘defocalising’ effect of two types of ‘expansion’: i) temporal expansion, achieved by the use of an imperfect participle (“And he was teaching daily in the temple”) and several other imperfect verbs used to create the impression of iterative action; and ii) participant expansion (The itinerant hecklers of the travel account, the Pharisees, are replaced in Jerusalem by a consortium of more severe opponents, “chief priests, the scribes, and the leaders of the people”; similarly Jesus has a group of people who give him their rapt attention—“all the people” of v. 48). The ambiguity of the reception of Jesus by the city is maintained right to the end of the conclusion. But the balance is tipped toward ‘hostility’ in the last words of the conclusion—“The chief priests and the scribes and the leaders of the people kept seeking for a way to destroy him; but they were not finding anything they could do, for all the people were hanging upon his words.”

---

5.5.1.7  Going Out to Meet Jesus As If He Were A Bandit (Luke 22:47-54a)

Because of the protection afforded by the crowd's 'rapt attention' toward Jesus (19:48; 22:2,6), the worst of the hostility is deferred in the next segment of the narrative (20:1–22:46), only to be resumed at the arrest, trial and crucifixion of Jesus (22:47–23:49). When readers reach Luke's account of the arrest, trial and crucifixion of Jesus they notice that Luke employs many parodic hospitality motifs to depict the gross inhospitality of Jerusalem to Jesus. First among these motifs is a cluster of parodies upon the theme of welcome—including a parody of 'going out to meet' and a parody of escorted arrival (Luke 22:47-54).

The first parodic motif of hospitality in the scene depicting Jesus’ arrest is Judas’s kiss. This motif of greeting and reconciliation is distorted to become a sinister motif of betrayal. The entire arrest scene constitutes a parody of the ‘coming out to meet’. The chief priests, the officers of the temple police and the elders ‘have come out’ (ἐξήλθατε), as Jesus’ rhetorical question to them makes clear, but it is a meeting with swords and clubs more appropriate for meeting a bandit (22:52). Escorted arrival is then parodied with ‘rough escort’: “Seizing him, they brought him (ἤγαγον) and led him in (εἰσήγαγον), into the house of the High Priest” (22:54a). This action of ‘bringing’ or ‘leading’ is given prominence, but it remains a parody of the honouring escort associated with earlier uses of the verb in the Gospel (e.g. 4:40, 10:34, 18:40). The ‘rough escort’ of Jesus continues later in the movement of Jesus to Pilate (ἡγαγον, 23:1), to Herod (23:7 and 11 where ἀναπέμπω is used), to Pilate again (where προσφέρω is used in Pilate’s speech at 23:13), and to the location of the crucifixion (23:26 where ἀπάγω is used). As we will see in the next chapter, ἄγω is also used to depict ‘rough escort’ for the apostles in Jerusalem in the early part of Acts (Acts 5:21,26,27; 6:12; 9:21).

---

35 One earlier depiction of ‘rough escort’ occurs in the scene ‘At the Nazareth Synagogue’ (Luke 4:16-30, particularly v. 29).
5.5.1.8 Further Parodies of Hospitality in the Lukan Passion Narrative (Luke 22:63–23:49)

Parodied elements of hospitality continue throughout Luke's Passion Narrative. As in the climactic chapters of the Odyssey, motifs conventionally understood as hospitality motifs are parodied to convey extreme inhospitality and rejection. Some of these parodied elements of hospitality relate to hospitality in general (and therefore their examination is outside the scope of this dissertation); but several elements (like the ‘coming out to meet’ by the chief priests and company) have a link to escorted arrival.

One instance of the mocking of Jesus in the Passion Narrative (by Herod and his soldiers—Luke 23:11) includes a parody of ‘investing’ in fine clothing, which we know from the Parable of the Father with Two Sons (and other biblical narratives) constitutes a motif depicting great honour (Luke 15:22; Esther 6:8,10-11; Genesis 41:42). The reader of Luke also will recall, again from Luke 15:22, that the father ‘invested’ the younger son ‘while he was yet far off’—the robes, ring and sandal were brought out so that the ‘investing’ could take places before the escorted arrival. The ‘investiture’ of Jesus by Herod’s soldiers evokes the reader’s memory of the only other ‘investiture’ in the Gospel—an honouring ‘investiture’ which included ‘coming out to meet’ and escorted arrival. The mocking investiture in Luke does not include the conspicuous element of mock ‘royal-homage’ that the equivalent Markan passage carries (Mark 15:16-20). Nevertheless there is an allusion to ‘royal-homage’ in the Lukan passage because of the setting (in the company of Herod) and because the term for the garment (ἐσθῆτα) in the phrase (literally) ‘bright shining garment’ (ἐσθῆτα λαμπρὰν) is used by Luke to describe Herod’s own ‘royal robes’ (ἐσθῆτα βασιλικὴν) in Acts 12:21.

36 For example: the stool traditionally used for guests is hurled by one of Penelope’s suitors at Odysseus’s head (Od. 17.462-5); the food that ought to be made freely available to the guest becomes the prize in the fight between two beggars (one of them Odysseus in disguise—Od. 18.44). The ‘hospitality’ motifs are carried further into the scene in which Odysseus slays the suitors (Od. 22.8-11, 20, 85-88). Homer makes clear to his reader that the suitors die surrounded by all the ‘icons’ of hospitality—the hospitality that the suitors abused (by freeloading on Penelope) and which they refused to extend to the stranger/guest—Odysseus disguised as a beggar.
The mocking of Jesus at the cross (23:36) further parodies ‘royal homage’. The offering of sour wine to Jesus is narrated in the midst of a three-fold repetition of the derisive challenge, that if Jesus is the king, he ought to save himself (spoken by the leaders, the soldiers and one of the criminals). This offer of sour wine parodies the hospitable offering of wine generally. Because of what the Lukan Jesus has said earlier in the context of sharing wine in the “kingdom” (Luke 22:17-18, 30), the motif also makes allusion to the royal (kingdom) banquet, and therefore contributes further to the suite of parodies of royal welcome. The possible parody of royal banquet and the final derisive taunt by the criminal brings the cluster of ‘royal’ parodic elements to its conclusion.

The parodies of a ‘royal welcome’ work as a reminder of what sort of reception the city ought to have extended to Jesus when he first entered. The disciples’ gestures with the cloaks (throwing them on the colt and on the road, Luke 19:35,36) and the royal acclamation (19:38) both suggest to the reader that Jesus is worthy of royal accolade. This accolade is first threatened by the rebuke of the Pharisees. Eventually other opponents silence the royal acclamation, and parodies of ‘royal welcome’ (mock adventus, mock homage, mock investiture, and mock royal banquet) dominate the ending of the Passion account. In the end, the appropriate ‘coming out to meet’ and escorted arrival of Jesus is subverted and completely ridiculed.

5.5.1.9 A Return to Honouring Responses after the Death of Jesus: Proleptic Glimpses of the Second Chance to Welcome Jesus (Luke 23:50–24:12)

The death of Jesus seems to mark a turning point in the narrative—a return to honouring responses toward Jesus. Luke describes three sets of actions in succession: Joseph’s care for Jesus’ body; the women’s preparation of spices and ointments; and Peter’s running to the tomb.

From this point in Luke’s Gospel onward (from 24:13 to the end), Jesus’ escort of the disciples—the first of the three broad categories of escort presented in this chapter—dominates the ending of Luke’s Gospel (in the narratives ‘On the Road to Emmaus’ and ‘On the Way to the Place of the Ascension’). And the first and the third categories converge.
The emphasis upon the question “will others appropriately welcome and escort the arrival of Jesus” diminishes. Jesus temporarily assumes more the role of ‘host’ that ‘guest’ (the reader hears this ambivalence in the ‘Emmaus’ narrative, e.g. Luke 24:29-30)—rather than the one for whom the reader anticipates escorted arrival. At the end of the Gospel, Jesus becomes the one who escorts others. And then, in Acts, the ‘reception of the emissaries’ replaces the ‘reception of Jesus’ as the central concern—although as the concept I call the ‘Luke 10:16 Reception Principle’ makes clear, to welcome the emissaries is synonymous with their welcoming of Jesus.

5.6 Conclusion

Luke’s Gospel is a narrative in which the ‘rejection’ of Jesus becomes the dominant motif, and the prospect of hospitality (being extended toward Jesus, and toward his emissaries) diminishes. We see this trajectory reflected in the three ‘preparations for mission’ speeches that Jesus gives—first to the ‘Twelve’ (Luke 9:3-5), then to the ‘Seventy’ (Luke 10: 4-12) and again to the apostles just before the departure to the Mount of Olives (Luke 22:35-38).

In the first ‘preparation speech’ the presumption is that the ‘Twelve’ will experience a positive and hospitable response—the contingency plan for what to do in the face of rejection is relatively brief (Luke 9:5, one verse). In the second ‘preparation speech’—at the sending out of the ‘Seventy’—the contingency plan for ‘what to do’ in the face of rejection is more pleonastic and elaborate and morphs into a lengthy pronouncement against the people of the places that do not show hospitality and reception (Luke 10:10-16).

10But whenever you enter a town and they do not welcome you, go out into its streets and say, 11‘Even the dust of your town that clings to our feet, we wipe off in protest against you. Yet know this: the kingdom of God has come near’. 12I tell you, on that day it will be more tolerable for Sodom than for that town.

13“Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the deeds of power done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. 14But at the judgment it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for you. 15And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades.

16“Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me.”

10But whenever you enter a town and they do not welcome you, go out into its streets and say, 11‘Even the dust of your town that clings to our feet, we wipe off in protest against you. Yet know this: the kingdom of God has come near’. 12I tell you, on that day it will be more tolerable for Sodom than for that town.

13“Woe to you, Chorazin! Woe to you, Bethsaida! For if the deeds of power done in you had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago, sitting in sackcloth and ashes. 14But at the judgment it will be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon than for you. 15And you, Capernaum, will you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades.

16“Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me.”
Luke presents the reception or rejection of the emissaries of Jesus as a significant issue. In this second ‘preparation speech’ the emphasis begins to shift from hospitality to hostility. The Lukan Jesus’ reference to Sodom is consistent with what immediately precedes it, because in the first century, Sodom’s sin was understood primarily in terms of inhospitality and misoxeny—the hatred (or fear) of strangers (see Josephus's *Antiquities* 1.11.1.194-195; Wisdom of Solomon 19:13-14, Ezekiel 16:48-49).

In the third ‘preparation speech’, Jesus appears to presume that ‘rejection’ and hostility are more likely to be the responses of the potential hosts ('hearers'), and therefore much of the earlier advice is retracted (22:35-38).

He said to them, “When I sent you out without a purse, bag, or sandals, did you lack anything?” They said, “No, not a thing.” He said to them, “But now, the one who has a purse must take it, and likewise a bag. And the one who has no sword must sell his cloak and buy one. For I tell you, this scripture must be fulfilled in me, ‘And he was counted among the lawless’; and indeed what is written about me is being fulfilled.” They said, “Lord, look, here are two swords.” He replied, “It is enough.”

As suggested by the trajectory of these three ‘preparation speeches’, Luke's Gospel ends with no one hosting Jesus in an exemplary manner. Despite the knowledge that no one hosts Jesus in an exemplary manner in the Third Gospel, the consolation is that everyone gets a second chance in the events described in the Book of Acts. The gestures immediately following the death of Jesus (Joseph’s wrapping of Jesus’ body in the linen cloth, the women’s preparedness to anoint the body of Jesus, and Peter’s running to the tomb) serve as proleptic glimpses of seizing this ‘second chance’. This motif of ‘second chances’ is then expanded upon in the Book of Acts. In Acts, however, it is not primarily the reception of Jesus that is narrated, but the reception of Jesus’ emissaries (including ‘going out to meet’ them and provision of escorted arrival and departure).  

tality extended to Jesus’ emissaries, throughout the rest of Acts, is equated to hospitality extended towards Jesus himself.


Joel B. Green notes the proleptic potential of the sending out of the ‘Seventy/Seventy-Two’, when he writes,

Nevertheless, in other ways, Luke uses this scene (the sending of the 72) to prepare for and anticipate a mission that is in the process of expanding beyond the land of the Jews. This is suggested by the number of important parallels between the sending of the seventy-two and the mission “to the ends of the earth” as it is portrayed in Acts—for example, the thread that runs from the mission of John to the mission of the seventy-two to the mission of Jesus’ followers in Acts, as well as the parallels between the forms of ministry (“in the name of Jesus”) and anticipated reception of the seventy-two and their counterparts in Acts.39

The kingdom is no less present for those who refuse Jesus’ agents (v. 10), but for them the message of divine visitation is transmuted into one of judgment. Inhospitality, after all, could be a form of negative sanction in the context of disputes over appropriate faith and behavior; [50 cf. 3 John 9-10]; refusal to accept the envoys designated by Jesus was a demonstration of the spurning of the good news of the kingdom propagated in Jesus’ ministry.40

---

38 There is remarkably little about the reception of the ‘Twelve’ after their sending out, particularly in the light of Luke 9:4-5. Luke 9:6 and 9:10 imply some degree of positive reception, allowing the ‘Twelve’ to fulfill part of their mission. However, there are many clues in the Lukian narrative that all may not have gone as well as the ‘Twelve’ would like to report. The ‘Twelve’ seem to be predisposed to several deficiencies which emerge in the narrative in relatively quick succession, shortly after their return from their mission and before the sending out of another ‘Seventy’: aversion to more active dimensions of ministry, e.g. healing and feeding (9:12, 9:40); inability to engage with the death of Christ (9:40); preoccupation with importance and hierarchy (9:46); refusal to collaborate with co-workers who are ‘outsiders’ (9:49); harsh judgement when it comes to extending ‘second chances’ to those who at first resist the good news or who reject Jesus (9:54-55).


Luke depicts a range of responses to Jesus in the Third Gospel. Even among those who received Jesus, Luke does not recount a reception that one would describe as ‘exemplary’ (Acts 10:1-48). In the one instance of a character who is praised for her hospitable responses (the woman in Luke 7:36-50) the setting is a visit in which the legitimate host (Simon) is grossly negligent in many aspects of hospitality (including that he did not ‘go out to meet’ or escort Jesus to his place at table). The hospitality in the house of Martha, although positive, is still not exemplary. Zacchaeus is the only character in the Gospel described as “joyful to welcome” Jesus and yet, in the scene with Zacchaeus, Jesus has to extend an invitation to himself, and Luke denies readers a mimetic narration of the actual visit, but rather hastens the reader onto the hostility and rejection that comes to dominate the narration of Jesus’ entry into Jerusalem and the Passion Narratives. But, as we will see in the next chapter, in Acts, when Jesus’ emissaries went out among the Gentiles, some of the positive responses by ‘good hosts’ were characterised by excellence and extravagance (Acts 10:7-48; 16:15; 18:27; 28:2; 28:15).

The implied reader’s understanding of the cultural conventions or cultural script equips them with a set of expectations as to how a ‘good host’ might have responded to Jesus, and among these expectations was ‘coming out to meet’ and escorted arrival. By contrast the ‘hospitality’ stories in Luke’s Gospel, with rare exception, range from outright rejection (9:53) and hostility (4:28-29) at the worst, and positive, but still with some transgression of the conventions (10:40), at the best. The reader of Luke’s Gospel is often ‘cued’ to suspect that something is amiss with the hospitality when hosts do not ‘come out to meet’ and do not escort the arrival of Jesus.

41 “[Martha’s] self-preoccupation and resentment led her to break the rules of hospitality far more radically than did her sister, for she asked a stranger to intervene in a family rivalry.” Johnson, The Gospel of Luke, pp. 175-176.

42 The ‘rare exceptions’—examples of exemplary hospitality—are the actions of the woman in Simon’s house (7:44-46) and the preparedness of Zacchaeus who is “joyful to welcome” Jesus (but who in narrative terms is not actually shown receiving Jesus).
CHAPTER 6

Meeting and Escorting in the Book of Acts

6.1 Introduction

‘Reception’ of the good news concerning Jesus Christ forms one of the major themes in the Acts of the Apostles. Jesus’ final command in Acts 1:8 functions as a ‘signpost’ announcing the direction in which the proclamation of the good news will proceed.¹

But you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you will be my witnesses in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth.

(Acts 1:8)

The same centrifugal direction is indicated at the end of the Third Gospel, where Jesus says, “…and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem” (Luke 24:47). In Acts, the disciples take the message of the good news to others, starting in Jerusalem and spreading outwards to the ends of the earth. Principally, Acts narrates the reception (or ‘non-reception’) of that message.²

¹ I am using ‘reception’ in the general sense that can embrace both positive reception and rejection. The abiding issue throughout Luke’s Gospel is whether Jesus will be accepted or rejected—and by which parties in either case. By the conclusion of the Gospel of Luke, as we saw in the last chapter, the ‘rejection’ of Jesus becomes the dominant motif—rejection through which the purpose of God, rather than being thwarted, actually goes forward. The motif is foreshadowed by Simeon in his second oracle (Luke 2:34-35) and is made explicit in the paradigmatic episode at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30).

In the Third Gospel, various characters’ reception of Jesus can be gauged by how they react directly to Jesus himself. But in the commissioning of ‘the Seventy’, Luke lays the foundation for a principle (the ‘Luke 10:16 Reception Principle’) that will apply almost exclusively within Acts.

Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me. (Luke 10:16)

This verse creates a link between ‘listening’ and ‘accepting’. So in Acts, ‘listen’ can almost be treated as synonymous with ‘accept’ or ‘receive’. In Acts, because Jesus’ departure takes place very early in the work (1:9), characters’ reception of the good news of Jesus (and their reception of Jesus himself) is reflected by their reception of Jesus’ emissaries, such as Peter, Philip and Paul. And as we proceed through Acts, it is vital to observe who receives the emissaries and how; and in order to do this well the reader has to possess the same cultural script assumed of the implied reader in regards to hospitality and escort.

The emissaries’ witness to the good news of Jesus causes division. Some hearers respond very positively and become believers; others reject the good news even to the point of becoming violent persecutors of the emissaries. The good news is received enthusiastically by a great diversity of people: Hebrew-/Aramaic-speaking Jews (including priests and Pharisees), Hellenistic Jews (including pilgrims to Jerusalem and other Diaspora Jews living throughout the eastern half of the Roman empire), “God-fearers” (a Lukan term for Gentiles who had great respect for Jewish faith, were often associated with synagogues, but who were not circumcised and did not adhere completely to the Torah), Greek-speaking Gentiles (“Hellenists”), and finally Gentiles beyond the bounds where Greek (or Latin) were spoken (barbaroi). The ordering represents a cultural approximation of the centrifugal pattern indicated in Acts 1:8.

A comparison of ‘reception scenes’ in Acts reveals patterns. The most common pattern (particularly conspicuous in the missionary journeys of Paul and Barnabas, and later, of

---

Paul without Barnabas) proceeds in the following order: an initial taking of the message to the local Jewish synagogue (this is always done first where there is a synagogue); initial positive or ambivalent reception from the Jews of the synagogue; a positive reception by some Gentiles in the same area; a consequent negative reaction by some Jews in response to Gentile inclusion, leading to some form of persecution or violence toward the emissaries; a more deliberate turning, therefore, to the Gentiles with the message (again with 'divided' responses). This pattern is first portrayed fully in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:13-52). This section finishes with a clear inter-textual reference to the commission and reception accounts in the Third Gospel. The phrase “So they shook the dust off their feet in protest against them” would evoke the implied reader’s memory of Luke 9:1-5 and 10:1-16, including what I call the 'Luke 10:16 Reception Principle’—if one receives Jesus' emissary, one receives Jesus. This pattern (Jews first, Gentiles second, consequent negative reaction to Gentile-inclusion, consequent greater turning to the Gentiles) is played out again and again: in Iconium (Acts 14:1-7); in Thessalonica (Acts 17:1-9); in Beroea (Acts 17:10-15—although, there, the Jews are portrayed as more receptive because of their greater diligence in examining the scriptures); in Corinth (Acts 18:1-17 with another ‘dust shaking protest’); and in Ephesus (Acts 19:1-10).

There are, however, some striking variations to this pattern. For instance: at Lystra, there is no mention of a synagogue or Jews; in Philippi, the persecution comes from the pagan Gentiles (not Jews); in Athens, there is no mention of a synagogue, and any violence, if present at all, is muted; on Malta, there is a very positive reception of both emissary and the message (on that occasion communicated more through deeds than words). Regardless of whether the scenes conform to the most common pattern or represent a variation, reception is the key theme throughout the many scenes in Acts’ numerous locations.

But what has reception to do with this dissertation’s more focussed interest in welcome, meeting and escort? In all these ‘reception scenes’, Luke has two options for narrating ‘reception’. The less focussed (less ‘focused’) option is to ‘tell’ the reader what happened. In narratological terminology, this is called diegesis. Luke uses this if he needs to
expend less text space in a section of the narrative. *Diegesis* is also called *recounting* or *summary*. When recounting a positive reception, Luke is likely to say something like, “the brothers received them gladly” or “the natives showed us extraordinary kindness”.

The second narratological option is to allow the reader to *witness events directly or immediately* by *showing* them what happened. This is a more focalised (or ‘focused’) option and is employed in cases where Luke demands his readers’ more intense attention. In narratological terminology, this is called *mimesis*. In *mimesis* the events are enacted as in the performance on a stage drama or at the cinema. When *showing* a positive reception, Luke is likely to say something like, “When believers from Rome heard of us, they came as far as the Forum of Appius and the Three Taverns to meet us” or “Since it had begun to rain and was cold, they kindled a fire and welcomed all of us around it” or “he ran and put his arms around him and kissed him”. *Acts of escort* including *escorted arrivals* and *escorted departures* are common *mimetic* events—events by which Luke ‘shows’ his reader positive reception, good will and an honouring attitude toward the guest in reception (or hospitality) scenes. Section A of this thesis established that—in a Mediterranean cultural script of the late first (early second) century (from both a Jewish and Greco-Roman milieu)—’going out to meet’ is one way in which characters are shown to be good and honourable hosts.

Scenes featuring escort (including escorted arrivals and escorted departures) are not unknown in the Third Gospel (as the previous chapter has shown). However, the phenomenon is far more common in Acts. The attention to escort is a truly Lukan feature.\(^4\) Perhaps the reason for its more common occurrence in Acts is that, whereas the Third Gospel is constrained by a well-attested tradition, the sequel, Acts, gives Luke a free hand. Whatever the reason, escort is certainly a common feature of Acts, occurring with a frequency of about once a chapter (although as we will see, the distribution is uneven). In Table 6.1 I have tabulated twenty-eight such instances of escort in Acts (I have included

\(^4\) Note that, in the Third Gospel, escort frequently occurs in episodes that are only recounted by Luke—for example The Father with Two Sons, The Compassionate Samaritan and the Emmaus Road episode.
Table 6.1: Instances of Escort in Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of escort</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acts 5:19</td>
<td>An angel brought the apostles out of the public prison</td>
<td>escorted departure</td>
<td>ἐξαγαγών (ἐξάγω)</td>
<td>This escort contrasts the dishonourable 'escorts' of Acts 5:21,26,27 (ἅγω). Compare to #13 and #17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8:30,31,36</td>
<td>Philip runs to the Ethiopian's chariot, and Philip and the Ethiopian travel together to the place where there was water; and both of them went down into the water</td>
<td>escorted departure and arrival (resonance with Emmaus episode)</td>
<td>προσδραμών ἅμαρτοσι</td>
<td>This journey is both a 'departure' from Jerusalem (Philip is seeing him on his way) and an 'arrival' at the water. Philip escorts the Ethiopian to baptism and inclusion in Christ's Kingdom. Escort is highlighted through the use of 'both' and the repeating their names.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Acts 9:2,5,8 (analeptic references at Acts 9:21 and 22:5)</td>
<td>Jesus encounters Saul on the Road to Damascus. Saul then requires being led by the hand and brought to Damascus.</td>
<td>resonance with the escorts on the Emmaus and Gaza Roads (except that Jesus speaks from heaven)</td>
<td>χειραγωγούντες εἰσήγαγον</td>
<td>Saul, who would provide a 'rough escort' (ἀγων) for those he would arrest (9:2) becomes needful of being led by the hand—escort of the blind (9:8 of Acts 13:11 and Luke 14:23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Acts 9:25</td>
<td>Saul's disciples took him by night and let him down through an opening in the wall, lowering him in a basket</td>
<td>escorted departure (aided escape to safety)</td>
<td>λαβόντες καθῆκαν χαλάσαντες</td>
<td>The first of many aided escapes for Saul/Paul (9:30; 14:6; 14:20; 17:10; 21:35; 23:23,31; 27:43). Night is frequently the time for visions and escapes in Acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Acts 9:27</td>
<td>Barnabas took Paul and brought him to the apostles</td>
<td>escorted arrival</td>
<td>ἤγαγεν</td>
<td>A significant ‘vouching’ for Paul by Barnabas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Acts 9:30</td>
<td>Disciples take Paul by night and sent him off to Tarsus</td>
<td>escorted departure (aided escape to safety)</td>
<td>κατήγαγον</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Acts 9:38-39</td>
<td>Escort by two men from Lydda to Joppa (Peter went with them); Escort to Dorcas's room upstairs (they took Peter up into…)</td>
<td>escorted arrival</td>
<td>συνήλθεν</td>
<td>The disciples in Joppa sent two men to request and accompany Peter’s visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Acts 10:5,7,8, 20,22</td>
<td>Cornelius sends emissaries to accompany Peter to Caesarea</td>
<td>with escorted arrival (to Cornelius’ house) as the plan</td>
<td>Many key words. See text. The most common three being: μεταπέμπω πέμπω and ἀποστέλλω</td>
<td>Cornelius sends three emissaries to request and escort Peter’s visit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Acts 10:21,23a</td>
<td>Peter went down and came out to meet Cornelius’s emissaries, then invited them in.</td>
<td>escorted arrival</td>
<td>κατάβας εἰσκαλεσάμενος</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Acts 10:23b</td>
<td>Peter went with Cornelius’s emissaries, and some believers from Joppa also accompanied him</td>
<td>escorted departure (from Joppa) and escorted arrival (in Caesarea)</td>
<td>συνήλθον αὐτῷ ἔξηλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Acts 10:25,27</td>
<td>Cornelius came out to meet Peter</td>
<td>escorted arrival</td>
<td>συναντήσεις εἰσηλθεν</td>
<td>This is revealed analeptically when Luke says that after being greeted Peter “went in”. The D Text explicates the ‘going out to meet’ in its longer version of the account of Peter’s arrival.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Type of escort</td>
<td>Keywords</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Acts 11:26</td>
<td>Barnabas found and brought Saul (Paul) to Antioch</td>
<td>escorted departure</td>
<td>εὑρὼν ἠγάγεν</td>
<td>Antioch to Tarsus is a long way to go to procure a missional partner (136 miles, 220 km, or one week’s journey).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Acts 12:7-10 (analeptically referenced at Acts 12:37)</td>
<td>An angel of the Lord brought Peter out of prison</td>
<td>escorted departure (escape)</td>
<td>ἐξαλθὼν ἐκκολοθεύμ (ἐξηγαγέν)</td>
<td>Contrasts with the dishonourable ‘escorts’ that Herod had in mind for Peter (Acts 12:4,6) and the ‘leading away’ (execution) of the guards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Acts 13:17, 23</td>
<td>Accompaniment language in Paul’s first sermon (“God led them out”, “God brought to Israel a saviour”)</td>
<td>escorted departure (Exodus) and escorted arrival (of Saviour to Israel)</td>
<td>ἐξήγαγεν ἠγάγεν</td>
<td>Irony of the two Sauls—Saul of Tarsus and Saul of Kish—both persecutors of the Messiah (Acts 13:9, 21).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Acts 15:3</td>
<td>The Antiochian church send Paul and Barnabas on their way to Jerusalem</td>
<td>escorted departure (from Antioch) and escorted arrival?</td>
<td>προαμφιβλήτες</td>
<td>In other places in Acts (20:38; 21:5) the verb implies escort and the giving of provisions. Also see its use in Pauline literature (Rom 15:24; 1 Cor 16:6,11).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Acts 15:22, 25</td>
<td>The apostles and the elders send their own men to accompany Paul and Barnabas to Antioch</td>
<td>escorted departure (from Jerusalem) and escorted arrival (in Antioch)</td>
<td>πέμψα … σὺν πέμψα … σὺν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Acts 16:30, 34</td>
<td>The Philippian jailer brings Paul and Silas out of the prison, and brings them up into his house</td>
<td>escorted departure (escape) and escorted arrival</td>
<td>προαγαγών ἀναγαγών</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Acts 16:37, 39</td>
<td>The magistrates are forced to provide honourable, liberating escort to Paul and Silas.</td>
<td>escorted departure</td>
<td>ἐξαγαγέτωσαν ἐξαγαγόντες</td>
<td>This contrast with the initial ‘rough escort’ of Acts 16:20 (προσαγαγόντες).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Acts 17:10</td>
<td>The Thessalonian believers send Paul off to Beroea</td>
<td>escorted departure (escape) and escorted arrival</td>
<td>ἐξέπεμψαν</td>
<td>Thessalonica to Beroea was 64km or 40 miles (a two day journey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Acts 17:14, 15</td>
<td>The Beroean believers sent Paul away to the coast; and some brought him as far as Athens</td>
<td>escorted departure (escape) and escorted arrival</td>
<td>ἐξαπέστειλαν ἠγαγόν ἕως Αθηνῶν</td>
<td>Beroea to Athens is 485 kilometres (about 16 days by foot).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Acts 17:19</td>
<td>In Athens, the philosophers brought Paul to Mars Hill (the Areopagus)</td>
<td>escorted arrival</td>
<td>ἠγαγόν</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Acts 18:18</td>
<td>Priscilla and Aquila accompany Paul from Corinth to Ephesus</td>
<td>escorted departure</td>
<td>ἕξεστι εἰς τὴν Συρίαν, καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ Ακύλας,</td>
<td>Paul is sailing for Syria. Priscilla and Aquila accompany him as far as Ephesus (about 250 miles or 400 km).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Acts 20:4</td>
<td>Paul is accompanied by seven representatives of churches in Greece and Asia Minor</td>
<td>prolonged escorted departure</td>
<td>συνέπεσε το (a military term for escort)</td>
<td>Journey from Greece to Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Acts 20:17, 38</td>
<td>The elders from Ephesus come out to farewell Paul on his journey to Jerusalem; and at the end of the “farewell” speech they brought Paul to his ship</td>
<td>escorted departure (farewell)</td>
<td>παρεγένοντο πρὸς αὐτὸν</td>
<td>At least 47 kilometres or 29 miles (a day and a half’s journey)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one episode which I have left unnumbered—an episode in which the lack of escort seems a significant omission (Acts 21:18).

In terms of methodology, I asked the question, ‘What is the best way to consider these twenty-eight instances of escort in Acts?’ In keeping with my commitment to a synchronic reading of Acts, each instance of escort needs to be seen in its wider context or setting; and so to some degree, I must provide some indication as to how I read the whole of Acts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Type of escort</th>
<th>Keywords</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Acts 21:5</td>
<td>The disciples from Tyre, their wives and children escorted Paul and his companions outside the city and to their ship</td>
<td>escorted departure (farewell)</td>
<td>προπεμπόντων ἕως ἑαυτῆς πόλεως</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Acts 21:16</td>
<td>Some of the disciples from Caesarea accompany Paul and his companions on the way to Jerusalem (as far as the house of Mnason)</td>
<td>escorted departure (from Caesarea) and escorted arrival (to Mnason’s)</td>
<td>συνήλθον ... σύν ἡμῖν, ἄγοντες</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Acts 21:18</td>
<td>The failure of James and the elders to provide escort for Paul's arrival.</td>
<td>Failure to escort arrival (No escorted departure by James and the elders either; instead...)</td>
<td></td>
<td>A great contrast to the quick succession of three escorts in the preceding 17 verses and the warm welcome of the preceding verse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Acts 21:35</td>
<td>Paul is carried by the soldiers from the Temple precinct to the barracks (because the violence of the mob was so great)</td>
<td>Escorted departure</td>
<td></td>
<td>Irony: The carrying is done for protection but it has the appearance of an honouring gesture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Acts 23:31 (The Compassionate Tribune)</td>
<td>The extravagant “escape” that the tribune of the cohort (Claudius Lysias) provides to escort Paul from Jerusalem to Caesarea (to governor Felix)</td>
<td>Escorted departure (escape or cavalcade) Provision of a mount—implications—king’s emissary, GS? entry</td>
<td>haste 3rd hour of night; 2 centurions, 200 soldiers, 70 horsemen; 200 spearmen; mounts (κτήνη) for Paul to be set upon (ἐπιβιβάσαντες). διασώσωσι</td>
<td>A great contrast to the spate of dishonourable escorts provided to Paul since the trouble in the Temple (21:34,37; 22:24,30; 23:10,18,28) and which follow (25:6,17,23,26). Possible links to the Compassionate Samaritan and Jesus’ Entry of Jerusalem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Acts 27:1–28:16</td>
<td>The escort to Paul provided by a centurion (Julius) of the Augustan Cohort</td>
<td>delivered into custody, but it turns into a different relationship. Escorted departure (from Caesarea), escorted arrival (to Rome and emperor)</td>
<td>παρεδίδουν βουλόμενος διασῶσαι 'Rough escort', but with many oddities and ironies (27:11,21-26,31-32,33-36,42-43; 28:10,14,16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Acts 28:15</td>
<td>The extravagant escort (adventus) provided to Paul by the Roman believers as Paul enters Rome</td>
<td>Escorted arrival</td>
<td>ἐλθανεibern ἀπάνητην</td>
<td>The distances from Rome to the Forum of Appius and the ‘Three Taverns’ were 49 and 65 km respectively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(its direction and purpose). The task of examining each instance of escort is to some degree motivated by the fact that they occur in some of the most significant mimetic (and therefore memorable) episodes in Acts. Escort is also a feature of some of Acts’ most often repeated and, therefore, important episodes in the work. In fact, as the table above reveals, escort is found in nearly every major section of Acts. For that reason, I will break the examination into the major sections of Acts according to the following structure:

§ 6.2.1  Beginning in Jerusalem (Acts 1:1–5:42);
§ 6.2.2  The Acts of the ‘Seven’ (6:1–8:40);
§ 6.2.3  Prelude to the Acts of Paul—Saul’s encounter, earliest witness and escapes (9:1–31);
§ 6.2.4  Peripatetic Peter—Aeneas, Dorcas, Cornelius (9:32–11:18);
§ 6.2.5  Beginnings of the Church in Antioch (11:19-30);
§ 6.2.6  Peter’s Escape from Prison (12:1-25);
§ 6.2.7  Mission from Antioch to Antioch—‘First’ Journey (13:1–14:28);
§ 6.2.8  The Council and the Letter (15:1-41);
§ 6.2.9  Acts of Paul—‘Second’ Journey (16:1–18:28);
§ 6.2.10  Paul’s Return to Ephesus (in ‘Third’ Journey) and Farewells upon Paul’s Final Journey to Jerusalem (19:1–21:16);
§ 6.2.11  Paul in Jerusalem, Arrest, Detention and Trials (21:17–26:32);
§ 6.2.12  Paul’s Journey to Rome (Sea Voyage, Storm, Shipwreck, Ministry on Malta, and Arrival in Rome) (27:1–28:16);
§ 6.2.13  Paul in Rome (28:17–30).


\footnote{According to the thirteen-part structure I have provided below, escort occurs in every section except the final one ‘Paul in Rome’. This makes sense when one recalls that, in this last section, Paul is under house arrest in Rome.}
6.2 \hspace{1em} \textbf{A Synchronic Reading of Acts with a Focus upon Meeting and Escort}

6.2.1 \hspace{1em} \textit{Beginning in Jerusalem (Acts 1:1–5:42)}

In this chapter’s introduction, I have already mentioned the function of Acts 1:8 as a ‘signpost’ to the centrifugal direction in which the message of the good news is taken in Acts. The reception of the message (and the messengers) is a key theme throughout the work. The schema\textsuperscript{7} of Acts 1:8 (“in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth”) explains the relative infrequency of escort in this section. This section from Acts 1–5, and continuing through to Acts 8:4, corresponds to the beginning of that schema—the beginning in Jerusalem. Jesus commands the disciples “not to leave Jerusalem”, but to wait for baptism of the Holy Spirit (Acts 1:5). In 5:20 the command of the angel of the Lord continues to add support for a ministry in Jerusalem (“Go and stand in the temple and speak to the people all of the words about this Life.”) Therefore this section is sedentary, in the sense of ‘set in the one general location of Jerusalem’, as opposed to the itinerant character of the bulk of the work from Acts 8:4–28:16. The only other stationary section of Acts occurs when Paul is in Rome under house arrest (28:17-30). While reception remains an important theme in these two relatively stationary bookends, the lack of travel means that there is no potential for Luke to use escort as a mimetic way to communicate positive reception. Hence, there is a relative scarcity of escort in the opening seven chapters of Acts. Until the persecution and “scattering abroad” (διασπαρέντες) of 8:1-4, the setting (and therefore the witness to God’s message) is confined to Jerusalem.

The long list of pilgrims visiting Jerusalem (2:9-11) offers a glimpse of the potential for the fulfilment of Acts 1:8. Reception comes to the fore in Peter’s proclamation of the

\textsuperscript{7} Luke might be suggesting that the return of pilgrims who became believers was the vehicle by which the witness to the news about Jesus reaches these far-flung regions. The Ethiopian pilgrim who becomes a believer is portrayed as a pilgrim and potential witness (8:26–40). The returning of pilgrims to their homes would also explain how Christian faith reaches Rome (28:15) without any account of which apostle travelled and witnessed there.
message in Chapter 2. The initial response of those who hear the message is very positive with “three-thousand” receiving (ἀποδέχομαι) the word (2:41). This first reception scene follows a “slowed” version of the “most common pattern” familiar from later reception scenes (e.g. in Antioch of Pisidia, 13:13-52), except that in the place of actual Gentiles we have only proleptic references to them in Peter’s sermons (2:17; 2:39; 3:21,25,26). There is an initial positive response among the Jews (2:37-47). Then follows a series of allusions to the universality of God’s salvation (2:17; 2:39; 3:21,25,26).

I will pour out my Spirit upon all [πᾶσαν] flesh (2:17)

the promise is to you and to your children and to all [πᾶσιν] that are far off [μακράν] every one [or “as many as ever”—ὁσους ἂν] whom the Lord our God calls to him (2:39)

until the time of universal [πάντων] restoration that God announced long ago through his holy prophets (3:21)

You are the sons of the prophets and of the covenant which God gave to your fathers, saying to Abraham, ‘And in your posterity shall all the families of the earth [πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς] be blessed.’ God, having raised up his servant, sent him to you first [πρῶτον] to bless you in turning every one of you from your wickedness (3:25-26)

These last two references to the universality of God’s salvation (with its implicit Gentile-inclusion) come in Peter’s message, which he delivered to a crowd attracted by the healing of a crippled beggar. Immediately following this sermon, there is a severe negative response from some of the Jews (4:1-31, n.b. v. 2, 3, 21, 29). Peter and John are arrested and only released after they are warned with further threats, which seems to inspire only a greater resolution and boldness (4:29,31—παρρησίας).

Another indiscriminate healing of many ill and afflicted people from towns around Jerusalem (Acts 5:12-16) concludes with the healing of all (ἐθεραπεύοντο ἰαontes). Consequently, the high priest and the Sadducees arrest the apostles and put them in the public prison (5:17-18). This imprisonment is surprisingly brief (in narrative space) when, during the night, an angel of the Lord brought them out (ἐξαγαγών) and said, “Go and stand in the temple and speak to the people all the words about this life.” Despite the
persecution of the apostles, the angel of the Lord asserts that this was still the ‘season’ for witnessing in Jerusalem (Acts 5:20).\(^8\)

Immediately after narrating the escape, Luke makes a series of references to what I call ‘rough escort’ (5:21,26,27). I have not included these instances of the use of the verb ἄγω among instances of escort in the context of welcome or positive reception, because clearly they are the antithesis of welcome. But I mention them here because there is something general about arrest and imprisonment that seems to parody hospitality—people are taken, brought, detained, inquiries are made; in imperial contexts, they are ‘guests of his majesty’. Readers of the Third Gospel would be familiar with the rough escort of arrest, trial and execution from Jesus’ passion accounts,\(^9\) and from the rough escort given to Jesus at his near-execution by the people at the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:29).

These rough escorts contrast dramatically with the angel’s escort when “he opened the prison doors and brought them out (ἐξάγων)”. Ἐξάγω (literally, “lead out”) occurs in the other two prominent jailbreaks in Acts—in 12:17 when Peter is recounting how the Lord ‘brought him out’ of the prison in which Herod had placed him, and in 16:39 where Paul and Silas are ‘brought out’ of the prison by Philippi’s magistrates with apology and exoneration. Ἐξάγω is also used (twice) in Stephen’s sermon in the context of recounting how Moses brought the Israelites out of Egypt (7:36,40) and in Paul’s first sermon in Acts to refer to how God brought Israel out of Egypt (13:17).\(^10\) Ἐξάγω is also used in the description of Jesus’ ascension at the end of the Third Gospel (“Then he led them out as far as Bethany”—Luke 24:50). In reference to Deut 18:15-19, Luke twice claims that Jesus is the prophet whom Moses predicted would come, one who would be like Moses, and whose

---

\(^8\) Pervo makes the point that sending the apostles to the temple (where they would again encounter those who had imprisoned them) shows that the purpose of the jailbreak was not to avoid the opposition (to put the apostles on ‘easy street’) but to allow further proclamation. This incident is therefore similar to the release from the Philippian jail—the apostles do not go far and still face their accusers (Pervo, Acts, p. 142, n. 18).

\(^9\) See Section 5.5.1.7 for analysis of ‘rough escort’ in the Gospel.

\(^10\) Ἐξάγω is also used in Exod 16:6 (“You shall know that the Lord brought you out of Egypt,” NETS). Pervo notes that “By using themes of the exodus tradition it [the report of the jailbreak] relates the liberation of the apostles to the liberation of the people of God” (Pervo, Acts, 142).
words must be listened to (Acts 3:22, 7:37). The implied reader, whose cultural script was in part formed by the Pentateuch, would recognise the references to the Exodus, which Moses led, as Israel’s most important account of escort, liberation and salvation. The intertextual connections of the angel’s liberating escort (5:19) to other liberating escorts, ascribed variously to the Lord and his emissaries (whether angel or prophet), testify that God through Christ was still, at that point of the apostolic ministry in Jerusalem, occupied with works of escort, liberation and salvation.

6.2.2 The Acts of the ‘Seven’ (Acts 6:1–8:40)

Jesus’ command to the apostles to stay in the city until the coming of the Holy Spirit raises the question: how soon after Pentecost and witnessing in Jerusalem should the apostles leave Jerusalem to witness “in all Judea and Samaria and to the ends of the earth”? The words of the angel of the Lord (commanding the apostles to return to the Jerusalem temple) seem to suggest that they have not yet over-stayed in Chapter 5. But beginning in Chapter 6, a chain of events leads to persecution and diaspora (8:1-4)—a dispersion among the nations which, ironically, sees all the believers leave Jerusalem, except the apostles. With this dispersion, Acts becomes a travel narrative; it remains a far-ranging travel narrative, until it comes to rest with Paul under house arrest in Rome. And it is as Acts goes ‘on the move’ that escort becomes a mimetic narrative feature through which Luke conveys positive reception.

This chain of events that leads to the leaving of Jerusalem has a surprising beginning—a complaint about fair food distribution among the widows (6:1-6). Luke, as a reticent narrator, does not go out of his way to explain how we should reconcile this with earlier utopian statements that “there was not a needy person among them” due to their communistic distribution of their resources (Acts 2:45; 4:34-35). The response of the apostles to the complaint is often assumed to be an exemplary decision.11 No commentators notice

11 F. F. Bruce writes, “...the apostles would be free to devote their undivided attention to directing the church’s regular worship and to preaching the gospel.” F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts. NICNT (Grand Rapids, Ee-
that the apostolic decision is at odds with several of Jesus’ teachings in the Third Gospel, including: teachings about *humility* in leadership (‘servant leadership’, Luke 22:26-30); Jesus’ challenge to his disciples not to seek “higher honour”; and Jesus’ demonstrated example of holding practical and confessional ‘ministry’ together. As disciples of the one who likens his own ministry to serving at table (Luke 22:27), ought the apostles repudiate food distribution or waiting on tables as a distraction from prayer and proclamation? As with so many actions of the apostles, Luke remains reticent—but not completely. Ironically, two of the ‘seven’ chosen for the food distribution task become prominent ministers in *word and deed*. I read this as undermining the apostles’ attempts to create ‘specialist’ ministries—reserving for themselves prayer and proclamation and assigning others to do more menial ‘table-tasks’.12

Stephen goes on to preach the sermon to which the greatest amount of text-space is dedicated in Acts (Acts 7:2-53), and he becomes the church’s first martyr (7:54-60). It is the day of Stephen’s martyrdom that marks the beginning of a severe persecution which leads to the dispersal of Jesus’ disciples (Acts 8:1), and which marks the point at which the witnesses to Jesus go ‘on the move’, creating possibilities for escort and welcome.

Philip becomes the single-handed instrument under the direction of the Spirit to fulfil a significant part of Jesus’ final instruction to the disciples (in Acts 1:8). Philip takes the good news to the Samaritans who receive (δέχομαι) the word of God enthusiastically (8:14). Then Philip takes the interpretation of the word of God to an Ethiopian who is returning to his far-away home (8:26-40). Luke, like Matthew (Matt 12:42), and like Ho-

---

12 David W. Pao, “Waiters Or Preachers: Acts 6:1-7 and the Lukan Table Fellowship Motif”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011): pp. 127-144. Pao has also noted the way in which Luke potentially undermines the Twelve's inappropriate attempt at 'division of labour' (p. 142). The importance of this more contemporary understanding of the appointing of the 'Seven' to my project is that the appointment of the 'Seven' and the consequent dispersion of Acts 8:1, are critical as the 'turning point' that sends Acts 'on the move' and serves as the starting point from which *escort* becomes prominent. Through his literary analysis of Acts 6:1-7 in the context of Luke-Acts and the motif of 'Table Fellowship', Pao concludes that this passage functions "as a transitional account that bridges the Jerusalem ministry and the one that reaches 'to the ends of the earth'".
mer before them, located Ethiopia at the “ends of the earth”. Philip is Jesus’ consummate witness “in Samaria and to the ends of the earth” (Acts 8:4). This token fulfillment of Acts 1:8 is a foreshadowing of its greater fulfillment realised in the gentile mission.

By contrast to the prominence to two of the ‘Seven’, this significant section (6:1-8:40) only mentions the apostles twice. The first mention is to note that the persecution that broke out after the death of Stephen had the effect of propelling all the disciples to the very places that Jesus commanded them to be witnesses (Judea and Samaria 1:8, 8:1) with the only exception being the apostles, who did not go.

And on that day a great persecution arose against the church in Jerusalem; and they were all (πάντες) scattered throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles (πλὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων).

The second mention of the apostles in this section (“The Acts of the ‘Seven’”) is in the context of the apostles coming late and, to a large degree, missing much of the significant ministry to the Samaritans (8:14-25). Before any of the twelve come to Samaria, Philip single-handedly goes down to Samaria, proclaims Christ, does signs and great miracles, exorcises those with unclean spirits, cures the lame and paralyzed, brings joy to the city and brings amazement even to one of their greatest magicians. And when the Samaritans believe Philip’s proclamation of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus, Philip baptises them.

Only after the full account of Philip’s actions do we read, “Now when the apostles at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John.” The irony of sending John would be lost on all except readers of the Third Gospel.

---

13 Homer called the Ethiopians the “farthermost of all men” (ἔσχατοι ἀνδρῶν—Od. 1.22-23). It was a place favoured and visited by the gods, including Zeus and Poseidon (Od. 5.282, Il. 1.423-4). Josephus locates Sheba (as in ‘Queen of Sheba’—1 Kings 10:1; 2 Chr 9:1, and which in Josephus’s writings and the LXX is spelled ‘Saba’) within Ethiopia (Antiq. 2:249 or 2.10.2.249)—“and at length they retired to Saba, which was a royal city of Ethiopia, which Cambyses afterwards named Meroe after the name of his own sister.” The location of Sheba within Ethiopia is of great relevance, because Luke says of the Queen of Sheba that she came from the “ends of the earth” (Luke 11:31). If Luke agrees with Josephus (that Sheba was in Ethiopia), then Ethiopia, for Luke, is also the “ends of the earth.”

14 As Pervo expresses it, “The universalism expressed in this phrase [‘to the ends of the earth’] is to be realised in the gentile mission (13:47)”. Pervo, Acts, pp. 44, 343.
with long memories. The implied reader would recall that when last in Samaria John (and his brother James) asked Jesus, “Lord, do you want us to bid fire to come down from heaven and consume them?” (Luke 9: 54, and some manuscripts add, as reflected in the KJV, “even as Elias did?” in reference to 2 Kings 1:10,12). On that occasion, Jesus rebuked James and John (Luke 9:55).

On that earlier occasion, the Samaritans had not received Jesus because he had “his face set towards Jerusalem” (9:53). Jesus’ rejection by the Samaritans is an ‘inhospitality’ (or negative reception) scene. In Acts, the Samaritans have heard the proclamation of the kingdom of God and the name of Jesus from Philip who, by Jesus’ command (Acts 1:8), does not have his face “set toward Jerusalem”.

The apostles’ contribution to the Samaritan mission seems mixed by contrast to the straightforward and positive accounts of Philip’s contribution in 8:5-13. They impart the Holy Spirit by the laying on of hands, although as later scenes demonstrate, they are by no means essential to this type of event. The apostles are still quick to call down judgement on Samaritans—again, in opposition to Jesus’ clear teaching about refraining from condemnation and judgement (Luke 6:37-42).

15 The initial rejection of Jesus by the Samaritans (Luke 9:53) followed by their eventual ‘acceptance’ of the gospel in Acts (Acts 8:6) is a conspicuous example of the Lukan motif of ‘a second chance’, wherein people who initially reject Jesus in the Gospel are given a further opportunity to hear and accept the good news concerning Jesus in Acts (Acts 2:36-41; 6:7; 26:5; 26:28).

16 These two elements—laying on of hands and the presence of one of the “twelve”—will both be shown to be optional. Sometimes the Spirit will descend with no laying on of hands (as in Cornelius’s house at 10:44); and at other times it will be the laying on of hands by “apostles” and disciples other than the “twelve” (9:17 with Ananias’ hands; 19:6 with Paul’s hands).

17 David W. Pao in “Waiters or Preachers”: pp. 142-143, writes “it seems best to view the Twelve as ambiguous characters”, and he cites many references from Acts that support a view of the ‘Twelve’ as failing to understand fully the nature of the mission to which they are called (e.g. Acts 1:6; 1:8; 6:2; 10:13,15,16). Peter, as a representative of the ‘Twelve’, is presented as one who needs “to become better informed about the work of God among other communities.” See also Joel B. Green, “Doing Repentance: The Formation of Disciples in Acts of the Apostles” Ex Auditu 18 (2003): pp. 1-23, n.b. pp. 18-19.

Before the apostles arrive, there is no suggestion of a problem between Philip and the magician, Simon. Simon’s inappropriate suggestion that he pay for the ability to lay hands on others so that he too might bring about the propagation of the Holy Spirit, draws a strong judgement of condemnation from the visiting apostles (Acts 8:20). John and Peter’s tendency to call down judgement or to stop the participation of others and make pronouncement of who will “have no part or share in this ministry” seems not very different from their behaviour in Luke 9:49-55 that drew Jesus’ rebuke. Simon’s final comment, “Pray for
Another contrast between the two apostles and Philip, is that John and Peter—in opposition to the exhortation in Acts 1:8—“returned to Jerusalem” (8:25), whereas Philip’s journeys continue to take him into “allophyle” territory away from Jerusalem. Philip travels to Azotus—a traditional “allophyle” area of the LXX—and to Caesarea Maritima, a significant port in which he can witness to those who, like the Ethiopian of the next episode, might take their newfound faith to the ‘ends of the earth’.

A contrasting set of images begins to emerge between Philip—as a member of the Seven, and as exemplar of ‘later’ witnesses—and the apostles—as members of the ‘former’ witnesses. Philip, on one hand, is itinerant and his travels represent his preparedness to join and escort the journey of others. The apostles, on the other hand, show a reluctance to journey far beyond Jerusalem, a fact first made conspicuous in the comment in Acts 8:1—“all were scattered throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles”. In Philip’s next encounter, escort is a prominent motif of both reception and evangelism.

me to the Lord...” portrays him positively as a compliant character who had made a genuine mistake. Rick Strelan interprets Simon’s final comment as genuine repentance and notes that many commentators are quick to malign Simon beyond what is actually written in the text (Strange Acts, pp. 209–215).

The traditional allophyle territories are listed in several parts of the LXX: Josh 13:3; 1 Sam 5:1-7; 6:17; 2 Chr 26:6; Jer 32:20; Amos 1:8; Zech 9:6; 1 Macc 5:68.

Surprisingly, nearly all commentators exonerate the apostles’ non-participation in the centrifugal mission to which they were commissioned in 1:8. Ben Witherington explains that the exemption (not only from dispersion but from persecution) is “not unexpected since Acts 1–6 has stressed the great respect for these early Jewish Christian leaders among the populace of Jerusalem and the fear of them by the authorities.” To the contrary, Johann Albrecht Bengel (Gnomon of the New Testament, 1742) thought that, “the apostles were in greater danger than the others; and yet they did not consider that they ought to consult for their safety above the rest. They ought to withstand (endure) dangers, who have attained a greater degree and measure of faith than the others” (Pericula sustinere debent, qui majore gradu et mensura fidei sunt). Similarly, Calvin (225), “the apostles stayed because they were good pastors”. F. F. Bruce (Acts): “The Twelve remained in Jerusalem, partly no doubt because they conceived it to be their duty to stay at their post.” And yet I would suggest that the only divine command to stay in Jerusalem is qualified by the temporal provision until the provision of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:4-5) and that the apostles’ post is beginning in Jerusalem to the ends of the earth (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8). Pervo suggests that, “Luke wishes to keep the apostles in town because of v. 14.” I would agree but add that delaying the apostles’ journey to Jerusalem demonstrates the comparative tardiness of their missional response to the Samarians, in contrast to Philip’s. Pervo continues, “The apostles’ avoidance of flight has the additional advantage of displaying their heroic fearlessness.” Because of what I perceive to be the strength of the intertextual link between 8:1 and 1:8 (specifically “Judea and Samaria”), and because of the very positive reception scenes that immediately follow for
After his faithful mission to the Samaritans, Philip continues to demonstrate that he is the faithful emissary of the Lord. He hastens to where he is sent (8: 5, 26-27, 29-30); an angel of the Lord sends Philip on the road to Gaza to meet an Ethiopian who has visited Jerusalem and now is on his way home. The 'Luke 10:16 Reception Principle' (to receive Jesus’ emissary is to receive Jesus) finds expression in the way that the Ethiopian’s hospitable reception of Philip reflects the Ethiopian’s positive acceptance of Jesus.

Philip ran to the Ethiopian in his chariot (8:30). While undoubtedly a good way to catch-up with a chariot, running (προσδραμὼν—Acts 8:29) works as a mimetic way in Luke and Acts to 'show' enthusiasm to meet.  

When Philip catches up with the chariot, he initiates conversation with a question—“Do you understand what you are reading?” This is just the first of many parallels with the Emmaus Road incident—another narrative in which escort plays a significant role.  


---

*itinerant Philip (including his single-handed baptism of one of the ‘furthermost’ of men), I have a different conclusion, that is not as hagiographic toward the apostles.*

*Running is a common motif in Luke's Gospel: Mary hastens to Elizabeth's (Luke 1:39); the father runs to his younger son (15:15); Zacchaeus runs to the ‘viewing’ tree (19:4); Peter runs to the tomb in the hope of meeting the risen Lord (24:12). Rick Strelan links the motif of ‘running’ with the prophetic tradition, in “The Running Prophet.” *Novum Testamentum* 43/1 (2001): pp. 31-38.*

*On the road to Emmaus, Jesus initiates conversation with a question—“What are you discussing while you walk?” Both episodes occur on a road—to Emmaus and to Gaza. Further, both involve characters in the roles of teacher (Jesus and Philip) and disciple (Cleopas and companion and the Ethiopian). Both commence with the disciples in a pessimistic, defeated and discouraged state—“But we had hoped…” and “How can I unless…?”. In both this episode and the Emmaus episode, there is an element of invitation from the disciple to the teacher (Luke 24:28-29; Acts 8:31b). The teaching in both stories leads to a fuller revelation concerning Jesus. Both narratives lead to a climax linked to sacraments. There is allusion to the Lord’s Supper in the meal on the road to Emmaus (the allusion is to Luke 22:19a—the textually more certain section), and an explicit reference to baptism on the road to Gaza. Pervo, commenting on the parallels between Emmaus and the Road to Gaza, writes, “This pattern exhibits Lucan theology in a nutshell expressed in Lucan fashion: faith kindled in a conversation that includes ‘word and sacrament’ and is developed in the course of a journey” (Pervo, *Acts*, p. 219).*
both at home and on the road (ἐν ὁδῷ)? Jesus discusses the scriptures while he walks with them—an escort strongly implied by the fact that they eventually came near to Emmaus (Luke 24:28). Philip teaches as the chariot proceeds along the road—an escort strongly implied by the fact that the chariot eventually comes to water (Acts 8:36). The Ethiopian says of the Isaiah reading “How can I [understand] unless someone guides me?”—literally, “leads (ὁδηγήσει) me?” For teaching, the Ethiopian uses a metaphor of guiding or leading (using the verb ὁδηγέω derived from the noun ὁδός “way” “path” or “road” and the verb ἄγω “I lead”).

As the Ethiopian and Philip enter the water (Acts 9:38), Luke emphasises the feature of escort by adding the redundant adjective “both” (ἀμφότεροι). This, together with the redundant repeat of “Philip and the eunuch”, has the effect of slowing down the baptism narrative so that the reader/hearer has time to imagine more fully this mimetically narrated moment.

Both this narrative and the Emmaus narrative conclude with a sudden and unusual departure of the teacher. As soon as the Ethiopian’s baptism is completed, the Spirit of the Lord snatched Philip away. The endings of the Emmaus Road and the Gaza Road scenes resemble the theoxeny scenes—a familiar element of a cultural script, due both to its frequency in Homerica and the LXX (Gen 18:2). An ideal intended reader, familiar with Homer, would recall that Homeric theoxenies often involve the inspiration of the host after the sudden departure of the god-guest.

The meeting of Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch is the first of two Lukan narratives where one character is a ‘good allophyle’ (the other being the story of Cornelius in Chapter 10 of Acts). The ‘goodness’ of the Ethiopian is evident in his regard for the prophets—
as represented by the fact that he is attempting faithfully to read the Book of the Prophet Isaiah (Acts 8:30-34);\(^{23}\) his hospitality toward Philip (asking him up into his chariot); and his willingness to be baptised (8:36). In the next ‘good allophyle’ narrative—‘Cornelius, the Centurion’—the reader sees Cornelius’s goodness through his regard for prayer and almsgiving (10:2) and through the extravagant hospitality that he prepares and extends to Peter.

The ‘good allophyle’ narratives involve breaking through barriers. Hence, like many surprising turning points in Luke and Acts, there is an angelic announcement (8:26, 10:3).\(^{24}\) The first barrier to be broken is simply that of being an ‘allophyle’—a foreigner or outsider. The Ethiopian also has a further impediment—the matter of his castration. According to Jewish Law, castration and other forms of sexual dismemberment constituted reasons for exclusion from the assembly (Deut 23:1). However, the Book of Isaiah (which the Ethiopian is reading) promises the inclusion of the foreigner and the eunuch—Isaiah 56:1-8, particularly vv. 4-5. In fact, it seems quite likely given the thematic overlap and the proximity to the quoted text that Luke is offering an enacted representation of the Isaiah 56 text. In the Third Gospel, Luke has quoted Isaiah 56:7 (Luke 19:46) and deliberately withheld “for all nations” from the quotation.\(^ {25}\) It seems that this is a deliberate deferral on Luke’s part. It is in these next eight chapters (8-15) that Gentiles are demonstrated to be among God’s people upon whom salvation has arrived.

Philip is a faithful witness to the news of Jesus; one of the principal ways this finds expression in the narrative is his preparedness to accompany (or escort). He comes out of his way, first to the Samaritans then to the Ethiopian on the Gaza Road. His eagerness to

---

23 Preparedness to listen to Moses and the prophets is also shown by the Emmaus road disciples (Luke 24:27) and the other disciples (24:44-45); it is lacking in the inhospitable rich man and his brothers (Luke 16:29-31).

24 J.R.R. Tolkien coined a helpful neologism to describe joyous turning points for the good—he dubbed them ‘eucatastrophes’. He then went on to write, “The Birth of Christ is the eucatastrophe of Man’s history. The Resurrection is the eucatastrophe of the story of the Incarnation”, from “On Fairy-Stories”, in Tree and Leaf, Smith of Wootton Major, and The Homecoming of Beorhtnoth (London: Unwin, 1975), p. 71. Note that eucatastrophes in Luke and Acts are often accompanied by the appearance of angels.

25 Mark’s Gospel includes “for all the nations” (Mark 11:17).
escort extends to running, climbing aboard the chariot, teaching on the road and his walk into the waters of baptism with the Ethiopian.

6.2.3 Prelude to the Acts of Paul—Saul’s encounter, earliest witness and escapes (Acts 9:1-31)

Luke sometimes structures his narratives so that a major character makes a small cameo appearance earlier in the narrative than their main scenes (e.g. Simon, Barnabas, Stephen and Philip). Paul has three such preludes. In the first, which is a very minor appearance at the execution of Stephen (Acts 7:58, 8:1-3), Luke introduces us to Paul using an allosynonym, “Saul”.

Then they cast him [Stephen] out of the city and stoned him; and the witnesses laid down their garments at the feet of a young man named Saul. (Acts 7:58)

And Saul was consenting to his death. And on that day a great persecution arose against the church in Jerusalem; and they were all scattered throughout the region of Judea and Samaria, except the apostles. Devout men buried Stephen, and made great lamentation over him. But Saul was ravaging the church, and entering house after house, he dragged off men and women and committed them to prison. (Acts 8:1-3)

Part of Saul’s persecution of the church is the rough escort that parodies hospitality: entering houses, drawing off men and women, delivering them to prison (detention) and questioning. This short cameo-prelude is followed by the Philip episodes discussed in the previous section (Samaritans and the Ethiopian). As soon as the reader leaves Philip, they find Saul in the same state they left him in 8:3:

But Saul, still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest and asked him for letters to the synagogues at Damascus, so that if he found any belonging to the Way [τῆς ὁδοῦ], men or women, he might bring them bound [δεδεμένους ἀγάγῃ] to Jerusalem. (Acts 9:1-2)

Like synchronicity (simultaneity) in the narrative, the device of cameo-preludes has the rhetorical effect on the reader of suggesting that God has definite plans that are being brought to fulfillment. In the case of the cameo-preludes, it is suggested, in effect, that God is working in the lives of character even before we become aware of their actions in detail.
Saul’s intention to bind and bring those of the Way (Jesus’ followers) who lived in Damascus is often repeated: in Ananias’s protest (Acts 9:13-14—δῆσαι); in the amazed response of Saul’s Damascus audience (Acts 9:21—δεδεμένους αὐτοὺς ἀγάγῃ); and in Paul’s defence speech after his arrest in Jerusalem (in Acts 22:4-5).

I persecuted this Way… binding [δεσμεύων] and delivering to prison both men and women, (Acts 22:4a)… and I journeyed to Damascus to bring [ἄξων] them who were there bound [δεδεμένους] to Jerusalem (Acts 22:5b).

Clearly, Saul’s action was significant enough for Luke to mention it repeatedly.

As the action alternates from exhilarating missions to outsiders (Samaritans, the Ethiopian Eunuch, Cornelius), to the violent opposition of Saul, simultaneity and sharp juxtaposition cause the reader to ponder—as God is clearly active in the fulfilment of the outward missional direction commanded by Jesus, what will become of Saul, the fierce opponent to that witness? A first time reader may fail to recognise Paul, because Luke calls him “Saul” until Acts 13:9. Yet even a first time reader might suspect that this opponent of the Way is somehow associated with the plan and purpose of God, particularly in relation to outsiders. The clue to the connection of “Saul” to the mission to the outsiders is provided by the alternating structuring of Saul’s first appearances (8:3; 9:1-31) with the first steps to witness to outsiders (8:4-40; 9:32–11:30).

The irony is that this persecutor of the church who threatens the disciples with rough escort, bondage and imprisonment, becomes a follower of Jesus. The irony of Saul’s encounter with Jesus on the road to Damascus evokes the theme of escort. The man who would have brought followers of the Way, bound to Jerusalem finds himself in need of being led—led by the hand (χειραγωγοῦντες) and brought (εἰσήγαγον) into Damascus.27 This is a proleptic glimpse of the nature of the greater part of the story of Paul that remains. Paul will be one of the most led and escorted characters in Acts. And for the lengthy

27 Haenchen wrote of v. 8, “such is the pitiful state in which the terror of the Christian makes his entry” (Haenchen, Acts, 323).

As Paul’s story continues—even in this relatively short ‘prelude’ section—we see that he becomes one of the most threatened and persecuted of Jesus’ followers who often finds himself threatened with *rough escort*, imprisonment, interrogation, and death. Sometimes in response to the dangers that confront Paul (but not always), he is routinely *escorted* from location to location. Out of the remaining ten sections of Acts (as per the structure of this chapter), eight include depictions of the escort of Paul (while the other two include depictions of the escort of Peter).

After his healing and baptism, Saul begins to speak in the synagogues of Damascus to Jews about Jesus as the Son of God. Saul’s powerful witness to Jesus as the Messiah leads to the first of many plots to kill him, which necessitates the first of two escorted escapes in this section (see 9:30) and the first of many escapes for Paul in Acts (14:6; 14:20; 17:10; 21:35; 23:23, 31; 27:43). *Night* features again as the time for escapes (and for visions associated with detention). ‘Plots becoming known’ is another repeated motif throughout Acts (9:24, 30, implicit in 20:3, 23:16), which contributes to the sense that God has all matters ‘in hand’. The escape is narrated with mimetic detail.

When many days had passed, the Jews plotted to kill him, but their plot became known to Saul. They were watching the gates day and night, to kill him; but his disciples took him by night and let him down over the wall, lowering him in a basket. (Acts 9:23-25)

---

28 After Saul’s experience on the Road to Damascus, the Lord sends Ananias to heal Saul’s blindness. A sense of fulfilment and of God having everything completely in hand is conveyed once again by an element of simultaneity. In Ananias’s vision the Lord says “Behold! He [Saul] is praying”—the “behold” implies that it is happening at the same moment that the Lord is speaking to Ananias (the NRSV takes the liberty of using the words “at this moment”). Simultaneity (or synchronicity) of visions and prayers will be very prominent in the next great reception and escort narrative concerning Peter and Cornelius. Ryan Schellenberg notes that Luke has something in common with the author of *Tobit*. “In the NT, Luke too capitalizes on the assumption that simultaneity signals divine providence.” Ryan S. Schellenberg, “Suspense, Simultaneity and Divine Providence in the Book of Tobit”, *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130/2 (2011): pp. 313-327.

29 The detail of the basket is attested in 2 Cor 11:32-33, and being lowered through a window in the wall is reminiscent of the escape of the spies from Rahab’s house (Josh 2:15).
Disbelief about Saul’s change of allegiance causes the disciples in Jerusalem to fear Saul. Barnabas, ‘Son of Encouragement’, whose own cameo-prelude was Acts 4:36, now encourages disciples by escorting Paul to them. His escort ‘vouches’ for Saul’s bona fides. Barnabas’s report (conveyed with indirect speech) is reminiscent of the brief report that the Emmaus disciples offer the apostles after their escorted encounter with Jesus on the road.

Barnabas’s accompanied introduction and report achieves Paul’s freedom to “go in and to go out” with the disciples in Jerusalem. But Paul’s speaking and arguing with the Hellenist Jews provokes another attempt to kill him (Acts 9:29). Again, the plot becomes known—this time to the disciples. And so Paul’s second “prelude” to his major part in Acts concludes with another escorted escape. This time it involves the escort across the extravagant distance from Jerusalem to Caesarea (89 km or 55 miles, a three day journey) and then the sending of him off to Tarsus (in Cilicia), which is about a 644 km or 400 mile journey. The first part of this life-saving escape follows the same route as the extravagant escape (272 men!) which the tribune Lysias provides for Paul later in Acts (23:31-35, and commissioned in 23:23-24).

And when the brethren knew it, they brought him down [κατήγαγον] to Caesarea, and sent him off [ἐξαπέστειλαν] to Tarsus (Acts 9:30)

Paul’s dismissal and departure achieves the defocusing and conclusion of this episode. The iterative sentence (9:31) that follows confirms that this is the end of a major section.

---

Marguerat (Acts, p. 342) notes the irony of the escort. “Ironically the one who wanted to bring (ἀγάγη, 9:26) the disciples bound from Damascus to Jerusalem needs one of them to lead (ἠγαγεν, 9:27) him to the Apostles” (my translation).

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>καὶ ἀυτοὶ ἐξήγαγοντο τά ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ καὶ ὡς [ὁ κύριος — v. 34] ἐγνώσθη αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου.</td>
<td>καὶ δημήσατο αὐτοῖς πάν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ εἶδεν τὸν κύριον καὶ ὁ ἡ έλαληκέν αὐτῷ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And [the Emmaus disciples] told (lit. “brought out”) the things on the road, and how [the Lord—v. 34] was known to them in the breaking of the bread</td>
<td>And [Barnabas] told (lit. “took them through”) how on the road he [Paul] had seen the Lord, and who spoke to him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leaving Paul in Tarsus is the technique that Luke uses to suspend Paul’s narrative and resume Peter’s. This alternating structure of these middle chapters of Acts from 6 to 16 (The Twelve-Stephen-Paul-Philip-Peter and John-Philip-Paul-Peter-Paul and Barnabas-Peter-Paul and Barnabas-Symposium in Jerusalem-Paul and Silas-Paul), and the mentions of synchronicity (8:1; 9:1,31; 10:9,19), communicate to the reader the message that God worked in this great diversity of individuals and associations. We leave Paul at the end of this section in far away Tarsus, but with the knowledge that the Lord has said, “…he is my chosen instrument to bear my name before Gentiles and kings and before the children of Israel.” When we resume Paul’s story, it will begin and end with extravagant escorts: Barnabas’s escort of Paul’s return from Tarsus to Antioch (11:25-26) and the Roman believers’ escort of Paul from the Forum of Appius and Three Taverns to Rome (28:15).


When we resume Peter’s story at 9:32, the most striking feature of his activity is his itinerant manner. For Peter in Acts, this marks a new phase which is introduced in an understated way, “Now as Peter passed through (NRSV “went here and there”) among them all….” Passing through (διερχόμενον) or “going from place to place” has previously been the activity of all believers except the apostles. The most notable travelling evangelist has been Philip of the Seven (8:1-5, n.b. 8:4; 8:40). Peter, who visited Philip’s Samaritan mission, alone of all ‘the Twelve’, captures the spirit of Philip’s itinerant mission and the imperative of Acts 1:8 to leave Jerusalem. As this section develops, Peter, like Philip, finds that being a witness to the gospel message will lead to situations in which he travels (as an expression of his preparedness to bear the gospel to characters outside Jerusalem) and is escorted (as an expression of other characters’ positive reception both toward the gospel and its bearer).

The geographical expansion of Peter’s mission is complemented by a cultural expansion. This cultural expansion becomes far more conspicuous in Chapter 10 with Cornelius, but is hinted at by the first named character that Peter encounters on his journey—
Aeneas. Peter will claim for himself the status of being premier missionary to the Gentiles (Acts 15:7). However, he seems to be portrayed as following a trajectory that Philip (“one of the Seven”) has pioneered. Like Philip, Peter goes into traditional “allophyle” territory—Lydda, Joppa, Caesarea, “another place”, and back to Caesarea.31

The first clue that Peter is venturing into increasingly Gentile territory comes in the opening of the Petrine section where he finds a man called Aeneas who has been bedridden and paralyzed for eight years. The name “Aeneas” would have been very significant for Luke’s Gentile readers. In Homer’s Iliad, Aeneas was a prince of the royal house of Troy, the son of Anchises and Aphrodite and descendant of Dardanus and Tros. After the Trojan War, Aeneas was the only survivor of the house of Troy. Before the fall of Troy, Poseidon predicted that Aeneas would “rule the men of Troy in power, / his son’s sons and the sons born in future years” (Il. 20.355-56F). But since Troy was destroyed, this enduring kingdom would presumably be continued in another location. A tradition in Roman times credited Aeneas and his son, Ascanius, with the settlement in Italy on the River Tiber of the site that became Rome. Virgil, of course, gave the tradition its classic form in the Aeneid. The ‘Aeneas’ healed in Acts may not be explicitly described as a Gentile, but he bears an auspicious Greek name which Greco-Roman readers could not fail to associate with important new beginnings.32

The next Petrine episode in Acts is the resuscitation of a woman who also bears a Greek name, “Dorcas”—in addition to her Aramaic name, “Tabitha”. Dorcas’s story contains a standard Lukan mimetic instance of honour-by-escort. Two emissaries are sent to invite

---

31 Lydda, Joppa and Caesarea were all within the district of the “five” cities of the Philistines or allophyles mentioned in Josh 13:3, 1 Sam 6:16-17; Jer 25:20MT=32:20LXX; see also 1 Macc 14:35.

32 Several commentators showed a historical interest in Aeneas’s name, affirming that there was Palestinian inscriptive evidence for it as a Jewish name from the second century BCE to the fourth century CE (Barrett, Acts I, p. 480; Witherington, Acts, p. 329; Pervo, Acts, p. 253, n. 16). Surprisingly, I could find no commentators with interest in the name’s conspicuous literary connections. Koet buries a similar thought in his footnotes. B. J. Koet, “Im Schatten des Aeneas: Paulus in Troas (Apg 16,8-10)”, in Luke and His Readers: Festschrift A. Denaux, edited by R. Bieringer, G. Van Belle, and J. Verheyden, Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicorum Lovaniensium 182 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005), p. 433, note 80. I note that Rick Strelan is “becoming increasingly convinced that names in Acts have some significance” (as he notes is the case with Dorcas and Bar-Jesus.) Strelan, Strange Acts, pp. 218-9, 235.
and then to *escort* (or *accompany*) the guest (Peter) to the hosts issuing the invitation (the disciples in Joppa). The sending of emissaries to invite the guest (or sometimes even the hosts’ coming to invite the guest personally) and then the provision of escort to the hosts’ house is a common Lukán motif enacted by a large *dramatis personae*: a Centurion (Luke 7:3,6), Jairus (8:41), someone who gave a great dinner (14:16-17), the father pleading with the son to come into the house and to join the celebration (Luke 15:28), Cornelius (Acts 10:7). In the case of Dorcas, the escort extends not just from Lydda to Joppa, but into an upper-room—a place often associated with great happenings in Acts.

So Peter rose and went with them. And when he had come, they took him to the upper room.

Ἀναστὰς δὲ Πέτρος συνήλθεν αὐτοῖς· ὃν παραγενόμενον ἀνήγαγον εἰς τὸ ὑπερῷον.

These two shorter stories (‘Aeneas’ and ‘Dorcas’) prepare the way for a lengthy third—in the same way as the short parables of ‘The Lost Coin’ and ‘The Lost Sheep’ prepare the way for the third extended parable, ‘The Lost Son’ (*i.e.*, ‘The Father with Two Sons’). The effect is like the aural equivalent to an asymmetrical triptych. The lengthier third story tells how the message of Jesus comes to the household of the Gentile Centurion, Cornelius, and how the Spirit falls upon the Gentile assembly and how they are baptised.

The other testament to the significance of the Cornelius incident is the high degree of hospitality, welcome and escort that is referred to throughout the account and its repetitions. The following is a summary of these numerous references to hospitality, welcome and escort in this episode.

---


34 The location of the Spirit’s descent upon the apostles at Pentecost (Acts 2:1) could be an upper room, if we assume it to be the same place as Acts 1:13; and the location of Eutychus’s fall and the meal that follows the declaration that Eutychus lives, is an upper room (20:8). See also Luke 22:12 which locates the Last Supper in an upper room (which parallels Mark 14:15).
Peter is initially *staying or lodging* with Simon the tanner, and this is mentioned three times (9:43, μεῖναι—“staying”; 10:6, 10:18, 10:32, ξενίζεται—“being the guest of”). Cornelius *sends escorting emissaries* to Peter to *invite* him to Cornelius’ house and to *escort* Peter’s journey to Cornelius’s house. The text repeatedly uses the following three verbs to describe various types of ‘sending’, which often implies ‘escort’:

- ἀποστέλλω, which usually has the sense of “send with a message or invitation” (used six times: 10:8,17,20,36; 11:11,13);
- πέμπω, which similarly means “send out”, often with an invitation and with a connotation of escorting (used three times: 10:5,32,33); and,
- μεταπέμπω, which, of the three verbs, has the greatest sense of “summon and bring the guest” (used five times: 10:5,22,29 twice; 11:13).

Μεταπέμπω certainly includes the idea of escorting the summoned one on the journey to the hosts’ house. Μεταπέμπω could therefore be translated “send for”, except that, because it is sometimes used immediately after πέμπω, the literal translation would result in a clumsy expression like, “Send men to Joppa and send for one Simon” (for Acts 10:5 and, similarly, 11:13). The NRSV removes the clumsiness by contracting this to, “Send men to

35 In relation to Peter’s residency with a tanner, the implied reader (familiar with the LXX) might surmise that Peter may already be facing some pragmatic issues about how to remain faithful to the Torah while in the challenging position of ‘lodging with a tanner’. The work of a tanner would regularly render the tanner, and possibly those who share his table, like Peter, ritually unclean (Lev 5:2; 11:24-25, 39-40). Peter appears to have accepted some degree of latitude about ritual cleanness. Therefore, Peter ought not be so particular about ritual cleanness as to deny hospitality to the Gentile messengers.

36 When Peter is speaking to those who have particular zeal for the law, and does not wish to draw attention to the identity of his host with whom he was lodging (Simon the Tanner), he pragmatically omits this detail from his re-telling at Acts 11:13-14.

37 Cornelius sends the emissaries to Peter—not just the usual two (cf. Luke 7:8 or Acts 9:38), but three—two of his slaves and a devout soldier. Although many witnesses have “three men” (at 10:19), Vaticanus (B) has “two” and many other texts (e.g. Codex Bezae, D) lack a number.

38 The frequent mention of Joppa (Acts 9:36,38,42,43; 10:5,8,23,32; 11:5,13) is the first of several clues that Luke portrays Peter as the new Jonah, being called to take God’s message to the Gentiles.
Joppa for a certain Simon”—but this contraction hides the fact that two imperatives are involved in the angel’s command.  

In addition to the frequent use of these three verbs, a sense of escort is further created by the simple use of “with” (σύν) with various verbs. This episode contains one of the densest occurrences of the mention of invitation sending, escort and gathering together in all Scripture. It is like a great gathering or symposium (in the classical sense), which reaches its expectant readiness by the end of verse 33.

- 10:5a, Now send (πέμψον) men to Joppa
- 10:5, to ‘summon and escort back’ (μετάπεμψαι) one Simon who is called Peter
- 10:8, he sent (ἀπέστειλεν) them to Joppa
- 10:17, behold the men that were sent (ἀπεσταλμένοι) by Cornelius
- 10:20, rise and go down and accompany (πορεύου σύν) them
- 10:20, for I have sent (ἐγὼ ἀπέσταλκα) them
- 10:22, was directed by a holy angel to ‘summon you and escort you back’ (μεταπέμψασθαι σε) to his house
- 10:23, he [Peter] called them in (εἰσκαλεσάμενος)
- 10:23, and gave them lodging (ἐξένισεν)
- 10:23, he rose and went off with them (ἐξῆλθεν σὺν αὐτοῖς)
- 10:23, some of the brethren from Joppa accompanied him (συναντήσας)
- 10:24, Cornelius had called together (συγκαλεσάμενος) his relatives and dear friends
- 10:25, As Peter was coming in (ἐισάλθεν)
- 10:25, Cornelius met (συναντήσας) him
- 10:27, and as he talked with him, he went in (ἐισῆλθεν) [which retrospectively reveals that Cornelius had gone out to meet Peter]

39 The appearance of an angel in the narrative signals to diligent readers the start of something auspicious and new (see footnote 24).

• 10:27, he found many persons gathered (συνεληλυθότας)
• 10:29, so when I was ‘summoned to be escorted here’ (μεταπεμφθείς) I came without objection
• 10:29, I ask then why did you ‘summon me and escort me here’ (μετεπέμψασθέ)
• 10:32, [A man in bright apparel said,] Send (πέμψον) therefore to Joppa…
• 10:32, …and call here (μετακάλεσαι) Simon.
• 10:33, So I sent (ἐπέμψα) to you at once
• 10:33, Now we are all here present (πάρεσμεν) before God

In the retrospective reporting of the incident, back in Jerusalem (11:5-17), sending and escort also figure prominently.

• 11:11, three men arrived… sent (ἀπεσταλμένοι) from Caesarea
• 11:12, the Spirit told me to go with them (συνελθεῖν αὐτοῖς)
• 11:12, These six brothers also accompanied me (ἦλθον … σὺν ἐμοί), [Luke withholds this detail for the final re-telling]
• 11:12, and we entered the man’s house (εἰσήλθομεν εἰς τὸν οἶκον τοῦ ἀνδρός) [Note that Peter tactfully omits Cornelius’s devotional ‘error’]
• 11:13, the angel…saying ‘Send (ἀπόστειλον) to Joppa…
• 11:13, and ‘summon and escort back’ (μεταπέμψαι) Simon called Peter

The chief way in which Luke shows the reader Cornelius’ reception of Jesus and the gospel is the excellence of the hospitality that he extends toward Peter, the bearer of the gospel message. Among the mimetic features of this exemplary hospitality account is escort. That Cornelius sent men to invite and escort Peter’s arrival is mentioned ten times (accounting for thirteen uses of the verbs ἀποστέλλω, πέμπω and μεταπέμπω). The preparations for the reception of Peter and the message he bears include Cornelius’s calling together (συγκαλεσάμενος, 10:24) of relatives and dear friends, so that when Peter comes into the house he finds many persons gathered (συνεληλυθότας, 10:27).

One of the greatest honours that Cornelius shows to Peter is that upon Peter’s arrival, Cornelius goes out to meet Peter. The reader learns that Cornelius had gone out to meet
when the narrator mentions that after the meeting (10:25-26), as Peter talked to Cornelius, Peter went in (εἰσῆλθεν) and discovered many people gathered.41

The hospitality, welcome and escort are not all Cornelius’s initiative. Peter’s reception role is also important. Peter’s response to the invitation is reflective of his response to the Lord. Peter is called to be the Lord’s witness and emissary (1:8), and he is called to accept the invitation and to go with Cornelius’s emissaries (10:20; 11:12). The overcoming of Peter’s reluctance to the Lord’s command in the vision (10:14; 11:8,9) runs parallel to any difficulty he may have as a Jew receiving the invitation and hospitality of a Gentile (10:28,29; 11:3). Peter calls Cornelius’s emissaries in and gives them lodging (10:23). By the principle of ‘honour the emissary, honour the one who sent him,’ Peter is immediately shown to be honouring Cornelius. Peter’s going with the emissaries to Cornelius’s house is another mimetic element showing Peter’s honour of Cornelius (10:23b,29,33).

The narrator encourages the reader to look beyond the actions of human beings in the narrative—the Spirit is portrayed as the ultimate instigator (“accompany them without hesitation, for I have sent them”, 10:20).42 The reader also gets a sense that accompaniment is also an action through which we can see God’s honouring of his son Jesus; when Peter describes the ministry of Jesus (in the speech he gives in Cornelius’ house), he ends his report of what Jesus did in his ministry after his baptism by stating that “as he went about (ὡς διῆλθεν)... God was with him (ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ)” (10:38). Similarly, a criterion for apostleship is to have been accompanying (συνελθόντων, Acts 1:21a) those who the Lord Jesus went in and out amongst (ᾧ εἰσῆλθεν καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐφ’, Acts 1:21b) and who, after Jesus’ resurrection, “ate with” and “drank with” him (οἵτινες συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν, Acts 10:41). “Ate with” recalls the escort of the Emmaus Road. Welcome, hospitality and escort characterise every relationship within the kingdom: between God and Jesus (10:38); Jesus

41 The D Text explicates this subtle feature of the conventional text.
42 Pervo writes, “ἀποστέλλω in the first singular is otherwise used of God or Jesus, but not the Spirit. This is an example of the “interchangeability” of Jesus and the Spirit in Acts.” And he continues in the footnotes (n. 84), “Note that in vv. 5-6 an angel issued the command. At some level, however casual the expression, God is the author of these orders.”
and his witnesses (1:21, 10:38); Jesus’ witnesses and those who respond positively to their message (8:36, 27:43).

The mutual meeting and escort of Cornelius and Peter reflects Peter’s faithfulness as his Lord’s witness and Cornelius’s faithfulness as one who accepts the word and becomes a new disciple of the Lord (10:33, 44; 11:1). This meeting between Jewish emissary and Gentile receiver is vindicated by the falling of the Holy Spirit. The Spirit’s descent is the clinching element of Peter’s defence, when he is asked why he transgressed the boundary between Jew and Gentile (Acts 11:3, 15-18).

Peter’s final words in the episode (“Who was I that I could hinder God”: 11:17b), create two strong intertextual links: i) to Philip’s ministry—a ministry that Peter’s is beginning to resemble; and ii) to the very final word in the Book of Acts that depicts Paul proclaiming the word of God with all boldness and without hindrance.

6.2.5 Beginnings of the Church in Antioch (Acts 11:19-30)

Luke has Saul make a third cameo appearance in association with the description of the church in Antioch. Paul is still at this stage referred to as ‘Saul’. (He will assume the role of the narrative’s main ‘continuity participant’ at roughly the same point at which Luke drops the allonym ‘Saul’ and starts calling him ‘Paul’ at Acts 13:9).

The persecution that disperses “all except the apostles” (8:1)—which is presented as the catalyst for Philip’s journeys to Samaria and beyond (8:4, 5, 26, 40)—caused some disciples to travel to Phoenicia, Cyprus and Antioch (11:19). In conformity to the most common Lukan pattern of evangelisation, these disciples speak first (and exclusively) with Jews in these regions (11:19). However, in Antioch, some disciples from Cyprus and Cyrene witness to ‘Hellenists’, which here refers to Greek-speaking Gentiles. 43

43 There is some ambiguity in the term ‘Hellenist’, as it previously has been used to refer to Greek-speaking Jews. Here, however, the contrast is not to Hebraic Jews but simply Jews, and so the implication is that these are Greek-speaking Gentiles. This would explain why it was necessary to coin a new name (“Christian”) for this mixed community. What the members of this new community had in common was more emphatically “following Jesus” than accepting from a Jewish starting position that Jesus was the Messiah. Antioch is also a centre from which Gentile missions are commissioned (13:1-28).
At this stage, the reader might imagine that the church in Jerusalem would comprise only ‘the twelve’ apostles, plus their most recent converts, and some who had escaped or drifted back from the diaspora mentioned in 8:1, for instance ‘James’ (not the brother of John and therefore not one of ‘the Twelve’) and Mary and her son, John Mark. When the church in Jerusalem hears of the great number of Gentile believers in Antioch, they send Barnabas (3:37, 9:27)—not John and Peter. Note, again, as with Philip’s evangelisation of Samaria, ‘the Twelve’ only ‘hear’ about the evangelisation of the Antiochian Gentiles—they are not portrayed by Luke as instrumental in it. Barnabas’s trip to Antioch goes well. A great many more people are brought to the Lord. What Barnabas does next contains a very significant escort for the most escorted character of Acts—Saul (=Paul) of Tarsus. Barnabas leaves Antioch to go to Tarsus to find Saul and then escort him back. Antioch to Tarsus is a long way to acquire a missional partner (220 km or 136 miles). But long-distance escorts will characterise much of Paul’s journeying throughout Acts.

The section on Antioch concludes with the explanation of the first Christian collection as a way of providing famine relief to believers living in Judea. The famine is predicted by a prophet named Agabus. Since the famine is said to affect the whole world it is unclear why Judea is identified as having the greater need. The sending of famine relief could be seen as an attempt to create diplomatic solidarity of the new Gentile-oriented church centred in Antioch with the Jewish church of Jerusalem and Judea.

The Greek phrase from which most English translations derive “send relief” is actually διακονίαν πέμψαι. Διακονία and the related verb διακόνεω are also often translated as “ministry/minister” or “service/serve”, but its use here (in Acts 11:29) further demonstrates that Luke frequently uses the word in terms of ‘table ministry’ or ministry associated with feeding people. ⁴⁴ Paul, in his writings, had used the words διακονία and

---

⁴⁴ In Luke and Acts there are 19 uses of διακονία (10) and διακόνεω (9). Although they could all be covered by the general term “ministry/minister” or “service/serve”—nine of the 19 definitely have a strong (sometimes explicit) sense of “serve food to people at tables”: Luke 4:39 (Peter’s mother-in-law after her healing); 10:40a&b (Martha’s “much serving”); 12:37 (the unconventional master who serves the faithful servant); 17:8 (the more conventional master who demands to be served); 22:26, 27a and b (Jesus’ explanation of servant leadership in terms of service at table); Acts 6:2 (the apostles’ contempt for waiting at tables). In a
διακονέω similarly to refer to the collection to be taken to Jerusalem and used to “supply the needs of the saints” (Romans 15:25, 15:31; 1 Cor 16:1-5; 2 Cor 8:19,20; 9:1,12-13). The context of the use of the word in Acts 11:29 would also allow the action to be interpreted as an expression of solidarity and table fellowship.

Luke’s use of διακονία in Acts 11:29 (to mean a collection sent to provide famine relief) deserves attention in relation to our focus on escort, because of the significance of sending relief to the believers in a later sections of Acts (Chapters 20 and 21) where escort becomes a very frequent feature of Paul’s final journey to Jerusalem.

Despite the conviction of many commentators (such as Ernst Haenchen) that Luke never mentioned Paul’s collection, my reading suggests that Luke alludes to Paul’s collection frequently in this latter section (Acts 20–21). There is an otherwise inexplicable entourage of representatives from each significant location accompanying Paul on the ‘homeward’ stretch of Paul’s ‘third missionary journey’ (Acts 20:4); there are discussions of διακονία and giving in the farewell to the Ephesians (20:24,33-35); there are many strong intertextual links from Chapter 21 to the transitional section of Acts (Chapter 6-15) in which the Antiochian collection is proposed; there is discussion of the use of money in the proposal that the Jerusalem elders put to Paul upon his arrival in Jerusalem.

further three cases the sense seems to be more about “provisioning” with food (whether daily distribution or what would be more appropriately called ‘famine relief’): Luke 8:3 (the women who provided food and/ or money with which to buy food for Jesus and the other disciples); Acts 6:1 (the Hellenists complaining that their widows were neglected in the daily food distribution); Acts 11:29 (a collection which will enable the provision of food or money with which to buy food on a scale that might more properly be described as ‘aid’ or ‘famine relief’). Links to this last example might also establish three more references, if collection and famine relief is what is being referred to in Acts 12:25 (certainly a reference to 11:29-30), Acts 20:24 (which would explain 20:33-35). Similarly the mention of “ministry” in Acts 1:17 and Acts 1:25 may refer back to Luke 22:26-7—for nowhere else does Jesus commission “ministry” in Luke or Acts. The possibility is that these more general references (Acts 1:17,25; 12:25; 20:24; 21:19) may refer more generally to “ministry” or “mission” (mission seems to be a strong possibility in 1:25; 12:25; 20:24). Nevertheless, we have at least twelve, possibly seventeen, of the nineteen references to ministry or service in Luke and Acts, referring to the provision of food. This only leaves Acts 19:22 where Luke refers to two of Paul’s companions as his ministering ones (διακονούντων).

45 Acts 21:8 picks up Philip whom we left at 8:40; Acts 21:10 picks up the story of Agabus who prophesied the original famine which initiated the διακονία (relief collection) in 11:27-30; Acts 21:19–20 alludes to 14:27 (the end of the first mission which begins and ends in Antioch) and 15:4 (the occasion on which this first Antiochian mission was reported to Jerusalem).
(21:23-26); in a later defence speech, Paul refers to having “brought alms” to his “nation” (24:17); and governor Felix is portrayed as convinced that Paul has access to significant financial resources when he sends for him often in hope of a bribe (24:26). Lastly, there is the otherwise inexplicable zeal on Paul’s part to make the final journey to Jerusalem in the face of a great amount of godly counsel urging him not to go to Jerusalem (21:4b, 11-12, 14). All these features make very little sense unless understood in the context of a ‘scaled up’ version of the Antiochian collection, whereby Paul (in Chapter 20–21) brings funds from many of the new and predominantly-Gentile churches (of Galatia, Asia, Macedonia and Greece) to Jerusalem. These subtle but frequent references to the collection (both as famine relief and expression of Gentile-Jewish solidarity in the church) reflect a Lukan conviction about the importance of ministry to bodies as well as minds, as well as a Lukan conviction about the justice of re-distributing wealth and resources. Luke’s dedication to depicting escort, meeting and hospitality (including shared meals) reflects similar convictions—the message of Jesus is communicated by embodied emissaries to embodied recipients.

When, at the conclusion of the Antioch section (11:19-30), the Antiochian disciples decide to send the διακονία to Jerusalem with Barnabas and Saul, it as if they are sending an invitation to join in table-fellowship with the increasingly Gentile church in Antioch. The implication of this challenge will not be faced squarely until Chapter 15—the Council in Jerusalem.

6.2.6 Peter’s Escape from Prison (Acts 12:1-25)—in the setting of Herod’s imperial behaviour

Luke begins a new episode by shifting the location back to Jerusalem, where King Herod is persecuting the church. Like other persecutors of the church, Herod provides rough escorts for the leaders of the church, particularly those of ‘the Twelve.’ After executing James, Herod arrests Peter. Peter’s eventual escape with the escort of an angel contrasts
with the dishonourable escorts he receives from Herod and which Herod has in mind for him.  

Herod seizes Peter and puts him in prison and delivers him to four ‘quaternion’ of soldiers (a total of sixteen guards). Herod intends to bring Peter (ἀναγαγεῖν αὐτὸν) to the people after the Passover. It is on the very night before Herod was ‘about to bring him forth’ (ἡμελλὲν προαγαγεῖν) that the angel of the Lord escorts Peter’s escape. The angel commands Peter to follow (ἀκολούθει) him. Despite believing himself to be having a vision, Peter dutifully follows (ἐξελθὼν ἠκολούθει) him. Verse 10 continues to describe their escape journey together: passing through the first and second guards; coming to the iron gate that led into the city; their going outside; and going down a street. At this point, the angel immediately departs. Peter comes to himself, realising that “the Lord sent [ἐξαπέστειλεν] his angel and rescued me.”

MacDonald finds the escort of Peter by the angel very evocative of Homer’s tale of Priam’s visit to Achilles escorted by Hermes. Original Lukan readers may very well have picked up some of the similarities, particularly the miraculous elements which, in both stories, support the idea that the gods (for Luke, ‘God’) desired the journey to be successful.

Later, at Mary’s house, Peter describes the escape as how the Lord had brought him out (ἐξήγαγεν) of prison. Ἐξάγω—which occurs only once in Luke’s Gospel and eight times in Acts—is the word used of the apostles’ earlier escape from prison (Acts 5:19) and of Jesus’ action at the end of the Third Gospel (Luke 24:50). As was noted earlier, ἐξάγω is

46 The angel’s escort of Peter from the prison also contrasts the macabre use of “escort” in relation to the sixteen guards who ‘lost’ Peter. Herod ordered them “to be led away” (ἀποχθῆναι) or “led up”, i.e. executed. Three times in Acts, Luke refers to the practice of executing guards for losing their prisoners (presumably an incentive not to fail in their duty)—Acts 12:19, 16:27, 7:42. The angel’s escort contrasts with the dishonourable ‘escorts’ that Herod had in mind for Peter and the “leading away” (execution) of the guards.

47 Codex Bezae at this point has one of its more eccentric additions—that Peter and the angel who was escorting him went down seven steps.

48 Sudden departure of the divine guest is a very common ending of theoxeny narratives.


In terms of hospitality conventions, Peter’s experience at the door at Mary’s house leaves a lot to be desired. Firstly, there is Rhoda’s failure to let Peter in (even, if the cause of the oversight is her joy at hearing his voice!) Note also that there is no mention of Peter’s entry of the house. Hence, when he is leaving for “another place” there is no mention of his ‘leaving’ the house. A redactors detection of the omission perhaps accounts for the D Texts restoration of an entry. Pervo also notices the omission from the conventional text, “The narrator does not even report Peter’s entry. One might expect his reception and a general celebration (cf. 4:23–31).”

Pervo’s invitation to compare 4:23–31 makes an apt point. The lack of entry and reception creates the impression of a rift opening between Peter—with his new attitude, from his transformative experiences and his going “to another place”—and the church in Jerusalem.

God’s saving escort of Peter seems intended to indicate divine approbation of the apostle’s call to witness and to his uniqueness among the Twelve for doing so in an itinerant manner. Peter’s “going here and there among all believers” (9:32) has been instrumental in taking the good news to the first Gentile group (10:1–11:18; note the “many”—πολλούς—assembled in Cornelius’s house in 10:27). The final words about Peter in Acts (apart from his testimony in the middle of the council at Jerusalem, 15:7b–11) are that Peter wants James and the Jerusalem “brothers” to know of this act of approbation. The narrator concludes by reminding us of Peter’s itinerant mission, writing, “Then he left and went to another place.” (12:17). This final portrayal of Peter is of one who has begun to understand the implication of being faithful to Jesus’ call to witness to the ends of the earth—Peter will need to become itinerant and ‘go on the road’.

---


51 Pervo (Acts, pp. 308-316) reads Peter’s imprisonment and escape as a symbolic representation of the death and resurrection of Peter. This symbolic interpretation makes great sense of what appears to be Luke’s invitation to make comparisons (syncrisis) between Rhoda (12:13–15) and the women whom the apostles would not believe regarding Christ’s resurrection (Luke 24:11). The parallels between the women of Luke 24:11 and Rhoda are several. The narrator shows the readers enough beforehand so that they know that the women
The broader section (12:1-12:24) has a coda—about the death of Herod—which makes a comment about the way food was used in the Empire as an agent of control. The people of Tyre and Sidon seek reconciliation with King Herod "because their country depended on the king's country for food". The whole of the broader section is then revealed to be surrounded by an inclusio about Barnabas and Saul who had taken διακονία (in the form of famine relief) to the believers in Jerusalem (inclusio: 11:27-30 and 12:25). The inclusio invites a comparison between how the church uses food (to foster a voluntary solidarity across diversity) and how the empire uses food (as an instrument of control to keep vassal states obedient and deferential). An angel of the Lord, possibly the one who has honoured Peter with an escorted escape from Herod's imprisonment, makes a re-appearance to judge the imperial system and its blasphemous forms of manipulated deference by striking Herod dead (10:22-23). The Christian practice of redistributing resources and providing relief to those in need is portrayed as opposed to the imperial systems of control.

The collections (both the earlier one from Antioch and the Pauline one from Asia-Minor, Macedonia and Greece) necessitate many of the escorts we observe in Acts.

Note the contrast when the crowd attributes deity to Herod and he does not deny it—Herod is judged and is struck dead by an angel of the Lord (Acts 12:22-23)—but when the Maltese attribute deity to Paul and he does not deny it—Paul lives (Acts 28:6). The contrast strengthens the possibility that Luke is implying that because of the 'reception principle' set out in Luke 10:16, those who treat Jesus' emissaries as divine—shown by the way they receive the emissaries—are making a 'vicarious' attribution (Acts 10:25, 14:11, 28:6). Therefore their behaviour, though technically idolatrous, is appropriate. The contrast also strengthens the perception of Luke's counterstatement to Imperial propaganda—Jesus' emissaries are more worthy of imperial-style accolades than the actual Imperial leaders.

are reliable witnesses. In both cases, the testimony is not believed by other characters in the narrative. These skeptical characters eventually come to see for themselves that the women were indeed telling the truth. (This allows readers the delight of being able to imagine the reliable female characters of the text replying in smug soliloquy—"I told them so!")
### 6.2.7  Mission from Antioch to Antioch (Acts 13:1–14:28) on the ‘First’ Journey

Chapters Thirteen and Fourteen represent a unit based around a missionary journey that begins and ends in Antioch (13:1,4; 14:26-28). Along the way there are several intersections with the theme of reception and escort: the sending out of two emissaries—Barnabas and Saul (13:4); Saul’s response to the false-prophet Bar-Jesus (a man who, like Saul on the Damascus Road, will be blinded and need to be led by the hand; 13:11); and the wealth of allusions to escorting in Paul’s first quoted sermon, including reference to the episodes involving King David and the King Saul, episodes in which escorting the fugitive king of Israel is a prominent motif (Acts 13:16b-41).\(^{52}\) It is in this section of Acts that Saul comes out from under Barnabas’s shadow. In 13:9, Luke reveals for the first time Saul’s better-known name “Paul”. From this point Luke only uses the name “Paul”.\(^{53}\) Up until now, the most common way of referring to the duo was “Barnabas and Saul”. From here on “Paul and Barnabas” is the far more common ordering.

Paul’s first action as “Paul” is the judgement of a magician named Bar-Jesus (or Elymas). Luke depicts this judgement as the action of one filled with the Holy Spirit, but the portrait of the blinded false-prophet is uncannily like Paul immediately after his encounter with Jesus on the Road to Damascus. After Paul’s encounter he was led by the hand (χειραγωγοῦντες) when he was brought to Damascus (9:8). When Paul pronounces that Elymas will be “blind for a time, unable to see the sun”, surely enough, darkness overcomes him and he goes about seeking someone “to lead him by the hand” (ἐζήτει χειραγωγούς).

Several times throughout Acts, apostles whom we know to have made great errors and to have been the recipients of great forgiveness (second-chances) participate in acts of

---

\(^{52}\) Luke’s explicit reference to the removal of Saul, the Benjaminite, and his replacement by David, explain why, of all the passages featuring escort in the more narrative sections of the LXX—I chose three from 1 and 2 Samuel which touch on the dynastic ‘succession’ (see Section 2.2).

\(^{53}\) Only in analeptic references (“flashbacks”) to Saul’s encounter with Jesus on the road to Damascus (and references to Saul at the house of Ananias) is Paul ever referred to as “Saul” (and then, only in the direct speech of his own character) after Acts Chapter 13 (Acts 22:7; 22:13; 26:14).
strong condemnation, for example Peter's condemnation of Ananias and Sapphira (5:1-11) and Peter's judgement of the magician, Simon (8:18-24). In all these cases, the narrator is reticent. Counter to the hagiographic interpretations of these passages (which uncritically support the actions of the apostles), I wonder whether Luke allows space for interpreting these moments as lapses in the apostolic obligation to bring release, second-chances and forgiveness to others. No one speaks to Elymas in the way that Jesus addresses Paul on the Damascus Road.\textsuperscript{54} No one acts like the Ananias who brought good news and healing to Paul while he resided in the house in the Street called Straight. It may be that the unsatisfied seeking by this deceitful villain for someone to lead him by the hand may in fact be a lapse—a failing to announce good news and the opportunity for repentance on behalf of Paul.

Why does Luke wait until 13:9 to use Paul's more familiar name? The question is worth pursuing because the answer has relevance to Paul and escort. Paul's frequently fugitive state necessitates escort in the same way that King David's fugitive state—fleeing another Saul—necessitates escort. In both Acts and the intertext referred to in Paul's first sermon—1 and 2 Samuel—escorting the messiah (or the messiah's emissary) demonstrates loyalty to the Messiah (see Section 2.2).

Very little has been written about Luke's use of the otherwise unattested allonym for Paul—“Saul”.\textsuperscript{55} This is a surprising omission in the secondary literature given that there is an obvious namesake for the allonym in the Old Testament—Saul, the first king of Israel. The omission is more perplexing since King Saul, the son of Kish, is mentioned only once

\textsuperscript{54} In the encounter with Elymas is the reader meant to suspect that Paul remembers his own experience of radical transformation after being initially misguided? There seems to be little support for that hypothesis in the text. The text could be read to suggest the exact opposite—that Paul suffers from amnesia about his similar past experience. At the least, one could say that Paul seems to lack empathy and compassion (upon one who ought to make him think, “There, but for the grace of God, go I”).

\textsuperscript{55} None of Paul's letters attest the allonym “Saul”. Sean M. McDonough also notes the unusual proximity of the only occurrence of the name “Saul of Kish” just after the name change of Saul of Tarsus, and has written a paper about why Paul may have chosen the name “Paul”, which means “little” or “small” in Latin, as a sign of Paul's allegiance with “little” David's messianic offspring. Sean M McDonough, ”Small Change: Saul to Paul, Again”, Journal of Biblical Literature 125 (2006): pp. 390-391.
in the NT and *that* reference follows on just twelve verses after Luke ceases to call Paul “Saul” in Acts, in the middle of Paul’s first sermon to be reported in direct speech (13:9,21).

Then they asked for a king; and God gave them Saul the son of Kish, a man of the tribe of Benjamin, for forty years. And when he had removed him, he raised up David to be their king (Acts 13:21-22a).

The quotation explicates another connection between the two “Sauls”. King Saul was known to be of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Sam 9:1)—and according to two of Paul’s letters, Paul was also of the tribe of Benjamin (Rom 11.1; Phil 3:5). Another connection between the two “Sauls” is that they were both persecutors of the Lord’s ‘anointed king’ (or ‘messiah’)—Acts 9:4, 22:7, and 26:14. The implied reader, familiar with the LXX, would recall that, for a large proportion of 1 and 2 Samuel, David is “in exile”. In 1 Samuel, David is fleeing from Saul, and in 2 Samuel, David is fleeing Absalom his son, but the “exile” is rumoured to have the support of pro-Saulides (2 Sam 16:3).

For much of 1 Samuel, King Saul persecutes “the Lord’s messiah” (1 Sam 16:1,13) and his travelling companions (from 1 Sam 18:8 through to the 31st chapter of 1 Samuel, when Saul is killed in battle). Persecuting the messiah and his travelling followers (those who

---

56 Mephibosheth was Saul’s grandson. According to Zîba, Mephibosheth celebrated David’s exile. Josephus in Antiquities (in the stories of David’s exile during the coup of Absalom, Antiq. 7.9.3.205-7.9.4.208) makes the Saulide connections of David’s detractors much more explicit than the scriptural account (2 Sam 16:1-4). See sections 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

57 There is very little discussion of the name “Saul” in commentaries on Acts. Witherington makes the point that the name is not attested anywhere else in the NT, and continues “some possible confirmation that it is correct is that Paul says he was of the tribe of Benjamin (Phil. 3:5).” Barrett makes the general observation that “Paul” does not represent a later change in name but an alternative name (Barrett, Acts, vol. 1, p. 616). Barrett also observes that in Acts 13:9 (when Luke first mentions the Roman name “Paul”) that “there may be more to be gained by asking why Luke had hitherto used the name Saul; the answer may be that he wished to show that the well-known Christian Paul had deep roots in Judaism. This, he may have considered, was now [by Acts 13:9] sufficiently demonstrated.” (Barrett, Acts, vol. 1, p. 616). Witherington writes about the introduction of the name Paul (in Acts 13:9), “Luke has now introduced the name at this juncture because now Paul will be dealing with Gentiles and will accordingly want to use his Roman name in doing so.” Similarly L.T. Johnson comments that Paul’s Roman name, “may simply be given now because this is the moment when Paul enters definitively into the world of Hellenistic culture.” (Johnson, Acts, p. 227). See also Sean M McDonough, “Small Change: Saul to Paul, Again,” Journal of Biblical Literature 125 (2006): 390-91.

While much discussion has focused on why Luke changes Paul’s name at Acts 13:9, very little comment has been made upon the literary effect of Paul’s Semitic name being given as “Saul” in the first place. The closest a commentator comes to remarking on the coincidence of the two “Sauls” is Barrett (Barrett, Acts,
belong to the “Way”) is just what Saul of Tarsus does (9:1-2 “still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord”; 9:4 “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?”). And so from a literary perspective ‘Saul’ is the perfect name for Paul’s character. The Saulides persecute David the messiah—it makes sense that a Benjaminite named ‘Saul’ would persecute Jesus whom God brought to Israel of David’s posterity (13:23).

As we saw in the second chapter of Part A of this dissertation (Section 2.2.2), the account of King David’s escape from Jerusalem in 2 Samuel establishes a link between escorting the messiah and loyalty. Those who remain loyal to David escort his departure from the city: Ittai the Gittite (from Gath and therefore an allophyle), Abiathar, Zadok, Hushai and Ziba. These passages from 2 Samuel also establish the cultural convention that those who come out to meet (especially those who hurry out to be the first to greet) pay great honour to the one who is coming.

The irony is that Saul of Tarsus turns from being a persecutor of the messiah and his followers, to joining them. And following his “turnaround” experience, Paul immediately becomes a persecuted fugitive, as we saw in Section III of this chapter (6.2.3), which examined Paul’s first two narrow-escapes. As readers learn to see connections between the two “Sauls” in Chapter 13 (13:9,21,22,27), they retrospectively reflect on the escorted narrow escapes of Paul, particularly the one from Jerusalem, and recall David’s narrow escapes, particularly his one from Jerusalem (2 Sam 15:13–16:14). Having realised the connection between the two “Sauls” (both persecutors of the Messiah) the implied reader realises another connection between their “replacements”. King Saul’s replacement is King

---

58 Koet and Strelan both express the view that names in Acts have symbolic significance. Koet, “Im Schatten des Aeneas”, p. 433, note 80; Strelan, Strange Acts, pp. 218-9, 235.
59 The last named “faithful escorter” of David (Ziba) may have had an ulterior pecuniary motive for his honouring gesture which becomes clearer at 2 Sam 19:24-30.
David (Acts 13:22); and it is through David’s story that LXX readers learn the connection between *escort* and *loyalty*. The “replacement” of Saul of Tarsus is Paul the follower of Jesus. In his first sermon, Paul describes Jesus as a Saviour whom God has brought (ἦγαγεν)—not the usual ‘sent’—to Israel as a descendant of David (Acts 13:23). God is portrayed in Acts as ‘accompanying salvation’: in Acts 10:38, where Peter speaks of God accompanying Jesus; in 13:23, where Paul speaks of God bringing the Saviour to Israel; and earlier in 13:17, when Paul speaking of the Exodus from Egypt, says, “with uplifted arm God led them out (ἐξήγαγεν) of it”.

Like David, who knew exile and opposition from Israel, and like Jesus, who knew condemnation from Israel (Acts 13:27), Paul, after his ‘turnaround’, experienced a fugitive life of narrow escapes. As with the *escorts* provided to David, we are able to see through instances of escorting Paul those who are loyal to him. By the principle enunciated in Luke 10:16, readers are also able to see who is loyal to Jesus and, therefore, to the reception of the Word of God.

6.2.8  *The Council and the Letter (Acts 15:1-41)*

By Chapter Fifteen, the reader is so accustomed to leaving the story of Paul to resume some other character’s story that it is easy to think of the council of Jerusalem in the same way. On the contrary, the council is very much an incident about ‘Paul and Barnabas’ (the naming order in which Luke now places them, Acts 15:2a, 15:2b, 15:22, 15:35, although the council still ‘hear’ them and speak about them as ‘Barnabas and Paul’). Paul and Barnabas are chief witnesses at the council, and the entire episode is ‘included’ (or ‘bookended’) by references to the *escort* of Paul and Barnabas, to and from Jerusalem (Acts 15:3, 22, 25, 30).  

---

60 Scholars with a more historical interest have the dilemma that Paul in Galatians appears to deny being involved in more than a “private meeting with the acknowledged leaders” (Gal 2:2) but that Luke says there was a multitude (πλῆθος) at the meeting (Acts 15:12). It is possible that Paul and Luke refer to different meetings. For further discussion see Barrett, *Acts*, p. 21xxxix. Taylor finds historical credibility in the Lukian account. “Paul is no less tendentious than Luke when defending the legitimacy of his apostleship by his total autonomy from the twelve of Jerusalem; the Lukian need to draw a link of continuity between the converted (Saul) and the Twelve is equally compelling.” Justin Taylor, “The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15:20, 29 and 21:25) and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-14)”, *New Testament Studies* 46 (2001): pp. 372-380.
Paul and Barnabas are *brought on their way* (προπέμψθεντες) to Jerusalem by the church at Antioch. The *NRSV* and *RSV* express this as “sent on their way” but there are several good reasons to translate it “brought on their way” which implies that at least some of their thitherward journey was escorted.

---

**Excursus: On the Meaning of Προπέμπω and Cognates in Acts, Pauline Letters, the Septuagint and Joseph and Aseneth**

The other two uses of προπέμπω in Acts give a strong indication that in those contexts an onward journey was partly escorted. In Acts 20:38, the consensus among English translations is that the Ephesian elders *escorted* Paul to his ship (*KJV* and *NIV* “accompanied”; *NRSV* and *RSV* “brought”). In Acts 21:5, the consensus is that the disciples from Tyre, with their wives and children, *escorted* Paul and his companions out of the city and as far as the beach where they prayed and said farewell before Paul and his companions boarded their ship (*KJV* and *RSV* “brought us on our way”, *NIV* “accompanied us”, *NRSV* “escorted us”). In the three uses of προπέμπω in authentic Pauline letters, the *KJV* preserves the sense of escort (Rom 15:24—“to be brought on my way”; 1 Cor 16:11—“but conduct him forth in peace”; 1 Cor 16:6—“may bring me on my journey”). In these Pauline uses of προπέμπω, the *RSV* uses “speed”, the *NRSV* uses “send”; and the *NIV* uses “assist” (Rom 15:24), “help” (1 Cor 16:11), and “send” (1 Cor 16:11). The provision of assistance for the onward journey is part of the way in which the “sending” is made effective—and that assistance most frequently takes the form of escort (which assures a safe start) although other forms of assistance include the giving of provisions for the journey (food or money).

Escort is clearly implicit in the meaning of the word προπέμπω in 1 Esdras and Judith from the Deuterocanonical sections of the LXX. In 1 Esdras 4:47, Darius “wrote letters for Zerubbabel to all the treasurers, governors, generals and satraps,
that they should give escort to him and all who were going up with him to build Jerusalem.” (RSV; the NRSV and NETS have “should give safe conduct”). In 1 Esdras 5:1 we see the enacting of the “escorted sending” when Darius sent Zerubbabel and his companions with one thousand horsemen to take them back to Jerusalem in safety.\(^{61}\) In Judith 10:15, an Assyrian patrol met Judith and part of what they said to her was “some of us will escort (προπέμψουσίν) you” (RSV, NRSV and NETS). “Escort” is clearly preferable to “send” in this context, as Judith 10:17 reads “They choose from their number a hundred men to accompany her and her maid” (RSV and NRSV).

In the LXX translation of the Pentateuch, συμπροπέμπω appears to be the preferred synonymous form of προπέμπω: the word only occurs twice in the LXX in Genesis 12:30 and Genesis 18:16. Genesis 12:30 describes Abram’s ‘rehearsal-in-miniature’ of the story of Israel’s journey to Egypt and the Exod. After plagues afflict Pharaoh and his house, he commanded his men “concerning Abram to join in escorting (συμπροπέμψαι) him and his wife and all that he had and Lot with him” (NETS). The Wisdom of Solomon attests to the same idea in relation to what sounds very much like the Egyptian’s sending out of the Hebrews, “How, having given permission to be away and having eagerly sent them on their way (προπέμψαντες), they would change their minds and pursue them.” (Wisdom 19:2, NETS). In Gen 18:16, Abraham (the OT paragon of hospitality) escorts the onward journey of his guests, “And when the men had set out from there, they looked down upon the face of Sodoma and Gomorra, and Abraam was going along with them as he joined in escorting them.” (συνεπορεύετο μετ’ αὐτῶν συμπροπέμπων αὐτοὺς) (Wis 19:2, NETS).

I would argue that προπέμπω (and the synonyms συμπροπέμπω) have the primary sense of “speed” or “send-off”, but in a context in which escort (at least at the

\(^{61}\) 1 Esdras 5:1 is an apt example of an extravagant cavalcade similar to the escort that Luke portrays as extended to Paul by the empire (Acts 23:23).
beginning of the onward journey) is an assumed part of the cultural script (convention) for being “sent-off”. Therefore, the best translation of προπέμπω is “brought on their way” or “escorted on their way”. A second implicit feature, which I would argue is frequently assumed by the use of the word προπέμπω, is the provision of gifts (other than safe escort) such as money or food for the journey. The use of συμπροπέμπω (and in some manuscripts προπέμπω and in others συνοδεύω, “travel with”) in Joseph and Aseneth (JosAs 22:11) also supports the assertion that the word implies escort (see the section on Joseph and Aseneth, 2.4). The longer text, accepted as the original by Christoph Burchard, includes a section about “sending-off” and the failure to accompany.

Only Simeon and Levi, Joseph’s brothers, the sons of Leah, escorted them [Joseph and Aseneth] on their way, (JosAs 22:11a)
καὶ συμπροέπεμψαν αὐτοὺς Συμεῶν καὶ Λευὶς οἱ ἀδελφὸι Ἰωσὴφ οἱ υἱοὶ Λίας μόνοι,
but the sons of Zilpah and Bilhah (the slaves of Leah and Rachel) did not accompany them because they envied them and were hostile against them. (JosAs 22:11b)
οἱ δὲ υἱοὶ Ζέλφασ καὶ Βάλλας τῶν παιδισκῶν Λίας καὶ ᾿Ραχήλ οὐ συμπροέπεμψαν αὐτοὺς διότι ἐφθόνουν καὶ ἤχθραινον αὐτοῖς.

The connection made explicit by this sentence from Joseph and Aseneth makes a very strong case for failure to escort being a serious omission. According to the cultural conventions, the implied reader would interpret the failure to provide escort as suggesting that the potential hosts envied (φθονέω) or had hatred toward (ἐχθραίνω) the potential guests.

The escort of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem by the church of Antioch (Acts 15:3) signifies that these two men are honoured and respected by the church. But how will Paul and Barnabas and their news of Gentile conversions to faith in Jesus be received by the church in Jerusalem? The question arises in the mind of the reader after they hear that Paul and Barnabas have no small dissension with some men who came down from Judea.
teaching, “Unless you are circumcised according to the custom of Moses, you cannot be saved” (15:1). The initial response of the church appears positive, although it is only communicated diegetically in summary form—“they were welcomed (παρεδέχθησαν) by the church and the apostles and the elders” (15:4)—so the reader does not get a mimetic picture of how warm the welcome proved to be.

The quality of the reception is dampened somewhat by the interjection of some from the sect of the Pharisees who stand and assert, “It is necessary to circumcise them, and to command them to keep the Law of Moses” (15:5). The Council’s consideration of whether Gentile believers had to keep all the Jewish laws had consequences for hospitality between believers of Jewish origin and believers of Gentile origin. After much debate (15:7), and hearing the testimonies of Peter (15:7-11), and of Barnabas and Paul (1:12), James reached a decision. The few “essentials” that the apostles and elders recommended to the Gentiles (Acts 15:20,28,29)—abstaining from what has been sacrificed to idols, from eating meat with blood still in it, from eating what has been strangled and from fornication—would facilitate Gentile-Jewish table fellowship.

The apostles, the elders and the whole church chose men from among themselves to escort (“to send with” πέμψαι... σὺν) Paul and Barnabas (15:22) as they take the letter to the Gentile believers. The letter reiterates the same commitment to send men with “our beloved” (15:25) Barnabas and Paul “who have risked their lives for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ” (15:26). This again substantiates a connection between high regards, good will and escort. To be clear, the escort is not merely to communicate good will and provide safety, but also so that Judas and Silas can add the strength of their witness to the pronouncement contained in the letter carried by Paul and Barnabas (“who themselves will tell you the same thing by word of mouth”). After hearing the letter itself, the reader is told, “they [Barnabas, Paul, Judas and Silas] were released (ἀπολυθέντες) and went down to Antioch” (15:30).

Just as the Pharisees’ interjection dampens the mood of this reception scene (Acts 15:4-5), so too their interjection dampens the mood of Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem (Luke19:38-39).
The positive response of the church in Antioch to the decision by the church in Jerusalem allows one last echoing of the connection between good will and escort; rejoicing at the exhortation (15:31), they “see off” or “release” (ἀπελύθησαν) “with peace” (μετ᾿ εἰρήνης) the emissaries back to Jerusalem, “to the ones who had sent them” (πρὸς τοὺς ἀποστείλαντας αὐτούς, Acts 15:34).


6.2.9.1 Breaking up with Barnabas

Paul’s break-up with Barnabas is an event surrounded by instances of escort and non-escort. The disagreement centres upon John called Mark. Barnabas wanted to take him with (συμπαραλαβεῖν) them (Acts 15:36). But Paul decided not to take with them (μὴ συμπαραλαμβάνειν) one who had departed from them (ἀποστάντα) and who had not accompanied (μὴ συμπαραλαμβάνειν) them in the work (v. 38). The sharp disagreement (παροξυσμὸς) between Barnabas and Paul causes them to part company (v. 39a). Barnabas took (παραλαβόντα) Mark and sailed to Cyprus (v. 39b). Paul chose Silas and went through Syria and Cilicia (vv. 40-41)—Paul presumably went with the letter which was also addressed to the Gentile believers in those places (15:23). This brief account of the split between Barnabas and Paul (15:36-41) also emphasises the connection between good will and escort. Paul questioned Mark’s character or intention because he had ceased to accompany them early in the first mission (13:1–14:28; 13:13). Barnabas’s preparedness to give Mark a second chance (or not to interpret the departure as Paul had) expresses itself in the continued companionship of Barnabas and Mark.

With his new companion, Silas, Paul returns to some of the places that he and Barnabas visited in the first journey (Derbe, Lystra, Iconium—16:1-5). But then they continue further west into ‘new’ territory as far as Troas (Homer’s ‘Troy’) where they set sail for Neapolis, from which they travel to Philippi (16:12). This is the beginning of a journey that will continue through Thracia, Macedonia and Achaia (Greece). Going into new territory is to be read as a good and obedient action in the light of Jesus’ final command to witness
to the “ends of the earth.” Very early in these new Hellenic territories the reader discovers *hospitality, reception* and *escort* again coming to the forefront of the narrative.

### 6.2.9.2 In Philippi

Narrative time slows down in Acts 16:13-40—Luke dedicates considerable space to Paul’s stay in Philippi. Paul and Silas and their message are very well *received* by a woman called Lydia (16:14: “listening”, “listening eagerly”). In terms of hospitality, the motif of *encounters with women by a river* (or any source of water) *outside the city gate* is a standard element in hospitality scenes both biblical and Homeric (Gen 24:11; *Od.* 5.85-126—Odysseus on the beach with the Phaeacian princess Nausicaa). Lydia invites Silas and Paul to “come and stay” at her house (*εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μένετε*). The hospitality in Lydia’s house forms an *inclusio* (16:15; 16:40) around the more dramatic incidents concerning the slave-girl with the Pythian spirit and the incarceration of Paul and Silas in the Philippian jail (16:16-39).

The more dramatic incident begins when Paul and his companions “meet [*ὑπαντῆσαι*] a slave girl”. Recalling the great diversity of scenarios (positive and negative) that follow on from OT “meetings” (see Section 2.1 in this dissertation), the implied reader with a knowledge of the LXX would not be surprised that there are ambiguous elements in this slave-girl’s behaviour.\(^\text{64}\)

---

\(^{63}\) See Andrew E. Arterbury’s “Breaking the Betrothal Bonds: Hospitality in John 4.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (1), 2010, pp. 63-83, especially note pp. 71-74 in relation to the connection between hospitality scenes (including, but not limited to, betrothal scenes) and sources of water in Greco-Roman and biblical literature.

\(^{64}\) She followed (*κατακολουθοῦσα*) Paul and his companions. The only other following described with *κατακολουθεῖ* is of Jesus’ faithful women companions who came with him from Galilee and who “followed” Joseph to see the tomb (Luke 23:55). Even though the slave girl is said to prophesy by a spirit associated with a pagan god (the Pythian spirit was associated with Apollo), she makes an accurate and seemingly faithful statement of the good news, “These men are slaves of the Most High God, who proclaim to you [Codex Bezae: “us”] a way of salvation.” As a woman slave who speaks a true prophetic word, her depiction invites comparison with the prophetic slave-women foretold by the prophet Joel, as quoted by Peter in his first sermon (Acts 2:18: “Even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.”—from Joel 2:28-29).
The reader seems forced to conclude that the slave-girl’s following of Paul and her status as God’s prophetic slave-girl must be a mockery or parody of the fulfilment of Joel’s words (Acts 2:18), because Paul becomes annoyed with the slave-woman and orders the spirit to come out of her.

The release from the spirit may be good news for the girl, but the reader was told earlier that the girl together with the spirit that possessed her brought her owners a great deal of money through fortune telling. The loss of the hope of making money motivates the slave’s masters to accuse Paul and Silas before the authorities. Economic gain is what Luke portrays as people’s motive for their attachment to idolatry or the Imperial structures (e.g. Acts 19:25; 24:26). Paul and Silas receive a rough escort—the slave’s masters took them (ἐπιλαβόμενοι) and dragged them (εἵλκυσαν) to the market place; and they brought (προσαγαγόντες) them before the magistrates. These rough escorts contrast with the remaining two escorts of the section—the jailer’s compassionate escort of Paul and Silas out of the prison and to his house, and the exonerating escort that the magistrates are compelled to provide Paul and Silas—ironically, because of Imperial consideration—when it is realised that they have wrongly punished and imprisoned Roman citizens.

The Philippian jailer’s compassionate escort follows a divine happening. The reader is accustomed to apostles being rescued supernaturally whenever they are jailed (cf. Acts 5:19, 12:7-10); the extension of a similar rescue to Paul appears to confirm his apostolic status or, at least, to place Paul’s mission in continuity with the apostolic mission of the original apostles. Paul deserves this as he is demonstrating his obedience to the apostolic command of Acts 1:8. Chains falling off and doors opening (either with the help of an angel or of their own accord) are familiar from the previous apostolic jailbreaks (chains—12:7; doors opening—5:19, 12:10). However, a new variation is that the escorting

65 Although even on this point (that exorcism is good news for the slave) commentators disagree. Feminist commentators point out that the girl is both marginalised, disempowered and now, in addition, of little economic worth as an oracle. Her future as a non-fortune-telling slave might be prostitution or hard labour. See Gail R. O’Day’s comments in O’Day, Acts, p. 311.
role (till now taken by an angel) in this account is taken by the jailer—an agent, not of the Lord, but of the Imperial system.

The jailer’s contemplation of suicide makes sense because it is known that jailers and guards were held responsible for the crimes of those who escaped (see 12:19 and 27:42). Paul’s assurance that the jailer had in fact lost none of his prisoners averts the suicide and ‘saves’ the jailer’s life. It is then that the jailer escorts Paul and Silas, bringing them out of the prison (προαγαγὼν αὐτοὺς ἔξω). The jailer takes Paul and Silas to his home where he and his entire household hear the word of the Lord and receive it. The jailer’s reception of the word expresses itself (is ‘shown’) by his escort of and hospitality to Paul and Silas.

The jailer’s gestures of hospitality recall the kindness of the Compassionate Samaritan, another well-known escorting companion (Luke 10:25-37). Both the jailer and the Samaritan seem at first unlikely candidates to tend the wounds of the respective victims (the ambushed man who had been travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho and Paul and Silas). In this parallel (or syncrisis), the magistrates approximate the role of the bandits in the parable who stripped, beat and left the victim to his fate.66

οἳ καὶ ἐκδόσαντες αὐτὸν καὶ πληγάς ἐπιθέντες ἀπῆλθον ἀφέντες ἡμιθανῆ (Luke 10:30)

who stripped him and beat him, and departed, leaving him half dead (Luke 10:30)

καὶ οἱ στρατηγοὶ περιρήξαντες αὐτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια ἐκέλευον ῥαβδίζειν, πολλὰς τε ἐπιθέντες αὐτοῖς πληγὰς ἔβαλον εἰς φυλακὴν (Acts 16:22-23)

and the magistrates tore the garments off them and gave orders to beat them with rods. And when they had inflicted many blows upon them, they threw them into prison (Acts 16:22-23)

The jailer’s similarity to the Samaritan is made evident in the quality of the care for the wounded.

66 It is important to remember when discerning instances of syncrisis in Luke-Acts that Luke relies not only on words to create internal intertextual links, but ‘pictures’. Luke demonstrates a clear preference for ‘showing’ (mimesis) above ‘telling’ (diegesis) and so can create parallels from similar pictures that transcend the need for common vocabulary (e.g. Luke 2:7 cf. 23:53).
καὶ προσελθὼν κατέδησεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ ἐπιχέων ἐλαιὸν καὶ οἶνον ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτήνος ἄγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς πανδοχεῖον καὶ ἐπεμελήθη αὐτοῦ. (Luke 10:34)

and went to him and bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine; then he set him on his own beast and brought him to an inn (an “all-welcome”), and took care of him (Luke 10:34)

καὶ παραλαβὼν αὐτοὺς ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ τῆς νυκτὸς ἔλουσεν ἀπὸ τῶν πληγῶν, καὶ ἔβαπτίσθη αὐτὸς καὶ οἱ αὐτοῦ πάντες παραχρῆμα, ἀναγαγών τε αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν οἶκον. (Acts 16:33-34a)

And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their wounds, and he was baptized at once, with all his family. Then he brought them up into his house, and set food before them… (Acts 16:33-34a)

The examples of hospitality and hostility in Philippi continue to give expression to the ‘Luke 10:16 Reception Principle’ that those who welcome and receive the apostles, and who welcome and receive the message about Jesus, receive Jesus himself. Those who reject the apostles, reject Jesus and salvation.

The magistrates who had Paul and Silas beaten, send a message to the jailer to let them go. But Paul insists that if they were acquitting them after having illegally punished and incarcerated them, then they should at least provide the honour of an escorted departure that would make their exoneration public. When the magistrates learn that they had illegally punished and incarcerated Roman citizens without trial, they not only escort Paul and Silas in their departure, but they also tender an apology (16:39a; cf. Acts 22:24-29, 23:27).67

The mimetic depiction of the escorted departure (exoneration and apology) provides an ironic vindication of the apostles and their message. They have done nothing wrong in Philippi. The ambivalent portrayal of the Roman Empire is typically Lukan: Roman government is a ‘mixed bag’. Sometimes Rome (with its rule of law) assists the apostles in spreading their message and making their journeys, affording them protection (16:38-39; 18:15-16; 19:38-41; 21:32,35; 22:26; 23:23-24; 24:23; 25:11-12; 27:3; 28:16,31); at other times

---

67 The magistrates also ask (‘invite’, ‘beseech’) Paul and Silas to leave (ἠρώτων ἀπελθεῖν). Luke only uses this phrase in one other place, also after an exorcism (Luke 8:33) and also in response to fear (8:35,37), after Jesus heals the Gerasene demoniac (“they asked him to leave” ἠρώτησεν… ἀπελθεῖν, Luke 8:37).
Rome is portrayed as corrupt, especially in the behaviour and disposition of its key officials (24:26,27; 25:9). From Luke’s perspective, the Roman Empire is a counterfeit of the true kingship of the world—the kingdom of God (12:22; 25:25,26,32). Some other instances of escort towards the end of Acts allude to the same ironically protective escort provided by the ambivalent empire, as when Paul is carried by soldiers (“chaired”) from the Temple precinct to the barracks (21:35), or escorted by a 200-horse cavalcade from Jerusalem to Caesarea (23:23-35), or shipped to Rome (with the escort of a centurion) to allow his legal appeal (27:1–28:16).

Luke’s portrayal of an empire which was fundamentally opposed to the claims of Christians (that there is another king—Acts 17:7), but which occasionally lent assistance to the subversive movement, is in itself a subtle subversion of Roman imperial values.

6.2.9.3 In Thessalonica

After the exonerated apostles enjoy the hospitality of Lydia’s house (the terminal part of the inclusio), they travel to Thessalonica. In Thessalonica, Paul and Silas enjoy the hospitality of Jason. In this scene, the costliness of providing hospitality to Paul and Silas is shown to be high. After three weeks, a mob led by some unbelieving Jews attack Jason’s house and drag Jason and some other believers before the city authorities. The accusation leveled against Jason’s guests conveys an ironic truth.

“These people who have been turning the world upside down have come here also, and Jason has received them (ὑποδέδεκται). They are all acting contrary to the decrees of the emperor, saying that there is another king called Jesus.” (Acts 17:6b-7)

The accusation is true. The kingdom of God is opposed to the Empire of Caesar. The kingdom’s codes of unconditional hospitality, egalitarianism and universalism run counter to the Empire’s codes of control through hierarchy, division, reciprocity and client-patron relationships.

Jason and the believing brethren ‘send-forth-on-their-way’ (ἐξέπεμψαν) Paul and Silas to Beroea (Thessalonica to Beroea is 64 km or 40 miles). The word ἐκπέμπω occurs in only one other place in the NT—also in Acts (13:4), where the Holy Spirit ‘sends-forth-
on-their-way’ Barnabas and Paul at the start of their ‘first missionary journey’. ἐκπέμπω is also a word used nine times in the LXX where it means to ‘send-forth-on-the-way’. Significantly, it is used three times to describe the way that Abraham’s servant wishes to be sent-off on his way back to Abraham and Isaac with Rebekah (Gen 24:54,56,59). It describes the way in which the fugitive David treated King Saul when David first had an opportunity to kill Saul (one of the two opportunities that surround the story of Abigail and David). David spared Saul’s life. When Saul realised his narrow escape, he said to David,

“…and that if one should find his enemy in distress and should send him forth [ἐκπέμψαι] in a good way, as you have done today, then the Lord will repay him good” (1 Sam 24:19 LXX).

Ἐκπέμπω describes the way that faithful Barzillai the Gileadite accompanied the exilic journey of David as he fled Jerusalem to escape Absalom.

Barzillai the Gileadite came down from Rogelim and crossed over the Jordan with the king, so that he might bring him forth safely (ἐκπέμψαι) across the Jordan (2 Sam 19:31).

And finally, ἐκπέμπω describes Mother Wisdom’s ‘sending-off’ of Israel’s children into exile in Baruch 4:23.

For I sent you forth [ἐξέπεμψα] with mourning and weeping: but God will give you back to me with joy and gladness for ever. (Baruch 4:23)

In the context of Paul and Silas being sent off to Beroea, it is reasonable to assume that the provision of safety (as in most of the LXX uses of ἐκπέμπω), perhaps also provision of supplies (as in Gen 24:59 LXX) and provision of an escort (as in 2 Sam 19:31) are implicit.

6.2.9.4 In Beroea

The Jews in Beroea received the word (ἐδέξαντο τὸν λόγον) of God—and, therefore, presumably its bearers—more favourably than those in Thessalonica; but the unbelieving Jews of Thessalonica followed Paul, Silas and Timothy to Beroea and caused trouble. Again the believers ‘sent-away’ (ἐξαπέστειλαν) Paul for his safety (Acts 17:14). The next verse (17:15) makes it clear that this, again, involved accompaniment.
Those who escorted Paul [καθιστάνοντες—‘escorted’ (NIV), ‘conducted’ NRSV, RSV, KJV] led [ἡγαγον] him as far as Athens; and after receiving instructions to have Silas and Timothy join him as soon as possible, they left him” (17:15).

From Beroea (modern day Veria) to Athens is 506 km or 315 miles (one possible interpretation of 17:14 is that Paul went by sea). If we assumed a walking pace of 32 km a day, that would be a trip of sixteen days—no small act of escort (even if by boat). The nobility of character spoken of in Acts 17:11 demonstrates itself not only in the way the Beroeans receive and welcome the message (and the message bearers), but also in the way that they “speed them on their way” when the necessity to leave arises. Their escort is extravagant (in terms of distance) and, therefore, presumably costly. Readers of Acts, who were familiar with Homer, would be reminded of the extravagant and costly escort that the Phaeacians provided to Odysseus (Od. 13.70-187).

6.2.9.5 In Athens

Luke’s account of Paul’s time in Athens begins with an introduction (17: 16-21) in which philosophers escort Paul from the agora to the Areopagus.

And they took him [ἐπιλαβόμενοι] and brought [ἠγαγον] him to the Areopagus. (Acts 17:19a)

The escort demonstrates a preparedness to hear what Paul has to say and the dialogue lends support to this as well (“May we know what this new teaching is which you are presenting?”). 68 Unlike the most common pattern in reception-scenes in Acts, there is

---

68 Contrary to my line of interpretation, Pervo, makes a case that Luke “wishes to present the event as a sort of trial before the Council of the Areopagus”. Pervo suggests, ἐπιλαμβάνομαι (“took”) in 17:19 is to be translated “apprehend” and “in this context…implies formal or informal arrest”. Pervo invites comparison with 16:19 (where the slave-girl’s owners “seized” Paul and Silas) and 21:33 (where the tribune “arrested” Paul). Pervo could also have cited 18:17 (the Jews seize Sosthenes) and 21:30 (the mob seized Paul and dragged him from the temple). However, there are more irenic uses of the verb, e.g. 9:27 (Barnabas took Paul to introduce him to the apostles) and 23:19 (the tribune took Paul’s young nephew by the hand), also Luke 9:47 (Jesus took a child to illustrate a point about greatness) or Luke 14:4 (Jesus took and healed a man with dropsy). Pervo suggests that the prompt departure after the speech conforms to other accounts of arrest: 16:40; 17:10 and 18:18. However, 16:40 and 18:18 give no indication of a prompt departure. Pervo argues that the absence of a verdict need not detract from the case for this scene being a legal trial and cites other legal cases in Acts that lack a formal verdict. Pervo supplies no specific references. Although other cases may not conclude with formal verdicts, there is always some sort of verdict-like conclusion—e.g. Gamaliel’s unusual advice—5:33-39; the Ephesian town-clerk’s advice that the trial has been brought about in an inappropriate
no mention of antagonism from the Jews, nor mention of any Jews with whom Paul had
discussion (17:17). The common motif of ‘the divided response’ occurs in verse 32 (“Some
mocked; but others said, “We will hear you again about this”’). The positive respondents
among the divided hearers are mentioned in the episode’s conclusion. “Certain men” in
Athens “joined” (κολλήθέντες from κολλάω) Paul and believed (17:34). This is the same
type of “joining” spoken of by the Spirit when Philip is exhorted to join the Ethiopian’s
chariot (κολλήθητι—Acts 8:29). ‘Joined’ may imply that they became travel companions
and this interpretation would be consistent with the general observation that accompani-
ment demonstrates reception of both the good news and its bearer.

6.2.9.6 In Corinth

The final significant reception scene in Paul’s ‘second’ journey is in Corinth. The reception
follows the most common pattern: Paul began by witnessing in the synagogue, but he also
witnessed to Greeks (maybe Hellenic Jews or maybe Hellenic God-fearers, 18:4); when
some of the Jews opposed Paul, Paul shook the dust from his clothes (in approximate
correspondence to the directive in Luke 10:10-12—which speaks of ‘feet’) and declared a
greater turning to the Gentiles with his message (Acts 18:6). Luke concludes the episode
at Corinth with an instance of the ironic provision support from imperial Rome. Gallio,
the proconsul of Achaia, dismissed the case brought against Paul before the tribunal on
the grounds that the charges pertained to what Gallio perceived to be an internal debate
about Jewish law.

“If it were a matter of unrighteousness or evil wrongdoing, I should have reason to
bear with you, O Jews. But since it is a matter of questions about words and names
and your own law, see to it yourselves; I do not wish to be a judge of these matters.”
(Acts 18:14-15)
Paul’s stay in Corinth concludes with some of the Jews seizing Sosthenes (possibly the companion of Paul mentioned elsewhere only in 1 Corinthians 1:1) and beating him in front of the tribunal (Acts 18:17). Paul’s eventual departure from Corinth, therefore, might be a timely departure from an ongoing threat of violence. Priscilla and Aquila escorted Paul from Corinth to Ephesus (ἐξέπλει …καὶ σὺν αὐτῷ Πρίσκιλλα καὶ Άκύλας—Acts 18:18). Priscilla and Aquila were Jews exiled from Rome by the Edict of Claudius (Acts 18:2). Paul lived and worked with them in Corinth (18:3), and after Paul left them in Ephesus (18:19), they taught Apollos more accurately about the Way (18:26). Their positive reception of Paul and his teaching (to the point of passing it on to others) is shown also in the way that they escorted Paul from Corinth to Ephesus.

6.2.9.7 The End of the ‘Second’ Journey and a Lukan Excursus (‘About Apollos’)

Ephesus is mentioned briefly (18:19-21) in advance of the lengthy section that Luke dedicates to that location and the church there later in the narrative (18:24–20:38). Luke simply notes that Paul had discussions with the Jews in the Ephesian synagogue and that they asked him to stay longer (18:19-20). The invitation to remain (‘good detention’) indicates a positive reception. The Ephesians’ reception of Paul (the bearer of the message) indicates reception of the message (and therefore Jesus). However, Paul declined the invitation to remain, but suggested another visit (18:21). On bidding farewell to the Ephesians, Paul said, “I will return to you if God wills,” and he set sail from Ephesus to Caesarea Maritima (a common port for a journey to Jerusalem). On this occasion, Luke offers no reason for Paul’s eagerness to be on his way. (In similar circumstances, in Paul’s next journey to Jerusalem, Luke does explain Paul’s haste—20:16). The implied reader (particularly one familiar with the Homeric ideals of hospitality) would doubly credit the Ephesians as good hosts—firstly, because they ask their guest to remain, and secondly, because they do not delay their guest when he desires to depart.69

---

69 Menelaus in the Odyssey explains what we could call “Homer’s Rule of Hospitality” clearly in Od. 15.71-74, “Better is due measure in all things. It is equally wrong if a man speed on a guest who is loath to go, and if he keep back one that is eager to be gone. One should make welcome (φιλεῖν) the present guest (ξίνον),
This miniature episode in Ephesus (18:19-21) serves as a prelude to an excursus—about Apollos in Ephesus, (18:24-28)—and an account of Paul’s ‘Acts in Ephesus and Asia’ (19:1–20:38). The excursus is uncharacteristic of the second half of Acts in that the action leaves Paul (the narrative’s “continuity participant”)\(^70\) to tell the story of Apollos in Ephesus. In this brief excursus, reception of those who bear Jesus’ message continues to be prominent. Apollos taught accurately (ἀκριβῶς) about Jesus—just as Luke claimed to have followed all things accurately in his preface to the Third Gospel. But Apollos knew only the baptism of John. After Priscilla and Aquila heard Apollos, they received (‘welcomed’ or ‘took aside’—προσελάβοντο) Apollos to explain ‘more accurately’ (ἀκριβέστερον) the Way of God to him. After this, when Apollos wished to go to Corinth, the brothers wrote to the disciples to urge them to welcome (ἀποδέξασθαι) him. As he was now a faithful emissary of Jesus, Apollos deserved a good reception. Note that in the creation of Apollos as a faithful new emissary of Jesus, no agency of any of the original apostles is necessary, just as it was not necessary with Paul—\(i.e.\) there is no simple, classic model of “Apostolic Succession” via anything like episcopal laying on of hands.

6.2.10  Paul’s return to Ephesus (in the ‘Third’ Journey) and Farewells upon Paul’s Final Journey to Jerusalem (Acts 19:1–21:16)

Paul’s ‘third’ journey commences with a brief summary in 18:23 (“after [Paul] had spent some time [in Antioch], he departed and passed throughout the region of Galatia and Phrygia, from place to place, strengthening all the disciples”). After the ‘Apollos’ excursus and with Apollos in Corinth, Luke resumes Paul’s narrative at 19:1 (“Paul passed through the upper country and came to Ephesus”).

\(^{70}\) Robert Walter Funk (The Poetics of Biblical Narrative, Foundations & Facets. Literary Facets. Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988, pp. 17, 305) provides a clear definition of “Continuity Participant”. The Continuity Participant is the participant (character) who appears throughout the narrative (not just one segment) and “provides one form of cohesiveness for the narrative as a whole.”

and send off (πέμπειν) him that would go.” (Murray, Odyssey, p. 81). Pope’s translation was, ‘Welcome the coming, speed the parting guest!’ See section 3.4 of this dissertation.
The scene in Ephesus initially conforms to the most common reception pattern. Paul entered the synagogue (19:8); some refused to believe and spoke evil of the Way (19:9a); Paul left the synagogue and took his message to the lecture hall of Tyrannus (19:9), where presumably there were more Gentiles than in the synagogue. Ephesus appears to be a hub from which all the residents of Asia, both Jews and Greeks, heard the word of the Lord (19:10).

In this Ephesian section, Luke sets out the ‘roadmap’ or ‘path’ for the end of Acts of the Apostles.

Now after these things had been fulfilled Paul resolved in the Spirit to pass through Macedonia and Achaia and go to Jerusalem, saying, “After I have been there, I must also see Rome.” (Acts 19:21)

Luke’s point in mentioning that Paul’s decision was “in the Spirit” is to present it as the divine plan (that Paul should travel from Ephesus, to Macedonia, to Greece, then to Jerusalem and finally to Rome). From this point of the narrative (the announcement of the ‘path’ or ‘divine plan’), the rest of Acts can be read as a series of threats to the fulfilment of the divine plan—threats that must be overcome—and assistance to the fulfilment of the divine plan. In this respect, the ending of Acts takes on a character similar to Homer’s Odyssey. As we have been led to anticipate from Chapter Three of this dissertation, the ending of Acts is thick with allusions to Homerica.71

The assistance to the divine plan’s fulfilment is often seen in the provision of safe escort. In the remainder of Acts, the reader is shown several more examples of extravagant escort. The identities of the parties providing the escort are unusually varied. Sometimes, unsurprisingly, it is believers who escort Paul’s journey along the path. At other times, in keeping with Luke’s capacity to portray ironic sources of assistance, it is the Empire—with

values very different to those of Christianity—that finds itself, against its character, assisting the fulfilment of the purposes of God.

While in Ephesus, the first of many threats to Paul's progress comes when Demetrius and the artisans formed a riotous mob to assail Paul and his travelling companions (συνεκδήμους—Acts 19:21-34)—again the opposition (as at Philippi with the slave-owners: 16:16,19) is portrayed as motivated by pecuniary interests. As in many other cases, the defence of Paul comes from a surprising corner; the town clerk (γραμματεὺς) defends Paul and his travelling companions and reminds the crowd that the courts and the pro-consuls are the legitimate avenues if they wish to bring charges against Paul (19:37-39). Then, warning the crowd that they were in danger of being charged with rioting, the town clerk dismisses the assembly (19:40-41).

The end of the uproar coincides with Paul's moving on. Paul farewells the disciples in Ephesus (Acts 20:1). The farewell is ‘reported’ at this stage rather than ‘shown’—a far fuller account of an Ephesian farewell is ‘deferred’ until 20:17-38 where it serves better the drama of Paul's fateful journey to Jerusalem. Luke informs his reader that the next two geographical stages of Paul's resolution (“to go through Macedonia and Achaia [Greece]”, Acts 19:21) were fulfilled (20:1-3). In summary form, Luke tells the reader that Paul passed through the regions of Macedonia and went to Greece (Acts 20:1-2). The ‘fulfilment’ of Paul's plans conveys to the reader that Paul's resolution (“in the Spirit”) was a true prophecy of the ‘divine plan’. Plans to sail for Syria (the route Paul used in 18:18-22 to reach Jerusalem on his previous visit) are threatened by a plot by some Jews (a pirate plot?). It is implied that Paul learned of the threat because he decides to return through Macedonia accompanied—συνεπομενον, a hapax legomenon in the NT, and associated with military escort in LXX—by at least the seven named companions (who we will examine in a little more detail below).

---

72 Although a hapax legomenon in the NT, συνεπομαι occurs three times (as participles) in the LXX (2 Macc 15:2.3 Macc 5:48 and 6:21) where it means “accompanying” in a military context (for instance where the infantry accompany their leader).
Luke’s use of συνείπετο may be because he portrays the Way as an alternative to the Roman military. This alternative ‘military’ is one that is non-violent and promotes the sharing of the world’s resources with justice (like the contemporary ‘Salvation Army’). Luke uses συνείπετο to create a non-violent, but nonetheless strong, counter-Imperial allusion. Further, Luke’s ‘military’ allusion lends the seven companions—another ‘Seven’ with origins in redistribution of the world’s resources (cf. 6:3)—aspects of the Pisistratian escort of Telemachus—a prolonged escort that provides sustained companionship and resources.

A plot against someone trying to sail to their destination would place an implied reader in mind of the plot of the suitors to kill Telemachus as he attempted to sail back to Ithaca after seeking news of his father. The mentions of Troas (Homer’s Troy) at Acts 20:5 and 20:6 and the extended narrative about Eutychus (whose name means ‘good fortune’ or ‘good luck’, see LXX Gen 30:11 or Isa 65:11) lend support to the view that Luke is deliberately alluding to Homerica throughout this section.

In Troas, the reason given for Paul’s perseverance in speaking until midnight is that he intended to leave the next day (20:7). The themes of urgency and the avoiding of over-detection re-occur on Paul’s journey to Jerusalem. His leaving of Ephesus immediately after the uproar might be in order not to allow Demetrius and the artisans the opportunity to go to the proconsul and the courts, to bring charges against him (20:1, 19:38).

After Troas, Paul continued south. Paul decided to sail past Ephesus, as Luke writes, so that he might not have to spend time in Asia; for he was hastening [or ‘eager’] to be at Jerusalem, if possible, on the day of Pentecost (Acts 20:16)

Haenchen wrote of this, “That the pious Jew Paul wanted at all costs to spend Pentecost in Jerusalem displaces for Luke the suppressed motive of the Pauline journey: the delivery of the collection.” However, the implied reader of Acts—familiar with the LXX, and what it
has to say about Pentecost—may not have found a possible connection between the feast and the collection as “suppressed” as Haenchen suggested.

Although Luke is not explicit about the reason for Paul’s desire to be in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, the implied reader familiar with the LXX would know some relevant facts about Pentecost that provide a clue. ‘Pentecost’ was the Hellenistic Jewish name for Shavuot or the Festival of Weeks (2 Macc 12:31-32), which fell seven weeks after Passover. It was one of the three feasts for which Jewish males were obliged to be present at the Temple (Exod 34:23; Deut 16:16a). It was also a time in which the worshippers were not to come empty-handed, but were to bring an offering that reflected how the Lord has blessed their labour (Deut 16:10,16b). Exodus 23:16 (LXX) says of the harvest festival, “And you shall make a feast of the harvest of first products of your labours, whichever you sowed in your field, and a feast of completion at the end of the year at the gathering of your labours that are from your field.” Leviticus 23:22 says, at the conclusion of the detailed account of how to observe the Festival of Weeks, “When you reap the harvest of your land, you shall not in your harvesting thereafter make a thorough job of the harvest of your field, and you shall not gather the gleanings of your harvest; you shall leave them remaining for the poor and for the guest [προσηλύτῳ]; I am the Lord your God.” Perhaps because of this verse (with its mention of harvest, gleaning, and provision for the poor and the guest), at some stage in the celebration of Shavuot, the reading of the Book of Ruth became a tradition associated with the feast—and the implied reader, familiar with the LXX, would see the appropriateness of this literary connection. The connection of Shavuot with the inclusion of the outsider and the bringing of an offering—not coming empty handed but bringing an offering commensurate with the way in which the Lord had blessed your labour—may have been the reason for Luke’s depiction of Paul’s interest in the feast (not just Paul’s ‘Jewish piety’, as Haenchen suggested). It may be that Luke thought this a very appropriate time for Paul to be portrayed as bringing his collection

74 2 Macc 12:31-32 (LXX): “… and [they] went up to Hierosolyma, as the Feast of Weeks was close at hand. After the feast called Pentecost, …”
from the Gentile (‘outsider’) churches to Jerusalem. The collection would be offered to the saints in Jerusalem as a measure of goodwill and solidarity, as well as an expression of distributive justice, sharing the material wealth of the Gentiles with those who were experiencing hardship in Jerusalem.

Haenchen writes that ἔθνος (in Acts 24:17) is an obstacle to the interpretation of Paul’s “alms” as synonymous with the collection Paul mentions in the letters and which was taken to the Christians in Jerusalem. However, I see no obstacle here to identifying the alms with the collection for the saints in Jerusalem, as this church was predominantly composed of Jewish believers and therefore still identifiable by Paul as “his nation”. Haenchen concluded that Luke made no reference to Paul’s collection and that readers of Acts only identified the collection in it because they had also read Paul’s letters. However, a closer reading of Acts suggests that Luke made a number of allusions to the collection which Paul took to Jerusalem (Acts 20:4, 24, 33-35; 21:24, 26; 24:17, 26) which an astute reader could recognise without necessarily having read Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians.

The reason I seemingly digress from my central theme of escort to make a case for Luke referring to Paul’s collection is because I see a possible connection between them. The collection may explain the need for a large number of companions from a represen-

---


76 The distributive justice of the collection reiterated on a larger scale the sending of relief from Antioch to Jerusalem (11:29), which in turn reiterated on a larger scale the redistribution of wealth which Luke tells us was first practiced in the church in Jerusalem (Acts 2:45, 4:32-37). It is also noteworthy that Luke portrays Paul as coming to his ‘resolution’ (Acts 19:21)—about the journey that I identify with the collection—immediately after Paul has an experience that makes it very clear that some of the new Gentile believers are wealthy enough to have spent no small fortune on books associated with magic (“fifty thousand silver coins”—Acts 19:19). To use an anachronism, some of these new Gentile believers had tremendous ‘discretionary’ income.


tative diversity of places—the seven named companions of 20:4. Luke may be describing the same connection between escort and administering the collection that Paul himself described in 2 Cor 8:19. The Lukan Paul appears to have wanted to go to Jerusalem to report “one by one the things that God had done among the Gentiles through his ministry” (21:19) and yet his only stated purpose for his journey to Jerusalem is “I came to bring alms and offerings (ἐλεημοσύνας ποιήσων... καὶ προσφοράς) to my nation” (24:17; note that all major English translations interpret the participle, ποιήσων, as a statement of purpose).

Luke depicts Paul conducting the Gentile mission in Galatia, Asia-Minor, Macedonia and Greece without the assistance of the church in Jerusalem. No longer, it seems, is the hand or presence of one of the “Twelve” required for the coming of the Holy Spirit (19:6-7, cf. 8:17,44; 9:17). And yet Luke depicts Paul as desirous of a relationship and connection between the emerging Gentile church and the predominantly Jewish church in Jerusalem, enough to risk the journey to Jerusalem and to take representatives from the new churches and presumably an offering similar to the one he first took from Antioch to Jerusalem with Barnabas (11:29-30).

There remains the question as to why Luke is not more explicit about the ‘collection’ when describing Paul’s journey to Jerusalem. I will deal with this more thoroughly in a later section, except briefly to say, here, that Luke had to contend with the dilemma that the reception of the ‘collection’ appears not to have gone as Paul had hoped. According to Luke’s account, in the very midst of negotiating the transaction, Paul caused a riot and was arrested, and was detained for at least two years before being transported under remand to Rome to make a legal appeal to the Emperor. I think Luke’s dilemma is that given the strong link he has forged between divine plan and fulfillment, where does this leave the ‘collection’?79 Was it part of the divine plan, and if so how could it have gone so wrong? On one hand, Luke would find so much to commend in Paul’s ‘collection’, in terms of redistribution of wealth and the legitimacy of Gentile inclusion among the saved people of

79 I think that Luke has inherited this tendency to forge an unbreakable nexus between divine plan (revealed by prophecy) and fulfillment from his Jewish literary heritage, particularly 1 and 2 Samuel (in which we see the same strong nexus).
God. Also it would speak to the implied reader of the establishment of a guest-friendship bond created by the exchange of a gift. And yet, on the other hand, although Paul’s ‘resolution’ in geographical terms finds fulfillment, his purpose for the journey (Acts 24:17)—to bring the ‘collection’—did not. Because Luke has forged such a strong nexus between divine plan and fulfillment, he cannot present the ‘collection’ as part of the divine plan, but as ‘the best laid plan’ of Paul. God cannot be seen to commission the ‘collection’, even if it was motivated by the highest ideals (ideals that Luke would affirm). In fact, the ‘failure’ of the ‘collection’ must be portrayed as no surprise to the deity—hence, all the prophecy regarding the tribulation and imprisonment that awaits Paul in Jerusalem (20:23,25,38; 21:4,11-14). It is because the ‘collection’ places Luke in a theological dilemma that I would suggest, that the ‘collection’ is subtly narrated in Acts.

Whatever the exact details of Paul’s eagerness to avoid delay on his way to Jerusalem, the Ephesian elders proved to be faithful ‘hosts’—that is, faithful hosts who do not cause the over-detention of their guest. Instead, they came out to Miletus to farewell Paul (47 km or 29 miles south of Ephesus). When Paul summoned (“sent and called” πέμψας) them, the Ephesian elders came, rather than insisting that Paul return to them in Ephesus. The avoidance of a place of potential delay would put an implied reader of Acts—familiar with the cultural script to which Homerica made a large contribution—in mind of the principle of not over-detaining guests—as in Telemachus’s plea to Pisistratus not to make him go home to Nestor’s house. 80

When the elders from Ephesus came out to farewell Paul on his journey, Paul delivered his “farewell” speech.81 Some commentators have noted similarities in this section to

80 Nestor was known for his over-detention of guests; see Od. 15.195-201.
81 That this scene is a “farewell Scene” is suggested, not only by Paul’s declaration that the Ephesian elders will not see him again (20:25,38), but also by the use of second-person imperatives (associated with other farewells, naturally) at key points (20:28 προσέχετε, 20:31 γρηγορεῖτε). In the Markan Jesus’ farewell discourse (Mark 13:1-37) there are thirteen second-person imperatives including γρηγορεῖτε (Mark 13:37), and in Luke 21:5-36, ten including προσέχετε (Luke 21:34), but not γρηγορεῖτε—another instance of Luke deferring a Markan Gospel element to Acts?
Greek Farewell Scenes.82 MacDonald hears in this speech allusions to the farewell speech that Hector gave to Andromache.83 As Pervo notes, “At the least, this is a reminder that “farewell speeches” have a wide background.”84 The speech is structured by the punctuating use of “and now” (καὶ νῦν—20:22, 25, 32) at the commencement of all but the first of the four sections (18b-21; 22-24; 25-31; 32-36). After the introduction (18b-21) in which Paul asked the Ephesians to recall the quality of his work among them, Paul said,

And now, behold, I go bound in the Spirit to Jerusalem, the things meeting [συναντήσοντά] me in there, not knowing. (Acts 20:22)

Although “things that I might happen upon”, “come across”, “what will happen to me” (NRSV, NIV) or “what shall befall me” (RSV, KJV) are legitimate general translations of the Greek, it is relevant to note that Luke does not use συναντάω in any of the other instances where he wishes to convey “happen” or “come across”. In the three other uses of συναντάω in Luke-Acts, the meaning unambiguously is “meet” (Luke 9:37, 22:10, Acts 10:25). Of the 18 occurrences of “happen” in the RSV of Luke-Acts, Luke uses γίνομαι 16 times and συμβάινω twice. Of the eight uses of “come upon” in the RSV translation of Luke-Acts, Luke uses ἐπέρχομαι four times, ἐπεισέρχομαι once, φθάνω once, ἥκω once, and ἐπιστημι once. I would argue, therefore, that we should translate Acts 20:22 (contra NRSV, RSV, NIV, and KJV) “And now, behold, bound in the Spirit, I go to Jerusalem—who and what will meet me there, I do not know.” This translation preserves the ambiguity and possibilities of the original. Given Luke’s preoccupation with meetings and

---


84 Pervo, Acts, p. 517, n. 31. A contrast with Hector’s Farewell to Andromache is that Homer goes on to narrate the actual death of Hector, whereas Luke only makes proleptic allusions to Paul’s actual trial and death (27:24a; 20:25,38) or narrates episodes which could be symbolically interpreted as the passion, death and resurrection of Paul: Paul’s imprisonment (21:33, 24:27), his trials (22:30, 24:2), including trials by ‘ordeal’ (27:33, 28:3) and his ‘salvation’ (27:44, 28:5-6).
reception, this translation is a far better option than others which disguise the fact that
the sentence contains a form of the verb *συναντάω* (“I meet”). It also allows the verse to
interact intertextually with verses 21:17-19 which describe Paul’s welcome and reception
upon his arrival in Jerusalem—where, I would claim, it is important to note *who meets*
Paul and *who does not meet* him.

We find a nexus between concerns about reception and the taking of the collection in
the reference to the collection in Rom 15:16,25-28,30-32 (especially v. 31 “that my minis-
try [διακονία or “bringing of a gift”] may be acceptable [εὐπρόσδεκτος] to the saints”).
The closest verb to εὐπρόσδεκτος in Pauline and Lukan writings is προσδέχομαι, which
means to welcome, receive or expectantly wait for.

Another possible allusion to the collection follows at the end of the *second section* of
the Miletus speech in verse 24.

...so that I might finish my race [δρόμον], and the ministry [διακονίαν], which I have
received from the Lord Jesus, to testify [διαμαρτύρασθαι] to the good news of the
grace of God. (Acts 20:24)

Elsewhere in Acts, Luke refers to the distribution of food among the needy in the Jeru-
salem church as διακονία—in Acts 6:1 and 6:2.85 This ‘ministry’ was an expression of the
ideal redistribution of wealth that was said to exist in the early church (Acts 2:45; 4:34-
35). This fair redistribution of wealth was then *scaled-up* one level when the church in
It could be that Paul’s more ambitious collection was a further *scaled-up* application of the
same principle. Paul, himself, certainly referred to the collection taken in Macedonia and
Greece and delivered to the poor in Jerusalem as διακονία (Rom 15:25,26,31; 1 Cor 16:1,15;
2 Cor 8:4,19,20; 9:1,12,13).

In the *third section* of the farewell, Paul declares his knowledge that all of the Ephesian
elders would no more see his face (20:25,38). This is how Luke subtly alludes to Paul’s

---

85 See the footnote about ways in which Luke uses διακονία—see footnote 44.
The reader knows that Paul’s prophetic announcements are reliable and so even though the narrative stops short of Paul’s death in Rome, his death is anticipated in this pronouncement. The third section continues with a mixture of a further description of Paul’s work among them (like the first section) and some instructions (“pay attention”, “be alert”)—the latter adding strongly to the sense of this being a farewell speech.

The fourth section begins like the conclusion to a farewell speech (“And now I commend you to God...”) but quickly changes to what, at first, seems an odd ending for a farewell speech—with references to Paul’s attitude to wealth and his financial self-support while serving the Ephesians. Again, these references to pecuniary issues may refer to the collection and the expectation that the Ephesians would contribute to it. The switch from the present tense of “now, I commend” to the series of aorist (“I coveted no-one’s gold, silver or clothing”, “these hands served my own needs and the needs of those who were with me”, “I have shown you that by so toiling one must help the weak”) highlights the unusual juxtaposition.

This last section is best understood as a call to contribute to the collection, rather than as a general exhortation to generosity. As in Paul’s letters, this section has the nexus between the Gentiles’ coming to share in what was formerly the exclusive inheritance of the Jews and the Gentile contribution to the collection (Romans 15:27; 9:4; 2 Cor 8:14; Acts 20:32b).

And now I commend you to God and to the word of his grace, which is able to build you up and to give you the inheritance among all those who are sanctified. (Acts 20:32)

86 Pervo maintains that Luke is equipping his readers for the absence of Paul in the same way that Deutero-Pauline literature does. Pervo suggests that the farewell (20:17-38) and other scenes (19:11-19; 21-41) give the reader hope that Paul’s influence or witness will continue after his death. The healing incidents with Paul’s artifacts (19:11-12), like the shadow (σκιὰ) of Peter (5:15), might be meant to operate symbolically to imply that even after the apostles’ passed-on’ their influence endured and blessed the next generation of the church. Haenchen wrote, “An author like Luke stresses such a sentence so expressly only ‘if a negation by events was precluded, i.e. if the Apostle was already dead’”—Haenchen, Acts, p. 595.

87 See note 79.

88 Haenchen observed that “the connection of thought with what precedes is not very close.” Haenchen, Acts, p. 594.
There is also a nexus in this section, as in Paul’s Second Letter to the Corinthians, between Paul’s demonstrated selflessness (self-sufficiency, refusal of remuneration or “to be a burden”) and his call to support the collection (2 Cor 11:7-9; 12:14-16; 8:3-7; 8:9-15; 9:1-15; Acts 20:33-35).

I coveted no one’s silver or gold or apparel. You yourselves know that these hands ministered to my necessities, and to those who were with me. In all things I have shown you that by so toiling one must help the weak, remembering the words of the Lord Jesus, how he said, ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive.’” (Acts 20:33-35)

Furthermore, Paul, as we know him through 2 Corinthians, was known to support a call-to-give with proverbial sayings like the one with which Luke has him conclude the Ephesian speech (“for Jesus himself said, ‘It is more blessed to give than to receive’”—Acts 20:35b).

For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that though he was rich, yet for your sake he became poor, so that by his poverty you might become rich. (2 Cor 8:9)

As it is written, “He who gathered much had nothing over, and he who gathered little had no lack.” (2 Cor 8:15)

The point is this: he who sows sparingly will also reap sparingly, and he who sows bountifully will also reap bountifully. (2 Cor 9:6)

for God loves a cheerful giver. (2 Cor 9:7b)

Again we know directly from Paul that escort played an important role in the collection. As well as contributing toward the safety of moving a considerable amount of money from Greece, Macedonia, Asia-Minor and Galatia to Jerusalem, escort was important in terms of accountability. As Paul explains, it was important not only that they do the right thing in the Lord’s sight, but also in the sight of others. By having trustworthy companions, Paul was above reproach in taking and distributing the funds to the poor of Jerusalem as he said he would (2 Cor 8:19-21). Thus there were representatives (from each of the churches that contributed toward the collection) travelling with the collection (1 Cor 16:3,4; 2 Cor 8:19).

With [Titus] we are sending the brother who is famous among all the churches for his preaching of the gospel; and not only that, but he has been appointed by the churches
to travel with us [συνέκδημος] in this gracious work which we are carrying on, for the glory of the Lord and to show our good will.

We intend that no one should blame us about this liberal gift which we are administering [διακονουμένη], for we aim at what is honorable not only in the Lord’s sight but also in the sight of men. (2 Cor 8:18-21)

The collection thus becomes an apt context within which to interpret Luke’s reference to the list of companions in Acts 20:4. All the places mentioned as being locations from which the companions hailed—Beroea, Thessalonica, Derbe and ‘Asia’ (Ephesus)—are places that were included in Paul’s ‘third’ journey. Based on the cumulative evidence I think Luke does show Paul taking a collection to Jerusalem, and much of the evidence comes in and immediately around the ‘farewell’ speech to the Ephesian elders.

After Paul’s speech to the Ephesian elders, there is an elaborate mimetically narrated scene in which the reader is shown the elders’ positive response to Paul. The reader is shown prayer and kneeling, much weeping among them all, embrace, kissing and, to conclude the mimetically narrated scene, an act of escort—‘Then they brought him on his way (προέπεμπον) to the ship’ (Acts 20:38b). This is the second use of προπέμπω in Acts; the first use of προπέμπω is when the Antiochian church sent Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem for the council (Acts 15:3), but the reader also knows that the Antiochian church had determined to ‘send relief’ (διακονίαν πέμψαι) to Jerusalem through Paul and Barnabas (11:29,30). A nexus between ‘sending with assistance’ or ‘sending with finances’ (a contribution to the collection) and προπέμπω is supported elsewhere in the

89 Acts 18:23 mentions the Galatian region which includes Derbe; Acts 19:1 mentions travel (from Phrygia, 18:23) through the interior regions of Asia to Ephesus; Acts 20:1-2 mentions Macedonia and Greece, the former of which includes Beroea and Thessalonica. We know from Paul’s letters to the Romans that both Macedonia and Achaia (Greece) contributed toward the collection (Rom 15:26), but Paul’s Second Letter to the Corinthians, while confirming the generosity of the Macedonian churches (2 Cor 8:5; 9:4; 11:8-9), leaves a question mark about how the Corinthians would respond to the collection. In Luke’s list of Paul’s companions (Acts 20:4), each city has a representative and some of the larger cities like Thessalonica and Ephesus have two (Aristarchus and Secundus, Tychicus and Trophimus, respectively).

90 Pervo writes, “At issue, is the never-mentioned but ever-present subject of the collection.” (Pervo, Acts, 527). I would question whether the multiple strong allusions to the collection merits the description “never-mentioned”. “Tacitly alluded to” might be more appropriate. Luke certainly does not hide Paul’s passionate determination to make the journey. Without belief in some good reason for Paul’s purpose for the journey, the determination makes Paul appear uncharacteristically irrational.
NT. First and Second Corinthians both contain prominent exhortations to contribute to the collection (e.g. 2 Cor 8:7 “see that you excel in this gracious work also” and 2 Cor 9:5 “arrange in advance for this gift you have promised”), and they also speak of Paul’s hope to be ‘brought on his way’ by them (1 Cor 16:1-6 especially 6 with προπέμψητε; 2 Cor 1:16 with προπεμφθῆναι). The Letter to Titus strongly suggests a connection between ‘sending upon one’s way’ (προπέμπω) and provision of resources to meet needs. “Diligently bring on their way [σπουδαίως πρόπεμψων] Zenas the lawyer and Apollos, in order that [ἵνα] nothing be lacking [λείπῃ] for them.” (Tit 3:13). The Third Letter of John also supports the connection between sending and giving provisions.

Beloved, it is a loyal thing you do when you render any service to the brethren, especially to guest-strangers [ξένους], who have testified to your love before the church. You will do well to bring them on their way [προπέμψας] as befits God’s service. For they have set out for his sake taking [λαμβάνοντες] nothing from the Gentiles. So we ought to support [ὑπολαμβάνειν] such people, that we may be fellow workers in the truth. (3 John 5-8)

Paul’s Letter to the Romans also uses προπέμπω when Paul writes of his hope that the Romans might bring him on his way to Spain.

As and when I go to Spain, I will come to you: for I hope to see you in my journey, and to be brought on my way [προπεμφθῆναι] there by you, if first I be somewhat filled by you [ἐὰν ὑμῶν πρῶτον ἀπὸ μέρους ἐμπλησθῶ] (Rom 15:24).

Robert Jewett goes so far as to suggest that the prime purpose for Paul’s writing of Romans was for Paul to elicit support from the Roman house and tenament churches for the mission to Spain. Jewett’s thesis lends weight to the idea that προπέμπω implied financial (and other types of) support. 91

The letters of Paul reveal one last detail regarding travel in connection with the collection—the sending of companions in advance, in order to give the churches opportunity to put together their contribution for the collection (2 Cor 9:5).

So I thought it necessary to urge the brothers to go on before [προέλθωσιν] me to you, and arrange in advance for this blessing you have promised, so that it may be ready not as an exaction but as a blessing. (2 Cor 9:5)


I have suggested that there is a cumulative weight of evidence that Luke does indeed feature Paul’s taking of the collection in his ‘third’ journey as described in Acts. Further, I would suggest that when the Ephesian elders’ “brought Paul on his way [προέπεμπον] to the ship” there is more implied by this expression than mere escort. While escort alone would reveal a measure of general goodwill and respect for Paul on the part of the Ephesian elders, the word προπέμπω here also suggests to the implied reader of Acts that the Ephesian elders added a contribution of financial support to Paul for his journey to Jerusalem. Most likely, they are being portrayed as adding their financial contribution to the collection that he was taking there. They were able to do this as it was the practice of sending ‘forerunners’ to prepare hosts not only for ‘reception’ but also proper ‘sending on one’s way’ (implicit in which was financial support).

After Miletus, Luke reports in summary form the journey as far as Tyre (21:1-3).

[We] landed at Tyre; for there the ship was to unload its cargo. And finding [or ‘meeting’—ἀνευρόντες] the disciples, we stayed there for seven days. Through the Spirit they told Paul not to go on to Jerusalem.

And when our days there were ended, we departed and went on our journey; (Acts 21:3b-5a)

Still in diegetic mode, Luke shares the unsettling news that while staying with the disciples in Tyre, “Through the Spirit they told Paul not to go on to Jerusalem.” (21:4b). The disclosure has unsettled more than one commentator. How could the Spirit reveal one message to Paul (19:21, 20:22) and a seemingly contradictory message to others? Most commentators opt to claim that Luke did not quite manage to say what he meant to say! A common form of this option is to suggest that what the Spirit had actually revealed to the Tyrian disciples was that Paul would be bound and suffer much in Jerusalem. This option
harmonises the Tyrian’s revelation with Agabus’s prophecy by the Holy Spirit (later, in 21:1—“This is the way the Jews in Jerusalem will bind the man who owns this belt and will hand him over to the Gentiles”) and with Paul’s claim in the farewell speech (20:23—“the Holy Spirit testifies to me in every city that imprisonment and persecutions are waiting for me”). The commentators, then usually seek to reconcile the apparent contradiction by suggesting that it was natural concern for Paul’s well-being that motivated the final expression of this as “Do not go to Jerusalem.” This approach was taken by Calvin, and followed by Bengel; more recently, it has been endorsed by C. K. Barrett and Pervo. The problem with this approach is that it is faithful neither to the text nor to Luke’s competence as a writer.

A second, more radical, option is to cast aspersions on Paul’s original resolution in the Spirit to go to Jerusalem. How much of the plan (in 19:21) was Paul’s own resolution and how much was “in the Spirit”? Barrett hears no reference to the Holy Spirit in 19:21, instead translating it as, “Paul formed the intention to pass through Macedonia and Achaia and travel to Jerusalem.” If Paul’s intention were not divinely inspired, might not the constant journeying back to Jerusalem (like the failure of many apostles to leave Jerusalem) in fact indicate disobedience to Jesus’ final command to witness centrifugally, that is, starting in, but leading out from Jerusalem to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:8)? The problem with this radical approach is that eventually the Lord adds a revelation that seems to affirm the ‘Jerusalem and Rome’ stages of the original alleged revelation (Acts 23:11). Note that while Luke reports that the divine revelation affirmed the geographical detail

92 Commenting about Luke’s claim that the Tyrian believers spoke through the Spirit, Barrett writes “διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος: presumably, showing the phenomena of inspiration. Luke does not express himself clearly. His words taken strictly would mean either that Paul was deliberately disobedient to the will of God or that the Spirit was mistaken in the guidance given. It is unthinkable that Luke intended either of these. It is probable that what he meant but failed adequately to express was something like what is written in vv. 10–14. The Spirit acting through prophets foretold that the journey to Jerusalem would bring Paul suffering, and his friends acting under the influence not of the Spirit but of a human concern sought to dissuade him from going there.”—Barrett, Acts II, pp. 990-991.

93 Barrett writes, “ἔθετο (etheto) alone could hardly mean ‘purposed’, so that τῷ πνεύματι (tōi pneumati) cannot be taken to refer to the Holy Spirit (as e.g. in RSV, Paul resolved in the Spirit)” (Barrett, Acts II, p. 919).
of Paul’s resolution (‘in the Spirit’), there could be no divine commissioning of what we suspect was Paul’s purpose for the ‘third’ journey—to take and deliver the collection to Jerusalem—because it appears the delivery of the collection was a failure. Similarly, divinity cannot appear to be ‘taken by surprise’ at the failure of the collection or, more particularly, the riot, and Paul’s beating, arrest, detention and trials (and hence the rush of prophecies foretelling these events—Acts 20:23, 21:4,11).

A third (and, to my mind, more satisfactory) approach is to allow Luke to mean what he says, accepting the unresolved tension that then emerges. The work of the Holy Spirit in the minds and hearts of the faithful is no guarantee that the believers in the church will always think “in one accord”—ὁμοθυμαδὸν, literally “with the same heart”. There are moments in the early stages of Acts where the believers are said to be “in one accord” (1:14; 2:46; 4:24; 5:12). However, at the council in Jerusalem, for instance, a consensus is only reached after much debate (15:7) and then only with the autocratic intervention by James (“I have reached a decision”—ἐγὼ κρίνω—15:19). The consensus of the church is only to choose men to deliver that decision. Despite the inspiration of the Spirit, consensus in the church can be elusive. The opinion of those who say to Paul “do not go” is not easily dismissed as misguided advice. Paul’s determination to continue to Jerusalem leads to a violent riot and subsequent imprisonment in Jerusalem and Caesarea, which prevents him from commencing his (Spirit-commissioned) journey to Rome for at least two years (24:27). And yet the trial also becomes the means by which Paul is transported to Rome (which in 19:21 and 23:11 is revealed as another ‘divine necessity’ or ‘divine plan’).

An older opinion among scholars was that Luke tried to present the early church as more harmonious and unified than was historically justifiable. However, the disagreement over whether Paul should proceed to Jerusalem demonstrates that Luke was content to show that sometimes believers to whom the Spirit spoke could not make an easy reconciliation of their understandings of what the Spirit was saying to them. The narrator in this instance passes over “the elephant in the room” with a typical laconic refusal to be an arbiter, simply concluding, “When our days there were ended, we departed and proceeded on our journey”—Acts 21:5.
The remarkable thing is that, despite the blatant disagreement (to which as little attention possible is drawn), the Tyrians still escort Paul. They have the grace not to allow the disagreement to lessen the honour and respect that they show toward Paul. Luke concludes the brief segment at Tyre with a mimetic illustration of the Tyrians’ regard for Paul.

...we departed and went on our journey; and they all, with wives and children [σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις], brought us on our way [προπεμπόντων ἡμᾶς] till we were outside the city [ἔξω τῆς πόλεως]; and kneeling down on the beach we prayed and bade one another farewell. Then we went on board the ship, and they returned home. (Acts 21:5)

The disciples from Tyre, their wives and children escorted ("brought on their way"—προπεμπόντων) Paul and his companions outside the city and to their ship, despite the fact that he completely ignored their Spirit-inspired advice. Luke’s implied reader would have been familiar with reports of imperial adventus ceremonies (‘triumphal processions’) in which the joining of women and children seems, as ‘icing on the cake’, to represent the unanimity with which emperors and conquering generals were honoured. Two instances of this are recounted by Josephus: in War 7.70, where he describes Vespasian’s reception by the Romans,

the whole remaining population, with wives and children [ἅμα γυναιξὶ καὶ παισὶ], were now waiting at the road-sides to receive him. (War 7.70)

and in War 7.101, where Josephus describes Antioch’s reception of Titus.

not the men only, but a multitude of women also with their children [ἀλλὰ καὶ γυναικῶν πλῆθος ἅμα παισὶ] (War 7.101)

The Tyrians add their support for Paul’s journey, and possibly for the collection, to the support (of the journey and the collection) provided already by the churches of Galatia, Macedonia, Achaia and Asia, and the ‘procession’ (convoy) toward Jerusalem continues. After a brief report of a stopover at Ptolemais (21:7), Paul and his companions come to Caesarea—the last stop before Jerusalem. Luke slows the narrative and enters mimetic mode again.

The same unresolved tensions (between Paul’s claim that the Spirit has directed his journey to Jerusalem and those who say “do not go”) are present in the scene in Caesarea.
Luke masterfully reintroduces two characters from the earlier part of Acts, each of whom import internal intertextual reminders. Philip, one of the ‘Seven’, reminds us of the time when, most dramatically, the action of the Spirit was leading Jesus’ emissaries out of Jerusalem in the diaspora (scattering) that followed Stephen’s martyrdom. That departure from Jerusalem led to the joyous conversion of the Samaritans and an Ethiopian, heralding the start of the witnessing to the end of the earth.\textsuperscript{94}

Agabus places the reader in mind of the first διακονία sent by the church in Antioch to the poor among the believers in Jerusalem in the time of a severe worldwide famine. Agabus predicted the famine accurately, ‘by the Spirit’—Acts 11:28. His reappearance could therefore be read as an affirmation of Paul’s intention to re-produce the gesture of solidarity and charity on a far greater scale with the Gentile ‘collection’. Agabus’s dramatic enacted prophecy does not say to Paul “do not go”. It could be interpreted as a mere forewarning about Paul’s arrest and detention (Acts 21:27–28:31).

When we heard this, we and the people there begged him not to go up to Jerusalem. Then Paul answered, “What are you doing, weeping and breaking my heart? For I am ready not only to be imprisoned but even to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus.” And when he would not be persuaded, we ceased and said, “The will of the Lord be done.” (Acts 21:12-14)

The companions and the other believers extrapolate from Agabus’s prophecy and beg Paul not to go to Jerusalem. (Barrett thought that Luke meant to say that this is what the Tyrians did as well—that is, they had a revelation about the danger and, of their own initiative, turned it into advice for Paul not to go to Jerusalem). Luke’s use of “we” at this

\textsuperscript{94} The seemingly pointless mention of Philip’s four daughters who can prophesy, but who do not, perplexed commentators. More recently it has been interpreted as further evidence that Luke silences the voice of women in the church (Turid Karlsen Seim, The Double Message: Patterns of Gender in Luke and Acts (Nashville: Abingdon, 1994); Elizabeth V. Dowling, Taking Away the Pound: Women, Theology and the Parable of the Pounds in the Gospel of Luke, (Library of New Testament Studies. London: Continuum, 2007); Beverly Gaventa “Whatever Happened to Those Prophesying Daughters?” in Amy-Jill Levine (ed.) A Feminist Companion to the Acts of the Apostles, pp. 49-60. Luke never comes to a firm arbitration on the matter of the Spirit’s role in Paul’s decision. If the undertaking were Paul’s own intention, I prefer to think that these women had a superior wisdom that recognised that Paul would not listen to them, even if they did prophesy, and so they choose to exercise the ancient proverbial wisdom of remaining silent before those who would not listen to wise counsel (Prov 23:9). On the other hand, if the journey were Spirit-inspired, Paul was determined and on the right course and there was no need for the prophetic women’s contribution on this occasion (and they alone had the wisdom to see this).
point (21:12) could be taken to mean that, at the time, he was one of the companions, and
that “do not go” was his opinion as well.\footnote{The seemingly endless and inconclusive scholarship on Luke’s use of first-person narration, see: Susan Praeder, “The Problem of First Person Narration in Acts,” \textit{Novum Testamentum} 29/3 (1987): pp. 193-218. Source critics claimed that Luke’s use of occasional first-person narrative indicated the use of a source which contained the “we” voice. I cannot imagine that Luke would fail to notice the uneven result if it were merely a feature of one of his sources. Narrative-critical (literary-critical) scholars have noted the use of “we” in some traditional Graeco-Roman sea-travel tales and suggest that it is a device which is simply evocative of the Homerian sea-tale parts of the narrative. Another suggestion (not entirely independent of the literary explanation) is that the first-person narrative lends verisimilitude to the narrative. Another possibility is that Luke may have wanted to indicate that Paul was accompanied at those points of the journey by the author. For a full discussion see Vernon K. Robbins, “The We-Passages in Acts and Ancient Sea Voyages,” \textit{Biblical Research} 20 (1975): pp. 5-18; Dennis R. MacDonald, “The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul,” \textit{New Testament Studies} 45 (1999): pp. 94-95; J. Wehnert, \textit{Die Wir-Passagen der Apostelgeschichte: Ein lukanisches Stilmittel aus jüdischer Tradition} (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1989).} Paul’s response to the companions’ pleading shows one possible flaw in Paul’s attitude. He claims that beyond preparation for imprisonment, he is also ready to die for the name of the Lord Jesus. But surely one who is divinely commanded to go to Rome (suggested in 19:21 and affirmed in 23:11) ought \textit{not} to be resigned to have this calling cut short and unfulfilled. Nevertheless, the narrative effect of Paul’s impassioned plea is to show the strength of his determination to journey to Jerusalem. Further, the strength of this determination is related to Paul’s passion for securing the solidarity between the predominantly Gentile Pauline churches and the predominantly Jewish church of Jerusalem. Part of Paul’s method for facilitating that solidarity was by means of the collection.

The conclusion of the scene in Caesarea is very similar to the conclusions of the scenes at Miletus (with the Ephesian elders) and in Tyre. Despite grief (weeping 20:37, 21:13) and reservation (21:4, 21:12), the believers do not deny Paul and his companions \textit{the honour and support of an escort.}

After these days we made ready and went up to Jerusalem. And some of the disciples from Caesarea went with us, bringing us to the house of Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple, with whom we should lodge. (Acts 21:15-16)
And so, as the final signifier of honour and respect in this section, the disciples from Caesarea escort Paul up to Jerusalem. They escort Paul from Caesarea,\footnote{In Luke’s geography, Caesarea acts as a “gateway” into and out of Jerusalem. It is appropriate that the first official Gentile convert (Cornelius) lived in nearby Joppa, so that his conversion signifies the good news radiating beyond Jerusalem (according to God’s purpose announced by Jesus in Acts 1:8). This becomes particularly significant later on when Paul is delayed in Caesarea for about two years (23:23; 24:27). We know that he is destined to leave Jerusalem.} at least part way up to Jerusalem, depending on where one understands the text’s location of Mnason of Cyprus.\footnote{The Western text’s amplification places Mnason (renamed Nason) in “a certain village,” presumably half way between Caesarea and Jerusalem (rather than in Jerusalem itself). The whole section is considerably lengthened (extension italicised). \textit{“Some of the disciples came along with us to bring us to the one with whom we were to stay. And coming into a certain village we came to Nason, who was a Cypriot and an early disciple. And departing from there we came into Jerusalem. The brothers welcomed us warmly.”} (Witnesses for this reading include D\textsuperscript{ms}, it\textsuperscript{a}, and syr b ms).} If, as seems likely, he is in Jerusalem, then the escorted journey is about 107 kilometres.\footnote{According to Barrett, \textit{Acts II}, p. 1004.} Just as escort has characterised several major scenes on the way to Jerusalem (20:4,38; 21:5), so escort will take Paul right up to the outskirts of the city.

Excursus: Paul’s Passion for his Journey to Jerusalem: a passion for recognition of his Gentile communities by the church in Jerusalem

Why does Luke emphasise Paul’s passion for his final journey to Jerusalem? What was to be gained from the journey? What was its purpose? Even though the visit ends in a violent riot and the arrest and detention of Paul for over two years, Luke thought it important to reveal Paul’s intensity of passion for this journey (21:13).

When Paul arrives in Jerusalem, Luke tells us that Paul related ‘one-by-one’ an account of the things that God has done among the Gentiles through his ministry. It is not inconceivable that part of this accounting was presenting travelling representatives (witnesses or auditors) from each of the churches that Paul spoke about (including the seven companions mentioned in Acts 20:4). It also seems that the
bringing of a collection is a frequently hinted at matter throughout the text ("alms to my nation", 24:17); Paul's carrying a sum of money sufficiently large to attract the covetousness of a corrupt governor hoping for a bribe, 24:26; the suggestion of 'spiritual money-laundering', 21:24; the travelling 'auditors' who could guarantee accountability in the administration of the fund, 20:4; the advance party to allow preparation of the gift in the next location, 20:5; the 'farewell' to the Ephesian elders following on from his hasty departure from Ephesus, 20:17; the pecuniary nature of parts of the farewell speech to the Ephesian elders, 20:33-35).

Luke shows us Paul travelling to Jerusalem hoping for a successful outcome. What would that ‘success’ have looked like? The Jewish church in Jerusalem would give thanks for what God had done among the Gentiles; they would accept the gift from Paul’s Gentile church communities. The acceptance of that gift would result in both alleviation of poverty and great thanksgiving by Jewish believers for Gentile believers (as anticipated in 2 Corinthians 9:12). According to the principle of exchange of guest-gifts (as reflected in Il. 6.215-232), the acceptance of the collection by the church in Jerusalem would reinforce a bond between the mother church and the Gentile church communities. The reception of the collection would reflect the recognition by the Christian Jewish community in Jerusalem—and their sympathisers elsewhere—that Paul’s Gentile (uncircumcised) communities were really churches, that is, part of the renewed People of God destined for salvation. The reception of the collection would create solidarity between the predominantly Jewish church in Jerusalem and the predominantly Gentile church communities in Galatia, Phrygia, Asia-Minor, Macedonia and Greece; this reinforced solidarity would ensure that the Gentile church communities continued to hold the Jewish church as the original custodian of the blessings and inheritance in which they, too, by God’s grace, had come to share; the witness to Jesus among Jews would possibly

99 John Chrysostom heard references to the collection in Acts 24:17 as he makes clear in Homily 55. Chrysostom quotes Romans 15:25—"I am going to Jerusalem to minister to the saints" —and then writes, “this is the same that he has said here, ‘To do alms to my nation I came.’"
be ‘spurred’ by the great numerical success of proclamation of the gospel among the Gentiles. Although these hopes of Paul’s may not have been fulfilled, Luke honoured the thought behind them as admirable. The Gentile Christians were those who by God’s grace had come to share in blessings that had origins and roots within Judaism.

Unlike Baur, I do not think that Luke narrated a fiction about a harmoniously unified church—an attempt to reconcile the hostile parties of the Paulinists and the Judaists. I believe that Luke perceived the potential for a lack of recognition of Gentile church by the Jewish church in Jerusalem, and he portrayed Paul as passionately trying to pursue a course to encourage solidarity across that divide. Luke portrayed part of that attempt—taking the collection to Jerusalem on Paul’s final journey there—as a noble endeavour that ultimately failed and ended in violent riot, arrest and detention.

Luke expects his readers to note that, whereas defence came from the most unlikely quarters (tribunes and centurions), defence for Paul did not come from the predominantly Jewish church in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, just as Paul, as we know him from his Letters, still held out hope for a turn around in the wider Jewish response to Jesus (cf. Romans 11:25-32), Luke, too, holds this hope for a wider Jewish response to Jesus, but with less confidence (Acts 28:17,25,27). I interpret Luke’s low degree of confidence about a greater turn to Jesus among Jews as a product of the time in which Luke was writing—decades later than the time when Paul wrote, and after the Fall of Jerusalem. But just as Paul was passionate about fostering good relationships between Gentile Christians and Jewish Christians (which in his day included the predominantly Jewish church in Jerusalem), so Luke continues to value a good relationship between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians throughout Asia Minor, Greece and Italy. Among Luke’s reasons for this would be the acknowledgement of Jews as the original custodians of the traditions and scriptures upon which Christianity is established.
Judean Christians in terms of “drought”. His readers would have known that this poverty was probably only made worse in the lead-up to and aftermath of the Jewish War. The Judean Christians (as predominantly Jewish) were among the original custodians of all the blessings promised in the law and the prophets, and as such Paul supports the idea of Gentile “indebtedness” to Jews (Rom 9:4-5; 15:25-27). Luke’s subtle depiction of the “bringing of the collection” may be a portrait of Paul trying to make some repayment of that debt, which, in the process, would forge an enduring guest-friendship through the giving of a guest-gift.

---

6.2.11  *Paul in Jerusalem, Arrest, Detention and Trials (Acts 21:17–26:32)*

6.2.11.1  *Paul’s Reception in Jerusalem*

The issue of Paul’s reception by the community of believers in Jerusalem immediately dominates the account of his arrival.

> When we came into Jerusalem the believers received [ἀπεδέξαντο] us gladly [ἀσμένως]. The day after, Paul went with us to visit James, and all the elders arrived too. (Acts 21:17-18)

The lengthy series of farewells and escorts on the way to Jerusalem (20:4,38; 21:5,16) causes the reader to anticipate with great expectation what will happen on Paul’s arrival. Significant clues about the quality of the reception are provided by attention to three questions—‘who comes out to greet’, ‘who welcomes’ and, more importantly, ‘who does not come out to greet?’

Upon arrival in Jerusalem, the believers—literally “brothers”101—are described as welcoming Paul and his companions (ἀσμένως), a Greek term that can be translated

---

101 The *NRSV* routinely changes “brothers” to “believers” to attempt gender inclusion, but this to my mind is too free a rendering. Translators could add “and sisters” to all references to “brothers” to explicate what was probably implied. “Siblings” would achieve the same result but sounds more scientific that fraternal. “Brethren”, although archaic, sounds to contemporary ears less exclusively male, as contemporary English
“warmly” (*NIV, NRSV*) or “gladly” (*RSV, KJV*).\(^{102}\) It is significant that Luke implies that these brothers *did not include* the people mentioned in the next verse—James\(^{103}\) and the elders—whom Paul and his companions visited and greeted *the next day* (ἐπιούσῃ). Neither is there any mention of a greeting by the apostles, which is a strong contrast to the meeting described in Chapter 15, particularly 15:4 (“when [Paul and Barnabas] came to Jerusalem they were welcomed by the church and the apostles and the elders”). The need for Paul to visit and greet (ἀσπασάμενος) James and the elders (and possibly those among the apostles still in Jerusalem) *the day after* his arrival strongly suggests that they failed in the hospitable act of *providing an escort*. They did *not come out to meet* him. The omission is highlighted by two contrasts. In the *immediate* context, the contrast is with the warm welcome of ‘the brothers’ (21:17). In a broader context, the contrast is with the three previous instances of generous and extravagant escorts: the escort by the Ephesian elders (who came out of Ephesus to Miletus and brought Paul to his ship—20:18,38b); the escort by the believers of Tyre (who brought Paul outside the city and to his ship—21:5,6); and the escort by the disciples from Caesarea (who brought Paul as far as Mnason’s house—21:16).

The failure of James, the apostles and the elders to come out and meet Paul also serves as an early sign of the tensions that emerge in the following scene (21:19-26, especially 21, 24b). Any contemporary readers consideration of the degree to which Luke is portraying the early church as divided will generally be coloured by the debates that have spanned these last two centuries regarding the degree to which the early Christian communities were divided. The *Tendenzkritiks* had their own tendency to *emphasise* the differences between the so-called Paulinists and Judaists, and usually expressed the opinion that Luke had fabricated an ahistorical depiction of the church as harmonious and unified—creating an apologetic for Pauline Christianity by showing how intimately and harmoniously

---

\(^{102}\) Ἀσμένως is a *hapax legomenon* for the NT (occurs in 2 Macc 4:12; 3 Macc 3:15; 5:21).

\(^{103}\) Not James of ‘the Twelve’, whose death prior to this has already been reported in Acts 12:2, but the James who is said to be among the brothers and is first mentioned in 12:17, and who appears to make the final decision at the meeting in Chapter 15 (15:13-21).
it was related to the Apostolic mother church. There are several modern apologetic proposals for the purpose of Acts: Acts as apologetic for Paul’s bona fides; Acts as apologetic for the Roman Empire as benign toward Christianity; Acts as apologetic for Christianity as no threat to Rome.  

The type of close reading that I am seeking does not generally support these theories for Acts as an apology, nor of Luke’s supposed depiction of the church as harmonious and unified. If Luke were trying to disguise or hide tensions in the early church, he failed miserably. A close reading reveals tensions and disunities in the early church, which Luke was content for his readers to see (Acts 6:1, 11:3, 15:2, 15:39). And yet Luke believes the church to be working within the framework of the plans and purposes of God that were being brought to fulfillment through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Note also, however, that the interpretation of what the Spirit was saying could lead to differences (19:21; 20:22; cf. 21:4; 21:11-12). But as the escorts of 20:38b, 21:5, and 21:16 demonstrate the disagreements did not always fracture the community or the hospitality shown to each other. Luke also depicts Paul in Acts as passionately seeking the recognition of his Gentile communities by the Jewish church in Jerusalem. Thus, while not claiming that the ‘churches’ (the communities of believers who followed Jesus) were united, Luke affirms the unity of the church as an ideal worthy of pursuit. Luke’s portrait of Paul as a seeker of Gentile-Jewish solidarity in the church is not dissimilar to the picture of Paul from his letters (Romans 11:18, 14:3,14; 15:7,27).

Bearing these preliminary comments in mind, we turn to the meeting of Paul, James and the elders. Is there any evidence that the apparent lack of escort foreshadows anything untoward in the relationship between Paul and the leaders of the church in Jerusalem (James, the elders, and possibly the apostles)? Luke begins the episode by recounting,

---


105 “If Luke were practicing concealment he was an incompetent practitioner.” Barrett, Acts, p. 2:xli.
After greeting them, he [Paul] explained [ἐξηγεῖτο] in detail, one by one, what God had done [ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός] among the Gentiles [ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] through his ministry [διὰ τῆς διακονίας αὐτοῦ] (Acts 21:19)

This account is very similar to what Luke reported of Paul and Barnabas earlier in Acts 15:12 when the assembly was considering whether the Law’s requirements should be imposed on Gentile believers. The similarity contributes to the sense of intertextual déjá vu, importing a reminder of the time when the first Gentile conversions had led to a discussion of the application of Jewish law.

The whole assembly kept silence and listened to Paul and Barnabas as they explained [ἐξηγοῦμένων] all the signs and wonders that God had done [ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός] among the Gentiles [ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν] through them [δι᾿ αὐτῶν] (Acts 15:12, compare also with 11:4,18; 14:27; 15:4).

In this much later meeting, after Paul speaks, James and the elders praised God. This could be interpreted on face value as a positive reception (of Paul, his mission to the Gentiles and possibly of the Gentile collection); but there have been other proposals, like the proposal of Lake and Cadbury that the elders were “not merely thankful, but relieved. The facts were not what had been reported” (21:21).106 Or it may be that the elders’ “praise” was a perfunctory formality before they quickly turn to their real concerns about what was being said of Paul’s Gentile mission.

If the praise of God is interpreted as a positive reception, the elders’ long speech that follows at first seems a contrast. This is a relatively long speech, especially considering that it follows on from the less-than-realistic ‘they said.’ (Are we to imagine the speech “in unison”, or as a summary of the comments of many—“what they said, in effect, was...”?).107 James and the elders ‘change the topic’ from Gentile missionary success to the myriad of Jewish believers (a possibly hyperbolic expression, which, if taken literally, would claim a


large proportion of the estimated population of Jerusalem at the time).\textsuperscript{108} This ‘change of topic’ could represent a competitive claim to rival Paul’s report. Or, mention of the ‘myriads’, together with the seemingly redundant mention of their zeal for the law, may serve as an introduction to the news about the rumour of Paul’s antinomianism (21:21).

6.2.11.2 The Rumour and the Proposition

The rumour (“They have been informed concerning you that you teach a falling away from Moses to those Jews who live near the Gentiles, saying not to circumcise their children neither to walk according to the customs”) is completely without foundation within the text of Acts. Nowhere do we hear or see a suggestion that the Lukan Paul would do such a thing. The reader must conclude that these accusations, like those brought against Stephen, were false.\textsuperscript{109} James and the elders also seem to give no credit to the rumour, even though they consider it important to refute the rumour in a public manner. (Acts 21:22,24).

The proposed solution (“take these four men under a vow, and be purified with them and pay their expenses to shave their heads”) has chiefly been identified as a way of demonstrating Paul’s Torah observance. Beyond this, several commentators have also seen a connection between the proposal and the receipt of the collection. Ben Witherington has suggested that,

[perhaps some of] the money [for the ‘proposed solution’] came out of the collection. This is perhaps not impossible, and perhaps the Jerusalem church suggested Paul use some of the money this way, thus making it clear that the rest was not some sort of bribe or inducement to overlook the Jewish violation of the Law supposedly encouraged by Paul.\textsuperscript{110}

\textsuperscript{108} The mention of myriads (μυριάδες) is probably hyperbole. Literally, it means “tens of thousands”, which would be somewhere between about 36% and 80% of the whole population of Jerusalem at the time (between 25,000 and 55,000 according to Bruce, \textit{Acts}, p. 445.)

\textsuperscript{109} A reader of Paul’s letters would also have good grounds to suspect the rumour to be false; Paul expresses clearly his “remain as you were” policy in 1 Corinthians 7:18-20.

Are we meant to understand that the proposal was the elders’ way of allowing Paul to deliver his collection? Did it amount to a sort of ‘spiritual money laundering’? That is, was Paul being asked to present at least some of the collection in a way that was seen to show respect for the Temple? This is a distinct possibility.\footnote{In a minor thesis for my Bachelor of Theology Honours degree, I wrote, “Was this the elders’ way of allowing Paul to deliver his collection? Did it amount to a sort of ‘spiritual money laundering?’” Dean Spalding, \textit{Reconciling Paul}, (lodged with The Mannix Library, Catholic Theological College, Melbourne College of Divinity, East Melbourne, 2004), p. 48.} In his commentary on Romans Robert Jewett has aired the view that “a kind of religious money-laundering scheme was in fact adopted that sanctified the Jerusalem offering by assimilating it into legalistic devotion.”\footnote{Robert Jewett, \textit{Romans}, p. 937. In 2009, Pervo also described one understanding of the proposal as a “laun-der”, but thinks it unlikely that Paul would have found such a proposal acceptable (Pervo, \textit{Acts}, 543).}

The speech by the apostles and elders finishes with a more explicit reference to the decision of James at the assembly in Jerusalem described in Acts 15. The intertextual déjà \textit{vu} created by the lengthy parallel between 21:19 and 15:12—both contain the words “explained what God had done among the Gentiles through…”—also transports the reader’s recollection back to Acts 15. The purpose of mentioning the original decision of James (first mentioned in Acts 15) is not made clear by the speakers. But perhaps it was to be understood as suggesting that the church in Jerusalem was not going back on the decision that it had reached as described earlier in the narrative at 15:20 and 29 (the so-called ‘Apostolic Decree’).\footnote{The expansion in the Western text (as seen in Codex Bezae) appears to suggest that this is the reason why the elders refer back to the decision first mentioned in Acts 15—to make clear that the Jerusalem elders were not reneging on the so-called ‘Apostolic Decree’, that is, that they were still content not to require \textit{Torah observance of Gentile believers}. The Western text adds a further six words into verse 25, which I have italicised in the following translation: “21:24…and everyone will know that there is nothing to these things they have been told concerning you, but that you live by principles and keep the law. 21:25 But concerning those Gentiles who have come to believe, we have sent them a decision to observe no such thing [as e.g. circumcision] but only that they are to keep themselves from…”} Perhaps they are making it clear that although they promote (and desire to be seen promoting) Torah observance for Jewish believers, they are not reneging on \textit{not} requiring Torah observance for Gentile believers (other than the ‘few essentials’, 21:25; 15:20,29).
However, by the end of James’ speech there remains an element of ambiguity, suggesting that the reception was not as positive as Paul might have hoped; and that maybe the reader is right to suspect there to be significance in the fact that James and the elders did not come out to meet Paul upon his arrival. Instead of standing up for Paul’s character against the false information or refuting those who had promulgated the false information, James and the elders propose a solution that puts the onus probandi upon Paul to demonstrate publicly that there is no substance to the accusation made against him. Thus the omission by Luke of any depiction of an escort of Paul’s arrival on the part of James and the elders may be significant—a hint to the reader that the apostles and the elders are not prepared to give unequivocal support to Paul and his Gentile mission.\textsuperscript{114}

Although the ‘solution’ proposed by James and the elders is portrayed as a genuine attempt to correct what is presented as a misunderstanding and to make the reception of the collection possible, \textit{another} misunderstanding derails the proposal (21:29)—Jews from Asia supposed that Paul had brought Trophimus, a Greek, into the Temple.\textsuperscript{115} The last piece of evidence that Luke was suggesting that all was not well between Paul and the leaders of the Jerusalem church is that, following the riot and arrest of Paul, we are not told that James or the elders made any effort to come to his defence. Neither do we read that the church fervently prayed for him (as it did for Peter when he was imprisoned, Acts 12:5). Instead, after they propose the solution that inadvertently lands Paul in so much trouble, James and the elders (like the apostles) \textit{disappear} from the text completely. Rescues, defences and pronouncements of exoneration \textit{continue} to come from sev-

\textsuperscript{114} Pervo writes, “One mark against this reconstruction [in which the elders want to defend Paul against the accusations toward the Torah] is the complete absence from Acts of the slightest hint that any believers at Jerusalem uttered so much as one word in defence of Paul. James disappears from the story, and after v. 26, so do the four. If arguments from silence are to be deployed, this absence of data supports the rejection of the collection by James rather than its acceptance “on the side”. Stanley Porter reads the episode as a rejection of Paul by the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem. The implication of the text supports his position.” (Pervo, Acts, 543, referring also to Stanley Porter, \textit{Paul of Acts}, Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen 115 (Tübingen:Mohr Siebeck, 1999), pp.172-186).

\textsuperscript{115} Josephus in \textit{War} twice speaks of the signs warning foreigners not to enter the Temple—\textit{War} 5.193-194 and 6.124-126. In the later, the character Titus speaks about the execution of foreigners who transgressed this law even if they were Roman Citizens—“Have not we given you leave to kill such as go beyond it, though he were a Roman?”
eral ‘surprising quarters’—mostly from the Roman Imperial leadership. Thus far in the narrative, ‘surprising’ help has come from Gamaliel (5:33-40), Gallio (18:12-17), and the Ephesian town clerk (19:35-41). None of the examples of ‘help from surprising quarters’ is a measure of whole-hearted or consistent support for ‘the Way’ (whether from Jewish leadership or Roman government). Each incident is coloured with irony—the characters help despite belonging to an institution that ought to oppose Christianity for proclaiming “another king named Jesus” (Acts 17:7). Help for Paul never comes from James nor the elders of the Jerusalem church.

Luke does not describe the early church as beset with an irreconcilable difference between the Paulinists and the Judaists (as Baur and his disciples suspected was the truth historically). But neither does Luke portray a harmoniously unified church (which is how Baur and his disciples perceived Luke’s Tendenz). Instead, Luke portrays parties who agreed on the essentials—Torah observance for Jewish believers, non-imposition of Torah on Gentile believers, and a mutually agreeable edict to promote intra-community fellowship across boundaries considered desirable by the leadership in both parties (Acts 15:19-20, 21, 28-29; 21:25).

Despite some small expressions of goodwill in the scene with Paul and the elders—Paul’s greeting of the elders (21:19a), the elders’ hearing of Paul’s account for which they praised God (21:19b, 20a), and the reiteration of the commitment to the so-called ‘Apostolic Decree’ (21:25)—most of the scene is marked by tension and strain between the two parties as revealed by a description of the false accusations leveled at Paul and the solution proposed for dealing with these rumours (21:20b-24). Perhaps the implied reader (aware of the Jewish War and its lead-up as described by Josephus) would interpret the strains evident in Acts 21:17-26 as a reflection of the state of affairs from the time that Paul made his final journey to Jerusalem (in the late 50s) to the time when Luke wrote, that is, after the Fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE. As Jerusalem headed toward the political turmoil of the Jewish War, maintaining good relations with the Gentile churches of Asia Minor, Macedonia, Greece and Italy would have proved increasingly difficult for the Jewish
church in Jerusalem, and Luke’s writing would have to accommodate and give an account of this growing reality. Craig Keener, describing the late 50s of the CE in Jerusalem, writes,

... tensions are rising, and the temple sicarii, or assassins, are murdering aristocrats suspected of collaborating with the Gentiles. Jewish nationalism is on the rise, and nationalism’s exclusivity makes it intolerable of supposedly faithful members of its people who have fellowship with members of other peoples. Thus it is incumbent on Paul to prove the integrity of his Jewishness; he can not compromise the Gentile mission, but he will affirm his Jewish heritage at any cost short of unbiblical exclusivism.¹¹⁶

6.2.11.3 Riot and the Arrest of Paul: Where Will Paul’s Help Come From?

From Paul’s Temple incident (Acts 21:27) to the end of Acts, Luke depicts the church in Jerusalem as a community that could not or would not come to Paul’s defence. The first hint of this possibility was communicated to readers in the leadership’s failure to come out and meet Paul; the second hint, in the leadership’s tentative and contingent plan to receive the collection (the gift of the Gentiles), which ultimately failed. If defence and help cannot or will not come from the apostles and the elders, where will it come from? The irony that Luke keeps before the readers’ eyes, right through to the conclusion of Acts, is it will come from an unlikely quarter—the Roman imperium.

Paul’s first escape after the riotous Temple incident is accomplished through his being carried (συνέβη ὁ στρατιώτης ἐμφανισθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ ἀνεμένη οὖν ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ τοῦ στρατιώτη) by the soldiers from the Temple precinct to the barracks (21:35–37). The carrying of a person (who is not dead or sick) exemplifies a rare mimetic image in scripture.¹¹⁷ It would not be so unfamiliar to those under Roman rule. Pliny the Younger, in praise of the Emperor Trajan, speaks of less virtuous emperors who insisted upon being carried upon human shoulders (sed umeris hominum).¹¹⁸ Being carried in a sella (a chair on poles usually carried by two) or lectica (which allowed the carried person

¹¹⁶ C. Keener, Bible Background Commentary (Downers Grove; InterVarsity, 1993), p. 386.
¹¹⁷ Haenchen thought that Paul was carried because he was injured (Haenchen, Acts, 618). But his quick recovery to make the speech supports the idea that Paul is being presented by Luke as not all that badly injured.
¹¹⁸ From the writing of Pliny the Younger in praise of the Emperor Trajan: Radice, Pliny: Letters and Panegyricus, vol. 2, 1969; Panegyricus 22.1-5. Éric Perrin-Saminadayar also notes how the more modest emperors (like Augustus and Trajan) were eulogised for foregoing these greater honours (not only more demonstrative, but frequently more expensive), partly because it imposed less of a financial burden upon the populace. Perrin-Saminadayar, “La préparation des entrées royales,” in Les Entrées, pp. 80-81.
to recline and was carried by up to eight slaves) would have been a familiar image to a Roman readership. Being carried in a *sella* or a *lectica* was the preserve of the wealthy and noble. Caesar limited being carried in *sellae* or *lecticae* within Rome to those of a certain rank and age. The *sedan chair* of 17th and 18th Century Britain is a descendant of the *sella*. “Chairing” in Britain (and, because of historical cultural influences, in most states of the Commonwealth of Nations and in the US) also refers to the practice of carrying someone aloft (usually seated upon the shoulders of two people) after a victory or some other great achievement. Therefore, the ironic ritual symbolism of Paul being ‘chaired’ by the imperium is evident, not only to a first century Lukan reader, familiar with Roman conventions, but even to many contemporary Western readers.

The image of Paul being carried although he is clearly a prisoner is the first of many ironic depictions of Paul the triumphant prisoner.

This ironic interplay, between *Paul the prisoner* and *Paul the victor* who enjoys considerable freedoms, continues right through to the completion of Acts. For instance, when Paul asked permission to make a speech from the steps of the barracks, the tribune granted his request.

He motioned to the people for silence; and there was a great hush. (Acts 21:40)

For a while, the people listened to Paul as if they were listening to a dignitary.

Throughout the detention section (21:31–26:32), the reader will continue to see Paul receiving assistance from the office-bearers of Rome in the face of threats from Jews

---


120 Luke ‘shows’ the reader the chains of Paul’s incarceration from Acts 21:33 to 28:20 which also make the final word in Acts—ἀκωλύτως (‘unhindered’)—particularly rich with ironic triumph.

121 Freedom to speak (21:39; 27:10,21,31,33); freedom to ride like a king (23:24); freedom to witness boldly before a king and a governor (26:1,23-29); freedom to appeal his case and sail to Rome (25:12, 27:1); freedom to be attended by friends (24:23; 27:3; 28:7,10; 28:14); freedom to go ashore (27:42-43); freedom to collect brushwood (28:3); freedom to minister to the sick (28:8-9); freedom to enjoy *Pax Romana* and the Roman roads (28:15); freedom to live in his own accommodation (28:16).

122 Pervo offers an insightful excursus examining the “triumph” of Paul the prisoner (Pervo, *Acts*, 552-3).
seeking his life. Sometimes the empire provides escape or protection (21:35, 22:24, 23:30, 25:11), including on one occasion, protection against interrogation by flogging on the basis of possessing Roman citizenship (22:25-29).

The second extravagant incident of escort consists in the enormous cavalcade provided to Paul (23:23-24) by the tribune of the cohort, Claudius Lysias. Arrangements were made to transport Paul safely from Jerusalem to Caesarea following a conspiracy by some Jews to kill Paul (23:12-15). Here, the Empire steps into the role that the Jerusalem brethren earlier fulfilled, of helping Paul to escape a threat to his life and by the very same route—Jerusalem to Caesarea (Acts 9:30). The similarities between the two escapes (9:29-30, 23:12, 21, 23-24) invite the reader to note the contrasting agents. This constitutes one of several instances of what I dub Luke’s ‘conspiracy revealed and thwarted’ motif—Acts 21:31-33; 21:35; 23:16-22; 25:3-12; 27:30-32; 27:42-44.

Then he called two of the centurions and said, “At the third hour of the night get ready two hundred soldiers with seventy horsemen and two hundred spearmen to go as far as Caesarea. Also provide mounts [κτήνη, literally “beasts”] for Paul to be set upon [ἐπιβιβάσαντες], and bring him safely [διασώσωσι] to Felix the governor (Acts 23:23-24)

The extravagance of this ‘escape’ is indicated by the numbers of men and horses—472 men and 72 horses, presumably. The men outnumber the 40 assassins said to be waiting to ambush Paul nearly 12 to 1. As Chrysostom writes at the very beginning of his Fiftieth Homily on the Acts of the Apostles, Paul was being escorted “Like a king whom his bodyguards escort”.123 The departure by night is reminiscent of an honor paid to Vespasian, Titus and Domitian when the military forces of Rome under the command of centuries and cohorts march to the Temple of Isis by night (ἐπὶ νύκτωρ) to be ready for the Triumph of the Three Princes (War 7.123).

There are intertextual links between this cavalcade and two passages in the Third Gospel: the Parable of the Compassionate Samaritan and Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem. The

---

123 Chrysostom, Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles. 50 on Acts 23:31, 32, 33. In contrast, Conzelmann’s response to the extravagance of the escort (half of all the garrison) was to write that the number of men was “sheer fantasy” (Conzelmann, Acts, 194).
links are achieved principally through the use of shared words: ‘mounts’ (κτήνη, literally “beasts”), ‘set upon’ (ἐπιβιβάσαντες) but also, in the case of the Compassionate Samaritan the concept of removing someone to a place of safety. In the parable, the Compassionate Samaritan set the victim upon his own beast (ἐπιβιβάσας δὲ αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸ ἴδιον κτήνος) and brought him to an inn (a “welcome-all”)—a place of safety. In the account of Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem the disciples set (ἐπεβίβασαν) Jesus upon a colt.

The first intertextual link (to the Compassionate Samaritan) also highlights that this help is from an unanticipated quarter. Aid from the Samaritan is surprising in view of Samaritan-Jewish hostilities. Likewise unanticipated is safe passage from Claudius Lysias, the tribune (who probably took the name of the ruling emperor of the day, upon being granted citizenship). This link between the Compassionate Samartitan and the tribune—would seem to the reader to cast the tribune as a “compassionate outsider”.

The second intertextual link (to Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem) reminds readers that Luke has similarly alluded to imperial triumphal escorts in Jesus’ entry of the same city that Paul is now departing. (Jesus’ entry of Jerusalem was the royal welcome gone ‘awry’.) The ironic glimpse of grand-style and pomp conveys essentially the same message: both the Messiah and his emissary (Paul) may have suffered atrocity under the imperium, but they were worthy of the honour that the imperium reserves for highest dignitaries—generals and emperors. And Rome, at this stage of Acts appears capable of being of assistance to the emissaries of Jesus.

Rome is not, of course, portrayed as unalteringly just and benign. The tribune was about to flog Paul until he learned of his Roman citizenship (22:25-29). When Lysias writes to Felix there is a significant departure from the truth in his letter (“When I learned that he was a Roman citizen, I came with the guard and rescued him”—Acts 23:24; whereas the reader knows that this was far from the order of events as recounted by the reliable narrator—Acts 22:30-39). Similarly, Claudius fails to release Paul even though he knows that Paul has done “nothing deserving death or imprisonment” (23:29).

The second intertextual link (to Jesus’ Entry into Jerusalem) also serves to remind the reader that Paul is, in fact, on a path different to the path followed by Jesus. Paul is des-
tined for Rome, as the Lord testified in the nocturnal visitation during his detention in Jerusalem (Acts 23:11).

The extravagant cavalcade is linked to the next major section (‘Paul’s Journey to Rome: Sea Voyage, Storm, Ministry on Malta and Arrival in Rome’) by the verb “save”. Just as he is brought “safely” (διασώσω) to Felix the governor (Acts 23:24), Paul (and all those who sail with him) will be brought safely to shore when threatened by the shipwreck (27:43b-44; 28:1,4)—and again the Imperial leadership plays a significant role in contributing to that safety (27:31-32; 27:42-43a).

The third instance of unanticipated help from the Empire is developed in this next section (the Sea Voyage). But the catalyst for the provision of the escorted journey by sea is contained in this section (25:6-12)—Paul’s appeal to the emperor. Although Festus provided a way in which Paul’s journey to Rome could be fulfilled, the portrait of the imperial system is far from unmitigated benevolence.

In this section we have seen that, on one hand, Rome can be friendly and aid the apostles as they go about their witness to the world. The tribune provided the rescue and then the extravagant cavalcade for Paul. Governor Felix allowed Paul to have some liberty and his friends are not prevented from attending to his needs (24:23, a pattern repeated in Sidon at 27:3). Festus put Paul’s case before King Agrippa (and thus brought about the fulfilment of the prophecies spoken by Jesus—Luke 21:12—and Ananias—Acts 9:15).

On the other hand, Luke portrays Rome’s dark side, characterised by greed and corruption of some of its key leaders (and ultimately by its error of ‘allegiance’ to a mortal Caesar mistakenly identified as Divine Lord, King and Saviour). Felix the Governor continued to detained Paul, despite being told of his innocence by tribune Claudius Lysias (23:29). Claudius Lysias had falsified his account of what had transpired in order to portray himself in a better light in the eyes of the governor (23:27). Paul had told Felix of his intention to “bring alms” to his “nation” and “to offer sacrifices”, and that he was arrested in the process of completing this (24:17-18), and consequently Felix sent for Paul often, hoping that a bribe might be given to him (24:26). Luke leads his readers to hypothesise that Felix must have presumed that Paul still had access to the substantial collection that
was never handed over.\textsuperscript{124} When Festus replaced Felix as governor, the impartiality of both of them was compromised by their desire to “do the Jews a favour” (24:27, 25:9).\textsuperscript{125} When Paul was threatened by extradition to Jerusalem (and another threat of ambush and assassination), he was forced to appeal to the emperor and, although Festus granted the right to make the appeal in Rome (25:12), it was clear to him that Paul had done nothing deserving death or imprisonment.

Even though the imperial leaders assisted in Paul’s \textit{escorted} passage to Rome, there remained the great injustice that Paul was known to be innocent of anything deserving death (25:18, 19, 25; 26:31) or imprisonment (26:31) and yet he was still ‘over-detained’ (for more than two years).


Paul’s journey to Rome is the longest escorted journey narrated in the whole of Acts. Paul’s escort was provided principally by the centurion Julius of the Augustan Cohort who would normally have been in charge of 100 soldiers (an indeterminate number of soldiers is mentioned at 27:31 and 42, and the total number of souls on the second ship for the voyage is stated as 276). Paul is also accompanied by some other companions (see 27:2), of whom Aristarchus is the only one named. \textit{One} named companion stands in great \textit{contrast} to the \textit{seven} named companions on Paul’s journey to Jerusalem (20:4).\textsuperscript{126} Is Luke

---

\textsuperscript{124} Pervo agrees that, at Acts 24:17, Luke lets the “cat out of the bag” regarding the collection. Pervo further explains that part of Luke’s motivation for this disclosure regarding the collection was to provide \textit{justification} for 24:26 (Felix waiting for a bribe)—Pervo, \textit{Acts}, p. 599. Tannenhill, \textit{Narrative Unity}, 2:300, (like Haenchen) did not wish to correlate 24:17 with the collection, but Haenchen’s original position (that Luke made no reference to the collection) is losing support.

\textsuperscript{125} The succession from Felix to Festus is dated by historians to c. 60 CE.

\textsuperscript{126} About the seven named companions of 21:4, Luke Timothy Johnson writes, “The passage testifies to the complexity of the Pauline mission. But it is once more strangely reticent concerning the function of the delegates, which we suspect—from Paul’s own testimony—to have been connected to the collection for the saints in Jerusalem.” (Johnson, \textit{The Acts of the Apostles}, p. 355).
implying that the failure to deliver the collection and the years of detention had taken their toll on the resilience and faithfulness of Luke’s entourage?127

The relationship between Julius and Paul is ostensibly that of guard and prisoner. And yet, several times on the voyage, Paul assumes roles more appropriate to a prophetic adviser, leader and mentor (27:9, 21, 31, 33; 28:8-10). Julius’s attitude to Paul will change over the course of their journey together (reflected in the way he responds to Paul’s advice).

The initial section of the journey (27:1-8) is narrated diegetically as a brief report. The journey’s conclusion in 28:11-12 is also narrated in a brisk diegetic mode. Together, these less focussed introductory and closing sections demarcate 27:1–28:16 as a literary unit. However, whereas the conclusion of the voyage is marked by easy and uneventful sailing, the beginning of the journey is marked by difficulty in sailing.128

Unlike the numerous Graeco-Roman antecedents of the sea-voyage genre (including Homer’s archetypal Odyssey), Luke does not attribute the difficulty of the sea-voyage to the action of the gods (nor even to God, as in Jonah), but rather to the natural consequence of attempting to sail the Mediterranean so late in the season.129 Paul’s first comment upon the matter of when to sail the seas (27:10) is not so much a prophetic utterance, but a statement of common sense that any well-seasoned traveller such as Paul could reasonably make. There is no actual ‘advice’ in what Paul says the first time; it is more a simple statement that sailing so late is dangerous. The ship’s owner and the pilot have another piece of “common sense” to contend with and that is that their present location is

127 Pervo writes, “If, as hypothesized, the collection failed of its purpose and Paul was arrested—both probable—it is possible that such of his colleagues who were themselves not arrested—gentiles in Jerusalem without many allies—would have left Jerusalem promptly to deliver the news, in writing and in person.” Pervo, Acts, p. 542.

128 Pervo agrees, “These conveyances roughly delineate the structure, which is framed by two brief ... itinerary passages: vv. 27:1-8 and 28:11-16. Pervo also notes other features of the inclusio, for example, friendly officials and the ministrations of fellow believers (Pervo, Acts, 654, 669).

129 Josephus’s War makes reference to the winter ‘closure’ of the Mediterranean Sea as a way to explain the long gap between the adventus of Vespasian (being welcomed to Rome as her new Caesar) and the adventus of the three princes, which included Titus who has first to finish the Roman-Jewish War, and who because he ‘misses’ the safe sailing season embarks on a tour up and down the Levant (from Egypt to Syria and back). War 4.658; 7.19-20.
an unsuitable and dangerous place in which to spend the winter. Therefore, the majority decide to risk the short journey to a safer harbour. In all of this, the centurion is said to have paid more attention to what the owner and the pilot had to say, than to Paul. There is irony in the suggestion that there was even a remote possibility that the Centurion could have done otherwise. For nautical advice, why would the opinion of a tent-maker have trumped the advice of professional sailors? Nevertheless, the narrator’s comment is necessary in order to illustrate the change that takes place in the centurion as he begins to listen and respond receptively to Paul’s words (first implied in 27:31-32). Throughout Luke and Acts, to listen to the emissaries of Jesus is to receive them, the Word of God and Jesus (who sends them in the first place)

As in so many Greco-Roman sea-journeys, the attempt to find safe harbour starts well (Acts 27:12-13). Nevertheless, things soon change dramatically for the worse (as they often do in the Odyssey). It is in the midst of the tempest that Paul stands up and makes his second comment—a message of encouragement and the revelation that there would be no loss of life (27:21-26). It is not only the similarities to the Homeric style of narrating a sea-journey and storm that would strike the implied reader. The contrasts are also

130 There is a parallel question perhaps raised in Peter’s mind in Luke 5:5—why should professional fishermen heed the advise of a carpenter on how to fish? By contrast, S. M. Praeder did not think it improbable that Paul participated in the discussions of whether to sail or not based on writings of the day that suggested that such decisions were not commonly left to the professional sailors. “Acts 27.1–28.16: Sea Voyages in Ancient Literature and the Theology of Luke-Acts.” Catholic Biblical Quarterly 46 (1984): pp. 683-706.

131 For “good starts” see: Od. 5.268, where Calypso sent Odysseus a fair wind, gentle and warm when he set out on his raft from Ogygia; Od. 12.399-402, describing Odysseus and companions setting sail for home after his men had feasted on the Cattle of the Sun God—“then the wind ceased to blow tempestuously, and we at once went on board, and put out into the broad sea when we had set up the mast and hoisted the white sail”; Od. 14.299-300a, where Odysseus , in disguise, spins Eumaeus a tale about an imaginary sea-voyage – “and she ran before the North Wind, blowing fresh and fair, on a mid-sea course to the windward of Crete”.

132 See Od. 14.300b-304—“and Zeus devised destruction for the men. But when we had left Crete, and no other land appeared, but only sky and sea, then it was that the son of Cronos set a black cloud above the hollow of the ship, and the sea grew dark beneath it”; and Od. 12.403—“But when we had left that island and no other land had appeared, but only sky and sea, then the son of Cronos set a black cloud above the hollow of the ship, and the sea grew dark beneath it. She ran on for no long time, for then at once came the shrieking West Wind (Ζέφυρος)”. 
striking. In *Odyssey*, *everyone* travelling with Odysseus *perishes* on his homeward journey (Odysseus *alone* is saved); in Acts, as we will see, *everyone* travelling with Paul is *saved*.

After Paul’s encouraging speech (27:21-26), Julius treats him differently. When Paul identifies the plot by the sailors to depart in the lifeboat as threatening the fulfilment of the prophecy that all would be saved, the centurion and his soldiers listen to Paul and scuttle the lifeboat (another instance of Luke’s ‘conspiracy revealed and thwarted’ motif). Julius’s increasing ‘attention to’ (or ‘reception of’) Paul’s words is significant in light of the ‘Luke 10:16 Reception Principle’—if Julius will accept what Paul will say, then he is ‘on the way’ toward receiving Jesus (and the God who sent him).

In a third comment (27:33-36), Paul offers further encouragement to the effect that none of the ship’s company will perish. The description of the meal that Paul shares, immediately following this comment, has caused many commentators, ancient and modern, to note the clear links to the institution of the Lord’s Supper (Luke 22:14-19a). The ending of the Storm at Sea (27:33–28:1) has the potential to evoke also the reader’s memory of the Emmaus journey. The passage has several links to the Emmaus journey: both share allusions to the Lord’s Supper (Luke 24:30; Acts 27:35); both occur in the context of a journey and escort (Luke 24:13,15; Acts 27:1,2); and both have a transition from discouragement to encouragement (Luke 24:21,32; Acts 27:33,36). The final parallel between Emmaus and the Storm at Sea occurs with the shipwreck on Malta. There is a transition from ‘not recognising’ the land (οὐκ ἐπεγίνωσκον—Acts 27:39) to ‘recognising’, as in learning the identity of, the island (ἐπέγνωμεν—Acts 28:1)—just as in the Emmaus journey there is a transition from ‘not recognising’ Jesus (μὴ ἐπιγνῶναι αὐτόν—Luke 24:16) to ‘recognising’ him (ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν—Luke 24:31). And that ‘recognition’ is juxtaposed with an incident of salvation. In other words, at the end of both journeys the companions of the one who bears the good-news *see salvation*. The drawing of the parallels may also be Luke’s way of communicating to his reader that his second work is approaching its con-

clusion—just as ‘Emmaus’ is the antepenultimate scene in Luke’s Gospel, so the Storm at Sea is the antepenultimate scene in Acts.

The final threat to the fulfilment ‘exactly as it had been told’ (27:24-25, that none would perish) is the soldiers’ plan to kill the prisoners “so that none might swim away and escape” (27:42). The reader would suspect that the soldiers’ fears are the same as the Philippian jailer’s—that if their prisoners escape they (the soldiers) would be executed.134 As we saw from Peter’s jailbreak, guards were held to account for their prisoners to the degree that if they let prisoners escape, guards could be executed in the prisoners’ place (12:19)—another portrait of Imperial methods of control (cf. 12:20). This time the centurion uses his own initiative to intervene (yet another instance of Luke’s ‘conspiracy revealed and thwarted’ motif) and keeps the soldiers from carrying out their plan because, Luke tells us, the centurion wished to save Paul. This represents the end-point of the transformation of the centurion. He is now receptive toward Paul and, therefore, presumably receptive toward the gospel, like other centurions before him (Acts 10:33,44; Luke 23:47; 7:9-10).135 As with so many Lukan characters, once his transformation is complete, Luke never mentions him again (although presumably the centurion has to be close by Paul’s side until he delivers him to Rome—that is, at least up to 28:16).

Salvation is the key motif that links the end of the shipwreck narrative with the episode on Malta, chiefly through Luke’s use of the verb διασώζω—“And so it was that all were brought safely [πάντας διασωθῆναι] to land” and “After we had reached safety [διασωθέντες]…” The implied reader would notice one sharp contrast between Luke’s narrative of ‘salvation at sea’ and the archetypal Homeric version. In the Odyssey, Odysseus loses all his travelling companions.136 The contrast to Luke’s voyage could not be

134 Note that the desire to save Paul saves all the prisoners.

135 Luke, the reticent narrator, does not mention explicitly the Centurion’s conversion—all we ‘see’ is his change in response to Paul’s words (27:11,31-32).

136 Odysseus sets out from Troy with a dozen vessels in his command. Along the various stops recounted in the Apologoi, the number of men is whittled away (killed in reprisals for their piracy; eaten by a Cyclops); the Laestrygonians sink all but Odysseus’s vessel (10.131-2); then the storm, as told in Book 12, finishes off the entire crew of the remaining ship, save Odysseus (Zeus punished Odysseus’s men for eating the Sun God’s cattle—12.419). Odysseus alone is saved and brought home.
clearer. In this voyage all are saved (27:22). In Paul’s odyssey we see the soteriology of God who wills that all should live. The narrative completely subverts imperial methods of control—food supply (12:20) and the threat of death (12:19, 16:27). The control by threat to food supply is subverted by hospitality and the distribution of resources with justice (4:32-37; 11:27-30; 20:4-6, 35; 24:17); and the control by means of the threat of death is subverted in a kingdom in which all are saved (27:44; 28:1).\textsuperscript{137}

The two “plots” (the sailors’ attempt to abandon the ship by the lifeboat and the soldiers’ plan to kill the prisoners) each represent an attempt by “some” to save their own lives, but at the cost of loss of life for others. The combined efforts of Paul and the centurion work to bring about what Luke conveys as God’s soteriological plan for humankind—the offer of salvation to all (24, 34, 44). Escort is presented by Luke as a correlate associated with the salvation of all, for God grants to Paul the lives, not “of all on the ship”, but as the angel says, “of all those who are sailing with you” (πλέοντας μετὰ σοῦ).\textsuperscript{138} As in other parts of Luke-Acts, it is while travelling with the gospel-bearers that others come to hear the good news of Jesus, and by receiving the gospel, are saved (Acts 8:36; Luke 24:32).

As the story proceeds from the ‘failure to recognise’ to the ‘recognition’ of the land, the implied reader, informed by the cultural script that owed so much to Homerica, would recall the formulaic question that often accompanied land-fall in the Odyssey. “Alas, to the land of what mortals have I now come? Are they cruel, and wild and unjust? or are they kind to strangers and fear the gods in their thoughts?” (e.g. Od. 6.119-121, 13:200-202). Luke wastes no time in answering this ancient question.

On Malta, the barbaroi immediately demonstrate kindness (φιλανθρωπία—Acts 28:2) toward Paul and his companions—the same kindness that Julius has shown toward Paul

\textsuperscript{137} As with the Philippian jailer’s question, ‘saved’ is used in the later part of the sea voyage with deliberate ambiguity (27:24,31,42,44, 28:1). The ambivalence between ‘saved from drowning’ and “saved” (as included in the kingdom of God, i.e. “salvation”) is deliberate—an example of what literary critics would call “polysemy”. Marguerat and Bourquin, How to Read the Bible, p. 118.

\textsuperscript{138} Pervo goes as far to say, “Paul is the cause of [all the passengers’] deliverance and thus their saviour,” and, “These two brief adventures [the plot of the sailors—27:30-32—and the plot of the soldiers—27:41-43] reinforce the theme that Paul is the reason why all are saved.” (Pervo, Acts, pp. 660, 662).
(Acts 27:3—φιλανθρώπως, the related adverbial form of φιλανθρωπία). These are two of only three occurrences of φιλανθρωπία in the NT, and therefore the use of this relatively uncommon word strongly links the two sub-episodes of this literary unit.139

The reception of Paul is shown by the kindling of a fire and the welcoming of all (πάντας) around it. The barbaroi demonstrate the same inclusivity that typifies God’s salvation (27:24,35,36,37,44). The reader suspects that the barbaroi, as characters who welcome Paul, would also have become welcomers of Paul’s message. Note that, although it is cold and wet, the shipwreck survivors do not “happen” upon the natives and their fire (as in Od. 3.32-37 when Telemachus comes upon the sacrificial feast of Nestor on the beaches of Pylos); the natives of Malta appear to have come to the shipwreck survivors and the fire is kindled (ἅψαντες) for the survivors.140 Although this encounter does not occur in one of Paul’s “three missionary journeys” (according to the conventional way of dividing his travels), it would be misguided not to see Malta as an encounter (reception-scene) that achieves missional objectives—that is, in which the good news of salvation is shared and received. In other words, Malta is a missionary episode, just as much as better-known scenes like those at Philippi, Athens, Corinth, or Ephesus—and the Malta episode has as much to contribute to missiological understanding as these earlier episodes.

The incident with the viper (28:4-6) is described in a brief passage rich in intertextual links to other parts of Luke-Acts. The reader would recognise the viper’s bite as a further threat to the fulfilment of the divine plan (“you must [δεῖ] bear witness also in Rome”, Acts 23:11).141 The reader would not be surprised to learn that Paul suffers no harm as,

139 Φιλάνθρωπος and its cognates occur 14 times in the LXX, but only in those Greek-only sections of the Deuterocanonical books which have no Hebrew precedent (φιλανθρωπιό τω 2 Mac 13:23; φιλανθρωπία Esth 16:11; 2 Mac 6:22; 2 Mac 14:9; 3 Mac 3:15; 3 Mac 3:18; φιλάνθρωπος 1 Esd 8:10; 2 Mac 4:11; 4 Mac 5:12; Wis 1:6; Wis 7:23; Wis 12:19; φιλανθρώπως 2 Mac 9:27; 3 Mac 3:20).


141 The revelation of ‘divine necessities’ throughout Acts, in one way, destroys narrative suspense (the reader knows what will happen); but in another way, narrative suspense is maintained because the reader does not know how these things will be brought to fulfilment. See similar comments about suspense (in the Book of Tobit) by Ryan S. Schellenberg, in “Suspense, Simultaneity and Divine Providence in the Book of Tobit”, p. 316.
by this late stage in the work, the ‘overcoming’ of ‘threats to fulfilment of the divine plan’ is expected. The failure of the viper’s bite to harm Paul makes a strong intertextual link with Jesus’ words upon the return of the “seventy” (Luke 10:18-19—“I have given you authority to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing shall hurt you”). The pagan response to Paul’s lack of harm—they proclaim him to be a god—does not draw the critical response which Paul and Barnabas make to the Lycaonians (Acts 14:14-18), or which Peter makes to Cornelius (10:25-26). Luke’s readers (because of the similar misunderstandings at 10:25-26 and 14:11-12, and because of the antecedent in Homeric literature—Od. 7.199-208; 16.183-187) would expect some form of corrective refutation to the misapprehension that the guests were divine. On this occasion, however, there is no rebuke.

The surprising lack of refutation has two possible explanations. The first possible solution is that since the Maltese were βάρβαροι (that is, they did not speak Greek or Latin) the option of refuting their conclusion that he was a god was unavailable to Paul—they would not understand him and he would neither have understood what they had said in the first place.

The second, and to my mind more satisfying, solution is that Paul models the realisation that the conclusion of the Maltese βάρβαροι, although not absolutely accurate, approximates a truth and is therefore, on some level, appropriate. As I remarked in the comments about the Cornelius incident (Acts 10:25-26) and the Lycaonian incident (Acts 14:11-12), the reverencing of the emissaries of Jesus may be an illustration of the vicarious reception (‘welcome’) that these groups of people extend toward Jesus, by the ‘Luke 10:16 Reception Principle’. Declaring the emissary to be a god and worshipping him is appropriate because the emissary stands in the place of Jesus, who stands in the place of God.

142 Od. 7.199: “But if he is one of the immortals come down from heaven...”; Od. 7.208: “Alcinous, far from you be that thought; or I am not like the immortals, who hold broad heaven, either in stature or in form, but like mortal men”; Od. 16:183: “truly you are a god”, Od. 16:187: “Be sure I am no god; why do you liken me to the immortals?” Dennis R. MacDonald also notes similarities between the idyllic Acts 28:1-16 and the shipwrecks of the Odyssey in “The Shipwrecks of Odysseus and Paul.” New Testament Studies 45 (1999): pp. 88-107.
The validation of Paul’s non-action (in that he does not remonstrate against the Maltese) is evident in that Paul is not judged as is Herod—when the people of Tyre and Sidon call him a god and he fails to correct their error (Acts 12:22-23).

On Malta, deeds are far more important than words. Consistent with Jesus’ instructions at the commissioning of the ‘Seventy’ (Luke 10:5-7, especially vv. 7 and 9), Paul stayed in a house and healed the sick in it. The Lukan Jesus closely links the healing of the sick with proclamation of the kingdom in Luke 10:9 (“heal the sick in it and say to them ‘The kingdom of God has come near to you’”). Acts 28:8-9—a passage that initially describes the healing of Publius’s father and then describes the healing of the rest of the people on the island who had diseases—creates a conspicuous parallel with Luke 4:38-40—that initially describes the healing of Peter’s mother-in-law and then describes the healing of the rest of the people of Capernaum who had diseases. The table below highlights the elements that contribute toward the parallelism.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And he arose and left the synagogue, and entered Simon's house</td>
<td>Now in the neighborhood of that place were lands belonging to the chief man of the island, named Publius, who received us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now Simon’s mother-in-law was ill with a high fever</td>
<td>and they besought him for her.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and they besought him for her.</td>
<td>and Paul visited him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And he stood over her and rebuked the fever</td>
<td>And when this had taken place,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[see below: τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτίθενες ἐθεράπευεν]</td>
<td>the rest of the people on the island who had diseases also came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and it left her [ἀφῆκεν αὐτήν];</td>
<td>[οἱ λαοὶ οἱ ἐν ἐκείνῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἔχοντες ἀσθενείας προσήχοντο]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and immediately she rose and served them.</td>
<td>and were cured [καὶ ἐθεραπεύοντον]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Now when the sun was setting,</td>
<td>[see above: ἐπιθεὶς τὰς χεῖρας]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all those who had any that were sick with various diseases brought them to him</td>
<td>he laid his hands [τὰς χεῖρας ἐπιτίθεσι] on every one of them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ἀπαντεὶς δὸς εἶχον θανατεύοντας νόσοις ποικίλες ἠγαγαν αὐτούς πρὸς αὐτόν];</td>
<td>and healed them [ἐθεράπευεν]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The passage (28:7-10) also has a symmetrical structure: the hospitality from one person (Publius) is followed by the healing of one person (Publius’s father); then the healing of the many (the rest) is followed by the hospitality of the many—“They bestowed many honours on us, and when we were about to set sail, they put on board all the provisions we needed” (28:10). Note that the hospitable farewell provided by the Maltese is ‘shown’ (rather than ‘told’) to the reader. Instead of just saying ‘They farewelled us warmly’ the reader is allowed to ‘see’ the actions of the Maltese—the giving of guest-gifts or provisions and an escorted seeing-upon-their-way.\(^{143}\)

The giving of guest-gifts was a very well known element of hospitality from Homer.\(^{144}\) This successful giving of a guest-gift reinforces in the mind of the reader that an enduring bond has been created between the pagan Gentiles and the proclamation of the Gospel. The pagan Gentiles of Malta have received Jesus’ emissary and they have given a guest gift. This contrasts with the lukewarm reception of James and the elders and the failure of the reception of the collection—the Gentile believer’s guest-gift to the mother church.

When Paul and his companions depart, the sailing is remarkably easy and uneventful. That which was so elusive at the start of their journey—ease of travel—now just happens. It would be hard to escape the conclusion (given Luke’s preoccupation with simultaneity and providence) that Paul was meant to be present on the ship that was wrecked. Paul’s actions on-board the ship and the actions of his ‘disciple’ Julius—‘disciple’ in the sense of one who increasingly values Paul and what he has to say (27:31-32, 43)—bring about the saving of all who sailed with Paul in the ship. Paul’s actions on Malta have amounted to a well-received proclamation of the kingdom—a proclamation that is achieved more by ‘deed’ than by ‘word’.

\(^{143}\) Note that the final gesture of the Maltese carries with it an implicit escorted farewell—in order to put the provisions on board, the Maltese must have come to the ship.

The third ship of Paul's journey from Caesarea to Rome has as its figurehead the Twin Brothers (or 'the Dioscuri'—Διοσκούροις—Acts 28:11). With this passing mention, Luke makes one concluding point to readers who knew Homer or Graeco-Roman religion well. The Dioscuri—Castor and Polydeuces, the twin sons of Zeus and Leda, brothers of Helen (Od. 11.343)—were held to be the guardians of the sea, saving and safeguarding the righteous.145 The identity of the ship's figurehead functions as a reminder (to readers with a Graeco-Roman cultural script) of the question surrounding Paul's need of any further acquittal. Who has the authority to pronounce the exoneration of Paul? With the passing mention of the Twin Brothers, Luke is continuing to make the point that Paul does not really require any acquittal other than God's. Already, pronouncements of Paul's innocence have come from many, varied and surprising quarters. Firstly, Claudius Lysias, Festus and Agrippa all seem to concur that Paul is not guilty of crimes deserving death or imprisonment (23:29; 25:18-19, 25; 26:32). From a pagan perspective, it appears that Dikē (the goddess Justice—Acts 28:4) acquits Paul by his survival of both the sea and the viper's bite, and that the Dioscuri favour the last leg of the journey with speed and easy sailing (28:12-13). Luke's readers (like Luke, and like his character, Paul) would have held all pagan gods to be mere idols (Acts 17:16,24-25, 19:26); it is by God's providence alone that a safe way is found through the sea.146 Paul's exoneration by tribunes, governors and kings is affirming of Paul's righteousness—but there is a higher authority, and it is not

145 The Homeric Hymn 33.7-10 says that the Dioscuri are "deliverers of men on earth and swift-going ships when stormy gales rage over the ruthless sea. Then the shipmen call upon the sons of great Zeus with vows of white lambs, going to the forepart of the prow; but the strong wind and waves of the sea lay the ship under water, until suddenly these two are seen darting through the air on tawny wings. Forthwith they allay the blasts of the cruel winds and still the waves upon the surface of the white sea: fair signs are they and deliverance from toil. And when the shipmen see them they are glad and have rest from their pain and labour." (translation by Hugh Evelyn-White, accessed on-line at http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text/doc=Perseus:abo:tlg,0013,033 on 14th February, 2014.)

146 Paul and Luke would probably take the same censorious view of looking towards idols for safety at sea as the author of Wisdom, chapter 14. ("Again, one preparing to sail and about to voyage over raging waves calls upon a piece of wood more fragile than the ship which carries him...but it is thy providence, O Father, that steers its course, because thou hast given it a path in the sea, and a safe way through the waves...but the idol made with hands is accursed, and so is he who made it; because he did the work, and the perishable thing was named a god" (Wis 14:1,3,8).
Caesar’s. God alone acquits and safeguards his emissary Paul. With God’s exoneration of Paul, Caesar’s verdict is rendered irrelevant. And that is perhaps one reason why Luke does not narrate Paul’s appeal trial.

From Luke’s perspective, the original charge (that Paul took Greeks into the Temple) was a misapprehension (Acts 21:29). Paul is portrayed as having far too great a respect for the traditions of his people to commit such a tactless error. However, if Paul had taken Gentiles into the Temple, it would have been an apt expression of what Luke (and his character Paul) believed: that Gentiles had heard and received the good news and become believers, that God had given the Gentile believers the repentance that leads to life, that they had received the Holy Spirit just as Jewish believers had, and that in cleansing their hearts by faith, God made no distinction between Jewish and Gentile believers. Similarly, Paul has not actually perpetrated an offence against the Emperor. Paul is portrayed as law abiding. Yet, Paul’s proclamation of Jesus as Lord and Messiah (9:22, 17:3, 18:5) constitutes a foundational opposition of the empire. The charges against Paul and his companions (when they were guests of Jason) are worded, “They are acting contrary to the decrees of the emperor, saying that there is another king named Jesus.” (17:7). These words are not really that far from the truth of what Jesus’ emissaries are proclaiming.

Throughout the final third of Acts, Luke is constantly engaged in subtle literary acts of subversion of imperial propaganda. Much of Luke’s irony derives from mimetic imagery which counters imperial values: when Paul is ‘chaired’; when the crowd at the barracks is ‘hushed’ to listen to Paul; when Paul is given the protective cavalcade of imperial scale; or when on the voyage to Rome, the centurion begins to take Paul’s advice. Luke reserves one last piece of dramatic imagery that also works to counter imperial propaganda.

6.2.12.1 Paul’s Arrival in Rome

When Paul arrives in the imperial capital, Rome, Paul—the prisoner—receives what “visually” (mimetically) appears as an adventus, a triumphal ritual welcome that incorporates escort on a grand scale. This final and most extravagant escorted arrival in Acts
(28:15) functions as the ‘hinge’ that links the journey to Rome (27:1–28:14) and the account of Paul in Rome (28:16-31).

The believers from Rome, when they heard of Paul and his travelling companions, “came to meet us (ἤλθαν εἰς ἀπάντησιν) as far as the Forum of Appius and the Three Taverns” (Acts 28:15). Witherington estimates these distances as 43 miles and 33 miles south of Rome respectively. Pervo converts these to kilometres (assuming Roman miles) as 49 kilometres from Rome to the Three Taverns and 65 kilometres from Rome to the Forum of Appius. The distances suggest that these escorted arrivals far exceeded the known distances that the populations of large cities came out to greet imperial celebrities. From Josephus we have it that the citizens of Antioch came 30 stadia—5½ km or 3½ miles—to greet Titus after the Fall of Jerusalem (Jewish War 7.100-103, especially 101). Earlier in Jewish War, Josephus tells us that the residents of Jerusalem came out 60 stadia—11 km or 7 miles—to greet Agrippa and Neapolitanus (War 2.338). The distances suggested by Acts 28:15 exceed the greater of these figures nearly five-fold. To get some perspective, a legion of Roman soldiers could travel about 30 kilometres a day. So the Roman ‘brethren’ came out at least a two-days’ journey to escort the arrival of Paul.

The mention of two different places where Paul was met suggests that there were two welcome parties. Some like Barrett, have speculated as to the identity of the two groups: did one group comprise Gentile Christians and the other Jewish Christians? There are many possibilities, but this one seems as likely as any. The implied reader would take from the cultural script one other possible extrapolation. According to the cultural script (reflected widely from Homeric, Jewish scripture and even Josephus’s account of public affairs), being the first to come out to greet a dignitary meant paying the highest honours. Does this mean that two groups within the church in Rome both held Paul in high regard, but that one (perhaps the Gentile believers?) held him in the highest regard. Even if this

147 Barrett (Acts II, p. 1231) suggests that the mention of two places assumes two groups. Was one gentile and the other Jewish? Luke mentions both in the final chapter of Acts. Tiede and D’Ancona, The Emmaus Mystery, p. 26, notes regarding the distance of 43 Roman miles (63.5 km) from Rome to Forum Appius, that, “For someone in a hurry it could be done in two days, but the seasoned traveler would have taken three.”
is too speculative, the existence of two points of rendezvous does, at the least, suggest a church in which not every group is in communication or coordination with the others. If the church in Rome were in perfect unity, presumably they would only have sent one greeting party.

The image of the people coming out of the city to escort an arrival is similar to that with which Josephus describes the arrival of Vespasian in Rome as its new Emperor. “Amidst all this devotion on every side citizens of distinguished status could no longer bear to wait, and hastened a very long way from Rome to be the first to welcome him.” (See 3.3.1 ‘Rome greets Vespasian’ and War 7. 21-22, 63-75).

Luke may not have been unaware that Paul occasionally appealed to ‘triumph’ imagery—notably that of a triumphal procession march in Paul’s Second Letter to the Corinthians (2 Cor 2:14-16). Both would have known that a triumphant parade was not a celebration for those who were prisoners, bound and led often to slaughter (like Simon in War 7. 162). Paul and his imitators had drawn upon the imagery of such parades (2 Cor 2:14; Col 2:15; 1 Thess 4:17) and had also ‘re-arranged’ the participants in ways that countered imperial propaganda—Christ and the apostles as leaders of the parade, believers as the cheering crowds, the defeated ‘rulers’ and ‘authorities’ who had opposed Christ among the vanquished in the ‘tail’ of the parade. In Luke’s depiction of Paul’s arrival in Rome, although Paul is a prisoner—one often associated with the ‘tail’ of the parade and destined for execution—Acts 28:15 portrays him as the focus and head of the Roman brethren’s adventus ceremony. The imperial allusion was not lost on John Chrysostom who wrote, “Like an emperor that has fought a naval battle and overcome, he entered into that most imperial city. He was nearer now to his crown. Rome received him bound, and saw him crowned and proclaimed conqueror.” Like Luke’s borrowing and modification of Odysseus’ sea-journey (where all survive instead of perish), Luke borrows and

modifies the imagery of the imperial triumphal parade. This is a subtle act of subversive writing.

Excursus: The Background of Ἀπάντησις in Acts 28:15

The use of the word ἀπάντησις creates a strong part of the allusion to adventus (Acts 28:15). Again, Luke may not have been unaware that Paul had once used ἀπάντησις in a manner which also subverts imperial triumph imagery. Paul had used the word in First Thessalonians to describe ‘the meeting’ of the Lord at the resurrection of the righteous when believers would go out (be “caught up in the clouds”) to meet and to escort the Lord’s return to earth (1 Thess 4:17).149

The word ἀπάντησις was known to be synonymous with adventus or triumphal procession. Cicero used the Greek word even when writing predominantly in Latin (see 3.3.1) to refer explicitly to the triumphal processions of Julius Caesar and Augustus.

\[ quas fieri censes ἀπαντήσεις ex oppidis, quos honores! \]

Just imagine what a meeting/royal welcome/escort (apantēsis) he is receiving from the town, what honours are paid him! (from Letters to Atticus 8.16.2 “Julius Caesar was greeted and worshipped as a God”)

\[ pueri municipia mire favent ... mirifica ἀπάντησις et cohortatio. \]

The municipalities are showing the boy remarkable favour…wonderful meeting/royal welcome/escort (apantēsis) and encouragement. (from Letters to Atticus 16.11 “And of Augustus”)

Josephus uses ἀπάντησις twice—Antiq. 7.11.5.276 and 13.4.4.101. On both occasions, he describes the greeting of a very important person—David and Jonathan, respectively. In the former, the citizens of Gilgal protest their exclusion from es-

---

149 See Erik Petersen’s “Die Einholung des Kyrios” Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie 7 (1930): pp. 682-702, which seeks the background of the word apantēsis in order to understand its use in the context of 1 Thess 4:17.
150 The Tebtunis Papyrus No. 43 is a petition sent by Menches to King Euergetes II (Ptolemy VII) and the two Cleopatras (this dates it to between 139-132 BCE). Menches (a village secretary) and his brother Polemon had been arrested when they "went out to meet" a newly arrived agent of the magistrate or police-chief. The letter reads in part "On Athur 17 of the present 53rd year it came to our knowledge that Asclepiades, one of the agents of Aminas, epistates of the phylacitae [overseer of the village guards, magistrate or police chief] of the said nome [province], was come to the village, and in accordance with (custom) we came to meet him (κατὰ τὸ... [. .]ον παρεγενήθημεν εἰς ἀπάντησιν σὺν) together with the komarch ["mayor"] of the village and some of the elders of the cultivators and Demetrius, who is performing the functions of epistates [magistrate or police chief] and archiphylacities [chief guard] of the said village, and other persons, and having no... we saluted him (ἐξεδεξιασάμεθα αὐτόν). But he arrested us and likewise Demetrius and one of the cultivators." The text makes it clear that the something (possibly 'custom') of coming out to meet was a correlate of a welcome or reception. Maybe, anticipating the case being brought against them, Menches and Polemon hoped to get the magistrate on side. The cast of the entourage also suggests respect (the village leader, elders from among the farmers, Demetrius who had been acting-magistrate, and other persons). The synonyms within the square brackets were suggested by the Centre for the Tebtunis Papyrus, within the Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley (http://tebtunis.berkeley.edu/collection/glossary on 30/1/2011) and the translation is that provided by Bernard P. Grenfell, Arthur S. Hunt and J. Gilbart Smyly, The Tebtunis Papyri: Part I (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology, Volume I; London: Henry Frowde, OUP, 1902).

151 The divergence between Vaticanus and Alexandrinus is so marked in Joshua Chapters 15, 18 and 19 and Judges that Brenton and NETS present both texts in side-by-side parallels, and in these sections the consistent substitution of ἀπάντησις for συνάντησις is conspicuous. In Judges there are fourteen occurrences of συνάντησις in Vaticanus in place of which Alexandrinus has ἀπάντησις thirteen times, and in only one place συνάντησις. Once, in Judges, Vaticanus uses ὑπάντησις and again Alexandrinus has ἀπάντησις.
to Atticus (8.16; 16.11), I Thessalonians, the Tebtunis Papyrus (P Teb I.43.i7—118 BCE) and Josephus’s use in Antiquities (7.11.5.276, 13.4.4.101), ἀπάντησις most likely meant the greeting of a very important person by going out and escorting their arrival as an action of honour.

It is entirely appropriate, given the scale of the gesture of honour extended toward him, that Paul should both thank God and be encouraged (28:15). For a moment, Paul, like the reader, sees a glimpse of the level of honour appropriate for those who witness faithfully to the kingdom of God.

6.2.13 Paul in Rome (28:17–30)

Having arrived in Rome, Paul lives under what appears to be house arrest (28:16). The liberty of allowing Paul to live in his own rented accommodation (rather than in a prison) cannot by this stage of reading through Acts be used to support a ‘benign’ view of Rome. Sometimes the Empire will lend support to the Christian movement. The imperial assistance is always surprising, and it is not an expression of the empire’s essential character—the assistance of tribunes, governors and kings is ironic because it is provided to Christ’s emissary, in spite of the empire’s character. Luke and his first readers were almost certainly instead. The impression seems to be that somewhere in the textual tradition that leads to Alexandrinus (being I presume a later text than Vaticanus) συνάντησις and ὑπάντησις have routinely been changed to ἀπάντησις. Remarkably, the Alexandrinus preference for ἀπάντησις over the other synonyms continues into the New Testament. Whereas Sinaiticus (01), Vaticanus (03), Theta from Tbilisi (038), Ephraemi Rescriptus (04) all seem to have a strong preference for ὑπάντησις (as do minuscules from “Family 1”, 33, 579, 1071), Alexandrinus (02) again (like K-018, I-019, U-030 and Π-041), seems to have a strong preference for ἀπάντησις. The other puzzling feature in terms of textual variations surrounding ἀπάντησις, ὑπάντησις and συνάντησις has to do with why in some places there is such consensus (Matt 8:28; Luke 9:37; John 11:20, 30; 12:18; Acts 10:25; 20:22) and in other places such a diversity (Matt 28:9; Mark 5:2; Luke 14:31; 17:12). See Appendix 3. It may be that instances of consensus represent verses that became very well-known and developed the reputation as ‘key’ verses; and that the instances of great diversity represent less well-known verses in which there was a change from alternative synonyms to the particular word choice in the ‘key’ verses. The change (to conformity with the ‘key’ verses) would create intertextual links that were not present in autographs or earlier copies.
aware that Paul had been executed in Rome. The finality in the tone of the Ephesian farewell supports this view (20:25,38). The lack of any further prophetic expressions of ‘necessity’—οὗ δὲί ‘you must’—beyond that which refers to Rome (Acts 23:11) and ‘standing before Caesar’ (Acts 27:24) also supports this view. There is no “you must bear witness also in Spain” in Acts (cf. Rom 15:24,28).

Paul invites guests to his lodgings and they visit him in his house-prison. Reception continues to be a critical issue right up to the end of the work. However, the setting does not allow Luke to employ escort as a mimetic device to express positive reception—other than the hugely extravagant escort of Acts 28:15. Presumably, Luke knew that Paul would not have been allowed to go out. From a literary perspective, after the adventus-scaled accompaniment of Acts 28:15, any lesser escorts would have proved anticlimactic. And yet the twin themes of reception and listening remain central in this last scene of Acts.

Paul, one last time, adheres to the typical reception-scene pattern so prevalent in the earlier parts of Acts. He ‘invites’ (rather than ‘goes to’) first the Jews (28:17). And the initial reception seems positive (“we would like to hear from you what you think…”). But then Luke mentions in passing the rumour of a great indictment of Christianity—“for we know that everywhere it [“this sect”] is spoken against”. However, by this stage the reader is well prepared not to put too much store by hearsay (Acts 6:14; 15:1; 21:28). The reader would also question the identification of Christianity as a mere “sect”, like the “sects” of Pharisees and Sadducees.⁴¹² Luke continues to present Christianity as the faithful continuation of everything that is written in the Law and the Prophets (Acts 28:23, cf. 7:53, 8:35; 17:11, Luke 24:27,44).

The typical pattern of a ‘reception’ scene continues, with the report of a divided reaction amongst Paul’s audience—“Some were convinced by what he had said, while others refused to believe. So, as they disagreed among themselves, they departed, after Paul had made one statement.” But the tone of the quotation of Isaiah 6:9-10 seems to suggest rejection more than acceptance. Luke treads an ambivalent path. He believes that Chris-

---

152 Josephus refers to schools of Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes as sects.
tianity is entirely the fulfilment of the Jewish Law and Prophets—that as a movement it only makes sense in the context of its Jewish origins. But he also writes at a time when the increasingly Gentile identity of the church and the rejection of Jesus as Messiah by many Jews were both more prevalent than at the time Luke’s narrative describes, several decades earlier. However, against the flow of the recent developments in his own time, Luke appears still to hold the door open to a greater positive response of Jews to Jesus—and the reader hears this ‘open door’ principally in the way Luke uses his final quotation from scripture.

…they departed, after Paul had made one statement: “The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your fathers through Isaiah the prophet: ‘Go to this people, and say, “You shall indeed hear but never understand, and you shall indeed see but never perceive.” For this people’s heart has grown dull, and their ears are heavy of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest they should perceive with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and turn to me and I will heal them.'” (Acts 28:25b-27)

This text from Isaiah 6:9-10 is quoted several times across the gospels of the NT in a similar context—Mark 4:12; Matt 13:14-15; John 12:40. Luke is therefore employing a standard early Christian way of seeing Israel’s lack of response to salvation brought by Christ foretold in Scripture. But whereas Mark and John use abbreviated paraphrases of Isaiah, Luke (like Matthew) quotes very carefully from the LXX. The quotation of

153 Pervo perceives the door to a positive Jewish response as more closed than open (Acts, p. 685). He invokes Acts 21:30 (the closing of the temple door) and Paul’s repeated separations from synagogues as evidence of Luke’s position. I would moderate this only by drawing attention to Beroea (where Luke was happy to narrate an incident in which the synagogue was wholly receptive of Paul’s message, and to the possibility that 21:30 could allude to the destruction of the temple in 70 CE). Pervo makes a strong statement in the final chapter of his commentary—“The movement does not reject Jewish converts, who must, however, leave the synagogue and expect no more than conditional tolerance for Torah observance. In short, those of Jewish background who adhere to the church are no longer “Jews,” certainly not to be numbered among “the Jews,” which is the preferred word for the other”. Jipp’s analysis of the ending of Acts find the ‘door’ (to further Jewish reception of the message of Jesus) firmly closed. Jipp, “Divine Visitation”, p. . Jervell, because of his commitment to his minority-held thesis (that all believers in Acts, both Jews and Gentiles, together constitute the ‘renewed Israel’, technically has the door ‘open’ (but more so to the newer members of ‘renewed (erneuerten) Israel’). Jervell, Die Apostelgeschichte, p. 628.

Isaiah 6:9-10 has the final 'heal' in the future indicative tense, whereas 'perceive' 'hear' and 'understand' are subjunctive and fall more strongly under the control of the negative conjunction μήποτε ('lest'). "I will heal them" (ἰάσομαι αὐτούς—Acts 28:27b) is more positive that Mark's subjunctive ἀφεθῇ ('forgive').

The combined effect of the future indicative promise "to heal" and the earlier portion of the Isaiah quotation it is to create an ambiguity. Thus, although Paul's parting words ("Let it be known to you then that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen") legitimise and affirm the success of the Gentile mission, these words do not exclude the possibility of a positive response of Jews to the Messiah. A second-chance that the Jews too might in the future display positive reception toward—'come out and meet'—Jesus' emissaries is not precluded. Note the balance that is created by the remembrance that although Paul has made pronouncements like this before, he never ceases from going to the Jews first (with the greater honour) in the very next scene (Acts 13:46; 18:6).

The masterfully constructed last sentence of Acts (28:30-31), far from being abrupt, is the epitome of a satisfying conclusion from a narratological perspective. Each of the five sections contributes to the defocalisation of the story’s ending. In addition, packed into the sentence are several of Luke's most important themes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts 28:30-31</th>
<th>Narrative methods of conclusion and defocalisation</th>
<th>Lukan themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And he lived there two whole years at his own expense,</td>
<td>temporal expansion</td>
<td>Paul's self-support (18:3; 20:34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and welcomed all (ἀπεδέχετο πάντας) who came to him,</td>
<td>participant expansion</td>
<td>The universalism of the invitation to salvation and the welcome of all (e.g. 10:35; 27:24; 44; 28:1,2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preaching the kingdom of God</td>
<td>action expansion (iterative)</td>
<td>The kerygmatic activity throughout Acts and an inclusio with Acts 1:3 (&quot;kingdom of God&quot;).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and teaching about the Lord Jesus Christ</td>
<td>action expansion (iterative)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A Synchronic Reading of Acts with a Focus upon Meeting and Escort

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acts 28:30-31</th>
<th>Narrative methods of conclusion and defocalisation</th>
<th>Lukan themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with all boldness/liberty (πάσης παρρήσιας)</td>
<td>action expansion</td>
<td>Boldness as the characteristic that typifies having being transformed by the Holy Spirit and the liberty of the ironic portrayal of Paul.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and unhindered (ἀκωλύτως).</td>
<td>action expansion</td>
<td>A reference perhaps to the ‘sometimes-obliging’ empire and an intertextual link to the earlier ‘overcomings’ of alleged impediments (8:36, 10:47, 11:17).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To some readers the lack of Paul’s appeal to Caesar and the seemingly abrupt ending suggested a lacuna in the text. But we have demonstrated that Luke has made it clear that the emperor’s acquittal is not required (page 302)—it is ‘adjourned’ to the time beyond the narrative’s range (27:24). Furthermore, Luke has alluded to other events beyond the terminal narrative time—the death of Paul (Acts 20:25) and the Fall of Jerusalem (Luke 21:6,20; Acts 21:30). Luke’s carefully constructed final sentence for his work makes it clear that we are dealing with deliberate omissions on Luke’s part (and not lacunae).

The last two words (παρρησία, ‘boldness’ or ‘freedom’, and ἀκωλύτως, ‘unhindered’) evoke the reader’s memory of the alleged impediments to the evangelisation and baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch (τί κωλύει με βαπτισθῆναι—“what is to prevent me from being baptized?” 8:37) and Cornelius’s household (“can any one impede [κωλύσαι] the water that these people should not be baptised” 10:47; “who was I that I could hinder [κωλύσαι] God” 11:17). In both these accounts the impediments on one level seem quite conspicuous (foreignness, physical impairment, Gentile-status). And yet, without a lot of words, the ensuing actions (8:38; 10:48) attest to the invalidation of any impediments. Both these earlier accounts were also narratives in which travel, reception and escort played crucial roles. How could Paul, in chains (28:20) and under house arrest (28:16,23)—with such

---

155 An excellent synopsis about the issue of the allegedly unsatisfying ending of Acts is provided in an excursus by Pervo (Acts, 688-690). Pervo makes a good case for Peter and Paul both having episodes that symbolise their death and resurrection (12:1-17; 27:1–28:6), and therefore make the astute reader more satisfied with the endings of both character’s stories—Pervo, Acts, p. 308-316, 649-667, 690. Paul’s historical fate (trial by Caesar and execution by the government in Rome) is alluded to in 27:24 and 20:38. John Chrysostom did not find the ending of Acts unsatisfying; in fact, he comments that Luke's ending, "But of [Paul's] affairs after the two years, what say we? The writer leaves the hearer thirsty for more: the heathen authors do the same (in their writings), for to know everything makes the reader dull and jaded.” John Chrysostom, Homilies on Acts, Homily 55, (Recapitulation).
conspicuous impediments to travelling and escort—continue to witness effectively? The actions of the last sentence of Acts (‘proclaiming’, ‘teaching’) assert that Paul continued, *despite* the conspicuous impediments, as if he were unimpeded. The question from the earlier scenes echoes in the last words of Acts. Can anything hinder the proclamation of the kingdom of God to all? The words ‘free’ and ‘unhindered’ suggest not.
CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

In Part A, this study has demonstrated the value of Greenblatt's "scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts" by the establishment of a detailed and reliable cultural script. The study has identified many key parts of the script in terms of hospitality and escort that have a bearing on the way Acts is interpreted in Part B. I shall here, briefly, revisit three parts of the cultural script in relation to hospitality.

Firstly, and most importantly, has been the restoration of the proper beginnings and endings of the hospitality scene-type. These beginnings frequently include conventions that arise early in the scene: catching sight of the guest or receiving news of their imminent arrival, going out to meet and escorting the guest's arrival. The endings include escorted departure, journeying with the guest for a part (sometimes a substantial part) of their onward journey. This re-capturing of the beginnings and endings is a contrast to the current emphasis in New Testament hospitality studies which tend to focus on meals and lodgings (in media res).

Secondly, another re-captured part of the cultural script has been a set of conventions which also typically occur early in hospitality scenes: preparation for arrival; haste in greeting; being the first to come out and meet an arriving dignitary.

Thirdly, we have re-captured the diversity of the status of the guest at the beginnings of hospitality scenes. The guests are not always perfect strangers—completely unknown to the host. Although the guests may be complete strangers to the host, in many hospitality scenes they are relatives (close or distant) or guest-friends from past encounters.

With a reliable and detailed cultural script with respect to hospitality and the role of escort in hospitality (appropriate for a late first- or early second-century implied reader)
we turned, briefly to the text of the Gospel of Luke and then, at length and synchronically, to the text of Acts.

The Gospel attests to Luke’s interest in hospitality and escort. Importantly, it establishes a principle whereby the reception of the emissaries of Jesus is strongly connected with the reception of Jesus himself—a principle which I dubbed the “Luke 10:16 principle”, because of its broad relevance as a paradigm for so much of what happens in Acts. The principle espoused in Luke 10:16 was by no means novel, but a well-established part of the cultural script—the way hosts treated emissaries was a reflection of their attitude to the one who sent the emissaries.

Although escort is a relatively rare motif in the Gospel of Luke, it occurs in some of the largest and most distinctively Lukan passages. The most significant of these scenes is the parable of ‘The Father with Two Sons’, particularly verses 15:20-25 which affirms Luke’s familiarity with many elements of the cultural script established in Part A. In this one section, many key elements occur: watching the distance for the arrival of the guest; hurrying (running) out to be the first to greet the guest; kissing and embracing; extravagant preparations (including the preparation of the choicest calf), also made with all haste; investiture (in the sense of clothing); the giving of gifts; escorted arrival; and provision of entertainments.

Throughout much of the Gospel of Luke, a key motif—in contrast to hospitality—is the rejection of Jesus. This motif is dominant until the depiction of the death of Jesus. Following the death of Jesus, Joseph of Arimathea and the women disciples of Jesus display honour toward Jesus’ body in a way that anticipates responses to the opportunity that is later extended to “all nations”. This affords a second chance for those who had rejected Jesus at his first visitation—through the proclamation to which Jesus commissions the disciples (Luke 24:46-49; Acts 1:8). Potential hosts will have a fresh opportunity to express their reception of Jesus in Acts—in the way they treat his emissaries who bear his Word.

A wider view of hospitality was then brought to a synchronic reading of Acts. By having re-captured the ‘lost beginnings’ for the implied reader, our interpretation becomes sensitised to the following elements: preparations for a guest’s arrival; the host being watchful
and catching sight of the guest; what happens at a gate or door (θύρα); coming out to greet (or conversely, the ‘failing’ in not coming out to greet); who is ‘first’ to greet; and escorted arrival. By having ‘re-captured’ the ‘lost endings’ in the cultural script of hospitality, our interpretation is also sensitised to: providing of resources to the departing guest for their onward journey; escorting them to the gate or the door (θύρα), the beach or the ship (or some other ‘liminal’ boundary); and escorting the onward journey of the guest for part (or all) of the way to their next destination (or an even more prolonged escort). In terms of escorted arrival, the implied reader would note who goes some of the way—like an Orpah (Ruth 1:14-15) or “John called Mark” (Acts 13:13b; 15:37-40)—and who goes all the way like Ruth, Ittai the Gittite (2 Samuel 15:21-22), Homer’s Pisistratus, Virgil’s fidus Achates, Barnabas (Acts 11:26; 13:3; 14:26) or the brethren of Beroea (Acts 17:15).

What difference did reading Acts with a detailed and ‘wide framed’ view of hospitality make? Here, I will only re-visit the effect of the ‘re-captured’ cultural script’s bearing on some scenes where Jesus’ emissaries make some notable arrivals and departures.

Peter’s experience upon arrival at Cornelius’s house must be understood in the context of a scene that is the most exemplary episode of hospitality in Luke and Acts. It is exemplary in many ways. The preparations that Cornelius has made for Peter’s visit include assembling his relatives and close friends in his house. The D Text’s mention of one of the slaves running ahead (as a ‘forerunner’) and Cornelius’s “jumping up”, just adds icing to the cake, explicating how Cornelius knew when to come out to greet Peter. Even the conventional text makes the “coming out to greet” clear by mentioning, in v. 27, that as they talked they entered the house. Escorting Peter’s entire journey from Joppa to Caesarea with delegates is both honouring and fitting for a centurion (cf. Luke 7:3-6). The ‘going out to meet’ is one element among many that contributes to the sense of an overwhelmingly positive extension of hospitality from Cornelius, the good allophyle (10:28), to Peter, the emissary of Jesus.

Peter’s experiences (n.b. 10:13-15,28,47; 11:17) in this episode place him on a trajectory of conversion that sets him apart from the Twelve. He goes from being typical of the
Twelve to being somewhat “out on a limb” (11:2; 15:1,5,9-11)—but obedient to the principle of Jesus’ final command (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8) to take the message to all nations.

The experience that Peter has at the door of Mary’s house—Mary the mother of “John whose other name was Mark”—is quite a contrast to Peter’s arrival at Cornelius’s house. Perhaps our entertainment by the humour of Rhoda leaving Peter at the door (because of her overwhelming joy!) distracts us from noticing the breaches of hospitality—an instance where modern readers perhaps get too much “delight” and not enough “profit”. The implied reader for whom there is great significance in what transpires at doors would probably not have been so completely amused. The text never mentions Peter’s entry into the house. Nor is there a celebration (cf. Luke 15:6,9; 22-24); nor even a long prayer of thanksgiving (Acts 4:23-31).

It is as if Peter gives his message from the doorway as a persona non grata—the sort of person to whom one might say, “Excuse me if I don’t invite you in.” There are nearby clues that a division may be developing between Peter and the church in Jerusalem—there are conflicts between Peter and others in the church narrated either side of this incident (11:2,17; 15:7,10-11). Peter’s last line, to tell James (not James of the Twelve, whose execution is narrated earlier, at the very beginning of the same chapter) and the brethren of his divinely assisted jailbreak is followed by the enigmatic, “Then he left and went to another place.” Going to another place is precisely what the apostles (the “sent”) are commissioned to do—and yet Acts 8:1 seems to imply that they alone are resistant to this command. (I discuss below what I see as the ‘gap’ that emerges between the Twelve (with the exception of Peter) and the later emissaries of Jesus (like Philip and Paul) under the sub-heading “Towards a location of this interpretation of Acts in relation to the characterisation of the Twelve”).

Paul becomes the chief focus of the spread of the Word to the ends of the earth and the ‘focus’ emissary of Jesus, firstly in ‘preludes’ at 9:1-31 and 11:25-30, and then in a sustained, uninterrupted manner from 13:1 to the end of the text.

The importance of a synchronic reading of Acts with an eye to hospitality and escort reveals itself across these Pauline sections. Such a reading makes a significant contribu-
tion to understanding Acts as narrating a succession or transition. Not only does Acts portray a “passing of the baton” (the Word or message with which Jesus entrusts his emissaries)—from the Twelve, firstly to the Seven, then to a ‘transformed’ Peter, and finally to Paul—it also reveals a transitioning of the *dramatis personae* who extend hospitality and escort to Paul.

In the earlier scenes, the arrivals and departures of Saul (= Paul) are escorted by his own disciples, Barnabas and other brethren (Acts 9:25,27,30). In parallel with this transitioning of ‘who escorts Paul’, another motif (widely spread throughout the text of Acts) is that of “help from unexpected quarters” (*e.g.* Acts 5:34-39; 18:14-17; 19:35-41). A subtype of this motif in the final section of Acts is “escort from unexpected quarters”. In Paul’s final journey to Jerusalem, the value of a synchronic reading again reveals itself, highlighting the transitioning of the *dramatis personae* who extend escort to Paul. (The transition is already partly underway in the escorts at 16:30-34 and 16:37-39). The three escorts (in the context of departure) in Paul’s final journey to Jerusalem are provided by the elders of the church in Ephesus (20:38b), the disciples in Tyre (21:5-6) and some disciples from Caesarea (21:16). These contrast strongly with the next three escorts in terms of radically different agents of the escorts. These latter three escorts include: the ‘chairing’ of Paul by the soldiers of the barracks (21:35); the escort of Paul by the vast contingent of infantry and cavalry (23:23-24,31-33); and the extended sea voyage supervised by the centurion Julius (27:1–28:17)—where the centurion pays great respect to and shows unusual regard for the prisoner Paul (27:11,21-26,31,32,42,43; 28:16).

These three escorts (21:35; 23:23-24,31-33; 27:1–28:17) contain ironic allusions to escorts usually afforded to royalty. The case for the hypothesis that Luke is alluding to imperial honours while Paul is a prisoner is strengthened by the occurrence of several other allusions to imperial escorts (usually in the form of royal welcomes) in the nearby narrative. These others allusions to imperial escorts include: the attendance of women and children in Paul’s escorted departure from Tyre (21:5)—a motif associated with royal escorts (*e.g.*
and, Paul's motioning for silence, and the resultant hushed silence of the crowd—twin motifs that also have royal allusions (e.g. War 7.5.4.127-128). The extravagance of the distances of the “coming out to meet” in 28:15 also makes a distinct royal allusion, heightened by the use of the word ἀπάντησις. Two of these allusions were detected and explicated by Chrysostom (Homily 50 on 23:23-24—Paul was escorted “like a king whom his body guard escorts” and Homily 55 on 28:15—“like an emperor that has fought a naval battle and overcome, he entered that most imperial city. He was nearer now to his crown. Rome received him bound, and saw him crowned and proclaimed conqueror”).

These allusions to royal escort are deliberate and, according to the cultural script's prescriptions for emissaries, appropriate; Paul is the emissary of a king and therefore deserves the attention that would be shown a king. This same ‘principle of emissaries’—one treats the emissary as one would their sender—accounts for the attribution of divinity to the emissaries at three crucial parts of the narrative (10:25; 14:18; 28:6). Following the cultural script of the ‘principle of emissaries’, these pagans are acting appropriately. If it is appropriate to worship Jesus (Luke 24:52), it makes sense that good hosts treat Jesus’ emissaries as divine and offer them obeisance and sacrifice.

These few scenes that I have reviewed here demonstrate the value of Greenblatt’s “scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts,” for constructing an accurate cultural script. This cultural script in respect of hospitality and escort conventions enables a more

1 Perrin-Saminadayar notes the epigraphy behind the cultural script—decrees requiring the attendance of women and children, Les Entrées Royales, p. 70, n. 15, p. 71.
2 My methodology mainly looked to a literary background, extant at the time of Luke's writing, to develop a cultural script from which to hear the implied reader's interpretation, but these snippets of “reception history” supply reinforcement for the interpretation.
3 This proposal is strengthened by the sharp contrast between the results of two attributions of deity to a man by a group of people. When Herod is called a god by the people of Tyre and Sidon (12:22), his failure to deny the attribution of deity (12:23a), bring about his immediate judgement by an angel of the Lord who slays him in dramatic fashion (“struck down, eaten by worms and died”, 12:23b). When the βάρβαροι of Malta say that Paul is a god (28:6b), Paul's failure to remonstrate with the Maltese is surrounded by accounts of God's providential assistance and healings (28:5-6a; 28:8-9). Note also that no judgement falls upon Cornelius and Peter in 10:25, nor upon Paul, Barnabas and the pagans of Lystra in 14:11,18 when similar attributions of deity are made. These earlier instances of the attribution of deity to a mortal are perhaps less of a contrast to the scene with Herod than the scene of Paul on Malta, because in those earlier instances the emissary refutes the ascription of divinity and attempts to stop the obeisance and worship.
informed reading of Acts. The inclusion of a wider view of hospitality—including arrivals and departures—does indeed pay an interpretational dividend.

My final task is to locate these interpretations into the context of some recent and not-so-recent (but enduring) questions that are debated in Acts scholarship.

7.1 Toward a Location of this Reading of Acts Within Luke’s Depiction of Church Unity

Since the days of Baur and the Tendenzkritik, Acts has been regarded as a “gaffe on the scale of world history” (Franz Overbeck’s famous comment). One dimension of the “gaffe” was the perception that Luke had reconciled and presented as harmoniously unified the Petrine and Pauline communities. Based on close readings, more recent critics have questioned whether the Tendenzkritik were perhaps unaware of their own Hegelian Tendenz. These more recent critics have commented that if Luke were trying to hide the controversies that challenged the earliest Christian groups, then he was not doing a very good job. The close-grained analysis, with a focus on hospitality and escort, supports and intensifies the latter view. Those divisions are usually made more noticeable in the text by the cultural script that focuses on hospitality conventions, especially “going out to meet” and “escorted arrival”.

An exception to this use of escort to portray disunity is a set of three occasions where Luke uses escort to demonstrate the resilience of church unity (at least perhaps among those who knew Paul) in the face of disagreement (20:38b; 21:5; 21:16). In this last journey of Paul to Jerusalem all the groups at the various stopping stations on the journey are grieved by, and had reservations about, Paul’s determination that he “must go to Jerusalem”. In one instance the group urges Paul not to go—21:12—and in another, a group tell him in the Spirit not to go—21:4. However, they are all ultimately portrayed as remaining in good will toward Paul, and ultimately supportive of him, despite their difference of

---

4 Barrett (“If Luke was practising concealment he was an incompetent practitioner”), Acts, p. 2:xli.
opinion over the issue of going to Jerusalem. Their support for Paul—despite the disagreement—demonstrates itself through escort and provision; they still “see him on his way”. Being a common scene “ending”, escorted departure functions well in this role to show the final disposition of the host toward the guest.

However, Luke usually uses failure to escort arrivals (12:14,17; 21:18; 21:22), or failure merely to escort (13:13; 15:38,39), as indicators of potential problems and disunity in the church. A few instances deserve a brief mention. The problem between “John who was also called Mark” and Paul first manifests when John/Mark will no longer accompany Paul and Barnabas (13:13), but returns to Jerusalem (a return, like the one in 8:25 that shows an inability to respond fully to Jesus’ final command in 1:8). Later, Barnabas wants to take John/Mark again, but Paul protests because John/Mark had deserted them on the previous missionary journey. The disagreement between Paul and Barnabas manifests itself in their parting ways and not accompanying one another.

Peter’s non-entry to the house of Mary was discussed earlier. This scene can be interpreted as alluding to the opening of a gap between Peter and the church in Jerusalem. Peter’s experiences concerning Cornelius (the vision in the leadup and the visit) and his imprisonment have transformed Peter, which is creating a division between him and the leadership of the church in Jerusalem (other members of the Twelve, James and the Elders).

In Luke's narratives, if the arriving guest subsequent to their arrival needs to seek out a particular character, the implication is that that character was not included in the welcoming party (Luke 19:15; Acts 21:18; 28:17). The failure of James and the Elders to greet Paul’s final arrival in Rome is a significant omission. Paul’s week-long stay in Tyre (21:4) and several-day stay in Caesarea (21:10) meant that news of Paul’s imminent arrival should have given the Jerusalem church sufficient time for the dissemination of the news and preparation of an appropriate welcome.5 Not only do James and the Elders fail to

5 Cf. the week long stay in Puteoli that serves the function of explaining the ability of the Roman believers to organise an extravagant adventus in terms of the great distances to which they come out to greet Paul and escort his arrival.
attend a welcome, and fail to organise an escorted arrival, but they also make it clear that of the many Jews in Jerusalem who have come to be believers in Jesus, most (if not all) remain uninformed of Paul’s arrival (21:22: “they will certainly hear that you have come”). These are not the only clues in the scene that extends from 21:17-26 and beyond, that all is not well between Paul and the church under the leadership of James and the elders. The decisive factors are: that no one attempts to come to Paul’s rescue (save Paul’s own nephew); none of the leaders defend Paul after his arrest; and the Jerusalem church is not even depicted in fervent prayer for Paul’s release (cf. 9:25,30; 12:5).

The greeting of Paul by two groups at different locations (about 10 miles apart) also conveys subtly that among the Christians in the imperial capital there is not complete co-ordination or cooperation. Luke demonstrates his awareness of the exile from Rome that Claudius imposed on Jews, including Jewish ‘believers’ like Aquila and Priscilla (Acts 18:2). Therefore, one possibility is that Luke was also aware that the Christian presence in the capital may include a quite independent Gentile Christian community that is distinctive and separate from Jewish Christianity because of the years where they were without the influence of Jewish Christian brethren.

7.2 Toward a Location of This Reading of Acts in Relation to the Characterisation of the Twelve

Several scholars are beginning to come to the view that the Twelve (with the exception of Peter, late in his role) are resistant to Jesus’ final command to be his witnesses to the ends of the earth. Acts 8:1 bears eloquent witness to the apostles’ stubborn refusal to honour the command in Acts 1:8. Instead, the Twelve appear to become preoccupied with the restoration only of Israel, which is perhaps why they are symbolically trying to restore their “Twelveness” in Acts 1:12-26—an action for which there is no divine command. This attempt to keep the number symbolically complete is shown to be futile when Herod executes James, the brother of John (in 12:2) and arrests Peter with the same intention. When Mary’s household are in fervent prayer, it is reminiscent of the household gath-
ering of 1:13-14 that precipitates the drawing of lots. Is this among their prayerful contemplations—to seek replacements? The failure of the Twelve to honour the integrated example of Jesus’ ministry (Acts 6:2-4; cf. Luke 22:27) and to follow Jesus’ final command to be his witnesses to the “ends of the earth” has been noted by others.

Spencer chastens the apostles for “their reluctance to become personally involved in table-service,” which “suggests that they still have not accepted Jesus’ holistic model of ministry.”

David Pao describes the Twelve as ambiguous characters, noting Spencer’s earlier comments about them being in an unholy alliance with regard to their neglect of widows and Jesus’ integrated model of ministry.

Moessner writes, “Peter and the eleven apostles do not fulfil the Christ’s mandate to “be his witnesses… to the ends of the earth”, and “Peter must be granted a special audition of a voice from heaven in order for him… to break out of this stubborn non-compliance.”

7.3 Toward a Location of This Reading of Acts in Relation to the Attempts to Hear Acts as Apologia

Another exercise of location is to situate my reading in what others are saying about Luke’s attitude to the Roman Empire. Here, I locate my reading with its attention to escort on a spectrum that ranges between what could be dubbed Cassidyism—which argues that Luke portrays Jesus as a subversive revolutionary with an essentially political message that was strongly directed against the establishment—and what could be dubbed

---

Walaskayism—which reads Luke and Acts as an apology pro imperio to counter anti-Roman sentiment in certain Christian circles.¹⁰

A related exercise will be to locate my reading in relation to the idea that Luke was writing an apology pro ecclesia¹¹—to present Christianity as an innocuous movement that was no threat to Rome. The apologia pro ecclesia proposal begs the question, to whom would that apology be directed? The idea that Luke would write to assuage Roman officials’ fear about Christianity has been dealt a heavy blow by the oft-quoted logic of C. K. Barrett: “No Roman official would ever have filtered out so much of what to him would be theological and ecclesiastical rubbish in order to reach so tiny grain of relevant apology.”¹²

The idea that Luke would write to Christians to persuade them that the Way was no threat to the Roman Empire does not resonate with this study’s reading of Acts. In this interpretation, Christianity, particularly in its radical ability to redistribute resources—observable at three very different scales at Acts 4:32-37; 11:28-30; and 20:4-6; 24:17—is being portrayed very much as a threat to the way Imperial leaders use resources to subjugate and control populations (Acts 12:20).

Luke’s portrayal of the Empire is so variable that there is an abundance of “proof-texts” for both apology pro imperio (‘Rome is good and helpful to Christianity’) and the opposite view—that Rome is corrupt and utterly opposed to the Way. An apology pro imperio tends to assemble references to the centurion Cornelius (10:2); Gallio (18:12-17); the Ephesian town clerk (19:35-40); the centurion Julius (27:1–28:16); and an edited sample of the actions of tribune Claudius Lysias (23:23-24)—perhaps omitting his preparedness to incorporate flogging with the interrogation of Paul (22:24) and his shamelessly fictional account of his actions to his superiors (23:26-30, cf. 21:31–22:29). The opposite case would point out the corruption (24:26), weakness and political crowd pleasing (24:27; 25:9); and

---

¹¹ P. W. Walaskay, And so we came, pp. ix, 1 and 4.
undelivered justice (where the law determines Jesus or Paul to be innocent but punishes or detains them anyway-26:31). The problem with many of the apologetic models is that none of them do justice to all the “proof-texts” considered in an integrated and narrative way.

The more nuanced view of Luke’s variable attitude to Rome, which has come out of this close-grained, culturally-attuned attempt to hear the implied reader’s interpretation, seems unsuited to either of the extremes of Cassidy or Walaskay. This reading is perhaps amenable to more recent versions of what has been dubbed the ”moderate Cassidyism” of Steve Walton or the ”moderate Walaskayism” of Philip Esler.13

The harder interpretational question remains, ‘What do the royal dignitary allusions signify, particularly as they are juxtaposed with the sobering reality of Paul’s imprisonment and “chains”?’

It is particularly difficult to press Luke’s ironic allusions of the Empire’s royal treatment of Paul into any of the apologetic models. What do the allusions reveal about Luke’s attitude to Rome? On one hand, they seem to suggest that the type of accolades the Empire reserves for its emperors and generals are more appropriately directed to king Jesus and his royal emissaries, and that, at a fundamental level, the kingdom of Jesus and the Roman Empire are utterly opposed and incompatible. On the other hand, Luke does not portray the Way as a military movement like that of the Zealots or the Sicarii. Still, Luke displays supreme optimism that, if God is in the Christian movement—and from Luke’s perspective this is a given—then this movement will not be defeated—even by the Imperial might (5:39). The portrayal of the Empire’s assistance of Jesus’ emissary, Paul, particularly in the way it escorts his progress to his God given destiny, is not just irony—it is a statement of certitude about the outcome of a goliath battle—a bloodless coup d’état—but a coup d’état nonetheless!

---

Luke as a ‘Painter’ of Hospitality and Escort

Luke is, in narrative terms, a subtle and complex worldmaker. He tells—or better, “shows”—stories of great complexity that resist simplification and over-generalised apologetic theories.

This is true of Luke’s portrayal of the church as unified; his actual narrative is complex and nuanced on the issue (far more than the Tendenzkritiks noticed). Luke portrays the church as being united by the agency of the Spirit (11:15: “The Holy Spirit fell upon them just as it had upon us in the beginning”)—not by the primacy of the Apostles. There is succession in Acts, but it is not “Apostolic succession” in the classical sense. (Note that Paul in Acts receives his commission directly from Jesus, and the hands laid upon him when he receives the Spirit are not the hands of one of the Twelve—Acts 9:6,17; 22:15,21; 26:16-18.) But even with the unifying agency of the Spirit, there were difficulties in interpreting what the Spirit was saying at any one time (Acts 19:21; 20:22; 21:4). Luke depicts characters in the church as pursuing unity (through councils and collections), but they are often portrayed as failing in that pursuit.

The same can be said of Luke’s view of Rome; Luke’s portrayal of the Roman Empire is complex, subtle and variable. It resists simplification or generalisation. On the one hand, the Empire should be fundamentally opposed to the Way (after all, Christians proclaim a king other than Caesar). On the other hand, in God’s providence, the leaders of the Empire sometimes give great assistance to the movement—frequently “shown” by Luke in terms of escorts painted in royal colours.

The same complexity applies to Luke’s portrayal of Judaism. Although some of the strongest resistance to the Way is portrayed as coming from within Judaism, the origins of the movement are shown to lie in the heart of Judaism and all of the first (2:41 and 4:4) and many of the later believers (21:20) are Jewish. The possibility of a Jewish ‘closed’ door toward the reception of Jesus and his envoys (at 21:30)—reflected in Paul’s pronounce-
Conclusion

ment in 28:28, “Let it be known to you that this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen”—is moderated by the fact that Paul has made similar statements on other occasions, but that never precludes him from witnessing to Jews at the very next opportunity (13:46; 18:6).

Luke’s demonstrated preference for “showing” (mimesis) rather than “telling” (diegesis) has led several readers to muse, ‘was Luke a painter?’ Karris and Bovon both liken Luke to a visual artist; Karris likens Luke to a tapestry artist, and Bovon likens Luke to a painter. The analogies are apt. The story told then requires the sort of attention to close-grained examination, both of the text of Acts, and of the background texts that help to establish the appropriate cultural script that this study has provided. The attention to a “scrupulous formal analysis of literary texts” in the establishment of a detailed and reliable cultural script with respect to hospitality and escort, produces a much more nuanced reading of the text of Acts—particularly with regard to the Twelve, the unity of the church and the relationship between Jesus’ followers and the Roman Empire. Without appreciation of the particular placement of colours and patterns, Luke’s complexity and subtlety can all too easily be lost.

The sequencing and the spacings of the differently coloured narrative events are vital considerations to be taken into account in order to notice the transitions, or successions, that occur in Acts. For instance, escorted assistance changes dramatically over the course of the narrative from something that is provided by “insiders” (9:25; 9:30, 12:5) to something more frequently provided by “outsiders” (21:35; 23:23-24; 25:3,9-12; 27:1–28:16), as the message of Jesus makes its way to the ends of the earth.

By the conclusion of Acts, hospitality and reception are predominantly provided to the emissaries of Jesus, not to outsiders—as in the model of Pitt-Rivers—but by “outsiders” (the leadership of the Roman Empire and the Maltese βαρβαροι). Meanwhile, the archetypal “insiders” (the remnant of the Twelve and the other leaders of the mother church in 15 Karris, Luke, p. 7; Bovon, Luke, p.3. Bovon notes a centuries-old tradition that Luke was a painter.

16 In the light of the final narrated plot to kill Paul (25:3,9-12), the journey to Rome becomes a giant escorted “rescue”.
Jerusalem) recede into narrative obscurity. This demonstrates—or “shows”, or “paints”—the “outward bound” nature of the proclamation of the gospel to all nations, to the ends of the earth (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8).

What Jesus fails to find among his own—a royal reception—becomes a vicarious possibility through his emissaries as he sends them as his witnesses to the ends of the earth. Jesus’ emissaries find hospitality and reception from some groups, but they find it decreasingly from among their own—from those within Judaism, which Luke depicts as the root of the Christian movement. Increasingly, Jesus’ emissaries find hospitality and reception from “outsiders” (βάρβαροι, Roman leaders); and, lastly from the church in the Imperial capital (28:15). I have demonstrated that many of the instances of hospitality and reception in the later stages of Acts carry distinct royal allusions (Acts 21:5; 21:35b, 40; 23:23-25; 27:1-3; 28:15). This does not mean that the Gentiles, including the Roman leaders and the βάρβαροι, had totally embraced the Way in Luke’s day. Nevertheless, Luke displays a conviction that the divine will was behind such a trajectory—a trajectory toward the reception of the kingdom of God among all nations (including Rome), as the good news of Jesus was taken to the ends of the earth by his royal emissaries.

Over-generalised apologetic theories seem to gravitate to threads of only one colour. Such theories ignore the sequence and frequency of the juxtapositions of sharp contrasts that create complex patterns. These patterns are essential to interpreting Luke’s subtle messages. However, to grasp Luke’s subtlety, the reader has also to allow Luke to “show” them his story—they cannot just attend to words spoken by characters (such as the speeches in Acts), or merely to the narrator’s infrequent commentary. The reader must

17 A trajectory of increasing rejection from among Jesus’ own is shown by the series of three ‘sending-out’ speeches in Luke’s Gospel (see Section 5.6). The first speech is confident about reception of Jesus’ emissaries; the second has far more to say about the possibility of rejection; the third is pessimistic. The discernment of this trajectory demonstrates the importance of a synchronic reading of the whole text from beginning to end.

18 Recalling Kinman’s conclusion, which I affirm, that the arrival of Jesus in Jerusalem is portrayed, in Luke’s Gospel, as a royal arrival gone “awry”—a gross insult to the king, Jesus. “Parousia, Jesus’ ‘A-Triumphal’ Entry”: p. 280.
also attend to the actions of the characters. In addition, the reader must have the interpretative skills to understand the significance of those actions.

This is why it has been critical to establish the cultural script (in regard to conventions of hospitality and escort) which Luke assumes of his readers. Luke does not tell his reader the internal thoughts of his characters. He illustrates their inward dispositions by showing his reader what they did. That is why in reading Luke and Acts the reader has to “watch” the gates and the doors, and “watch” who goes out to meet, and with what degree of haste, and how far, and “observe” who stays at home, and who ignores the arriving guest. The reader must “watch” who provides supplies for the onward journey of the guests, or who escorts their onward journey, and “watch” how far they go. “Showing” is how Luke achieves characterisation. With the detailed appropriate cultural script of the intended reader, a “watcher” of Luke’s story—paying close attention to actions of hospitality and escort—can learn much.
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Appendix 1

Appendix-Table 1.1 shows the Greek and Hebrew words used of ‘meeting’ or ‘to meet’ (often as noun or an infinitive) for all the occurrences of ‘meeting’ in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets. It also lists the Greek and Hebrew ‘auxiliary’ verbs used in the phrase that describes the meeting (e.g. went out to meet, ran to meet, arose to meet, etc.). In the final column I offer a classification of ‘scene type’ (see Section 2.1.3 for an explanation of the classification) in which ‘meeting’ occurs. The aim of the exercise is to discern the significance of meeting in general and of ‘going out to meet’ (often the first step of escorted arrival) in these narrative sections of the Old Testament. A further exercise was then to look at the Greek vocabulary (main verbs) associated with meeting in these passages to see if particular words correlated with particular ‘scene types’ (Appendix-Table 1.2). The last exercise tests whether the ‘auxiliary’ verbs had any significant correlations with the ‘scene types’ (Appendix-Table 1.3 which examines ‘auxiliary’ Hebrew verbs and Appendix-Table 1.4 which examines ‘auxiliary’ Greek verbs). Horizontal double-lined borders in Appendix-Table 1.1 have been used to separate scenes. The wavy border in Appendix-Table 1.1 indicates a significant transition within a scene.

In Appendix-Tables 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4, a question mark indicates a high degree of difficulty in determining the ‘scene type’; a “>” symbol indicates a scene that transitions from one scene type to another; a strikethrough (e.g. 129) indicates that despite some initial ambiguity the scene type has been determined with a fair degree of confidence (under a different category to the one in which the strikethrough occurs); an exclamation mark
indicates an excellent example of its type; an asterisk indicates a high degree of complexity in the scene. Whenever a symbol is used in addition to the reference number, one is referred back to Appendix-Table 1.1. The shaded rows in Appendix-Table 1.1 were passages that were initially thought to be of relevance to the lexical field for ‘meeting’ but were removed from the analysis in Appendix-Tables 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4 on the grounds of being about ‘finding’ or ‘happening’. They have been retained and ‘shaded’ in the table rather than deleted, to make it clear that they were initially considered, but ultimately deemed to be not strictly of relevance to this exercise.
### Appendix-Table 1.1: Instances of ‘meeting’ in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (LXX and MT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref No.</th>
<th>Scripture reference</th>
<th>Word for ‘meet’ from LXX: e.g. συνάντησιν, ἀπάντησίν, ἀπαντὴν, ὑπάντησιν</th>
<th>form (parsing)</th>
<th>Hebrew equivalent (MT)</th>
<th>LXX auxiliary verb</th>
<th>Heb equivalent (from MT)</th>
<th>Root of the Hebrew auxiliary verb</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Class-ification (mine)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>001</td>
<td>Gen 14:17</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>n.f.s,a(c)</td>
<td>κατά ἥν</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἀναπτύσσω</td>
<td>yṣ' to go out</td>
<td>Abram’s return from his defeat of Chedorlaomer and rescue of Lot</td>
<td>A3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>002</td>
<td>Gen 15:10</td>
<td>οἰκτοροποίουσαν αὐλήκας</td>
<td>n.f.s,a(c)</td>
<td>κατά ἥν</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἀναπτύσσω</td>
<td>yṣ' to go out</td>
<td>The covenant ritual</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>003</td>
<td>Gen 18:2</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>n.f.s,a(c)</td>
<td>κατά ἥν</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἀναπτύσσω</td>
<td>yṣ' to go out</td>
<td>Abraham runs to meet “three men” by the oak of Mamre</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>004</td>
<td>Gen 19:1</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>n.f.s,a(c)</td>
<td>κατά ἥν</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἀναπτύσσω</td>
<td>yṣ' to go out</td>
<td>Lot arises to meet two visitors at the gate of Sodom</td>
<td>A1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Agent</td>
<td>Object</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>005</td>
<td>Gen 24:17</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>m.f.s.a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Abraham’s slave goes to get a wife for Isaac and runs to meet Rebekah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>006</td>
<td>Gen 24:29</td>
<td>ἐπέδραμεν</td>
<td>he [the slave] ran</td>
<td>and he [the slave] ran</td>
<td>rws</td>
<td>Laban runs to meet Abraham’s slave after he sees the gifts that Rebekah has</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>007</td>
<td>Gen 24:65</td>
<td>ἐπέδραμεν</td>
<td>he [Laban] ran</td>
<td>and he [Laban] ran</td>
<td>rws</td>
<td>Isaac walks to meet his father’s returning slave and Rebekah</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>008</td>
<td>Gen 29:13</td>
<td>ἐξῆλθεν</td>
<td>she [Leah] went out</td>
<td>and she [Leah] went out</td>
<td>yš</td>
<td>Leah purchases sexual access to Jacob with her son’s mandrakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>009</td>
<td>Gen 30:16</td>
<td>ἐζήτησε</td>
<td>she [Leah] went out</td>
<td>and she [Leah] went out</td>
<td>yš</td>
<td>Leah purchases sexual access to Jacob with her son’s mandrakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>010</td>
<td>Gen 32:2 (MT 32:1)</td>
<td>συνήντησαν</td>
<td>καὶ ὦ ἑορτὴν</td>
<td>The angels of God meet with Jacob</td>
<td>Appendix 1 353 010 Gen 32:2 (MT 32:1) συνήντησαν ὦ καὶ ἑορτὴν and they [the angels of God] met with him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011</td>
<td>Gen 32:6 (MT 32:7)</td>
<td>νῦν ἦλθον</td>
<td>ἔρχεται</td>
<td>The message that Esau is coming to meet Jacob with four hundred men</td>
<td>B1 or A2? D1 or D2? (Joseph’s response is fear)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>012</td>
<td>Gen 32:17 (MT 32:18)</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἐρχεται</td>
<td>Jacob instructs his slaves what to say to Esau if he meets them</td>
<td>C1 (still trying to purchase that which should not be purchased?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>013</td>
<td>Gen 32:19 (20)</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ εὑρεῖν</td>
<td>ἐρχεται</td>
<td>Further, as above</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>014</td>
<td>Gen 33:4</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἐρχεται</td>
<td>Esau runs to meet and embrace Jacob</td>
<td>A27* (reconciliations and reunions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>015</td>
<td>Gen 33:8</td>
<td>ἔνας ὁμώνυμος</td>
<td>ἐρχεται</td>
<td>Esau’s question: What are these to you, all these companies that I have met?</td>
<td>Appendix 1 353 015 Gen 33:8 ἔνας ὁμώνυμος ἐρχεται that I met</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>English Translation</td>
<td>Hebrew Text</td>
<td>Greek Translation</td>
<td>English Comment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>Gen 46:28</td>
<td>to appear before his face</td>
<td>מִדְרֶה יְּרֵצָה</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>Καὶ ἀπέστειλεν έμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ Ἰσραήλ πρὸς Ἰούδα</td>
<td>Israel sends Judah on a forerunner for the reunion of Joseph and Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>016</td>
<td>Gen 46:29</td>
<td>to meet Israel</td>
<td>לֹֽא יִשְׂרָאֵל</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἅπαν ἔστείλεν πρὸς Ἰουδᾶ ἀνὰ πρὸς Ἰωσῆφ</td>
<td>Joseph’s reunion with his father, Jacob</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>017</td>
<td>Exod 3:18</td>
<td>has met with us</td>
<td>נִמְשָׁכָה</td>
<td>συνάντησεν</td>
<td>᾿ΙΑΟΝ Πορεύθητι</td>
<td>God explains that Aaron is coming out to meet Moses…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>018</td>
<td>Exod 4:14</td>
<td>to meet you</td>
<td>μέτρια γῆς</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἔξελεύσεται</td>
<td>Flashback: God tells Aaron to go into the wilderness to meet Moses…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>019</td>
<td>Exod 4:27</td>
<td>met him</td>
<td>μετὰ τὴν ὑπέρισχον</td>
<td>συνάντησε</td>
<td>ἰδὼς ὑπάγῃ</td>
<td>On the way, an angel of the Lord met Moses and sought to kill him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>020</td>
<td>Exod 4:27a</td>
<td>to meet Moses</td>
<td>μέτρια γῆς</td>
<td>συνάντησεν</td>
<td>ἰδὼς ὑπάγῃ</td>
<td>Flashback: God tells Aaron to go into the wilderness to meet Moses…</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>Part</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English (Translation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 4:27b</td>
<td>συνήντησεν (αὐτῷ ἐν τῷ ὄρει τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ κατεφίλησαν αὐτὸν)</td>
<td>v:3,s,ao, ac,ind</td>
<td>wayyip̱g</td>
<td>and met him</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθη καὶ …</td>
<td>καὶ ἐπορεύθη καὶ …</td>
<td>wayyip̱g</td>
<td>and he went...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exod 5:3</td>
<td>συνήντησαν</td>
<td>v:3,p,ao, ac,ind</td>
<td>wayyip̱g</td>
<td>and they met</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(This suggests some synonymy between these two verbs) | v:pr,ac, part,m,s. | niṣṣaḇ | to meet him | evwov̄k̄ν̄ς | coming | nisap̱̅m | nisap̱̅m | to stand | B2? (they have rebuke and criticism for Moses and Aaron) |
<p>| Exod 5:20a | συνήντησαν | v:3,p,ao, ac,ind | wayyip̱g | and they met | - | - | - | - |
| Exod 5:20b | συνάντησιν | n:f,s,a(c) | liqrāʾṯô | to meet him | βάδισον | you [Moses] go! | στήσῃ | you will stand | nisap̱̅m | nisap̱̅m | to stand | B2/7 (they have rebuke and criticism for Moses and Aaron) |
| Exod 7:15 | συναντῶν | v:pr,ac, part,m,s. | kip̱̅jōm | to meet him | βάδισον | you [Moses] go! | στήσῃ | you will stand | nisap̱̅m | nisap̱̅m | to stand | B2/7 (they have rebuke and criticism for Moses and Aaron) |
| 027 | Exod 14:27 | ἐξῆλθεν | wayyēṣēʾ | nws | The pursuing Egyptians drowned: they fled from meeting the sea | B1? |
| 028 | Exod 18:7 | συνάντησιν | liqraʾṯ | yṣʾ | Jethro comes to visit Moses in the wilderness bringing Moses wife and children with him | A2 (reconciliation and reunion) |
| 029 | Exod 19:17 | συνάντησιν | liqraʾṯ | yṣʾ | Moses prepares the people and then brings them out of the camp to meet God | A2 (reconciliation and reunion) |
| 030 | Ex 23:4 | συναντήσῃς | ἐξῆλθεν | yṣʾ | A law regarding the return of your neighbours livestock if you “meet it going astray” | Happen upon. |
| 031 | Exod 25:22 | - | - | - | There I will meet you | |
| 032 | Num 20:18 | συνάντησιν | ʾēṣēʾ | yṣʾ | Edom refuses Israel’s request to pass through its territory. | B1 |
| 033 | Num 20:20 | συνάντησιν | liqraʾṯ | yṣʾ | Edom comes out to meet them with a great host and a strong hand | B1 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix 1</th>
<th>357</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 21:23</strong></td>
<td>to meet him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 21:33</strong></td>
<td>to meet them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 22:34</strong></td>
<td>to meet me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 22:36</strong></td>
<td>to meet him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Num 23:3</strong></td>
<td>to meet him</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes
- **Num 21:23** (27:4) Eliphaz, who exhorts his son to go to Edom, is not a military leader, but he comes out to go to Edom to meet Israel. This suggests that Eliphaz does not see any military necessity to Edom's involvement in the battle against Israel.
- **Num 21:33** (29:18-20) Og, the King of Bashan, went forward to meet Israel and all his people to war. Og, the king of Bashan, came out for war with them and is defeated.
- **Num 22:34** (30:1) Balaam says to the angel of the Lord, “I did not know that you were standing opposite in the road to meet me.”
- **Num 22:36** (31:4) Balak, king of Moab, son of Zippor comes out to meet Balaam to ask why he delayed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>RAW TEXT</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>glossary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>039</td>
<td>Num 23:4</td>
<td>εἶδεν ὁ θεὸς τῷ Βαλαάμ God appeared to Balaam</td>
<td>if [God] will appear to me</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wayyiqqār ʾel-bilʿām and God met Balaam</td>
<td>I will walk, perhaps it will happen</td>
<td>to befall, happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>040</td>
<td>Num 23:15</td>
<td>ἐπερωτήσας τὸν θεὸν to inquire of God</td>
<td>I will meet here</td>
<td>πορεύσομαι I will go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wayyiqqār ʾel-bilʿām and God met Balaam</td>
<td>God met Balaam, and put a word in his mouth</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>Num 23:16</td>
<td>συνήντησεν ὁ θεὸς τῷ Βαλαάμ God met Balaam</td>
<td>God met Balaam</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wayyiqqār yhwhʾel-bilʿām and the LORD met Balaam</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>042</td>
<td>Num 24:1</td>
<td>συνάντησιν to meet the divinations</td>
<td>he [Balaam] did not go as customary</td>
<td>ραβαλαάμ did not go as at other times, &quot;to meet the divinations&quot; sui generis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wayyēṣʾû to go out</td>
<td>Moses, Eleazar the priest and all the leaders of the congregation meet the soldiers after the war against Midian</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>043</td>
<td>Num 31:13</td>
<td>συνάντησιν to meet them</td>
<td>he [Moses et al] went out and they went out</td>
<td>א5 → ב2 (starts like adventus but deteriorates to rebuke and criticism)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wayyiqqār ʾel-bilʿām -pē</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>044</td>
<td>Num</td>
<td>συνάντησι</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>A law regarding the execution of a murderer by the &quot;avenger of blood&quot; Bri? Another sui generis. Has more the sense of happen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verse</td>
<td>passage</td>
<td>c,subj.</td>
<td>when he meets him</td>
<td>v:ao,ac,in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35:19</td>
<td>Num 35:21</td>
<td>ἐν τῷ συναντῆσαι αὐτῷ</td>
<td>ὅταν αὐτὸν</td>
<td>when he meets him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Deut 1:44</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ὑπέρ θεοῦ</td>
<td>to meet you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Deut 2:32</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἐξῆλθεν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Deut 3:1</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>ἐξῆλθεν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Deut 22:23</td>
<td>εὑρὼν αὐτὴν</td>
<td>ἐπιστανταί</td>
<td>finding her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Deut 22:25</td>
<td>εὑρῇ</td>
<td>ἔμψης</td>
<td>he finds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref.</td>
<td>Book</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>051</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>22:28</td>
<td>εὕρῃ</td>
<td>should find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>052</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>23:4</td>
<td>μὴ συνάντησιν σοὺς αὐτοὺς μετὰ ἀρπαγής καὶ ὕδωρ σὰρξ</td>
<td>not meet you with bread and water on the way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX</td>
<td>23:5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>Deut</td>
<td>29:7</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX</td>
<td>29:8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>054</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>2:16</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX</td>
<td>2:17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>055</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>8:5</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX</td>
<td>8:14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>056</td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>8:14</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX</td>
<td>8:15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Chapter</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>057</td>
<td>Josh 8:22</td>
<td>συνάντησαν</td>
<td>to meet them</td>
<td>εξήλθοσαν they [the Israelite ambushers] went out</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 058 | Josh 9:11 | συνάντησαν | to meet them | πορεύσῃς [our elders said to us] go! (c.f. Aaron) | ἐξῆλθοσαν they [the Israelite] went out | hlk to walk | The Gibeonites by pretending to be from "very far away" persuade Israel to make a peaceful treaty | A2?
<p>| 059 | Josh 11:20 | συνάντησαν | to meet Sisera | κοποιῶναίσαν ἐνύσιραμ to strengthen the heart | ἔτισκεν ἐκκαρδίαν to strengthen the heart of them | hzq to strengthen | It was the Lord's doing that they would harden their hearts to come out to meet Israel in battle | B1 |
| 060 | Judg 4:18 | ἀπάντησιν | to meet Sisera | ἐγκύνεων she [Jael] came out | ἔτισκεν ἐκκαρδίαν and she [Jael] went out | yṣ to go out | Jael came out to meet Sisera with the appearance of hospitality | C2 par excellence (the tent peg through the skull) |
| 061 | Judg 4:22 | ἀπάντησιν | to meet him | ἐγκύνεων she [Jael] went out | ἔτισκεν ἐκκαρδίαν and she [Jael] went out | yṣ to go out | Jael went out to meet Barak, the man denied glory | B2? (with good news or with Barak's glory robbed from him?) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>6:35</td>
<td>συνάντησιν  (A &amp; B)</td>
<td>to meet them</td>
<td>A2 (solidarity?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td>they went up to him (A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they went up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>they went up to them (B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>063</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>7:24</td>
<td>συνάντησιν  (A &amp; B)</td>
<td>to meet Midian</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,a(c)</td>
<td>you [Ephraimites] come down!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>you (pl) [Ephraimites] come down!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>064</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>8:21</td>
<td>ἀπάντησον  (A)</td>
<td>and meet us</td>
<td>B1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συνάντησον  (B)</td>
<td>you [Gideon] arise!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ν:2,s,ac</td>
<td>(c.v. Lot and Eglon)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>065</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>11:31</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν  (A)</td>
<td>to meet me</td>
<td>A3 (adventus?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συνάντησιν  (B)</td>
<td>[whoever] comes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,a(c)</td>
<td>the going-out-one who goes out from the door/s of my house to meet me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>066</td>
<td>Judg</td>
<td>11:32</td>
<td>(omit · Brenton's mistake · no &quot;meet&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Script</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>067</td>
<td>Judg 11:34</td>
<td>mons (A) and συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>κατά (to meet him)</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν (A)</td>
<td>Jophthah’s daughter comes out to meet him with timbrels and dancing (cf 1 Sam 18:6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>068</td>
<td>Judg 14:5</td>
<td>mons (A) and συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>κατά (to meet him)</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν (A) and συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>Samson met by a lion, who roaring met him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>069</td>
<td>Judg 15:12</td>
<td>mons (A) and συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσητε (A)</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσητε (A) and συναντήσητε (B)</td>
<td>Samson makes the men of Judah promise that they will not “meet him” (fall on him) themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>070</td>
<td>Judg 15:14</td>
<td>mons (A) and συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>κατά (to meet him)</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσητε (A) and συναντήσητε (B)</td>
<td>The foreigners shouted to meet him and ran to meet him (Samson)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>071</td>
<td>Judg 18:25 (S)</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσωσιν (A)</td>
<td>συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>lest they [men of bitterness] meet you</td>
<td>ἐξ ἀνίατου ὑπάνεται ἵπποι</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>072</td>
<td>Judges 19:3</td>
<td>κύριά τί</td>
<td>συνάντησιν (B)</td>
<td>to meet him</td>
<td>κύριον (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>073</td>
<td>Judges 19:15,18</td>
<td>Lesbos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ηὐφράνθη (B)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>074</td>
<td>Judg 20:25 (S)</td>
<td>κύρια Ἰαβύν</td>
<td>κύρια Ἰαβύν (A)</td>
<td>to meet them</td>
<td>κύριον (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>075</td>
<td>Judg 20:31</td>
<td>κύριά Ἰαβύν</td>
<td>κύρια Ἰαβύν (A)</td>
<td>to meet the people</td>
<td>κύριον (A)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>076</td>
<td>1 Sam 4:1</td>
<td>the meeting is implicit</td>
<td>v:3,plgr, m,ind</td>
<td>ננהל to meet</td>
<td>הָלַח to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>077</td>
<td>1 Sam 4:2</td>
<td>the meeting is implicit</td>
<td>v:3,plgr, m,ind</td>
<td>ננהל to meet</td>
<td>הָלַח to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>078</td>
<td>1 Sam 6:13</td>
<td>the meeting is implicit</td>
<td>v:3,plgr, m,ind</td>
<td>ננהל to meet</td>
<td>הָלַח to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>079</td>
<td>1 Sam 9:11</td>
<td>they found</td>
<td>v:3,plgr, m,ind</td>
<td>ננהל to meet</td>
<td>הָלַח to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>080</td>
<td>1 Sam 9:13a</td>
<td>you will find him</td>
<td>v:3,plgr, m,ind</td>
<td>ננהל to meet</td>
<td>הָלַח to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>081</td>
<td>1 Sam 9:13b</td>
<td>you will find</td>
<td>v:3,plgr, m,ind</td>
<td>ננהל to meet</td>
<td>הָלַח to go out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>English (Lukan style of shaping)</td>
<td>English (Samuel's 'news' for Saul)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>082</td>
<td>1Sam 9:14</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet them</td>
<td>he [Samuel] came out to meet them</td>
<td>Samuel came out to meet Saul and his father's slave boy (as they were going up and entering the middle of the city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>083</td>
<td>1Sam 10:2</td>
<td>εὑρήσεις</td>
<td>you will find</td>
<td>you will find [as soon as you have departed]</td>
<td>Samuel tells Saul that he will find two men (a sign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπελθῇς as you go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>084</td>
<td>1Sam 10:3</td>
<td>εὑρήσεις</td>
<td>you will find</td>
<td>you will depart</td>
<td>Samuel tells Saul that he will find three men with supplies (a sign)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπελθῇς as you go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὑσμᾶς ὑμᾶς you will come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὑσμᾶς ὑμᾶς you will leave</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὑσμᾶς ὑμᾶς you will meet</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὑσμᾶς ὑμᾶς you will find</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>085</td>
<td>1Sam 10:5</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσεις</td>
<td>you will meet a band of prophets</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Part of Samuel's 'news' for Saul: that he would meet a band of prophets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>086</td>
<td>1Sam 10:7</td>
<td>ἔρχεται</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>come</td>
<td>Samuel says to Saul, &quot;When these signs come upon you&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>1 Sam 10:10</td>
<td>ἐξ ἐναντίας to meet him</td>
<td>καὶ ἤδω χερσὶ προσφήμων and behold a band of prophets</td>
<td>καὶ ἤδω χερσὶ προσφήμων and behold a band of prophets</td>
<td>ἡμῖν behold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>088</td>
<td>1 Sam 13:10</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσειν n:f,s,a(c) to meet him</td>
<td>εὐλογήσαι to bless him</td>
<td>εὐλογήσαι to bless him</td>
<td>ἐξῆλθεν Saul went out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>089</td>
<td>1 Sam 13:15</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσειν n:f,s,a(c) to meet him</td>
<td>[the people] rose after Saul</td>
<td>[the people] rose after Saul</td>
<td>ὤρθρισεν he rose early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>090</td>
<td>1 Sam 15:2</td>
<td>τῇ ἀπαντήσει in meeting him in opposing [him] them [?]</td>
<td>ν.:3,7.3a,7.7,7.7</td>
<td>ν.:3,7.3a,7.7</td>
<td>ὤρθρισεν he rose early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>091</td>
<td>1 Sam 15:12</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσειν n:f,s,a(c) to meet him</td>
<td>ἔπεσαν and the elders were amazed (beside themselves?)...</td>
<td>ἔπεσαν and the elders were amazed (beside themselves?)...</td>
<td>ἐξέστησαν and the elders were amazed (beside themselves?)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>092</td>
<td>1 Sam 16:4</td>
<td>ἐξ ἐπιστάμων in meeting him</td>
<td>ἔπεσαν and the elders were amazed (beside themselves?)...</td>
<td>ἔπεσαν and the elders were amazed (beside themselves?)...</td>
<td>ἐξετέσθησαν and the elders were amazed (beside themselves?)...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Hebrew</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>093</td>
<td>1 Sam 17:2</td>
<td>הִצְנַנְךָ</td>
<td>εἷς ἐναντίας</td>
<td>Saul and the Israelites go to war against the Philistines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>094</td>
<td>1 Sam 17:21</td>
<td>לֹא</td>
<td>σύναντησιν</td>
<td>Further battle between Israel and the Philistines</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>095</td>
<td>1 Sam 17:48</td>
<td>שָׂם</td>
<td>συναντήσιν</td>
<td>The foreigner, Goliath, arose and went to meet David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>096</td>
<td>1 Sam 17:48b</td>
<td>מָתָּא</td>
<td>σύναντήσιν</td>
<td>[MT only: Saul enquires about the identity of David (“When Saul saw David go out to meet the Philistine, he said to Abner...”)]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>097</td>
<td>1 Sam 17:55</td>
<td>מָתָּא</td>
<td>σύναντήσιν</td>
<td>The women’s greeting of David (omit Saul) after the killing of Goliath</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>099</td>
<td>1 Sam 21:1</td>
<td>ἡ ἀπαντήσει</td>
<td>τῇ ἀπαντήσει</td>
<td>to answer</td>
<td>to greet Saul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>1 Sam 22:17</td>
<td>ὁπολύσα ἐς τοὺς ἱερεῖς κυρίου</td>
<td>ν.ο.ν.τ.</td>
<td>to meet</td>
<td>to meet (attack) the priests of the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>1 Sam 22:18</td>
<td>ὁπολύσα ἐς τοὺς ἱερεῖς</td>
<td>ν.ο.ν.τ.</td>
<td>to meet</td>
<td>to meet (attack) the priests of the Lord</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>1 Sam 23:28</td>
<td>συνάντησαν</td>
<td>ν.ο.ν.τ.</td>
<td>to meet</td>
<td>to meet the Philistines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Notes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>1 Sam 25:20</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet her</td>
<td>κατέβαινον</td>
<td>they (David and his men) were coming down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>wᵉ ḫinnê ḏāwiḏ waʾ nāšāyw ʾyōr ᵇḏı̂m</td>
<td>and behold David and his men were coming down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to go down</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>and she met them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>1 Sam 25:20b</td>
<td>ἀπήντησεν</td>
<td>to meet them</td>
<td>ἀπήντησεν</td>
<td>Abigail goes out to meet David, who in turn, with his men is coming down to meet her</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>αὐτοῖς</td>
<td></td>
<td>αὐτοῖς</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v:3,sa0, ac.ind</td>
<td></td>
<td>wattip̱gōš ʾōṯām</td>
<td>and she met them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105</td>
<td>1 Sam 25:32</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet me</td>
<td>ὃς ἀπέστειλέν σε σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ</td>
<td>who sent you this day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>οὗ ἀπέστειλεν σε σήμερον ἐν ταύτῃ</td>
<td>who sent you this day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106</td>
<td>1 Sam 25:34</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet me</td>
<td>εἰ μὴ ἐπιτύπωσας καὶ παρεγένου</td>
<td>if you had not hurried and come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>mihart wattāḇōʾṯı̂</td>
<td>you hurried and you came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>1 Sam 30:21a</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet David</td>
<td>εἰς ἑλλᾶν</td>
<td>they [the 200] came out</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>nayyeyʾọ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108</td>
<td>1 Sam 30:21b</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν</td>
<td>(same verb as above)</td>
<td>(still under the verb above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(still under the verb above)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Still under</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>…and the greeting of the men who were with David</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Sam 28:10</td>
<td>εἰ ἁπάντησιν ἂν ἁγιάζῃ, if injustice will befall you</td>
<td>v:3.sdmv, ind</td>
<td>Im-ysi-qeqqā dālaš</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td>2 Sam 1:6</td>
<td>Παρετέθη ομοσπονδίαν, a happening: by</td>
<td>n:meša, d (c)</td>
<td>nigrēś</td>
<td>παρετεθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cf 2 Sam 18:9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>2 Sam 2:13</td>
<td>καὶ συνάντησιν and met them</td>
<td>v:3.psd, ac,ind</td>
<td>wayyiqqēṯ</td>
<td>συνάντησαν and met them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>2 Sam 2:25</td>
<td>συνάντησιν in meeting</td>
<td>m:fas(c)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>συνάντησαν they gathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113</td>
<td>2 Sam 5:23a</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>m:fas(c)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>συνάντησαν they gathered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
114 | 2 Sam 5:23b | **Not “meet” – Brenton’s error** | **Any meeting is implicit** | **παρέσει** you will be there | **σῆς** to turn, go around | **and you shall pass by them before the Wailing** | B1

115 | 2 Sam 6:20 | **to meet David** | **ἐξῆλθεν** she [Michal, Saul’s daughter] came out | **ἐπαντὴν** and she [Michal, Saul’s daughter] came out | **ἀπάντησιν** to answer to | Context: adventus: Michal’s lack of recognition to David and the ark. (corrupted - interrupted) | A3*

116 | 2 Sam 10:5 | **to meet them** | **παρετάξαντο** they set in battle lines (they arrayed them) | **σῆς** to send | **ἀπαντὴν** to meet them | David sent to meet his envoys who had gone to see the new king of Ammonites (unsuccessfully) | B2

117 | 2 Sam 10:9 | **in opposition to** | **παρετάξαντο** they set in battle lines (they arrayed them) | **ἀπαντὴν** to meet them | **ἐξ** in opposition to | The Ammonites with the Arameans fight Israel, Joab arrays some against the Syrians (Arameans). | B1

118 | 2 Sam 10:10 | **in opposition to** | **παρετάξαντο** they set in battle lines (they arrayed them) | **ἀπαντὴν** to meet them | **ἐξ** in opposition to | The Ammonites with the Arameans fight Israel, Joab arrays the rest against the Ammonites. | B1

119 | 2 Sam 10:17 | **against David** | **παρετάξαντο** they set in battle lines (they arrayed them) | **ἀπαντὴν** to meet them | **ἐξ** in opposition to | Further. | B1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>English (Analysis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>120</td>
<td>2 Sam 15:32</td>
<td>ἵνα ἴθη</td>
<td>to meet him</td>
<td>David’s exile during the coup d’etat of Absalom: on his way out of Jerusalem (Mt of Olives) Hushai came to meet him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἰδοὺ διερρηχως</td>
<td>and behold...he chanced to meet (passive)</td>
<td>(similarly, no came word)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ὡς ἥσυχα ἀρκι̂</td>
<td>and behold...Hushai the Arkite (similarly, no came word)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἵνα</td>
<td>to meet</td>
<td>(with many provisions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἐξ ἐναντίας</td>
<td>he went out</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>εὐανάρτησεν...ἐνώπιον</td>
<td>he met...face to face</td>
<td>Further: the death of Absalom. Absalom happened to meet the servants of David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>εὐπροσερχόμενος</td>
<td>he met...face to face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>εὐπροσερχόμενος</td>
<td>he met...face to face</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ησύχα προσερχόμενος</td>
<td>and he chanced to meet (passive)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἣπειρας εἰς Γαλγάλα</td>
<td>they [the men of Judah] came to Gilgal to go</td>
<td>The people of Judah came to Gilgal to go to meet the king, to bring the king over the Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ησύχας οἴς</td>
<td>they [the men of Judah] came to Gilgal to go</td>
<td>A2 (expression of solidarity, loyalty and honour)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἤλθαν εἰς Γαλγάλα τοῦ πορεύεσθαι</td>
<td>they [the men of Judah] came to Gilgal to go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>μετὰ τοῦ ξαφνικῶς θρησκεύοντος</td>
<td>when unexpectedly they were about to worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line</td>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Root(s)</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>125</td>
<td>2 Sam 19:16</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσαν</td>
<td>παρακλῆσαι</td>
<td>to meet King David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX v. 17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(cf 1 Sam 25:34)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Sam 19:20</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσαν</td>
<td>παρακλῆσαι</td>
<td>to meet my lord the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX v. 21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Sam 19:24</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσαν</td>
<td>παρακλῆσαι</td>
<td>to meet the king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(LXX v. 25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Speech of Shimei related to the above**

(“I came today, first of all the house of Joseph to go down and meet my lord the king”)

“First” recapitulates the idea of haste.
<p>| 128 | 2 Sam 19:25 | ἀπάντησιν | (LXX) to meet the king | εἰσῆλθεν into Jerusalem | ἰδίῳ γνώσκει when he went to Jerusalem | bw' to come | (same context as above) And it came to pass when he went to Jerusalem to meet the king, that the king said... | A2 |
| 129 | 2 Sam 19:25b | οὐκ ἐπορεύθης not go with me | (LXX) not go with me | lōʾ-ḥālaḵtā not go with me | hlḵ to walk | Why did you not walk/go with me, Mephibosheth? | Apparent C3 – but not really because Mephibosheth is lame and was tricked |
| 130 | 2 Sam 19:31-40 | επισώμα to send off or to escort | περιήρων to send him off or to escort him | κατέβη he went down | yāda he went down | yrd to go down | Barzillai the Gileadite who accompanies and had supported (cherished) the king | A2 (honour, loyalty) |
| 131 | 2 Sam 20:1 | - and there a worthless man by chance happened to be called Sheba, son of Bichri | αὐτῷ εἰς τὰ σκηνώματά σου, Ἰσραήλ every man to his tent, Israel | ʾı̂š lᵉʾōhālāyw yiśrāʾēl every man to his tent, Israel | ʾı̂š lᵉʾēhārēn yiśrāʾēl every man to his tent over the Jordan | ‘br to pass over | Barzillai the Gileadite who accompanies and had supported (cherished) the king | C3 – and tries to persuade others not to accompany or greet David |
| 132 | 2 Sam 20:8 | ἐμπροσθεν before them | ἱερέων before them | ἐστήκεν he entered | bāʾ he entered | Amasa comes before Joab and is wrongfully killed | just prior to Joab’s C2! |
| 133 | 1 Kings 2:7 | ἑγγον̣:ν̣ they drew near | ὄπισς (προσέχεις ἔλογι) in this way (doing mercy) | ἵππος (ἱππόποιν θεῷ) for thus (making lovingkindness)... | ἵππος (ἱππόποιν θεῷ) for thus (making lovingkindness)... | different vocab. here but central to the thesis! | A2 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>134</td>
<td>1 Kings 2:8</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει (acute?)</td>
<td>τοις</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει</td>
<td>he came down</td>
<td>Wayyāqām hayyardēn</td>
<td>David’s counsel to Solomon to “Deal wisely” with Shimei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>135</td>
<td>1 Kings 2:19</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει</td>
<td>τοις</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει</td>
<td>he arose</td>
<td>Wayyāqām hammeleḵ</td>
<td>King Solomon rises to meet the queen-mother Bathsheba</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 136  | 1 Kings 2:32 | οὐκ ῥίχαν | τοις | ρίχαν | he met | Wayyippaʿ-
|      |           | οὐκ ῥίχαν | τοις | ρίχαν | he met | Solomon relating how Joab had attacked [met] and killed two men without David’s knowledge |
| 137  | 1 Kings 2:34 | οὐκ ῥίχαν | τοις | ρίχαν | he met with him | Wayyārif … | And Benaiah came to Joab in the temple and put him to death |
| 138  | 1 Kings 3:1  | (omit as it is syn with 1 Kings 2:8) | τοις | see 77 above | see 77 above | Solomon speaking of the peace of his days as having no “meeting evil” |
| 139  | 1 Kings 5:18 | μετά τον | τοις | μετά | meeting or | see 77 above | see 77 above |

See 77 above
| 141 | 1 Kings 8:37 | συνάντησαν | καὶ κακοῖaires | - | - | Solomon listing adversities that people will bring in prayer to the temple to God, including plague |
| 142 | 1 Kings 12:24k | συνάντησαν | not in MT | not in MT | [Would possibly be yiššōth to go out] | Achiæ, the prophet, said to his slave, “Go and meet Ano the wife of Jeroboam”. Ano is bringing gifts, hoping for good news about her son who is ill. |
| 143 | 1 Kings 12:24l | συνάντησαν | not in MT | not in MT | [Would possibly be yiššōth to go out] | The bad-news prophecy: “When you enter Sarira, your slave women will come out to meet you and will say to you, ‘The child has died’” |
| 144 | 1 Kings 12:24m | συνάντησαν | not in MT | not in MT | [Would possibly be yiššōth to go out] | Fulfilment: “And it happened as she entered Sarira, that the child died, and the wailing came out to meet her” |
| 145 | 1 Kings 13:24 | εὗρεν | not in MT | not in MT | - | A lion met (found) the prophet who was deceived by the other prophet into not following the Lord’s instructions |
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| 1 Kings 8:37 | συνάντησαν | καὶ κακοῖaires | - | - | Solomon listing adversities that people will bring in prayer to the temple to God, including plague |
| 1 Kings 12:24k | συνάντησαν | not in MT | not in MT | [Would possibly be yiššōth to go out] | Achiæ, the prophet, said to his slave, “Go and meet Ano the wife of Jeroboam”. Ano is bringing gifts, hoping for good news about her son who is ill. |
| 1 Kings 12:24l | συνάντησαν | not in MT | not in MT | [Would possibly be yiššōth to go out] | The bad-news prophecy: “When you enter Sarira, your slave women will come out to meet you and will say to you, ‘The child has died’” |
| 1 Kings 12:24m | συνάντησαν | not in MT | not in MT | [Would possibly be yiššōth to go out] | Fulfilment: “And it happened as she entered Sarira, that the child died, and the wailing came out to meet her” |
| 1 Kings 13:24 | εὗρεν | not in MT | not in MT | - | A lion met (found) the prophet who was deceived by the other prophet into not following the Lord’s instructions |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Greek Words</th>
<th>English Translation</th>
<th>Hebrew Words</th>
<th>English Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>146</td>
<td>1 Kings 18:7</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>ἔλθεν</td>
<td>Elijah met Obadiah, chief servant of Ahab during the drought the end in the priests-of-Baal confrontation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ǝ.histô</td>
<td>A2 (meeting between good men - but with the threat of danger)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>1 Kings 18:16a</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>ἐπορεύθη</td>
<td>A2 (bad news for Ahab) - information &quot;Elijah wants to meet you&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>ʾaḥʾāḇ</td>
<td>B2 (each calling the other &quot;perverter of Israel&quot;)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>148</td>
<td>1 Kings 18:16b</td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>ἐξέδραμεν</td>
<td>A2 (curse - how Ahab will die)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n:f,s,a(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ἀνάστηθι καὶ κατάβηθι</td>
<td>B2 (fulfilled in 2 Kings 9:21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to arise! and go down!</td>
<td>2 Kgs 21:27 (MT) Kings, warfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kings 21:36</td>
<td>2 Kings 20:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>151</td>
<td>2 Kings 21:36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>εὑρίσκειν</td>
<td>found (him)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>wayyimṣāʾêhû</td>
<td>(a lion) found him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A lion met (found) the prophet who didn’t help with the enacted prophecy against Ahab the king of Israel by striking another prophet who had a word from the Lord (saying ‘strike me!’)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Kings 1:3</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>152</td>
<td>2 Kings 1:3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet the messengers of the king of Samaria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀναστὰς δεῦρο</td>
<td>arise and come! (the former is a participle)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qûm ʿa</td>
<td>arise! and go up!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Kings 1:6</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>153</td>
<td>2 Kings 1:6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet us</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἀνέβη ὅ τις</td>
<td>a man went up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Kings 1:7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>154</td>
<td>2 Kings 1:7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>συνάντησιν</td>
<td>to meet you (pl)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>νεμέων ὅ τις</td>
<td>who rose (lit. the arising to meet you man)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ὅ τις</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 Kings 2:15</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>155</td>
<td>2 Kings 2:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>συναντήσαι</td>
<td>to meet him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἔλθον ὅ τις</td>
<td>they (the sons of the prophets) came ... and did obeisance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ἔλθον ὅ τις ὁ ἐλλην</td>
<td>and they [the sons of the prophets] came... and they bowed down to the ground to him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

A2: (honour)
<p>| 156 | 2 Kings 4:26 | ḫwh | καί ἵσθι | νῦν δράμε | ἐπεστρέφεται | τῷ ἰσραήλ | ῥ writeTo bow, worship | to run | The slave of the prophet is sent to meet the distressed Shunammite women | B2 (Is it peace? No, her son has died!) |
| 157 | 2 Kings 4:29 | ἀπαντήσῃ | καί ἵσθι | νῦν δράμε | ἐπεστρέφεται | τῷ ἰσραήλ | ῥ to run | The slave of the prophet is sent to meet the distressed Shunammite women | B2 | (Is it peace? No, her son has died!) |
| 158 | 2 Kings 4:31 | ἀπαντήσῃ | καί ἵσθι | ἐπετρέπεται | ἐπεστρέφεται | τῷ ἰσραήλ | ῥ to run | Gehazi came to meet Elisha with bad news -- the child had not &quot;awakened&quot; | B2 |
| 159 | 2 Kings 5:21 | ἀπαντήσῃ | καί ἵσθι | ἐπετρέπεται | ἐπεστρέφεται | τῷ ἰσραήλ | ῥ to run | Naaman honours Elisha's slave (delegate) Gehazi (&quot;from him but not sent by him&quot;) | B2 (honouring action on Naaman's part) |
| 160 | 2 Kings 5:26 | ἀπαντήσῃ | καί ἵσθι | ἐπετρέπεται | ἐπεστρέφεται | τῷ ἰσραήλ | ῥ to run | Naaman honours Elisha's slave (delegate) Gehazi (&quot;from him but not sent by him&quot;) | B2 (honouring action on Naaman's part) |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>161</th>
<th>2 Kings 8:8</th>
<th>ἀπαντήσει</th>
<th>μ.ν.α.(c)</th>
<th>ἀπαντήσει: to meet the man of God</th>
<th>ἀπαντήσει: to meet the man of God</th>
<th>ἀπαντήσει: you take in your hand a gift and go!</th>
<th>ίση μνήμης</th>
<th>ίση μνήμης</th>
<th>ἀπαντήσει: you take in your hand a gift and go!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>2 Kings 8:9</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει</td>
<td>μ.ν.α.(c)</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει: to meet him</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει: he [Hazael] went</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει: he [Hazael] went</td>
<td>ἦπορεύθη</td>
<td>ἦπορεύθη</td>
<td>ἦπορεύθη: he [Hazael] went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>2 Kings 9:17</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>μ.ν.α.(c)</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: to meet them</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: to meet them</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: to meet them</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: to meet them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>2 Kings 9:18</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>μ.ν.α.(c)</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: to meet him</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: he [the horse rider] went</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: he [the horse rider] went</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν</td>
<td>ἐμπροσθεν: he [the horse rider] went</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hadad's son, the King of Syria (Aram) says to Hazael: "Go to meet the man of God, and enquire of the Lord through him…"

(Complex: the prophet gives good news and then bad news) (gift: obligation/reconciliation)

D2 (Is it peace?)

Joran checking out Jehu - Is it peace?

He sent a horse rider in front of Jehu

And so the horse rider went to meet him

D2 (Is it peace?)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>2 Kings 9:21a</td>
<td>ἀπαντὴν</td>
<td>to meet Jebo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>2 Kings 9:21b</td>
<td>καὶ εὗρον</td>
<td>to find</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>2 Kings 10:15a</td>
<td>ἐπορεύθη ἐκεῖθεν καὶ εὗρεν τὸν Ἰωναδαβ υἱὸν Ρηχαβ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ and he [Jehu] went from there and found Johonabad son of Rechab on the way</td>
<td>wayyēleḵ miššām wayyimṣāʾ ʾeṯ yēhônāḏāḇ ben ῥēḵāḇ and he went from there and he met (found!) Jehonadab the son of Rechab...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>2 Kings 10:15b</td>
<td>ἀπαντὴν</td>
<td>to meet him</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ἀπαντη</td>
<td>to walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kings 16:10</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσῃ</td>
<td>ἐπορεύθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>2 Kings 16:10</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσῃ</td>
<td>ἐπορεύθη</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Kings 23:29</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσῃ</td>
<td>ἐπορεύθη</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Josiah went up to meet Pharaoh Neco king of Egypt (who himself was going out to battle at the river Euphrates with the king of Assyria). Josiah met Pharaoh Neco at Megiddo and was killed by him.
Appendix - Table 1.2: Greek verbs associated with ‘meeting’ against ‘scene types’ in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (LXX).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>sui generis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>συναντεῖν</td>
<td>m.3sa(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>001 001</td>
<td>002 007 011</td>
<td>014 017 019</td>
<td>021 028 029</td>
<td>058 061 062A</td>
<td>062B 072 0103</td>
<td>146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντήσαι</td>
<td>n:ao,ac, inf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>001 013 016 058</td>
<td>090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνήντησεν</td>
<td>v:3.s,ao, ac,ind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>032 033 035</td>
<td>036 046 047</td>
<td>048 053 055</td>
<td>056 057 063A</td>
<td>063B 068 070A</td>
<td>070B 074B 075B</td>
<td>095 102 113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντῶν</td>
<td>v:pr,ac, part, m, s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντησαι</td>
<td>v:pr,ac, part, m, s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντησεον</td>
<td>v:pr,ac, part, m, s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντήσει</td>
<td>038</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>092</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντᾶσαι</td>
<td>155 060</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συναντησαι</td>
<td>152 062</td>
<td>059 082 084 095 108 107 110 115 118 120 121 124 127 135 169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπάντησις</td>
<td>150 170 141 149 121 125 136 134 159 168 156 155 161 162 164 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀπαντήσεις</td>
<td>150 170 141 149 121 125 136 134 159 168 156 155 161 162 164 165</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1</td>
<td>386</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| ὑπάντησιν | παρατάσασθαι |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |

| ἐμπροσθέν | prep. | 386 | 386 |
Appendix-Table 1.3: Auxiliary Hebrew verbs associated with ‘meeting’ against ‘scene types’ in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (MT).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambiguous auxiliary verbs</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>sui generis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><code>yš</code></td>
<td>082</td>
<td>081</td>
<td>081</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>078</td>
<td>077</td>
<td>076</td>
<td>075</td>
<td>074</td>
<td>073</td>
<td>072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>082</td>
<td>081</td>
<td>080</td>
<td>079</td>
<td>078</td>
<td>077</td>
<td>076</td>
<td>075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>hlḵ</code></td>
<td>007</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>008</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to walk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>008</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>006</td>
<td>005</td>
<td>004</td>
<td>003</td>
<td>002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>hn</code></td>
<td>018</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>016</td>
<td>015</td>
<td>014</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>012</td>
<td>011</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>009</td>
<td>008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><code>yrḏ</code></td>
<td>003</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>001</td>
<td>000</td>
<td>024</td>
<td>023</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>020</td>
<td>019</td>
<td>018</td>
<td>017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table provides a detailed list of auxiliary Hebrew verbs associated with 'meeting' against 'scene types' in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (MT). The numbers correspond to specific occurrences or categories within the biblical text.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>sui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʿlh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿrṣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to arise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mhḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to hasten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive auxiliary verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>sui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bʿw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to come</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šḥḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to send</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šmh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to move</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qrh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go down</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʿrṣ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to arise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mhḥ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to hasten</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix 1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>sui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥwh (1)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>np̱l (1)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḥḻk (1)</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative auxiliary verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ḡ</td>
<td>077 083 094</td>
<td>117 118 119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṉ̇ḫ</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.22/0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʃg</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ṗw̱</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Diagnostic auxiliary verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥzq</td>
<td>to strengthen</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šwḇ</td>
<td>to return</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>škm</td>
<td>to rejoice</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šḥb</td>
<td>to turn, go around</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Diagnostic auxiliary verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Diagnostic values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ḥrd</td>
<td>B1: 52, C1: 109, D1: 279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṣḥf</td>
<td>A1: 30, A2: 184</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **A1, A2, A3, A4**: Rows 1-4 in the table above.
- **B1, B2, C1, C2, C3, D1, D2**: Columns 1-7 in the table above.
- **sui**: Rightmost column in the table above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rk</th>
<th>to find</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rk</td>
<td>to mount and ride</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix-Table 1.4: Auxiliary Greek verbs associated with ‘meeting’ against ‘scene types’ in the Pentateuch and Former Prophets (LXX).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ambiguous auxiliary verbs</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>έξέρχομαι</td>
<td>082</td>
<td>&lt;ref&gt;082&lt;/ref&gt;</td>
<td>061</td>
<td>086</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>098</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>118 115</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go out</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πορεύομαι</td>
<td>&lt;ref&gt;007&lt;/ref&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ref&gt;007&lt;/ref&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ref&gt;007&lt;/ref&gt;</td>
<td>&lt;ref&gt;007&lt;/ref&gt;</td>
<td>010</td>
<td>021</td>
<td>022</td>
<td>058</td>
<td>065</td>
<td>088</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to walk</td>
<td>(17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ιδού</td>
<td>013</td>
<td>082</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>&lt;ref&gt;007&lt;/ref&gt;</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>043</td>
<td>063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>behold</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>καταβάειν</td>
<td>007</td>
<td>068</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go down</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀναβάειν</td>
<td>017</td>
<td>002</td>
<td>084</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to go up</td>
<td>(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σπεύδω</td>
<td>to hasten</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παραγίνομαι</td>
<td>to go, appear</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive auxiliary verbs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ėρχομαι</td>
<td>to arrive</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>016 017 023 146 155</td>
<td></td>
<td>0117</td>
<td>0217</td>
<td>136</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0117</td>
<td>0117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀποστέλλω</td>
<td>to send</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>016 016 116 163</td>
<td></td>
<td>1002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εὐφραίνω</td>
<td>to rejoice</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>077 070 078</td>
<td></td>
<td>078</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐξάναστημι</td>
<td>to arise</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>00 00 00</td>
<td></td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προστρέχω</td>
<td>to run forth</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>00 03</td>
<td></td>
<td>01 04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιτρέχω</td>
<td>to run up</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>00 05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Negative auxiliary verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>sui</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>εἴσχομαι</td>
<td>128</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εἴσχω</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>προσκυνάω</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιπτέρχω</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστάθω</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐκπορεύομαι</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εξάγω</td>
<td>029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>πάρειμι</td>
<td>072A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>παρατάσσω</td>
<td>to arrange (draw up battlelines)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀνίστημι</td>
<td>to arise (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἱστήμι</td>
<td>to stand (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>συνθήσημι</td>
<td>to stand (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὑψώσω</td>
<td>to raise (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἀλλάζω</td>
<td>to change (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κατασχέω</td>
<td>to strengthen (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιτρέψω</td>
<td>to permit (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὀρθρίζω</td>
<td>to roar (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek Verb</td>
<td>Translation</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>D1</td>
<td>D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιφέρω</td>
<td>to send (the hand)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιστρέφω</td>
<td>to turn, go around</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Corrupt-use auxiliary verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>Sui generis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>τρέχω</td>
<td>to run</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ταχύνω</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diagnostic auxiliary verbs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>Sui generis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνω</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχοστημα</td>
<td>to teething, four</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>A1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A3</th>
<th>A4</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>Sui generis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>λαμβάνω</td>
<td>to take</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἔχοστημα</td>
<td>to teething, four</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Greek</td>
<td>Row</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>εὑρίσκω</td>
<td>to find</td>
<td>εὑρίσκω</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἐπιβάλλω</td>
<td>to mount and ride</td>
<td>ἐπιβάλλω</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>διέρχομαι</td>
<td>to bear, now</td>
<td>διέρχομαι</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Appendix 2: Close Analysis, Segmentation and Encoding of Ten Biblical Passages according to the ‘Narrative Poetics’ Methodology of Robert Funk (as set out in The Poetics of Biblical Narrative).¹

Appendix-Table 2.1: Narrative Codes
Appendix-Table 2.2: When Abigail Met David (1 Sam 25:2-43)

Appendix 2.1: Prose reading of "When Abigail Met David"
(1 Sam 25:2-43)

Appendix-Table 2.3: The Parable of the Father with Two Sons
(Luke 15:11-32)
Appendix-Table 2.4: Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10)

¹ Robert Walter Funk, The Poetics of Biblical Narrative, Foundations & Facets. Literary Facets series (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988). Funk’s methodology is gradually set out throughout the entire work. However, many of the best applications of Funk’s methodology can be seen in Poetics, on pp. 164-185 (“Chapter 7: Segmentation”).
### Appendix-Table 2.1 Table of Narrative Codes listed alphabetically from Funk’s Poetics (p. xv) with my own additions (in grey).²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>action (character is agent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aa</td>
<td>action anticipator (telegraphs action into INTRO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A, B</td>
<td>individual participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accel</td>
<td>narrative tempo getting faster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ae</td>
<td>action expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afore</td>
<td>action forecast (in CON)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a xv</td>
<td>Holy Spirit (CP in Acts; TP in Former Prophets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a:retro</td>
<td>reference to preceding action as past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arr</td>
<td>arrival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actrm</td>
<td>termination of action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attn</td>
<td>attention getting device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>com</td>
<td>commentary of narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>constop</td>
<td>conversation stopper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>continuity participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decel</td>
<td>narrative tempo getting slower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>def</td>
<td>defocalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desc</td>
<td>description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dep</td>
<td>departure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>divine happening (divine passive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dia</td>
<td>dialogue (direct speech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exp</td>
<td>explicit features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for foc</td>
<td>focalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flurry</td>
<td>succession of many actions in relatively little narrative time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fst</td>
<td>fast narrative tempo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>happening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hinge</td>
<td>hinge (combining near simultaneous defocalisation and focalisation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hypo-dia</td>
<td>dialogue (direct speech) within dialogue (direct speech) – often associated with anachrony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id</td>
<td>identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id:term</td>
<td>terminal identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imp</td>
<td>implicit features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iter</td>
<td>iterative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lc</td>
<td>locale connective (with link to preceding narrative)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Funk, Poetics, p. xv.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>lchq</th>
<th>an explicit shift in locale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>le</td>
<td>locale expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ls</td>
<td>location setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mut arr</td>
<td>a mutual simultaneous or near</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>simultaneous arrival of two parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>na</td>
<td>non-action (failure or omission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>where an action might be anticipated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noct-p</td>
<td>nocturnal pause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pc</td>
<td>participant contraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pe</td>
<td>participant expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perc</td>
<td>perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perc-prec</td>
<td>perception precipitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pershift</td>
<td>shift in perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pid</td>
<td>the formal identification of a new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pnom</td>
<td>reuse of noun (rather than</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pronoun)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pnomchg</td>
<td>change in nomenclature for a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos</td>
<td>position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-def</td>
<td>pre-defocaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-f or pre-foc</td>
<td>pre-focaliser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freid</td>
<td>the reidentification of a continuity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pset</td>
<td>introduction of a new set of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recap</td>
<td>recapitulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recip</td>
<td>reciprocal (always used with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focaliser)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rep</td>
<td>report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>retro</td>
<td>retrospective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sl</td>
<td>slow narrative tempo (<em>Poetics</em>, 145)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tc</td>
<td>temporal connective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tchg</td>
<td>an explicit temporal shift</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>te</td>
<td>temporal expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>term</td>
<td>terminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>termf</td>
<td>terminal function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>termt</td>
<td>terminal time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>God (Continuity Participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td>theme participant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ts</td>
<td>temporal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[]</td>
<td>indicates a silent, passive bystander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or an absent participant under</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix-Table 2.2: When Abigail Met David (1 Sam 25:2-43)

### Dramatis Personae

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Participant status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nabal</td>
<td>TP (Theme Participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Abigail</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>David</td>
<td>CP (Continuity Participant)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>David’s men (the “10”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Nabal’s young men (shepherds)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>David’s 400 young men (with swords)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>David’s 200 young men (stuff minders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>One of Abigail’s/Nabal’s young men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Abigail’s young men</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>The Lord God</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>Abigail’s 5 maidens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>King Saul</td>
<td>CP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Michal, Saul’s daughter</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Palti (son of Lais)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ref) Text Grammatical notation  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ending of the previous Narrative Unit</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Participants and their identification</th>
<th>Location time and other narrative codes</th>
<th>Other comments and time codes (<em>t</em>'s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1Sam. 25:2 And Samuel died, and all Israel assembled and mourned him, and they buried him at his home in Harmathaim. And David got up and went down to the wilderness of Maon</td>
<td>1Sam. 25:2</td>
<td>C (CP) [def:death]</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Act 1, Scene 1

#### Segment i

- **P set:** C=David
- **A=David’s 10 young men**
- **B=David’s 200 young men**
- **C=Abigail**

#### Segment ii

- **P set:** C=David
- **D=David’s 10 young men**
- **E=Abigail’s 5 maidens**
- **F=King Saul**

---

The ending of the previous Narrative Unit:

- **Text:** 1Sam. 25:2 And Samuel died, and all Israel assembled and mourned him, and they buried him at his home in Harmathaim. And David got up and went down to the wilderness of Maon.
- **Participants and their identification:** C (CP) [def:death]
- **Location time and other narrative codes:** t1
- **Other comments and time codes (*t*'s):**

### Act 1, Scene 1

#### Segment i

- **P set:** C=David
- **A=David’s 10 young men**
- **B=David’s 200 young men**
- **C=Abigail**

#### Segment ii

- **P set:** C=David
- **D=David’s 10 young men**
- **E=Abigail’s 5 maidens**
- **F=King Saul**
And David heard in the wilderness, that Nabal the Carmelite was shearing his flock.

And David sent ten young men, and he said to the young men, "Go up to Carmel, and go to Nabal, and ask him in my name regarding peace."

And you shall say this, 'To good times; may you and your house be in good health, and all that you have be in good health. And now, behold, I have heard that your shepherds who were with us in the wilderness are shearing your sheep, and we did not hinder them, neither did we demand any thing from them all the days they were in Carmel.

Ask your young men, and they will tell you."

So the young men came and spoke these words to Nabal, according to all these words in the name of David.

And he jumped up, rash action;
(17a) 10 and Nabal answered the young men of David, and said,  
(17.1) "Who is David? and who is the son Jesse?" [C (CP)]  
(17.2) Nabal does not ask his young men for their report. The 'slight' reference to David's exile from Saul.  
(17.3) slaves have been multiplied today, when they are breaking away each from the face of his master.  
(18a) 12 And David's young men turned away on their way, and returned, 
(18b) hinge def:dep (exp)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT I, SCENE i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D=David's young men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C=David</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A=Nabal] – implicit in &quot;reported&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F=David's four hundred men (with swords)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G=David's two hundred men (stuff minders)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(19) and came and reported to David according to these words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D hinge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C pre-farr is pre-f:perc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t10 hearing a report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20a) 13 And David said to his men, &quot;Each man strap on his sword!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.1) F+G dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d a attn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t12 (n.b. gap)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(21a) And they went up after David, about four hundred men:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F def:dep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22a) and two hundred remained with the stuff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G def:non-dep (=t13 and later)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT I, SCENE ii a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H=one of Nabal's/Abigail's young man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B=Abigail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[A=Nabal]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[C=David]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23a) 14 And one of the young men reported to Abigail Nabal's wife, saying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H pre-f:orr (imp)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t14 uncertain chronology &gt;t9; &lt;or&gt;t10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B (TP) pre-f:perc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heightens suspense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(23.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**ACT 2, SCENE 2**

**segment iii**

| (24a) | And Abigail hurried, and took two hundred loaves, and two vessels of wine, and five sheep ready dressed, and five ephahs (110 l) of parched grain, and one homer (220 l) of dried fruit, and two hundred cakes of dried figs, and put them upon the donkeys. | B (TP) | *t16* (t>9;<or>10?) |
| (25a) | Go on before me, and behold I am coming after you.” | 1 | “t17” *t18* fore-runners |
| (25b) | But she told not her husband. | [A (TP)] | na def:dep(imp) non-actions are not achronic “t19” |

---

**ACT 3, SCENE 1**

**segment iv**

| (29) | And it happened when she had mounted her ass | B (TP) | t20 |
(30a) and was going down by the cover of the mountain,  
καταβαίνοντος  
| Is  
(31a) and behold, David and his men came down to meet her, 
καὶ ἰδοὺ Δαυὶδ καὶ οἱ ἄνδρες αὐτοῦ καταβαίνουσιν  
| C (CP) perc (reader) focarr  
| mutual arrival is emphasizes by double "coming-down" and double "meet"  
(32a) and she met them,  
καὶ ἀπήνυσεν αὐτοῖς  
| C+F perc favr  

ACT 3, SCENE 1, SOLILOQUY segment iv b  

| (Describing David's state of mind when he was told of Nabal's response or as he comes to this meeting which then serves to highlight the transformative effect of Abigail's actions and words)  

P set:  
C=David  
F=the 400 (those addressed by the speech?)  

(33a) 21 And David said,  
C (CP) F, although not nec. if soliloquy.  
| ts dia flashback analepsis t11  

(33.1) "Perchance for an unrighteous fellow I have protected all his possessions in the wilderness that he should wrong me,  
[A (TP)] α:retro analepsis within analepsis t11, t2  
(33.2) and we have not ordered to receive anything of all his belongings;  
α:retro analepsis within analepsis t11, t7  
(33.3) yet he has returned me evil for good.  
α:retro analepsis within analepsis t11, t8  
(33.4) 22 So God do to David and more also, if by morning I leave of all who belong to him one wall‐pisser [male].  
[θ CP] [C (CP)] [A (TP)] [E+] prolepsis t25 (next morning) theme: morning  

ACT 3, SCENE 1, NUCLEUS (resumed) segment iv c  

P set:  
B=Abigail  
C=David  
[A=Nabal]  

(34a) 23 And Abigail saw David  
B (TP) f:recip  
C (CP) perc  
N.b. it certainly does not mean that they met twice or that there has been a clumsy reduction.  
| t20 (resumed) a double meeting detail of t20 reference to  
(35a) and she hurried  
καὶ ἔπευξεν  
| farr:recip  
(36a) and jumped down from her donkey;  
| ε  

LENGTHY AND SLOW
and she fell before David on her face, and did obeisance to him, bowing to the ground even to his feet, and said,

"Upon me, my lord, be the injustice: do let your slave speak in your ears, and hear a word of your slave. Let not now my lord, set his heart on this pestilent person, for as his name is, so is he; Nabal is his name, and folly is with him: but I your slave did not see the young men of my lord whom you sent.

And now, my lord, the Lord lives, and your life lives, as the Lord has kept you from coming against innocent blood, and from executing vengeance for yourself, even now may your enemies, and those that seek evil for my lord, become like Nabal.

And now accept this benefaction that your slave has brought for my lord, and you shall give it to the young men who follow my lord.

Do remove the trespass of your slave; for the Lord will make for my lord a faithful house, for my lord is fighting the battles of the Lord, and there shall not evil be ever found in you.

And a person will rise up persecuting you and seeking your life, and the life of my lord will be bound up in the bundle of life under the care of the Lord God, and you shall whirl the life of your enemies as
| (39.21) | in the midst of a sling.  
| 30 And it will be that the Lord will do for my lord all the good things he has spoken concerning you, | prolepsis  
| (39.22) | and shall command you to be ruler over Israel; | royal Davidic covenant  
| (39.23) | then this shall not be an abomination and offence to my lord, to have shed innocent blood without cause, | prolepsis  
| (39.24) | and to save the hand of my lord for himself: | anticipating 2 Sam 5  
| (39.25) | and so may the Lord do good to my lord, | end of prolepses – “this” day (hypothetical)  
| (39.26) | and you shall remember your slave to do good to her,” | hypoth. today  
| (40a) | 32 And David said to Abigail, “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who sent you this very day to meet me: | deuter. princ.  
| (40.1) | and blessed be your character, | analepsis  
| (40.2) | and blessed be you who has hindered me this very day so as not to come into spilling of blood, and to save my hand for myself, | Cross ref to INTRODUCTION th “good at understanding” now – t21  
| (40.3) | For surely the Lord the God of Israel lives, who has hindered me today from harming you, | theme: the Lord’s action  
| (40.4) | because if you had not hurried ὅτι εἰ μὴ ἔσπευσας | analepsis  
| (40.5) | and come to meet me, | “t15”-“t19”  
| (40.6) | καὶ παρεγένου ἐκ ὀπαντησίαν μου | analepsis  
| (40.7) | then I had said, | a:retro “t16”-“t19”  
| (40.7.1) | ‘There will surely not left to Nabal by the morning one wall-pisser [male:] ‘ | analepsis  
| (41a) | And David took of her hand all that she brought to him, and said to her, | pre-meeting t11  
| (42a) | “Go up in peace to your house: see, I have heard to your voice, and chosen your face.” | Whose house?  
| (42.1) | [A (TP)] | hypo-dia | analepsis  
| (42.2) | [B (TP)] | a:retro | pre-meeting  
| (42.3) | [C (CP)] | def/step (implied) | t22  

**CONCLUSION:**  
**SCENE 1:**  
**segment iv a**  
**accel.**  

---

> (39.21)  
> 30 And it will be that the Lord will do for my lord all the good things he has spoken concerning you, and shall command you to be ruler over Israel; then this shall not be an abomination and offence to my lord, to have shed innocent blood without cause, and to save the hand of my lord for himself: and so may the Lord do good to my lord; and you shall remember your slave to do good to her,”

---

> (40a)  
> 32 And David said to Abigail, “Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who sent you this very day to meet me: and blessed be your character, and blessed be you who has hindered me this very day so as not to come into spilling of blood, and to save my hand for myself, For surely the Lord the God of Israel lives, who has hindered me today from harming you, because if you had not hurried and come to meet me, then I had said, ‘There will surely not left to Nabal by the morning one wall-pisser [male:] ‘And David took of her hand all that she brought to him, and said to her, “Go up in peace to your house: see, I have heard to your voice, and chosen your face.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P set :</th>
<th>B=Abigail</th>
<th>A=Nabal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(43a)</td>
<td>and Abigail came to Nabal: B (TP) A (TP) is</td>
<td>t24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(44a)</td>
<td>and, behold, he had a feast in his house, like the feast of a king, A (TP) a</td>
<td>theme: house Whose house? theme: king/ anointed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(45s)</td>
<td>and the Nabal's heart was merry within him,</td>
<td>id:stat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(46s)</td>
<td>and he was exceedingly drunk:</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(47na)</td>
<td>and she did not tell him thing great or small until the morning light.</td>
<td>ts morning: time at which all were to die analepsis anticipates t25 accel.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION:**

**SCENE 2**

**segment iv b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P set :</th>
<th>B=Abigail</th>
<th>A=Nabal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(48ahs)</td>
<td>And it happened in the morning, when Nabal sobered up from the wine, A (TP) ts</td>
<td>accel. time at which all were to die t25 Who? Not &quot;Abigail&quot; t26 prolepsis anticipates t27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(49a)</td>
<td>his wife told him these things; B (TP) a dia?</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(50h)</td>
<td>and his heart died within him, id:term?</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(51s)</td>
<td>and he became like a stone.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION:**

**SCENE 3**

**segment iv c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P set :</th>
<th>A=Nabal</th>
<th>θ=God</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(52)</td>
<td>And it happened after about ten days, θ (CP) tchg</td>
<td>accel. t27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(53dh)</td>
<td>that the Lord struck Nabal, and he died. θ (CP) A (CP) dh</td>
<td>God enters the stage outside speech</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CONCLUSION:**

**SCENE 4**

**segment iv d**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P set :</th>
<th>C=David</th>
<th>[θ] [A=Nabal] [B] D= David's young men (the &quot;10&quot;)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(54a)</td>
<td>And David heard θ (CP) C (CP) perc ts</td>
<td>fast t28 analepsis t8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(55a)</td>
<td>and said, dia a:retro analepsis t20</td>
<td>theme: keeping David's hand from evil, c.f. Saul in cave analepsis t26-t27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(55.1)  | "Blessed be the Lord who has judged the judgment of my reproach at Nabal's hand, [θ (CP)] [A (TP)] a:retro recap. | t8 |
| (55.2) | and has preserved his slave from the hand of evil acts: [C (CP)] a:retro | |
| (55.3) | and the Lord has returned the evildoing of | |
**Appendix 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scene</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Set</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 55.4  | Nabal upon his own head.  
And David sent [his young men] and  
spoke concerning Abigail, to take  
her to himself as a wife. | D | def/dis  
a/dia  
def:dep(imp) | t29 prolepsis  
anticipates t35  
t30 | lengthy and slow |

**Scene 5 segment iv e**

*P set:*

D=David’s young men  
[C=David]  
B=Abigail  
J=the five maidens

| (56a) | And David’s young men came to  
Abigail to Carmel,  
and spoke to her, saying,  
"David sent us to you, to take  
you to himself as a wife." | D | is | t31 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(57a)</td>
<td>[C (CP)]</td>
<td>dia</td>
<td>t32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (57.1) | [B (TP)] | def:dis  
a/dia  
def:dep(imp) | | |

| (58a) | And she rose, | a | Parallels17a  
and 17b |
|-------|----------------|---|---|
| (59a) | and did obeisance with her face to  
the ground,  
and said, | a | |
| (60a) | Behold, your slave is for a  
servant-girl to wash  
the feet of your young men. | dia | She extends  
the ritual of  
foot washing to  
the "10"  
Honour the  
messenger,  
honour the  
sender. |
| (60.1) | | | |

| (61a) | And Abigail arose,  
and mounted the donkey,  
and five maidens followed her:  
and she went after the young men of  
David, | flurry  
a  
a | t33 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(62a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(63a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| (63a) | | ts  
def:dep  
def:marr  
arr(imp)  
ls  
def:marr  
termf | |
| (65s? not a) | and became his wife, | def:marr  
id:stat  
status change s | terminal  
function | t34  
t35  
t36 |

**CODA 1 segment va**

*P set:*

C=David  
K=Ahinoam  
B=Abigail (implicitly present in the  
"they")

| (66a) | And David took Ahinoam out of  
Jezreel, and they were both his  
wives. | C | com | accel  
gap-opener  
diegetic | |
|-------|--------------------------------------------------|---|---|-------|
|       | K | def:pe  
def:ae | |
|       | B | id:stat | |

**CODA 2 segment vb**

*P set:*

L=Saul
(67a) And Saul gave Michal his daughter, David’s wife, to Palti the son of Lais who was of Romma.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M=Michal</th>
<th>N=Palti, son of Lais</th>
<th>L (CP)</th>
<th>M (TP)</th>
<th>com</th>
<th>defpe</th>
<th>defiae</th>
<th>accel.</th>
<th>gap-opener</th>
<th>dijective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix 2.1: Prose reading of “When Abigail Met David” (1 Sam 25:2-43)

I have included this prose reading based on the codification in Appendix-Table 2.2 to demonstrate how the data from the analysis is interpreted.

A methodology for a close reading of the three extended focus narratives

In my introduction and explanation of methodology, I expressed the intention to attend closely to biblical texts along the lines of the carefully segmented analysis proposed by structural narratologists, as exemplified by Robert Funk, who himself builds upon the work of Vladimir Propp, Seymour Chapman, Gérard Genette, and Shlomith Rimon-Kenan.\(^1\) In order to demonstrate the fruitfulness of this type of methodology I apply it to the episodes examined in detail in this and the following two chapters of this dissertation, including this central passage from David’s ‘first’ exile. I have segmented and encoded the passages (1 Samuel 25:1-43, 2 Samuel 15:13-16:14 and 2 Sam 19:8b-40) according to Funk’s methodology and included it in the appendix a table of results (see Appendix-Tables 2.2 in Appendix 2) together with a Table of Funk’s Narrative Codes (from page xv of Poetics to which I have made some additions) — Appendix-Table 2.1 in Appendix 2. I have also created tables of the \textit{dramatis personae} assigning each character (in order of their appearance in this episode) as well as designating which characters are also Continuity Participants (in 1 and 2 Samuel they include Samuel, Saul, David and God) and which are Theme Participants (in this episode, for instance, they are Nabal and

\(^1\) Robert Walter Funk, \textit{The Poetics of Biblical Narrative}, Foundations & Facets, Literary Facets series (Sonoma, CA: Polebridge Press, 1988), p. viii. Funk’s methodology has the advantage of being set out very transparently and systematically. It aims to be a methodology that conforms to the scientific (empirical) criterion of repeatability.
Abigail). For the *dramatis personae* of 'When David Met Abigail' also see Appendix-Table 2.2 in Appendix 2.²

*Close analysis of 1 Sam 25:1-43*

One conspicuous structural phenomenon in the narrative is its anachrony, that is, the narration of the events out of their chronological order.³ In order to demonstrate this episode’s anachrony, I first reconstruct *in chronological order* the 37 events of the story (Table 2.1). Reading down the left column of the table below, one gets a prosaic and artless précis of the narrative, the only virtue of which is that it reveals *the most likely* strict chronological ordering of events. To indicate this I have used ‘time codes’: t1, t2, t3… etc. to t37 (in column 2 of Table 2.1).

To indicate instances of initial ‘with-holding’ and subsequent ‘gap-filling’ (what Genette calls ‘completing analepsis’) I have used **bold** type for the time code (*e.g.* t2). To indicate the time of events whose narration is implicit I have used italicised time codes (*e.g.* t6). Departures are the most common *implicit* events. Often, we only know that messengers leave one place because they immediately arrive in another (because departures often serve a defocalising function in narratives, implicit departures are encoded as *def:dep(imp)*). To indicate instances where the reader is not entirely sure of the exact chronological order (because the narrator does not make it clear), I have used time codes within double inverted commas (*e.g.* “t14”). Dots to the left of a time code (*e.g.* •••t25) indicate that an event is referred to before it transpires (*prolepsis*). Dots to the right of a time code (*e.g.* t2•••) indicate that it is referred to after it transpires (*analepsis*). Each dot represents one reference in the episode.

² For a definition of 'Continuity Participant' and 'Theme Participant', see Funk, *Poetics*, p. 17.
Table: Chronological reordering of the events in the story of ‘When David Met Abigail’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Other events listed are those referred to with analepsis ('flash-backs')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>David went to Maon/Carmel/wilderness as a fugitive</td>
<td>t1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David afforded protection to Nabal’s shepherds in the wilderness</td>
<td>t2</td>
<td>iterative/indefinite in reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nabal’s shepherds took the sheep for shearing</td>
<td>t3</td>
<td>only in retrospect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David’s heard about Nabal shearing his flock</td>
<td>t4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David commissions 10 of his men to take a request to Nabal</td>
<td>t5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 10 men leave David</td>
<td>t6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 10 men report to David</td>
<td>t7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David considers his response</td>
<td>t8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David gathers 400 of his men to attack Nabal</td>
<td>t9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A young man reports to Abigail telling her of Nabal’s slight to</td>
<td>t10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David’s men and therefore David</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail considers her response OR “The Lord sends her”</td>
<td>t11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail gathers provisions</td>
<td>t12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail puts the provisions on the donkey</td>
<td>t13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail sends forerunners to David</td>
<td>t14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail departs for David</td>
<td>t15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail and David meet</td>
<td>t16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail and David have a discussion in which Abigail averts</td>
<td>t17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David’s deadly mission to kill Nabal and all the males</td>
<td>t18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David receives Abigail’s gift</td>
<td>t19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail sets out for home</td>
<td>t20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail departs for David</td>
<td>t21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The morning (by which Nabal and all the males were to be killed and</td>
<td>t22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when Abigail tells Nabal everything</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ten days later Nabal dies</td>
<td>t23</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>News of Nabal’s death reaches David and David speaks</td>
<td>t24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David sends messengers for Abigail</td>
<td>t25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David’s messengers depart</td>
<td>t26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David’s messengers arrive at Abigail’s</td>
<td>t27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail arranges to come with them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abigail and David marry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saul takes back his daughter, Michal, another of David’s wives and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gives her to another</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the conspicuous anachronies in the episode is the omission of what happens at what I have termed t2 (when “David afforded protection to Nabal’s shepherds in the wilderness”). If this were in its ‘proper’ chronological place, it would come part way through v. 2, after the reader had heard that David went down to the wilderness of Maon (v. 1) and that there was a man in Maon with three thousand sheep and a thousand goats (v. 2a). This would be the ‘appropriate’ time (if strict chronology were being kept) to mention that while the shepherds had those flocks out in the wilderness David afforded protection to them. Instead it is omitted. The first the reader hears about David’s protection of Nabal’s shepherds is in the message that David wants ten of his men to take to Nabal (vv. 6-8)—in segment iia; in the midst of the message as spoken by David are the following words.

7 And now, behold, I have heard that your shepherds who were with us in the wilderness are shearing your sheep, and we did not hinder them, neither did we demand any thing from them all the days they were in Carmel. 8 Ask your young men, and they will tell you. Let then the young men find grace in your eyes, for we have come on a good day; do give whatsoever your hand may find, to your son David.

This places the reader in a similar position to Nabal. The reader has not witnessed the alleged protection. The reader has only David’s word for it at this stage. Furthermore, the reader (unlike Nabal) lacks the capacity to ask the “young men”. Did David protect Nabal’s shepherds, or is it a ruse to get provisions out of the wealthy man? At this stage, the reader does not know. The reader does know that David has lied before in order to get provisions for himself and his fugitive band; in 1 Samuel 21:2-3, David lied to the priest, Ahimelech (“The king has charged me with a matter today…” and on that occasion, David even finished the request similarly (“…give into my hand today what is found.”) The only clue to David’s truthfulness is his apparent eagerness that Nabal ask his “young men” to substantiate the claim that David afforded them protection (v. 8a).

Segment iib describes Nabal’s response to the delivery of David’s message. When Nabal does receive the request, his response (“[Nabal] jumped up; and [he] answered the young men of David, and said, ‘Who is David? And who is the son of Jesse?...’”) communicates the poor character which the narrator described in the episode’s Introduction (segment i; vv. 2-3—“the man was surly, and mean in his practices, and the man was dog-
like”). Nabal, presumably, does not ask his young men; instead, he insults David’s messengers, and therefore he insults David. This slight at t8 is referred to, in retrospect (analepsis) again and again indicating that it is very significant to the narrative. David’s men report the slight of t8 (v. 12b); Abigail’s slave reports the slight to her (v. 14b); David’s soliloquy broods on the slight (v. 21b); Abigail’s words to David explain that she herself did not witness it (v. 25b) and implores David to remove the trespass (v. 28a).

Segment iiic also contains an anachronism. Between David receiving the men’s report of Nabal’s rude response and David’s issuing of the command “Each man strap on his sword” there is presumably some process of thought going through David’s mind. However, narrative haste serves to heighten the terror of what is about to unfold by racing through this stage. Instead of being located here (as strict chronological ordering would recommend), David’s thought finds itself skilfully narrated as a soliloquy in the very moment that he and Nabal’s wife Abigail meet one another (much later in v. 21).

The next segment (iii) reveals the full extent of Nabal’s folly. The reader now learns that had Nabal asked his young men, at least one of them would have substantiated David’s claim. But not only has Nabal not asked; no one can speak to him (v. 17). Instead, one of the young men speaks to Nabal’s wife, whom we know from the introduction is good at understanding. Now we have a second witness to the missing t2 (when “David [allegedly] afforded protection to Nabal’s shepherds in the wilderness”). The young man not only substantiates David’s alleged protection, he describes it as extravagant.

15 And the men were very good to us; they did not hinder us, neither did they demand from us any thing, and when we were in the field. 16 they were as a wall round about us, both by night and by day, during all the days that we were with them feeding the flock.

In segment iiiia all the time references have been placed in double inverted commas to indicate that there is uncertainty in relation to the precise chronological placement of these events. The reader has no way of knowing how much time has transpired since Nabal slighted David and his messengers. The ‘time’ could be anytime immediately following the departure of David’s messengers after Nabal slighted them, hence t>t6 (t6 is a rare explicit departure probably by virtue of the fact that that departure was rudely pre-
cipitated by the offence that Nabal gave). But it could be as late as ‘well after’ the departure of David and his 400 sword-bearing men to attack Nabal and his house (t12). The effect on the reader is to heighten the tension. Abigail’s haste in preparing to ‘go out and meet’ David is justified because like the reader she cannot be sure that David will not arrive at any minute and kill all the males of her household.

This report to Abigail (segment iii$a$) initiates the nucleus of the story (segments iv$a$ and iv$c$). Instead of Nabal sending a gift to David, Abigail will take one. She will ‘go out to meet’ David. This is another instance of the many times that Nabal and Abigail will be contrasted with one another. The juxtaposition between the character of Nabal and his wife is set up by the narrator in the introduction and continues right through to her reception of David’s messengers when they are sent a second time (vv. 39–41)—she does obeisance and washes their feet—the epitome of hospitality and positive reception (v. 41 in segment iv$e$). At this point in the narrative the contrast between Abigail and Nabal finds its expression in the difference of their response to David’s request. Nabal was dishonouring and insulting; he rejected the messengers and slighted David. Abigail begins to prove that she is the epitome of hospitality. For an entré she hastens, she prepares, she gathers provisions and she sends forerunners. The second half of segment iii$b$ begins with a ‘flurry’ of immediate action (a). Although there are only three action verbs—‘hurried’, ‘took’ and ‘loaded’—the long list of things that Abigail ‘took’—six categories—413 items (!)—adds to the narrative sense of ‘flurry’ of activity. The loading of the donkeys and the dispatching of the forerunners create anticipation of the nucleus (segments iv$a$ and iv$c$).

The enacted hospitality of Abigail continues in the nucleus (vv. 22–35) she ‘goes out to meet’, she does obeisance, her words avert disaster, she presents her gift, she departs in peace. Of all these actions, however, the most highlighted is ‘going out to meet’. This

4 In the introduction the contrast between Abigail and Nabal is expressed through a chiastically structured set of juxtapositions. See Appendix–Table 2.2 in relation to verse 3 (“And the man’s name was Nabal, and his wife’s name was Abigail: and she was good at understanding and very beautiful in appearance: but the man was surly, and mean in his practices, and the man was dog-like”).
action (going out to meet) becomes a re-occurring motif. It will be referred to in two very significant points in the speech of David.

The ‘meeting’ itself is given great length and dramatic tension by the insertion of a soliloquy (segment ivb). The ‘thought’ that must have crossed David’s mind between hearing of Nabal’s reply and the command for each man to strap on his sword is transposed right into the centre of the meeting, slowing down the moment, like the cinematographic effect of ‘slow-motion’, just before Abigail and David first make eye-contact. As they approach one another, there is a ‘voice-over’ of David’s ‘thought’. While the reader is still uncertain of how Abigail’s gesture will be received, the reader hears David’s threatening soliloquy (which draws for the third and final time upon the ‘missing’ events of t2):

Perchance for an unrighteous fellow I have protected all his possessions in the wilderness that he should wrong me, and we have not ordered to receive anything of all his; yet he has returned me evil for good. 22 So God do to David and more also, if by morning I leave of all who belong to him one wall-pisser [male].

The tense slow-motion approach and threatening soliloquy are brought to conclusion by a perception, which, as Funk emphasises, often indicates a greater degree of ‘focalisation’ in a narrative. David sees Abigail. With this focalising perception the nucleus proper resumes at ‘normal speed’. This jolting resumption of ‘normal speed’ is achieved through another ‘flurry’ of activity that also serves to reveal the determination of Abigail.

and she hurried [ἔσπευσεν] and jumped down from her donkey; and she fell before David on her face, and did obeisance to him, bowing to the ground 24 even to his feet, and said,…

Abigail’s actions and her words are effective in dissuading David from his murderous intentions toward her husband Nabal and the male members of Nabal’s household. In the ensuing dialogue between Abigail and David, the narrator highlights the role of the ‘coming out to meet’, firstly in Abigail’s speech and then in David’s. Abigail’s speech highlights that she has not only gathered the provisions, she has brought them out to David.

27 And now accept this benefaction that your slave has brought [ἐνήνοχεν from φέρω] for my lord,
Then David’s speech highlights the central role of Abigail’s ‘coming out to meet’ him. David’s very first words carry importance, as first words often do.

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who sent you [ㄛς ἀπέστειλέν] this very day to meet me [εἰς ἀπάντησίν]:

David’s words raise the possibility of another anachrony. When did the Lord God of Israel ‘send’ Abigail ‘to meet’ David? Was it while she listened to the report of the one young man in vv. 14-17? Or in some moment between that report and the first ‘flurry’ of activity in v. 18? In the table of chronology, I have assigned its time code as “t15”•. Whenever it was, David’s reference, to the Lord’s sending of Abigail, places upon the action of ‘going out to meet’ a stamp of divine providence—a major motif throughout all of 1 and 2 Samuel. David’s speech, continues to highlight the role of ‘coming out to meet’ as he reflects on what would have happened had Abigail not come out to meet him. David concludes:

…34 For surely the Lord, the God of Israel, lives, who has hindered me harming you, because if you had not hurried [ἔσπευσας] and come to meet me [παρεγένου εἰς ἀπάντησίν μοι], then I had said, ‘There will surely not left to Nabal by the morning one wall-pisser’

The NUCLEUS concludes with the acceptance of Abigail’s gift. The acceptance of a gift is another very important ritual in hospitality and visitation narratives: acceptance of a gift creates a binding mutual obligation.5 David’s dismissal of Abigail (“Go up to your house in peace”), and the implicit departure of Abigail serve to ‘defocalise’ the NUCLEUS. The remaining episodes similarly ‘defocalise’ the entire episode; they narrate the death of Nabal (episodes ix, x, xi), the marriage of Abigail and David (episodes xii, xiii), and two diegetic (‘told’) statements (vv. 43 and 44).

Conclusion

‘Going out to meet’ in this instance is a little more complex than simple escorted arrival—Abigail, after all, is trying to avert David’s arrival at Nabal’s household with the homicidal

5 On gift-giving in the ancient world as a ritual that creates obligation see John Barclay, “Paul, the gift, and the battle of circumcision”, Australian Biblical Review 58 (2010), pp. 36-56.
consequences that the reader anticipates. Still, this episode clearly establishes ‘going out to meet’ as a significant motif which continues throughout the rest of 1 and 2 Samuel. ‘Going out to meet’ continues to be a way in which characters demonstrate their goodwill toward David, especially in those parts of the narrative where David is a fugitive. The episode of Abigail and Nabal not only establishes how being well met communicates goodwill, loyalty and solidarity—it also demonstrates how being well met has the power to bring about reconciliation when relations have been damaged or broken. In this dimension it resonates strongly with those episodes in the previous section which were classified as A2, especially the account of Esau’s ‘going out to meet’ (actually ‘running out to meet’) his estranged brother Jacob.
### Appendix-Table 2.3: The Parable of the Father with Two Sons (Luke 15:11-32)

**Dramatis Personae**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characters (participants) and their identification from Dramatis Personae</th>
<th>Location, time and other narrative codes from table</th>
<th>Other observations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A=a man (the father of two sons)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B=two sons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(^1)=younger son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B(^2)=older son</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C=a citizen of that country (&quot;a far country&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D=the servants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(^1)=one of the servants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### seg i

**INTRO**

Pset: A=father  
B=two sons  
B\(^1\)=younger son  
B\(^2\)=older son


(1.1) "There was a man who had two sons;  

(2a) and the younger of them said to his father,  

(2.1v) 'Father, give me the share of property that falls to me.'  

(3a) And he divided his living between them.

#### seg ii

**a INTRO**

Pset: B\(^1\)=younger son;  
C=a citizen of that country

(4d) Not many days later,  

(5a) the younger son gathered all he had and took his journey into a far country,  

(6a) and there he squandered his property in loose living.  

(7a) And when he had spent everything,  

(8a) a great famine arose in that country,  

(9h) and he began to be in want.  

(10s) So he went  

(11a) and joined himself to one of the citizens of that country,  

(12a) who sent him into his fields to feed
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(14s) And he would gladly have fed on the pods that the swine ate; and no one gave him anything.  

(16s) But when he came to himself he said, ‘How many of my father’s hired servants have bread enough and to spare, but I perish here with hunger!’  

(17a) I will arise and go to my father, and I will say to him, ‘Father, I have sinned against heaven and before you;’  

(17.1) I am no longer worthy to be called your son;  

(17.5) 19 I am no longer worthy to be called your son;  

(19a) And he arose and came to his father.  

(20d) But while he was yet at a distance, his father saw him  

(21d) and had compassion,  

(22d) and ran and embraced him.  

(23d) and kissed him.  

(26.1) I have sinned against heaven and before you;  

(26.2) I am no longer worthy to be called your son.’  

(27a) But the father said to his servants, ‘Bring quickly the best robe, and put it on him; and put a ring on his hand, and shoes on his feet; and kill it, and let us eat and make merry;’
for this my son was dead, and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.'

And they began to make merry. D B1 A

Now his elder son was in the field; and as he came and drew near to the house, he heard music and dancing.

And he called one of the servants D1 and asked what this meant.

And he said to him, 'Your brother has come, and your father has killed the fatted calf, because he has received him safe and sound.'

But he was angry and refused to go in.

His father came out and entreated him, B2

and I never disobeyed your command; yet you never gave me a kid, that I might make merry with my friends.

But when this son of yours came, who has devoured your living with harlots, you killed for him the fatted calf?

And he said to him, 'Son, you are always with me, and all that is mine is yours.'
| (42.3) | It was fitting to make merry and be glad, | a:retro | analepsis |
| (42.4) | for this your brother was dead, | def:recap | antithet. paral. |
| (42.5) | and is alive; | | |
| (42.6) | he was lost, | | |
| (42.7) | and is found.’ ” | Suspended ending. The story doesn’t defocalize conventionally |

… (no departure, nor participant expansion, no iterative actions, no action expansion, no commentary by the narrator, no status change for brother, no temporal expansion)
Appendix-Table 2.4: Peter and Cornelius (Acts 10)

**Dramatis Personae**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>D1</th>
<th>D2</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>H1</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>I1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>=Cornelius (TP);</td>
<td>=an angel of God (CP);</td>
<td>=Simon Peter (CP);</td>
<td>=men sent to Joppa by Simon;</td>
<td>=two slaves;</td>
<td>=a devout soldier;</td>
<td>=Simon the Tanner;</td>
<td>=the Holy Spirit (=απν);</td>
<td>=the (6) men who accompanied Peter;</td>
<td>=Cornelius’s household;</td>
<td>=Cornelius’s relatives and close friends;</td>
<td>=the apostles (apart from Peter);</td>
<td>=the circumcised believers who remain in Jerusalem (the &quot;us&quot; in Acts 11:15 suggests that these might be synonymous with I);</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |...
Appendix 2

The inserted passage is.

(10h) he had a vision
(11h) in which he clearly saw an angel of God
(12h) coming in and saying to him,
(12.1) “Cornelius.”
(13a) He stared at him in terror
(14a) and said,
(14.1) “What is it, Lord?”
(15a) He answered,
(15.1) “Your prayers and your alms have ascended
(15.2) as a memorial before God.
(15.3) Now send men to Joppa
(15.4) for a certain Simon
(15.5) who is called Peter;
(15.6) he is lodging with Simon,
(15.7) a tanner,
(15.8) whose house is by the seaside…”
(16dh) When the angel who spoke to him had left,
(17a) he called two of his slaves
(18a) and a devout soldier
(19d) from the ranks of those who served him,
(20a) and after telling them everything,
(21a) he sent them to Joppa.

---

scene ii

Pset: D=men sent to Joppa by Simon; C=Simon Peter (CP); F=the Spirit (CP); B=an angel of God (CP); [A=Corneulus (TP)]; [E=Simon the Tanner].

INTRO

(22d) About noon the next day,
(23d) as they were on their journey
(24d) and approaching the city,
(25a) Peter went up on the roof to pray.
(26h) He became hungry and wanted something to eat; and while it was being prepared, he fell into a trance.

(30h) He saw the heaven opened and something like a large sheet coming down, being lowered to the ground by its four corners.

(33h) In it were all kinds of four-footed creatures and reptiles and birds of the air.

(34h) Then he heard a voice saying, "Get up, Peter; kill and eat."

(35a) But Peter said, "By no means, Lord; for I have never eaten anything that is profane or unclean."

(36h) The voice said to him again, a second time, "What God has made clean, you must not call profane."

(37h) This happened three times, and the thing was suddenly taken up to heaven.

(39s) Now while Peter was greatly puzzled about what to make of the vision that he had seen, suddenly the men sent by Cornelius appeared.

(41h) They were asking for Simon’s house and were standing by the gate.

(44a) They called out to ask whether Simon, who was called Peter,

(45d) While Peter was still thinking about the vision, the Spirit said to him, "Look, three men are searching for you."

(46.1) "Now get up, go down, and go with them without hesitation;"
(46.5) for I have sent them.”

(47a) 21 So Peter went down to the men

(48a) and said,
(48.1) “I am the one you are looking for; what is the reason for your coming?”

(49a) 22 They answered,

(49.1) “Cornelius, a centurion,
(49.2) an upright and God-fearing man,
(49.3) who is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation,
(49.4) was directed by a holy angel
(49.5) to send for you to come to his house
(49.6) and to hear what you have to say.”

CONC
(50a) 23 So Peter invited them in

(51a) and gave them lodging.

Pset:
C=Simon Peter (CP);
D=men sent to Joppa by Simon;
G=the (6) men who accompanied Peter;
A=Cornelius (TP);
H₁=Cornelius’s relatives and close friends;
[B=an angel of God (CP)];
[E=Simon the Tanner];

INTRO
(52d)
The next day
(53a) he got up
(54a) and went with them,
(55a) and some of the believers from Joppa accompanied him.
(56d) 24 The following day

(57a) they came to Caesarea.
(58d) Cornelius was expecting them
(59a) and had called together his relatives and close friends.
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NUCLEUS (60d) 25 On Peter’s arrival
(61a) Cornelius met him,
(62a) and falling at his feet,
(63a) worshiped him.
(64a) 26 But Peter made him get up,
(65a) saying,
(65.1) “Stand up;
(65.2) I am only a mortal.”

(66d) 27 And as he talked with him,
(67a) he went in
(68a) and found that many had assembled;
(69a) 28 and he said to them,
(69.1) “You yourselves know that it is unlawful
for a Jew to associate with or to visit a Gentile;
(69.3) but God has shown me
that I should not call anyone profane or unclean.
(69.5) 29 So when I was sent for,
(69.6) I came without objection.
(69.7) Now may I ask why you sent for me?”
(70a) 30 Cornelius replied,
(70.1) “Four days ago at this very hour,
(70.2) at three o’clock,
(70.3) I was praying in my house
(70.4) when suddenly a man in dazzling clothes stood before me.
(70.5) 31 He said,
(70.5.1) ‘Cornelius, your prayer has been heard
and your alms have been remembered before God.
(70.5.3) 32 Send therefore to Joppa...
(70.5.4) and ask for Simon,  
(70.5.5) who is called Peter;  
(70.5.6) he is staying in the home of Simon,  
(70.5.7) a tanner,  
(70.5.8) by the sea.’

(70.6) Therefore I sent for you immediately,  
(70.7) and you have been kind enough to come.  
(70.8) So now all of us are here in the presence of God  
(70.9) in the presence of God to listen to all that the Lord has commanded you to say.”

(71a) Then Peter began to speak to them:  
(71.1) “I truly understand that God shows no partiality,  
(71.2) but in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him.  
(71.3) You know the message he sent to the people of Israel,  
(71.4) preaching peace by Jesus Christ—  
(71.5) he is Lord of all.  
(71.6) That message spread throughout Judea,  
(71.7) beginning in Galilee  
(71.8) after the baptism that John announced:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>and ask for Simon,</td>
<td>new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>who is called Peter;</td>
<td>hypo:dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he is staying in the home of Simon,</td>
<td>hypo:dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a tanner,</td>
<td>hypo:dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the sea.’</td>
<td>end of hypo:dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therefore I sent for you immediately,</td>
<td>back to dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and you have been kind enough to come.</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So now all of us are here</td>
<td>accel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the presence of God</td>
<td>accel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to listen to all that the Lord has commanded you to say.”</td>
<td>to hear what you have to say</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I truly understand that God shows no partiality,</td>
<td>dia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but in every nation anyone who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him.</td>
<td>analepsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You know the message he sent to the people of Israel,</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preaching peace by Jesus Christ— he is Lord of all.</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That message spread throughout Judea,</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beginning in Galilee</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after the baptism that John announced:</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the Holy Spirit and with power;</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how he went about doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil, for God was with him.</td>
<td>JC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are witnesses to all that he did both in Judea and in Jerusalem.</td>
<td>Acts1:8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- C=Simon Peter (CP); H=Cornelius’s relatives and close friends; A=Cornelius (TP); G=the (6) men who accompanied Peter; D=men sent to Joppa by Simon; [F=the Spirit (CP)]; [θ=God (CP)]; [JC=Jesus Christ];
They put him to death by hanging him on a tree; but God raised him on the third day and allowed him to appear, but to us who were chosen by God as witnesses, and who ate and drank with him after he rose from the dead. He commanded us to preach to the people and to testify that he is the one ordained by God as judge of the living and the dead. All the prophets testify about him that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name."

While Peter was still speaking, the Holy Spirit fell upon all who heard the word. The circumcised believers were astounded that the gift of the Holy Spirit had been poured out even on the Gentiles, for they heard them speaking in tongues and extolling God.

Then Peter said, "Can anyone withhold the water..."
(80.2) for baptizing these people

(a) [I?] [aa] Does this anti-
cipate the grum-
bling in the next chapter

(80.3) who have received the Holy Spirit
(80.4) just as we have?”

(81a) So he ordered them to be baptized

(82d) in the name of Jesus Christ.
(83a) Then they invited him to stay for several days.

---

**EPILOGUE**

Psc:

I=the apostles (apart from Peter)
and the believers who remained
in Judea

I¹=the circumcised believers who
remained in Jerusalem
(synonymous with I? The
“us” in 11:15 suggests so).

C=Simon Peter (CP);
[F=the Spirit (CP)];
G=the (6) men who accompanied
Peter;
[A=Cornelius];
[H=Cornelius’s household];
[Θ=God (CP)];

---

(81.1) Now the apostles and the believers
who were in Judea

(85h) heard that the Gentiles had also
accepted the word of God.

---

(86d) 2 So when Peter went up to Jerusalem,

I¹ the circumcised believers criticized him,

(88a) 3 saying,

(88.1) “Why did you go to uncircumcised
men

(88.2) and eat with them?”

(89a) 4 Then Peter began to explain it to them,

(90d) step by step,

(91a) saying,

(91.1) 3 “I was in the city of Joppa praying,

(91.2) and in a trance I saw a vision.

(91.3) There was something like a large sheet

(91.4) coming down from heaven,

(91.5) being lowered by its four corners;
(91.6) and it came close to me.
(91.7) As I looked at it closely I saw four-footed animals,
(91.8) beasts of prey, reptiles, and birds of the air.
(91.9) I also heard a voice saying to me, hypodia
(91.9.1) ‘Get up, Peter; kill and eat.’ hypodia
(91.10) But I replied, hypodia
(91.10.1) ‘By no means, Lord; for nothing profane or unclean
(91.10.2) has ever entered my mouth.’ hypodia
(91.11) But a second time the voice answered from heaven, hypodia
(91.11.1) ‘What God has made clean, you must not call profane.’ end of hypodia
(91.12) This happened three times; unclean
(91.13) then everything was pulled up again to heaven.
(91.14) At that very moment three men, [H3] synchro-
[91.15] sent to me from Caesarea,
(91.16) arrived at the house where we were.
(91.17) The Spirit told me to go with them theme:
(91.19) and not to make a distinction gap-fill
between them and us. analeps.(6)
(91.20) These six brothers also Witnesses, G
accompanied me, together they made 7; acting more
(91.21) and we entered the man’s house. [A] abbrev.
(91.22) He told us how he had seen the recap
(91.23) standing in his house recap
and saying,

(91.24.1) ‘Send to Joppa and bring Simon,

(91.24.2) who is called Peter;

(91.24.3) 14 he will give you a message

(91.24.4) by which you and your entire household will be saved.’

(91.25) 15 And as I began to speak,

(91.26) the Holy Spirit fell upon them just as it had upon us at the beginning.

(91.28) 16 And I remembered the word of the Lord,

(91.29) how he had said,

(91.29.1) ‘John baptized with water,

(91.29.2) but you will be baptized with the Holy Spirit.’

(91.30) 17 If then God gave them the same gift that he gave us

(91.31) when we believed in the Lord Jesus Christ,

(91.32) who was I that I could hinder God?”

(92d) 18 When they heard this,

(93h) they were silenced.

(94a) And they praised God,

(95a) saying,

(95.1) “Then God has given even to the Gentiles

(95.2) the repentance that leads to life.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ ἀπαντάω group</th>
<th>Words in the ὑπάντησις/ ὑπαντάω group</th>
<th>Words in the συνάντησις/ συναντάω group</th>
<th>Miscellaneous notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 8:28</td>
<td>ὑπήντησαν  *unanimous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context: two demoniacs met him (Jesus).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 8:34</td>
<td>ὑπάντησιν *uw  ΝΒΘ  f1 33</td>
<td>συνάντησιν τ  CΡΚLMNU WΔΠ  2 f13 157 565 1424 579 700 788 1071 1346</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context: then the whole town came out to meet Jesus (ἐξηλθον εἰς though two mins. have ἐξηλθον - 565 and 1424.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 25:1</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν τ  ΒCDΡΚLM UWΔΘΠ  2 f13 28 33 118 157 565 579 700 788 1071 1346 1424</td>
<td>ὑπάντησιν <em>uw  ΝΒ</em> C  1 124<em>124c 1582</em> 1582c</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ten virgins took their lamps and went to (ἐξηλθον εἰς meet the bridegroom (D 1 124* 1582* add “and the bride”). No words in F (not a lacuna).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 25:6</td>
<td>ἀπάντησιν [u] w τ  ΝΑΒΔΡΚLM UWΔΠ  f1 2 f13 28 118 565 579 700 788 1071 1346 1424</td>
<td>ὑπάντησιν  Θ</td>
<td>συνάντησιν Θ</td>
<td>&quot;Look! Here is the bridegroom! Come out to meet him.” No word in 33 (a lacuna). The verb changes also from ἐξηρξασθε to ἐγείρεσθε in Θ  f1 and 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Words in the ἀπαντησις/ἀπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the ἀπαντησις/ἀπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the συναντησις/συναντάω group</td>
<td>Miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 27:32</td>
<td>εἰς ἀπαντησιν αὐτοῦ D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Context: Simon of Cyrene. No other manuscripts have this addition. Min 33 has &quot;coming from the field&quot; (ἐρχόμενον ἀπ’ ἀγροῦ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew 28:9</td>
<td>ἀπήντησεν τ</td>
<td>ὑπήντησεν *uw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context: &quot;And behold, Jesus met them and said,&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|          | Νε Α Δ Ρ Κ Λ Μ Υ W Δ          | Νε * Β Υ Θ Π          |                                   |                                                                                   |
|          | 2 28* 28ε 33 69 157 579 1071 | 2 28* 28ε 33 69 157 579 1071 |                                   |                                                                                   |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ἀπαντάω group</th>
<th>Words in the υπάντησις/ὑπαντάω group</th>
<th>Words in the συνάντησις/συναντάω group</th>
<th>Miscellaneous notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark 5:2</td>
<td>ἀπήντησεν τ</td>
<td>υπήντησεν *uw</td>
<td></td>
<td>Parallel passage Matt 8:28. &quot;Immediately he met them from the tombs with an unclean spirit who lived among the tombs&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark 14:13</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσει all except 28</td>
<td>ὑπαντίσει 28</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context: “he will meet you (a man, carrying a jar of water)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 4:51</td>
<td>ἀπήντησαν τ</td>
<td>υπήντησαν u w</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context: “his [the official’s] slaves met him and told him that his child was alive”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 11:20</td>
<td>υπήντησεν all mss.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“When Martha heard that Jesus was coming, she went [lit. goes] and met him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John 11:30</td>
<td>υπήντησεν all mss. (missing from P46 and 33)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“[Jesus] was still at the place where Martha had met him”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ἀπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the ὑπάντησις/ὑπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the συνάντησις/συναντάω group</td>
<td>Miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| John 12:13 | ἀπάντησιν | ὑπάντησιν | συνάντησιν | “So they took branches of palm trees and went out to meet him” (all ἐξηλθον εἰς).
<p>|         | A K U Π | u w τ | D G L | P2 has a lacuna. |
|         | 28 1424 | P66 P75 | f1 3 2 28 124 535 565 579 700 1071 | |
| John 12:18 | ὑπήντησεν | all mss. | συνάντησιν | “that the crowd went out to meet him”. |
|         | u w τ | | | Lacuna in 33. |
|         | P66 P75 | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ἀπαντάω group</th>
<th>Words in the ὑπάντησις/ὑπαντάω group</th>
<th>Words in the συνάντησις/συναντάω group</th>
<th>Miscellaneous notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 8:27</td>
<td>ἀπήντησέν Γ</td>
<td>ὑπήντησέν u w τ</td>
<td></td>
<td>“As he stepped out on land, a man of the city who had demons met him”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P75 N A B D E Ρ H K L M U W Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ</td>
<td></td>
<td>f¹ 2 f¹³ 28 33 157 565 579 700 1071 1424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 9:37</td>
<td></td>
<td>συνήντησέν u w τ</td>
<td></td>
<td>“When they had come down from the mountain, a great crowd met him.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P45 N A B E Ρ H K L M U W Δ Θ Λ Π Ψ</td>
<td></td>
<td>f¹ 2 f¹³ 28 33 157 565 579 700 1071 1424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D has a completely different sentence κατελθόντα αυτῶν συνελθεῖν αὐτῷ ὁ χλον πολύν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ὑπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the ὑπάντησις/ὑπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the συνάντησις/συναντάω group</td>
<td>Miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 14:31</td>
<td>ἀπαντήσαι τ</td>
<td>ὑπαντήσαι u w</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sense: oppose (lit. &quot;meet&quot;) &quot;is able with ten thousand to oppose the with-twenty-thousand-coming-against-him-one&quot; D moves ὑπαντήσαι from the beginning to the end of the phrase/question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 17:12</td>
<td>ἀπήντησαν [w]</td>
<td>ὑπήντησαν [w]</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;and entering into a certain village ten leprous men met him standing at a distance&quot;. D has ὁ ποὺ ἰσάν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Words in the (\text{ἀπάντησις}/\text{ἀπαντάω}) group</td>
<td>Words in the (\text{ὑπάντησις}/\text{ὑπαντάω}) group</td>
<td>Words in the (\text{συνάντησις}/\text{συναντάω}) group</td>
<td>Miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:10</td>
<td>(\text{ἀπαντήσει}) D 124</td>
<td>(\text{ὑπαντήσει}) C L 1071</td>
<td>(\text{συναντήσει}) (\text{u w τ})</td>
<td>&quot;a man carrying a jar of water will meet you&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 10:25</td>
<td></td>
<td>(\text{συνάντησας})</td>
<td></td>
<td>D is longer (\text{συνάντισας} \text{Κορνήλιος})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 16:16</td>
<td>(\text{ἀπαντήσαι}) (\text{τ})</td>
<td>(\text{ὑπαντήσαι}) (\text{u w}) (\text{p}^{45} \text{p}^{74})</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context &quot;we were met by a slave-girl&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ ύπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the ὑπάντησις/ ύπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the συνάντησις/ συναντάω group</td>
<td>Miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 20:22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συναντήσοντάς u w τ</td>
<td>Context “Going to Jerusalem, bound in the spirit, not knowing what shall meet me there”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ν B L P Ψ 049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 33 226 440 547 614 618 927 1241 1245 1505 1611 1646 1854 2344 2412 2495 Er1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συναντίσοντά</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2147</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συναντήσαντά</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A D E H 056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>69 88 104 323 330 1243 1828 1837 2492</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..υναντήσαντ..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>..υναντήσαν..</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>συμβησόμενα</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C 945 1175 1270 1739 1891</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse</td>
<td>Words in the ἀπάντησις/ἀπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the ὑπάντησις/ὑπαντάω group</td>
<td>Words in the συνάντησις/συναντάω group</td>
<td>Miscellaneous notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 28:15</td>
<td>ἀπάντησις / uJpa¿nthsiς</td>
<td>ὑπάντησις / uJpanta/w</td>
<td>συνάντησις / sunanta/w</td>
<td>Context: The believers from Rome come out to meet Paul, as far as the Forum of Appius and the Three Taverns. P74 has an indeterminate fragment surrounded by lacunae ...ἀντ... 33 has an even larger lacuna. 88 omits the words &quot;came to meet&quot;.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I originally constructed the table in Appendix 3 as an elaborate way of supporting the claim that the three words —apantēsis, hypantēsis and synantēsis, and related verbs —were basically synonymous and therefore interchangeable. But the patterns that emerged after constructing it intrigue me. I cannot figure out why in some places there is 100% agreement (Matt 8:28, Luke 9:37, John 11:20,30, 12:16, Acts 10:25; 20:22) and in other places such a mix (Matt 28:9; Mark 5:2; Luke 14:3, 17:12). |

I think part of the solution might be that some manuscripts (especially the codices) appear to have a strong preference for a particular word. Sinaiticus (01), Vaticanus (03), Theta from Tbilisi (038), Ephraemi Rescriptus (04) all seem to have a strong preference for hypantēsis (as do minuscules from "Family 1", 33, 579,1071). Whereas Alexandrinus (02) and K (018), l (019), U (0307), II (041?) seem to have a strong preference for apantēsis. |

Most intriguingly this is the same Alexandrinus preference that one observes in the LXX, where Alexandrinus (02) has a strong ‘preference’ for hypantēsis and Vaticanus has a ‘preference’ for apantēsis. I only know this about this phenomenon in LXX because the divergence between Vaticanus and Alexandrinus is so marked in Joshua Chapters 15, 18 and 19 and Judges that Brenton present both texts in side-by-side parallels. In Judges there are fourteen occurrences of synantēsis in Vaticanus which Alexandrinus renders apantēsis thirteen times (and one ‘maintains’ as synantēsis). Once, in Judges, Vaticanus uses hypantēsis and again Alexandrinus has apantēsis instead. |

Outside scripture apantēsis is attested in one of the Tebtunis Papyri (P Teh L43:17 - BC 118) in a letter which discusses how some people went out "to meet" (welcome) a new magistrate to try and make a good first impression, presumably before he heard the case that was being brought against them. Since this is Egyptian, I think there is a possibility that whoever is compiling the Alexandrinus Codex (or somewhere along the textual
'lineage' that leads to it), in the copying Judges and the Gospels/Acts, is routinely changing any occurrences of synantēsis and hypantēsis to apantēsis — unless, as in a very few instances, there is an over-riding reason (a subtle shade of meaning in some contexts?) for not doing so. Maybe apantēsis is more consistent with a Coptic/Alexandrian dialect of Koine Greek. Whatever the reason it looks like copyist for Alexandrinus (or a pre-cursor of that text) is changing synantēsis and hypantēsis to apantēsis.

Another line of enquiry might be to read more closely those instances that are 'atypical' uses: Judg 6:35 (where A has synantēsis - Asher, Zebulun and Naphtali went up to meet Gideon when the Midianites and the Amalekites threaten him); Judg 7:24 (where A uses synantēsis - in the context of the Ephraimites going down to meet the Midianites in warfare); John 12:18 (where A has hypantēsen - the crowd went out to meet Jesus); Luke 8:27 (A using hypantēsen - a man of the city who had demons met Jesus); Luke 9:37 (A using synantēsen - a great crown met Jesus); Luke 14:31(A using hypantēsai - is able to meet with ten-thousand (in war) the with-twenty-thousand-coming-against-him-one); Luke 22:10 (A using synantēsei - a man carrying a jar of water will meet you); Acts 20:22 (A has synantēsanta - Paul going to Jerusalem and not knowing "what will meet me there"); Matt 25:6 (the only Sinaiticus use of apantēsis in the gospels and Acts - the virgins come out to meet the bridegroom).