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I. Introduction

The gospel of Luke includes a scene in its passion narrative not found in the other three gospels (Lk 23:39-43). Instead of reviling Jesus (Mt 27:44; Mk 15:32), the second criminal rebukes the first, defends Jesus and asks Jesus to remember him in his kingdom (Lk 23:40-42). Jesus responds by solemnly promising him his fellowship in paradise (Lk 23:43).

Speculations about “paradise” flourished in the later traditions of the three monotheistic religions. Among Christians, “paradise” recurs in the patristic writers, in Ephraem of Syria’s hymns, in Dante’s Purgatorio, and in John Milton’s Paradise Lost, Paradise Regained. This concept is firmly entrenched in the popular Western imagination today. Outside Christianity, the Jewish and especially the Islamic traditions hold also “paradise” as a major symbol for eschatological salvation. Asking about “paradise” in Luke 23:43, therefore, is asking about one of the sources of this idea in our collective religious psyche.

Modern scholarly literature often assumes this scene (Lk 23:39-43) to be an example of “repentance”: the “good thief” repents of his former sins and so is promised “paradise” or “heaven.” I wish to make a different suggestion: the second criminal is not so much “repenting” as he is opposing the negative judgment on Jesus with his own positive judgment (Lk 23:41). He is a sign of God’s reversal of the judgment and death sentence on Jesus, and so finds his own sentence of death and shame reversed in paradise.

Previous Research

In his article for the Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, Joachim Jeremias (1967)\textsuperscript{1} gives brief summaries of the derivation of the word “paradise,” and of the changes in its meaning in Judaism and in the New Testament. According to Jeremias, “paradise”

(παράδεισος) found its way into Greek from the Old Persian word pairidaēza (“enclosure”) through the writings of Xenophon, denoting a royal park. In the Septuagint, “paradise” then took on a religious meaning as “the garden of God” at the beginning of creation, while κήπος (“garden”) was reserved for the secular meaning. Jeremias sees the religious meaning of “paradise” in Judaism as the paradise of creation (Gen 2-3), the paradise at the end of history which is like the first paradise (implied in Ezek 36:35; Isa 51:3; explicit in early Jewish apocalyptic), and the hidden paradise which exists now for the righteous dead (Enochic literature, Life of Adam and Eve, Testament of Abraham, Jubilees). He sees these three meanings of “paradise” as indicating one paradise in various stages. Jeremias interprets “paradise” in the New Testament under this threefold schema of past-present-future. “Paradise” in Revelation 2:7 refers to the paradise at the end of history; “paradise” in Paul (2 Cor 12:4) refers to a hidden paradise where he received secret revelations; and “paradise” in Luke 23:43 refers to an intermediate state for the righteous dead. According to Jeremias, the “paradise” promised to “the penitent thief” (Lk 23:43),2 is “a special privilege” of “fellowship with the Messiah” between his death and the last judgment.3 The meaning of this episode, for Jeremias, is to show “how unlimited is the remission of sins in the age of forgiveness which has now dawned.”⁴

Jerome Neyrey (1985)⁵ interprets Luke’s “paradise” as part of a Lukan scheme which bases salvation through Christ on “an Adam-Jesus comparison.”⁶ Neyrey has picked up on the fact that the Septuagint refers to the garden abode of Adam and Eve as a “paradise” (παράδεισος, Gen 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16; 3:1, 2, 3, 8(62), 10, 23, 24), although he does not explicitly mention this point. Instead, Neyrey draws mainly upon the reference to “paradise” in Testament of Levi

---

2 Jeremias, “Paradeisos,” 770.
3 Jeremias, “Paradeisos,” 771.
4 Jeremias, “Paradeisos,” 771.
18:10-12 for the background of Luke’s “paradise,” making several thematic connections between it and Luke-Acts, and sees it as evidence that “paradise” was “a condensed symbol of the Genesis myth for dealing with sin and death.” For Neyrey, Luke 23:43 is Jesus’ reopening of the once closed paradise of Adam, “a juridical pronouncement by Jesus the Judge of the living and the dead (Acts 10:42; 17:32).” Although I am also taking up the judicial implications of Luke’s paradise, I have moved away from seeing an Adamic Christology in Luke’s passion narrative. In fairness to Neyrey, it should be noted that he does not base his Adam-Christ comparison on Luke 23:43 alone. Rather, he argues along the following steps:

(i) Luke divides history into epochs – Jesus founds a new age of salvation after an age of sin;
(ii) Luke portrays Jesus as the holy and righteous one of God; (iii) Luke extends his genealogy of Jesus back to Adam and calls him a “son of God” (Lk 3:38), in order to affirm “a definite break” between the time of Israel and Jesus, making Jesus the representative of a new group in which Adam’s disobedience is overcome; (iv) Luke portrays Jesus as the new Adam in the temptation narrative immediately following the genealogy (Lk 4:1-13) – here Jesus succeeds against Satan where Adam failed; and (v) the Adam-Jesus comparison continues into the passion narrative – Jesus struggles again on the Mount of Olives with the tempter (see Satan’s return at “an opportune time,” Lk 4:13), and again proves his fidelity to God. There is some plausibility in the idea that Luke’s “paradise” may be an allusion to a comparison between Adam and Christ, but a couple of points should first be noted. (i) Neyrey seems to be drawing the idea of an Adam-Jesus comparison from the clear references to it in the letters of Paul, which Luke did not necessarily know. (ii) The interpretation of “paradise” in Luke 23:43 as a sign of an Adam-Jesus comparison makes several leaps through the Lukan narrative: from the genealogy, to the temptation in the desert, to the struggle in Gethsemane,

---

to the crucifixion scene. It seems “safer” to make the immediate context of Luke’s “paradise” (Lk 23:39-43) the guiding principle for its interpretation. One final point can be noted: (iii) there is no clear indication that the Adam of Genesis 2-3 was tempted by Satan, as Jesus was in Luke 4:1-13. It is possible that Luke knew the tradition of 2 Enoch 31 and the Life of Adam and Eve, which attribute Adam and Eve’s eviction from paradise to Satan. However, the texts in question chauvinistically apply Satanic corruption to Eve but deny it of Adam (2 Enoch 31:6 [J]; LAE 10:4; cf. LAE 3:1).

**Joseph Fitzmyer (1989)** deals with the pericope Luke 23:39-43 in the last chapter, “‘Today You Shall Be with Me in Paradise,’ (Luke 23:43),” of his book, *Luke the Theologian*. Fitzmyer understands the passage as an example of the second criminal’s “*metanoia,* ‘repentance’” because “he recognizes his guilt and that he rightly hangs crucified: ‘For us it represents justice,’ or lit[erally], ‘at least we suffer justly.’” The episode is also a declaration of Jesus’ innocence, such as those made by Pilate and Herod in Luke’s passion narrative. The crux of this pronouncement story, for Fitzmyer, is Jesus’ promise of paradise, which is his promise of eschatological salvation to the “repentant criminal,” because it means being with Christ after death (Lk 23:43; see 1 Thess 4:17; Phil 1:22-23). Fitzmyer understands the share in “paradise” as the criminal’s share in Jesus’ kingship. Out of the nuances of the word “paradise” given in Jewish literature – as a garden, the garden of Eden or of God, or the afterlife of the righteous – Fitzmyer interprets “paradise” in Luke 23:43 as Luke’s semantic equivalent to his other concepts of Jesus’ post-resurrection life: “the entrance of Christ ‘into his glory’ (Lk 24:26) or... the exaltation to God’s right hand (Acts 2:33; 5:31).” “Paradise” for the second criminal is, according to Fitzmyer, Luke’s

---

“theologia crucis” (“theology of the cross”): the gift of salvation “through... [Jesus’] suffering and death” authorised by “his regal and messianic power of salvation.” For Fitzmyer, the context of this story of salvation is “the Lucan appeal for faith, repentance and conversion,... [and] baptism.”

John Carroll (1990) sees the second criminal’s entrance into paradise as a consequence of his repentance. He recognises that “in Luke-Acts, salvation is sharply focused on repentance. Through repentance, one experiences God’s forgiveness” (Lk 5:32; 7:48, 50; 15:7, 10; 19:1-10). Repentance is itself a “response to the message of Jesus” given especially by “the sick (eg., [Lk] 6:6-11; 8:41-45; 17:12-19), sinful (eg., [Lk] 5:32; 7:36-50; 15:1-32) and toll collectors ([Lk] 5:27-32; 19:1-10; cf. 18:9-14).” This ministry of salvation for the repentant continues through the apostles (Lk 24:47; Acts 2:37-40; 3:19; 4:12; 10:43; 13:38-39; 16:31). The “penitent criminal,” because he “repents,” “experiences salvation” in the form of “assurance of immediate status as ‘righteous’ and enjoyment of ‘Paradise,’ the abode of the righteous, in advance of the eschatological kingdom.” However, the crowd which stands by, watching Jesus, does not yet repent: their beating of their breasts (Lk 23:48) more likely means “abasement” and “awareness of guilt” (as the same expression indicates in Luke 18:13) which are “correlated with repentance... [but] are not synonymous.” Furthermore, the expression that the crowds “returned” (Lk 23:48) indicates spatial rather than spiritual movement. Carroll’s conclusion is that “at the cross, a penitent criminal receives assurance of salvation, and the people are moved toward repentance (which will be reported in Acts).” Carroll admits in an endnote that “the terminology of ‘repentance’ is lacking” in Luke 23:39-
but adds that “surely the criminal enacts it (as in the case of the lost son, [Lk] 15:11-24).”

However, it may be asked whether the “penitent criminal” is in fact also expressing “abasement” and “awareness of guilt” rather than repentance, and whether Luke is actually putting this character forward as the model for some other saving quality.

**Frederick Danker (1990)** understands the Lukan Jesus’ promise of paradise as the act of a “Benefactor.” The designation of the two criminals as “malefactors” (κακοφέργοι) emphasises Jesus as a benefactor by contrast. Danker finds other Lukan allusions to Jesus as a “benefactor,” under God “the Supreme Superstar or Benefactor,”

drawing on the Greco-Roman tradition in: the devil’s arrogant self-designation as a benefactor in claiming to have been given “all kingdoms” by God to give to anyone he chooses (Lk 4:5); Jesus’ self-designation as a liberator in his inaugural mission statement (Lk 4:18-19); Jesus’ double thanksgiving to God for his beneficence at the last supper (Lk 22:19-20); Jesus’ warning to his disciples not to act like the pagan rulers inappropriately named “benefactors” (εὐεργεταὶ, Lk 22:25), but to recognise God as “the Supreme Benefactor” through their “service”;

Jesus’ struggle with danger on the Mount of Olives (Lk 22:39-46); Jesus’ prayer for the forgiveness of those crucifying him (if Lk 23:34a is textually authentic); Peter’s testimony to Cornelius that Jesus “went about as benefactor” (ὅς δὲ ἔλθαν εὐεργετῶν, Acts 10:38). In this context, Danker understands Jesus’ gift of paradise to the second malefactor as the act of a benefactor’s “amnesty” or “an astounding invitation to join the Great King in his garden that very day.”

Danker also sees a typical Greco-Roman benefactor’s claim to immortality in “[Jesus’ claim of] jurisdiction over Paradise and [in] his promise to the malefactor.”

---

26 Danker, "Imaged through Beneficence," 58.
27 Danker, "Imaged through Beneficence," 61.
28 Danker, "Imaged through Beneficence," 60.
29 Danker, "Imaged through Beneficence," 64.
30 Danker, "Imaged through Beneficence," 64.
Jesus’ claim to be “an Immortal” is vindicated by the “celestial phenomena” accompanying his death (like Alexander the Great; Lk 23:44-45) and by his ascension to heaven (like Romulus, mythical founder of Rome; Lk 24:51; Acts 1:9).

Raymond E. Brown (1994), in his synoptic commentary on the four canonical passion narratives, portrays Luke 23:39-43 as Jesus’ great act of mercy towards a sinner. Brown identifies three possibilities for the source of this pericope, favouring the third “intermediary view” while doubting the first: (i) it is from an “independent tradition,” (ii) it is Luke’s “theological creation” or (iii) “Luke has drawn an element from independent tradition and developed it into the present episode.” He identifies three themes of Luke’s adaptation of the scene to his theological outlook: (i) it is a “positive” counterpoint to the three mockeries (Lk 23:35, 37, 39); the second criminal is “another impartial witness to Jesus’ innocence”; and (iii) Jesus again demonstrates his “healing forgiveness.” Brown understands the second criminal’s reference to “fear of God” in his rebuke as fear of “divine [eschatological] justice,” and the “same judgment” as the legal condemnation of all three crucified men. However, in speaking of the second criminal, Brown explicitly moves away from the thesis that he repents, an approach which I have also come to adopt:

Is the recognition of his own guilt and of Jesus’ innocence equivalent to repentance (*metanoia*) on the part of the wrongdoer? ... Or has this wrongdoer not yet reached *metanoia*? ... The Lucan Jesus healed the ear of the high priest’s servant who was hostile to him. His very presence healed the enmity that had existed between Herod and Pilate. He spontaneously pleaded with his Father for forgiveness for those who crucified him. In none of those three cases did he look for *metanoia*. Obviously, then, interpreters cannot demand that *metanoia* must have existed in the heart of this crucified wrongdoer who recognized that Jesus had not done anything disorderly, deserving condemnation.

---

31 Danker, "Imaged through Beneficence," 64.
34 Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1002.
Brown notes the textual difficulty in the second criminal’s request to Jesus: “Jesus, remember me when you come into [εἰς] / in [or: “with,” ἐν] your kingdom” (Lk 23:42). He favours the reading εἰς, understanding it as a reference to Jesus’ ascension, and rules out the possibility of a reference to the parousia in the reading ἐν, on the basis of the word “today” in Jesus’ response (σήμερον, Lk 23:43). Brown understands the second criminal’s request as a willingness for discipleship, which is confirmed by Jesus’ pronouncement that he will be “with me” (Lk 23:43). Finally, Brown, understanding Luke’s “paradise” as a kind of “heaven,” favours the understanding that Luke intends the “final bliss” or “ultimate happiness” of full divine presence (cf. Isa 51:3; 1 Enoch’s “paradise of righteous”; PsSol 14:3; 2 Enoch 65:10; T Dan 5:12; T Levi 18:10-16; Rev 2:7; 22:2) as opposed to an interim waiting place of the blessed before final judgment, of lesser divine presence (cf. Gen 2:15; 3:8; 2 Cor 12:3-4; 2 Enoch 8; LAE 37:5).

Gerard Luttikhuizen (1999) has edited a series of articles which was first delivered in a symposium on the Judeo-Christian concept of “paradise,” and published in 1999 under the title, Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity. The meanings of “paradise” in their pre-Christian contexts are explored in articles by J.N. Bremmer, E. Noort, E.J.C. Tighelaar, J.T.A.G.M. van Ruiten, F. García Martínez and W.J. van Bekkum. The post-New Testament conceptions of “paradise” are explored in articles by A. Hilhorst, G.P. Luttikhuizen, H.S. Benjamins, Chr. Auffarth., S. Brouwer and H. Wilcox. Although this work is of great value for students of the origins of “paradise” in Judeo-Christian religion, there is no article devoted to the three occurrences of paradise in the New Testament. The most extensive treatment of Luke’s “paradise” is found in two pages of the background material in A. Hilhorst’s article on the meaning of paradise in the Apocalypse of

---

37 Brown, Death of the Messiah, 2:1010-1012.
Hilhorst divides his background material on “paradise” into the pre-“fall” paradise of Adam and Eve and its later representations, the post-“fall” paradise of the just on earth, and the heavenly paradise which also houses the just. Hilhorst notes that Luke 23:43 is silent on whether “paradise” is on earth or in heaven, but “take[s] for granted that [Luke’s] Paradise is in heaven,” where the righteous dwell with God.⁴⁰

In various commentaries on the gospel of Luke (1977-1997, 2008), exegetes have seen Luke’s paradise in terms of salvific faith, kingship, creation, judgment and repentance (metanoia). Herman Hendrickx (1977) sees Luke’s paradise as an implicit allusion to Jesus’ “resurrection and subsequent glory,” which is shared with “the just... from the moment of death,” and, in this particular case, is a sign of forgiveness to those who like the criminal are “repenting sinners.”⁴¹ I. Howard Marshall (1978) sees Luke’s paradise as a “state of bliss... directly after death” given by Jesus in his role as king to a man who has shown penitence by accepting his punishment as just.⁴² Eduard Schweizer (1984) sees Luke’s paradise as a symbol of the radical difference between earthly life and eternal life, which is given to those who have “faith as acceptance of salvation” and fear of God as “acceptance of God’s judgment.”⁴³ Joseph Fitzmyer (1985) sees Luke’s paradise eschatologically as a “place of expected bliss” and “the mythical place or abode of the righteous after death.”⁴⁴ According to Fitzmyer, the second criminal receives this “share in Christian destiny” upon recognising the justice of his and his companion’s execution, and the denial of justice in Jesus’

---

⁴¹ Herman Hendrickx, The Passion Narratives of the Synoptic Gospels, (Manila: East Asian Pastoral Institute, 1977), 133.
condemnation. However, the second criminal has also shown metanoia before God in the admission of his guilt.

David Tiede (1988) sees Luke’s paradise as essentially heaven, given to a man who shows faith in Jesus’ identity as messiah, who exercises God’s merciful and just judgment in “a scene of final judgment in which the faith of the criminal is saving faith.” Donald Senior (1989) sees banquet imagery implicit in Luke’s paradise, which “emphasizes the immediacy of salvation” to a criminal who “is a model of repentance.”

John Nolland (1993) sees Jesus’ promise of paradise as a sign of his “royal clemency,” which presupposes the Lukan Jesus’ exaltation. He avoids designating this scene “as an eschatological reopening of paradise” or as a story of martyrdom of Jesus (let alone of the second criminal), but regards “paradise” as an intermediate resting place before resurrection. Sharon Ringe sees an Adamic Christology at work in Luke 23:39-43, where Jesus, whom she compares to the cherubim guarding paradise (Gen 3:24), succeeds at the devil’s test (not trying to save himself from death, Lk 4:9-12; 23:39), in contrast to Adam’s failure and expulsion from paradise.

Robert Tannehill (1996) regards Luke’s paradise as a sign of Jesus’ friendship and his “royal power” to forgive, given to a man who recognises Jesus’ identity as “the royal Messiah” and expresses repentance before facing the final judgment of God. Joel Green (1997) sees Luke’s paradise as “an eschatological image of new creation” which also symbolises Jesus’ “enthronement” through his death on the cross.

Wilfrid Harrington (1997) sees Luke’s “paradise” as a symbol for being “with Christ in the

---

51 Nolland, Luke, 3:1152-1153. The quote is from p.1152.
full presence of God,” which Jesus offers as “healing forgiveness” for a sinner who does not show metanoia, but who acts as an “impartial witness to Jesus’ innocence.”\(^{55}\) Richard Vinson (2008) briefly notes the interplay between the criminals’ guilt, Jesus’ innocence and the judgment of God in terms of entry into the kingdom, without developing this idea in detail.\(^{56}\)

**The Approach of this Study**

The question of concern is, “What is the meaning and the function of the word παράδεισος (‘paradise’) in Lk 23:43?” I will make use of three types of methodology in answering this question.

First, I will make use of historical criticism supplemented with semantic analysis. “Paradise” is a word with its own pre-history in the Jewish and Hellenistic traditions, occurring in diverse contexts, each using the word in its own particular way. However, the various occurrences of “paradise” can be grouped together into broad semantic categories. In summary, the different meanings of “paradise” according to different themes are: kingship, luxury, Israel as a righteous community, the temple, wisdom as personal righteousness and virtue, ascension, creation, judgment and the overcoming of that judgment, including “judgment” in the eschatological sense (i.e. post-mortem). The task is to determine the most probable meaning(s) of the word “paradise” in Luke 23:43 by searching for the most probable “paradise” traditions Luke had in mind when writing his passion narrative. I will suggest that the last two themes, judgment and the overcoming of judgment, carry the most weight. The background assumptions I am making, or the criteria I will presume in evaluating the different usages and meanings of “paradise,” are as follows: (i) older written works (such as the books of the Septuagint) which contain “paradise” and are used frequently by Luke or in


significant locations in the Lukan narrative will be given weight; (ii) writings which contain “paradise” and are contemporaneous with Luke-Acts\textsuperscript{57} will also be given weight, even though these may not have been known by Luke: they will be presumed to be reflections of Jewish culture at the time of Luke; and (iii) usages of “paradise” which pick up similar themes to those found in the immediate context of “paradise” in the Lukan narrative will be given the most weight.\textsuperscript{58} Regarding this last point, I will presume that the “safest” way to determine the meaning of Luke’s “paradise” is by looking at the use he makes of it in its immediate literary context. However, determining the use Luke makes of “paradise” in its immediate context will require a study of the form of the pericope in which it occurs (Lk 23:39-43).

I will therefore make use of form criticism supplemented with rhetorical analysis. The word \textit{παραδείσως} (“paradise”) occurs only once in the Lukan narrative, within the pericope Luke 23:39-43. The function of “amen I say to you” pronouncements in the synoptic gospels, of which Luke 23:43 is one, will be examined to help determine the use Luke makes of “paradise,” particularly in relation to sayings about the “kingdom” (\textit{βασιλεία}, Lk 23:42). I also presume that the dialogue between the two criminals and Jesus is significant in determining the meaning and function of Luke’s “paradise.” I will make what I think is a fairly safe assumption: given the position of this dialogue in the Lukan narrative (i.e. it takes place between two men about to die), there is an eschatological nuance to Luke’s paradise, picking up the eschatological dimensions of “paradise” found in its literary background. I will also suggest that this dialogue includes some of the formal elements of a trial scene, as found elsewhere in Luke-Acts. In particular, I will draw upon Greco-Roman reflections on the practice of forensic oratory, and suggest that Luke 23:39-43 is a short narrative which contains the bare bones of forensic speeches, which would have been longer and fleshed out

\textsuperscript{57} I am assuming a dating for Luke-Acts of roughly the late first century CE, towards its end.

\textsuperscript{58} There are two other ways I could have pursued a “historical-critical” enquiry, neither of which I am interested in for the purposes of this study: (i) whether Luke 23:39-43, especially v.43, is traceable back to the historical Jesus; or (ii) a chronology of the evolution of the term “paradise” in the ancient near east.
on the lips of an orator in a law court. I will also argue that dialogue makes implicit use of Luke’s theme of divine reversal of the exalted and the lowly among human beings. However, backing up this last point will require asking what connection Luke makes between “judgment,” “reversal” and “eschatology” in (i) his passion narrative and (ii) elsewhere in his literary corpus.

Therefore, one final methodology will be employed: redaction criticism complemented with composition criticism. In using this methodology, I will make two assumptions common, or once common, among New Testament scholars: the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark and a sayings source Q and the literary unity of Luke-Acts. I understand that the classical two document hypothesis has come under heavier criticism than the unity of Luke-Acts. However, since redaction criticism would be difficult without some approach to the synoptic problem, I find the first assumption a convenient starting point from which to analyse Lukan redaction. The limitations of this approach are partially offset by my use of composition criticism, which focuses on special Lukan material and the significance of this material to the end product which is the Lukan narrative. The main pericope under study (Lk 23:39-43) is unique to Luke. It is therefore reasonable to evaluate this pericope on par with other unique touches and redactions Luke has made in writing his narrative. The first focus will be on Luke’s passion narrative, where Lukan alterations emphasise Pontius Pilate’s reversal of his own judgment from acquittal to condemnation of Jesus, but in contrast to Pilate and other judges of Jesus, there are still characters in Luke 22-23 who make a positive evaluation of Jesus. I will also examine the portrayal of the passion in the gospel and Acts for signs of a Lukan understanding of reversal. Finally, I will see how an “eschatological reversal of judgment” fits with the general Lukan theology of reversal, to see if such an understanding is coherent with the Lukan passion.
These three methodologies play complementary roles in determining the meaning and function of Luke’s “paradise.” First, historical-semantic criticism *opens up* the whole range of *possible* meanings of Luke’s paradise, but this range of possibilities will be ordered according to *probability* of influence. Next, form-rhetorical criticism will *narrow down* this range of probable meanings to as few meanings as possible, preferably one, by examining the *function* of “paradise” in Luke 23:39-43. Finally, redaction-composition criticism will *verify* whether the meaning I attribute to Luke’s “paradise” is indeed an idea Luke would have recognised as his own, and if so, the examination of this idea in Luke will *illuminate* the meaning and function of Luke’s “paradise.”
II. The “Paradise” Traditions Leading up to and Contemporaneous with Luke-Acts

The following presentation of “paradise” as it is found in the writings of Second Temple Judaism is primarily descriptive, and arranged thematically. My goal is to illustrate the diversity of meanings and nuances which Luke’s “paradise” could be associated with, given his historical context of Hellenistic Judaism. The sources I will be relying on most are the Septuagint, Josephus, the “pseudepigrapha” and the other two New Testament uses of “paradise” (2 Cor 12:4; Rev 2:7). To a lesser extent, the writings of Qumran will be examined, and Philo will be alluded to. I will also complement my descriptive approach to the semantic range of “paradise” in Second Temple Judaism with an analysis of the likelihood that each source of “paradise” may have contributed to Luke’s understanding of it. To this end, I will note the possibility of Luke’s literary reliance on each source, especially the relevant sections of the Septuagint, but also consider the possibilities that uses of “paradise” contemporary with Luke also form the cultural context of his understanding. When I speak of Luke’s contemporary cultural context, I am assuming a dating of Luke-Acts in the late first century CE (such as the 80’s), and the real possibility of the early tradition about Luke’s Syrian Antiochene origins. The most important criterion, however, is the immediate context in which Luke puts his “paradise” to use. Therefore, the results of this chapter form a necessary preliminary study of what Luke’s “paradise” could mean, but its results are provisional until a more detailed examination of the Lukan context of “paradise”


(Lk 23:39-43) can be made. In this chapter, primary source references in **bold** indicate the incidence of the word “paradise.”

### Paradise as a Royal Park

The implicit reference to Jesus as a king, in that the second criminal asks Jesus to remember him in his kingdom (Lk 23:42), may have suggested the idea of a king’s garden in the minds of Luke’s audience when they heard Jesus’ promise of “paradise” in the next verse. If so, the declaration that Jesus has a kingdom reverses the charge earlier in Luke’s passion narrative that Jesus was a false king or political rebel (Lk 23:2), and the ironic mockery that Jesus, despite being an “anointed one” or “king of the Jews,” cannot save himself (Lk 23:35, 37, 39). The references in Acts to Jesus being exalted as a leader, saviour and judge (Acts 2:36; 5:31; 10:36, 42; 17:31; 24:24-25) point to God reversing Jesus’ status from one condemned and mocked as though a failed usurper to one who reigns as the true king. Some references to a “paradise” as a royal garden or park will now be given.

Josephus, roughly contemporary with the author of Luke-Acts, uses the word παράδεισος (“paradise”) mainly to describe a luxurious and fruitful garden, quite often that of a king (Josephus, Against Apion, I.141; Jewish War IV.467; Antiquities VII.347; VIII.186; X.226; XII.233). Steve Mason has put forward evidence that both Luke and Josephus, while neither might be dependent on the other, may have shared a common range of sources for their historical data. Mason’s general evidence covers similarity of genre (Hellenistic apologetic history), patronage and the use of realistic speeches to convey their own

---

62 All primary source references to Josephus are from Flavius Josephus, The Life; against Apion; the Jewish War; Jewish Antiquities, trans. H. St J. Thackeray, et al., 9 vols., LCL, (London: Heinemann, 1926).


64 Mason, Josephus and the NT, 186.

65 Mason, Josephus and the NT, 190.
Mason’s specific evidence for a shared set of historical sources includes the report of the census which led to the rebellion of Judas the Galilean (Josephus, *Jewish War*, 2.117-118; *Antiquities*, 18.1-5; Lk 2:1-3; Acts 5:37),\(^{67}\) and the three rebellions of “Judas the Galilean, Theudas, and the Egyptian prophet”\(^{68}\) (Acts 5:36-37; 21:38),\(^{69}\) where the Egyptian figure led a band of *sicarii* (Acts 21:38).\(^{70}\) Of course, even if Luke and Josephus had the same historiographical bookshelf, this does not necessarily mean that Luke used the word “paradise” in the same way as his contemporary. Josephus’ usefulness for this study consists in his witness to the original, non-religious meaning of paradise still present in Luke’s time and culture, centuries beyond the first clear Greek occurrence of the word in Xenophon.\(^{71}\)

In Against Apion I.128-141, Josephus gives a lengthy quotation of Berossus as corroborative evidence for the Babylonian exile found in the Hebrew bible. He finishes this quotation with Berossus’ mention of Nebuchadnezzar’s “hanging garden” (κρεμαστὸν παράδεισον, *Against Apion* I.141), which that king built for his Median wife simply to remind her of home. Since, according to Josephus’ source, this “hanging garden” was completed in just fifteen days (Against Apion I.140), it is a sign of Nebuchadnezzar’s extensive resources and royal authority. This mention of Nebuchadnezzar’s hanging gardens in the same quotation of Berossus is also found in Josephus’ *Antiquities* X.226. In *Antiquities VII*.347, Josephus makes a royal garden (τῶν βασιλικῶν παραδείσων) the scene of the plotting of David’s fourth son to usurp the throne against Bathsheba’s son Solomon (VII.345-350). In *Antiquities VIII*.186, Josephus tells us that King Solomon, at the height of his reputation for “virtue and

---


\(^{67}\) Mason, *Josephus and the NT*, 205-208.

\(^{68}\) Mason, *Josephus and the NT*, 208.

\(^ {69}\) Mason, *Josephus and the NT*, 210-211.

\(^{70}\) Mason, *Josephus and the NT*, 211-212.

\(^{71}\) The best study of the evolving, but still *secular*, meaning of “paradise,” from Median origins to the Greco-Roman period, is Jan N. Bremmer, “Paradise: From Persia, Via Greece, into the Septuagint,” in *Paradise Interpreted: Representations of Biblical Paradise in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. Gerard P. Luttikhuisen, (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 1-20. However, Bremmer is not interested *merely* in the secular meaning of “paradise,” but wants to explain how it came to be the word chosen to translate the “garden (of Eden)” in the Septuagint.
wisdom‖ (VIII.182), used to ride in his chariot with a large entourage of horse-riders in luxuriant parks (παραδείσοις) near Jerusalem (VIII.186). Here the “paradise” again appears to be a symbol for royal power and luxury. In Antiquities XII.233, Josephus mentions a royal garden in connection to the Maccabean-Hasmonean dynasty. According to Josephus, John Hyrcanus was unable to win popular support in Judea, so he invaded the Nabateans (Ảrhoाς) on the opposite side of the Jordan (XII.229) There he built a fortress in the cliff-face, both easy to defend and luxuriant and beautiful in its white marble and gardens (παραδείσοις, XII.233; the description of the cliff fortress occurs XII.230-233). Here the gardens are part of a structure built as both a luxurious palace and a military base by a man attempting to acquire royal power.

Mention should also be made of two occurrences of “paradise” which also refer to a king’s gardens, but are of special interest because they have divine judgment and repentance as secondary motifs. In Antiquities IX.216-227, Josephus tells us about God’s judgment on King Ozias of Jerusalem, son of Amasia. According to Josephus, Ozias began his reign as “a good and just man” (IX.216), but became “corrupted in mind by pride” (IX.222). In his hubris, Ozias attempted to offer sacrifice on the altar in the Jerusalem temple in place of the high priest, and threatened the priests with death when they tried to prevent him (IX.224). In Josephus’ legendary account, an earthquake then splits the temple “sanctuary” (τοῦ ναοῦ, IX.225; cf. “the splitting of the sanctuary [τοῦ ναοῦ] curtain” just before Jesus’ death, Lk 23:45), and hills miraculously move to block off “the royal gardens” (τοῦς παραδείσους τοὺς βασιλικοὺς, IX.225). The king is then smitten with leprosy and the priests drive him out of the city as someone unclean (IX.226). Eventually Ozias dies and is buried alone in his gardens (κήποις, ποτὶ παραδείσοις, IX.227). Here the miraculous barricading of the royal gardens occurs in an account of God’s humiliation of a self-exalted king.
Further in the *Antiquities*, Josephus tells the story about divine judgment on another king, but who by his repentance found that judgment against him reversed. The divine chastisement of King Manasseh was his capture by the king of Babylon. However, he escaped after successfully petitioning God, and “repented” (μεταβολὴ, X.42) of his former sins. In gratitude for his freedom, Manasseh restored the temple and reinstated the Mosaic sacrifices (X.40-46). Josephus describes Manasseh after his “change” (μεταβολὴ) as “blessed” (μακαριστός) and pious towards God (τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείν, X.45). In the end, Manasseh is buried in his own gardens (παραδείσοις, X.46).

Josephus follows the account of Manasseh given in 2 Chronicles 33:1-20 rather than 2 Kings 21:1-18. The account of Manasseh’s repentance is missing from the parallel account of his life in 2 Kings 21:1-18. There, the Septuagint translates ἡάδωρ (“garden”) the place of Manasseh’s burial, as κήπος (2 Kgs 21:18), rather than use the phrase ἐν παραδείσῳ οἶκου αὐτοῦ (“in the garden of his house”) in Chronicles (2 Chr 33:20). According to the Chronicler, Manasseh began his reign by doing “evil in the sight of the Lord” (2 Chr 33:2): he rebuilt shrines destroyed by Hezekiah, restored worship of Baal and other gods, practised magic and idolatry and teaches the kingdom of Judah to do likewise (2 Chr 33:3-9). After Manasseh refused to listen to the Lord’s warnings (2 Chr 33:10), the Lord punishes Manasseh by sending the “Assyrian” army against him, who capture him and lead him to Babylon (2 Chr 33:11). Now Manasseh repents and humbles himself before the Lord with prayers (2 Chr 33:12). God shows favour to him, and restores him and his kingdom (2 Chr 33:13). Manasseh changes his former practice of idolatry and restores the Jerusalem liturgy (2 Chr 33:15-16). The account of Manasseh which Josephus chose to tell was the one which involved not only divine judgment on the idolatrous king, but God’s revocation of his judgment on Manasseh when he repents of his former ways and restores right worship. Josephus’ account of
Manasseh is the opposite of his account of King Ozias, who started his reign well but became arrogant and lost his royal power when he, like King Saul (1 Sam 13:8-15; 1 Chr 10:13-14), attempted to offer unlawful worship to God.

**Paradise as a Symbol of Wealth and Luxury**

A broader category of the meaning of “paradise” than that of a king’s garden was “paradise” as the personal garden of any wealthy or powerful individual. Before going into particular cases about such gardens, it should be noted that the translators behind the Septuagint often interpret the “garden of Eden” as the garden of a wealthy land-owner, implied by a subtle change of meaning in the words used to translate “Eden.” The Septuagint has two Greek words for the Hebrew “Eden” (אֵדֶן). One is a simple transliteration, ἔδεν (“Eden,” Gen 2:8, 10; 4:16). The other word is an interpretation: the garden of Eden becomes the “paradise of luxury” (παραδείσεως τῆς τροφῆς, Gen 3:23, 24). This is a reading of the Hebrew root-word יִרְעָה not as “Eden” (יִרְעָה) but as the noun יָרְעָה/ירָעָה (“joy, rapture” or “ornaments, finery”) which is related to the verb יָרְעָה (“[to] luxuriate, enjoy the good life”) all of which have the same consonantal spelling. The Septuagint has translated the Hebrew “Eden” as “luxury” in the account about Adam and Eve after their eviction (Gen 3:23, 24), in Ezekiel’s oracles of judgment on the kings of Tyre and Egypt (Ezek 28:13; 31:9, 16, 18), in Ezekiel’s oracle of promise that God will restore the cities of “house of Israel” like “a garden of luxury” (Ezek 36:35), in Joel’s oracle of judgment on Israel (Joel 2:3). The Septuagint’s interpretation of the judgment in the garden of Eden as a judgment on “luxury” fits well with Luke’s anti-
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73 But “Eden” is transliterated in Gen 2:8, 10; 4:16 and omitted in Gen 2:15.
74 The alternative word for “garden,” κῆπος, is given instead of παραδείσεως for the “garden of Eden” (אֵדֶן) here.

Allusions were made in the section on royal gardens to their sometimes luxurious or decadent nature. These allusions also occur for some non-royal gardens. The speaker of the wisdom book Qoheleth tries to find value or meaning in becoming wealthy and enjoying his riches (Eccl 2:1-11). Part of this enjoyment of luxury is the planting of gardens (both κῆπος and παραδείσος, Eccl 2:5). However, the author concludes that this too is “vanity” (חוסן) or “error” (ματαιότης, Eccl 2:1, 11). From an opposite perspective, the Song of Songs captures the sense of joy in a luxurious garden. The male lover twice praises his female lover as “an enclosed garden” (κῆπος κεκλεισμένος, Song 4:12). He also rejoices in hearing word from her messengers (ἀποστολοί), whom he describes as “a garden of streams” (παραδείσος ῥόϊν, Song 4:13). The story of Susanna describes the garden of Susanna’s husband as that of a “very rich” man who was held in great honour by the Jewish exiles in Babylon (Sus 4). Susanna’s marriage to a wealthy husband comes after the description of her beauty (Sus 2) and righteousness in following the Torah (Sus 3), two traits of the protagonist which move the plot forward.75 Josephus explicitly describes luxuriant gardens as a reward for righteousness. He praises the rich and fertile “gardens” (παραδείσους) around Jericho (Jewish War, IV.467), watered by a spring which allows all kinds of plants to grow (IV.468-470). Josephus even goes as far as suggesting the adjective “divine” (θειόν) for this place (IV.469). Josephus recounts a legend about how this spring was blighted during Joshua’s conquest of Jericho (IV.459-460). However, Elisha (cf. 2 Kgs 2:19-22) then worked a miracle to make this spring life-giving in return for the hospitality shown him by the inhabitants of Jericho, and it would remain life-giving if they remained “righteous” (δικαιοί, IV.461-463).

75 Susanna's beauty is the reason for the elders' lust for her (they would "see her" and "began to lust for her", v.8). Her righteousness is the reason for her resistance to the elders (vv.22-23) and for her eventual deliverance by the Lord (vv.42-44).
Paradise as a Metaphor for Israel or a Righteous Community

One Israelite-Jewish tradition expands the literal meaning of “paradise” from the king’s private, luxurious gardens, to make the word stand for the people represented by the king. This social metaphor of “paradise” later contracted its reference to stand for a self-designated “righteous” community within the people of Israel. Luke’s paradise alludes to this communal dimension: Jesus’ promise to the second criminal is, “Amen I say to you, today you will be with me (μετ’ ἐμοῖ ἐστιν) in paradise” (Lk 23:43). However, since both second person references are in the singular, Luke’s paradise would be the smallest possible community of two people, unless the second criminal is meant as a symbol for a particular group.

“Paradise” occurs in Balaam’s third oracle of blessing for Israel (Num 24:3-9). Here Balaam praises the dwellings of Jacob/Israel (Num 24:5), using the similes “like palm groves that stretch far away, like gardens beside a river [καὶ ὠς ἐστι παραδεισος ἐστιν ἐπὶ ποταμῶν], like aloes that the Lord has planted, like cedar trees beside the waters” (Num 24:6). The oracle then foretells the glory of the Davidic king and his kingdom over “Gog” (Num 24:7 LXX, “Agag” in MT) and victory over other enemy nations in war (Num 24:8). The word “paradises” or “gardens” here seems to be a simile for the kingdoms of Israel and Judea with potential for messianic re-interpretation of the Israelite king. The plant metaphor for the land and people of Israel, used here and elsewhere (for example, Israel as a “vine”, Ps 80:8-16; Israel and Judah as a “vineyard”, Isa 5:1-7), later contributed to the Qumran community’s (second and first century BCE) self-description as a “garden.” The identification of Israel as a plant and even as a “paradise” continued in the psalms of Solomon (PsSol 14:3, late first century BCE). There is also an implicit self-designation of one’s community as a “paradise” (as this community will be after God’s final conquest of evil) within the New Testament itself (Rev 2:7; late first century or early second century CE).
In a collection of hymns found in Qumran\textsuperscript{76} cave 1, we find the following lines: “I give thanks to You, O Lord, for You set me by a fountain which flows in a dry land, a spring of water in a desolate land, a well watered \textit{garden} [\[3]] and a pool… You planted a stand of juniper and pine together with cypress for Your glory; trees of \textit{life} [\[4\]] at the secret spring, hidden among all the trees by the water so that a shoot might grow up into an eternal planting” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 16:5-7). This metaphor of a fountain watering a garden in the wilderness occurs in a thanksgiving hymn existing early in the Qumran community.\textsuperscript{77} A mention of “Eden” follows in the same hymn (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 16:21) and in a preceding hymn (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:19). The “planting… eternally” of “a glorious Eden [\[5\]]” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 16:21) is the result of the hymnist’s reception and preaching of God’s words (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 16:17), and may refer to the planting of a community. The hymnist now suffers and laments that his “tongue” can no longer give “instruction” to support his disciples (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 16:36-37).

In a preceding hymn of the same collection, “the rivers of Eden” will water a plant (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:19), which more clearly represents the Qumran community. This plant is an image for the people of God’s “council” who are companions to “the angels” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:16). The hymnist envisages his community as a “remnant” who are being “cleansed from guilt” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:11) and saved from “the congregation of fraud and... violence” (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:8): this remnant will receive God’s merciful judgment because its deeds are righteous (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:12).

There is another reference to a “garden” (4Q433a frag. 2 1.3) in a different set of thanksgiving hymns assigned to “the instructor” (ליימון, 4Q433a frag. 2 1.2). Here the


\textsuperscript{77} This “hymn 19” is called “a true Teacher [of Righteousness] hymn” by Martin Abegg, in Wise, Abegg, and Cook, \textit{Dead Sea Scrolls}, 187.
hymnist sings praise of a “delightful plant” in “his [i.e. God’s] garden and in his vineyard [גֵּרְעֶה הָאָדָם]” (4Q433a frag. 2 l.3). According to this thanksgiving song, this plant sprouts up to heaven, “it offered itself willingly” (a motif of obedience; l.5), lasts through “eternal generations” (l.6), giving fruit to all who come to it (ll.6-7). These plant and garden of Eden images appear to refer to an elect group within Israel,78 most likely the Qumran faction itself.

The psalms of Solomon probably originated in Palestine around “the second half of the first century BCE.”79 Some historical allusions occur in this collection: Pompey’s capture of the city of Jerusalem (63BCE) as “an act of God’s righteous judgment” (PsSol 8:14-17)80 and the death of Pompey (48BCE) as God’s punishment “for his arrogance” (PsSol 2:27-29).81 The idea of divine judgment, both in history and in the eschatological future, pervades the psalms of Solomon.82 In this context we find the phrase, “The holy ones of the Lord will find him forever; the paradise of the Lord [ὅ παράδεισος τοῦ κυρίου], the trees of life [τὰ ξύλα τῆς ζωῆς], are the holy ones of the Lord” (PsSol 14:3). According to the immediate context, the “holy ones” are those who walk in the Torah (ἐν νόμῳ), “which he commanded us so that we may have life” (PsSol 14:2), explicitly identified with Israel as “God’s inheritance” (PsSol 14:5). The righteous Israel is sharply distinguished from the wicked, “the sinners and the lawless” (PsSol 14:6), who “do not remember God” (PsSol 14:7) and whose “inheritance is Hades, darkness and destruction” (PsSol 14:9). The “holy ones of the Lord,” however, “will inherit life and joy” (PsSol 14:10). The fourteenth psalm of Solomon reuses the metaphors of a plant (PsSol 14:4), a forest and a garden (PsSol 14:3) for the people of Israel portrayed as a

78 Wise, Abegg, and Cook, Dead Sea Scrolls, 499.
80 Vriezen, Literature, 587.
82 Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life, 134.
righteous community. The common wisdom motif of “the two ways” also occurs in this psalm: one way through righteousness to life, another way through wickedness to death.

The author of the Apocalypse also seems to envisage “paradise” in communal terms. In the first letter to the seven churches, the seer John affirms a promise of “paradise” to those in the community who are found worthy. The verse in full is: “The one with an ear, let him listen to what the Spirit says to the churches. To the conqueror I will give to him to eat from the tree of life, which is in the paradise of God” (Rev 2:7). The mixed form of letter and oracle in Revelation 2-3 includes several dimensions discussed in this chapter: repentance, judgment and righteousness. However, given the communal dimensions of “the tree of life” in the book of Revelation and the fact that the promise of paradise is addressed to a community, I have included “paradise” in Revelation 2:7 under the heading of “righteous community.”

The phrase, “He who has an ear, let him hear what the Spirit says to the churches,” in the context of Revelation 2-3, is a “prophetic signature” at the end of an oracle. It is found in the synoptic gospel tradition (Mk 4:9, 23; Mt 11:15; 13:9, 43; Lk 8:8; 14:35). This saying is coupled with a promise to the “conqueror” (Rev 2:7, 11, 17, 26-28; 3:5, 12, 21), the first of which regards the tree of life in the paradise of God. Besides being a symbol of salvation, the tree of life was also a symbol for the centre of the universe, God’s dwelling, which binds all reality together as a whole. Two traditions about this tree “eventually merged” in Jewish thought: (i) the apocalyptic notion of “eschatological access to the tree of life in the heavenly paradise” which signified “eternal life”; and (ii) “the tree(s) of life as a metaphor for the elect community.”
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85 Aune, Revelation 1-5, 1:151.
86 Aune, Revelation 1-5, 1:152.
87 Aune, Revelation 1-5, 1:152.
88 Aune, Revelation 1-5, 1:153.
Two places are said to contain the tree of life in Revelation: the “paradise of God” (Rev 2:7) and the new Jerusalem (Rev 22:2) which descends from God’s dwelling in heaven to the earth (21:10). The promise about the tree of life in God’s “paradise” is made to the “churches” (Rev 2:7), and the social image of a city is also used to describe the beneficiaries of the “tree of life” (Rev 22:2). Therefore a communal meaning attaches itself to the soteriological meaning of paradise in this Christian apocalypse. It should also be noted that this eschatological community is not one simply of human beings, but a communion between God and humanity, a marriage between heaven and earth (Rev 21:2, 9). In Revelation, there is then an implied view that “paradise,” which contains the tree of life, will no longer be located in the (almost unattainable) heavenly sphere, but will be located in the earthly realm in the time of the new heavens and the new earth.

There is another communal image of paradise as the city of Jerusalem (2 Bar 4:3) and its temple (2 Bar 4:6). The references in 2 Baruch are a response to the destruction of Jerusalem (2 Bar 4:1). Paradise symbolises the city and temple of Jerusalem hidden and preserved with God (explicitly not the earthly city and temple destroyed in 70 CE, 2 Bar 4:3, 6), secretly revealed to Adam before his sin, to Abraham during his covenantal sacrifice, and to Moses when he saw how the temple and its sanctuary were to be built (2 Bar 4:3-6). Although 2 Baruch was probably written in the early second century CE, after Luke-Acts, these references are significant in that they associate God’s paradise with the phrase “with me” (spoken in God’s voice), which also occurs in Luke 23:43 (spoken in Jesus’ voice). Although the reference to paradise in Luke is unlikely to be the image of a whole city, since it occurs in a saying addressed to a single person, the conjugation of “paradise” and “with me” (2 Bar 4:3, 6) puts weight on Luke’s paradise as the beginning of a new community, after the
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90 Aune, Revelation 1-5, 1:154.
91 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:616-617.
destruction of the earthly Jerusalem (Lk 23:27-31). The notion of paradise as the temple will be explored in the next section.

**Paradise as a Metaphor for the Jerusalem Temple**

Above we saw how Edenic or “garden” motifs could apply to a holy nation, Israel, or to a self-appointed righteous community within Israel. Now we will consider the application of the “paradise” motif to the holiest place within the nation of Israel: the Jerusalem temple or even its sanctuary. This use of “paradise” is found in Jubilees, parts of the Dead Sea Scrolls influenced by Jubilees, and 2 Enoch. Immediately between Jesus’ promise of paradise and his death, Luke records some apocalyptic signs, one of which is that “the veil of the sanctuary (ναὸς) was split in the middle” (Lk 23:45). Luke shares this phrase with Mark and Matthew, but in a different form, whereas Matthew’s and Mark’s forms are almost identical (Mk 15:38; Mt 27:51). It is not known if Luke knew of the Jubilees tradition which associated “paradise” with the Jerusalem sanctuary. However, one correlation between the two texts is that Jubilees identifies “the garden of Eden” with “the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord” (Jub 8:19), whereas the Lukan Jesus associates “paradise” with his own presence (μετ’ ἐμοῦ, “with me,” Lk 23:43). However, Luke de-emphasises the role of the temple in his passion narrative. He has removed references to the Markan Jesus’ judgment and reconstruction of the temple (Mk 14:58; 15:29; Mt 26:61; 27:40). Nor does Luke identify Jesus with the temple, as John does when picking up this Markan-Matthean accusation against Jesus (Jn 2:21). The reference to the splitting of the sanctuary has been adapted from Mark (Mk 15:38; Lk 23:45; see also Mt 27:51). Therefore I am hesitant to posit a direct link between Luke’s paradise and the temple. However, I will still note below the association between paradise and the temple in intertestamental Judaism, besides that of Baruch 4:6.
In **Jubilees 3:8-14**, the writer combines the idea of the garden of Eden with the law concerning the purification of women after childbirth (Lev 12:2-5). The author makes the following links between the Leviticus and Genesis texts. There is one week between the creation of Adam and Eve (Jub 3:8), and one week of uncleanness for a woman after a male childbirth (Jub 3:10). On the second week Adam sees Eve (Jub 3:8), after two weeks a woman is clean from a female childbirth (Jub 3:11). A forty day old Adam enters Eden (**Jub 3:9**), until forty days after a male childbirth a woman is in “the blood of her purity” (Jub 3:10). An eighty day old Eve enters Eden (**Jub 3:9**), until eighty days after a female childbirth a woman is in “the blood of her purity” (Jub 3:11). During this period of “blood,” a woman should not enter the sanctuary or touch any sacred object, which is prefigured by the “holy” garden of Eden and every “holy” tree in it (**Jub 3:12**). Other allusions to the garden of Eden as the temple sanctuary are the situating of the couple’s first sexual encounter before their entry into Eden, in line with the ritual impurity associated with intercourse (Exod 19:15; 11QT⁹ 45:11-12; CD 11:21-12:2; 4Q274).⁹² Furthermore, Adam burns incense at the entrance to the garden (Jub 3:27) and covers his nakedness (Jub 3:16, 21-22, 30-31) “as a prototype of a priest” (incense: Exod 30:7-8, 34-38; Num 16:39-40; 2 Chr 26:16-20; Lk 1:9; covering: Exod 20:26; 28:42).⁹³ The Dead Sea Scrolls have a parallel to Jubilees 3:8-14 in a collection of rules for the Qumran community (**4Q265 frag. 7 ll.11-14**), in which the holiness of the garden of Eden seems linked to the sanctity of the community enforced by its various laws (**4Q265 frags. 3-7**).

Further connections between “paradise” and the temple sanctuary occur in Jubilees. During the distribution of land for Noah’s sons after the flood, Shem’s portion extends eastwards until “the garden of Eden” (**Jub 8:16**). The reference to Ham’s dwelling north of the garden

---


⁹³ van Ruiten, "Eden and the Temple," 77-78.
of Eden (Jub 8:22-23) shows that “paradise” is envisaged here as a this-worldly location. In Jubilees, Noah rejoices that the Lord has chosen to dwell with Shem, because “he knew that the garden of Eden was the holy of holies and the dwelling of the Lord” (Jub 8:19). Two other “holy places” are then mentioned, Mount Sinai (alluding to the Torah) and Mount Zion (alluding to the temple), making a triad of “holy places” (Jub 8:19). Shem is probably singled out as the son of Noah who possesses the whole “land of Eden” (Jub 8:21) because, according to Genesis 11:10-27, he is the ancestor of Abraham and therefore of the people of Israel.

There are references to a “paradise” in the Melchizedek legend at the end of 2 Enoch. This “paradise of Edem”\(^ {94} \) is not so much a “temple,” but relates to the temple motif via a priestly motif: paradise is a safe hiding place for Melchizedek until the unveiling of his priesthood.

According to this legend, Sopanim/ Sothonim, the old and infertile wife of Noah’s priest brother Nir, mysteriously conceives a child without intercourse with her husband Nir (2 Enoch 71:1-2). When he discovers her pregnancy, Nir accuses Sopanim/ Sothonim of marital infidelity (2 Enoch 71:6) and threatens her (2 Enoch 71:8). His wife dies immediately, apparently of shock (2 Enoch 71:9). After Nir consults Noah about hiding his wife’s body (2 Enoch 71:13-14), her child emerges from her corpse (2 Enoch 71:17). This child is “Melkisedek,” a priest from the moment of birth (2 Enoch 71:20). In answer to Nir’s anxiety that the child might die in the forthcoming flood, God’s judgment against a lawless world (2 Enoch 71:25), the Lord promises Nir the preservation of Melkisedek in “the paradise of Edem” (2 Enoch 71:28 [J, A]; see also 2 Enoch 72:1, 5, 9 [J, A] and 2 Enoch 71:11 [A]) until he is revealed as the great priest of God’s people (2 Enoch 71:29) and the agent who will restore the priesthood as the head of a new line of priests to God (2 Enoch 71:30-37).

\(^ {94} \) The unusual spelling “Edem” for “Eden” is found in the Slavonic text: Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 1:99. It seems to transliterate the Septuagintal Greek Ἐδέμ (“Eden”).
Paradise as a Wisdom Motif

Another association of “paradise” related to the association of a righteous community is the wisdom motif of paradise as a righteous individual. This motif of the righteous person in terms of “paradise” is found in the book of Sirach and one of the Dead Sea scrolls. The book of Sirach also connects the “paradise” motif to the presence of Wisdom at the beginning of creation, with allusions to the garden of Eden. Although the Ethiopic Book of Enoch connects “paradise” to wisdom, it is in a way dissociated from “righteousness”: the tree of knowledge of good and evil which brought judgment on the first couple is renamed the “tree of wisdom.” Finally, there is Philo’s conception of “paradise” as virtue following the Hellenistic philosophical tradition.

In Sirach 24, Lady Wisdom describes her presence and permeation throughout all creation. She praises herself (Sir 24:1), describing herself as the first of all creatures (Sir 24:9). Here the Greek word “paradise” occurs in a passage where God’s wisdom is implicitly connected to the garden of Eden. Lady Wisdom describes herself as an abundant source of water for a “garden” (named both παραδείσος and κήπος; Sir 24:30-31). The connection to creation and the garden of Eden occurs in the naming of its four rivers: the rivers Pishon (Sir 24:25; Gen 2:11), Tigris (Sir 24:25; Gen 2:14) Euphrates (Sir 24:26; Gen 2:14) and Gihon (Sir 24:27; Gen 2:13). These rivers, along with the Jordan and the Nile, represent “wisdom” (σοφία, Sir 24:25) “understanding” (σύνεσις, Sir 24:26) and “instruction” (παιδεία, Sir 24:27), not completely understood by “the first person” (ὁ πρῶτος, Sir 24:28), but which are found in the book of the covenant and the Torah of Moses (Sir 24:23).

There are two further references to “paradise” with connotations of wisdom in the book of Sirach. The first reference occurs in a description of the “two ways,” a common wisdom motif which compares the life of the wicked with the life of the faithful (Sir 40:12). The
riches of an unjust person will be like a dried-up river, the lawless will fail, the godless have few descendants (Sir 40:13-15); but the generous have joy (Sir 40:14), “graciousness is like a garden amongst blessings” (χάρις ὡς παράδεισος ἐν εὐλογίας) and mercy lasts forever (Sir 40:17). The other occurrence is in a list of comparative wisdom sayings: “A is good, but B is better” (Sir 40:18-27). At the crux of the list is the common wisdom motif, “fear of the Lord” (φόβος κυρίου, Sir 40:26-27). Here, the “fear of the Lord” is said to be better than “riches and strength,” fulfils all human needs (Sir 40:26), and is “like a garden of blessing” (ὡς παράδεισος εὐλογίας), “better than any glory” (Sir 40:27). Where Sirach 24:30 tied “paradise” to wisdom’s presence at the beginning of creation and the garden of Eden, Sirach 40:17, 27 links “paradise” to the wisdom found in a righteous person. “Paradise” in these latter two references continue the “plant” metaphor which represents not only Israel or a righteous community within Israel, but also the wise and righteous individual, as we find in the first psalm (Ps 1:3).

The word “garden” (נֵוֶן) is apparently used as a metaphor for the wise or righteous person in a passage of the Dead Sea Scrolls, but also alludes to the garden of Eden of Genesis 2-3. This reference occurs in a wisdom text which makes use of the “two ways” motif: choose good, reject evil (4Q423 frags. 1-2 l.7). The word “garden” is used here to speak of the “wise person,” with an allusions to the tree of wisdom and to Adam: “every fruit of the crops and every pleasant tree ‘that is desirable to make one wise [חֶפֶל הַחָלָם]’ (Gen 3:6), is it not the garden […] […] desirable to make one [very] wise, and he made you ruler over it to till it and keep it” (4Q423 frags. 1-2 ll.1-2).

We also find an interpretation of the tree of knowledge of good and evil as “the tree of wisdom” in 1 Enoch. However, this “wisdom” brought judgment rather than righteousness to
the first couple who ate from it. The character Enoch travels to the far east, past several mountains with trees and plants (1 Enoch 28:1-32:2). Eventually Enoch reaches the “garden of righteousness” (1 Enoch 32:3), where he sees “the tree of wisdom” which confers “great wisdom” to those who eat it (1 Enoch 32:3). When Enoch, admiring the beauty of the tree, asks about it (1 Enoch 32:4-5), Raphael tells him that his ancient father and mother ate from it, “learnt wisdom,” saw their nakedness and “were driven out of the garden” (1 Enoch 32:6). This passage is a short retelling of the Adam and Eve myth, whose righteousness is lost when they gain “wisdom.” From the same literary unit within the book of Enoch, known as “The Book of Watchers” (1 Enoch 1-36), we find the fallen angels teaching the arts of civilisation to humanity: potion-making (1 Enoch 7:1), the making of weapons, jewellery and cosmetics (1 Enoch 8:1), magic and astrology (1 Enoch 8:3-4). The authors of Enoch criticise the human wisdom upon which most of the civilised world is founded, while attributing a salvific, revealed wisdom to themselves.95

In Philo we find a hellenisation of the wisdom tradition of paradise. He conceives of paradise according to the Greek philosophical category of “virtue” (ἡ ὀρφεῖτη), and the “paradise of Eden” as the enjoyment (τρυφή) achieved by a life of virtue (Allegorical Interpretation I.14).96 In his fluid allegorisation of “paradise,” Philo conceives of “the divine garden” (ὁ θεῖος παράδεισος) producing the fruits of virtue and discernment, whose tree of life represents the highest virtue of “worship” (θεοσέβεια) and “holiness” (ὁσιότης) which confer “immortality of soul (or life)” (ἀθανασία ἡ ψυχή, ἡ ἀθάνατος ζωή, On the Creation, 54-54). Elsewhere Philo conceives of the tree of life according to the Platonic category of the Good, which contains all virtues as a whole (Allegorical Interpretation I.18). Of interest to

96 These references are from Philo, On the Creation; Allegorical Interpretations of Genesis 2, 3, trans. F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker, LCL, (London: Heinemann, 1929).
us is the fact that Philo connects paradise to righteousness (conceived as virtue) and immortality, two themes which seem connected to Luke’s paradise (Lk 23:43, 46-47).

**Paradise and Ascension**

Before I move onto the most prolific associations of “paradise” in Second Temple Judaism, creation and judgement, I will briefly consider one other possibility for Luke’s paradise: ascension. Luke implies that Jesus enters “paradise” on the day of his crucifixion (Lk 23:43), but also speaks of Jesus being “lifted up into heaven” on the day of resurrection (Lk 24:51), but also taken up into heaven on a cloud forty days later (Acts 1:2-3, 9-11). This association occurs in 2 (Slavonic) Enoch: the protagonist encounters “paradise” as a heavenly garden while ascending past the third heaven (2 Enoch 8:1-9:1). There is an implied association of Paul’s “paradise” experience (2 Cor 12:4) with ascension insofar as he associates it with an experience of the third heaven (2 Cor 12:4). However, the more immediate context of Luke’s “paradise” deals with judgment (Lk 23:40) rather than an ascension through the heavens.

In his second letter(s) to the Corinthians, Paul speaks about himself in the third person as “a person in Christ” who had an experience “fourteen years ago” (i.e. about 40-44 CE) of “the third heaven” (2 Cor 12:2) or “paradise” (παραδίσειος, 2 Cor 12:4). Whatever this experience may have been, it is not identifiable with any other “vision” or “revelation” (2 Cor 12:1) of Paul found in his letters or in Acts. However, it is an experience which Paul sees as coming from the Lord: he uses the “divine passive” of himself being “taken up” (ἀνάβεβλησαν, 2 Cor 12:2,
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97 It should be noted that the quoted phrase is missing from Codex Bezae and the pre-“corrected” text of Codex Sinaiticus, but is found in Papyrus 75. Eberhard Nestle et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 27th ed., (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1993), 246.

98 The text of 2 Corinthians may be of a composite nature.
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a word also used by Paul for Christians being taken up to meet the Lord Jesus in the sky at the parousia (1 Thess 4:17). Kuρίου (“of the Lord”) in the phrase concerning “visions and revelations” (2 Cor 12:1) is “probably… a subjective genitive”: the Lord is “the giver of these experiences.” However, Paul shows great reluctance in mentioning his paradise experience, refusing to repeat the “unutterable words” (2 Cor 12:4), perhaps alluding to the initiation rites of the mystery religions. Paul also downplays the significance of his “paradise” experience for his Corinthian audience, mentioning it only in a polemical setting concerning “visions and revelations” (2 Cor 12:1), and subordinates it to sharing in Christ’s sufferings as a sign of authentic apostleship (2 Cor 11:23-33; 12:5-10).

Paradise and Creation

The association of “paradise” with creation is often connected to that same creation coming under judgment, the prime example being the garden of Eden (Gen 2-3). “Paradise,” the Septuagint’s term for the garden of Eden (Gen 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16), is located “towards the east” (κατὰ ἀντωλαζ, Gen 2:8; but δῆμος is both temporal and spatial). This mythological place, both concretely real and unlocatable in the naming of the four rivers (Gen 2:10-14), is the home of the first man, “Adam,” who is taken there by God when he is created (Gen 2:7-8). It is also the home of the first woman created from Adam’s rib to be his partner (Gen 2:21-22). It contains four rivers (Gen 2:10-14), various trees to provide food and
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beauty, including the tree of knowledge and the tree of life (Gen 2:9), and various “beasts of the field” and “birds of heaven” named by the man (Gen 2:19). This image of “paradise” as a primordial garden with four rivers occurs also in Sirach 24:30, as discussed in the section on wisdom above.

Jubilees 2:7 harmonises the two creation accounts of Genesis 1-2, making the creation of the garden of Eden on the third day of the seven day creation. The creation of paradise happens alongside the appearance of the dry land (Jub 2:5-6) and the creation of rivers, lakes, trees, edible plants and fruit (Jub 2:7). Jubilees later identifies paradise as the home of the first man and woman, whose placement in the garden is implicitly compared to birth of a child (Jub 3:8-14). The first man works in the garden as a crop farmer (Jub 3:15-16). After his eviction, He is able to survive on the agricultural skills he learnt in Eden (Jub 3:35).

2 Enoch 30:1 [J] makes the same harmonisation as Jubilees, identifying the third day as the time of the creation of paradise with its armed guards and fiery angels, as well as fruit trees, mountains. The book also identifies the garden as the home of Adam and Eve (named the mother of life, 2 Enoch 31:1 [J]). Paradise is located in the east, full of light and open to heaven, so that Adam can gaze upon the angels from the centre of his reign over the earthly world (2 Enoch 32:1-3 [J]). He is in the garden for five and a half hours before his eviction (2 Enoch 32:1 [J]).

There is a brief mention in 4Q504 8,6 to the garden of Eden as Adam’s home. The Qumran text harmonises Genesis 2:7 with Genesis 1:27, saying that Adam is created in God’s likeness and gifted with the breath of life. Adam is also said to be created with the gifts of wisdom and knowledge.

The beginning of the Sibylline Oracles ties together the creation of the cosmos in a week (Gen 1:1-2:4a; SibOr 1:7-24a) with the creation and placing of the man and the woman in
Eden (Gen 2:4a-25; SibOr 1:24b-37). The garden of Eden is given a Greek mythological hue as “an ambrosial garden” (SibOr 1:25). The “garden” is also called a “luxuriant plantation” (SibOr 1:26) and is the home of the first couple (SibOr 1:30). Eve is created from his side as “a wonderful maidenly spouse” who satisfies his desire for intelligent conversation (SibOr 1:27, 33-34), but apparently the couple have no sexual desires (SibOr 1:35-36). They are given the gift of procreation only as a vicarious immortality (SibOr 1:57) once they have been evicted from “the place of immortals” (SibOr 1:51).

In the Ethiopic Enochic literature, paradise is still identified as an element of the earthly creation, but no longer as the home of Adam and Eve. According to the historically earliest reference (1 Enoch 77:4),109 the “garden of righteousness” occupies one of three parts of the northern corner of the earth. The other two parts of this world-quarter are human civilisation and the wilderness of seas and forests. A mention of seven mountains and seven rivers follow (1 Enoch 77:5-6). The next reference in likely historical occurrence (1 Enoch 32:3, 6),110 locates the “garden of righteousness” to the east of seven mountains (1 Enoch 32:1-3), one of which has God’s throne and the tree of life on its summit (1 Enoch 25:3-5). The “garden,” however, contains only the “tree of wisdom”: a fragrant and beautiful carob tree with grape-like fruit (1 Enoch 32:3-5). The historically latest reference (1 Enoch 60:8, 23),111 locates the “garden of righteousness,” now identified as the “garden of Eden,” to the west of the “invisible desert” of Dundayin, hidden in the chest of the male monster Behemoth (1 Enoch 60:7-8). Between these two references to paradise is a long list of natural phenomena and the spirits who control them, whose secrets the seer is permitted to know (1 Enoch 60:10-23).

110 VanderKam, Enoch, 114.
The fourth book of Ezra identifies paradise as the home of Adam who was formed out of dust (4 Ezra 3:4-6). However, there are more references to paradise as an inscrutable, inaccessible mystery of creation. The angel Uriel uses the narrator’s ignorance of the “entrances of Paradise,” the “exits of hell,” the inhabitants of the ocean depths, and the streams above and below the firmament (4 Ezra 4:7) to challenge his right to question God (4 Ezra 4:8-11). The parallelism of 4 Ezra 4:7-8 suggests a heavenly location for paradise. The book then explicitly links creation with eschatology: the laying of the foundations of paradise is one of God’s primordial acts of creation (4 Ezra 6:2), but God decided on how “the end” will happen before anything created came into being (4 Ezra 6:6).

2 Baruch 59:8 also identifies the “greatness of Paradise” as one of the mysteries of creation, along with fire, the abyss, the winds, the number of raindrops, the atmosphere, lightning, thunder and light. The author asserts that the mysteries of both creation and the coming judgment were revealed to Moses when God was showing him how to build the temple sanctuary (2 Bar 59:3-4). Pseudo-Philo also identifies paradise as one of the mysteries of creation which God revealed to Moses before his death (LAB 19:8-9), along with the source of water for clouds and rivers, the firmament, the origin of manna, and Egypt (LAB 19:10). In the other Pseudo-Philic reference to paradise as a mystery revealed to Moses (LAB 13:9), it is also identified to home of Adam and Eve, where the drama with the serpent occurred (LAB 13:8). Paradise is also a specially revealed mystery of creation in Apocalypse of Abraham 12:10; 21:6.

Paradise and Judgment

The remainder of this chapter deals with the association of “paradise” with judgment in Second Temple Judaism. The destruction of paradise or eviction from paradise was a theological symbol of God’s judgment on human sin, especially in the mythology surrounding the garden of Eden. Conversely, regaining paradise was a theological symbol of divine approval, a privilege granted predominantly to those whom God judges as righteous, and had eschatological bearings. This theme is prominent in the apocalyptic literature. However, two folk-tales, the Life of Adam and Eve and Joseph and Asenath, also portray repentance as a way to regain paradise: if one is not righteous, one can repent and receive God’s forgiveness. Finally, there was the idea of gaining paradise through a “reversal of judgment,” which could involve God revising a previously negative judgment against his people out of pity (and not necessarily because of their repentance, Isa 51:3). On the other hand, God, acting through human and angelic agents, could override a condemnation made by human beings concerning what crime occurred in a “paradise” (Susanna). Alternatively, God could override the condemnations of his own judicial agent, allowing that human agent to change his judgments to mercy for sinners seeking paradise (Testament of Abraham).

Loss of Paradise as Judgment

Genesis 2:4-3:24 is the story of the creation of the man and the woman in the garden of Eden, their crime and the judgment of God which expelled them from the “paradise” (Gen 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16; 3:1, 2, 3, 8(2), 10, 23, 24 LXX). Claus Westermann recognises and analyses the clear motif of a divine judgment taking place in Genesis 3, despite the influence of what appears to be an existentialist framework into which he fits the Hebrew text, when he sees its main concern as the existential question of why humanity, although creatures of God, are
'limited by death, suffering, toil and sin.' However, he does well to recognise the unlikelihood that the original authors understood their own myth as a historical event. According to Westermann, Genesis 3 acquired a ‘historical or quasi-historical’ status as a “fall” (i.e. an original historical state of innocence followed by a period of guilt) only in ‘late Judaism.’ According to Westermann’s analysis, this story involves God giving a command to human beings, the human disobedience shown to that command, and the punishment following that disobedience. That is, the Eden narrative involves a judgment of God upon human beings, ‘the breaking of a law and punishment.’ Westermann divides the text into the “crime” scene (Gen 3:1-7), and the “punishment” scene (Gen 3:8-24), and identifies the object of the crime (the forbidden knowledge of good and evil) as a wisdom motif, involving knowledge of what is beneficial or injurious to human beings as a collective. He recognises that there is no mention of ‘repentant sinners,’ but the text (Gen 3:8-24) is about God’s judicial inquiry which slowly discovers the guilt of human beings. For Westermann, the punishment of the human couple was originally ‘expulsion from the garden and alienation from God’: the sentence of death, pain in childbirth and manual labour are further elaborations of what human beings experience as a result. To some extent, this judgment involves a reversal of the primordial blessings of creation. The man and the woman’s lack of shame at being naked (Gen 2:25) is reversed by their shame at their nakedness, or lack of clothing, upon breaking God’s commandment (Gen 3:7-8, 10). God confirms the man and woman’s new state of shame, when he makes garments for them (Gen 3:21), just as they had done (Gen 3:7). Furthermore, the man’s joy at seeing the woman

121 Westermann, *Genesis*, 1:257.
as “bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh” (Gen 2:23) is reversed by the man’s dominance over the woman in God’s pronouncement of judgment (Gen 3:16). Finally, God’s gift of life to the man and the woman (Gen 2:7, 21) is reversed by God’s sentence of death upon the man (Gen 3:19; cf. Gen 2:17). The sentence of death upon the man is made final by his expulsion from the garden, resulting in a loss of access to the tree of life, so that he might not “live forever” (Gen 3:22-24). There are some allusions to the garden of Eden and the judgment which took place in it elsewhere in the Old Testament and in early Jewish literature. These allusions will now be examined.

Early in the Abraham narrative, Abraham and his relative Lot decide to go their separate ways after their shepherds bicker over land rights (Gen 13:7-9). Lot chooses the cities of the plain as his territory (including Sodom), which are described as “like the paradise of God (ὡς ὁ παραδείσου τοῦ θεοῦ) and like the land of Egypt” (Gen 13:10). In the Masoretic text, the phrase “like the paradise of God” reads “like the garden of Yahweh” (יהושע הַגּוֹדֶר, Gen 13:10), perhaps alluding to the garden of Eden as Yahweh’s personal garden (Gen 3:8). The other simile for the cities of the plain, “like the land of Egypt” (Gen 13:10), probably alludes to the riches Abraam and Lot have just gained from the king of Egypt (Gen 12:16; 13:1-2). There is a sense that a place like “God’s paradise” would be rich and luxurious. However, the narrator also speaks of a forthcoming judgment of God upon the cities of the plain: Sodom and Gomorrah are still yet to be destroyed (Gen 13:10; see Gen 19:1-29), as “the people of Sodom were wicked, great sinners against the Lord” (Gen 13:13). The destruction that will be caused by God’s judgment is a reversal of the previously rich status of the cities of the plain.

There is reason to believe that “paradise” in Genesis 13:10 may have influenced Luke’s use of the word. Luke knew and made some use of the book of Genesis in his writings: Stephen’s speech before his accusers, recounts Israel’s pre-Mosaic history (Acts 7:3-7). The Lukan
genealogy of Jesus assumes the descent of human beings described in Genesis 1-11 (Lk 3:34-38). Most importantly, Luke alludes to judgment in the book of Genesis in an apocalyptic context. When the Lukan Jesus talks about the coming of the kingdom of God and of the Son of Man (Lk 17:20-23), he speaks of that coming day as a surprise, as was the judgment on the earth in the days of Noah (Lk 17:26-27) and the judgment upon Sodom in the days of Lot (Lk 17:28-29). There is a further reference to the judgment upon Sodom, when the Lukan Jesus says that it will easier for Sodom “on that day” (Lk 10:12) than for the town that rejects the preaching of Jesus’ disciples about the coming of the kingdom of God (Lk 10:11).

A reference to God’s judgment on a land “like paradise” (Joel 2:3) occurs in Joel’s oracle directed against those who dwell “in Zion” (Joel 2:1). The prophet announces “the day of the Lord” (Joel 2:1), which is not about salvation but judgment, “a day of darkness” unlike any other (Joel 2:2). The disaster of the oracle is an invading “people strong and numerous” (Joel 2:2) which may actually be an invading swarm of locusts (Joel 1:4; 2:25). However, there also seems to be re-reading of the prophecy in terms of a judgment on the nations for the exile of Jerusalem (Joel 3:1-8). The army of locusts is reinterpreted in the same prophetic book as the invading Babylonian army (Joel 2:20; 3:1, 6) The advance of this “army” is like a “devouring fire” that will turn the land from “like a garden of luxury” (ὁς παραδείσεις τρυφής) into a “devastated plain” (Joel 2:3). The phrase “like a paradise of luxury” is the Septuagint’s interpretation of the Masoretic “like the garden of Eden” (levanti eschatologi).

The same interpretation of “Eden” (levanti eschatologi) as “luxury” (τρυφή) occurs in Joel 2:3 (LXX) as it does in Gen 3:23-24 (LXX). This is a reversal of the prosperity of the land to desolation on “the day of the Lord”: when God’s judgment on Israel takes place instead of his expected act of deliverance (Joel 2:1-2). Whether the disaster is a swarm of locusts or an invading army, there is an ongoing call to repentance in the face of the threat (Joel 1:13-14; 2:12-13, 15).
After the devastation of the land, God promises to reverse his judgment upon Jerusalem and Judah in a new “day of the Lord” (Joel 3:4). That is, God promises to enter into judgment with the nations that have ravaged Judah and Jerusalem, and vindicate his people by reversing the relationship of domination between Zion and the nations (Joel 4:1-8 LXX).

The book of Joel is an important text for Luke in his second volume. Joel 3:1-5\(^\text{122}\) becomes the programmatic mission statement in Peter’s speech (Acts 2:17-21). Here the outpouring of the Holy Spirit becomes a fulfilment of Joel’s prophecy of “the day of the Lord,” a day of salvation for those who call on the Lord (Joel 3:4-5; Acts 2:20-21). The “day of the Lord” Luke has selected from the prophet Joel is not the day of disaster for Israel (Joel 2:1-3), but the day of salvation for his people. Luke has chosen the “Lord’s day” (Joel 3:4) which reverses the previous “Lord’s day” involving God’s judgment on the paradisiacal land of his people. Luke has interpreted the “signs and wonders” (Acts 2:19; cf. Joel 3:3) of Joel’s prophecy as those given in Jesus’ ministry (Acts 2:22), before the final wonder of God “freeing from the pangs of death” the one who had been “given into the hands of the lawless, hung and killed” (Acts 2:23-24).

Ezekiel uses the word “paradise” in an oracle of judgment against Tyre (Ezek 28:11-19). Part of the condemnation of the ruler of Tyre is that he has “come into the luxury of the garden of God” (ἐν τῇ τροφῇ τοῦ παραδείσου τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐγένηθης, Ezek 28:13), but the city is full of injustice, lawlessness and sin (Ezek 28:15-16). In the Masoretic text, the word “Eden” (translated as “luxury” by the Septuagint) is used of the “garden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God” (גarden of God”) is used of the “garden of God” (גarden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”) is used of the “garden of God”). Some allusions to the judgment in the garden of Eden are retained in this oracle.

According to the Septuagint, the judgment on Tyre will be executed by a “cherub” (χερουβ, Ezek 28:14, 16) who will lead the accused out of his “shining stones” (Ezek 28:16), like the

\(^{122}\) Joel 3:1-5 is given as “Joel 2:28-32” in the NRSV. However, I am following the versification of both Rahlfs Septuaginta and the Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia.
cherubim involved in blocking re-entrance into the garden of Eden (Gen 3:23-24). The king, like the first man and his wife, had tried to make himself like “a god,” and so is driven out of his “paradise” (Ezek 28:2; Gen 3:5, 22). The king’s pretension to divinity is the self-exaltation of his heart (Ezek 28:2, 6, 9), fostered by the acquisition of wealth, power (Ezek 28:4-5) and knowledge (Ezek 28:17). There is also repeated use of the phrase “since the day you were created” in the oracle against Tyre (Ezek 28:13, 15), alluding to “the day God made heaven and earth” (Gen 2:4) preface the Eden account of creation. The subsequent oracle of judgment against the sister-city Sidon explicitly mentions God’s “judgment” (κρίμα, Ezek 28:22, 26). God’s judgment against Tyre and Sidon involves a reversal from wealth, power and wisdom to the conquest and destruction of the cities by other nations (Ezek 28:7-8), and being disgraced before them (Ezek 28:17-19). Meanwhile, God will vindicate Israel over Tyre and Sidon (Ezek 28:24-26).

One scholar, Ed Noort, has noted that the Masoretic text of this oracle alludes to a myth other than the garden of Eden suggested by the Septuagint. The problem lies with a subtle difference between the Hebrew and Greek texts. In the reference to the “cherub” mentioned above, the Masoretic text addresses the king of Tyre, “you are the cherub [בֶּן־רֶפֶן] covering the anointed and it was given to you on a holy mountain of God, you were walking in the midst of stones of fire” (Ezek 28:14). The same verse reads in the Septuagint, “with the cherub [μετὰ τοῦ χερουβ] I placed you on a holy mountain of God, you came to be in the midst of shining stones” (Ezek 28:14). The Greek translator has interpreted the difficult reading of the feminine singular “you” (ἡ) as “with” (κατά), both of which have the same consonantal spelling in Hebrew. The different meaning which results is that the king of Tyre is no longer thrown out of the “paradise” by an angel (according to the Septuagint), but is

identified with the angel coming under God’s judgment (according to the Masoretic text). Noort suggests that the Masoretic version of Ezekiel is alluding to the priestly account of “the fall,” the story of the flood immediately following the first creation myth (Gen 1:1-2:4a), rather than the “fall” in the garden of Eden (Gen 2:4a-3:24). Noort notes the use of priestly language in the Hebrew of Ezekiel 28: the idea of blamelessness (יָפָה, Ezek 28:15), as used of Noah (Gen 6:9), and the verb “to create” (יבָא, Ezek 28:13), as used in Genesis 1 and second Isaiah, and the accusation of “violence” (בַּכָּה) made against the king of Tyre and the earth (Ezek 28:16; Gen 6:11). God’s judgment on the fallen angels is an alternative Jewish tradition of “the fall,” concerning “the sons of God” who married “the daughters of men” (Gen 6:1-4), which existed in the time of Luke (e.g. 1 Enoch 1-36, the Dead Sea Scrolls). However, if Luke knew the oracles of Ezekiel 28, I presume he was more familiar with the Septuagint version which alludes to “the fall” in God’s paradise.

Luke seems to be aware of a former oracle of judgment against Tyre and Sidon. The Lukan Jesus pronounces woe against Chorazin and Bethsaida, and declares that if “Tyre and Sidon” had experienced his deeds of power, they would have repented long ago (Lk 10:13). However, the Lukan Jesus goes on to say that Tyre and Sidon will face an easier judgment than Chorazin and Bethsaida (Lk 10:14). Jesus then alludes to Ezekiel’s polemic against Tyre’s self-exaltation, when he pronounces against Capernaum, “And you, Capernaum, you will not be exalted up to heaven, will you? You will be cast down to Hades” (Lk 10:15). The formulaic saying attached to the end of this pericope suggests that the “crime” of these Galilean towns was a rejection of the preaching of Jesus’ disciples, which involves a rejection of Jesus and the one who sent Jesus (Lk 10:16).

If Luke knew the oracles of judgment against Tyre and Sidon in Ezekiel 28, he may also have known Ezekiel’s oracle of judgment against Pharaoh (Ezek 31:1-18). Like the oracles against Tyre and Sidon, Ezekiel’s oracle against Pharaoh is a polemic against the self-exaltation of kings. “Paradise” occurs three times in this oracle of judgment against Pharaoh (Ezek 31:8×2, 9). The prophet compares the king of Egypt to Assyria’s self-exaltation (Ezek 31:3-9) and fall (Ezek 31:10-17). Assyria was like a cypress tree extending its head into the clouds (Ezek 31:3), far taller than all the trees “in the garden of God” (ἐν τῷ παραδείσῳ τοῦ θεοῦ (twice), Ezek 31:8) or “the trees of the garden of the luxury of God” (τὰ ξύλα τοῦ παραδείσου τῆς τρυφῆς τοῦ θεοῦ, Ezek 31:9). Egypt, or Assyria, is identified with the myth of the cosmic tree at the heart of the universe. Its favourable comparison with the trees of Eden emphasises “the splendour and beauty of the cosmic tree.” Assyria’s self-exaltation seems to consist in the expansion of its empire (Ezek 31:6). Because of its pride (Ezek 31:10), God delivered Assyria into the hands of the nations (Ezek 31:11-12), bringing it down to “Hades” (Ezek 31:15, 17). The Masoretic text speaks of God’s judgment against the cosmic tree (Egypt) in relation to “the trees of Eden” (נים עץ גן, Ezek 31:9, 16, 18), translated by the Septuagint as “the trees of luxury” (τὰ ξύλα τῆς τρυφῆς).

The Eden account of Jubilees condenses the account of the judgment on Adam and Eve and their ejection from the garden (Jub 3:17-25). The author also uses various techniques of minor “omissions, additions and... rearrangement[s]” in order to iron out the discrepancies within the Genesis creation accounts (Gen 1-3) and to harmonise them with Jewish literature contemporary to Jubilees. The most significant change Jubilees makes to the Eden account is to portray the first paradise as a temple and Adam as a priest. Eden is again described as

---

131 van Ruiten, “Eden and the Temple,” 77-78.
a place of judgment when Jubilees moves on to the figure of Enoch. The angels take Enoch to the garden of Eden, where he is exalted as judge and recorder of the sins of humanity (Jub 4:23). Enoch is even described as a judge of the angels, the “watchers” who mated with human women (Jub 4:22). The garden of Eden was preserved from God’s judgment via the flood, so that Enoch might be undisturbed in recording the sins of the world (Jub 4:24). In this rather pessimistic passage, there is also a flicker of hope: the promise that judgment will one day cease because the earth will finally have been purged of “all sin and from pollution” (Jub 4:26). Four holy places will be preserved for the new creation: “the garden of Eden and the mountain of the East and... Mount Sinai, and Mount Zion” (Jub 4:26).

We also occasionally find some allusions to the judgment in Eden in the Dead Sea Scrolls. However, references to the garden of Eden in the Qumran manuscripts are quite rare: a recent concordance lists eight references to a “garden” (גֵּנוֹן), only four of which are the “garden of Eden” (גֵּנוֹן הַגֶּדֶנֶּה) and only four references to “Eden” (גֵּדֶנ) unattached to “garden.”

As Florentino García Martínez aptly says, “when we start reading the whole collection of manuscripts found at Qumran, looking for re-readings, interpretations or simply echoes or allusions to the Eden story as told in Gen 2-4, the biggest surprise is the small amount of material that this search brings to the fore.” Qumran seems to have placed more emphasis on “the fall of the Watchers” than the fall of Adam. The Qumran allusions to a judgment in Eden follow.

In a hymn of praise of God as creator, the writer recalls the creation of Adam in God’s “image,” God’s gift to him of “the breath of life” and “understanding and knowledge”

---

133 Abegg et al., The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance, 2:546.
135 García Martínez, “Man and Woman,” 97.
(4Q504 frag. 8 ll.4-5) when God “set him over the garden of Eden [דְּרוֹשׁוֹת] that you [i.e. God] had planted” (4Q504 frag. 8 ll.6). Up to this point the content of the prayer is reminiscent of the biblical Psalm 8. However, there follows a fragmentary allusion to Adam’s disobedience (4Q504 frag. 8 ll.8-9) and the filling of the earth with violence and bloodshed (4Q504 frag. 8 ll.14).

There are Qumran fragments of the Enochic literature which concern the “giants,” each born of the union between an angel and a human woman (cf. Gen 6:1-4). One of the giants, Ohya, dreams that “three of its roots […] while I was watching, there came […], they moved the roots into this garden [נַדֵד], all of it” (6Q8 Frag 2 ll.1-3). Another giant has a dream of “the great garden”136 (4Q530 frag. 2 2:7) in which two hundred trees suffer destruction by fire coming down from heaven (4Q530 frag. 2 2:8-10). The giant Ohya interprets this dream as a coming divine judgment on the giants (4Q530 frag. 2 2:16-19).

Josephus, in his retelling of the Eden narrative, once uses the Septuagint’s word παραδείσως (“paradise”) for the garden of Eden (Antiquities I.37). In all other instances in this Eden narrative, Josephus refers to the garden of Eden as a κήπος (“garden,” I.38(2), 45, 51). Josephus reinterprets the tree of the knowledge of good and evil as “the tree of practical wisdom” (τὸ τῆς φορονήσεως, I.37). He also interprets Adam’s sin as preferring to follow the counsel of a woman to the commandment of God (I.46, 47, 49). As noted above, Josephus uses the word παραδείσως (“paradise”) elsewhere for royal or luxuriant gardens.

4 Ezra, written probably around 100 CE (thirty years after the destruction of Jerusalem, 4 Ezra 3:1),137 refers to “paradise” once as the garden in which Adam was created (4 Ezra 3:6),

---
136 This phrase, “the great garden,” is based on a reconstruction of the scroll, found in Wise, Abegg, and Cook, Dead Sea Scrolls, 293., but not present in the older edition of García Martínez and Tigchelaar, The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition.
137 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:520.
but whom God judged to be worthy of death (4 Ezra 3:7), and so too all human beings who imitate Adam in disobedience (4 Ezra 3:8-9). Because of Adam’s sin (4 Ezra 7:116), paradise is now closed to all sinners (4 Ezra 7:123). The author also holds a very pessimistic view about the exclusion of the nations from the heavenly paradise at the time of the great judgment (4 Ezra 7:36-39). The presentation of the heavenly paradise as one of the inscrutable mysteries of God’s creation emphasises its inaccessibility (4 Ezra 4:7-8). The creation of paradise in the beginning (4 Ezra 6:2), along with the other primeval elements (4 Ezra 6:1-5), appears as a foil to emphasise God’s pre-planned control over the universe until the last judgment, “the end,” which only God can bring about (4 Ezra 6:6).

At the beginning of the Sibylline Oracles, in its re-telling of the Eden narrative, the weight of the blame is placed on the woman when the couple transgresses the command (SibOr 1:42-44). The effect of God’s consequent judgment is their expulsion “from the place of immortals” (SibOr 1:51) by “the Immortal” (SibOr 1:50). In their newfound mortality, the first couple receive God’s earthly blessings of procreation, work and food in place of the heavenly blessing of deathlessness (SibOr 1:57-58).

In 2 Enoch, the creation of “paradise” on the third day (2 Enoch 30:1) occurs immediately after God pronounces judgment on the rebellious archangel (2 Enoch 29:4-5; cf. Lk 10:18). There follows the devil’s entry into paradise to trick Eve (2 Enoch 31:1-6), which brings about the judgment which sees the human couple expelled from the garden (2 Enoch 31:7-8). However, the author records a promise of God to change his judgment against Adam in order to save him (2 Enoch 32:1).

“Paradise” occurs in Isaiah’s oracle of judgment against the rulers and “strong ones” of Jerusalem (Isa 1:23, 24). They have failed to act justly towards the widows and orphans, but

---

are accomplices in murder, theft and bribery (Isa 1:21, 23). However, there is promise of a
restoration in God’s act of judgment against “the lawless and the sinners” (Isa 1:28), restoring
the city to its former righteousness (Isa 1:26-27). Part of the judgment on Jerusalem involves
its inhabitants’ shame at their “idols” and “gardens” (τοῖς κήποις, which may be places of
cultic worship, Isa 1:29). These illicit cultic acts are compared to a terebinth with withered
fruit “and a garden without water” (καὶ ώς παραδείσως ὦδωρ μὴ ἔχων, Isa 1:30).

“Paradise” occurs at the beginning of a letter of Jeremiah to the exiled Judeans in Babylon
(Jer 36:4-23 LXX). The advice given by Jeremiah, “Build houses and live in them, plant
gardens [παραδείσους] and eat their fruit” (Jer 36:5 LXX; Jer 29:5 MT) is repeated by
Jeremiah’s opponent Shemaiah, who quotes this phrase of Jeremiah in an attempt to have the
priest Zephaniah silence him. Shemaiah’s change of παραδείσους to κήπους suggests the
synonymous use of these two words for “gardens” (Jer 36:28 LXX). The advice of Jeremiah
to the exiles (Jer 36:6-7 LXX) is aimed at helping the exiles to accept God’s judgment on
Jerusalem for at least “seventy years” (Jer 36:10 LXX). Jeremiah promises the exiles that
God will hear their prayers, and will be with them when they seek him (Jer 36:12-13 LXX).
The planting of a παραδείσος (“garden”) here seems to mean accepting God’s judgment in a
spirit of penitence.

The Apocryphon of Ezekiel is a book attributed to the biblical prophet, written no later than
95 CE, but was probably composed around 50 BCE–50 CE. Originating as a Jewish work,
it enjoyed huge popularity in early Christian circles, but survives now only in fragments.

The first fragment of this work, which we know from Epiphanius and the Babylonian
Talmud, tells the parable of a king’s judgment on two men for trespassing in his “garden”

---

139 The work is used by Pope Clement I and alluded to by Josephus. Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 2:488.
140 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 2:489.
(παράδεισος in Epiphanius, בַּבְּלִית in the Babylonian Talmud). The two men are a blind man and a lame man, who respectively represent the body and the soul of a human being (ApocEzek frag.1 2:10): the lame man rides on the back of the blind man and guides him (ApocEzek frag.1 1:10). When questioned by the king, they defend themselves by pointing out their inability for the crime they are accused of (ApocEzek frag.1 2:2). However, the king, or “the just judge,” sees through their deceit and punishes them together (ApocEzek frag.1 2:6). The point of the parable is God’s final judgment of both body and soul at the resurrection (ApocEzek frag.1 2:11).

### Entering Paradise through Righteousness

The promise of paradise for the righteous occurs in the “Similitudes of Enoch” (1 Enoch 37-71). The scholarly consensus in the time of R.H. Charles was that this portion of 1 Enoch was to be dated around 105–64 BCE. However, with the discovery of Enochic fragments at Qumran of all parts except 1 Enoch 37-71, a later date has now been proposed for the “Similitudes.” The conclusion of the Society of New Testament Studies’ seminar in 1977-8 was to place 1 Enoch 37-71 at the end of the first century CE. If this conclusion is correct, the references to “paradise” as a place for the righteous (in 1 Enoch 60:8, 23; 61:12) is roughly contemporaneous with Luke-Acts.

1 Enoch 60:1-10 is an apocalyptic judgment scene which recalls that of Daniel 7:1-28. The visionary sees “the Antecedent of Time” seated upon a throne surrounded by his heavenly court (1 Enoch 60:2; Dan 7:9). This divine figure is attended by a huge quantity of angels (1 Enoch 60:1; Dan 7:10). The sight causes great fear in the visionary (1 Enoch 60:3; Dan 7:15,

---

141 Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 2:493 nn. f, i.
but he is reassured by an angel (1 Enoch 60:4). The angel then explains the vision (1 Enoch 60:5-6; Dan 7:17, 23-27). The angel of the Similitudes foretells a day of judgment separating the “elect” in God’s covenant from the “sinners” who reject God’s “righteous judgment” (1 Enoch 60:6). Two apocalyptic monsters are introduced (1 Enoch 60:7), whose description coincides with a mention of paradise: “the garden of Eden, wherein the righteous and elect ones dwell, wherein my grandfather was taken, the seventh from Adam [i.e. Enoch]” (1 Enoch 60:8). “Paradise” here is envisaged as an earthly but mythological place, west of the dwelling place of the desert monster Behemoth (1 Enoch 60:8). This “garden of the righteous ones” is mentioned again (1 Enoch 60:23) after an angel reveals to Enoch the secrets of the created world (1 Enoch 60:11-22) and before the pronouncement of God’s judgment on the two apocalyptic monsters and the whole earth (1 Enoch 60:24-25).

The judgment scene continues in 1 Enoch 61-63, with the revelation of a messianic figure who will execute God’s judgment on all creatures: he is named “the Elect One” and “the Son of Man” (1 Enoch 61:5, 8, 10; 62:1, 5, 7, 9, 14; 63:11), recalling Daniel 7:13-14. The day of this “messiah’s” manifestation is a time of judgment for the world’s rulers (1 Enoch 62:1-11) but salvation and resurrection for the “elect” and the “righteous” (1 Enoch 62:12-16), who will receive eternal fellowship with the Son of Man (1 Enoch 62:14). Before receiving their eternal reward, the righteous ones await the uncovering of the Elect One in “the garden of life,” who will bless God with all the holy angels on his day of judgment (1 Enoch 61:12).

The Similitudes of Enoch (1 Enoch 37-71) therefore portray “paradise” as an interim waiting place for the righteous before the final judgment of creation and the gift of eternal life to the righteous, through God’s agent of judgment, the Son of Man.

---

In 2 (Slavonic) Enoch, “paradise” is associated with judgment: the judgment upon the man and woman sees the loss of paradise (2 Enoch 31:1, 3; 32:1), but those whom God judges to be righteous regain paradise (2 Enoch 8:1-9:1; 42:3; 65:10; 66:8). The dating and provenance of 2 Enoch has its difficulties. \(^{146}\) However, one scholar has recently challenged the uncertainty surrounding 2 Enoch. \(^{147}\) Andrei Orlov argues that the polemics present at the end of 2 Enoch, which replaces Noah as the prototypical priest of the sacrificial cult with his unknown relative Nir, is the sure sign of a Second Temple provenance, and dates the work to the first century CE before the temple’s destruction. \(^{148}\)

“Paradise” is seen by Enoch on the third heaven, as he ascends through a series of heavens (2 Enoch 8:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8). Paradise is here pictured as a luxurious garden, which seems to be a heavenly version of the garden of Eden (it has fruitful trees, streams dividing into four rivers, v.2, the “tree of life”, v.3, the name “Eden”, v.5). This “paradise” is promised as an “eternal inheritance” for “the righteous,” who suffer while doing what is right, give just judgment, have mercy on the poor and worship the Lord (2 Enoch 9:1). This paradise is also called a place of relaxation for the Lord (2 Enoch 8:3). This heavenly paradise is located “between the corruptible and the incorruptible” (2 Enoch 8:5, 6), which is probably a temporal-eschatological designation rather than a cosmological one: 2 Enoch 65:10 will speak of a “paradise” which is “incorruptible” at the end of time. \(^{149}\)

After seeing the condemned suffering in “hell” with Adam and Eve (2 Enoch 40:12-41:1), Enoch again travels to the “paradise of Edem” connected to the third heaven, “where rest is prepared for the righteous” (2 Enoch 42:3). At the end of history, Adam and the other ancestors will re-enter paradise, to enjoy fellowship and eternal blessedness (2 Enoch 42:5).

\(^{146}\) Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:94-97.
\(^{148}\) Orlov, Enoch-Metatron Tradition, 330-333.
\(^{149}\) cf. Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:116 n.1.
A series of beatitudes follow, promising this happiness to those who reverence God, those who judge justly, those who clothe the naked and do good to the orphan and widow, the unworldly, the truthful, and those who understand God’s ways (2 Enoch 42:6-14).

“Paradise” is mentioned towards the end of 2 Enoch, where it is the reward of immortality for the “righteous” (2 Enoch 65:10; this verse also occurs in Merilo Pravednoe): those who are acquitted in “the Lord’s great judgment” (2 Enoch 65:8). This is the time of the final judgment for all creation, when the old world will end and a new one will come into being (2 Enoch 65:6-7). The new world is called “the great age,” which is eternal and created for the sake of the righteous (2 Enoch 65:8). The end of the old age means the end of death and all affliction, and the birth of an “incorruptible” world or paradise (2 Enoch 65:9-10).

Further on, “paradise” is one of the rewards experienced “sevenfold” by the righteous who “escape the Lord’s great judgment” (2 Enoch 66:7-8). This may mean that the paradise of the just before the great judgment (2 Enoch 8:1-9:1; 42:3) is augmented after the last day. Its inhabitants will be the righteous ones who are “long-suffering,” meek, faithful, truthful, hopeful, but who suffer “affliction,” “distress,” “weakness,” “derision,” “assaults,” “temptation,” “deprivation” and “nakedness” (2 Enoch 66:6), envisaging a reversal of the situation of the righteous.

Mention of 4 Ezra’s pessimism about the regaining of paradise was made above. In this work, “paradise” is presented as a reality closed to mortals because of the sin of Adam and Adam’s descendants. However, the possibility of the righteous regaining paradise is acknowledged in a judgment scene (4 Ezra 7:26-44). The beginning of this scene foretells the coming of a messiah, who will reign for four hundred years before dying (4 Ezra 7:28-29). After the death of this messiah, the world will return to its pre-creation silence for seven days and everything will be unmade (4 Ezra 7:30-31). The narrator then envisages a re-creation in the form of a
universal resurrection of the dead and God’s final judgment on all (4 Ezra 7:32-34). At this last judgment, a great separation will occur between the righteous and the unrighteous: the unrighteous will receive “the pit of torment” and “the furnace of Hell,” while the righteous will receive “the place of rest” and “the Paradise of delight” (4 Ezra 7:36). This great judgment of God will overshadow all the elements of the creation until they fade into virtual non-existence (4 Ezra 7:37-43). When the narrator later expresses the fear that he may be found among the unrighteous (4 Ezra 8:31-32), God reassures him that his humility shows him to be one of the righteous (4 Ezra 8:47-49). God promises those like the narrator, that “it is for you that Paradise is opened, the tree of life is planted, the age to come is prepared, plenty is provided, a city is built, rest is appointed, goodness is established and wisdom perfected beforehand” (4 Ezra 8:52).

In another post-Jewish War text motivated by the fall of the temple, 2 Baruch,150 “the extents of Paradise” (2 Bar 51:11) are an eschatological reward for the righteous because of their obedience to the Torah (2 Bar 51:3, 7). The eschatology envisioned is the final judgment between the righteous and the wicked (2 Bar 51:1-2) following the resurrection of the dead (2 Bar 50:2-3). However, a person’s final destination, paradise or Gehenna, is determined by how they live their life now, in obedience or disobedience to the Mosaic law.151 With the reward of paradise comes fellowship with and exaltation over the angels (2 Bar 51:10-12), a glorious body of light (2 Bar 51:5, 10), agelessness (2 Bar 51:9) and possession of the new creation (2 Bar 51:3, 8).

Another juxtaposition of “hell” for the unrighteous and “paradise” for the righteous occurs in a fragment of the Sibylline Oracles. The last lines of this fragment condemns the idol-worshippers (SibOrFrag 3:41-45), but promises “those who honour the true eternal God” that

151 Henze, "Qoheleth and the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch," 42.
they will “inherit life, dwelling in the luxuriant garden of Paradise for the time of eternity, feasting on sweet bread from starry heaven” (SibOrFrag 3:46-49). This third fragment probably belongs to a lost book preceding SibOr 3:1-45, and if it is part of the Christian redaction on the extant books 1-2,\textsuperscript{152} probably dates around 150 CE.\textsuperscript{153} However, this reference may still be useful in showing the persistence of the idea of “paradise” as a reward for the righteous throughout the beginning of the Christian era.

**Restoration of Paradise through Repentance**

The Life of Adam and Eve is a legendary tale about the first human couple, and their attempts to re-enter the garden of Eden (“paradise”) through penitence after God has expelled them for their sin. The tale exists in two major versions: a Latin *Vita Adae et Evae* (hereafter *Vita*) and a Greek “Apocalypse of Moses” (hereafter LAE). On the basis of the knowledge that other works show of the *Life*, these two versions were written no later than 400 CE, but probably earlier.\textsuperscript{154} The Greek and the Latin texts as we have them were probably translations of an earlier document: their similarities suggest “a common source” as their basis.\textsuperscript{155} This earlier work was probably extant in the second century CE\textsuperscript{156} or late first century CE,\textsuperscript{157} given its “many parallels”\textsuperscript{158} with other works of the same period: early rabbinic literature, Josephus, 2 Enoch and the writings of Paul.\textsuperscript{159} *The Life of Adam and Eve* is therefore roughly contemporary with Luke-Acts, and so provides insight into some of the speculation about regaining paradise in that period.

\textsuperscript{152} Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 1:469.
\textsuperscript{153} Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 1:332.
\textsuperscript{154} Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 1:332.
\textsuperscript{155} Vriezen, *Literature*, 631.
\textsuperscript{156} Vriezen, *Literature*, 631.
\textsuperscript{157} Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 2:252.
\textsuperscript{158} Charlesworth, ed. *O.T. Pseudepigrapha*, 2:252.
Of all the pseudepigrapha relating to the Old Testament and preserved in Greek, the *Life of Adam and Eve* contains the most references to παράδεισος, “paradise” (LAE 1:1; 6:1, 2; 7:1; 8:1; 9:3\(^{(x2)}\); 10:1; 13:1, 4; 15:2; 16:3\(^{(x2)}\); 17:1, 2, 5; 19:1; 22:2\(^{(x2)}\), 3\(^{(x2)}\); 26:3; 27:1, 4; 28:1, 4; 29:1, 2, 3, 4, 6; 37:5; 38:4\(^{(x2)}\); 40:1, 6, 7; 42:3, 6):\(^{160}\) thirty-nine in total.\(^{161}\) The theme of the narrative seems to demand an abundance of occurrences of the Septuagint’s word for the garden of Eden in Genesis 2-3. The mere quantity of occurrences in this work is not necessarily a sign that other works containing “paradise” shared the same structure of meaning surrounding the word.

The story runs as follows. Adam and Eve, having just been driven out of paradise because of their sin, decide to engage in works of penitence by standing in a river (*Vita* 1:1-8:3; LAE 29:7-14). The devil comes to tempt Eve, and tricks her into cutting her penance short (*Vita* 9:1-10:1; LAE 29:15-17). Adam rebukes her for falling prey to the devil once more (*Vita* 10:3-4). The time for Adam’s death comes, in which he gives his last word and testament to his son Seth (*Vita* 30:1-2; LAE 5:2-3). Seth, surprised at his father’s pain, offers to fetch him fruit from paradise (*Vita* 31:1-3; LAE 6:1-3). Adam refuses, and retells the story of his fall (*Vita* 32:1-34:3; LAE 7:1-8:2). Adam asks Eve and Seth to acquire “oil” from paradise (a symbol of God’s mercy) by expressing repentance to God (*Vita* 36:2; LAE 9:3). Travelling to the primeval garden, the mother and son are waylaid by a beast, but drive it off (*Vita* 37:1-39:3; LAE 10:1-12:2). They weep as a sign of penitence at the edge of paradise, yet Michael refuses to give Eve and Seth the oil of mercy (a minority of manuscripts refer to salvation at the end-time of resurrection here; *Vita* 40:1-42:1; LAE 13:1-6). Eve recalls their expulsion from paradise in a narrative (LAE 15:1-30:1) which expands upon Genesis 3, and is extant only in the Greek version. According to the Greek *Life*, the devil tricked the serpent into becoming his mouthpiece, and the serpent tricks Eve into swearing an oath to eat the

---


\(^{161}\) Denis and Janssens, *Concordance Grecque Des Pseudepigraphes*, 61.
forbidden fruit and give some to her husband (LAE 16:1-19:3). God enters paradise to enact judgment upon Adam and Eve (LAE 22:1-23:5). The punishments of weariness (for Adam), birth pangs (for Eve) and a curse (for the serpent) follow (LAE 24:1-26:4). Adam expresses sorrow for his sin as he is being driven out of paradise by the angels, and begs forgiveness (LAE 27:1-2). God relents a little, and promises Adam a share in the tree of life at the time of resurrection, if he acts righteously (LAE 28:4). Adam is allowed some spices from the garden for food (LAE 29:5-6). After her account of the expulsion, Eve makes an act of repentance, in the form of a confession of sin, as Adam dies (LAE 32:1-4). Eve sees a vision of her dead husband in a heavenly chariot, while angels plead with God to forgive Adam (LAE 33:1-5). The heavenly bodies darken in mourning over Adam (Vita 46:1; LAE 36:1-3). According the Greek text, but not the Latin text, God finally has mercy on Adam and accepts him into the paradise of the third heaven (LAE 37:2-5). The bodies of Adam and his murdered son Abel are buried in the earthly paradise (LAE 42:6-7). According to the Latin text (Vita 47:3), God pities Adam but reserves his exaltation until the final day of judgment.

The tale entitled “Joseph and Asenath” is a koinē Greek162 “romance”163 of Hellenistic Judaism,164 most likely written in Egypt around 100 BCE to 117 CE.165 This tale is a considerable expansion of the short references to Joseph’s Egyptian wife in the book of Genesis (Gen 41:45, 50). The tale speculates on how the Israelite Joseph came to accept a non-Jewish wife, and so is a tale of conversion (not simply repentance) of Asenath from her Egyptian idols to the living God of Israel. The tale reflects an attitude of warm acceptance of proselytes into Judaism. The conversion of Asenath wins her the food of the paradise of God, administered by an angel (JosAsen 16:14).

162 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 2:185.
163 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 2:186.
164 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 2:181.
165 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 2:187.
Asenath’s repentance focuses on two sins: her initial, arrogant rejection of Joseph (JosAsen 4:9-11; 6:2-8; 11:6; 12:5; 13:13) and her idolatry (JosAsen 10:12, 13; 11:4, 8, 16; 12:12, 15; 13:11). A constant motif of Asenath’s prayers of repentance is that she takes “refuge” in Joseph’s God, so she is renamed by an angel as the “City of Refuge,” a mother of proselytes who will shelter converted Gentiles from “many nations,” who now worship God “in the name of Repentance” (JosAsen 15:7). Because of her repentance, the angel gives Asenath the honeycomb made by “the bees of the paradise of delight... from the dew of the roses of life that are in the paradise of God” which confers “eternal life” (JosAsen 16:14). This honeycomb of “paradise” ends the religious separation between Asenath and Joseph: it is “bread of life... a cup of immortality... ointment of incorruption” (JosAsen 16:16; cf. 8:5) which makes Asenath like “the cedars of the paradise of delight of God” (JosAsen 16:16). A further paradisiacal reference to Asenath is made: in language reminiscent of the Song of Songs, her body parts are praised as likenesses of natural objects, including her hair which is “like a vine in the paradise of God” (JosAsen 18:9).

Paradise and a Reversal of Judgment

Paradise occurs in an oracle of consolation in second Isaiah (Isa 51:3). Here the Lord promises to “comfort” Zion and transform its wilderness (ארץ) into a likeness of “Eden” (Isa 51:3 MT but not LXX) and “as a paradise of the Lord” (ὁ θεός παράδεισος κυρίου, Isa 51:3 LXX). This promise occurs within an oracle of “salvation” (σωτηρίαν) for God’s people (Isa 51:5, 6, 8). God’s act of salvation occurs when his judgment (Isa 51:4, 7) and righteousness (Isa 51:6, 8) goes forth as a light for the nations (φῶς ἐβδομῶν, Isa 51:4) and alleviates the shame and disgrace experienced by Israel in exile. Here “paradise” is used as a theme for God’s new judgment on Israel’s behalf (in the form of return from exile) which reverses his old judgment against Israel (in the form of the Babylonian exile itself). This
oracle is spoken with God acting as Israel’s advocate against human opponents who would bring shame upon the nation (Isa 51:7). God’s judgment, in Second Isaiah, seeks to vindicate Israel against these human accusers of the nation, using the courtroom image of the ἱλαρία, or legal contest (Isa 41:11, 21; 49:25; 50:8; 51:22, 36).

Luke, in his infancy narrative, alludes to this oracle of the reversal of God’s judgment in Isaiah 51:3. Simeon is waiting expectantly for “the consolation of Israel” (παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἱσραήλ, Lk 2:25), picking up the theme of God’s promise to “console” Israel (παρακαλέω, Isa 51:3). When Simeon sees the child Jesus in the temple, he praises God (Lk 2:28) because he has now seen the “the light for revelation to the nations” (φῶς εἰς ἄποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν, Lk 2:32), just as God promises his judgment will be “for light to the nations” (εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν, Isa 51:4). The theme of reversal is also picked up in Simeon’s prophecy, and connected to the upcoming passion narrative, in that Jesus will be “for the falling and rising of many in Israel and a sign of opposition” (Lk 2:34). The theme of God’s appointment of a “light of the nations” (φῶς ἐθνῶν) also occurs in the Lukan Paul’s turn from Israel to preach to the gentiles (Acts 13:47; quoting Isa 49:6, but also recalling Isa 51:4).

The drama of the book of Susanna takes place in the “garden” (παραδείσους, Sus 4, 7, 36, 54 [Symmachus]; Sus 4, 7, 15, 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 36[α2], 38 [Theodotion]) of a rich Judean exile living in Babylon and his pious wife Susanna. The book of Susanna may have been the original prologue of Daniel.167 There are some thematic parallels between the figure of Susanna and Jesus in Luke’s passion narrative. Both are judged to be worthy of death, yet both are innocent. Both have their innocence defended: Susanna’s innocence by Daniel,

Jesus’ innocence by the second criminal (Lk 23:41). The judgment of their innocence involves a reversal of their previous condemnation: Susanna is saved from death, Jesus is not saved from death but exalted by God after his death. However, these parallels are not necessarily signs of direct borrowing by the evangelist from Susanna. A more cautious approach would see all the works in the same literary genre as Susanna, rather than any identifiable book in the group, as a possible generic influence on the synoptic passion narratives.

The Symmachus text of Susanna is “primarily the story of a judgment.” In this version, the two elders in their lust for Susanna (Sus 7-8) turn their eyes from heaven and forget “just judgments” (Sus 9). When Susanna refuses to consent to their advances rather than sin against God (Sus 22-23), the “lawless” elders conspire to have Susanna put to death (Sus 28). They concoct a false charge of adultery against Susanna (Sus 36-41) in the gathering of the judges (Sus 29). Susanna, while being judged, silently confesses her innocence to God and prays for deliverance (Sus 35). An angel inspires the young man Daniel to reject the judgment of the gathered elders (Sus 44-45, 48). Daniel pronounces judgment upon Susanna’s two false accusers (Sus 52-53, 56-57) who judge the innocent unto death (Sus 53). In a forensic investigation, Daniel proves to the gathered people that it is not Susanna, but the two elders, who are in the wrong (Sus 54, 58). The gathered congregation respond by condemning the two elders instead of Susanna, to which an angel adds divine judgment in confirmation of this changed human judgment (Sus 59-62).

The Theodotion text of Susanna emphasises the virtue and beauty of Susanna. Susanna is “beautiful and God-fearing” (Sus 2), and her “just” parents bring her up in the law of Moses.

---

169 Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life, 55.
170 Collins, Daniel, 437.
171 Collins, Daniel, 437.
When the elders attempt to seduce Susanna, she cries out in a loud voice (Sus 24), which, according to the law of Moses, is the sign of non-consent for a woman being raped in a city (Deut 22:23-24).\(^\text{172}\) When the false judgment of adultery brings the death sentence upon Susanna (Sus 36-40), she does not pray silently but proclaims in a loud voice to God (in the congregation’s hearing) her innocence, which God knows, and laments that she will be put to death on a falsehood (Sus 42-43). God confirms Susanna’s innocence by listening to her prayer (Sus 44) and inspiring Daniel with a “holy spirit” to intervene (Sus 45). Daniel tells the congregation to reverse their judgment of Susanna (v.49) because she is innocent (Sus 46). After Daniel condemns the two elders and proves them to be in the wrong (Sus 52-54, 56-58), he announces that an angel is waiting to confirm his human judgment with God’s judgment (Sus 55, 59). The moral of the story in both versions is that “innocent blood was saved on that day” (Sus 62).\(^\text{173}\)

The Testament of Abraham is roughly contemporaneous with Luke-Acts, having been written around 75-117 CE, originally in Greek and most likely has an Egyptian provenance.\(^\text{174}\) E.P. Sanders remarks in his introduction to the text in Charlesworth’s collection that “the most striking feature of the Testament of Abraham is... the lowest-common-denominator universalism of its soteriology.”\(^\text{175}\) By this Sanders means a “good works” approach “according to which all people, whether Jew or gentile, are judged according to how well they observe these [obvious] ethical requirements.”\(^\text{176}\) It emphasises neither the absorption of Hellenistic philosophy as in Philo, nor insists upon the separation between Jew and gentile as in Joseph and Asenath.\(^\text{177}\) The Judaism represented in the Testament of Abraham sees itself “as a religion of commonplace moral values” while still insisting on God’s strict judgment.

\(^{172}\) Collins, Daniel, 431.  
\(^{173}\) Collins, Daniel, 435.  
\(^{174}\) Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:874-875.  
\(^{175}\) Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:877.  
\(^{176}\) Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:876.  
\(^{177}\) Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:877.

The storyline involves God’s sending an angel to inform Abraham of his death, who, because of his extreme reluctance, is given a tour of the inhabited world before the heavenly realms, the place of judgment and paradise (TAb 10:6-8). As Abraham observes the people of the world, he sees many of them committing sins. Offended, he prays for God’s judgment upon the sinners, and God apparently concedes to Abraham’s condemnations (TAb 10:4-11). However, God complains about Abraham’s harsh judgments, and brings Abraham to the place of judgment, paradise and Gehenna, to show Abraham the consequences of his strictness (TAb 10:12-15). In the place of judgment, Abraham sees a glorious Adam figure who rejoices when he sees his children entering the gate to paradise, but laments over the eternal punishment of his descendants (TAb 11:9-11). While in this place of judgment, Abraham repents of his earlier harsh judgments upon sinners which, by God’s permission, condemned them (TAb 14:10-13). The cause of Abraham’s change of mind is his difficult decision to save one person who was neither righteous nor sinful, and who is then able to enter paradise (TAb 14:8). In response to Abraham’s sorrow at his harsh judgments, the angel informs him that God has reversed those judgments, so that those whom Abraham had condemned are no longer condemned (TAb 14:14-15). At the end this work, Abraham himself goes to paradise, which is identified with “Abraham’s bosom” (TAb 20:14). This identification, if it were present in an oral or literary tradition known to Luke, would make a strong connection between Jesus’ promise of paradise to the second criminal and Jesus’ parable about the poor Lazarus who was welcomed into Abraham’s bosom (Lk 16:22). However, I have not been able to find any identification of “paradise” with “Abraham’s bosom elsewhere in the literature.

178 Charlesworth, ed. O.T. Pseudepigrapha, 1:877.
Evaluation of the Possible Sources for Luke’s Paradise

It is now time to evaluate the likelihood that these various semantic associations of “paradise” play a role in the meaning of Luke’s paradise, using the three criteria of (i) the immediate context in Luke’s gospel, and the two historical contexts of (ii) the Septuagint as a direct literary influence on Luke and (iii) how the culture contemporary with Luke saw “paradise.”

Criterion 1: The Immediate Context of Luke’s Text

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Possible Relevance to the Immediate Lukan Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park/ Garden</td>
<td>Reference to Jesus’ kingdom, Jesus as king, Lk 23:37-38, 42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel/ Community</td>
<td>The second criminal will be in paradise “with” Jesus (Lk 23:43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Splitting of the sanctuary (Lk 23:45b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>“Fear of God,” (Lk 23:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>Entering “into” the kingdom? (Lk 23:42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Solar eclipse (Lk 23:44-45a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (negative)</td>
<td>The second criminal’s rebuke, that the first is also “in judgment” (Lk 23:40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (positive) – righteousness</td>
<td>The centurion’s declaration of Jesus’ righteousness (Lk 23:47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (positive) – repentance</td>
<td>The second criminal acknowledges that he is “justly” condemned (Lk 23:41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (positive) – reversal</td>
<td>To be shown in the next chapter of this study (Lk 23:39-43)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation of the first criterion is provisional until a more thorough analysis of Luke 23:39-43 can be made in the next chapter. However, I favour the view that there is some kind of “judgment” occurring in this pericope.

179 Brown, *Death of the Messiah*, 2:1006-1008.
### Criterion 2: The Context of the Septuagint as a Literary Influence on Luke

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Occurrences of παράδεισος</th>
<th>Lukan Dependence on the Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sus 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>[See entries on “Judgment (negative)” below.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cf. Gen 3:23, 24;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Gen 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16</td>
<td>Allusions (6): six to Genesis in Luke-Acts, limited to the two creation accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (negative)</td>
<td>Gen 3:1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 23,</td>
<td>Allusion (1): Gen 3:15 // Lk 10:19, limited to the judgment in Eden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[180\] For this table, I have been heavily reliant on Appendix IV: *Loci Citati vel Allegati* of Nestle et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 772-808.
Association | Occurrences of παράδεισος | Lukán Dependence on the Work
--- | --- | ---

**Judgment (positive) – righteousness** | cf. Isa 51:3 | [see below]

**Judgment (positive) – repentance** | * | *


| Sus 4, 7, 36, 54 [Symmachus]; Sus 4, 7, 15, 17, 18, 20, 25, 26, 36, 38 [Theodotion] | *Allusion (1):* Sus 46 // Acts 20:26

According to the second criterion, I would put most weight on the connection between “paradise” and “judgment.” I would keep the latter term broad enough to include both negative judgment (especially Isa 1:30; Joel 2:3), and positive judgment in the sense of “vindication” (a concept I see included in the meaning of “reversal of judgment”), as it is found in both Susanna and Isaiah 51:3. I would put particular weight on Isaiah 51:3, with its
sense of divine vindication against enemies using quasi-legal imagery, for the meaning of Luke’s paradise, which seems to be part of a positive judgment pronounced by Jesus.

Criterion 3: The Context of Other Second Temple Jewish Texts as Signs of Possible Shared Traditions with Luke\textsuperscript{181}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Occurrences of parádeisoς or equivalent</th>
<th>Probable Dating/Provenance of Work</th>
<th>Parallels of Work with Luke-Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Royal Park/ Garden</td>
<td>Josephus, Against Apion I.141; Antiquities, VII.347; VIII.186; IX.225; X.46, 226; XII.233</td>
<td>Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE, Palestine</td>
<td>Possible shared historiographical sources with Luke-Acts.\textsuperscript{182}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apocryphon of Ezekiel, frag. 1</td>
<td>50 BCE–50 CE, in circulation in late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxury</td>
<td>Josephus, Jewish War, IV.467</td>
<td>Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE, Palestine</td>
<td>Possible shared historiographical sources with Luke-Acts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SibOr 1:25, 26</td>
<td>30 BCE to 250 CE, Phrygia</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TAb 4:2</td>
<td>Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century to early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century, Alexandria</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel/ Community</td>
<td>1QH\textsuperscript{a} 14:19; 16:6; 4Q433a frag. 2 line 3</td>
<td>Late 2\textsuperscript{nd} century to 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE, Palestine</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PsSol 14:3</td>
<td>Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE, Palestine</td>
<td>Allusions (5): PsSol 8:15// Acts 1:8; PsSol 16:5// Lk 22:37; PsSol 17:25// Lk 21:24; PsSol 17:32// Lk 2:11; PsSol 18:10// Lk 2:14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rev 2:7</td>
<td>Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century CE, Patmos &amp; Asia Minor</td>
<td>Rev 2:7a is a gospel logion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Bar 4:3</td>
<td>Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century to early 2\textsuperscript{nd} century CE, Palestine</td>
<td>Allusion (1): 2 Bar 54:10// Lk 1:42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Jub 3:9, 12; 3:27; 4:26; 8:16, 19, 22, 23</td>
<td>Mid-2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE (Hasmonean period), transmitted by Qumran</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{181} For the third column of this table, I am relying mainly, but not exclusively, on the introductions in Charlesworth, ed. \textit{O.T. Pseudepigrapha}. For the fourth column, I am relying on Nestle et al., \textit{Novum Testamentum Graece}, 772-808.

\textsuperscript{182} Mason, \textit{Josephus and the NT}, 185-229.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4Q265 frag. 7 lines 11-14; 11Q19 37:2</td>
<td>Late 2nd century to 1st century BCE, Palestine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Priesthood</em>: 2 Enoch 71:28; 72:1, 5, 9 [J, A]; 71:11 [A only]</td>
<td>1st century CE, pre-70 CE&lt;sup&gt;183&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bar 4:6</td>
<td>Late 1st century to early 2nd century CE, Palestine</td>
<td><em>Allusion</em> (1): 2 Bar 54:10/Lk 1:42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>4Q423 frag. 1-2, line 2</td>
<td>Late 2nd century to 1st century BCE, Palestine</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enoch 32:3, 6</td>
<td>Early 2nd century BCE,&lt;sup&gt;184&lt;/sup&gt; transmitted by Qumran</td>
<td><em>Allusions</em> (3): 1 Enoch 22:9-14/Lk 16:26; 1 Enoch 94:8/Lk 6:24; 1 Enoch 97:8-10/Lk 12:19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philo, <em>On the Creation of the World</em>, 54, 55; <em>Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis</em>, I.13-19, 28, 30, 32; III.1, 9, 17.</td>
<td>50 BCE – 20 CE, Alexandria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>2 Cor 12:4</td>
<td>Mid-1st century CE, Paul writing to Corinth</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch 8: 1, 3, 8 [J, A]; 8:4, 5, 6 [J only]</td>
<td>1st century CE, pre-70 CE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation</td>
<td>Jub 2:7; 3:9, 12, 15, 16, 32, 35</td>
<td>Mid-2nd century BCE (Hasmonean period), transmitted by Qumran</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q504 frag. 8, line 6</td>
<td>Late 2nd century to 1st century BCE, Palestine</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SibOr 1:25, 26, 30</td>
<td>30 BCE to 250 CE, Phyrgia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enoch 77:4</td>
<td>3rd century BCE,&lt;sup&gt;185&lt;/sup&gt; transmitted by Qumran</td>
<td><em>Allusions</em> (3): 1 Enoch 22:9-14/Lk 16:26; 1 Enoch 94:8/Lk 6:24; 1 Enoch 97:8-10/Lk 12:19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enoch 60:8, 23</td>
<td>1st century CE, section not found at Qumran</td>
<td><em>Allusions</em> (3): 1 Enoch 39:4/Lk 16:9; 1 Enoch 51:2/Lk 21:28; 1 Enoch 63:10/Lk 16:9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>184</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch 1*, 25.
<sup>185</sup> VanderKam, *Enoch*, 88.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Association</th>
<th>Occurrences of παράδειγμασ or equivalent</th>
<th>Probable Dating/Provenance of Work</th>
<th>Parallels of Work with Luke-Acts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Ezra 3:6; 4:7; 6:2</td>
<td>Late 1st century CE (about 100 CE), Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch 30:1; 31:1, 2, 6 [J only]</td>
<td>1st century CE, pre-70 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Bar 59:8</td>
<td>Late 1st century to early 2nd century CE, Palestine</td>
<td>Allusion (1): 2 Bar 54:10// Lk 1:42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Philo, LAB 13:9; 19:10; 32:8</td>
<td>1st century BCE to 1st century CE, Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApocAb 12:10; 21:6</td>
<td>Late 1st century to mid-2nd century CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (negative)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jub 3:17, 18, 26; 4:23, 24</td>
<td>Mid-2nd century BCE (Hasmonean period), transmitted by Qumran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q504 frag. 8, line 6; 4Q530 frag. 2 2:7; 6Q8 frag. 2 lines 1-3</td>
<td>Late 2nd century to 1st century BCE, Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SibOr 1:25, 26, 30</td>
<td>30 BCE to 250 CE, Phyrgia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch 32:1</td>
<td>1st century CE, pre-70 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apocryphon of Ezekiel, frag. 1</td>
<td>50BCE-50CE, in circulation in late 1st century CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo-Philo, LAB 13:9; 19:10; 26:8</td>
<td>1st century BCE to 1st century CE, Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApocAb 23:4</td>
<td>Possibly a Bogomil interpolation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (positive) – righteousness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Enoch 60:8; 23; 61:12</td>
<td>1st century CE, section not found at Qumran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Enoch 8:1, 3, 8; 42:3; 65:10 [J, A]; 8:4, 5, 6; 66:8 [J only]</td>
<td>1st century CE, pre-70 CE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association</td>
<td>Occurrences of παράδεισος or equivalent</td>
<td>Probable Dating/Provenance of Work</td>
<td>Parallels of Work with Luke-Acts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SibOr (Frag.) 3:45, 46 TLevi 18:10</td>
<td>Towards 150 CE?</td>
<td>Fragments present among Qumran literature, but has later Christian interpolations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAb 11:10; 20:14</td>
<td>Late 1st century to early 2nd century, Alexandria</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ApocAb 21:6</td>
<td>Late 1st century to mid-2nd century CE</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JosAsen 16:14, 16; 18:9 Rev 2:7</td>
<td>1st century CE, Alexandria</td>
<td>Rev 2:7a is a gospel logion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life of Adam and Eve (Greek): 1:1; 6:1, 2; 7:1; 8:1; 9:3; 10:1; 13:1, 4; 15:2; 16:3; 17:1, 2, 5; 19:1; 22:2, 3; 26:3; 27:1, 4; 28:1, 4; 29:1, 2, 3, 4, 6; 37:5; 38:4; 40:1, 6, 7; 42:3, 6 Life of Adam and Eve (Latin): 1:1; 2:2; 3:1; 4:1; 9:4; 10:4; 25:2, 3; 29:1, 2; 31:1, 2, 3; 32:1, 2; 36:1; 37:1; 40:1, 2</td>
<td>Late 1st century to 2nd century CE, Palestine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgment (positive) – reversal</td>
<td>TAb 14:8</td>
<td>Late 1st century to early 2nd century, Alexandria</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third criterion offers more possibilities for Luke’s paradise, particularly the notion of “paradise” in the sense of a primordial creation and paradise as a righteous community. However, I would still put most weight on the connection between paradise and judgment. There is, however, some linkage: allusions to “paradise” as creation are often coupled with allusions to a primordial judgment, and the “paradise” metaphor of an elect community presupposes a divine judgment or decision in favour of that community. I would still keep
this theme of judgment broad enough to cover both negative judgment (condemnation, especially 1 Enoch 32:3, 6; Apocryphon of Ezekiel, frag. 1) and positive judgment. “Positive judgment” has now been broadened to cover “paradise” as recompense for the righteous (especially 1 Enoch 60:8, 23; 61:12; 2 Bar 51:11) and “paradise” as forgiveness for the repentant (especially JosAsen 16:14, 16; 18:9 and the whole of the Life of Adam and Eve). However, Testament of Abraham 14:8 is especially noteworthy in that paradise is given to a person in a morally ambiguous situation (much like the second criminal of Luke 23:39-43), whose judge, Abraham, errs on the side of mercy instead of condemnation. This results in a divine confirmation that God also prefers mercy to wrath for sinners, and would reverse human judgments of condemnation to acquittal.

This chapter concentrates on the scene in which the Lukan Jesus utters his “paradise” saying: the conversation between the two criminals and Jesus (Lk 23:39-43). First I make some general remarks about the category of “paradise” hinted at in Luke 23:43, one which involves eternal life. Secondly, I look at the other elements of Luke’s paradise saying: “today,” “with me,” and “amen I say to you.” In particular, I look at the various kinds of judgment linked to Jesus’ “amen” sayings. Finally, I argue that the scene of the dialogue between the two criminals and Jesus (Lk 23:39-43) is a “trial scene” narrating a judgment of the characters involved, which picks up elements of the Greco-Roman tradition of judicial oratory and contains some forensic characteristics found in the trial scenes of Luke-Acts.

The Eschatology of Luke’s Paradise

It seems safe to presume that Jesus’ promise to the second criminal on the cross is in some way a promise of eternal life. The internal logic of the narrative demands this interpretation. Jesus’ promise of paradise is suggestive of the immediate future: “Today (σήμερον) you will be (ἐστιν - to be, second person singular future indicative) with me in paradise” (Lk 23:43). This “paradise” appears to be a post-mortem reality. Both characters are in the middle of being executed. Jesus expires a few verses later (Lk 23:46). Luke does not record the death of either of Jesus’ co-crucified, because he was more interested in the death of Jesus. (Nor do Mark and Matthew record the death of the two brigands. Curiously, John implies that these two did not die on the cross, but presumably after being taken down; Jn 19:32-33). However, the Lukan Jesus promises the second criminal that he will be “with me” (μετ’ ἐμοῦ) in paradise: to whatever kind of “paradise” Jesus goes to in his death, there the second criminal is with him. Therefore, Luke’s “paradise” would certainly appear to be eschatological. The
kind of “eschatology” involved here can be more precisely limited to “forensic apocalyptic eschatology.” This kind of eschatology involves the individual decision to be for or against God, where eternal life and eternal death are the consequences of such a decision. It uses the imagery of God as the universal judge of humanity passing his sentence in a “courtroom,” suggesting Jewish reflection on the story of Adam and Eve in paradise (Gen 2-3). Individuality is certainly suggested by Luke’s use of singular forms in Jesus’ address to his co-crucified: “Amen I say to you (σοι, not ὑμῖν), today you will be (ἐσή, not ἐσεσθε) with me in paradise” (Lk 23:43). In the second half of this chapter, I will argue that Luke is using the metaphor of a courtroom in the way he portrays the dialogue between the two criminals and Jesus (Lk 23:39-43). First, however, I will consider the overall genre of eschatology found in the synoptic passion narratives.

George Nickelsburg has presented an informative study on the development of literary forms related to eternal life in intertestamental Judaism. He concludes that there are three basic forms which carry the motif of eternal life. The first concerns the exaltation of the righteous person. In the origins of this form, the righteous person was a royal courtier, falsely accused and condemned, only to have his sentence reversed and to be vindicated over his enemies just before his death. This tradition then developed to have the hero exalted to the heavenly realm after death, taking on the dimensions of God’s righteous judgment and resurrection. Nickelsburg sees the second form relating to eternal life as “the judgment scene.” This literary form originated as an apocalyptic conclusion, as a vindication of the

---

187 de Boer, “Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology,” 176. The alternative, for de Boer, is “cosmological apocalyptic eschatology,” which is (i) a Jewish reflection upon Genesis 6:1-4, (ii) uses the imagery of God fighting a war against the evil angelic powers rampant in the created world, (iii) climaxes in God’s victory over the fallen angels and his resurrection of the dead human beings whom he has elected, to live eternally in a redeemed cosmos: de Boer, "Paul and Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology," 174-175.
188 Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life, 170-171.
189 Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life, 171-173.
just against the unjust, which sought to promise rectification for some historical persecution
of the “righteous.” Their vindication was to be resurrection, which later came to include the
poor who suffered economic injustice, after which the resurrection-judgment came to include
the whole cosmos. The third eschatological form identified by Nickelsburg is a development
of the “two-way theology” of the wisdom tradition. Here the blessings and curses of
Israelite covenant theology were extended into eternal life and death. The eschatology of this
form is immediate, experienced in this life, and generalised to all human beings, regardless of
situation.

There is reason to regard the first form, the “wisdom tale,” as a generic literary influence on
the passion-resurrection narratives in the synoptic gospels. As can be seen in the table
below, the “wisdom tale” involves the false accusation and unjust condemnation of a
righteous person by the unrighteous, the reversal of the righteous person’s sentence to
vindication and exaltation, and the humiliation of his accusers. The following table is an
adaptation of Nickelsburg’s form-analysis of the “wisdom tale,” but where Nickelsburg
was searching for the form of Wisdom 1-6, I am looking for a possible form of the synoptic
passion narratives, when they are read from the viewpoint of faith in Jesus’ resurrection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal Element</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>Luke</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reason for hostility</td>
<td>Passim through the gospel</td>
<td>Passim through the gospel</td>
<td>Passim through the gospel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conspiracy</td>
<td>14:1-2; 15:1</td>
<td>26:3-5, 14-16; 27:1</td>
<td>22:2-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusation</td>
<td>14:56-59; 15:3, 26, 29</td>
<td>26:61; 27:12, 37, 40</td>
<td>23:1-2, 10, 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpers of the accused protagonist</td>
<td>14:3, 6, 8; 15:40-41, 42-47</td>
<td>26:12, 53</td>
<td>22:42; 23:18, 21, 23-25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice made by the protagonist</td>
<td>14:36, 39</td>
<td>26:39, 42, 44</td>
<td>22:42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

191 “Wisdom tale” is Nickelsburg’s term for Genesis 37-50, Ahikar, Esther, Daniel 3: 6, Susanna, 2 Maccabees
### The Elements of Luke’s Paradise Saying (Lk 23:43)

I will now examine the meaning of “paradise” suggested by the other three elements of Luke 23:43 (“today,” “with me” and “amen I say to you”) before moving on to the meaning suggested by the form of Luke 23:39-43 as a whole.

---

“Today (σήμερον) you will be with (μετά) me...”\textsuperscript{194}

The word “today” (σήμερον) in the Lukan narrative can have both soteriological and temporal references. The soteriological uses of “today” are weighted towards the gospel: “today” is the birth of Jesus the saviour (Lk 2:11); the fulfilment of scripture through Jesus’ liberative ministry (Lk 4:21, see vv.18-19); the time when “strange things” (παραστάσεις) are seen (Lk 5:26); the healing and forgiveness of a paralytic (Lk 5:17-26); the time in which Jesus casts out demons and heals the sick (Lk 13:32), and the day of his death in Jerusalem (Lk 13:33); and the day on which salvation comes to Zaccheus’ house (Lk 19:9). The temporal references in Luke’s “today” are either Q sayings (Lk 12:28; cf. Mt 6:30) or Markan borrowings (Lk 22:34, 61; cf. Mk 14:30), or, in one case, has its temporal meaning transformed into a soteriological meaning (Lk 19:5, cf. v.9). The uses of “today” in Acts are weighted towards the temporal meaning (Acts 4:9; 19:40; 20:26; 22:3; 24:21; 26:2, 29; 27:33). In one case there is a soteriological reference: “today” is the day of Jesus’ resurrection (Acts 13:33, cf. v.34; quoting Ps 2:7). A number of the temporal references in Acts also imply “today” as the day on which an apostle or Paul is being judged (Acts 4:9; 24:21; 26:2). Given both the above evidence and positive eschatological nuances of “paradise” in apocalyptic writings of Second Temple Judaism, it seems best to identify “today” in Luke 23:43 as the moment of the second criminal’s salvation, with possible nuances of immediacy (cf. the temporal references) and of being tested (cf. Lk 22:34, 61) or of coming under human judgment (cf. Acts 4:9; 24:21; 26:2).

For the numerous occurrences of “with/ after” (μετά) in Luke-Acts, I will consider only those that take the genitive (meaning “with,” as in Luke 23:43) and eliminate those instances where the object of “with” is impersonal and not a metaphor for a person (which usually indicate the manner in which an action is done, Lk 1:39; 8:13; 9:39; 10:17; 14:9; 17:15, 20; 21:27; 22:52;

\textsuperscript{194} In this section I was dependent upon W. F. Moulton et al., \textit{Concordance to the Greek New Testament}, 6th ed., (London: T&T Clark, 2002), 973 (“today”), 683-684 (“with”).
When God, the Lord or an anthropomorphism of the deity (most often “the hand of the Lord”) is the subject of “with,” the meaning is of divine graciousness and mercy towards human beings, where God is at work in human actions, particularly Jesus’ ministry (Lk 1:28, 58, 66, 72; Acts 2:28; 7:9; 10:38; 11:21; 14:27; 15:4; 18:10; 27:24). There are some similar references to human beings doing good works and being merciful “with” others (Lk 10:37; Acts 9:39; 15:35; 20:18). Most often “with” refers to human companionship, whether in marriage or family life (Lk 2:36; 11:7; 15:31), on a journey (Lk 2:51; 6:17; Acts 24:1), leading an army (Lk 14:31; Acts 7:45), in conversation (Acts 25:12; human-angelic: Acts 7:38), in being reconciled (Lk 23:12), or sharing a meal (where the subject is not Jesus, Lk 6:3, 4; 15:29, 30). The most prominent use of “with” relating to human companionship involves Jesus’ table-fellowship with tax-collectors and “sinners” (Lk 5:29, 30), with a Pharisee (Lk 7:36), and especially with his disciples (Lk 5:34; 22:11, 15, 21; 24:29, 30). There are other references of “with” to Jesus’ companionship with his disciples (Lk 22:28, 33) and the companionship among the disciples after Jesus’ death and resurrection (Acts 9:19, 28; 20:18, 34; before Jesus’ death: Lk 9:49). There are some references of “with” to the physical presence of other people without companionship (Lk 22:53; 24:5; Acts 24:18). Other times it refers to membership in a group without presupposing even physical presence (Lk 12:46; 22:37; Acts 1:26). Beyond companionship and neutrality, “with” can also refer to hostility among human beings, connoting an eschatological judgment scene (Lk 11:32, 33; cf. 12:46), a mundane trial (Lk 12:13), the betrayal of table-fellowship (Lk 22:21), or, in a related usage, connote being on the side of Jesus against hostile opponents (Lk 11:23 twice). Given this complex context of “with” (μετά plus the genitive) in Luke-Acts, I will tentatively advance the claim that its meaning in Luke 23:43 is the second criminal’s companionship with Jesus, perhaps even discipleship, which
was demonstrated in his defence of Jesus against a hostile opponent (Lk 23:40–41), and may have connotations of divine graciousness and mercy enacted through Jesus.

The Use of the “Amen I say to you” Formula in the Synoptic Gospels

The saying under examination in this study, “Amen I say to you, today you will be with me in paradise” (Lk 23:43), takes the form of an “amen” saying, identifiable by its use of the “Amen I say to you...” (ομην λεγω υμιν or ομην λεγω σοι) formula to introduce its content. In the gospels, it always occurs on the lips of Jesus. The dominant use of the “Amen I say to you” formula of Jesus in the synoptic gospels\(^\text{195}\) is that of judgment, whether this is a negative judgment involving punishment, directed to either outsiders or insiders, or a positive judgment involving commendation or reward. There is also use of the “amen” formula in scenes of apocalyptic judgment. There are, however, some uses of the “amen” formula which do not seem to fit these categories of judgment, but take the form of a prediction or prophecy about the future. Since the “amen” saying in Luke 23:43 is joined to the second criminal’s expectation of the “kingdom” (Lk 23:42), special note will be taken where “amen” judgments involve a divine response to a human reaction to the kingdom preached by Jesus. I will also take note of the presence of the theme of “reversal” in Lukan uses of the “amen” formula, since I will argue that a reversal theme is implicit in Luke 23:39-43.

“Amen” Sayings of Prediction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:25</td>
<td>Jesus’ anticipation of his upcoming death and vindication in the last supper narrative.</td>
<td>Jesus’ vindication is his drinking new wine in “the kingdom of God” (Mk 14:25).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{195}\) John’s gospel makes use of a double “amen” formula: “Amen, amen, I say to you...” with “you” in the plural (Jn 1:51; 5:19, 24, 25; 6:26, 32, 47, 53; 8:34, 51, 58; 10:1, 7; 12:24; 13:16, 20, 21; 14:12; 16:20, 23) or singular (Jn 3:5, 11; 13:38; 21:18). Moulton et al., *Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, 50. However, the Johannine use of this formula will not be considered here.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:1// Mt 16:28</td>
<td>Just before Jesus’ transfiguration.</td>
<td>Jesus’ anticipates the imminent arrival of the kingdom, in his generation (Mk 9:1; Mt 16:28).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 24:2</td>
<td>Jesus’ prediction the destruction of the temple, before his apocalyptic discourse.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 4:24</td>
<td>Jesus’ inaugural sermon at Nazareth (Lk 4:16-30). Jesus’ self-application of an “amen” saying about the rejection of a prophet in his home town (Lk 4:24), and his near death at the hands of the Nazarenes (Lk 4:29), suggests that he is anticipating his eventual condemnation and execution in Jerusalem, a city which “kills the prophets” (Lk 13:34).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jesus’ acceptance at Nazareth becomes rejection (Lk 4:22).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In favour of seeing a nuance of prediction in the “amen” saying of Luke 23:43, that verse is phrased in the future tense, and the other Lukan prediction usage (Lk 4:24) is joined to the “today” of salvation (Lk 4:21) and anticipates Luke’s passion narrative. There is, however, a broader set of uses, relating to the theme of judgment. It should be noted a kind of judgment is taking place against Jesus in Luke 4:16-30, insofar as he is condemned and rejected by the people he grew up with.
### “Amen” Sayings of Universal, Apocalyptic Judgment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 25:40, 45</td>
<td>The judgment of the nations by the Son of Man (Mt 25:31), which results in eternal punishment and eternal life (Mt 25:46).</td>
<td>Eternal life is portrayed as a king’s bestowal of a “kingdom” upon the blessed (Mt 25:34).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 13:30// Mt 24:34// Lk 21:32</td>
<td>The apocalyptic discourse of Jesus. The “amen” saying relates to the fulfilment of the final, apocalyptic signs of the coming of the Son of Man as the cosmic judge and saviour of the “elect” (Mk 13:26-27; Mt 24:30-31; Lk 21:27-28).</td>
<td>Present in Luke 21:31; but Mark 13:26, 29; Matthew 24:30, 33 refer to the Son of Man instead of the “kingdom.”</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the final, apocalyptic judgment scene is prophesied with an “amen” saying in all three synoptic gospels, the “amen” saying in Luke 23:43 is addressed to a single individual. Although I tend towards seeing a judgment taking place in Luke 23:43, it is less likely to be a reference to a universal judgment, as in Luke 21:32.

### “Amen” Sayings of Negative Judgment against Outsiders (Polemics)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 3:28</td>
<td>Jesus speaks against his detractors who say he is demon-possessed (Mk 3:22, 30)</td>
<td>Jesus argues that his exorcisms are the overthrow of Satan’s kingdom (Mk 3:24), suggesting invasion by the kingdom of God.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location of “amen” saying</strong></td>
<td><strong>Context</strong></td>
<td><strong>Relation to the “kingdom”</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presence of a “reversal” theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mk 8:12</strong></td>
<td>Jesus rebukes the Pharisees and “this generation” who demand a sign (Mk 8:11-12).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mk 11:23</strong></td>
<td>The cursing of the fig tree, symbolising a judgment on the temple (Mk 11:12-25).¹⁹⁶</td>
<td>The judgment of the Jerusalem authorities (Mk 11:13) rests on their unreadiness for the herald of “the coming kingdom” (Mk 11:10).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt 6:2, 5, 16</strong></td>
<td>Jesus’ polemic against the “hypocrites” who perform works of piety to be praised by others (Mt 6:1-18)</td>
<td>A prayer for the coming of the kingdom is inserted into this polemic (Mt 6:9-13)</td>
<td>These “hypocrites” praised by other human beings are not rewarded by the Father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt 10:15</strong></td>
<td>Jesus’ pronouncement of eschatological judgment against “that town” (Mt 10:15) which rejects Jesus’ disciples.</td>
<td>The disciples are missionaries of the “kingdom” (Mt 10:7-8).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mt 21:31</strong></td>
<td>Jesus’ polemic against the “high priests and elders of the people” (Mt 21:23)</td>
<td>Jesus’ targets are not entering “the kingdom of God” (Mt 21:31)</td>
<td>Disreputable members of society (“tax collectors and prostitutes”), however, are following “the way of righteousness” into the kingdom (Mt 21:31-32).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The polemical uses of the “amen” saying as a judgment against outsiders to Jesus’ circle of disciples is not present in Luke. Furthermore, although the second criminal is an “outsider” to his own society, he is not so to Jesus, and the promise of paradise is unlikely to be a negative judgment.

“**Amen**” Sayings of Negative Judgment against Insiders (Warnings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 23:36</td>
<td>Jesus’ polemic against “this generation” (Mt 23:36), identified as “scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites” in seven woes (Mt 23:13, 15, 16, 23, 25, 27, 29).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:15// Lk 18:17// Mt 18:3</td>
<td>Jesus’ warning to the disciples about the necessity of becoming children.</td>
<td>A saying about entry into the “kingdom.”</td>
<td>The kingdom belongs to the “least,” the servants and children. In order to become great, a disciple must become least.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:18// Mt 26:21</td>
<td>Jesus’ warning to the disciples that “one of you will betray me”: Judas Iscariot.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:30// Mt 26:34</td>
<td>Jesus’ warning to Peter about his threefold denial.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 5:26</td>
<td>Jesus’ warning to his disciples about anger and judgment against each other.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 18:18</td>
<td>Jesus’ warning to his disciples about the refusal to reconcile with each other.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although I see the second criminal as an insider in relation to Jesus, and although an “amen” warning is directed to Jesus’ disciples in Luke 18:17, it is unlikely that Jesus is warning the second criminal about not entering the kingdom of God in Luke 23:43. Where Luke 18:17 may be relevant, however, is the fact that Jesus makes becoming “least” or a child the necessary condition for entering the kingdom (Lk 18:15-17). The second criminal lowers himself, by calling himself deserving of his crucifixion, while exalting Jesus by proclaiming his innocence (Lk 23:41; compare the tax collector in Luke 18:9-14).

### “Amen” Sayings of Positive Judgment (Acts of Praise)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mt 19:23</td>
<td>After the rich young man’s failure to follow Jesus (Mt 19:22), Jesus warns his disciples about wealth.</td>
<td>Wealth is a hindrance to entering “the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 19:23).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 25:12</td>
<td>The parable of the ten virgins (Mt 25:1-13), where Jesus warns against the lack of vigilance in waiting for the master’s return.</td>
<td>This is a parable about “the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 25:1).</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 12:43</td>
<td>Jesus praises the widow who gives her last two pennies to the temple treasury.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jesus rebukes the scribes (Mk 12:38) who consume widows’ houses and therefore “receive the greater judgment” (Mk 12:40).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of “amen” saying</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Relation to the “kingdom”</td>
<td>Presence of a “reversal” theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 14:9//Mt 26:13</td>
<td>Jesus commends the unnamed woman who anoints his head for imminent burial (Mk 14:3; Mt 26:7), who will be praised wherever the gospel is preached (Mk 14:9; Mt 26:13).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 8:10</td>
<td>Jesus praises the centurion for his faith in Jesus’ authority to heal the sick (Mt 8:10)</td>
<td>The centurion’s faith is a sign of the world’s multitudes entering “the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 8:11).</td>
<td>While the multitudes enter the kingdom, “the sons of the kingdom” will be thrown out (Mt 8:12).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 11:11</td>
<td>Jesus praises John the Baptist as the greatest “born of women” (Mt 11:11).</td>
<td>John’s greatness is contrasted with those in the kingdom (Mt 11:11).</td>
<td>The “least” in the kingdom are greater than John (Mt 11:11).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although I see it as much more likely that the “amen” saying in Luke 23:43 involves Jesus’ positive evaluation of the second criminal, there are no other clear uses of the “amen” saying in Luke as purely praise without some promise of a concrete reward.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Amen” Sayings of Positive Judgment (Promises of Reward)</th>
<th>Location of “amen” saying</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Relation to the “kingdom”</th>
<th>Presence of a “reversal” theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mk 10:29-30//Mt 19:28-29//Lk 18:29-30</td>
<td>After Jesus’ encounter with the rich young man (Mk 10:17-22; Mt 19:16-22; Lk 18:18-23).</td>
<td>The failure of the rich young man is a reflection on the difficulty of entering the kingdom (Mk 10:23-27; Mt 19:23-26; Lk 18:24-27).</td>
<td>The one who refuses to leave all to follow Jesus does not find the kingdom, but the disciples who have left all gain eternal life (Mk 10:29-30; Mt 19:28-29; Lk 18:29-30).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of “amen” saying</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Relation to the “kingdom”</td>
<td>Presence of a “reversal” theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mk 9:41// Mt 10:42</td>
<td>Jesus promises a “reward” (μισθόν) to those who show hospitality towards his “least” disciples (Mk 9:41; Mt 10:42).</td>
<td>Scandalising one of the “least ones” is tied to non-entry into “the kingdom of God” (Mk 9:42, 47).</td>
<td>Jesus shows his concerns for his “least ones” (Mk 9:41-42), serving whom is a sign of true greatness for Christian leaders (Mk 9:34-35). Jesus defines discipleship (Mt 10:38) in terms of the twofold reversal between seeking/losing oneself and losing (for Jesus’ sake)/finding oneself (Mt 10:39).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 5:18</td>
<td>The immutability of the Torah, and Jesus’ fulfilment of it (Mt 5:18).</td>
<td>Doing or not doing the commandments is linked to one’s status (being great or being least) in “the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 5:19).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 13:17</td>
<td>Jesus blesses his disciples, because his words and deeds are the fulfilment of the hopes “the prophets and the righteous” (Mt 13:16-17).</td>
<td>The disciples, in receiving Jesus’ message, have been given “knowledge” of “the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven” (Mt 13:11).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location of “amen” saying</td>
<td>Context</td>
<td>Relation to the “kingdom”</td>
<td>Presence of a “reversal” theme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 21:21</td>
<td>Jesus promises a divine answer to those who pray trustfully (Mt 21:21-22). Although Matthew 21:21 parallels Mark 11:23, unlike the context in Mark, the context in Matthew does not necessitate an anti-temple reading.¹⁹⁷</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt 24:47// Lk 12:37</td>
<td>Jesus’ contrast of the faithful slave with the unfaithful slave (Mt 24:45-51; Lk 12:35-46).</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The slave who acts like a lord when his master is away is punished on his return. The faithful slave, however, is entrusted with all the master’s possessions (Mt 24:47; Lk 12:44).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Lukan use of the “amen” formula to have Jesus promise a reward to his faithful disciples is the most probable use of it in Luke 23:43. In the background to the word “paradise” examined in Chapter II, paradise was often a reward which God judged the righteous worthy to receive. Luke makes at least two uses of the “amen” formula as a promise of reward. First, this promise is of eternal life for Jesus’ disciples who leave everything to follow him (Lk 18:29-30), and who are able to enter the kingdom because they are not tied down by wealth (Lk 18:24-27). Second, this promise is for the faithful slave, who having fulfilled his duties, is served like a lord by his master, who now humbles himself to become a slave (Lk 12:37). The second criminal has already lost everything, but shows that he prepared to lose even the final respect of his executioners and his companion by defending Jesus against their slander.

¹⁹⁷ Telford, Barren Temple, 82-84.
(Lk 23:36-42). The second criminal also finds the service he performed for Jesus reciprocated: just as he acted as Jesus’ advocate, so now Jesus becomes the second criminal’s advocate (Lk 23:40-43). It appears that Luke 23:43 is the promise of an eschatological reward to one of Jesus’ disciples. In particular, the second criminal, like a good disciple, has shown an assured expectation of the kingdom proclaimed by Jesus (Lk 23:42). However, it may be asked in what sense this man responds to the kingdom and so finds “paradise.” One approach reasons that he is repenting of his sins, exemplified by the phrase, “For we committed deeds worthy of what we are receiving” (Lk 23:41). However, I will suggest an alternative: the second criminal is actually making a defence speech of Jesus, vindicating him against the first criminal who accuses Jesus (Lk 23:39-42). From this perspective, Luke 23:41 is not so much the criminal’s own confession of sins, but a call to repentance directed to those who slander Jesus, set within the wider context of a forensic (“judicial”) defence of Jesus. It is this judicial defence of Jesus which is often repeated in the apostles’ witness to him in the Acts of the Apostles. The second criminal’s defence of Jesus forms the lead up to his expectation that, ultimately, Jesus will be vindicated by his entry into (or coming with) the kingdom he proclaimed (Lk 23:42). Luke’s “paradise” would then be the eschatological vindication of those who defend Jesus by theirs words and actions.

Luke 23:39-43 as a Trial Scene

I will now argue that the literary form of Luke 23:39-43 can be best described as trial scene, with accusation (v.39), defence (vv.40-42), and verdict (v.43). It is, however, an unusual trial scene, insofar as the accusation of Jesus presumes that he is the defendant, but the defence of

---

Jesus presupposes that he is not just a defendant, but in another sense, judge. Jesus himself assumes the role of judge in giving the verdict on the one who defended him and appealed to him as judge. In order to justify my claim that Luke 23:39-43 is a trial scene, I will examine the literary form of forensic rhetoric found in Greco-Roman oratory, before picking out Luke’s own forensic tendencies found in the trial scenes of Luke-Acts, before my analysis of Luke 23:39-43.

The Form of Forensic Speeches in the Greco-Roman World

Aristotle is responsible for the classical division of oratory into the three categories of epideictic, deliberative and forensic rhetoric.199 His views on forensic rhetoric, as found in The Art of Rhetoric, are of interest to this study. The treatise Rhetoric to Alexander, attributed to Aristotle, is a pseudo-Aristotelian work, possibly written by Anaximenes of Lampsacus in the generation after Aristotle’s death.200 However, it is still useful as a witness to the Hellenistic tradition of oratory. These rhetorical traditions were adapted by Roman authors and orators. One witness to this adaptation is an early work of Cicero, De Inventione (“On Finding”), which uses the Greek orator Hermagoras as its principal source and deals mostly with forensic rhetoric. If we presume that Luke was from the eastern part of the Roman empire, studying the early, “Asianist” period of Cicero’s oratorical career is more likely to be of help than studying his later, refined “Atticist” period.201 Continuing the Greco-Roman tradition of reflecting upon the art of oratory into the late first century C.E. is Quintilian, a

199 Epideictic rhetoric seeks to praise or blame some well known person for the entertainment of a crowd, deliberative rhetoric seeks to guide government decision-making in adopting or rejecting a proposed course of action, forensic rhetoric seeks to justify or condemn someone in a court trial.
Latin author who draws upon a range of rhetoricians’ views of his era. Of these four authors, most weight will be put on Quintilian, because he seems to best represent the state of forensic oratory in the Roman empire at the time Luke wrote his gospel. In particular, I will assume Quintilian’s five-fold division of the forensic speech, in accordance with “most authorities,” into prologue (prooemium), narration (narratio), proof (probatio), refutation (refutatio), and epilogue (peroratio).

In dealing with any judicial case, there is the fundamental basis (status) around which the case revolves. According to Quintilian, this is not so much the first question asked in a conflict, but the essential question upon which the conflict arises. This can be conjectural (coniectura): whether or not an act was committed; definitive (finitio): if an act is admitted, what that act essentially was, whether good or bad, just or unjust; and qualitative (qualitas): if an unjust act is admitted, what attendant circumstances ameliorate, excuse or worsen the crime. As Quintilian succinctly quotes Cicero on this matter, each forensic case revolves one of the three questions, sitne, quid sit, quale sit? (“Is it, what is it, what kind is it?”).

According to Aristotle, the prologue (προοίμιον) should clarify the case for the audience. Here the advocate (ἀπολογουμένος) can dispel the prejudices about the defendant, which were insinuated into the audience’s minds by the accuser’s (κατηγορητής) epilogue. Techniques available to advocate are clearing him or herself of suspicion, disputing the accuser’s argument, ameliorating the gravity of the crime, and making a counter-accusation

---

202 Kraus, "Theories and Practice of the Enthymeme," 96.
204 Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, III.6.4-5.
205 Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, III.6.4-5, 66-67, 76-80.
206 Quintilian, Institutio Oratoria, III.6.44, Quoting Cicero, Ad Brutum, XIV.45.
of the accuser in order to bring him or her into disrepute.\footnote{Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.15.1-3, 7.} Above all, both orators ought to use their prologue to steer their audience towards their own advantage by manipulating their emotions towards the defendant, or by making them more attentive (or more distracted) to the case at hand.\footnote{Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.14.7.} The treatise \textit{To Alexander} sees the prologue as an opportunity for the prosecutor to win the court’s favour through praise of their client and speaking ill of their opponent, or by at least neutralising negative bias towards their client.\footnote{Pseudo-Aristotle, “Rhetoric to Alexander,” 1441b-1442b.} The advocate should use the prologue to concentrate on attacking the weaker charges and denying the motives attributed to the defendant, or at least argue that any act admitted by the defendant was just, legal or done in ignorance.\footnote{Pseudo-Aristotle, “Rhetoric to Alexander,” 1443b-1444a.} Likewise, both Cicero and Quintilian see the prologue’s (\textit{exordium}) purpose as making the audience “well-disposed [\textit{benivolum}], attentive [\textit{attentum}] and receptive [\textit{docilem}]” to the rest of the speech.\footnote{Marcus Tullius Cicero, “De Inventione,” in \textit{De Inventione; De Opímo Genere Oratorum; Topica}, ed. H. M. Hubbell, LCL. (London: Heinemann, 1949), LXV.20; Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.1.5.} Techniques for the prologue advocated by both Cicero and Quintilian are the \textit{principium}, a clear and upfront address to a favourable audience, and the \textit{insinuatio}, which aims to subtly confuse or obscure the thoughts of a hostile audience.\footnote{Cicero, "De Inventione," I.XV.20-21; XVII.23; Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.1.42.} Quintilian adds a third technique for the prologue, the \textit{apostrophe}, which involves turning away from the judge to rebuke one’s legal opponent for their abusive language or unfair advantage, while the real target audience remains the judge and the goal winning his or her favour.\footnote{Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.1.66-68.}

According to Aristotle, the \textit{narration} (\textit{η διήγησις}) should not be too long or too short, but only demonstrate the essential points of one’s case: whether an act was committed, or whether it was unjust or harmful.\footnote{Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.16.4.} The narration on the defendant’s behalf should be
especially short.\textsuperscript{217} Narrations should also demonstrate the moral character of the person being defended or accused, by describing their virtues or vices, or by making their emotional state at the time of the alleged crime evident in the way their actions are described.\textsuperscript{218} Cicero regards the narration (\textit{narratio}), as “an account of the relevant events which happened or supposedly happened.”\textsuperscript{219} Forensic narrations, unlike those of other speeches, “should be brief, clear and plausible.”\textsuperscript{220} This means the omission of unnecessary details (for brevity), logical ordering, simplicity and relevance (for clarity), and realistic portrayal of events and characters (for plausibility).\textsuperscript{221} Quintilian disagrees with “many” others that the narration is “always” necessary.\textsuperscript{222} However, he sees two roles for the narration: dealing with the actual actions of which the defendant is accused of (\textit{narratio} \textit{ipsius causae}), or dealing with attendant circumstances of direct relevance (\textit{rerum ad causam pertinentum expositum}).\textsuperscript{223} These attendant circumstances include the moral characters of those involved, those circumstances which justify or worsen the alleged action, and reasons for hostility against the defendant which may be the real motivation for the trial.\textsuperscript{224} Importantly, the narration, for Quintilian, is not meant merely to inform, but to persuade.\textsuperscript{225}

\textit{Proofs} (\textit{πιστεις}), for Aristotle, should demonstrate one’s case precisely on the point under dispute: whether an act was committed, or whether it was injurious, significant or unjust.\textsuperscript{226} Forensic oratory makes best use of enthymemes (\textit{ἐνθυμηματα}),\textsuperscript{227} but these should be used sparingly, and not for arousing emotions nor for demonstrating moral character.\textsuperscript{228} Aristotle

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{218} Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.16.8-10.
\textsuperscript{219} Cicero, "De Inventione," I.XIX.27.
\textsuperscript{220} Cicero, "De Inventione," I.XX.28; see also Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.2.36, 40, 52.
\textsuperscript{221} Cicero, "De Inventione," I.XX.28-29.
\textsuperscript{222} Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.2.4-8.
\textsuperscript{223} Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.2.11.
\textsuperscript{224} Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.2.12-18.
\textsuperscript{225} Quintilian, \textit{Institutio Oratoria}, IV.2.21, 31.
\textsuperscript{226} Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.17.1.
\textsuperscript{227} Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.17.5.
\textsuperscript{228} Aristotle, \textit{The Art of Rhetoric}, III.17.7-8.
\end{flushright}
also alludes to the five “informal” (ἀτέχνων) methods of forensic oratory for producing conviction: “laws, witnesses, contracts, torture, oaths.” Witnesses (μάρτυρες) include those ancient writers (οἱ παλαιοί) who have assumed canonical authority in the society, and recent witnesses (οἱ πρόσφοροι) who have either set a precedent for the current case or are present at the trial to give direct testimony. To Alexander identifies two means of evidence as the testimony of witnesses and confessions obtained by torture. For Cicero, the proofs (confirmatio) are the arguments in favour of one’s case, which “are either made to seem likely or demonstrated to be necessary.” The arguments from “necessity” employ cause-and-effect chains, “dilemmas” (per complexionem) or “simple inference” (per simplicem conclusionem). A “dilemma” presents two alternatives, both of which serve to refute the opponent. A “simple inference” argues “a necessary consequence” of some point already conceded. A “probable” argument, on the other hand, bases itself on what generally happens or what most people believe, which includes something observable by all (signum) and the audience’s opinions (credibile). Quintilian regards the proofs to be the most necessary part of the speech. He clarifies the “informal” (inartificiales, ἀτεχνων) proofs as those pieces of evidence external to the speech itself: “previous court decisions (praecidicia), rumours, tortures, written testimony, oaths and witnesses (testes).” For Quintilian, the witnesses can include the gods (divina testimonia), mediated through “oracles, prophecies and omens,” as well as “soothsayers, augurs, diviners and
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The previous court decisions can be either legal precedents or prior rulings on the same case. Quintilian considers it very unlikely that a Roman court would “reverse” (refelluntur) a prior ruling on the same case, except perhaps in the case of obvious error or injustice, because the judge would not want to create a precedent where his or her own rulings would be also called into question. Against the judgment of the highest courts, the senate, the rulers and the magistrates, “there is no remedy.”

According to Aristotle, refutations (ἕλεγκτικά) are easier to argue than positive proofs, because of their greater clarity to the audience. Usually the second speaker would argue his case positively first, except when his opponent has put forward strong arguments, in which case the refutation would be uttered before the positive proofs. Strategies to avoid in the refutation are praising one’s own moral character or speaking ill of the opponent’s, which create a bad impression in the audience, except when praise or blame is placed on the lips of a third (absent) person. In To Alexander, the prosecutor should anticipate the advocate’s arguments by making them harder to argue by the way he or she presents the case, even prejudicing the judges against granting pardon. The advocate, on the other hand, can refute his or her opponent by conceding the charge while simultaneously justifying their client’s action. According to Cicero, the refutation (reprehensio) seeks to destroy or weaken the opponent’s positive arguments (as a “counter-argument,” adversariorum confirmatio), by “[attacking] the same methods of reasoning by which it can be supported.”
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conclusions follow from its premises, (iii) rejecting the particular methodology of the argument, or (iv) by presenting a stronger argument for the opposing side.  

Finally, the epilogue (ἐπίλογος), according to Aristotle, ought to aim at four targets: (i) appealing for the audience’s favour; (ii) augmenting the speaker’s case while undermining the opponent’s; (iii) stirring the audience’s emotions to the speaker’s advantage; and (iv) reminding the audience of the case demonstrated.\(^{250}\) To Alexander sees the epilogue as a final summing-up, in which the prosecutor ought to reiterate the charge against the defendant (ἡ αἰτία) to provoke the audience to hostility for the defendant and sympathy for the plaintiff.\(^{251}\) The advocate ought also to win the judges over, by portraying the defendant as their benefactor (inspiring compassion) and the plaintiff as a malefactor (inspiring envy).\(^{252}\)

Cicero documents three ways of ending the speech (conclusio): (i) the speaker’s sums up all their arguments (enumeratio); (ii) the speaker makes a final attack on their opponent to bring them into the judge’s contempt (indignatio); or (iii) the speaker makes a final plea to the judges for their sympathy and compassion on behalf of the speaker’s client (conquestio).\(^{253}\) Quintilian likewise argues that the epilogue can appeal either to the information given (enumeratio) or the judge’s and audience’s emotions:\(^{254}\) the accuser would try to excite anger, while the advocate would attempt to soften the judge, both striving to secure the court’s goodwill at the expense of their opponent.\(^{255}\)

---

\(^{249}\) Cicero, “De Inventione,” I.XLII.79.


\(^{251}\) Pseudo-Aristotle, “Rhetoric to Alexander,” 1443b.


\(^{253}\) Cicero, “De Inventione,” I.LII.98.

\(^{254}\) Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, VI.1.1.

\(^{255}\) Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, VI.1.9-11.

Keeping in mind Richard Burridge’s caveat that classical rhetorical theory is not necessarily immediately applicable to the gospels in general, his observation of Luke’s ease with different styles of rhetoric suggests the possibility that this evangelist received a rhetorical education. This section is based on the hypothesis that there are some points of contact between Luke’s rhetorical style and the rhetoric of the Greek and Roman theorists.

The forensic speeches of the Lukan narrative seem to follow the basic pattern outlined above, with the order occasionally re-arranged, especially when the refutation comes before other parts of the speech. Occasionally the speech is cut short by what happens in the narrative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>Narration</th>
<th>Proofs</th>
<th>Refutation</th>
<th>Epilogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peter to the Sanhedrin (Acts 4:8b-12)</td>
<td>Address (v.8b)</td>
<td>Death and resurrection of Jesus (v.10)</td>
<td>Scriptural evidence (v.11) Note: the healing (v.10) functions as a “probable” proof of Jesus’ saving power: the signum or observable reality.</td>
<td>Re-definition of an “illicit” act as a good deed (v.9)</td>
<td>Appeal to believe in Jesus as the only saviour (v.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter and the apostles to the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:29-32)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus for Israel’s repentance and forgiveness of sins (vv.30-31)</td>
<td>Witness of the apostles and of God’s Holy Spirit (v.32)</td>
<td>Against charge of disobedience: priority of obeying God over human beings (v.29b)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speech</th>
<th>Prologue</th>
<th>Narration</th>
<th>Proofs</th>
<th>Refutation</th>
<th>Epilogue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen to his accusers (Acts 7:2-53)</td>
<td>Address, appeal to listen (v.2)</td>
<td>Recital of Israel’s history (vv.3-50)</td>
<td>Defending God’s fidelity to Israel, through Abraham (vv.3-8, 17), Joseph (vv.9-15), and Moses (vv.19-37)</td>
<td>Against the charge of disobedience to Torah: Israel’s infidelity through idolatry (vv.39-43); against the charge of dishonouring the temple: relativisation of the temple (vv.44-50)</td>
<td>Final attack on the accusers, in which the point of the whole speech becomes clear (vv.51-53). This epilogue is an <em>indignatio</em> of Stephen against his own accusers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul before the chiliarch (Acts 21:37-22:29)</td>
<td>Asking the judge permission to speak, appeal to the audience to listen (21:37-22:2)</td>
<td>Paul’s account of his former life and reasons for change (22:3-21)</td>
<td>Paul’s former <em>piety and zeal</em> in persecuting Christians (22:3-5), a <em>heavenly vision</em> provokes change (22:6-11), Ananias’ well-known <em>piety</em> (22:12-16), further <em>divine</em> commissioning (22:17-21)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>- [The rest of Paul’s speech is prevented by the interruption of the crowd condemning Paul (21:22)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech</strong></td>
<td><strong>Prologue</strong></td>
<td><strong>Narration</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proofs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Refutation</strong></td>
<td><strong>Epilogue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul before the Sanhedrin (Acts 22:30-23:11)</strong></td>
<td>Paul opens his speech by testifying to his clean conscience (23:1b). After an interruption, Paul re-open his speech by confusing his hostile judges, setting them up against each other (insinuatio, 23:6)</td>
<td>- [The rest of Paul’s speech is made impossible by the ensuing chaos (23:7-10)]</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tertullus’ prosecution of Paul (Acts 24:2-9)</strong></td>
<td>Flattery of the judge, call to listen (vv.2-4)</td>
<td>Account of two charges: Paul’s disobedience to universal Roman authority (v.5) and to local Judean temple authority (v.6)</td>
<td>The common knowledge of the judge and the Jews is presumed as proof: this is the “probable” proof of the credibile (vv.8-9)</td>
<td>- [Paul has not yet made his speech.]</td>
<td>An implicit appeal to the judge (v.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul’s defence against Tertullus (Acts 24:10-21)</strong></td>
<td>Flattery of the judge (vv.10b-11a)</td>
<td>Re-telling of Paul’s activities in order to support his case (vv.17-20)</td>
<td>Paul’s virtues: Jewish faith, hope in the resurrection, blameless conscience (vv.14-16)</td>
<td>Refutation that Paul is anti-temple or anti-Roman (vv.11b-13)</td>
<td>Final appeal to the judge to believe in the resurrection of the dead (v.21)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Paul before Agrippa (Acts 26:2-23)

**Prologue**
Address, flattery, appeal to listen (vv.2-3)

**Narration**
Paul’s account of his former life and reasons for change (vv.4-21)

**Proofs**
Confrontation and commissioning by the heavenly Jesus as justification for change (vv.13-18). Paul’s virtue in carrying out this commission (vv.19-21)

**Refutation**
- [The audience here is curious rather than hostile.]

**Epilogue**
Summing up of the evidence for Paul’s gospel: Moses and the prophets (enumeratio, vv.22-23). Further appeal to the judge to believe Paul’s gospel (vv.26-27)

I will now outline what I believe are the basic tendencies of Luke’s forensic rhetorical style, in the context of Greco-Roman oratory. First, when the trial scenes involve accusations against the protagonists, they often make or imply a counter-accusation against their accusers in their defence. According to Quintilian, “proofs” or the confirmatio could take the form of a counter-accusation (ἀντικατηγορία), a technique used by Cicero in one of his first defence speeches: this was “an attempt to fix the responsibility for the crime onto another person.”

**Use of counter-accusation in defence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Content of counter-accusation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s trial of Jesus</td>
<td>Luke 22:67b-68</td>
<td>Of lack of faith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s first trial of some of the twelve</td>
<td>Acts 4:10</td>
<td>Of crucifying Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s second trial of some of the twelve</td>
<td>Acts 5:28</td>
<td>Implied by the judges: of unjust execution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trial of Stephen</td>
<td>Acts 7:27-28, 35, 39-41</td>
<td>Implied by Stephen: of Israel’s infidelity to God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, as noted in the previous section, there is *stasis* theory: the basis, or fundamental question, on which an orator mounts his or her argument. The trials of Jesus in Luke’s gospel seem to operate on the basis of conjecture: does Jesus make false claims about himself or not, has Jesus committed an act of rebellion against Rome or not? Most trials of Christians in Acts, on the other hand, operate on the basis of definition, rather than conjecture: the protagonists do not so much deny the actions attributed to them by their accusers (proclaiming Jesus), but re-define those acts as just in the sight of God. These bases are, of course, more implicit than explicit.

**Trials with *status coniecturalis***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Content of counter-accusation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s trial of Stephen</td>
<td>Acts 7:51-53</td>
<td>Of the accusers’ infidelity to God, by opposing the holy spirit, by killing the “righteous one,” by not keeping the law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s trial of Paul</td>
<td>Acts 23:3, but cf. v.5 (retraction of accusation)</td>
<td>Of physical abuse, accompanied by an invocation of the <em>lex talionis</em> on the high priest who ordered Paul to be struck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Fundamental Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s first trial of Jesus</td>
<td>Luke 22:67a, 70a, 71</td>
<td>Does Jesus claim to be the Christ? Does Jesus claim to be the Son of God? Implicit verdict of guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontius Pilate’s second trial of Jesus</td>
<td>Luke 23:2-3a, 4</td>
<td>Does Jesus stir up the people, hinder taxes to Caesar and make himself a king or not? Verdict of innocence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontius Pilate’s first trial of Jesus</td>
<td>Luke 23:14-15</td>
<td>Does Jesus stir up the people or not? Verdict of innocence. Pilate also interprets Herod’s trial of Jesus as “he has done nothing worthy of death.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The governor Felix’s trial of Paul</td>
<td>Acts 24:5-6, 11-13</td>
<td>Against Tertullus’ accusations, Paul directly denies actions against the temple or Rome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The governor Festus’ trial of Paul</td>
<td>Acts 25:5</td>
<td>Festus’ stated motive is to determine whether Paul has done anything “out of place” in which he is accused of.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Trials with *status finitionis***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Fundamental Argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s first trial of some of the twelve</td>
<td>Acts 4:9</td>
<td>Healing a lame man is argued to be a good deed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This brings us to the third point: those involved in the trials often appeal to higher judicial authorities than those judging them, whether it is the apostles appealing to God, Paul working his way up the imperial chain to Caesar, or Jesus to the Son of Man. As noted in the previous section, appeal to divine testimony, mediated through oracles, auguries, omens and so on, could form a legitimate line of argument in the ancient world. The appeal to higher authorities, such Paul’s appeal to be judged by Caesar, presupposes that a more authoritative court could overturn the decision of a lesser court, but not vice versa. The apostles’ appeal to a higher authority in the form of the God of Israel presupposes a shared theological outlook between Luke and his audience, which would have carried no weight in a real Roman court, and which earns the apostles only greater hostility from the Sanhedrin.

**Appeal to higher authorities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Content of appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s trial of Jesus</td>
<td>Luke 22:69</td>
<td>Jesus appeals to the Son of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s first trial of some of the twelve</td>
<td>Acts 4:19</td>
<td>Peter and John appeal to God in questioning the Sanhedrin’s command to silence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

260 Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, V.2.2-5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Content of appeal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s second trial of the twelve</td>
<td>Acts 5:29,</td>
<td>Peter and the apostles appeal to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trial of Stephen</td>
<td>Acts 7:59-60</td>
<td>Stephen appeals to Jesus seen as the Son of Man to accept his spirit and forgive his executioners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The chiliarch’s trial of Paul with the diaspora Jews</td>
<td>Acts 22:6-11</td>
<td>Paul appeals to divine authority, in the form of a heavenly vision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The governor Festus’ trial of Paul</td>
<td>Acts 25:11</td>
<td>Paul appeals to be judged by Caesar over Festus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Agrippa’s trial of Paul</td>
<td>Acts 26:32</td>
<td>Re-iteration of Paul’s appeal to Caesar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fourthly, in some cases the appeal to God as the true judge is confirmed by divine assistance to the protagonists. This is an implicit “proof” for Luke’s audience: the apostles’ appeal to God is shown to be justified by God’s actions on behalf of the apostles. In the background of Acts, God himself acts as an advocate, co-judge and co-witness of the apostles, Stephen and Paul. This results in an ongoing trial throughout Luke-Acts, which calls those involved to make a decision about the person of Jesus Christ.

**Divine assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Nature of assistance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s first trial of some of the twelve</td>
<td>Acts 4:8a</td>
<td>Peter speaks with the co-testimony of the Holy Spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter’s trial of Ananias and Saphira</td>
<td>Acts 5:5-6,</td>
<td>Implicit divine execution of Peter’s judgment against Ananias and Saphira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trial of Stephen</td>
<td>Acts 6:15</td>
<td>Implicit in Stephen’s angelic appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trial of Stephen</td>
<td>Acts 7:55-56</td>
<td>Stephen’s vision of Jesus in heaven as the Son of Man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sanhedrin’s trial of Paul</td>
<td>Acts 23:11</td>
<td>The Lord’s appearance to Paul in a dream after a trial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I wish to argue that the dialogue between the two criminals and Jesus takes the form of a trial scene: a short narrative depicting accusation, counter-accusation and defence of a third party between two opponents. In short, we have here an informal, judicial trial of Jesus involving the two crucified criminals. This pericope is not a full-blown forensic speech which the
ancient Greek orators may have given in a formal judicial setting, but a bare skeleton of several speeches in a narrative format.

In the following analysis of Luke 23:39-43, we see some elements of Greco-Roman forensic rhetoric. Both speeches of the two criminals have at least a statement of the case and a supporting reason. The accusatory nature of the first criminal’s speech and the defensive stance of the second criminal’s speech identify these as short forensic speeches. It is possible that the first criminal’s speech could also be seen as a vituperative speech (a negative epideictic speech, in which a person’s failings are ridiculed for the entertainment of a crowd). However, key motifs in the second criminal’s speech (fearing God, being under judgment, guilt and innocence) identify this as a forensic scene, in line with the trial scenes of Luke-Acts. Both speeches of the criminals are suggestive of a desire to please a judge. In the case of the first criminal, the judges are those who have already condemned Jesus, such as the leaders of the people and Pilate represented by his soldiers (Lk 23:35, 36, 39). In the case of the second criminal, Jesus himself is the judge to whom he appeals (Lk 23:42). His expectation that Jesus will, despite his condemnation, inherit a kingdom should be compared to the judicial role civil rulers often play in Luke-Acts (Pilate, Herod, Felix, Festus, Agrippa, implicitly Caesar). Whereas the speech of the first criminal contains only an accusation with a supporting reason, the speech of the second contains more of the elements of a forensic speech: a prologue in the form of a counter-accusation, a series of arguments supporting the counter-accusation (which are suggestive of a common narrative known to both criminals), a refutation in which the first criminal’s accusation is denied, and the supporting reasons for the refutation implicit in the epilogue, or final appeal, to Jesus.

**Lk 23:39**  
*One of the hanging criminals was slandering him, saying,*  
"*Are you not the Christ? Save yourself and us!*"

**Accusation**  
Introduction: accuser’s speech  
Accusation: Jesus is a pseudo-messiah  
Reason: he cannot save, as is evident by the fact that he
is still hanging on the cross, and will be until he dies.
This implies the use of an enthymeme: one cannot both claim to be a saviour and fail to save himself; but this applies to Jesus; therefore Jesus is not the Christ he claims to be.
The first criminal’s case against Jesus is also (implicitly) backed up by a previous court decision: that of Pontius Pilate (Lk 23:24). This shown in the way he sides with the mocking leaders (Lk 23:35), who pushed for Pilate’s condemnation of Jesus, and the mocking Roman soldiers (Lk 23:36-37), who represent Pilate as his executioners.

Lk 23:40  But, while answering, the other rebuked him, and said,

“Do you not fear God,
Because/that (ὅτι) you are under the same judgment?
Lk 23:41  And we indeed justly
For we committed deeds worthy of what we are receiving;

But this one did nothing out of place.”

Reasons a-c forms a miniature, implicit narration, implying a life history known to both criminals. This narration supports the counter-accusation of the prologue, therefore functioning also as a series of proofs.

Refutation
The second criminal now presents the case for Jesus’ acquittal – his innocence – which refutes the claim that he is worthy of the judgment he is suffering, in contrast to both himself and the first criminal. The knowledge of Jesus’ life which Luke assumes in his audience supports this refutation.
The second criminal’s argument also operates on the basis of an enthymeme: one cannot make a just condemnation of an innocent person while being guilty himself; but the first criminal has done this; therefore his accusation is unjust.
The lack of an explicit narration to back up this point about the character of Jesus is best explained by the assumption Luke is making about his audience. They have already heard his long narration (Luke’s καθέξις, which has been influenced by many δύναμιν; Lk 1:1,
Lk 23:42  And he said,

“Jesus, remember me whenever you will come in(to) your kingdom.”

Lk 23:43  And he said to him,

“Amen I say to you,

Today you will be with me in paradise.”

3) about the life and character of Jesus: another is not needed here.

Epilogue

The second criminal now makes his appeal for mercy to the judge, Jesus. Mention of Jesus’ kingdom implicitly rebuts the first criminal’s claim that Jesus is a pretender, as the inscription of his charge implies (Lk 23:38). The appeal presupposes that Jesus is able to save him, which clarifies the basis of the refutation.

Verdict

Introduction: Jesus’ speech

Formal element: pronouncement of judgment, in this case, a promise of salvation.

Content of judgment: imminent salvation, in the form companionship with the soon to be vindicated judge/judged in “paradise.”

This pericope shows signs of the tendencies of the trial scenes in Luke-Acts. First, the second criminal makes use of counter-accusation in defending Jesus. Secondly, the basic question around which this trial revolves is whether Jesus is who he says he is. The first criminal denies straight out that Jesus is the Christ, while the second counters that Jesus has not done anything wrong. This trial does not concern itself with questions of definition (as often occurs in Acts), but with the question of whether or not Jesus has made a false claim, suggesting the status coniecturalis present in the other trial scenes of the gospel. Thirdly, there is the appeal to a higher authority. The first criminal bases his judgment of Jesus on the final verdict made by Pilate. The second criminal, however, whose speech presupposes that Jesus is the Christ, is appealing to a higher authority than Pilate by appealing to Jesus himself. Finally, Jesus, by making a pronouncement of salvation, promising companionship with himself after death and paradise (with all its theological connotations), is offering a form of divine assistance to his advocate.

A subtle reversal of roles is also revealed in this dialogue. To begin with, the first criminal is the accuser and Jesus is the defendant (Lk 23:39). The second criminal then becomes the

---

advocate who defends Jesus (Lk 23:40-41). However, by making his final appeal to Jesus (Lk 23:42), the second criminal shows that he is really interested in the judgment to be made by Jesus, not the judgment already made by Pilate. By arguing against the first criminal’s accusation, he believes that Jesus is the Christ, and shows this belief by appealing to Jesus’ judgment over Pilate’s judgment which has condemned all three of them. Jesus, in making his pronouncement of salvation for his advocate (Lk 23:43), shows that he has in fact already assumed his role as judge. In order for there to be two simultaneous, conflicting judgments occurring, Luke is presumption special knowledge in his audience: that the judgment of divine authority conflicts with the judgment of human authorities. The judgment of human authorities has already condemned the three crucified men, but a new realm of merciful judgment comes into view, mediated by Jesus on behalf of the second criminal, just as the second criminal has made a just evaluation of Jesus. A *reversal* has occurred: the accuser has become the accused, the judged one has become the judge, the one defending has become the one defended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Initial identity</th>
<th>Final, reversed identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first criminal</td>
<td>Accuser of Jesus</td>
<td>Accused by the second criminal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The second criminal</td>
<td>Condemned by human authorities, advocate of Jesus</td>
<td>Advocated by Jesus, acquitted by Jesus’ authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>Judged One</td>
<td>The Judge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What does all this imply for the meaning of Luke’s paradise? I will now draw on the findings of chapter II, above, to suggest an answer. The loss of paradise, whether it was a primordial eviction from the garden of Eden, destruction of one’s homeland which was once like the garden of Eden, or being denied entry into the eschatological paradise, was a sign of divine judgment which convicted rather than acquitted. Restoration of paradise, most often entry into the eschatological paradise, was usually associated with the righteousness of the one
entering paradise. That is, God has judged the paradisiacal citizen as worthy of eternal life, vindicating him or her against any persecutions they suffered during life or false judgments made by their enemies. Jesus’ entry into paradise is most likely because of his own righteousness (Lk 23:47). The second criminal, however, has judged himself guilty and worthy of death. It is quite plausible that he has repented, shown *metanoia*, and so is now entering upon the salvation promised by God to the penitent. This interpretation presupposes that the second criminal was under God’s judgment, but his penitent act has brought him into the realm of God’s mercy. However, the “same judgment” which this character applies to the first criminal and Jesus (*ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ κρίματι εἶ*, Lk 23:40), or to all three of them in a lesser textual witness (*...ἐσμεν*, Lk 23:40), 263 is speaking of judgment according to the Roman authority. The second criminal’s admission that in his own case and in that of his colleague, that this Roman condemnation was done “justly” (*δικαιῶς*, Lk 23:41), hints at a possible agreement of God with the Roman condemnation of both of them. However, the second criminal seems to place the possible divine condemnation in the indefinite future (*ὁταν* plus the subjunctive, Lk 23:42). Furthermore, his confidence in Jesus as his future advocate before God, perhaps even his judge who represents God (Lk 23:42), shows that he is not anticipating a certain condemnation from God in the indefinite future.

I will now suggest an alternative to seeing this scene as an example of Luke’s *metanoia* theology. The second criminal’s action in Luke 23:39-43 is portayed by the evangelist as his defence of Jesus against an unjust accusation, which opposes Jesus’ condemnation by human authorities. Just as the second criminal opposed the civil condemnation of Jesus, but was powerless to reverse it, so now Jesus is opposing the civil condemnation of the second criminal, and has the power to reverse that condemnation by pronouncing a divine acquittal. The reversal of the human-given death sentence of the second criminal into the God-given

263 Nestle et al., *Novum Testamentum Graece*, 240.
acquittal happens today, a gift of immediate salvation, rather than in the indefinite future. This divine acquittal, which conflicts with the human condemnation, is symbolised by companionship with Jesus, the righteous one (Lk 23:47), in paradise, entry into which is impossible if the criminal is also condemned by God.

From the historical-semantic study above, the status of being in “paradise” (in Luke) seems to reflect the pre-Christian allusions to the destruction of or eviction from paradise as a sign of a divine judgment (in the negative sense of condemnation), but more probably the entry into paradise as a symbol of divine approval or favour (judgment in the positive sense of acquittal or even exaltation). On the basis of the form-rhetorical study above, I expand upon this thematic connection between “paradise” and “judgment,” by attributing to Luke’s “paradise” the symbolic meaning of an eschatological reversal of judgment, where God enters into trial with human beings and acquits two men they condemn, manifested in the impromptu trial conducted by both of them and one other crucified man.

The questions then are whether “reversal” is a theme of Luke, apparent in the way he has edited or added to his sources, and whether “reversal” is, according to the Lukan redaction, tied to “judgment” and “eschatology,” and so is plausibly applicable to Luke 23:39-43. More specifically, is an “eschatological reversal of judgment” an idea which Luke applies to Jesus’ suffering and death, both in the passion narrative itself and its kerygmatic re-presentations in Acts? I will argue that Luke has redacted the story of Jesus’ death to imply this theme.

As for the “reversal” theme in the body of Luke’s gospel, I have chosen pericopes which reflect special Lukan material (which Luke 23:39-43 is) and carry this theme. A recurring problem is whether each of these redactions showing reversal is pre-Lukan traditional material or a Lukan composition. At the heart of this problem is the unity of Lukan reversal: if all (or most of) the Lukan special material is traditional, there is the problem that this material may not be a unitary (written) source “L,” but may reflect a collage of disparate materials, whose linking with each other would be tenuous. If we take the prologues to the
gospel and to Acts at face value, the Lukan narrative seems to have involved a unitary redaction of disparate sources (plurality of sources: Lk 1:1-2; unity of final editing implied by the use of singular forms: Lk 1:3; Acts 1:1). My discussion below reflects the difficulty in deciding between “Lukan composition/ Lukan tradition” for each pericope individually. However, I will argue for a way out of this impasse, through the method of complementing other scholars’ redactional analysis with composition criticism. That is, wherever Luke’s special reversal material may have come from, these pericopes show signs of a thematic (or theological) unity regarding reversal itself (i.e. connecting eschatology and judgment), whether or not the pericopes in their original form shared a common author, particularly in the way Luke has used them in his wider text.

Redaction in Luke’s Passion Narrative

Reversal of Roles and Judgment in Luke’s Last Supper Narrative


Luke 22:24-27

24 There happened a conflict among them, about who of them seemed to be great (δοκεῖναί μείζων).
25 But he [Jesus] said to them,

Mark 10:41-45

41 And when the ten heard they began to grumble about James and John.
42 And calling them, Jesus said to them, “You know that

---

"The kings of the nations lord over them (οἱ βασιλεῖς τῶν ἑθνῶν κυριεύουσιν αὐτῶν) and their authorities (οἱ ἐξουσιάζοντες) are called benefactors. But with you not like this (ὑμεῖς δὲ σὺς οὗτος), but the great one among you (ὁ μεῖζων ἐν ὑμῖν), let him be as the young one, and the leader as the servant (ὁ διακονῶν)."

After Luke adapted Mark’s saying, he composed the enclosing verses (Lk 22:24, 27) in order (i) to connect the dispute over greatness with the discussion over who would betray Jesus (Lk 22:23); (ii) to connect this dispute with the other dispute over greatness (Lk 9:46-48), where the child (παιδίον), like the young one (ὁ νενεώτερος) Luke adds to Mark here (Lk 22:26), is the exemplar; and (iii) to offer a different theology of Jesus’ saving work as “table service” rather than Mark’s theology of service as giving one’s life as a ransom for many (Mk 10:45). The enclosing verses, the question about who is “great” (Lk 22:24, 27), also act as an inclusio for the pericope, which contrasts Jesus working as a servant at the table to motivate his disciples to adopt a similar attitude towards “greatness.”

[265 Soards, Passion According to Luke, 50-51. According to Soards, Passion According to Luke, 51., Mark 10:45 is an example of “mere ‘ransom’ theology” [his emphasis]. However, Mark presents his ransom theology of Jesus as the Son of Man’s mission not to take servants for himself but to become a servant of “the many.” Mark and Luke differ not in whether there is service of Jesus, but in the kind of service.]

[266 Neyrey, Passion According to Luke, 22.]
reversal of roles, how the lowly are raised up and the proud are put down,” and contains “an element of the eschatological reversal that permeates Luke’s Gospel.”

The verses following the pericope about greatness continue the theme of banquets (Lk 22:28-30). Here, however, the anticipated situation of Jesus and his disciples contrasts with the exhortation to table service in Luke 22:24-27. Luke 22:30b shares a Q tradition with Matthew 19:28b. If we compare the two texts:


Matthew 19:28

28 “But to you who have remained with me in my trials;
29 and I bestow upon you just as my Father bestowed upon me – a kingdom,
30 in order that you may eat and drink at my tables in my kingdom,
and so that you may sit upon thrones (καθήσεσθε ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους) judging the twelve tribes of Israel (τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς κρίνοντες τοῦ Ἰσραήλ).”

Jesus said to them, “Amen I say to you, for you following me in the rebirth, whenever the Son of Man will sit upon his throne of glory you too will sit upon twelve thrones (καθήσεσθε καὶ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ δώδεκα θρόνους) judging the twelve tribes of Israel (κρίνοντες τὰς δώδεκα φυλὰς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ).”

The Q saying shared by both evangelists is Jesus’ promise to his intimate disciples that they will receive a share in his (or the Son of Man’s) judicial role over Israel (Lk 22:30; Mt 19:28). Luke expresses the theme of eschatology with the notion of “trials” (πειρασμός, Lk 22:28) instead of Matthew’s “rebirth,” which Luke uses elsewhere for Jesus’ testing by Satan in the desert (Lk 4:13), for the Lord’s prayer (Lk 11:4), and for Jesus’ warning to the disciples on the Mount of Olives (Lk 22:40, 46). Luke links this eschatological promise with the expectation of a “kingdom” (Lk 22:29) where the previous situation of the disciples’ table service is reversed: “you will eat and drink at my tables in my kingdom” (Lk 22:30), in

contrast to Jesus’ exhortation to be like himself, who waits on tables as a servant rather than
eats at the table as a lord (Lk 22:26-27; cf. Lk 12:37 for the same idea of a lord working as a
table servant.) In Luke’s second volume, Stephen becomes the evangelist’s (polemical?)
illustration of a disciple appointed to serve tables (Acts 6:2-3) but who proceeds to pronounce
judgment upon Israel (Acts 7:51-53).

Some vocabulary and themes of Luke 22:28-30 link with the pericope about paradise (Lk
23:39-43). First, Jesus refers to his disciples as those who have been “with me” (μετ’ ἐμοῦ) in
his trials (Lk 22:28), just as the second criminal will be “with me” (μετ’ ἐμοῦ) in paradise
(Lk 23:43). Secondly, the Jesus confers upon his disciples the kingdom which his Father
conferred upon him (Lk 22:29), which links with the second criminal’s hope to be
remembered in Jesus’ kingdom (“your kingdom,” rather than the more common Lukan
designation, “kingdom of God,” Lk 23:42). The criminal’s request for Jesus to remember him
(μιμήσκει) in his kingdom (Lk 23:42) complements Jesus’ request for his disciples to
remember him (ἀνάμνησις) whenever they share the Eucharistic banquet (Lk 22:19; an oral
(μιμήσκει) elsewhere for God’s mercy and covenantal fidelity to Israel (Lk 1:54, 72), for an
eschatological warning to the rich man who ignored Lazarus (Lk 16:24; cf. Lk 17:32 for a
similar use of “remember,” μνημονεύω), for God’s recognition of a gentile’s good works
(Acts 10:31) and for recapitulations of earlier narrative (Lk 24:6, 8; Acts 11:16). Jesus’
own final celebration of Passover with his disciples before he suffers (Lk 22:15) anticipates
the coming of the kingdom of God (Lk 22:16, 18). Jesus’ expectation of the kingdom in a
banquet (Lk 22:16, 18) is emphasised by the third evangelist: Mark and Matthew have only
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one such anticipation for the kingdom (Mk 14:25; Mt 26:29). Luke’s redaction of Mark’s account emphasises this eschatological aspect.\(^{272}\)

Conflict and Reversals of Judgment in Luke’s Passion Narrative

Now I will consider the particular way in which Luke portrays the judgment of Jesus in his passion narrative, especially how Luke portrays (i) Pilate reversing his judgment of Jesus, (ii) the opposition between different characters’ judgments, and (iii) the Lukan implication that God is taking sides in these opposing judgments, by overriding (i.e. reversing) the human condemnations of Jesus. The following Lukan redactions to his passion narrative are relevant for this topic: (i) Pilate’s threefold acquittal of Jesus, only to be reversed when Pilate allows his judicial responsibility to be usurped by the mob; (ii) the threefold mockery of Jesus as “Christ/ King” and three contrary human evaluations of Jesus: the second criminal (vs. his companion, the first criminal), the centurion (vs. his own soldiers), Joseph of Arimathea (vs. his colleagues among the Sanhedrin); and finally (iii), the implications of a contrary divine judgment: the “Son of Man” claim made by Jesus in his trial by the Sanhedrin, Jesus’ address to the daughters of Jerusalem, the Lukan Jesus’ last words, and Jesus’ resurrection and exaltation.

(i) Pilate’s Judgment of Jesus

First, there is the reversal that takes place in Pilate’s own judgment of Jesus. When the Sanhedrin leads Jesus to Pilate, they make a formal accusation according to Luke, but not in Mark and Matthew: “We found this one stirring up our people, hindering taxes to the emperor, and calling himself Christ, a king” (Lk 23:2). In the next verse, Pilate picks up on the third charge, and questions Jesus about his alleged claims to royalty (Lk 23:3). According

to Matthew 27:11 and Mark 15:2, Pilate immediately questions Jesus without a formal charge from the Sanhedrin. Furthermore, these evangelists record Pilate’s amazement to Jesus’ silence before the priests’ accusations following his inquiry (Mk 15:4-5; Mt 27:12-14), whereas the Pilate of Luke announces an immediate verdict in response to the formal charge: “I find nothing as a cause [i.e. for guilt] in this person” (Lk 23:4). Luke’s Pilate pronounces this acquittal twice more in the passion narrative.

The second acquittal occurs after Herod’s trial of Jesus (Lk 23:6-12, special Lukan material). When Pilate re-gathers Jesus’ accusers (Lk 23:13) and reiterates their charge against him, “stirring up the people” (Lk 23:14), he repeats his acquittal of Jesus for the specific charge against him: “Look! I, in your presence, after judging have found nothing in this person of the cause which you accuse against him” (Lk 23:14). The Pilate of Luke then specifically draws on the trial by Herod, and interprets Herod’s non-judgment of Jesus (who instead questioned Jesus out of curiosity, beat and mocked him, then sent him back to Pilate, Lk 23:8-9, 11) as though Herod also acquitted Jesus: “But neither Herod, for he sent him back to us, and look, there is nothing (οὐδὲν) worthy (ἄξιον) of death in his deeds (πεπραγμένον)” (Lk 23:15). There is a striking linguistic parallel between Pilate’s interpretation of Herod’s actions and the judgment of the second criminal: “For we are receiving things [i.e. death] worthy (ἀξία) of what we did (ἐπράξαμεν); but this one did (ἐπράξεν) nothing (οὐδὲν) out of place” (Lk 23:41). In Luke’s account, Mark, Pilate instead attempts to bargain with the crowd, offering them the choice of Jesus as the recipient of amnesty for the local festival, whom the crowd rejects in favour of Barabbas (Mk 15:6-11; preserved in Mt 27:15-18, 20). This choice of “Jesus or Barabbas?” is cut short in Luke’s account, and the reference to a festival custom is omitted (cf. Lk 23:18-19; v.17 is probably an inauthentic scribal harmonisation).
In Luke, after the crowd rejects Pilate’s acquittals of Jesus and his attempts to persuade them (Lk 23:18, 20-21), Pilate makes an explicitly “third” (τρίτον) acquittal of Jesus: “Why, for what evil did this one do? I found nothing as a cause of death in him” (Lk 23:22). The second sentence spoken by Pilate here, the explicit acquittal, is a Lukan addition to Mark’s account, and is not a potential Q-saying present in Matthew (cf. Mk 15:14; Mt 27:23). However, when the crowd’s voices prevail (Lk 23:23), Pilate, in a single action, reverses his threefold acquittal of Jesus: “He judged that their cause should come to be” (Lk 23:24; not present in Mark-Matthew), executes the release of the murderer instead of Jesus, “but betrayed (παρέδωκεν) Jesus to their will” (Lk 23:25). Luke’s source (Mk 15:15; see also Mt 27:26) has Pilate hand Jesus over “to be crucified”: Luke’s editing (“to their will”) makes explicit the triumph of the crowd’s condemnation of Jesus over Pilate’s three judgments of “not guilty” (Lk 23:4, 14, 22). Luke’s Pilate is a failed advocate of Jesus.

(ii) Conflicts between Human Judgments of Jesus

In addition to the judicial conflict between Pilate and the crowd (which ends in Pilate’s acquiescence), there are further oppositions of judgment in the crucifixion scene itself. Luke records a threefold mockery of Jesus. First, after the note added by Luke that, “and the people stood watching (θεωρῶν)” (Lk 23:35a), their leaders were abusing Jesus and saying, “He saved others, let him save himself, if this one is the Christ of God” (Lk 23:35b). The people, however, are not said to be making a judgment opposed to their leaders, but, like Herod of Galilee, seem to be refraining from making a judicial decision. If “the people standing watching (θεωρῶν)” (Lk 23:35a) and “all the crowds gathered alongside for the spectacle [θεωρίαν]” who “watched [θεωρήσαντες] what happened” (Lk 23:48) are the same people gathered with the leaders and priests in Pilate’s trial of Jesus (Lk 23:13), then the crowd has changed their judgment from condemnation to neutrality (signified by beating their breasts,
Lk 23:48). In support of a changed stance to neutrality rather than a complete turn-around, see the further note added by Luke about a subsection of the spectators, that “all who knew him (οἱ γνωστοὶ αὐτῷ) were standing from a distance (ἀπὸ μακρόθεν)” (Lk 23:49a). This phrase shows the influence of Psalm 30 (LXX) beyond the last words of the Lukan Jesus (Lk 23:46; Ps 30:6 LXX): compare Luke 23:35a, 49a with, “Alongside all my enemies I have become a reproach, and to those who bore me a labour, and fear to those who know me (καὶ φόβος τοῖς γνωστοῖς μου), those watching me (οἱ θεωροῦντές με) were fleeing out away from me” (Ps 30:12 LXX). The parallel is not perfect: Jesus’ acquaintances are standing (“at a distance”) while those of the psalmist are fleeing. But, in both cases the acquaintances of the victim are refraining from taking a stand. So too Peter, in the high priest’s house, is said to be following Jesus “at a distance” (μακρόθεν, Lk 22:54b; Mk 14:54) and he also fails to take a stand for or against Jesus when questioned (Lk 22:56-62).

The first opposition of judgment occurs not between the leaders and the people, but the leaders (Lk 23:35) and Joseph of Arimathea, who, like the second criminal, is expecting the kingdom of God/ Jesus (Lk 23:42, 51b). Joseph’s righteousness consists, at least in part, in his “expectation” of the kingdom. After describing the one who buries Jesus as “a man good and righteous” (Lk 23:50b), Luke adds another note about Joseph not found in his sources, Mark or Q: “This one was not a party to their plan and their deed” (Lk 23:51a; cf. Mk 15:43; Mt 27:57). Given Joseph’s social status in having an unused tomb already hewn (Lk 23:53), this half-verse most likely refers to a disagreement between Joseph and the rest of the Sanhedrin, “the elders of the people, priests and scribes” (Lk 22:66). It is this Sanhedrin who, according to Luke, and unlike his Markan source, do not begin by

274 cf. Doble, Paradox, 102-104. Doble says that Luke is portraying Joseph as one of the anawim, rather than an aristocrat (p.102). However, Doble still regards Joseph as one of the Sanhedrin: Doble and I are in agreement that Luke portrays a conflict of judgment between Joseph and “the rest of the Sanhedrin[…]” (p.103).
immediately seeking his death sentence (cf. Mk 14:55) but by questioning him (Lk 22:67). In Luke, they do not bring false witnesses against him (cf. Mk 14:56-57), their final judgment is not a death sentence (Lk 22:71; cf. Mk 14:64) and most importantly, the final judgment of the Sanhedrin in Luke loses its unanimity (Lk 22:71; cf. “everyone,” πάντες, Mk 14:64).\(^{275}\) The temporal gap between the “whole of their multitude” bringing Jesus to Pilate (Lk 23:1), at least some of whom make the formal accusation (Lk 23:2), and the trial itself allows the possibility of someone of their group standing apart from the rest. The loss of explicit unanimity in Luke’s Sanhedrin trial allows the dissenter to stand apart from them (Lk 23:51a), and later to make public his dissent by asking Pilate for the body of Jesus to give his corpse a burial of honour (Lk 23:52-53). The first opposition of judgment is therefore between the leaders and Joseph, with the crowd in the middle.

The second opposition of judgment occurs between the soldiers and their officer-in-charge, the centurion. As noted above, the governor in charge of the Roman soldiers, Pontius Pilate, had finally given in to the judgment of the local leaders, priests and people, allowing his own acquittal to be superseded by condemnation. Now the Roman soldiers (οἱ στρατιῶται, Lk 23:36), having seen the “epigraph” over Jesus, “This One is the King of the Jews” (Lk 23:38), and having struck Jesus and offered him gall (Lk 23:36), echo the mockery of the leaders of the people (Lk 23:35b): “If you are the king of the Jews, save yourself!” (εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ βασιλεύς τῶν Ἰουδαίων, σῶσον σεαυτόν, Lk 23:37). However, after Jesus’ dialogue with his two co-crucified (Lk 23:39-43), the celestial phenomena (Lk 23:44-45a), the tearing of the temple veil (Lk 23:45b), Jesus’ final prayer and his death (Lk 23:46), then “the centurion having seen what happened, praised God saying, ‘In reality, this person was righteous.’ [ἐντώς ὁ ἀνθρωπος οὗτος δίκαιος ἦν]” (Lk 23:47). The centurion’s judgment of Jesus has come into

conflict with the judgments of his soldiers before Jesus’ death. Mark has the centurion give the evangelist’s own confession of Jesus (“Son of God,” Mk 15:39; cf. Mk 1:1 if the last two words are authentic), while Matthew develops this into a Christology based on the book of Wisdom (Mt 27:43, 54; Wis 2:13, 18-20). Luke, by portraying Jesus as “righteous” and trusting in God, may also have had in mind a Christology based on the Wisdom of Solomon, where the righteous man is condemned by his enemies but vindicated by God. Luke’s centurion confesses Jesus’ righteousness while “he glorified God” (Lk 23:47). The phrase “glorified God” comes into semantic proximity with “fearing God”: to “fear God” means “to have profound reverence and respect for deity, with the implication of awe bordering on fear – ‘to reverence, to worship’. In this case, the centurion’s praise of God fits with the second criminal’s demand that his accomplice “fear God” (Lk 23:40). The centurion’s judgment that Jesus was “righteous” therefore is not merely a legal term, referring to “innocence” in opposition to “guilt,” but a theological term which attributes to Jesus justice in the eyes of God. Robert Karris sees Jesus’ “justice” in terms of a conflict between God and the evil present in the world, so that through Jesus God may rectify the wrongs done to the afflicted: “In him God is on trial.” There may also be a hint of a theological-judicial role in the adjective “righteous” (δίκαιος) when linked to “paradise”: paradise is for the righteous “who carry out righteous judgment” (2 Enoch 9:1, [J, A]); the righteous Ezra, to whom paradise is promised (4 Ezra 8:52), unsuccessfully attempts to change the judgment of God against the wicked (4 Ezra 7:102-8:45); and, finally, the righteous Enoch bears witness to God’s judgment against the world while hidden in paradise (Jub 4:23).
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The third opposition of judgment directly concerns the central passage for this thesis, Luke 23:39-43. It is between the two criminals crucified with Jesus: “Are you not the Christ? Save yourself and us!” (Lk 23:39); “And do you not fear God, because you are under the same judgment as he? And we justly, for we are receiving things worthy of our deeds; but this one did nothing out of place” (Lk 23:40-41). This scene has already been analysed in Chapter III of this study, but this redaction study has shown how the opposition between the judgments of the two criminals fits with the other redactions Luke has made to the passion narrative. In Chapter III, I analysed Luke 23:39-43 as a legal scene: there I argued that the formal elements of this pericope take on the aspects of Luke’s forensic rhetoric. However, a redactional study of its context of the passion narrative allows a connection between the theological dimensions of “paradise” in Second Temple Judaism and the theological dimensions of Jesus’ death in Luke. The opening rebuke of the second criminal, “And do you not fear God?” when referring to the “judgment” the three crucified men are undergoing opens up the question of divine judgment: although Jesus and the two criminals have been judged worthy of death by human authorities, what is God’s judgment? The centurion’s attribution of righteousness to Jesus, with its theological connotations, and the second criminal’s claim that they received their condemnation “justly” but Jesus has not, implies Lukan redaction to show a divine judgment in Jesus’ favour, whereas the second criminal senses a possible future divine judgment against himself and his colleague. The issue of “divine judgment” in Luke’s passion narrative will now be spelt out in more detail.

(iii) Divine Judgment

Jesus’ “Son of Man” saying to the Sanhedrin suggests the presence of a heavenly, divinely appointed judge whom Jesus calls upon to witness to his cause (Mt 26:64; Mk 14:62; Lk 22:69). There are differences in the way the three synoptic evangelists present this saying of Jesus. Unlike Mark and Matthew, Luke does not record the Sanhedrin’s attempt to use false
witnesses to condemn Jesus to death (Mk 14:55-56; Mt 26:59), on the charge that Jesus claimed to be able to destroy and rebuild the temple in three days (Mk 14:58; Mt 26:61; see also Jn 2:19), before which Jesus is silent (Mk 14:61; Mt 26:63). Instead, Luke has the Sanhedrin immediately question Jesus about his identity (Lk 22:67). A synopsis follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[The high priest speaks:]</td>
<td>[The high priest speaks:]</td>
<td>[The Sanhedrin speaks:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63“I invoke you by the living God to tell us, are you the Christ, the Son of God?”</td>
<td>61“Are you the Christ, the Son of the Blessed One?”</td>
<td>67“If you are the Christ, tell us.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Jesus:] 64“You have said it. However I tell you, from now you will see the Son of Man seated on the right hand of the Powers and coming on the clouds of heaven.”</td>
<td>[Jesus:] 62“I am. And you will see the Son of Man seated on the right of the Powers coming with the clouds of heaven.”</td>
<td>[Jesus:] 68“If I tell you, you will not believe. If I ask, you will not answer. 69From now there will be the Son of Man seated on the right of the Powers of God.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65[The high priest rips his clothes.] “He blasphemed! Why do we still need witnesses? Look now, you have heard his blasphemy! What do you think?”</td>
<td>63[The high priest rips his clothes.] “Why do we still need witnesses?”</td>
<td>71[They say:] “Why do we still need witnesses? For we ourselves have heard from his own mouth.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64“You have heard his blasphemy! How does it seem to you?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to the Sanhedrin’s inquiry, Luke has added to Jesus’ response an enthymeme, a dilemma to counter that inquiry (Lk 22:68), to the effect: “If I answer your question about who I am (concerning being the Christ), you will not believe my answer. If, on the other hand, I ask you who you think I am, you will not answer me.” The implied enthymeme from contraries is this: you cannot both ask about my identity while pre-emptively refusing to believe my answer and fail to have an answer yourselves; but you are doing this; therefore I will not cooperate with you. The Lukan Jesus presents a similar dilemma to the teachers’ question in the temple, concerning who gave him his authority: there Jesus traps them with a counter-question, concerning their stance on the authority behind John’s baptism (Lk 20:1-8; see also Mk 11:27-33; Mt 21:23-27). Luke has also transferred the Sanhedrin’s question about Jesus’ identity as the Son of God, and Jesus’ self-confession, to after his Son of Man saying (Lk 22:70). The Son of Man saying which follows Jesus’ counter-dilemma to the Sanhedrin is found in all three synoptic gospels (Mt 26:64; Mk 14:62; Lk 22:69) with the following Lukan peculiarities: the omission that the Sanhedrin will see the Son of Man, the qualification that “the Powers” (on whose right the Son of Man sits) are “of God,” and the omission of the Son of Man’s “coming on/ with the clouds of heaven.” The two Lukan omissions take away the ability to witness the Son of Man’s judgment from those who will later seek Jesus’ death, and makes this witness the special role of those whom Jesus has chosen (Lk 24:48; Acts 1:8, 21-26; 10:41). It is the apostles who witness Jesus ascending to heaven on clouds who will see him return in the same way, implying Jesus’ later identification with the Son of Man (Acts 1:9-11), and it is Jesus’ witness Stephen who explicitly sees Jesus as the Son of Man standing...
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on the right hand of God in heaven (Acts 7:55-56). Furthermore, in Mark’s and Matthew’s accounts, the question “Why do we still need witnesses?” is given the sense, “We do not need further evidence that he is a blasphemer” (Mk 14:64; Mt 26:65). Luke’s alteration of Mark’s “We have heard his blasphemy” to “We have heard from his own mouth” (Lk 22:71), given that this statement follows the Lukan Jesus’ self-confession (Lk 22:70), implies a recognition by Luke’s Sanhedrin that Jesus is acting as his own witness to his identity as Christ, as Son of God and to the judgment of the Son of Man. Therefore, in Luke’s account of the Sanhedrin trial, the evangelist removes the witness to the divine judgment from some indefinitely future, universally recognisable moment, and makes Jesus himself (and later the apostles) the witness to this divine judgment for the human authorities. In similar fashion, the second criminal expects to face the divine tribunal in the indefinite future (Lk 23:42), but Jesus brings the divine acquittal forward to “today” (Lk 23:43).

Jesus’ address to the “daughters of Jerusalem” who follow him weeping is special Lukan material (Lk 23:27b-31). There are probable connections between this pericope and two other pericopes of special Lukan material: the gentile conquest of Jerusalem in Jesus’ pre-passion apocalyptic discourse (Lk 21:20-24), and Jesus’ own lament over Jerusalem (Lk 19:41-44).282 The links are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jesus “weeps” (ἔκλαυσεν) over Jerusalem (v.41)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Jesus tells the daughters of Jerusalem to “weep” (κλαίετε) over themselves instead of him (v.28).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| A reference to “on that day” (ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτη, v.42), the “days come upon you” (ἥξουσιν ἡμέραι ἐπὶ σέ, v.43) and “the time of your visitation” (τὸν καιρὸν τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς σου, v.44) | A reference to “the days of vengeance” (ἡμέραι ἐκδικήσεως αὕταί, v.22) and “on those days” (ἐν ἐκείναις ταῖς ἡμέραις, v.23) and the fulfillment of the “times of the nations” (καιροὶ θεόν, v.24) | A reference to “coming days” (ἔρχονται ἡμέραι, v.29) |
| A reference to Jerusalem’s ignorance of what makes for peace (v.42), and a reference to a siege of Jerusalem (v.43) | A reference to a siege of Jerusalem (v.20), and the sword and captivity coming upon Jerusalem (v.24) | - |
| A reference to the children being taken from Jerusalem (v.44) | A woe pronounced against pregnant mothers and those nursing small children (v.23) | Jesus tells the women to weep over their children as well as themselves (v.28). A beatitude is pronounced upon sterile and childless women (v.29). |
| - | A reference to the flight of Judeans to the mountains (τὰ ὄρη) (v.21) | A cry to the mountains (τοῖς ὀρεσιν) and hills to “fall on us” and to “cover us” (v.30) |

The event in question seems to be the Roman re-invasion of Jerusalem in 70 CE. Is Luke portraying this event as an act of divine judgment against Jerusalem? Despite the apocalyptic allusions to “days of vengeance” which “fulfil everything written” and “wrath” in the second pericope (Lk 21:22-23), there is no clear reference to a divine act of vengeance against Jerusalem in any of the three pericopes. The reference to wrath and vengeance (Lk 21:22-23) may be that of Caesar and the Roman legions which, in Luke’s theological worldview, work somehow to fulfil God’s “necessary” (δεῖ) plan. There is an explicit reference to the wrath of the nations against Christ in Acts 4:25-26 (quoting Ps 2:1-2), and an implicit reference to the nations’ wrath in the reference to “wars and uprisings,” of which “it is necessary that these things first happen” (Lk 21:9). Furthermore, the retrospections on the death of Jesus in Acts portray the divine response to this event not as wrath but as God’s
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raising Jesus from the dead in order to give salvation to the people in Jerusalem and to the ends of the earth. Additionally, Luke would be painting an odd picture of Jesus if his Jesus were to pronounce a sentence of divine retribution against those mourning his own condemnation and death. Finally, if we can presume that Luke’s portrayal of Jesus reflects his conception of God, it is not God’s anger that destroys Jerusalem, but God weeps for the loss of Jerusalem through Jesus (Lk 19:41; 23:28). It appears that, according to Luke, God’s judgment is opposed to the destruction of Jerusalem as it is to the death of Jesus, but both losses somehow fulfill the divine “necessity” (Lk 21:9; 24:26) and “scriptures” (Lk 21:22; 24:46).

According to Mark, and Matthew who follows him (with slightly different wording), Jesus’ last words are: “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” (Mk 15:34; Mt 27:46). Mark records Jesus’ last words as a quotation of the opening of the lament Psalm 22. Luke, however, has preserved the last words of Jesus in a different form, quoting a psalm of trust (Ps 30:6 LXX): “(Father), into your hands I commend my spirit” (Lk 23:46). The tradition which Luke is drawing on, or even Luke himself, interprets the death of Jesus through the lens of a psalm which confidently expects God’s rescue (Ps 30:2, 6, 16 LXX) and mercy (Ps 30:8, 10, 17, 20, 22 LXX), in an act of hoping in the Lord (Ps 30:2, 7, 15, 25 LXX). The psalmist expects God’s intervention to rescue him or her from unnamed enemies (Ps 30:9, 12, 16 LXX). The Lukan Jesus, in contrast to what Luke would have received in the Markan tradition, expresses confidence and trust in God, whom he names as “Father” (Luke’s text adds this word to Psalm 30:6 LXX), amidst his condemnation by human authorities. There is an implication here that Luke wants to portray Jesus as someone confident in a divine judgment which will vindicate him, contrary to the human judgment he receives before his
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285 The assertion of Neyrey which I place in italics, that “The daughters of Jerusalem are not now weeping over Jesus, nor are they ever told to. They weep for the ruin of their children” (Neyrey, Passion According to Luke, 112.) is not supported by the text. The “him” (αὐτόν) in “and the women were bewailing and lamenting him” (καὶ γυναικῶν ἀν ἐκόπτοντο καὶ ἔθρηνον αὐτόν, Lk 23:27b) clearly refers to Jesus. Otherwise, Jesus’ instruction, “Do not weep over me” (Lk 23:28), makes no sense.
death. Jesus’ trust in the God whom he names “Father” is realised in his resurrection and exaltation, which in the Acts of the Apostles is portrayed as God’s response to his condemnation and death, reversing them to the contrary states of glory and eternal life.

**Portrayals of Jesus’ Passion Elsewhere in the Lukan Narrative**

According to the narrative order in which Luke refers to Jesus’ passion outside of Luke 22-23, he portrays the disciples’ slow growth in understanding of the necessity of the messiah’s suffering. In these references, there are some hints that such an understanding of Jesus’ passion involves a theology of reversal. In the first Lukan passion prediction, Jesus responds to Peter’s confession of his messiahship (Lk 9:20) by ordering silence (Lk 9:21) and saying: “It is necessary (δεῖ) that the Son of Man suffer much and be rejected by the elders and priests and scribes and be killed but (καὶ) on the third day be raised” (Lk 9:22). In the following verses, the Lukan Jesus advocates a discipleship based on “taking up the cross” (Lk 9:23) which involves a dynamic of reversal: “For whoever wishes to save their life will lose it; but whoever loses their life on my behalf will save it” (Lk 9:24). There is also a dynamic of judgment, in which rejecting Jesus and his words involves a counter-rejection in the apocalyptic scene of the Son of Man’s heavenly court (Lk 9:26).

The Lukan Jesus’ second passion prediction is brief: “The Son of Man is about to be handed over into people’s hands” (Lk 9:44). The disciples do not understand this short, enigmatic saying, and are afraid to ask for its meaning (Lk 9:45). Their misunderstanding of this passion prediction is also a failure to understand the dynamic of reversal: they argue about who among themselves is the greatest (Lk 9:46). Jesus’ response to their argument is to
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compare himself with a little child: receiving the least in Jesus’ name is accepting Jesus, and accepting God who sent Jesus, “for the least among all of you, this one is great” (Lk 9:48).

The disciples again fail to understand (Lk 18:34) the Lukan Jesus’ third passion prediction: “See, we are going up into Jerusalem, and there will be completed everything written in the prophets to the Son of Man: he will be handed over to the gentiles, maltreated, abused, struck and flogged, but (καὶ) on the third day he will rise” (Lk 18:33-34). However, some insight is hinted at in the blind man, in contrast to those who order this least one to silence his cries for mercy (Lk 18:39). He asks Jesus that he may see again (Lk 18:41), and having been saved by his faith (Lk 18:42), implicitly becomes a disciple of Jesus (Lk 18:43). A hint of reversal consequent on discipleship precedes this third passion prediction. Peter shows some understanding that discipleship will be recompensed (Lk 18:28), to which Jesus responds with a promise that those who leave house, family and fields “for the kingdom of God” will receive back again “a manifold in this age and eternal life in the coming age” (Lk 18:29-30).

The disciples slowly come to understand the necessity of Jesus’ passion after his resurrection. When the angels at the tomb remind the women of Jesus’ words, of the necessity (δεῖ) of the Son of Man being condemned by “sinners” in order to rise (Lk 24:7), they first point out their mistake of seeking “the living one among the dead” (Lk 24:6), suggesting a not yet understood reversal from death to life for Jesus (Lk 24:11). The two disciples travelling away from Jerusalem to Emmaus regard the fact that “the chief priest and the leaders handed [Jesus] over to the judgment of death (κρίµα θανάτου) and crucified him” to be Jesus’ failure to be “the one intended to redeem Israel” (Lk 24:19-20), and do not understand what had happened to the women (Lk 24:21-22). The risen Jesus rebukes them for failing to understand the necessity of the Christ suffering in order to enter his glory (Lk 24:26), based on the Torah and the prophets (Lk 24:27). Their eyes are not opened until the risen Jesus...
breaks bread with them (Lk 24:30-31). The risen Jesus commissions the group of disciples to be “witnesses of these things” (Lk 24:48) in a mission of proclaiming repentance to the nations (Lk 24:47), once they understand the scriptures about “the Christ’s suffering and rising from the dead on the third day” (Lk 24:45-46).

The apostles’ speeches in Acts show that they finally come to grasp the paschal mystery, portraying Jesus’ resurrection and exaltation as God’s intervention to overturn the sinful human condemnation of Jesus to death. These kerygmatic fragments show a common pattern: the condemnation and death of Jesus was an act of human authorities, but his resurrection and exaltation is an act of God in response to this human action. The consequence of God’s decision in favour of Jesus is a reversal of the human decision against Jesus. There are also testimonial actions: the apostles, Paul, the Holy Spirit, God’s miracles and the scriptures bear witness to the divine decision to reverse the human judgment against Jesus. This idea of “bearing witness” suggests the picture of a cosmic courtroom: a judgment greater than the judgment of the highest human authorities throughout the world is testified to by a small group of human beings with no authority from the world’s kings, governors and emperors. I would suggest that the calls to repentance which the apostles make to their Jerusalem audiences in these contexts (such as Acts 2:38) are appeals to change their judgment against Jesus to one which accords with the judgment of God. 287

Peter’s Speech at Pentecost (Acts 2:22-24)

Acts 2:22 Testimonial action of God: bearing witness to Jesus, “having been shown forth from God for us by acts of power and wonders and signs,” apparent to Peter’s audience

Acts 2:23 Action of the antagonists (“the lawless”; “you”): putting Jesus to death; but an action foreseen and foreplanned by God


**Peter’s Pentecost Speech continued (Acts 2:32-36)**

Acts 2:32  Counter-action of God: raising Jesus from the dead. Testimonial action of the apostles: bearing witness to this (μάρτυρες).

Acts 2:33  Testimonial action of the Holy Spirit: bearing witness, whose presence is evident to Peter’s audience.

Acts 2:34-35  Implicit reference to Jesus’ ascension, with a divine judgment involved (quoting Ps 110:1).


**Peter’s Speech to the Crowd at Solomon’s Portico (Acts 3:13-15)**

Acts 3:13  Counter-action of God: glorifying Jesus, “his child/servant” (παῖς αὐτοῦ). It is compared to the action of the antagonists: handing over and denying Jesus before Pilate.

Acts 3:14  Action of the antagonists: denying Jesus, “the holy and righteous one,” asking a murderer to be released instead.


**Peter’s Speech to the Sanhedrin (Acts 4:8-10)**

Acts 4:8  Implication of two witnesses: Peter and the Holy Spirit

Acts 4:9  Reference to a human judgment on the apostles, for the healing of the sick man.

Acts 4:10  Action of the antagonists (“you”): crucifying Jesus. Counter-action of God: raising him from the dead. Testimony: the previously sick man’s newfound health as a witness to the power of Jesus’ name.

**Peter and the Apostles’ Speech to the Sanhedrin (Acts 5:30-32)**

Acts 5:31  Counter-action of God: exalting Jesus as “prince and saviour” for the sake of Israel’s repentance and forgiveness of sins.


Peter’s Speech to Cornelius and his Household (Acts 10:38-43)

Acts 10:38  Testimonial action of God: bearing witness to Jesus by working through him during his ministry.


Acts 10:40  Counter-action of God: raising Jesus and revealing him as raised.

Acts 10:41  Testimonial action of the apostles: bearing witness (μάρτυρες) to the reality of Jesus’ resurrection, being especially chosen by God for this purpose.

Acts 10:42  Testimonial action of the apostles: to bear witness (διαμαρτύρασθαι) to a universal divine judgment to be executed through Jesus as “one chosen by God.”

Acts 10:43  Testimonial action of the prophets: bearing witness (μαρτυροῦσιν) to Jesus, through whom sins are forgiven.

Paul’s Speech in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts 13:27-31)

Acts 13:27  Action of the antagonists (“those dwelling in Jerusalem and their leaders”): denying Jesus in their act of judgment, as was done to the prophets.


Acts 13:31  Testimonial action of the companions of Jesus: bearing witness (μάρτυρες) to his risen life before the people

The Lukan Theology of Reversal

If there is a theme of “reversal” implicit in Luke’s passion narrative, is there a relationship between this and the more explicit Lukan theology of reversal found in the gospel? In answering this question, I will focus on how the Lukan theology of reversal connects to his eschatology and theology of judgment, noting especially cases where the theme of eschatological reversal is joined to a conflict of judgment between God and human beings.
The “Reversal Formulae” in Luke. There are two reversal formulae found the synoptic tradition. The first formula involves a reversal between the “first” (πρῶτοι) and the “last” (ἔσχατοι), found in all three synoptic gospels (Mt 19:30; 20:16; Mk 10:31; Lk 13:30), with the basic form, “the first will be last and the last will be first.” The second formula involves a reversal between the “exalted” (ὑψών) and the “humbled” (πατερούν), found in the “Q” tradition (Mt 23:12; Lk 14:11; 18:14), with the basic form, “the one exalting himself will be humbled and the one humbling himself will be exalted.” Fragmented traces of these sayings occur elsewhere in the gospels (Lk 10:15; a judgment text) and even outside the gospels (2 Pt 2:20; 5:6; Jas 4:10; possibly 2 Cor 11:7). The way Luke understood these two traditional formulae will now be briefly examined, before I examine the Lukan theology of reversal in more detail.

The context of Luke 13:30 is a question about salvation (Lk 13:23), whose answer comes with a warning to the self-confident: those confident of their own acceptance in the kingdom will be excluded, implicitly by a judgment of God (Lk 13:25-27), while those multitudes they thought to be rejected will be included in the kingdom to feast with the patriarchs (Lk 13:28-29).

The context of Luke 14:11 is a parable (Lk 14:7-11) directed to the guests of a leader of the Pharisees (Lk 14:1), who were seeking the best places at the dining table (Lk 14:7). Jesus advises them not to seek the first places at a feast, lest they be shamed by the host when a more honoured guest arrives (Lk 14:8-9). Instead, by seeking the least place, they will be raised to a higher place (Lk 14:10). Jesus’ advice to the host adds an eschatological dimension to this reversal (Lk 14:12-14). If, instead of inviting only honourable guests to a feast, who can repay the host with reciprocal honour (Lk 14:12), the host invites dishonourable guests (Lk 14:13), he will find his dishonour (by association) reversed into
honour by God (implied by a theological passive) “in the resurrection of the righteous” (Lk 14:14).

The context of Luke 18:14b is a parable (Lk 18:9-14) which Jesus directs to those convinced of their own righteousness and who despise others (Lk 18:9). Jesus first gives the example of a pious Pharisee, who thanks God that he does good deeds and is not a sinner like everyone else, especially the tax-collector whom he condemns (Lk 18:11-12). The second example is the same tax-collector who simply prays for mercy as a sinner (Lk 18:13). The one who is judged a sinner (by himself and by a self-exalted human being) is in fact made righteous by God, while the other is not (Lk 18:14a).

The Magnificat (Lk 1:46-55). There is agreement among scholars that the Magnificat contains a clear reference to Luke’s motif of reversal, here between the exalted and the lowly. In the text as we have it (Lk 1:51-53):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humbling the exalted</th>
<th>Exalting the lowly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>51[God] has shown power with his arm, scattered the haughty in the thoughts of their heart,</td>
<td>52He cast the powerful from thrones and exalted the lowly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53The hungry he has filled with good things</td>
<td>and the rich he sends away empty.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of redaction critics see the Magnificat as a pre-Lukan hymn which the evangelist inserted into his gospel, based mainly on the discontinuity between the song and its surrounding context. However, the argument for continuity between text and context by a
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literary critic  allows for the possibility that even if Luke were adapting an earlier hymn, he has absorbed the theology of that hymn into the composition of his wider narrative. Therefore, the Magnificat may be trusted as at least a source (even if not an original expression) of the Lukan theology that for those who fear God, the Lord shows mercy forever (Lk 1:50; cf. Lk 23:40), always remembering (cf. Lk 23:42) his covenant with Israel (Lk 1:54-55). This covenantal mercy means that the God of Luke is the saviour of the lowly (Lk 1:47-48) by making an act of judgment (Lk 1:51) to reverse the situation between the powerful and the humble (Lk 1:52), the hungry and the rich (Lk 1:53).

The Beatitudes and Woes (Lk 6:20-26). The beatitudes and woes, as they now stand in Luke’s text, clearly contain the motif of reversal, with implicit references to eschatology and judgment. This is an eschatological reversal of current earthly, socio-economic conditions into opposite spiritual conditions, with some debate over whether Luke intends a “realized” or “future” eschatology. Fitzmyer and Nolland, while acknowledging an eschatological dimension in Luke 6:20-26, consider it to be de-emphasised, because of the Lukan addition “now” (νῦν), understanding eschatology as “future.” C.F. Evans, on the other hand, judges that “Luke’s now underlines the eschatology, pointing to ‘then’ as the time of divine satisfaction.” However, Evans is more hesitant about finding an eschatological dimension in the woes, despite the fact that the Lukan “now” is found in two of the four woes as well as two of the four beatitudes (Lk 6:21, 25). It is especially in the woes that scholars see intimations of divine judgment. Some also see a hint of the “day” of judgment in the fourth

---
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beatitude (Lk 6:23).\textsuperscript{296} In any case, it is the radical effect of the “reversal of the human situation” which indicates the significance of “God’s valuation.”\textsuperscript{297}

Comparing Luke’s list of beatitudes and woes with the parallel list of beatitudes in the Sermon on the Mount (Mt 5:3-12) reveals a specific emphasis on reversal not shared with Matthew.\textsuperscript{298}

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\textbf{Luke 6:20b-26} & \textbf{Matthew 5:3-12} \\
20b.\textit{Blessed are the poor,} & \textit{Blessed are the poor} [in spirit], \\
\textit{because yours is the kingdom of God.} & \textit{because theirs is the kingdom of the heavens.} \\
21a.\textit{Blessed are those hungering [now],} & \textit{Blessed are those hungering} [and thirsting for righteousness], \\
\textit{because you will be satisfied.} & \textit{because they will be satisfied.} \\
21b.\textit{Blessed are those weeping [now],} & \textit{Blessed are the sorrowful,} \\
\textit{because you will laugh.} & \textit{because they will be comforted.} \\
22\textit{Blessed are you whenever [people hate you and whenever they exclude you] and rebuke and throw out your name as evil on account of the Son of Man;} & \textit{Blessed are you whenever they rebuke you [and persecute] and speak [all] evil against you [falsely] on account of me.} \\
23\textit{Rejoice [on that day] and dance, for behold your reward is much in heaven:} & \textit{Rejoice and celebrate, because your reward is much in the heavens;} \\
\textit{for their fathers acted that way to the prophets.} & \textit{for they persecuted the prophets this way before you.} \\
24\textit{[However, woe to you rich,} & \textit{[However, woe to you rich,} \\
\textit{because you have received your comfort.]} & \textit{because you have received your comfort.]} \\
25\textit{[Woe to you, who have been filled up now, because you will hunger.]} & \textit{[Woe to you, who have been filled up now, because you will hunger.]}
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{297} Evans, \textit{Saint Luke}, 332.
\textsuperscript{298} \textbf{Bold} text indicates a common verbatim Q-tradition. Text in square brackets, “[...],” indicates additions by the evangelist. Text in \textit{italics} indicates a variation between Matthew’s and Luke’s witnesses. Text in \textbf{bold italics} indicates a near verbatim match. Text enclosed by asterisks, “*...*,” indicated a different order between the two gospels.
Woe, those laughing now, because you will mourn and weep.

Woe whenever all people speak beautifully of you, for their fathers acted that way to the false prophets.

As can be seen above, the common material includes the beatitudes for the poor (Mt 5:3; Lk 6:20b), the hungry (Mt 5:6; Lk 6:21a), the weeping (Mt 5:4; Lk 6:21b), and those hated because of Jesus (Mt 5:11) or the Son of Man (Lk 6:23). Special Lukan material includes the four woes, which counterbalance the four beatitudes and most clearly bring out the aspect of “bi-polar reversal” (Lk 6:24-26), the addition of the adverb “now” to the beatitudes for the hungry and the weeping (Lk 6:21), and other additions to the beatitude for the hated (Lk 6:23).

Those redaction critics who accept the two document hypothesis see some form of the four beatitudes of Luke as part of the common “Q” tradition. The question they then ask is whether the four woes of Luke’s text are also from “Q” or were composed by Luke. Whether Luke obtained the woes from a source or composed them himself, there is the alternative question of how well Luke has integrated them into his surrounding text. The level of integration of Luke’s woes with its context may be taken as an indicator of its integration into Luke’s own theological outlook. Despite the awkwardness of the mixture of second and third person forms, the inclusion of woes with beatitudes brings out a clear theology of reversal found elsewhere in Luke. There is also the question of awkwardness in Luke adding a series of woes in an address of Jesus to his disciples (Lk 6:20a). However, the judgmental tone of the woes is found also at the end of the sermon, as Jesus’ distinction
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299 According to the definition of York, *The Last Shall Be First*, 42.
between “everyone coming to me and hearing my words and doing them” and “the one hearing and not doing” (Lk 6:47, 49). The Lukan Jesus, in pronouncing the woes, could be “sifting” through his disciples, or least warning them to be authentic in their discipleship. The call to listen is found in the words immediately following the woes as a contrastive statement (Lk 6:27a). The following pericope, the exhortation to love one’s enemies (Lk 6:27-35), promises those who listen and love while being hated, that “your reward will be great” (ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολύς) as children of the most high (Lk 6:35), with little credit given to those who love while being loved (Lk 6:32-34). Similarly, the fourth beatitude promises those who are hated on account of the Son of Man, that “your reward will be great” (ὁ μισθὸς ὑμῶν πολύς) in heaven (Lk 6:23), whereas the fourth woe is pronounced against those praised by “all people” (Lk 6:26). Although Luke 6:27-36 appears to have come from a tradition shared with Matthew 5:43-48, the vocabulary which connects it with the Lukan beatitudes and woes (“your reward will be great”) is not found in the Matthean parallel. Whether the beatitude-woe pairings are Lukan composition or from a Lukan source, they appear to reflect a Lukan connection between reversal and eschatological judgment as a motivation for the love of enemies during persecution, as expressed by the Lukan Jesus during his passion (Lk 22:51; 23:34a, if textually authentic).

**The Rich Man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-31)**. In the special Lukan parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Lk 16:19-31), which Jesus directs to the Pharisees (Lk 16:14-15a), there is a clear motif of an eschatological reversal taking place between the two characters. During their earthly lifetimes, the rich man is dressed in purple and feasts everyday in luxury (Lk 16:19). Lazarus, on the other hand, spends his earthly days at the rich man’s gate, starving to eat the scraps from the rich man’s table, his sores licked by the dogs (Lk 16:20-21). Both die: the poor man is carried by angels to the bosom of Abraham; the rich man is buried.
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presumably with a costly funeral (Lk 16:22). After death, their conditions are reversed: the rich man is tormented in the underworld, unable to cool his tongue with water, while the poor man reclines in Abraham’s bosom (Lk 16:23-24). The imagery of reclining in Abraham’s “bosom” itself suggests the image of an eschatological feast.\footnote{Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 636; Fitzmyer, Gospel According to Luke, 2:1132.} The chasm separating the two men suggests the finality of their post-mortem state (Lk 16:26). Abraham’s words to the rich man forms the interpretative key to the parable: “Child, remember that you received your good things in your life, and Lazarus likewise the bad things; but now he is comforted here, and you are in agony” (Lk 16:25).\footnote{The presence of Lukan vocabulary throughout this verse, rather than merely in single phrases, suggests the possibility that it is Luke’s interpretation of an earlier tale: Nolland, Luke, 2:830.} However, another dimension opens up in the parable as the dialogue continues: there is a question of being saved from post-mortem torments by repentance (Lk 16:28), and a connection is made between not listening to the law and the prophets and not repenting at someone rising from the dead (Lk 16:29-31). Two Lukan themes have been woven into the original story: eschatological reversal between the rich and the poor, the satisfied and the hungry (Lk 16:19-26; cf. Lk 1:53; 6:20b-21a, 24-25a); and repentance as both faith in Jesus’ resurrection and obedience to the scriptures (Lk 16:27-31; cf. Lk 24:25-27, 31-32, 44-47; Acts 2:14-39; 26:27). Therefore, it may not be helpful to designate the first half of the parable as pre-Lukan and the second half as Lukan composition,\footnote{Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 633.} since both parts show signs of the incorporation of Lukan themes into earlier folk tales.\footnote{The most common suggestion for the “inspiration” of the parable is of the Egyptian Si-Osiris who reveals to his father the radical post-mortem difference in the fates of a rich man and a poor man, first suggested by Hugo Gressmann in 1918. Marshall, Gospel of Luke, 633; Fitzmyer, Gospel According to Luke, 2:1126-1127; Evans, Saint Luke, 612-613; Nolland, Luke, 2:826.}

It may be asked whether the motif of eschatological reversal (Lk 16:19-26) is in any way connected to a divine judgment. Nolland thinks there is a “judgment” taking place between
the rich man and Lazarus, \(^\text{310}\) but Fitzmyer more wisely points out that “the story says nothing about judgment, but inculcates only the reversal of fortunes.”\(^\text{311}\) This Lukan parable makes no mention of God acting as judge between the two men, most likely because the original folk story, as it came to Luke, did not carry the motif of divine judgment. However there are signs that Luke himself understands a divine judgment present in this tale, according to the context into which he has inserted it. The context in Luke’s gospel means the parable of the rich man and Lazarus is uttered by Jesus to the Pharisees (Lk 16:14-15).\(^\text{312}\) The Lukan Jesus has just uttered the parable about the unjust steward to his disciples (Lk 16:1-8), which deals with the proper use of wealth in order to be welcomed into “the eternal homes” of the beneficiaries of one’s financial dealing (Lk 16:9). The Lukan Jesus then gives some aphorisms about showing faithfulness in the use of money (Lk 16:10-12), and the radical choice each disciple must make between God and mammon (Lk 16:13). Upon hearing this parable of the unjust steward and the aphorisms about the use of wealth, Luke tells us that the Pharisees, whom he polemically calls “lovers of money” (\(\phiιλάργυροι\)),\(^\text{313}\) mocked Jesus (Lk 16:14). The Lukan Jesus’ reply alludes to a conflict of judgment between the Pharisees (and human beings in general) and God: “You are those who justify yourselves (\(ο\ ν\ δικαιο\ν\ τ\ έ\ λα\ ικ\ ν\ έ\ α\ ν\ τ\ ο\ ν\)) in the presence of people (\(\v\\nu\'\\pi\\w\\o\'\\s\\t\i\s\\i\s\\ ν\ ι\ ν\ πλο\υ\w\\s\\i\s\\o\'\\s\)) , but God knows your hearts: because what is exalted (\(\ups\\y\l\o\l\o\n\)) among people is an abomination (\(\beta\\d\e\l\\u\m\a\)) in the presence of God (\(\v\\nu\\w\\o\'\\s\\i\s\\ ν\ ι\ ν\ τ\ ο\ u\ \\theta\\e\o\u\))” (Lk 16:15). The parable of the rich man and Lazarus, aimed at the Pharisees before Jesus again addresses the disciples (Lk 17:1), starts in the same way as the parable of the unjust steward: “There was some person who was rich…” (\(\\alpha\nu\\rho\\r\w\o\p\o\\s\) τ\(\i\s\\i\s\\v\) \(\h\i\n\ \pi\\l\o\w\\i\s\\o\)ι\s\\o\s\, Lk 16:1; Ἄνθρωπος δὲ τὰς ἦν πλούσιος, Lk 16:19). If these two parables are taken in parallel,\(^\text{314}\) Luke

\(^{310}\) Nolland, \(\text{Luke}\), 2:831-833.
\(^{313}\) Green, \(\text{Gospel of Luke}\), 599.
seems to intend to exhort their hearers to the proper use of wealth: the first directed to the disciples, the second to the Pharisees. Overall, it seems that Luke has read the tale of eschatological reversal (Lk 16:19-31) as a consequence of the conflicting judgments between God and human beings on wealth (Lk 16:15).

**The Parable of the Unjust Judge (Lk 18:1-8).** This parable, which gets its name from Luke 18:6, contains strong thematic and linguistic links to Luke 23:39-43 (in terms of judgment), and an allusion to eschatological judgment, but it does not contain the Lukan motif of “reversal” in the obvious way. The Lukan concept of “reversal” which Luke 18:1-18 does not contain is the divine decision to change the status of rich and poor, hungry and satisfied, to their polar opposites. However, the parable alludes to the “reversal” of judgment as it is found in Luke’s passion narrative: the conflict of judgment between human beings, and between human beings and God, where one side is compelled to change its judgment to the opposite of its previous stance.

There is a juxtaposition of diverse themes (probably from distinct sources) either in the special Lukan tradition or conjoined by Luke himself. However, the final form of Luke 18:1-8 suggests that the evangelist saw a connection between these different themes – prayer, justice, the Son of Man – and he chose to reflect this in his text. The parable itself talks about a widow’s quest to obtain a just result from a judge who “neither feared God nor respected human beings” (Lk 18:2, 4). The Lukan choice to identify this judge as “unjust” (Lk 18:6) links to the second criminal’s counter-accusation, that the first criminal’s unjustified attack on Jesus shows that he does not “fear God” (Lk 23:40). In the Hellenistic world, a fear of God or the deities was a fundamental expectation of judges, in order for them to be
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considered just.³¹⁶ In this pericope, the widow’s successful efforts in changing the decision of the judge, from not judging her cause to doing so (Lk 18:5), forms an allegory of God listening to the prayers of his “elect” who continuously cry out to him (Lk 18:1, 7) and doing justice for them (Lk 18:7). The designation of the faithful as the “elect,” symbolised by the widow, suggests an eschatological nuance behind God’s judgment on their behalf.³¹⁷ The final Son of Man saying brings this nuance of eschatological judgment to the fore (Lk 18:8b), and forms a Lukan inclusio with the previous section on the coming of the Son of Man (Lk 17:22-37).³¹⁸ There the coming of the Son of Man likened to the sudden and unexpected judgment of the earth in the time of Noah, and of Sodom in the time of Lot (Lk 17:26-30). So too in Luke 18:8a, God is said to do justice “in sudden haste” (ἐν τάχει), contrary to the unjust judge (Lk 18:4a). That the Son of Man’s judgment of the earth will be primarily a negative one is reflected in both pericopes (Lk 17:27, 29; 18:8b).

Overall, there seems to be at least a generic connection between the more commonly recognised Lukán theology of reversal (as found in the reversal formulae, the magnificat, beatitudes and woes, the rich man and Lazarus) and the implicit theology of reversal in Luke’s portrayal of Jesus’ death and resurrection. In both cases, there is a conflict between the ways in which God and human beings evaluate (or judge) reality, in which God’s judgment wins out and reverses the human evaluation in the post-mortem, eschatological world.

The relevance of this broader Lukán theology to the single occurrence of Luke’s paradise appears to be this: just as the God of Luke steps into the human world and reverses its human judgments in the eschatological world, so too paradise, attainable only by those whom God’s

judgment approves, is surprisingly given to two men condemned by human authorities. One of these men acts as an advocate of the other against his human companion, while the other man repays the favour by acting as his advocate before his own divine Father. Luke’s paradise is a reality accessible by those willing to act as an advocate of the condemned Jesus, who in turn is the advocate of his own.
V. Conclusion

In this study, I asked about the meaning of the word “paradise” in Luke’s passion narrative and how he uses this word. Using a three-part methodology, my research has led me to associate Luke’s “paradise” with judgment.

Using historical and semantic criticism, I studied the context of Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism, looking at the various semantic associations of “paradise” in the Septuagint, Josephus, Qumran literature and the “pseudepigrapha.” I evaluated each semantic association of “paradise” – the royal garden, a luxurious garden, creation (e.g. the garden of Eden), as a metaphor for a righteous Israel or for the temple, wisdom, ascension and judgment (both negative and positive) – according to their apparent influence on the context of Luke 23:39-43, as a general literary influence on Luke-Acts, and as a possible cultural influence contemporaneous with Luke. My findings have led me to put particular weight on “judgment,” with its nuances of the loss of paradise as condemnation and restoration of paradise because of righteousness, repentance or a reversal of judgment.

Using form and rhetorical criticism, I examined the elements of Luke 23:43 and the pericope Luke 23:39-43 as a whole to see how they interact within their structure to create meaning, with the meaning of “paradise” as the end goal. I argued for looking at the pericope as a trial scene. To back this claim, I examined the theory of forensic rhetoric in Greco-Roman writers, its connection to the trial scenes of Luke-Acts and the forensic tendencies implied by these trial scenes, before analysing Luke 23:39-43 as such. I saw first an accusation of Jesus (v.39), secondly a defence of Jesus, which subtly turns Jesus from accused to judge (vv.40-42), and finally a verdict given by Jesus as judge (v.43). I saw a dynamic of “reversal” in Luke 23:39-43, where Jesus is accused, defended, and then made judge; and the second criminal is
(already) condemned, then self-accused, then has his civil sentence reversed by divine acceptance with Jesus in paradise.

Using redaction criticism and composition criticism, I examined signs of Luke’s editing to his passion narrative and the portrayals of Jesus’ passion in Luke-Acts, in order to test my thesis that a “reversal of judgment” is taking place in Luke 23:39-43. I sought to uncover: (i) a Lukan emphasis on Pilate’s reversal of his own judgment of Jesus, from acquittal to condemnation; (ii) the three pairs of opposing judgments made by characters in the passion narrative (the leaders of the people and Joseph of Arimathea, the soldiers and the centurion, the first and the second crucified criminals); and (iii) signs of a divine judgment which ultimately vindicates Jesus while still being merciful to those against whom Jesus has been vindicated. Finally, I looked for traces in Luke-Acts which connect the reversal taking place in Jesus’ death and resurrection to Luke’s wider theology of reversal, noting its connection to eschatology and judgment.

In a nutshell, Luke’s paradise seems to be this. Paradise is a symbol of salvation immediately after death, but does not exclude allusions to the loss of salvation because of the divine judgment in the garden of Eden. The salvation implied by the word “paradise” is for those willing to act as advocates and companions of Jesus, who is righteous but condemned. Jesus’ promise implies that they will have himself as an advocate before God, who opposes their condemnation by human authorities and makes effective that opposition with an eschatological reversal of their condition.
## Appendix: A Concordance of “Paradise” and “Garden”

### Hebrew Bible [Ἅ]

| Book         | Genesis 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16  | Genesis 3:1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 23, 24  | Deuteronomy 11:10  | Numbers 24:6  | 2 Chronicles 33:20  | Nehemiah 2:8  | Isaiah 2:5  | Canticle 4:13  | Joel 2:3  | Isaiah 1:30  | Jeremiah 51:3  | Ezekiel 28:13  | Joel 51:3  | Song of Songs 4:12, 15, 16, 16  | Ezekiel 31:8, 7, 9, 8, 10  | Lamentations 2:6  | Nehemiah 3:15  |
|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Genesis      | 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16             | 3:1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 23, 24          |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| 1 Kings      |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| 2 Kings      |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| 2 Kings      |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Isaiah       |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Jeremiah     |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Joel         |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Lamentations |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Nehemiah     |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |

### Septuagint [παράδεισος]

| Book         | Genesis 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16  | Genesis 3:1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 23, 24  | Deuteronomy 11:10  | Numbers 24:6  | 2 Chronicles 33:20  | Nehemiah 2:8  | Isaiah 2:5  | Canticle 4:13  | Joel 2:3  | Isaiah 1:30  | Jeremiah 51:3  | Ezekiel 28:13  | Joel 51:3  | Song of Songs 4:12, 15, 16, 16  | Ezekiel 31:8, 7, 9, 8, 10  | Lamentations 2:6  | Nehemiah 3:15  |
|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|----------------|------------|---------------|-------------|-----------|----------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| Genesis      | 2:8, 9, 10, 15, 16             | 3:1, 2, 3, 8, 10, 23, 24          |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| 1 Kings      |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| 2 Kings      |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| 2 Kings      |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Isaiah       |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Jeremiah     |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Joel         |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Lamentations |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |
| Nehemiah     |                               |                                  |                   |              |                   |                |            |               |             |           |                |                |             |                |                |               |

### New Testament [παράδεισος]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Genesis</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Kings</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Kings</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremiah</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nehemiah</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></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dead Sea Scrolls [_traits]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scroll Name</th>
<th>1QH 16:5</th>
<th>3Q15 11:6</th>
<th>4Q216 6:3</th>
<th>4Q265 7, 12</th>
<th>4Q265 7, 14</th>
<th>4Q270 321</th>
<th>4Q271 2, 4</th>
<th>4Q423 1-2i2</th>
<th>4Q423 1-2i2</th>
<th>4Q504 8, 6</th>
<th>11Q19 37:2</th>
<th>Philo [traits]</th>
<th>[incomplete]</th>
<th>Allegorical Interpretation of Genesis 1.13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 28, 30, 32</th>
<th>III.1, 9, 17</th>
<th>Josephus [traits]</th>
<th>Against Apion 1.141</th>
<th>Jewish War IV.467</th>
<th>Antiquities I.37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1QH</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Q15</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q216</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q265</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q270</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q271</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q423</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Q504</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11Q19</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Philo [traits]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>On the Creation of the World chh. 54, 55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Josephus</td>
<td>Against Apion 1.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamentations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pseudepigrapha

I (Ethiopic) Enoch
20:7
32:3, 6
60:8, 23
61:12
77:4
2 (Slavonic) Enoch
[poroda; rai]
[longer recension, J]
8:1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8,
30:1
31:1, 2, 6
32:1
42:3
65:10
66:8
70:25
71:28
72:1, 5, 9
[shorter recension, A]
8:1, 3, 8
42:3
65:10
71:11, 28
72:1, 5, 9
[Merilo Pravednoe]
cf. 65:10

Sibylline Oracles
1:25, 26, 30
Sibylline Oracles (Fragments)
3:45, 46

Apocryphon of Ezekiel
(Fragment in Epiphanius, Against Heresies, 64.70, 5-17) [παράδεισος]
1:4, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14
2:3

Apocalypse of Abraham
12:10
21:6
23:4

Apocalypse of Adam
7:21

Life of Adam and Eve (Greek) [παράδεισος]
1:1
6:1, 2
7:1
8:1
9:3, 3
10:1
13:1, 4
15:2
16:3, 3
17:1, 2, 5
19:1
22:2, 2, 3, 3
26:3
27:1, 4
28:1, 4
29:1, 2, 3, 4, 6
37:5
38:4, 4
40:1, 6, 7
42:3, 6

Questions of Ezra [A]
21

Apocalypse of Sedrach
1:22
4:4
9:1
12:2
16:6

2 Baruch
4:3, 3, 6
51:11
59:8

3 Baruch [Slavonic]
[poroda; rai]
4:7, 7, 10, 13
3 Baruch [Greek]
[παράδεισος]
4:10, 15

4 Baruch
9:16
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Testament of Abraham</th>
<th>Psalms of Solomon</th>
<th>History of the Rechabites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[παράδεισος]</td>
<td>[παράδεισος]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[longer recension, A]</td>
<td>14:3</td>
<td>7:2a, 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:10</td>
<td>Life of Jeremiah</td>
<td>Hellenistic Synagogal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:8</td>
<td>9:14</td>
<td>Prayers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20:14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[shorter recension, B]</td>
<td>2:7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:9, 9, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 35</td>
<td></td>
<td>(=Apostolic Constitutions 8.12.18, 19, 20 respectively)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testament of Levi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:23, 24, 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:16, 19, 22, 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph and Asenath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[παράδεισος]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:14, 14, 16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19:10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32:8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have made use of several concordances in constructing this list. However, a large number of the references to “paradise” in the pseudepigrapha were found by my noting each occurrence while reading Charlesworth’s two volume edition (1983, 1985); likewise for the Loeb edition of the two works of Philo referenced.

---

319 For the Hebrew Bible: Avraham Even-Shoshan and John H. Sailhamer, A New Concordance of the Bible: Thesaurus of the Language of the Bible, Hebrew and Aramaic Roots, Words, Proper Names, Phrases and Synonyms, (Jerusalem: Kiryat Sefer, 1985). For the Septuagint: Hatch and Redpath, Concordance to the Septuagint. For the New Testament: Moulton et al., Concordance to the Greek New Testament; Bachmann et al., Concordance to the Novum Testamentum Graece. For the Dead Sea Scrolls: Abegg et al., The Dead Sea Scrolls Concordance. For Josephus: Gregory R. Crane, ”Perseus Digital Library,” Tufts University, www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper; accessed 1 June 2009. The references to παράδεισος found in this search engine were then checked against the printed Loeb edition of Josephus. For those parts of the pseudepigrapha which have extant Greek fragments or versions: Denis and Janssens, Concordance Grecque Des Pseudepigraphes.
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