

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Expository Times* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_expository-times_01.php

pdfs are named: [Volume]_[Issue]_[1st page of article].pdf

The Twofold Use of 'Jerusalem' in the Lucan Writings.

By J. VERNON BARTLET, M.A., MANSFIELD COLLEGE, OXFORD.

To begin with the phenomena in Luke's Gospel, as the simpler, we find that out of 31 instances Jerusalem occurs in the Hebraic form (Ἱεροσολάημ) in 27, and in the Hellenic (Ἱεροσόλυμα) only in 4, namely 2²² 13²² 19²⁸ 23⁷. When we analyze them, these four cases seem due to the final author of this Gospel. Thus 2²², 'they brought Him (the infant Jesus) up to Jerusalem, to present Him to the Lord,' is the first reference to the Jewish capital in the work, and so it naturally appears in the form familiar to Gentile readers. In marked contrast to this, the five remaining cases of the name in the chapter present Jerusalem under the Hebraic form (2²⁵. 38. 41. 43. 45.; see below). The next case, 13²², is a purely objective topographical note, touching Jesus' progress as He 'journeyed on towards Jerusalem'; similarly 19²⁸, 'and when He had thus spoken, He went on before, going up to Jerusalem'—a verse which simply reminds the reader of the course already indicated more than once (and may be suggested by Mk 11¹). The last instance, 23⁷, is the verse which states that Pilate, 'when he knew that He was of Herod's jurisdiction, sent Him unto Herod, who himself also was at Jerusalem in these days.' *Ierosolūma*, then, seems so far to be Luke's own word when writing freely for his readers as Gentiles. And when we pass to Acts the same holds good. Thus it is this form which first meets us in the preface linking Acts to the Gospel, in the words, 'He charged them not to depart from Jerusalem' (1⁴); whereas the next 11 occurrences of the name (1⁸–7 *fin.*) exhibit the Hebraic form.

But, granting that the Hellenic form is that which Luke naturally uses when telling a plain tale to his Gentile readers (without regard to the original 'atmosphere' of the actors), what causes can be suggested for the frequent emergence of the Hebraic form? This happens in the Gospel 27 times out of a total of 31, and in Acts 36 times out of some 59. As regards the Gospel, the fact is the more noticeable in that the Hebraic form never occurs in any other Gospel save in the

solitary case of Mt 23³⁷—the sad apostrophe: 'Jerusalem, Jerusalem, which killest the prophets' (= Lk 13³⁴). Here there is an emotional reason for the persistence of the more Hebraic form, the city being addressed as the hearth of Hebrew religion; that is, it is regarded strictly from the Jewish or theocratic standpoint. Speaking broadly, then, we may say that the habitual occurrence of this form in Luke's Gospel is due to the strong tradition (oral or written in parts), charged with Hebrew sentiment, into which Luke felt himself to have entered in telling the Gospel story, and which controls his style even in certain objective topographical notices where the context is full of Hebraic feeling (see e.g. 17¹¹ 24¹³. 52). This probably explains the habitual use of the Hebraic form in Lk 2–3 (after 2²²), as explained above. A special case is the phrase, 'Judæa and Jerusalem,' always found in the Hebraic form (5¹⁷ 6¹⁷).

The like holds good in Acts, though the proportions of the two uses are greatly modified by the change in the narrative, and by the author's freer hand in telling his story. Thus in the long section, 1⁸–7 *fin.*, dealing with the early history of the Jerusalem Church, the Hebraic form alone appears, and that in cases where there is almost certainly no question of a written source (e.g. 1¹⁹ 2⁵ 6⁷, cf. 9²⁶. 28). Here what one seems to recognize is the instinctive adjustment of the writer's language to the spirit of the situation—a feature in our author which becomes plainest in his self-identification with the standpoint of his speakers and their audiences. This psychological or sympathetic cause of our author's departure from his own usage, and that the one most familiar to his readers, alone explains many cases in speeches by Jews and to Jewish hearers, where the Hebraic form occurs apart from any probable use of a written source. Among such cases I would reckon 9¹³. 21 and 22¹⁷ (in contrast to 26⁴. 10. 20) in particular. But these cases of direct speech do not seem to exhaust the material. There are virtual quotations or statements of motive which

naturally suggest the use of the Hebraic form. To the former variety may belong 9^2 15^2 (in contrast to 15^4) 22^5 ; to the latter, 8^{28} (though it may be a case of assimilation to the quotation of angelic words in 8^{26}).

If now we include the possibility of written sources as a factor, such a variety of possible explanations of the Hebraic form leaves a certain number of cases on the border between two, e.g. 1^{12} 2^5 . 14 11^2 . 22 12^{25} (which is textually suspected). But, even though it clearly has the effect of making more doubtful the actual use of written sources in some cases, it has a most important bearing on authorship. For the Greeks, who fell so instinctively into the standpoint and spirit of the Jews whose words and motives he reproduces, can hardly have been other than a man who had mingled in the life of those whose experiences and feelings he thus sympathetically reflects. On the other hand, he must have been a man of wonderfully fine literary and historical sense, as regards his imaginative realization of what he relates. For the shades

of distinction which we seem to have found to lie behind Luke's twofold use of 'Jerusalem' are totally absent from the Gospel of Mark, and are hinted at only in one passage in our Matthew, and that a Logian passage of deep patriotic pathos—Christ's lament over the city of the Promises (23^{37}). Elsewhere the evangelists, including the fourth, are content to use the Gentile form in a plain, matter-of-fact way, in addressing their Greek or at least Hellenistic¹ readers.

¹ It is interesting to note that in a Hellenistic (Christian) interpolation in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* we get the Hebraic form and not the pure Hellenic one: *Test. Dan*, 5, *καὶ οὐκέτι ὑπομένει Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἐρήμωσιν, οὐδὲ ἀλχμλωτίζετα Ἰσραήλ* (cf. *Levi*, *passim*). Here the city is used, not in a geographical but in a quasi-personal or collective human sense—a sense analogous to one of the Pauline uses, that in Gal $4^{26f.}$; cf. He 12^{22} , Rev 3^{12} 21^2 .¹⁰, and *Test. Dan*, 5, *καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς νέας Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐφρανθήσονται δίκαιοι*. On the dual Pauline usage, analogous to the Lucan, see Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, 316 n.⁷ The religious use of the name persists in 1 Clem. xli. 2, sacrifice being *ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ μόνῃ*.

At the Literary Table.

THE BOOKS OF THE MONTH.

I.

BIBLE-CLASS PRIMERS: BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA. BY ROSS G. MURISON, M.A., B.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. 12mo, pp. 116. 6d.)

Here is a scholar's estimate of the place of Assyria and Babylonia in history, and it is written in language of schoolbook simplicity. Mr. Murison has studied his subject as if for a work of exhaustive magnitude. He gives a selection of authorities, without parade, but instructive. Nowhere can the beginner begin better than here.

HANDBOOKS FOR BIBLE CLASSES: THE PASTORAL EPISTLES. BY THE REV. J. P. LILLEY, M.A. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. 261. 2s. 6d.)

It is highly instructive to compare this Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles with the one by Dr. Horton, recently published. How two men can travel the same road and never see one another is instructive to observe. Mr. Lilley is so serious, Dr. Horton is so gay. Not a point

will Mr. Lilley pass, the more difficult the more determination; Dr. Horton trips from grammar to Church government, and has not his mind made up on this, and does not think that worth half the dust it raises. In the end it is hard to say which gives us the best commentary. We only know which we should consult when perplexed and which we should read when downhearted.

ST. PAUL AND THE ROMAN LAW. BY W. E. BALL, LL.D. (*T. & T. Clark*. Crown 8vo, pp. 228. 4s. 6d.)

Dr. Ball has two rare gifts. He is a discoverer and a writer. Only a few men have been both: Livingstone in nature and Ramsay in literature occur as notable. Dr. Ball discovered the place that Roman law and custom have in the Epistles of St. Paul. And when he first came forward with his discovery in the pages of the *Contemporary Review* he caught the ear of every reader