

CHRISTOPHER M. HAYS

Luke's Wealth Ethics

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
275

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

275



Christopher M. Hays

Luke's Wealth Ethics

A Study in Their Coherence
and Character

Mohr Siebeck

CHRISTOPHER M. HAYS, born 1983; BA (Ancient Languages), MA (Biblical Exegesis), MA (Theological Studies) from Wheaton College, IL; D. Phil. (New Testament) from the University of Oxford; currently wissenschaftlicher Mitarbeiter at the Rheinische Friedrich Wilhelms Universität, Bonn.

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151618-4

ISBN 978-3-16-150269-9

ISSN 0340-9570 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 2. Reihe)

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliographie; detailed bibliographic data is available in the Internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

© 2010 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

This book may not be reproduced, in whole or in part, in any form (beyond that permitted by copyright law) without the publisher's written permission. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed by Laupp & Göbel in Nehren on non-aging paper and bound by Buchbinderei Nädele in Nehren.

Printed in Germany.

To my Michelle

וַיִּבְרָא אֱלֹהִים אֱדָם

Genesis 2:22

Acknowledgments

This monograph is an expanded version of my University of Oxford D.Phil. thesis, though it was composed at the University of St Andrews, Scotland, and at the Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität, Bonn, as much as at Oxford. During the course of its composition, myriads of friends, colleagues, and even strangers from the US, the UK, and Germany showered me generously with advice, time, and resources. The first individual on the long list of people to whom I owe profound thanks is my supervisor, Prof. Markus Bockmuehl. He has dedicated far more time to my supervision than a student could ask for or even hope. Prof. Bockmuehl facilitated my transition from Cambridge to St Andrews to Oxford as I followed him around the island, and helped secure funding for me every step of the way. He spent countless hours offering penetrating analyses of my work, sparked my imagination with a dozens of riveting seminars and colloquia, and helped me navigate the strange waters of the European academy. If elements of this work prove to be valuable, it is because his keen insight has propped up my more modest musings; nobody who knows him will doubt that all the shortcomings of this monograph are entirely my own.

In addition to Prof. Bockmuehl, I am most appreciative of Prof. Dr. Jörg Frey and Dr. Henning Ziebritzki for accepting this monograph to WUNT II, and for giving me the opportunity to expand the book well beyond the scope of my thesis. Thanks also to the editorial staff at Mohr Siebeck, especially Tanja Mix, for extensive assistance in formatting this text for publication.

I am deeply indebted to the faculties of theology at St Andrews, Oxford, and Bonn, as well as to the many friends who have lent their ears and minds to me these past years. During my time in Scotland, I learned from Prof. Bruce Longenecker and the exceptional cadre of scholars in the Roundel, especially RJ Matava and my lifting buddies from the Red Rooves gym: Kevin Diller, Aaron Kuecker, and Kelly Liebengood. I am grateful for the friendship and insights of Mary Marshall and Richard Ounsworth at the University of Oxford, and especially for the constant encouragement of Prof. Chris Rowland. Prof. Rowland and Prof. Richard Burridge from King's College, London, were gracious enough to serve as

examiners for my doctorate; their insights and critiques have aided me greatly in sharpening this monograph.

Since the last year of my doctoral research, I have been privileged to study at the University of Bonn, where I was warmly welcomed, generously hosted, and, at times, veritably guided by members of the faculty, including Prof. Dr. Michael Wolter, Dr. Jochen Schmidt, Dr. Jochen Flebbe, and, above all, Prof. Dr. Wolfram Kinzig.

This monograph is rooted in earlier research and formative studies at my *alma mater*, Wheaton College. I am especially grateful for the constant encouragement of my mentor, Prof. Gene Green, and to the myriad of other scholars who invested in me there, including Professors G.K. Beale, Dan Treier, Scott Hafemann, and Lynn Cohick.

My wife and I have been immensely blessed by the constant friendship of Dr. David Lincicum and his wonderful wife Julia. Dave and I studied together in Wheaton, St Andrews, and Oxford, and we moved to Germany together as well. He is an utterly selfless friend, a faithful Christian, and a brilliant scholar; our countless long conversations and debates have strengthened me an academic and enriched me as a Christian.

This project has received funding from dozens of sources. I am grateful for the many beneficent scholarships and grants I received, especially from the Overseas Research Students Awards Scheme, the Oxford Faculty of Theology, All Soul's College, the Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst, the Panacea Society, and the Sir Richard Stapley Educational Trust. I am obliged to many private supporters as well, who are too many to name exhaustively, though I cannot fail to mention the Combs family, Prof. Gene and Deb Green, Troy Cudworth, Wes and Beth Wetherell, Doug Classen, Nate and Becky Akers, and Josh and Rachel Hicks. My family has also been wonderfully magnanimous and supportive. Many thanks to my parents Mark and Cathy, my siblings Scott and Julie, my in-laws Dave and Kathy, my grandparents Ralph, Alice, Dale, and Betty, and Katrina.

Doctoral students often comment that their families are the ones who make the biggest sacrifices in pursuit of the doctorate. This is perhaps triply so in my case. My wife Michelle has repeatedly embraced Luke 14.26, uprooting her life to allow me this scholarly itinerancy. She reads and edits my work, endures uncertainty, and encourages me endlessly. Michelle also cares masterfully for our sons Judah and Asher, who have missed out on many of the comforts of a stationary childhood and remain nonetheless glowing and delightful boys. I am richly blessed to have such brilliant sons and such a beautiful and generous wife.

Thanks be to God for these past years of study, struggle, growth, and joy, for the chance to be student of Scripture. "In your presence is the fullness of joy; at your right hand are pleasures forever." *Soli Deo Gloria*.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	VII
Table of Contents.....	IX
Abbreviations.....	XV
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 History of Research	1
1.1.1 Bi-vocational Solutions	3
1.1.1.1 Hans-Joachim Degenhardt.....	3
1.1.1.2 Hans-Josef Klauck	4
1.1.1.3 Kyoung-Jin Kim.....	5
1.1.2 Interim Solutions.....	6
1.1.2.1 David Peter Seccombe.....	6
1.1.2.2 Vincenzo Petracca.....	8
1.1.3 Literary Solutions.....	10
1.1.3.1 Gerd Theissen.....	10
1.1.3.2 Wolfgang Stegemann.....	12
1.1.3.3 Friedrich Wilhelm Horn	14
1.1.4 Personalist Solutions.....	17
1.1.4.1 Luke Timothy Johnson	17
1.1.4.2 Hans-Georg Gradl.....	18
1.1.5 Summary.....	19
1.1.6 Excursus: The Influence of Luke on Liberation Theology.....	20
1.2 Outline	23
Chapter 2. Wealth Ethics in Ancient Judaism.....	25
2.1 Introduction	25
2.2 Righteousness and Riches	26
2.3 Affluence and Injustice.....	28
2.4 Criticism of the Rich and Riches.....	31
2.4.1 Reactions against the Rich.....	31
2.4.2 The Corrupting Influence of Wealth.....	32
2.4.3 Idolatry.....	34
2.4.4 Relativization of Wealth.....	34
2.4.5 Ephemerality of Wealth.....	35

2.4.6. Retribution.....	35
2.4.7 Reversal	36
2.4.8 Divestiture	37
2.5 Care for the Poor.....	39
2.5.1 Tithes and Heave-Offerings	39
2.5.2 Sabbath and Jubilee Years.....	40
2.5.3 Soup Kitchens and Community Chests.....	42
2.5.4 The Practice of Private Charity	42
2.5.5 Motivations to Charity	44
2.6 The Lifestyle(s) of Essene Communities.....	46
2.7 Conclusion	48
Chapter 3. Greco-Roman Wealth Ethics.....	50
3.1 Introduction	50
3.2 Friendship	50
3.2.1 The Character of Ideal Friedship	50
3.2.2 The Benefits of Friendship	52
3.2.3 The Social Status of Friends.....	53
3.3 Patronage	54
3.3.1 Services Rendered.....	55
3.3.2 Rural Patronage.....	56
3.4 Euergetism.....	58
3.4.1 Types of Euergetism	58
3.4.2 Distribution according to Status.....	59
3.4.3 Purposes of Euergetism	61
3.5 Minor, Disinterested Charity	63
3.5.1 Higher Priorities than Charity	63
3.5.2 Evidence for the Popular Practice of Charity.....	64
3.5.3 Charity in Philosophical Ethics.....	66
3.6 Conclusion.....	69
Chapter 4. Coherence and Character of Lukan Wealth Ethics.....	70
4.1 Prolegomena on Interpreting Luke and Acts.....	70
4.1.1 Synoptic Relations	70
4.1.2 The Relation between Luke and Acts	72
4.1.3 Genre.....	73
4.1.3.1 The Gospel	73
4.1.3.2 The Acts of the Apostles	75
4.1.4 Dates	77
4.1.5 Author	77
4.1.6 Audience	78
4.2 Outline of Ensuing Discussion	79
4.3 Luke’s Depiction of the Twelve	81

4.3.1	The Calls of Peter, James, John, and Levi: 5.1–11, 27.....	82
4.3.2	The Women Followers of Jesus: 8.1–3.....	84
4.3.3	A Would-Be Disciple: 9.57.....	86
4.3.4	The <i>Ausrüstungsregeln</i> : 9.1–6; 10.1–11; 22.35–38.....	88
4.3.4.1	Redaction.....	88
4.3.4.2	Vulnerability and Divine Provision.....	90
4.3.4.3	An Essene or Cynic Ethic?.....	91
4.3.4.4	Possessionlessness: The Exception to the Rule.....	93
4.3.5	The Apparent Reversal of Jesus' Ethics: 22.35–38.....	93
4.3.5.1	Conzelmann's Interpretation.....	94
4.3.5.2	The Fulfillment of Isa 53.12.....	95
4.3.5.3	What is Enough?.....	97
4.3.5.4	Luke on Violence.....	98
4.3.5.5	Explaining the Allusion to the <i>Ausrüstungsregeln</i>	99
4.3.5.6	Conclusion.....	100
4.4	Ethical Paraenesis in the Lukan Didactic Texts.....	100
4.4.1	The Magnificat.....	101
4.4.2	Excursus: Polarity and Reversal in Luke.....	104
4.4.3	The Sermon on the Plain: 6.20–38.....	107
4.4.3.1	Who are the Blessed Poor?.....	107
4.4.3.2	Why the Status Reversal?.....	108
4.4.3.3	Excursus: Jesus' Ministry in Light of 4.16–30.....	110
4.4.3.4	Radical Maxims in the Sermon on the Plain.....	111
4.4.3.5	Transfigured Reciprocity.....	113
4.4.3.6	Theological Motivations.....	115
4.4.3.7	Conclusion.....	117
4.4.4	The Good Samaritan: 10.25–37.....	117
4.4.5	The Woes against the Pharisees: 11.37–44.....	120
4.4.6	Excursus: Luke and the Law.....	123
4.4.7	Life and Death: 12.13–34.....	125
4.4.7.1	The Rich Fool: 12.16–21.....	126
4.4.7.2	Arguments from Nature: 12.22–28.....	127
4.4.8	Banquet Behavior: 14.7–24.....	129
4.4.9	The Demands of Discipleship: 14.25–35.....	133
4.4.9.1	The Meaning of ἀποτάσσομαι πᾶσιν.....	134
4.4.9.2	Models for Imitation.....	138
4.4.9.3	Summary.....	139
4.4.10	Money and Eternal Tents: The Unjust Steward: 16.1–13 ...	140
4.4.10.1	The Steward's Deed.....	140
4.4.10.2	The Master's Response.....	142
4.4.10.3	The Ethical-Eschatological Exposition.....	144
4.4.10.4	Excursus: An Anti-Essene Polemic?.....	146
4.4.11	Double Indictment: 16.14–18.....	148

4.4.11.1	The Greedy Pharisees?	148
4.4.11.2	The Lawlessness of the Pharisees	151
4.4.12	Money and Eternal Torments: Dives and Lazarus: 16.19–31 .	153
4.4.12.1	One Explanation for the Reversal of Fortunes	155
4.4.12.2	Moses and the Prophets	156
4.4.12.3	Conclusions on Dives and Lazarus	158
4.4.13	Apocalyptic Ethics: 17.22–33	159
4.4.13.1	<i>Traditionsgeschichtliche</i> Analysis	160
4.4.13.2	Lot’s Wife	162
4.4.13.3	Pre-Parousia Ethics	164
4.4.13.4	Who Will Be Left Behind?	165
4.4.14	The Rich Ruler: 18.18–30	166
4.4.14.1	Doing Deeds to be Saved	167
4.4.14.2	The Challenges and Reward of Renunciation	170
4.4.14.3	A Personal Problem?	172
4.4.14.4	Options for Rich Itinerants	173
4.4.14.5	Summary	175
4.4.15	The Salvation of a Rich Man: 19.1–10	175
4.4.15.1	The Decisive Action: Apology or <i>Apologia</i> ?	176
4.4.15.2	Salvation for the “Sedentary”	178
4.4.16	The Generosity of the Poor: 20.45–21.4	181
4.5	Summary and Conclusions: Coherence of Lukan Wealth Ethics	184
Chapter 5. Lukan Wealth Ethics in the Acts of the Apostles		189
5.1	Introduction	189
5.2	The Summary Statements: 2.42–47; 4.32–35	190
5.2.1	Unity	191
5.2.2	Meal Sharing	192
5.2.3	Intertextual Ingredients	193
5.2.4	Communal Possession? Capper on the Summary Statements	195
5.2.4.1	Engaging the Essene Thesis of Brian Capper	196
5.2.4.2	Continuity with the Practice of the Twelve?	198
5.2.4.3	The Grammar of the Summary Statements	198
5.2.4.4	A Semitic <i>Vorlage</i> ?	199
5.2.4.5	Communal Houses	199
5.2.4.6	An Alternative	200
5.2.5	Philosophical Utopianism or Friendship?	201
5.2.5.1	Pythagoreanism	202
5.2.5.2	Platonism	203
5.2.5.3	Aristotelianism	204
5.2.5.4	Stoicism	205
5.2.5.5	Utopia	205
5.2.5.6	Luke’s Appropriation and Construal of Friendship ...	208

5.2.6 The Coherence of the Lukan Ethics in Acts 2 and 4.....	209
5.3 Barnabas, Ananias, and Sapphira: 4.36–5.11	211
5.3.1 Barnabas	212
5.3.1.1 Status Reversal.....	212
5.3.1.2 Euergetism and Honor Acquisition.....	213
5.3.2 Ananias and Sapphira’s Sin: 5.1–11	214
5.3.3 Giving All Revisited: Capper’s Thesis Once Again	216
5.3.3.1 Disanalogies between the Practices	217
5.3.3.2 Technical Terminology.....	218
5.3.3.3 While What Remained?.....	220
5.3.3.4 Supererogatory Divestiture.....	221
5.3.4 Theodicy	222
5.3.5 Relation to Lukan Wealth Ethics.....	225
5.4 Distribution to Widows: 6.1–7	225
5.4.1 Pre-70 CE Institutionalized Care for the Poor?	226
5.4.2 Hellenists and Hebrews: Linguistic Barriers	226
5.4.3 Apostolic Response	227
5.4.4 Essene Parallels? A Final Examination of Capper’s Thesis.....	228
5.4.4.1 Continuity with the Summary Statements.....	229
5.4.4.2 Only Appointed from Hellenists?	230
5.4.4.3 Collection of Wages?.....	231
5.5 Tabitha and Cornelius: 9.36–10.48.....	233
5.5.1 Tabitha: 9.36–42	233
5.5.2 Cornelius: 10.1–48	234
5.5.3 Concluding Comments.....	237
5.6 The Antioch Collection: 11.27–30	237
5.6.1 Excursus: The Absence of the Collection from Acts.....	240
5.7 Greed	243
5.7.1 Simon Magus: 8.18–24	244
5.7.2 The Slave Girl with the Pythonic Spirit: 16.16–24.....	245
5.7.3 Magic-Books: 19.18–19.....	246
5.7.4 Ephesian Silversmiths: 19.23–41	247
5.7.5 Felix: 24.25–26	247
5.8 Hospitality	248
5.8.1 Conversion and Integration	249
5.8.2 Serving of Expansion of the Kingdom	249
5.8.3 Excursus: A Lapse in the Divestiture Teaching?	250
5.8.4 Divine Provision.....	252
5.8.5 Summary.....	253
5.9 Paul’s Miletus Speech: 20.33–35	254
5.9.1 Does Paul Deny Being Covetous or Being Supported?.....	255
5.9.2 Another Narrative Exemplar	257
5.9.3 Plagiarism?	258

5.9.4 Coherence with Prior Teaching.....	259
5.10 Conclusion.....	261
Chapter 6. Concluding Summation	264
Primary Source Bibliography	271
Secondary Source Bibliography	273
Index of Ancient Sources	303
Index of Modern Authors	343
Index of Subjects	345

Abbreviations

Works of ancient authors are cited according to the abbreviations listed in the *SBL Handbook of Style*. Most secondary literature is cited in Author-Date format according to the *Chicago Manual of Style*, 15th edition. Citations of standard reference works use the following abbreviations.

- ANF* *Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325*. Edited by Alexander Roberts and James Donaldson. 10 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.
- BDAG* Bauer, W., F. W. Danker, W. F. Arndt, and F. W. Gingrich. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3rd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- CIL* *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum*. Berlin: G. Reimerum, 1862–.
- DNP* *Der neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. Edited by H. Cancik and H. Schneider. 19 vols. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1996–2003. When available, I cite the English translation of *DNP: Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopaedia of the Ancient World*. Edited by Christina Salazar. Leiden: Brill, 2002–.
- EncJud I* *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 1st ed. 16 vols. Jerusalem: Encyclopaedia Judaica, 1972.
- EncJud II* *Encyclopaedia Judaica*. 2nd ed. 23 vols. Detroit: Thompson Gale, 2007.
- IG* *Inscriptiones graecae*. Berlin: G. Reimerum, 1873–.
- IGR* *Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes*. Edited by R. Cagnat. 3 vols. Paris: Leroux, 1906–1927.
- ILS* *Inscriptiones Latinae selectae*. Edited by Hermannus Dessau. 5 vols. Berlin: Weidmannos, 1892–1916.
- LSJ* *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Edited by H.G.R. Liddell and H.S.J. Scott. 9th ed. with revised supplement. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- NewDocs* *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Edited by G.H.R. Horsley and S.R. Llewelyn. 9 vols. North Ryde, N.S.W., Australia: Ancient History Documentary Research Center, Macquarie University, 1981–.
- Str-B* *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*. Edited by Hermann L. Strack und Paul Billerbeck. 5 vols. Munich: Beck, 1922–1928.
- RIC* *Roman Imperial Coinage*. 1st ed. Edited by Harold Mattingly *et al.* 10 vols. London: Spink & Son, 1923–1994.
- TDNT* *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964–1974.
- TLNT* *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Edited by Celsus Spicq. Translated by James D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 History of Research

When St Antony sold his parents' estate and trudged off into the Egyptian desert to tussle with the devil, he was influenced by the writings of Luke (Athanasius, *Vit. Ant.* 1).¹ When Cyprian of Carthage demanded profound generosity of the affluent members of his congregation, he preached particularly from Luke's Gospel (see especially *de Opera et Eleemosynis*). And when Karl Kautsky, the former secretary of Friedrich Engels, argued that Christianity demanded communism (Kautsky, 1925:331–47), he appealed to Luke. Luke's teachings on wealth and possessions have also been a bone of contention in the past half-century. Outside of the theses, articles, and monographs dedicated to Lukan ethics *in se*, historical studies on the life Jesus have examined the moral paradigm Luke transmits,² biblical theology has entered the fray,³ theological ethicists have discussed the question,⁴ and liberation theology has demanded that an account be given for the neglect and oppression of the poor in the Majority World. No single study can hope to summarize all of the related literature; conversely, a defense must be offered for any new investigation hoping to add to the conversation. The present chapter will schematize previous research on Lukan wealth ethics, and close by offering a brief outline of the body of this dissertation.

¹ In this passage, three New Testament accounts are mentioned: the divestiture of the apostles, the Rich Ruler, and the sharing of the Jerusalem community. Athanasius quotes Matt 19.21 when narrating the account of Antony's divestiture, which is not strange in light of the wider usage of Matthew's Gospel in the early Church. But only in Luke's Gospel do the apostles leave "all," as Athanasius narrates was influential for Antony's asceticism (in Matthew they only leave their nets), and of course the account of the Jerusalem community only occurs in Acts. While it is impossible from Athanasius' second-hand account to be sure of which Gospel inspired Antony, the evidence seems to indicate that Luke was at least jointly influential alongside Matthew.

² Such as Oakman, 1986; Stegemann, et al., 2002.

³ Most notably Blomberg, 1999:111–46, 60–75.

⁴ Stassen and Gushee, 2003; Verhey, 1984; significantly in Sider, 1997:52–63, 75–82, 93–105; Kraybill, 1990; Yoder, 1972:26–77.

The present thesis does not intend either to recreate the wheel or to overturn all of the interpretation of previous scholarship. A great deal of beneficial work has already taken place in clarifying Luke's attitude towards property. But at the heart of the debate there remains one significant issue which has not yet been sufficiently addressed: the apparent inconsistency in Luke's ethical paradigm. Scholars have long observed the internal tension in Luke's admonitions regarding possessions. In certain passages, he appears to demand absolute divestiture of wealth (Luke 14.33; 18.22), at other junctures, only 50% of one's belongings (Luke 3.11; 19.8). Luke occasionally enjoins almsgiving (Luke 11.41; 12.33). Still elsewhere he depicts what has often been interpreted as a form of "love communism" (Acts 2.44–46; 4.32–35), and throughout both the Gospel and Acts he warmly portrays the extension of hospitality to Jesus and the disciples (Luke 9.4–5; 10.5–8; *et passim*). Such a diversity of prescriptions might be construed as self-contradictory, and a number of theories have been proffered towards a solution.

Consequently, this *Forschungsgeschichte* will focus on the manner in which various studies of wealth in Luke (and Acts) account for the heterogeneity of prescriptions. I do not propose to make an exhaustive survey of all prior interpretations of Lukan wealth ethics; such an endeavor would have limited returns, since many positions merely recycle and recombine the observations of former scholars. For the sake of brevity, I eclectically engage with major voices in this debate, and cannot give attention to all major works. For example, this *Forschungsgeschichte* passes over Halvor Moxnes' *Economy of the Kingdom*, since it never directly addresses the polyvalence in Luke's teachings (Moxnes, 1988). *Hostility to Wealth in the Synoptic Gospels*, by Thomas Schmidt, will be omitted, as it primarily discusses the twin themes of criticism of wealth and reliance on God, and does little in the way of positively constructing a Lukan view of the rich *per se* or of wealth in general (Schmidt, 1987).⁵ I do not summarize Martin Hengel's landmark work *Property and Riches in the Early Church*, because he focuses on *Jesus'* teachings on wealth (Hengel, 1974:23–30; slightly updated in Hengel, 2008:353–423), not specifically on Luke; he devotes only four pages to Acts (31–34).⁶

By and large the influential suggestions hitherto proffered engage one or more of four different strategies, which I have categorized as: *bi-*

⁵ He also freely admits that he is not interested in the harmony of the teachings on wealth ethics in Luke and Acts (Schmidt, 1987:136).

⁶ A more exhaustive survey of scholarship on Lukan wealth ethics is provided by Phillips, 2003:231–69.

*vocational, interim, literary, and personalist.*⁷ The *bi-vocational* solution accounts for the variance in Luke's injunctions by specifying distinct practices for disciples depending on the manner in which they are summoned to follow Jesus, while the *interim* explanations restrict the divestiture imperatives to a discrete temporal period. *Literary* resolutions appeal to sources in order to ameliorate the disharmony in Luke, and *personalist* explanations permit a variety of praxes based upon individual life-situations. More detailed interaction with the other major tenets of the authors discussed, or with their interpretations of individual passages, will occur as appropriate in the exegetical examinations of the salient pericopae.

1.1.1 Bi-vocational Solutions

1.1.1.1 Hans-Joachim Degenhardt

Hans-Joachim Degenhardt provides a fitting starting point for our review, since his 1964 book *Lukas: Evangelist der Armen* constituted the first full-length study of Lukan property ethics in modern critical scholarship.⁸ Indeed, it was Degenhardt who first brought the problem of the diversity in Luke's teachings and descriptions onto the academic center stage.

Degenhardt generates his *bi-vocational* thesis by positing a technical distinction between the μαθηταί and the λαός; the former group refers to the radically dedicated inner circle of Jesus, loosely equivalent to the Twelve and the Seventy-(Two), while the latter encompasses all believers in Jesus (Degenhardt, 1965:31). Interpreting the Luke's teachings on wealth through this lens, Degenhardt concludes that the demands for complete divestiture of possessions fall only upon the μαθηταί, while the more moderate injunctions to hospitality and almsgiving are incumbent on the λαός. Degenhardt contends that the lexeme μαθητής serves as a shorthand referent to those in "full-time ministry," the so-called *Amtsträger*: missionaries, apostles, itinerant preachers, etc. (39). Thus, one's vocation determines the degree to which divestiture of assets is necessary. Nonetheless, he contends that after Jesus' earthly ministry ended, disciples abandoned this form of radical divestiture (33); scholars offering *interim* solutions picked up and expanded this latter interpretive maneuver, as we will see below.

⁷ Some of the interpreters discussed will exhibit features of more than one category. They have been classified according to the interpretive maneuver of greatest neuralgic import in characterizing their solution.

⁸ His solutions were followed closely by Hornung, 1975:436–37, 48–50, 52–53.

The criticism Degenhardt sparked largely owes to his tightly circumscribed reading of μαθητής in contrast to the λαός.⁹ Without rehearsing the entire lexical critique and discussion of the relationship between Jesus' μαθηταί and rabbinic תלמידין (see Seccombe, 1982:101–05), a few other problems warrant mention.

Degenhardt's interpretation of μαθητής forces him to limit the reference of the parable of salt (Luke 14.34–35) to *Amtsträger*; those who are rejected by God and damned (“cast outside”; see p. 134) are not disciples who fail to act as disciples, but full-time ministers. This, however, implies that abdication from a position of full-time ministry results in damnation, a somewhat troubling interpretation of the parable. So also, as we will argue below (p. 86), the women who follow Jesus in Luke 8.1–3 should be counted among the disciples, and yet they clearly do not divest themselves of all their goods before coming to follow Jesus, but rather support the disciples from their wealth.

Conversely, Degenhardt's positive estimation of the λαός as referring to the entire body of Jesus' adherents (38) lacks sobriety; the λαός, like the people of Israel the term evokes through its LXX roots (cf. Strathmann, 1967:34–37), vacillates in its allegiance to Jesus. The λαός demands Jesus' death (Luke 23.13) and Jesus describes the destruction of Jerusalem as “wrath on this λαός” (Luke 21.23). Moreover, in contrast to the triumphal entry account in Matthew in which the cheering crowds¹⁰ spread their coats out for Jesus, Luke ascribes the adulation to “crowd of disciples” (πληθος των μαθητων; Luke 19.37). In sum, Degenhardt's rigid delineation between the terms μαθητής and λαός, rather than arising from the text, seems incompatible with its contents.

1.1.1.2 Hans-Josef Klauck

With the essay “Die Armut der Jünger in der Sicht des Lukas” Hans-Josef Klauck highlights the interrelatedness of the themes of poverty and celibacy in the Lukan books (Klauck, 1989:1284), comparing Luke's wealth ethic analogically to the theme of celibacy. Though Luke holds celibacy in high regard, he never betrays a universalizing tendency toward the practice (187–90); celibacy and marriage are both viable alternatives. Klauck suggests that Luke permits a similar diversity in wealth ethics, that appropriate use of possessions depends upon the individual's life circumstances (192).

Where others have overlooked it, Klauck rightly perceives the crucial interconnection of wealth renunciation and hostility towards family,

⁹ Jacques Dupont provides a helpful correction to Degenhardt's hard distinctions between the disciples and the crowd in Luke; Dupont, 1973:22–25; cf. Kim, 1998:16–17.

¹⁰ ὄχλοι, a term Degenhardt thinks is generally coterminous with λαός (31).

though celibacy only functions as part of a larger discussion of discipleship and family obligations. But Luke does not discuss celibacy *per se* in terms as specific as Klauck implies. Additionally, as I have argued elsewhere, the interconnection of these themes in Luke derives not from a common plurality of viable lifestyle decisions, but from the shared theological considerations which inform both of these ethical issues (Hays, 2009b:47–68). The ambivalence towards family in Luke does not intimate the endorsement or foreclosure of either matrimony or celibacy, but rather underlines the danger of being distracted from discipleship by family concerns. Moreover, appealing to an analogy between celibacy and renunciation of possessions does not, in itself, justify a plurality of viable ethical decisions, since Luke makes more exclusivist statements about wealth than family (e.g. Luke 14.33).

Klauck's solution straddles the *personalist* and *bi-vocational* camps. He avoids Degenhardt's flat-footed bifurcation between *μαθητής* and *λαός*, and, at the level of the reader's moral response, he recognizes with the *personalists* the importance of each individual discerning how they appropriate the Lukan teaching as their own situation requires (see pp. 17–19). Still, Klauck's underlying way of dealing with the diversity in Luke's texts is basically *bi-vocational*, as he accounts for all the teachings on complete divestiture by means of the disciple's vocation in following Jesus, while allotting the injunctions to generosity to the non-itinerant disciples.

1.1.1.3 Kyoung-Jin Kim

Kyoung-Jin Kim's doctoral thesis *Stewardship and Almsgiving in Luke's Theology*, makes an eclectic set of appeals that does not fit easily into just one of the interpretive categories I have described. His most significant contribution is to renew Degenhardt's observation that the characters of the Gospel can be divided into two groups: itinerant disciples (like Peter, James, John, and Jesus) and "sedentary" disciples (such as Mary, Martha, Levi, the women from 8.1–3) (Kim, 1998:100–10). I discuss Kim's *bi-vocational* schema in more detail in chp. 4 (pp. 179–180).

One of Kim's agendas is to isolate a specific practice that Luke wants to endorse. Kim concludes repeatedly that the one concrete behavior that Luke enjoins for his audience is "almsgiving."¹¹ This requires Kim to flatten out or overlook a number of the other behaviors that Luke enjoins. He gives no weight to Luke's teachings on debt remission (Luke 6.34–35; 7.41–43; 11.4) or meal sharing (Luke 14.12–24; Acts 2.43, 46). He does

¹¹ The same homogenization of Luke's teachings into an endorsement simply of almsgiving is also characteristic of Mineshige, 2003:243, 64.

not seem to differentiate between sharing and almsgiving (though see Luke 3.11; Acts 2.44; 4.32).

In highlighting Luke's exclusive concern with almsgiving, Kim argues that Luke 14.33 does not call for an actual renunciation of goods. Kim avers that Luke meant renunciation "metaphorically," referring to the surrender of "ownership to God," who is the Christian's spiritual master (111–130), while not completely surrendering use. "Luke seems to keep and even emphasize the radical notions of total renunciation of goods, but understand that as the renunciation of the *ownership* of goods" (109). With advocates of the *literary* strategy (see below), he claims that the renunciation commands were embedded in his sources owing to the historical practices of the Twelve, and that Luke could not therefore remove them. Still, he is confident that "Luke is not preoccupied with total renunciation of possession in a literal sense because *it would not have meant anything in his community*" (109, italics mine; cf. Dupont, 1971:570). This maneuver is predicated upon the assumptions that Luke's audience is largely affluent (40–44) and that renunciation is incompatible with the "day-to-day living" now necessitated by the delay of the *parousia* (108, citing Luke 9.23). I critique this aspect of Kim's proposal on pp. 179–180.

Although significant problems accompany Degenhardt and Kim's proposals, their recognition that vocation influences the practice of the disciples remains meritorious. In chp. 4 I will argue that diversity of vocations does account, *in part*, for the disharmony in Luke's teaching. In addressing the afterlife of the second half of Degenhardt's proposal, namely, that the demands for radical divestiture applied only to the epoch of Jesus' ministry, we turn to our next section.

1.1.2 *Interim Solutions*

1.1.2.1 David Peter Seccombe

Published in 1982, David Seccombe's doctoral dissertation *Possessions and the Poor in Luke-Acts* remains to date the most formidable and distinctive work on our topic in the English language. Seccombe is a prominent advocate of what this thesis will refer to as *interim* solutions, viz., approaches that limit Jesus' statements on renunciation and divestiture to the brief historical period of his ministry.¹² The unique strokes of his interpretation fall broadly into two categories.

¹² I will pass over the 1974 article of Walter Schmithals "Lukas – Evangelist der Armen," which contended that the radical teachings on wealth derive from Luke's concern with persecution. According to Schmithals, Luke fears that attachment to this world

First, Seccombe understands most references to the “poor” in Luke as referring, not literally to the socio-economically disadvantaged, but figuratively to Israel, flowing in the stream of Isaiah’s usage (Seccombe, 1982: 35–43; but see below pp. 111). Consequently, he reads passages such as the Magnificat (Luke 1.46–55), Jesus’ sermon at Nazareth (4.16–20), and the Beatitudes (6.20–26) as emphasizing the arrival of God’s salvation for Israel *qua* a nation.

Second, Seccombe interprets the major statements on renunciation of possessions (especially 14.25–35) within the thematic framework of the Travel Narrative (9.51–19.28). Seccombe contends that Jesus’ consciousness of his own impending death dominates these chapters. Where he controversially parts ways with general scholarly opinion is in his elaboration that Jesus expects his disciples to *die with him* in Jerusalem as the ultimate expression of “following” him (112–13), an interpretation largely dependent on Seccombe’s stark reading of Luke 14.27.¹³ On these grounds Seccombe argues that the imperatives to radical divestiture are situationally conditioned. “In the extreme situation of the last journey to Jerusalem, all this was literally necessary. Normally it will not be necessary, but at any moment it could be” (116).

For now, it will suffice to flag only my concern with Seccombe’s understanding of the Travel Narrative section. Seccombe accurately affirms that Jesus’ coming death occupies Luke’s attention in this narrative; Luke repeatedly expositis Jesus’ suffering messianic vocation, as well as the corresponding behavior required of the disciples. Where we differ is in our understanding of the specific shape of the behavior expected of the disciples.

Against Seccombe, I might invoke Luke Timothy Johnson’s groundbreaking narrative-critical analysis of Luke and Acts (see below). Johnson argues persuasively for the predominance of a “Prophet and the People” pattern, tracing continuity between Moses, Jesus, and the disciples as they all create division in Israel and incur the rejection of the religious elite. This rejection of Jesus’ message of salvation by the Jerusalem leadership created a “leadership vacuum” to be filled by the Twelve as the new lead-

might tempt a Christian to fold under threat of persecution; the Christian must be prepared (“muß bereit sein”) to give up all his or her possessions, and even his or her own life (Schmithals, 1974: 164). As such, Schmithals considers the instructions on divestiture to be historically situated teachings, and not abiding imperatives. Though taking an important step in the history of scholarship on Lukan wealth ethics, Schmithals has not gained many followers.

¹³ The promise of many-fold reward to the disciples for leaving their homes and families in 18.29–30 clashes with Seccombe’s contention that Jesus intended the disciples to come die with him in Jerusalem (Seccombe, 1982:112–13), for how could the disciples receive their earthly recompense if their demise were imminent?

ers of Israel (Johnson, 1977:124). As such, it is far more natural to reason that Jesus' ethical injunctions, expounded at such length in the Travel Narrative, do not constitute *interim* ethics in order to ensure the martyrdom of the Twelve at Jesus' side, but rather functioned as abiding ethical principles, laying the groundwork for the faithful people of God who would *continue* to follow Christ after his death.

1.1.2.2 Vincenzo Petracca

Vincenzo Petracca's dissertation *Gott oder das Geld: Die Besitzethik des Lukas* (published 2003) is among the most lucid expositions of Lukan wealth ethics to date. Nevertheless, with respect to the tension in Luke's teachings on wealth, Petracca's account differs only slightly from most previous *interim* solutions. Rather than limiting the applicability of the divestiture imperatives to the time of Jesus' earthly ministry (like Seccombe, Horn, Degenhardt, and Stegemann), Petracca draws the line between the *eyewitnesses* of Jesus' ministry and the later disciples, thus explaining why Barnabas and Paul hold private property (Petracca, 2003:326). Only the original disciples persisted in their radical renunciation of wealth (Acts 3.6).

While accounting for some of the textual evidence of Luke and Acts, Petracca's interpretation allows other passages to fall through the cracks. For example, the women in Luke 8.1–3 were obviously not without possessions, but perpetually providing for the needs of Jesus and the Twelve. Moreover, Luke 14.33 extends the demand of renunciation to "anyone" who would be Jesus' disciple.¹⁴

Perhaps the most significant influence in Petracca's decision to invoke an *interim* solution was his adoption of the position, common in German scholarship, that the disciples became "poor" (πτωχοί) as followers of Jesus. Much of this is a consequence of accepting Stegemann's somewhat outmoded description of the social classes of the ancient world, in which the upper classes (1–5% of the population) are parsed into minute subgroups, but the lower classes (95–99% of the population) are said to consist only of πένητες (the poor, who live above the subsistence minimum and work for a living) and πτωχοί (the poor, who live under the subsistence minimum).¹⁵

¹⁴ Petracca attempts to soften this passage by reading ἀποτάσσομαι as "sich trennen von" ("to separate oneself from"; 160), but see the lexical discussion on pp. 135–137.

¹⁵ See, e.g. Aristophanes, *Plut.* 551–552; Marcus Aurelius, *Med.* 4.29.2; Petracca, 2003: 19; Stegemann and Stegemann, 1999:88–89; Moxnes, 1988:165; Stegemann also falls broadly in line with the work of Justin Meggitt, who suggests a similar binary categorization of the Roman economy; see Meggitt, 1998:1–7, 41–74. Stegemann cogently

The latter distinction is categorically artificial and derives exclusively from the perspective of the elite. Notwithstanding this homogenizing elite perspective, there certainly were members of the non-elite who could not be considered πένητες or πτωχοί from the perspective of Luke, Matthew, and the first-century Palestinian audience of Jesus.¹⁶ In 2004 Steve Friesen propagated a more judicious account of ancient socio-economic strata, eschewing the binary perspective and elaborating a seven-layered poverty scale (PS 1–7). In Friesen’s scale, the top three strata (PS 1–3) subdivide what the binary schema refers to as the “rich.” A fourth level (PS 4) refers to those with a moderate surplus, while the lower three strata (PS 5–6) describe those who live below, at, or just above the subsistence line (Friesen, 2004:321–61). The broad strokes of Friesen’s works have been hailed by John Barclay (Barclay, 2004:363–66), whose main criticism of Friesen was that Friesen was relatively arbitrary in assigning 7% and 22% of the population to PS 4 and 5, respectively (Barclay, 2004:365). Recently, Bruce Longenecker has offered a remedy to this shortcoming, and adjusted Friesen’s scale so that PS 4 and 5 comprise 17% and 25% of the population (Longenecker, 2009a:243–78).

Petracca’s adoption of a binary socio-economic model is problematic in its own right, but Petracca and his predecessors go on to engage it as part of a larger effort to identify the disciples with the πτωχοί of the Sermon on the Plain, on the grounds that, by their divestiture of possessions, they became πτωχοί. Notwithstanding my arguments regarding the lack of complete divestiture by the disciples (see p. 93), it is not accurate to think of them as beggars (“Bettelarmen”; 96). While the Twelve may not have possessed significant liquid capital (Acts 3.6) and had left behind most of their possessions (Luke 18.28), Acts 4.34 avers that they were not needy.¹⁷ It would be a mistake to classify the disciples, who were adequately fed and clothed (Luke 22.35–38), in the same category as beggars and severely impoverished day laborers; I doubt that the beggars would have made the same mistake. Moreover, it is an over-reading of the Sermon on the Plain to contend that the Beatitudes are addressed exclusively to the Twelve disciples as πτωχοί, not only because the Woes use second person plural verbs

describes and categorizes intra-elite relations, but the grounds on which he derives the categories for the non-elite are lacking.

¹⁶ The non-elite would not have identified, for example, a successful merchant or tradesman as “poor” (by either Greek lexeme), and conversely those in the Roman social elite would not count those in Luke’s Gospel those designated “rich” (Pharisees, leaders in small villages) as members even approximating their own ranks.

¹⁷ Though normally we should not bring the text of Acts to bear on interpretations of Luke’s Jesus, Petracca invites just such a maneuver by asserting that the original disciples persisted in the practice of “poverty” that had characterized their years wandering with Jesus.

and pronouns, but also due to the fact that the term “disciples” encompasses a group larger than those who voluntarily divest themselves of wealth (a point which Petracca himself argues; 103–5).

In conclusion, attempts to ameliorate the inconsistency in Luke’s moral paradigm by limiting certain teachings to a temporary episode in history invariably run aground either on the rocks of contrary textual evidence or the reefs of artificial narrative interpretations. We can now turn our attention towards various *literary* solutions, by which I refer inclusively to approaches that emphasize source, tradition, redaction, and narrative-critical elements.

1.1.3 Literary Solutions

1.1.3.1 Gerd Theissen

Gerd Theissen expounds a *literary* solution to the apparent incoherence in Lukan wealth ethics; he accounts for the diversity in Luke’s teaching by assigning the material endorsing divestiture to Luke’s sources that do not reflect his own views. Theissen’s contribution to this discussion resulted indirectly from a larger argument he made about the sociology of early Christianity in his 1973 article “Wanderradikalismus.”¹⁸ Based largely on analogies to the Cynics, inference from the Synoptics, and the *Didache*’s reference to itinerant prophets, Theissen reconstructs an ascetic group of wandering charismatics, who were characterized by homelessness, an afamilial ethic, and criticism of wealth (Theissen, 1973:249–51). This radical behavior attempts to “seek first the Kingdom,” as Jesus admonished (260). Theissen contends that the modern shape of the Church lacks direct continuity to Jesus, whereas the itinerant radicalism practiced by the apostles, missionaries, and Theissen’s “wandering charismatics” is rooted directly in the teachings of Jesus (257).

The element of Theissen’s thesis which is most significant for our purposes is his assertion that the radical ethical portions of the Synoptics allegedly derive from the teachings of the itinerant radicals, in large part via the “*Logienüberlieferung*.”¹⁹ Although Luke conveys these traditions, owing to the influence of his sources, he distances himself from the wandering charismatics (cf. Luke 22.35–38), perceiving them to be *false prophets*,

¹⁸ That Theissen still holds to this theory of *Wanderradikalismus* is clear in his more recent work *A Theory of Primitive Christian Religion* (Theissen, 1999:95–99, 240–42).

¹⁹ Theissen describes the teachings of the charismatic itinerants in terms of a *Logienüberlieferung*, which is not coextensive with Q, but seems to overlap substantially and essentially transmit the unmoderated teachings of Jesus; cf. Tuckett, 1996:356–59.

in contradistinction to the Twelve genuine itinerant missionaries (270). In response, he offers the voluntary community sharing of the early Church and the behavior of Barnabas as exemplars of Christian ethics.

Although the present study certainly cannot elaborate a full-scale response to Theissen's reconstruction of Christian origins, I might highlight some of the points of rebuttal that other scholars have raised.²⁰ Suffice it to say that Theissen's basic hypothesis regarding the itinerant radicals who transmit Q-like material essentially follows the research of Paul Hoffmann (as also do Louise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann, see below). Nonetheless, few Q scholars still consider these itinerant radicals to be the primary traditors of the Q traditions.²¹ The weight of opinion within Q-scholarship seems to have shifted in favor of the proposals exemplified by John Kloppenborg, namely, that Q is a document composed by the lower-class scribes residing in Galilean towns, who endorse local renewal and resistance to Roman authority and the Jerusalem elite (see Kloppenborg [Verbin], 2000:172–75, 200–13; cf. Horsley, 1989:116–19).²² While people in these towns certainly knew and supported itinerant teachers, they were not under the leadership of those teachers (Kloppenborg [Verbin], 2000:182; Tuckett, 1996:360).²³ Now, the present author does not subscribe to the existence of Q; I instead endorse the Farrer-Goulder-Goodacre hypothesis (see below, pp. 70–72). Nonetheless, I summarize this development within Q scholarship to underscore that I am not attempting an “end-run” around this (and other) *literary* solutions on the basis of my affiliation with a minority camp within Synoptic scholarship.

Some supplementary points of critique are in order. Theissen's reconstruction depends in part on the analogy to the Cynics. Although Luke does seem to portray Jesus and his disciples in a manner reminiscent of the Cynics (see below, pp. 91–93), that literary evocation hardly permits us to read additional elements of Cynic behavior back onto the historical Jesus movement (so Schottroff and Stegemann, 1984:156; cf. Dunn, 2003:293–302). Theissen's *direct* historical evidence for these wandering charismat-

²⁰ See Tuckett, 1996:356–67; Kloppenborg [Verbin], 2000:179–84; Horsley, 1989:43–50.

²¹ See the critiques of Kloppenborg [Verbin], 2000:179–84; Tuckett, 1996:356–267.

²² There is another school of thought among Q scholarship, represented especially by F. Gerald Downing (Downing, 1992a), as well as Burton Mack and Leif E. Vaage, which sees more direct connections between the Q document and the Cynics than do Theissen, Schottroff, and Hoffmann (see summary and critique in Tuckett, 1996:368–90; Kloppenborg [Verbin], 2000:184–88).

²³ One should also note Dunn's sage criticisms about both the implausibility of reconstructing a Q community and the uncertainty that the hypothesized community would only have possessed a single gospel or collection of Jesus' teachings (Dunn, 2003:149–58).

ics derives exclusively from the *Didache* (especially 11–13). But the *Didache* depicts these wandering charismatics as rather eccentric figures on the margins of the Christian movement, and hardly as the primary tradents of authoritative teaching. In fact, *Did.* 11.1–2 indicates that *apostolic* teaching functioned as the litmus test for the claims of the itinerants. So also, the book of Acts depicts the apostles as the source of the teachings about Jesus (though Theissen assumes, much in the tradition of Baur, that Acts is a big “cover-up”). Finally, it seems inconsistent that Luke would be so vehemently opposed to the traditors of the Logia materials, considering them “false prophets” (270), and yet simultaneously utilize their tradition as the basis for so much of the distinctive material in his Gospel. Why would Luke not at least file the sharp edges off of their ascetic tradition, as Matthew allegedly did? Surely Luke was not so redactionally hapless at to be incapable of that. Because of its controversial historical underpinnings and its anemic account of Lukan redaction, Theissen’s source-critical thesis does not offer a satisfactory account of the ethical variegation in Luke.

1.1.3.2 Wolfgang Stegemann

Luise Schottroff and Wolfgang Stegemann proffer a variation on Theissen’s *literary* solution. First published in German in 1978, their book *Jesus and the Hope of the Poor* progresses in three parts. Schottroff penned the first two chapters, dealing respectively with the earliest traditions about the wealth teachings of Jesus and the exhortations of the wandering prophets preserved in the “Sayings Source.” The final chapter, composed by Stegemann, proposes that Luke moderates the radical teachings of the Jesus movement and the wandering prophets in order to pastor his affluent audience. Because of his accurate transmission of traditions, certain tensions persist in his treatment of wealth and possessions (Schottroff and Stegemann, 1986:68). Nonetheless, Luke’s larger narrative recasts the requirement of complete divestiture, received from the Sayings Source, as being exclusively applicable to the disciples. For a time, the disciples lived in a way appropriate to the Kingdom of God, which was only present during the time in which Jesus was on earth, and is thus no longer literally applicable to Luke’s readers (76). Luke maintains the accounts of divestiture in order to criticize the lifestyles of the rich, similar to the method adopted by the Cynics (82–87). In response, he expects the rich to pursue almsgiving, benefaction of the lower class, and debt forgiveness (109–15), with Zacchaeus’ 50% divestiture serving as a heuristic guideline (117). In short, Stegemann arrives at the same destination as *interim* solutions, albeit along

a different route.²⁴ I am inclined to lay much of the German partiality towards an *interim* solution at the feet of Conzelmann's three-epoch view of Lukan history.²⁵

Part of Stegemann's thesis rests on his association of the disciples with "the poor," a notion critiqued briefly in the discussion of Petracca's thesis and to be addressed at greater length below (p. 107). So also, Schottroff and Stegemann's view of the Q community (or better, "Q people"; Kloppenborg [Verbin], 2000:170–71), as indicated above (p. 11), has not won the day in Q scholarship. For the sake of brevity, then, I will simply discuss my disagreement with Stegemann's thesis that the Kingdom of God was present *only* among the disciples during the three-year ministry of Jesus.

Stegemann offers no explicit support for this thesis that the Kingdom did not persist after the time of Christ; the texts he mentions are Luke 6.20; 12.32; 17.21, which merely establish that the Kingdom of God was indeed present among the disciples. Conversely, Luke 13.18–21 describes the slow and steady growth of the Kingdom. In the same vein, Luke 17.21 prefaces a discourse about the eschatological arrival of the Kingdom, affirming that the Kingdom had already begun in the midst of the disciples and thus they should not be looking for a future coming after Jesus is gone. In conjunction with the evidence from the Gospel, Acts depicts the Kingdom of God both as a future hope and a present reality inaugurated with Christ's ministry (Acts 8.12; 28.23, 31; cf. Acts 2.16–36).

Stegemann expounds his position at length in his discussion of the account of the Rich Ruler. He claims that the command that the Ruler renounce his possessions is "a call to the present kingdom of God" (76) in which the ruler becomes one of the new poor. But Luke says that the ruler sought "eternal life" (18.18). As such Jesus' command to "sell all" should

²⁴ At this juncture, it would be appropriate to mention Walter Pilgrim's *Good News to the Poor* and John Gillman's *Possessions and the Life of Faith*. Both of these volumes target pastors and educated laity rather than scholars, but need to be located in our framework. Pilgrim picks up Stegemann's conclusion that the wealth ethics of Jesus were limited in their application to the ministry of Jesus (Pilgrim, 1981:101). Gillman briefly notes the positions of Degenhardt and Schmithals, and then throws his hat into the ring with Pilgrim, basing his conclusion, not so much on source criticism, as on Luke 22.35–38 (Gillman, 1991:72).

²⁵ The same perspective is evident in another recent proponent of the *interim* view, Kiyoshi Mineshige, who argues along lines similar to Horn and Seccombe: "Für Lukas gehört die Aussendungsrede zur Vergangenheit. Früher musste man zwar nicht arbeiten. Von nun an (Lk 22,36) beginnt aber die Zeit der Kirche. In dieser neuen Zeit wird aufgefordert, sich durch eigene Erwerbarbeit den Unterhalt zu verdienen" (Mineshige, 2003:259). The role of Luke 22.35–38 in historicist readings of Luke will be discussed at length on pp. 93–100.