Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts: The New Covenant Sacrifice

John Kimbell

A steady debate over the meaning of the death of Jesus in Luke-Acts runs through the heart of scholarly attention to Lukan theology. Alongside the growing recognition of Luke as a theologian in his own right, the uniqueness of his interpretation of the cross over against other biblical authors has been regularly emphasized. In this regard, it has become commonplace to affirm Luke attaches no direct soteriological value to the death of Jesus, or at the very least minimizes any such connection.[1] More specifically, a broad contingent of critical scholarship has concluded that nowhere in Luke-Acts is Christ's death presented as an atonement for sin.[2] Rather, Luke's soteriological emphasis is said to land squarely upon Jesus' resurrection and exaltation as Lord.[3]

Without denying scholarship's well-grounded assessment regarding Luke's emphasis on the saving significance of Jesus' resurrection and exaltation, the value Luke attributes to the death of Christ has been underestimated. A proper reading of the Lukan narrative shows the death of Christ is given greater *direct* soteriological significance in Luke-Acts than scholarship generally acknowledges. Specifically, Luke presents the death of Jesus as a substitutionary atonement that brings about the forgiveness of sins. This is not to say Luke emphasizes the saving significance of Christ's death *above* other soteriological events such as resurrection and exaltation. Rather, it is to say that atonement plays a fundamental role in Luke's soteriology such that when this aspect is rejected or minimized, Luke's presentation of the cross and salvation is distorted.

John Kimbell is Associate Pastor at Clifton Baptist Church in Louisville, Kentucky.

Dr. Kimball earned the Ph.D. in New Testament from The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary and completed his dissertation on "The Atonement in Lukan Theology."

THE NEW COVENANT SACRIFICE

One significant way Luke presents his soteriological understanding of the cross to his readers is by showing that the death of Jesus was the atoning sacrifice that established the new covenant God had promised to make with His people.[4] A key Lukan text for establishing this understanding occurs in the account of Jesus' Last Supper

with his disciples. In his description of this event, Luke sets forth one of the most direct statements explaining the purpose of Jesus' death. The statement comes through the words of Jesus himself, at a climactic place in the narrative, and at a strategic location for explaining the immediately following events of Jesus' passion.

In subsequent episodes of Luke-Acts, Luke points back to this interpretation of Jesus' death in ways that reaffirm its centrality for explaining why Jesus died and signify its importance for his narrative as a whole. First, the breaking of bread at Emmaus in the resolution of Luke's Gospel indicates that Jesus' sacrificial death was at the essence of his messianic task to redeem God's people. Second, the breaking of bread in remembrance of Jesus' saving death is identified as one of the essential characteristics of the church in Acts, demonstrating its ongoing significance for the new community of believers. Third, Paul's charge to the future leaders of the church, located within a farewell speech that serves as a literary parallel to that given by Jesus at the Last Supper, is grounded in the fact that God acquired the church through Jesus' atoning blood. As a result, not only does Luke present the death of Jesus as an atoning sacrifice, he also identifies this atonement as the foundational event for establishing the church as God's redeemed community.

THE LAST SUPPER

What appears to be one of the most direct references to the atoning nature of Jesus' death in Luke-Acts comes in the words of Jesus at the Last Supper. Jesus states, "This is my body, which is given *for you* (*hyper hymōn*) … This cup, which is poured out *for you* (*hyper hymōn*), is the new covenant in my blood" (Luke 22:19b-20).[5] Furthermore, the supper occurs at a climactic point in Jesus' ministry and holds a strategic place in the narrative for interpreting his suffering and death, the account of which begins thereafter.[6] Nevertheless, challenges have been raised against the view that Luke presents Jesus' death as an atonement in these verses.

Body and Blood "for You"

It is evident at a general level that "for you" (*hyper hymōn*) is used in this context to describe an action done for the sake of another's benefit.[7] Yet one needs to be more specific than this, for it has been suggested this need not imply a substitutionary or atoning explanation of Christ's death. Some scholars see the death of Christ only as sealing and guaranteeing the new covenant with no necessary implications of atonement for sin.[8]

Perhaps the most significant issue in this discussion is the way Old Testament ideas are driving Luke's account of the Last Supper. Clearly Luke portrays the Last Supper as a Passover meal.[9] In Luke 22:19-20, Jesus reinterprets elements of the Passover meal, the bread and the cup, in relation to his own death. In the word about the cup, Jesus explains it as representing "the new covenant in my blood." This data brings together backgrounds of the deliverance of Israel from Egypt (celebrated in the Passover meal) and the subsequent establishment of the old covenant at Sinai (cf. "blood of the covenant" in Exod 24:8), which the new covenant fulfills or supersedes (Jer 31:31-34).[10]

C. H. Talbert recognizes these backgrounds for the Last Supper. But when it comes to understanding what they mean for how Luke interprets Jesus' death, Talbert appeals particularly to the covenant ceremony with Abraham. He writes, "If the death of Jesus is in any way to be regarded as sacrificial in Luke-Acts, it is as a sacrifice that seals a covenant (cf. Gen 15:8-21; 17): it is not an atonement for sin."[11] I. J. du Plessis follows Talbert, stating, "In the Old Testament we sometimes read of a covenant that was sealed by a sacrifice (Gen 15; Exod 24:3-8). These words in Luke 22:20, however, do not focus on a sacrifice for sins, but one that seals the pact made between Jesus and his followers."[12]

The dispute, therefore, is not whether Jesus' death institutes a covenant. On this there is agreement. The dispute is whether this covenant-instituting death includes the notion of a sacrifice for sins. What leads scholars such as Talbert and du Plessis to conclude against this? One of the pri-

mary arguments given for their negative assessment appears to be that the "dominant thrust of Luke's understanding of Jesus' death is that of martyrdom."[13] However, attempting to interpret these words of Jesus through the paradigm of martyrdom rather than atoning sacrifice simply fails to do justice to the Old Testament concepts informing these verses. As a result, it fails to let one of the most significant and direct interpretive statements in Luke's narrative concerning the nature of Jesus' death speak for itself. This can be shown especially through a closer look at the Passover and covenant-institution backgrounds that are brought together by Luke's account.

PASSOVER

In God's deliverance of the Israelites from Egypt at the original Passover, each Israelite family was required to kill a lamb and apply the blood with hyssop to the doorframe of their house. This was so that when God killed the firstborn of the Egyptians, the Israelite firstborn would be spared (Exod 12:1-32). The smearing of the blood with "hyssop" suggests the cultic purification of the people, an idea closely associated with cleansing from sin (Exod 12:22; cf. Lev 14:4-6, 49-53; Ps 51:7; Heb 9:19).[14] Furthermore, the substitutionary imagery is dramatically described in the narrative. Exodus 12:23 reads,

> For the Lord will pass through to strike the Egyptians, and *when he sees the blood* on the lintel and on the two doorposts, the Lord will pass over the door and will not allow the destroyer to enter your houses to strike you" (NASB, emphasis mine; cf. Exod 12:13).

The distinction God makes between the Israelites and the Egyptians is not that the Egyptians deserve judgment and destruction whereas the Israelites do not.[15] Rather, the Israelites escape the destruction befalling the Egyptians because God allows the death of a lamb as a substitute and passes over them *in view of* the sacrificial blood. For the Egyptians, every firstborn is killed. For the Israelites, a lamb is killed and their firstborn are spared.[16]

In addition, significant parallels exist between setting apart the Israelites through the Passover and setting apart the Aaronic priests in Exodus 29 and Leviticus 8. Both instances involve a sacrifice, the application of blood, and eating a meal from the sacrificial victim.[17] Furthermore, as the Israelites were commanded not to go out of their houses, so the priests were commanded not to go out of the tent of meeting until their consecration was complete. In both cases it was so that they would not be killed (Exod 12:22-23; Lev 8:33-35). In the context of priestly consecration, the slaughter of the animal and application of blood is explicitly explained as making atonement for the priests (Exod 29:33; Lev 8:34).[18] It seems, therefore, that the blood of the Passover lamb served the same function.

In view of Luke's emphasis on the Passover context of the Last Supper (Luke 22:1, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15), the parallels between the original Passover and Jesus' reinterpretation of the meal are difficult to miss. Just as God's people celebrated the Passover the night previous to their deliverance through the lamb's blood, so Jesus celebrates the Last Supper with his disciples on the night previous to "pouring out" his own blood.[19] It does not seem far-reaching to perceive the theological point from Luke's narrative that, as with the Passover lamb, Jesus dies an atoning death for God's people so that they will be spared God's judgment.[20]

A significant objection may be raised against this reading. If Jesus really intended to connect his death to the sacrifice of the Passover lamb, would he not have identified his body with the lamb rather than with the bread?[21] While this is a strong objection on the face of it, its weight is lessened when one considers Jesus' injunction for the *future* repetition of this meal in remembrance of him (Luke 22:19). Jesus knew the implications of his death for the cessation of animal sacrifice, and the nature of the new community that He was establishing. The killing of the Passover sacrifice pointed forward to what his death would accom-

plish, but now that the fulfillment had come the pointer naturally would cease. Furthermore, the community of God's people to be established by Jesus' saving death would no longer be focused ethnically within Israel or cultically upon the temple. This community would be a worldwide community, remembering the savior's death in local gatherings stretching to the end of the earth (cf. Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8; 2:42, 46; 20:7).[22] These considerations make it quite comprehensible why Jesus might identify the bread as the appropriate symbol of his broken body rather than the lamb.[23]

COVENANT INSTITUTION

By identifying the establishment of the new covenant with the pouring out of his blood, Jesus also draws into view the establishment of the old covenant with blood in Exodus 24. This is evident for a number of reasons. First, the terms *haima* and *diathēkē* are brought together in the same phrase in the Septuagint (hereafter LXX) only in Exodus 24:8 and Zechariah 9:11. The Lukan context of Passover (Exodus deliverance) and the establishment of a (new) covenant would likely bring the Exodus text to mind for Luke's audience. Second, the new covenant of Jeremiah 31 is specifically considered "new" in comparison with the *Mosaic* covenant that was established just subsequent to the Passover deliverance:

> "Behold, days are coming," declares the LORD, "when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah, *not like the covenant which I made with their fathers in the day I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt*, My covenant which they broke" (Jer 31:31-32 NASB, emphasis mine).

The contrast between the new covenant and the Mosaic covenant points Luke's readers particularly to the covenant establishment of Exodus 24 as a relevant background rather than the ceremony with Abraham in Genesis 15, as suggested by Talbert and du Plessis.[24] In this regard, it is also significant that the term "blood" is never mentioned in Genesis 15.[25] Third, Doug Moo points out the parallel drawn between the establishment of the new covenant through Jesus' blood and the establishment of the *Mosaic* covenant through blood in Hebrews 9:15-20. As Moo puts it, "Whether Heb. 9:20 is evidence of an independent application in the early church, or of dependence on the eucharistic word, that citation supports the Exodus 24 derivation."[26]

In Exodus 24, Moses sprinkles the "blood of the covenant" both on the altar and on the people (24:6, 8). What is the significance of the manipulation of the blood? Certainly the action relates to the institution of the covenant. Yet integral to this institution is the atonement for sin that makes the covenant relationship between God and his people a possibility. Targumic texts make explicit that the sprinkling of blood was necessary to *make atonement* for the people so that they might enter into covenant with Yahweh.[27]

Furthermore, as with the Passover sacrifice, significant parallels can be seen with the consecration of the Aaronic priests. Once again, a sacrifice, the application of blood (to both the altar and the people!), and the eating of a sacrificial meal make up both ceremonies. The context of Sinai indicates that the covenant ratification of Exodus 24 amounts to setting apart the people of Israel as a "kingdom of priests."[28] In the case of Aaron and his sons, atonement was an essential aspect of their consecration as priests (Exod 29:33; Lev 8:34). So it is with the people of Israel in their consecration as God's people through the Mosaic covenant.[29]

In his account of the Last Supper, Luke draws a typological[30] connection between the covenant sacrifice in Exodus 24 and the death of Jesus. Jesus' death is therefore presented as a sacrifice that atones for the sins of God's people so that they might enter the new eschatological covenant with God that had been foretold by Jeremiah.[31] It is no coincidence that the foundational reason for God's new relationship with His people in the new cov-

enant is "because (*kî*) I will forgive their iniquity and no longer remember their sin" (Jer 31:34).[32]

In summary, when careful attention is given to the Old Testament backgrounds that drive Luke's Last Supper account, Jesus is seen to interpret his death as an atonement for the sins of God's people that allows them to enter a new covenant relationship with God. In both the deliverance from Egypt and the establishment of the Sinai covenant, a blood sacrifice was required as an atonement for a sinful people. According to Luke, so it is with the deliverance Jesus provides in establishing the new covenant by his death.

TRADITION OR INTERPRETATION?

Before moving on, one more challenge must be heard regarding Luke's presentation of Jesus' death at the Last Supper. Some say that the atonement theology presented here is merely part of the "traditional material" that Luke has decided to include, which should not be regarded as integral to Luke's own theological teaching. For example, Brian Beck writes,

> In view of his overall treatment of the death of Jesus, [we should] perhaps regard this passage, along with the less precise Acts 20:28, as unassimilated fragments of pre-Lucan tradition, or at least as subsidiary strands in his thought, rather than conscious formulations intended to be regulative of the whole narrative."[33]

Should the interpretation of Jesus' death in Luke's Last Supper account be regarded as "unassimilated fragments of Pre-Lucan tradition," or should it be understood as part of his "conscious formulations intended to be regulative of the whole narrative"? Should it be seen merely as "subsidiary strands in his thought" or does it form an integral part of Luke's "overall treatment of the death of Jesus"? These are crucial questions that will need to be addressed as we continue to broaden our scope on the landscape of Luke's narrative.

THE BREAKING OF BREAD AT EMMAUS

In the final chapter of Luke's Gospel, he presents the resolution to Jesus' earthly ministry. The chapter falls neatly into four episodes: the empty tomb (24:1-12), appearance to the disciples on the road to Emmaus (24:13-35), appearance to the apostles and disciples in Jerusalem (24:36-49), and the ascension (24:50-53). It is interesting to note for the purposes of our study the repeated emphasis on the "necessity" (*dei*) of Jesus' death and resurrection in the salvific plan of God (24:7, 26, 44). Between the testimony of the Scriptures and the previous proclamations of Jesus, the disciples should have been able to make sense of Jesus' suffering, death, and resurrection (24:5-7, 25-27, 44-47).

In the Emmaus account, we hear the fascinating story of two disciples who are met by Jesus on their journey away from Jerusalem.[34] Amazingly, the disciples do not recognize Jesus. The passive verb (*ekratounto*; 24:16) suggests a divine concealment,[35] and in the story points forward to the slowness of the disciples to perceive the reality of what has happened in the death and resurrection of Jesus. For even after hearing Jesus "explain to them in all the Scriptures the things concerning himself" (24:27), the disciples fail to recognize their traveling companion. As they draw near to Emmaus, the two invite Jesus to stay with them for the night. After reclining at the table with them, Jesus takes bread, blesses and breaks it, and gives it to the disciples. At this moment, Luke reports that their eyes were opened (*diēnoichthēsan*; 24:31) to recognize Jesus. Jesus vanishes from their sight, and apparently Jesus' prior instruction from the Scriptures concerning himself falls into place for the disciples. Without hesitation, the two get back on the road to Jerusalem, and report to the apostles how Jesus had been made known to them "in the breaking of the bread" (24:35).

The evident climax of Luke's narration occurs at the recognition of Jesus in the breaking of the bread (24:30-31).[36] This is confirmed by the fol-

lowing report by the two disciples in Jerusalem that it was "in the breaking of the bread" that Jesus was made known to them (24:35). The question presses itself upon the reader, Why is it that Jesus is revealed to his disciples in this way? Stated in another way, What does Luke intend his readers to gather from the disciples' recognition of Jesus in the breaking of the bread?

Some indication can be found in the immediate context. The Emmaus account moves from concealment and confusion to revelation and clarity.[37] The disciples on the road are unable to make sense of how the recent events in Jerusalem fit with their expectations that Jesus had been the one to redeem Israel. Luke's reader already knows that the risen Jesus is among them, so the disciples' unfulfilled hopes regarding "redemption" are filled with irony. As one would expect, Jesus goes on to explain to them why the Messiah had to suffer and rise again. And yet, surprisingly, they still fail to recognize him! The "revelation" is not complete—until Jesus breaks and gives the bread. It is only then that the previous instruction falls into place. From this narrative sequence, it would seem that whatever was communicated to the disciples through the breaking of the bread enabled them to understand how a Messianic death and resurrection could fit into God's plan of redemption.[38] But what specifically did the breaking of the bread communicate?

The breaking of bread is given without explicit explanation in the Emmaus account itself. Jesus does not pronounce any interpretive words and Luke does not give any interpretive commentary. It seems, then, that the narrative action should be able to speak for itself. A natural question arises: Are there previous scenes from Luke's Gospel that would be evoked by Jesus' action? For many, the obvious answer is Jesus' Last Supper with the apostles, wherein he institutes the Lord's Supper.[39] Indeed there are strong reasons for holding this view.

First, when the parallel statements in Luke 22:19 and Luke 24:30 are set next to each other, the similarity in language is striking:

> Luke 22:19: And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them (*kai labōn arton eucharistēsas eklasen kai edōken autois*)
>
> Luke 24:30: he took the bread and blessed and broke it and gave it to them (*labōn ton arton eulogēsen kai klasas epedidou autois*)

Second, the expression "breaking of bread" (in various forms) becomes Luke's characteristic way of describing the Eucharistic meals of the early church (Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11).[40] Previously in his Gospel, Luke includes numerous references to meals and eating (5:29-30, 33; 6:3-4; 7:33-34, 36; 10:7-8; 11:37-38; 12:19, 22-23, 29, 42, 45; 13:26, 29; 14:7-11, 12-13, 15-16, 24; 15:2, 23; 16:19; 17:7-8, 27-28), yet he rarely uses the language of "breaking bread" (only in 9:16; 22:19; 24:30, 35).[41] The reference to recognition "in the breaking of the bread" (24:35) seems to confirm Luke's desire for his readers to recognize eucharistic overtones in the Emmaus story. Third, the three resurrection narratives in chapter 24 are tied together by the notion of "remembrance." The women at the empty tomb are exhorted by the angels to "remember" what Jesus had "spoken" about his death and resurrection "while he was still in Galilee" (24:6). When Jesus instructs the disciples in Jerusalem, he also reminds them of "my words which I spoke to you while I was still with you" (24:44). It fits well in the scheme of Luke's resurrection accounts, then, that the Emmaus disciples also would be called to "remember" the significance of Jesus' death in the breaking of the bread. This is precisely what Jesus had instructed the apostles to do when he broke bread with them at his Last Supper ("Do this in remembrance of me," 22:19) and explained to them the meaning of his death.[42] Fourth, the Emmaus account and the Last Supper account are tied together by the themes of Jesus' "suffering" (22:15; 24:26) and his *interpretation* of that suffering for his disciples (22:19-20; 24:26-27). In both cases, Jesus is seeking to help them understand

how his death fits into God's plan of redemption. This final point is strengthened when one considers the broad narrative structure of Luke's Gospel.

From early on the Gospel moves consistently toward Jesus' divinely ordained rejection, suffering and death in Jerusalem (2:34; 4:28-29; 5:35; 6:11, 16; 9:21, 31, 44, 51, 53; 11:53-54; 12:50; 13:31-33; 17:25; 18:31-33; 19:28, 47; 20:13-15, 17, 19-20).[43] In chapter 22, the fulfillment of these events are set in motion as Judas consents to betray Jesus to the Jewish leaders (22:1-6). At this climactic point, just prior to recounting the actual betrayal and death, Luke narrates Jesus' farewell speech to his disciples. Included within that speech is Jesus' most explicit statement regarding the *meaning* of his death (as opposed to merely predicting its occurrence) and the institution of a meal by which his disciples are to remember what he has done "for them" (22:19-20). As on previous occasions, however, the disciples do not seem to grasp Jesus' words (22:24, 33-34, 38, 49-51, 54-62; cf. 9:45; 18:34).

Jesus' farewell speech is followed by the account of the actual betrayal and death of Jesus (22:39-23:56). Finally, in chapter 24, resolution is brought to the consistent narrative progression of Luke's Gospel that climaxed in the suffering and death of Jesus. In these resurrection accounts, the veil is at last lifted as the followers of Jesus begin to understand the words he had spoken to them prior to his death. It does not seem in the least surprising or arbitrary to find that in the process of the disciples having their eyes opened to understanding the "necessity" of Jesus' death (resolution), Luke would point back to that interpretive moment (22:19-20) when Jesus had explained the purpose of his death to his followers (climax) as a death "for them."[44] After the resurrection, the disciples finally begin to see how "redemption" could be accomplished through the death of the Messiah.

Table Fellowship and Hospitality

While many scholars find sufficient evidence to see the connection between Emmaus and the Last Supper, pertinent objections have been raised against this view. First, nothing is said over the elements as had been done at the Last Supper.[45] Second, no wine is mentioned in the Emmaus meal, whereas the Last Supper included bread and wine.[46] Third, table fellowship and hospitality are common themes in Luke, so there is no need to limit the connection to the Last Supper.[47] Fourth, the Emmaus disciples apparently were not among the "apostles" (22:14) with whom Jesus celebrated the Last Supper, and therefore must have recognized his actions on some other basis.[48]

The fact that there is no interpretive word over the meal does not appear to be a strong objection, for Luke has already recounted the interpretive words at the Last Supper. If the action of Jesus is intended to evoke this prior event in the narrative, as argued above, it makes sense that no interpretive words are needed. The lack of wine at the Emmaus meal matches up with the lack of wine in the eucharistic meals in Acts. It appears that the "breaking of bread" is Lukan shorthand for identifying the Eucharist, rather than a detailed description of the entire meal.

It is certainly the case that table fellowship and hospitality are significant themes for Luke. However, finding a connection to these broad themes *over against* a specific connection to the Last Supper appears unjustified. The Last Supper is a climactic moment in the broad theme of the necessity of Jesus' death, which is actually the issue central to the Emmaus account (not to mention the resurrection accounts as a whole). Furthermore, the support given above demonstrates concrete connections with the Last Supper account specifically, and not merely a general connection with table fellowship or hospitality.

Nevertheless, the themes of table fellowship, hospitality, and atonement need not be isolated from one another. In fact, the Last Supper account demonstrates how intricately these themes are tied together. "New covenant" fellowship is established by the "blood" of Jesus (22:20). Jesus serves his disciples not just by sharing a meal "with" them

(22:15), but most importantly by giving his life "for" them (22:19-20). The final glorious fellowship that Jesus will share with his disciples at the Messianic banquet (22:16-18, 29-30) cannot be fulfilled until he first suffers on their behalf (22:15, 19-20). Therefore, it is the death of Jesus that is the foundation and climax of these other Lukan themes.

The absence of the Emmaus disciples at the Last Supper appears to be a strong objection. Joseph Fitzmyer recognizes the difficulty and suggests that historically the recognition of Christ by the Emmaus disciples must have been based on their presence at a scene like Luke 9:10-17. But Fitzmyer distinguishes the historical question from whether or not Luke intended a Eucharistic connotation in his narrative. Whether or not there is sufficient information to settle the historical question, Luke's composition indicates the Eucharistic connection.[49]

However, a different historical explanation is possible that may raise less tension with the Lukan narrative. It seems historically plausible that the Emmaus disciples would have been told by the apostles about Jesus' actions and words performed at the Last Supper.[50] We know from Luke that the two Emmaus disciples had been present with the apostles between the crucifixion and the discovery of the empty tomb (Luke 24:22-24; cf. 24:9).[51] Jesus had performed these symbolic actions and uttered these interpretive words with regard to his own death in a farewell speech just prior to that death taking place. It seems quite likely that, when this death occurred, the apostles would have discussed the events of the Last Supper with the other disciples as they sought to understand what had just happened. That such a discussion would have included the actions of Jesus at the Last Supper is made even more likely by Jesus' command for the apostles to continue this practice in his remembrance.[52]

However, it was not until after the resurrection that the apostles and other disciples had their "eyes opened" to perceive the meaning of Jesus' death.[53] This meaning was perceived in part through recalling the previous words and actions of Jesus. For the Emmaus disciples specifically, it was not until they met the risen Christ, heard his explanation from all the Scriptures, and then observed his actions at the table that their eyes were opened to perceive the meaning of Jesus' death as he had previously interpreted it in the breaking of the bread.[54]

Yet B. P. Robinson pushes the objection further:

> It would be strange if Luke expected us to believe that the Emmaus meal taken with two minor disciples was a repetition of the Last Supper when he makes it quite clear that the meal that he represents Jesus as sharing with the Eleven, who *had* been present at the Last Supper, was not (Luke 24:43).[55]

Why is it that these two "minor" disciples report to the apostles about their experience with Jesus in the breaking of the bread rather than vice versa? Perhaps there is a Lukan pattern in that it is the women who report to the apostles about the empty tomb rather than vice versa. Furthermore, in view of the revelatory nature of Jesus' action with the two, once they had reported this to the apostles, along with its evident meaning, there would be no need for Jesus himself to repeat the action for them. Meanwhile, Jesus' eating of fish before the whole group (apostles and disciples, including the two from Emmaus) serves a different purpose than the giving of broken bread at Emmaus. At Emmaus the issue of the moment is understanding his death in relation to his Messiahship. In Jerusalem the issue of the moment is the reality of his bodily resurrection.[56] Not only is this made clear by the previous dialogue in each respective account, it is also evidenced by the different nature of Jesus' actions in the two instances. At Emmaus he breaks and gives bread to his disciples, signifying his atoning death as central to his messianic work on their behalf. In Jerusalem he himself eats the fish, thus demonstrating he is truly raised in body and not just in spirit.

THE BREAKING OF BREAD IN ACTS

In addition to the Emmaus account, Luke alludes to the interpretation of Jesus' death presented at the Last Supper through instances in Acts where the church is reported to "break bread" (2:42, 46; 20:7, 11). In Acts 2:42, the same nominal phrase that the Emmaus disciples had used to summarize their experience with Jesus ("the breaking of the bread," *hē klasis tou artou*; Luke 24:35) is used to describe a defining characteristic of the newly formed Christian community.[57] In addition to "the breaking of the bread," the community is said to devote itself to the teaching of the apostles, to fellowship, and to prayers. The definite article before all four nouns in the list suggests a technical sense for the terms Luke is using.[58] Furthermore, the setting described is clearly one of religious worship. It appears, therefore, that "the breaking of bread" refers to the celebration of the Lord's Supper.[59]

The subsequent mention of "breaking bread" in Acts 2:46 sets the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the homes of believers parallel with their attendance in the temple. This is another indication of its "religious" significance.[60] Here, the Supper is said to occur in the context of a full common meal, a description that fits the situation addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians 11:17-34.[61]

This reading appears to be confirmed by the breaking of bread reported in Acts 20:7-11.[62] There Luke describes a scene in which Paul delivers a message to the believers at Troas "on the first day of the week" (*en de tē mia tōn sabbatōn*; 20:7) when they were "gathered together to break bread" (*synēgmenōn hēmōn klasai arton*; 20:7). Here we have the description of an early Christian worship service,[63] and "breaking bread" is described as a central purpose for the gathering. In this instance, the service is interrupted by the accidental death of the young Eutychus, who falls from a window of the upper room during Paul's message. Eutychus, however, is miraculously raised to life by Paul. Paul goes back up and completes the service by "breaking the bread and eating" (*klasas ton arton kai geusamenos*; 20:11). He then continues to converse with the believers at Troas throughout the night, before departing at daybreak.

While the church meals seem to be rather clear references to the Lord's Supper,[64] it has been argued that the situation is in fact more complicated. Hans Lietzmann distinguished between two kinds of community meal in early Christianity. One form is reported to us in Acts as practiced by the Jerusalem community. It had as its essence the continuation of the daily fellowship meals the disciples had experienced with Jesus. This form had no connection with the death of Christ and no specific relation to the Last Supper, but rather was a joyful celebration of the risen Lord's presence. A second form of the meal originated with Paul by virtue of a direct revelation from the Lord. In contrast to the Jerusalem form, Paul's meal was specifically tied to the Last Supper as a remembrance of Jesus' saving death.[65]

Joel Green also sees a distinction between the "breaking of the bread" represented in Acts and the Lord's Supper as described by Paul. Green, however, links the meals in Acts primarily to the post-resurrection meals with Jesus.[66] He acknowledges some link with the Last Supper, and yet sees this link primarily in that the Last Supper was one of many fellowship meals Jesus shared with his disciples. Therefore, the meals in Acts should be understood as "fellowship meals" that had as their focus the resurrected Lord, and not his salvific death.

Green most clearly lays out the reasons for these distinctions:

> (a) Luke records no connection between the community meal and the Last Supper, as does Paul. (b) Luke does not report the repetition of any interpretive words in the context of the church meal, as does Paul. (c) Unlike Paul, Luke makes no reference in the church meal to the death of Jesus. (d) Neither does Luke, as opposed to Paul, mention the use of wine in the meal.[67]

Green agrees with other scholars[68] that Lietzmann attributes too much to Pauline originality, as well as creating a false antithesis between the joyful Jerusalem meal over against the Pauline death memorial, for both meals surely exhibited joyful anticipation.[69] Nevertheless, he claims the differences listed above still warrant a distinction between the two meals.

Whether or not Paul and Luke agreed on the nature of the Lord's Supper is not the primary concern for our purpose. Nevertheless, the discussion above is crucial in that it raises the issue of whether or not the "breaking of bread" in Acts is related to the atoning understanding of Jesus' death as communicated in the account of the Last Supper. The distinctions between the Pauline and Lukan versions of the Supper, as listed above, are essentially arguments against such a connection and therefore need to be answered here.

Those who view the meals in Acts as an extension of the daily fellowship meals with Jesus, and as focusing on his resurrection to the exclusion of his death, meet their most significant hurdle in the call to remembrance reported by Luke at the Last Supper (Luke 22:19). Green, who demonstrates a keen sensitivity to interpreting narrative literature, realizes there must be a connection between this call of Jesus and the subsequent meals portrayed by Luke in Acts. He claims, however, that since the Last Supper was "one more in a series of meals shared between Jesus, his disciples, and others," Jesus' desire for repetition of the meal is fulfilled by the continuation of these "fellowship meals." Yet Green acknowledges that this view can only be taken at the cost of attributing to Luke "precise, literary continuity" from Jesus' words at the Last Supper to the meals in Acts.[70]

Green recognizes that the call of Jesus for his followers to repeat this meal is not simply a call to meals of fellowship. Nor is it a call to remember his resurrection. Rather, it is a call to remember his atoning death on their behalf (Luke 22:19). As argued above, this was not merely a passing comment, but a climactic moment of interpretation, which is subsequently highlighted in Luke's resolution (Luke 24:30, 35).

When Luke continues the story of the fledgling church in Acts, he reports their faithful observance of what Jesus had commanded (Acts 2:42, 46). As in the previous instances, this report is not simply a passing detail of the narrative. Rather, it is given as one of the central and essential characteristics of an ideal picture of the newly established community.[71] Near the end of Paul's ministry, Luke reports the communal breaking of bread at Paul's closing meeting with the church at Troas. The "breaking of bread" in Acts therefore brackets Luke's presentation of the spread of the gospel.[72] If Luke is given the benefit of doubt with regard to narrative consistency, these meals can be nothing other than the Lord's Supper in which the atoning death of Jesus is remembered by the early church.

Furthermore, when Luke's flow of thought is traced in this way, the other suggested distinctions between a Lukan Supper and a Pauline Supper essentially disappear. A rather clear connection is in fact established between the community meals and the Last Supper in particular. Therefore, Luke has no need to elaborate regarding the actions or meaning of the meals because this has already been made clear for those who are acquainted with his Gospel. The theological interpretation has already been given, and Luke simply needs to show that the church did in fact remember the saving death of Jesus for them as he had commanded.[73] By doing so, Luke intentionally and significantly carries on the theme of Jesus' atoning death as fundamental to the ongoing story of the new community of believers.

THE ACQUISITION OF THE CHURCH THROUGH BLOOD

In Acts 20:17-38, Luke reports Paul's farewell speech at Miletus to the Ephesian elders. In verse 28 Paul tells the elders to "shepherd the church of God, which he acquired through his own blood" (or "the blood of his own"). However, the textual tradition is varied. While some texts make ref-

erence to "the church of God" (*tēn ekklēsian tou theou*), others read "the church of the Lord" (*tēn ekklēsian tou kyriou*). Unlike the variant affecting the Supper words, the external evidence is nearly balanced.[74] Although the expression *ekklēsia kyriou* occurs seven times in the Septuagint, it is not found elsewhere in the New Testament. On the other hand, "church of God" (*ekklēsia tou theou*) appears eight times in the Pauline epistles.[75] This could point to the originality of "church of (the) Lord" (*ekklēsia kyriou*), which was changed to the more familiar "church of God."[76] Conversely, the fact that Luke is reporting a Pauline speech could support the originality of the latter, since it is a common Pauline phrase.

The reading *"church of God"* ends up being a much more difficult reading in light of the following clause (*dia tou haimatos tou idiou*). If understood as referring to "his own blood," one can see how a scribe might be led to change *theou* to *kyriou*. God shedding blood seems to be problematic, and nowhere else do the authors of the New Testament use such language. The difficult nature of *theou* and its ability to explain the variant reading gives it a slight advantage for being original.[77]

If this is the case, one must seek to discern what Luke means when he affirms that God acquired the church *dia tou haimatos tou idiou*. A number of scholars find it at plausible that *tou idiou* is a reference to Christ, therefore translating "through the blood of his own [Son]."[78] However, it may also simply be that Luke has combined two familiar formulas, namely, (1) the church of God and (2) Christ acquiring the church by his blood, without making the explicit grammatical change.[79] In either case, there is little doubt that Acts 20:28 makes reference to Christ's death ("blood") as a redemptive act by which God makes the church his own.

In spite of this, Walter Pilgrim argues at length Acts 20:28 does not prove Luke understood the cross in terms of an atonement for sin.[80] First, although God does act through Christ's death to create a new people for himself, it is not made clear *how* the death functions in this regard. Luke makes no mention of atonement or reconciliation with God. Second, the non-Lukan characteristics of verse 28 suggest it should be regarded as "peripheral to Luke's view of salvation." This is supported by the observation that the "blood" of Christ plays no independent role in Luke's theology.[81] Furthermore, the context is one of practical "pastoral admonition to church leaders," whereas in kerygmatic texts that directly address the way of salvation statements such as this never arise. Finally, this verse should probably be regarded as Luke's attempt to echo the mind and teaching of Paul, whether or not it is a successful one. In that case, it does not represent the particular view of Luke himself.[82]

Bart Ehrman also argues against seeing atonement in Acts 20:28, but from a different perspective. Like Pilgrim, he argues atonement theology is not explicitly set forth in this verse and is read into it by those who assume Pauline thought. Then, appealing to Acts 5:28-31 as the only other occasion where Luke mentions the "blood" of Christ, he suggests "The blood of Jesus produces the church because it is his blood that brings the cognizance of guilt that leads to repentance."[83]

The Greek verb here (*peripoieō*) is used two other times in the New Testament, once with reference to "saving" or "preserving" one's life (Luke 17:33)[84] and once with reference to "obtaining" or "acquiring" a good standing through serving well (1 Tim 3:13). It is associated in the LXX with Israel as God's elect people (Isa 43:21; cf. Mal 3:17).[85] The immediate context suggests the idea of "acquiring" since Paul's speech emphasizes the elders' responsibility in view of the fact that it is God's church they are shepherding. The church is *God's* church—and it became so *through* blood. Nevertheless, the two ideas are really not so distinct in this case, for, as C. K. Barrett notes, "God acquired a people by saving them."[86]

The related word *peripoiēsis* is used in Ephesians 1:14 and 1 Peter 2:9 to speak of the church as God's "possession." In both cases, the immediately preceding context grounds this in redemp-

tion through the "blood" (*haima*) of Christ, which is explained respectively as providing forgiveness of sins (Eph 1:7) and as a sacrifice akin to a spotless lamb (1 Pet 1:19). Unless one comes to Acts 20:28 with the prior conviction that Luke does not understand the death of Christ as an atonement, there is no good reason to understand Acts 20:28 any differently from these other New Testament texts so similar in theological context and vocabulary. The parallel with Ephesians holds particular weight since Luke is seeking to represent Paul at this point in his work.

Returning to Luke's own work, it is highly significant that both Pilgrim and Ehrman take the shorter reading of the Last Supper text (omitting Luke 22:19b-20). This is a major point of disagreement, and the contrary position has been taken here. If the longer text is accepted, Ehrman's appeal to Acts 5:28 as the "only" other text where Luke mentions Jesus' blood falls away. Moreover, Luke 22:20 gains relevance for our understanding of Acts 20:28 by the fact that it is far more interpretive in nature than the statement in Acts 5:28. Luke 22:20 is intended to communicate the meaning of Christ's "blood" in a salvific context. This is not the case in Acts 5:28.[87]

In regard to the meaning of Acts 20:28, it is especially noteworthy that Luke 22:19-20 interprets Christ's "blood" as an atonement that institutes the new covenant. For in the new covenant God declares that he will establish a people for himself: "I will be their God, and they shall be my people" (Jer 31:33).[88] Therefore, we have significant indication from Luke's Gospel of what he means when describing the church as that which God "acquired through his own blood." The church is God's new covenant people, who have been established as such by the atoning death of Christ.

The question remains, however, whether the theology present in Acts 20:28 is really Lukan theology. Pilgrim's charge that the "blood" of Christ plays no independent role in Luke's theology loses much of its force when the present verse is added to the interpretive statement on Christ's "blood" in Luke 22:20. One might ask how many references to a concept an author must make for it to "play a role" in his theology?

The argument that Luke is presenting Paul's view and not his own again relies heavily on coming to this text having already accepted the thesis that Luke does not understand the death of Christ as an atonement. There is certainly no indication that Luke presents Paul with disapproval. Indeed, the context suggests quite the opposite. Haenchen remarks, "As the ideal missionary and church leader Paul is the example which Luke holds before his own present age."[89] That Luke presents the speech with a particularly Pauline stamp may support his credentials as a historian, but there is no need therefore to assume he fails to make a theological statement.[90] If Luke-Acts were approached this way generally, one would be hard-pressed to discern a "Lukan" theology of any kind.

Finally, that this is a "pastoral admonition to church leaders" should not count against its ability to communicate theological truth. Luke's primary means of communicating theology is through narrative. In this regard, it is highly significant that Luke presents Paul as grounding the elders' solemn responsibility to oversee the church in the theological truth that the church was obtained with Christ's blood. Barrett rightly calls this "the practical and theological center of the speech."[91] It does not do justice to the text to find here simply an "offhand" comment.[92]

Furthermore, the significance of Paul's statement is raised even more when one considers its location within Luke's narrative as a whole. Paul's speech to the Ephesian elders is a farewell speech that brings to a close his ministry to the churches (Acts 20:17-38).[93] Therefore we have a climactic moment in the story, remarkably parallel to Jesus' farewell speech in Luke's Gospel, where Paul reflects on his life and approaching death.[94] Jesus, in the prior speech, points to his own death as the saving event that will establish the new community. Paul, in his speech, points to Jesus' death as the saving event that *has* established the new community.

CONCLUSION

In his account of the Last Supper, Luke establishes through the words of Jesus that the death he was to die would be on behalf of others. Jesus' statement occurs in a theologically charged context and draws on central Old Testament themes of salvation. When rightly understood in relation to these backgrounds, it is apparent that Luke is interpreting the death of Jesus as a sacrifice that atones for the sins of God's people and ushers in the new eschatological covenant with God.

Far from being a minor or unimportant point for Luke, this statement is set at a climactic place in the narrative, and at a strategic location for introducing the immediately following passion of Jesus. Furthermore, Luke goes on to emphasize the significance of Jesus' words for his narrative by drawing his readers' attention back to them in subsequent episodes.

In the Emmaus account, the breaking of bread in Acts, and Paul's farewell charge to the Ephesian elders, Luke reaffirms the atoning nature of Jesus' death and highlights its foundational importance for the establishment of God's new covenant people. The key locations of these texts within the structure of Luke-Acts suggest they are meant to inform the rest of his narrative. As a result, atonement theology is not merely presented in passing or in a way that shows he is simply "aware" of this interpretation of Christ's death. Rather, these texts create an important theme through Luke's work, pointing his reader to the foundational importance of this understanding for his presentation of the cross.

ENDNOTES

[1]Hermie C. van Zyl states in a summary article on this issue that "since the rise of critical scholarship it has become the standard view that Luke does not accord salvific meaning to the death of Jesus" ("The Soteriological Meaning of Jesus' Death in Luke-Acts: A Survey of Possibilities," *Verbum et Ecclesia* 23 [2002]: 533). Peter Doble writes, "What, precisely, is the nature of this widespread complaint against Luke? It is alleged that in Luke-Acts Jesus' death is 'played down'" (*The Paradox of Salvation: Luke's Theology of the Cross* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 3-4). François Bovon states matter-of-factly, "All agree to recognize that Luke rarely confers a soteriological function on the cross, but minds are divided in the explanation of this given" (*Luke the Theologian* [2nd rev. ed.; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006], 183-84).

[2]Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: Macmillan, 1927), 280; John M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930), lxxi-lxxii; M. Kiddle, "The Passion Narrative in St. Luke's Gospel," *Journal of Theological Studies* 36 (1935): 277-80; C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments* (2nd ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944), 25; Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; London: Faber & Faber, 1960), 201; Ernst Käsemann, "Ministry and Community in the New Testament," in *Essays on New Testament Themes* (trans. W. J. Montague; Naperville, IL: Allenson, 1964), 92; Gerhard Voss, *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965), 130; Philipp Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; trans. Wm. C. Robinson, Jr., and Victor P. Furnish; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 44-45; Richard Zehnle, "The Salvific Character of Jesus' Death in Lucan Soteriology," *Theological Studies* 30 (1969): 438-44; Walter E. Pilgrim, "The Death of Christ in Lukan Soteriology" (Th.D. diss., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1971); Augustin George, "Le Sens de la Mort de Jesus pour Luc," *Revue Biblique* 80 (1973): 198, 208-09; W. Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975), 65-67; idem, *Luke: Interpreter of Paul, Critic of Matthew* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994), 77, n. 1, 120-21, 130; C. H. Talbert, "Martyrdom in Luke-Acts and the Lucan Social Ethic," in *Political Issues in Luke-Acts* (ed. Richard J. Cassidy and Philip J. Scharper; New York: Orbis, 1983), 99; Robert J. Karris, *Luke: Artist and Theologian. Luke's Passion Account as Lit-*

erature (New York: Paulist, 1985), 1, 80, 115; Joseph B. Tyson, *The Death of Jesus in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina, 1986), 170; John T. Carroll, "Luke's Crucifixion Scene," in *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus* (ed. Dennis D. Sylva; Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1990), 202, n. 64, 68; David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1995), 157-69; Doble, *The Paradox of Salvation*, 234-37. Joel Green is slightly less emphatic, stating, "While aware of this interpretation of the cross he does not appear very interested in it" ("The Death of Jesus, God's Servant," in *Reimaging the Death of the Lukan Jesus* [ed. Dennis D. Sylva; Frankfurt am Main: Anton Hain, 1990], 7). Similarly W. G. Kümmel, "Current Theological Accusations Against Luke," *Andover Newton Quarterly* 16 (1975): 13; Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 31, 98; Robert F. O'Toole, "How Does Luke Portray Jesus as Servant of YHWH," *Biblica* 81 (2000): 336.

[3]I. Howard Marshall, who according to C. K. Barrett "makes as much as anyone could of Luke's references to the Cross" ("*Theologia Crucis*—in Acts?" in *Theologia Crucis—Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag* [ed. C. Andersen and G. Klein; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1979], 74) asks, "How does Jesus save? The clear view expressed in Acts is that Jesus saves men by virtue of His exaltation" (*Luke: Historian and Theologian* [3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1988], 169). Recently, Marshall briefly affirmed without discussion that in Luke's Gospel Jesus' death is to be seen as "sacrificial and redemptive" (*New Testament Theology* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2004], 153) yet summarized with regard to the book of Acts, "Little is said about the function of the death of Jesus in achieving salvation, and more stress is placed on his authoritative position as the exalted Lord" (181).

[4]This is not the only theme Luke utilizes to set forward an atoning understanding of the cross. For a full consideration of the way Luke presents Jesus' death as an atonement within Luke-Acts, including his description of Jesus' passion, his identification of Jesus with the suffering servant of Isaiah, and a variety of other narrative indicators, see John Kimbell, "The Atonement in Lukan Theology" (Ph.D. diss., The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2008).

[5]The words of Jesus in Luke 22:19b-20 have been viewed as textually suspect by some. However, the external evidence overwhelmingly favors their authenticity. When internal evidence is taken into account, support remains very strong for the longer reading. For a detailed treatment of the textual issues and defense of the longer reading as original see Kimbell, "Atonement in Lukan Theology," 22-33; cf. also Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2nd ed.; Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994), 148-150.

[6]Robert Tannehill writes, "The crucifixion casts its shadow across the whole of the Last Supper, giving it its unique importance—its character as the *Last* Supper—and causing every word and event to take on added meaning ("A Study in the Theology of Luke-Acts," *Anglican Theological Review* 43 [1961]: 198).

[7]Cf. J. P. Louw and E. A. Nida's semantic domain of "benefaction" (*Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains* [2nd ed.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1988, 1989], 90.36. BDAG lists Luke 22:19f. as descriptive of the death of Christ "in behalf of" others. For similar NT uses of *didōmi* with *hyper*, see John 6:51; Gal 1:4; 1 Tim 2:6; Titus 2:14. The latter two texts are the closest parallels to Luke's usage since *hyper* relates the benefaction directly to people. In these cases Jesus "gives" himself, respectively, as a "ransom for all" and "for us, in order to redeem us from all lawlessness and to purify for himself a people for his own possession."

[8]E.g. C. H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (rev. ed.; Macon, GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 233-37; I. J. du Plessis, "The Saving Significance of Jesus and His Death on the Cross in Luke's Gospel—Focussing on Luke 22:19b-20," *Neotestamentica* 28 (1994): 523-40.

[9]The historical question is too large to deal with in detail. At present, our goal is to discern what Luke intended to communicate in his narrative. There is little doubt he intends a Passover context as the set-

ting (Luke 22:1, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15). So Robin Routledge, "Passover and Last Supper," *Tyndale Bulletin* 53 (2002): 206, 221; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 749; Donald Senior, *The Passion of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke* (Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, 1989), 42-43, 57, 59 n. 16; Frank Matera, *Passion Narratives and Gospel Theologies: Interpreting the Synoptics through Their Passion Stories* (New York: Paulist, 1986), 159-60; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X – XXIV* (Anchor Bible 28a; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981), 1389; Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 57-75; Ralph P. Martin, "Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel," *Interpretation* 30 (1976): 376.

[10]There appears to be almost unanimous agreement on perceiving these backgrounds for Luke's account. See Green, *Death of Jesus*, 187-96; Douglas J. Moo, *The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives* (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 301-25; Leonhard Goppelt, *Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (trans. Donald H. Madvig; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 110-16; Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*), 91-92; N. T. Wright states of nearly all commentators, "It emerges that Jesus, in prophetic style, identified the bread with his own body, and the wine with his own blood, and that he spoke about these in language which echoed the context of Passover, sacrifice, and covenant which the meal, in any case, must already have possessed (*Jesus and the Victory of God*, [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996], 559-60).

[11]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 236.

[12]du Plessis, "Saving Significance," 534. Cf. George, "Le Sens de la Mort," 210.

[13]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 236; similarly, du Plessis, "Saving Significance," 531.

[14]See Rikki E. Watts, "Exodus," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* (ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2000), 480; T. D. Alexander, "The Passover Sacrifice," in *Sacrifice in the Bible* (ed. Roger T. Beckwith and Martin J. Selman; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 7-8.

[15]The Israelites themselves are charged with participating in idolatry during their stay in Egypt (Josh 24:14 Ezek 20:7-8; 23:8, 19, 21). See Watts, "Exodus," 480; Geerhardus Vos, *Biblical Theology: Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1948; reprint, Edinburgh: Banner of Truth, 1975), 112 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

[16]Stephen G. Dempster (*Dominion and Dynasty: A Biblical Theology of the Hebrew Bible* [Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 2003], 98-99) also perceives substitutionary death in the Passover rite. An additional indication that substitution has taken place with the Passover sacrifice is the fact that the lives of the Israelites' firstborn now belong to the Lord (Exod 13:2, 11-13; cf. Num 3:11-13; 8:16-17). They belong to him because their lives were forfeit to him in death, but he redeemed them with a substitute (Alexander, "Passover Sacrifice," 17).

[17]Ibid., 8.

[18]Added to these specific indicators of atonement in the Passover sacrifice is the general observation that all OT blood sacrifices, despite their variety, probably contained some element of atonement for sin (cf. Lev 17:11). So Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 77; Leon Morris, *The Apostolic Preaching of the Cross* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 130-32; Gordon J. Wenham, "The Theology of Old Testament Sacrifice," in *Sacrifice in the Bible* (ed. Roger T. Beckwith and Martin J. Selman; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 82.

[19]Moo, *Passion Narratives*, 324-25. Clearly this connection was made by at least some early Christians, as shown by 1 Cor 5:7.

[20]Fitzmyer states, "The vicarious gift of himself is the Lucan Jesus' intention in reinterpreting the Passover offering of old" (*Luke X – XXIV*, 1401). Darrell Bock observes that Jesus "compares the salvific eras, one past, the other yet to come. Both involve death, in one a lamb, in the other a Messiah" (*Luke* [Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996], 2:1726). Jesus "made clear the parallel between himself and the lamb" (2:1727). See also Leon Morris, *The Cross in the New Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1965), 99. David Moess-

ner suggests a connection here with the "opening" of Luke's plot, where Jesus is presented to the Lord with a sacrifice of redemption for the firstborn son. Luke emphasizes that this fulfills Exod 13:2 (Luke 2:22-23), drawing a specific connection to the Passover. In the "end," it is Jesus who presents himself to the Lord as a sacrifice for the redemption of Israel and all the nations ("Reading Luke's Gospel as Ancient Hellenistic Narrative: Luke's Narrative Plan of Israel's Suffering Messiah as God's Saving 'Plan' for the World," in *Reading Luke: Interpretation, Reflection, Formation* [ed. Craig C. Bartholomew, Joel B. Green, and Anthony C. Thiselton; Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2005], 151).

[21]Scot McKnight claims this would be "a virtual soteriological necessity for the one who is seeking to communicate to his followers that what is being consumed is analogous to the very offering of himself.... The choice of Jesus to prefer the bread to the lamb for his sacrifice, if lamb was present, is nearly incomprehensible" (*Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* [Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005], 270).

[22]So Routledge, "Passover and Last Supper," 216, who states, "It would be strange indeed if believers were required to kill a lamb to commemorate the fact that they no longer needed to kill a lamb."

[23]There is precedent for unleavened bread bearing atoning significance in Exod 29:32-33; cf. 29:1-2.

[24]Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 236; du Plessis, "Saving Significance," 534.

[25]The lack of any manipulation of the blood in the sacrifices of Gen 15 seems to suggest a different significance for that ceremony than that performed in Exod 24.

[26]Moo, *Passion Narratives*, 302.

[27]Martin Hengel, *The Atonement: The Origins of the Doctrine in the New Testament* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 53-54. Rather than sprinkling the blood on the people, *Targum Onkelos* and *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan* both state in Exod 24:8 Moses sprinkled the blood "on the altar to atone for the people" (see Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 92). Israel Drazin notes the possibility this change was made to avoid the NT interpretation that the sprinkling upon the people prefigures the Last Supper (*Targum Onkelos to Exodus: An English Translation of the Text with Analysis and Commentary* [Hoboken, NJ: Ktav; Denver: Center for Judaic Studies, University of Denver, 1990], 239, n. 10). Such a response would still point to an early Jewish understanding of Exod 24 as having to do with atonement. Their disagreement with Christians would be over whether or not this ultimately pointed to what Christ's death had accomplished.

[28]Cf. Exod 19:5-6, "Now then, if you will indeed obey My voice and keep My covenant ... you shall be to Me a kingdom of priests and a holy nation" (NASB). See Richard E. Averbeck, "*selem*," in *New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis* (ed. Willem A. VanGemeren; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 4:140. William J. Dumbrell states that the verses of Exod 19:3b-8 "summon Israel, as a result of Sinai, to its vocation" (*Covenant and Creation: An Old Testament Covenantal Theology* [Exeter: Paternoster, 1984], 80).

[29]Therefore, Ralph Martin's comment that Luke was *not* concerned with the significance of atonement *but* with the "practical, pastoral mediation of forgiveness by the establishing of the new covenant of Jeremiah 31:31-34" ("Salvation and Discipleship in Luke's Gospel," *Interpretation* 30 [1976]: 378) separates what Luke's use of the OT requires the reader to keep together. Interestingly, covenant institution and atonement are precisely the elements the author of Hebrews holds together in his comments on Exod 24 (Heb 9:15-22). The author makes clear that when the people are sprinkled with blood in Exod 24 they are undergoing a cultic cleansing (*katharizō*) with blood that is directly connected with forgiveness (*aphesis*) (v. 22). William Lane comments on this text: "The comparison of the blood by which the old covenant of Sinai was ratified with that of Christ clearly presupposes that the blood sprinkled by Moses had expiatory value" (*Hebrews 9-13* [Word Biblical Commentary 47B; Dallas: Word, 1991], 245).

[30]I use "typological" as defined by Darrell Bock: "*Typology* or better *typological-prophetic* usage expresses a peculiar link of patterns with movement from the

lesser OT person or event to the greater NT person or event.... God's pattern of salvation is being reactivated in a present fulfilment. This fulfilment takes place both in accordance with messianic hope and promise and in accordance with the pattern of God's activity in salvation (*Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* [Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987], 49).

[31]Green, *Gospel of Luke*, 763; Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 92, 148. Dale C. Allison, Jr., writes of Jesus' supper words, "A reference to Exod 24:7-8 seems manifest, as does the meaning: God is initiating a new covenantal relationship through the blood of sacrifice" ("Jesus and the Covenant: A Response to E. P. Sanders," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 29 [1987]: 65.

[32]Both Talbert (*Reading Luke*) and du Plessis ("Saving Significance") fail to give any place to the forgiveness of sins in their discussion of Jesus' establishment of the new covenant with his blood. This is remarkable in view of the foundational place it is given in Jeremiah's statement. In contrast, Martin Hengel states, "In a symbolic action he related the broken bread to the breaking of his body and at the end of the meal the wine in the cup of blessing to the pouring out of his blood, through which the new eschatological covenant with God would be founded and atonement would be achieved for all" (*The Atonement*, 72).

[33]Brian E. Beck, "'*Imitatio Christi*' and the Lucan Passion Narrative," in *Suffering and Martyrdom in the New Testament: Studies Presented to G. M. Styler by the Cambridge New Testament Seminar* (ed. William Horbury and Brian McNeil; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981), 37. See also Jerome Kodell, "Luke's Theology of the Death of Jesus," in *Sin, Salvation and the Spirit* (ed. Daniel Durken; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979), 222-23.

[34]On the significance of the journey motif, see Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 843, 850.

[35]Cf. Luke 9:45; 18:34. So Bock, *Luke*, 2:1909-10; Fitzmyer, *Luke X – XXIV*, 1563; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 893; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 104-05; contra Nolland (*Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1201) who without explanation sees the concealment as Satanic. Bock (*Luke*, 2:1910) rightly points to Satan's absence from the resurrection account.

[36]Paul B. Decock, "The Breaking of Bread in Luke 24," *Neotestamentica* 36 (2002): 39; Robert J. Karris, "Luke 24:13-35," *Interpretation* 41 (1987): 58; Walter L. Liefield, "Luke 24:13-35," *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981): 228; Ellis, *Gospel of Luke*, 276.

[37]Tannehill writes, "The whole Emmaus narrative is a revelatory process, for the disciples needed to understand how death and resurrection befits the Messiah before they could recognize the risen Lord (Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke* [Abingdon New Testament Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996], 358).

[38]I therefore see more happening in this account than Marshall, who says the main purpose of the Emmaus account is to guarantee the "fact" of the resurrection (*Gospel of Luke*, 891). Certainly this is part of Luke's intent. Yet the account's movement from concealment and confusion regarding the death of Jesus in the plan of redemption to explanation and clarity suggests that the recognition of Jesus at the breaking of the bread is more than the mere recognition that Jesus is alive. It appears, rather, they are recognizing Jesus as the living *Messiah* (cf. *Christos*; 24:26) because they now understand how his death (and resurrection) fits into God's plan of redemption. Green states, "Before the disciples will be able to recognize the risen Lord, they must grasp especially the nexus between suffering and messiahship" (*Gospel of Luke*, 844). Decock writes, "Their eyes are now opened (24:31) not simply to recognize Jesus physically but to recognize what God had done in Jesus, particularly in his death and resurrection" ("Breaking of Bread," 50). Dillon comments regarding the concealment and disclosure motif that shows up earlier in the Gospel (9:45; 18:34) and is carried into the Emmaus account, "By means of this narrative economy, Luke teaches that the content of the Easter revelation is nothing more than the meaning and effects of Jesus' mission on earth" (*Eye-Witnesses*, 147).

[39]Senior says there is "little doubt" that "the evangelist evokes for his community the meaning of the

Eucharist" (*Passion of Jesus*, 156). Marshall says the language points "irresistably" to the actions of Jesus at the last supper (*Gospel of Luke*, 898). Stein states, "Luke purposely portrayed this meal as a kind of Lord's Supper" (*Luke,* 613). Craddock writes, "That this meal is the Lord's Supper is evident from the language" (*Luke* [Interpretation; Louisville: John Knox, 1990], 286). Burton S. Easton claims it is "beyond doubt" that this refers to a Eucharist (*The Gospel According to Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary* [New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1926], 362).

[40]Nolland, *Luke 18:35-24:53*, 1207; Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1559, 1569; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 105; Stein, *Luke*, 613 n. 23; Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 131-33; Easton, *Gospel According to Luke*, 362. This point is disputed by some, but not convincingly. These objections will be discussed in more detail below.

[41]In Acts, this language occurs only in the previously mentioned eucharistic texts and in 27:35.

[42]Moessner, "Ancient Hellenistic Narrative," 146-49; Decock, "Breaking of Bread," 43. Decock also suggests a connection between the emphasis on Jesus' "body" in Luke 24 (24:3, 23; cf. 24:12, 36-43) and his elusive presence in the body (24:31, 51) with the disciples meeting Jesus' "body given for them" in the broken bread.

[43]See also the structural indicators observed by Douglas S. McComiskey, *Lukan Theology in the Light of the Gospel's Literary Structure* (Milton Keynes, UK: Paternoster, 2004), 288-89, 292, 303.

[44]These structural observations not only support the connection between Emmaus and the last supper, they also raise the significance of these texts for Luke's overall presentation of the death of Jesus.

[45]Bock, *Luke*, 2:1919.

[46]Richard T. Murphy, "The Gospel for Easter Monday: The Story of Emmaus (Luke 24:13-25)," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 6 (1944): 139; Bock, *Luke*, 2:1919; B. P. Robinson, "The Place of the Emmaus Story in Luke-Acts," *New Testament Studies* 30 (1984): 487.

[47]Liefield, "Luke 24:13-35," 228. Karris suggests the focus is on "hospitality" as opposed to the Eucharist, since "the theme of hospitality is truer to the broad sweep of Luke's story theology" ("Luke 24:13-35," 58).

[48]Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke* (International Critical Commentary; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1901), 557; John M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (London: Macmillan, 1930), 262; Murphy, "Gospel for Easter Monday," 140; Robinson, "Emmaus Story," 487.

[49]Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 1560. Similarly, Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 174, n. 35; Raymond Orlett, "An Influence of the Early Liturgy upon the Emmaus Account," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 21 (1959): 219.

[50]Norval Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (New International Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1954), 634-35. Geldenhuys, however, also thinks a characteristic action from other ordinary meals may have led them to recognize Jesus.

[51]The description in these verses of the women ("some women from us," *gynaikes tines ex hēmōn*; 24:22) and those who went to see the empty tomb ("some of those with us," *tines tōn syn hēmin*;24:24) seems to indicate that "the eleven and all the rest" (*tois hendeka kai pasin tois loipois*; 24:9) were together much of the time between the crucifixion and resurrection. The immediate return and report to the apostles in Jerusalem following their encounter with Jesus also indicates the close fellowship these two have with "the eleven and the ones with them," who at that point also were "gathered together" (*ēthroismenous*; 24:33).

[52]Marshall explains regarding Jesus' call to remembrance, "Jesus wished his disciples to carry out this action in order that they might remember him, and more specifically so that they might remember the significance of his death for them" (*Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 89). For a thorough discussion of the term *anamnēsis* that results in a similar understanding see Green (*Death of Jesus*, 200-04).

[53]The opening (*dianoigō*) of the eyes corresponds to the divine concealment in 24:16. The divine source of the opening points again towards a recognition that entails an understanding of Jesus' messianic work rather than the simple recognition of Jesus' identity

by some physical characteristic. Cf. the "opening" (*dianoigō*) of the minds of the other disciples in 24:45.

[54]Those who see a Eucharistic connection in the Emmaus account generally perceive the theological point that the risen Christ is present with his people as they participate in the Eucharist. However, these scholars rarely point out the emphasis this connection places on the atoning nature of Jesus' death as presented in Luke's Gospel (however, see Moessner, "Ancient Hellenistic Narrative," 148). Based on the present reading, it is the latter rather than the former that comes to the fore in Luke's intended meaning.

[55]Robinson, "Emmaus Story," 487; cf. Murphy, "Gospel for Easter Monday," 140.

[56]This is made clear by the conversation in Luke 24:37-41.

[57]These are the only two occurrences of the term *klasis* in the New Testament.

[58]C. S. C. Williams, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2nd ed.; Black's New Testament Commentaries; London: Adam & Charles Black, 1964), 71.

[59]Those who understand "the breaking of the bread" in Acts 2:42 to refer to the Lord's Supper (in some views including a common meal) include Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, 73; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel, Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 23; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Anchor Bible 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998), 270-71; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*; Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Sacra Pagina 5; Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier, 1992), 58; Simon J. Kistemaker, *Acts* (New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 111; Gerhard A. Krodel, *Acts* (Augsburg Commenary on the New Testament; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986), 93; William J. Larkin, Jr, *Acts* (The IVP New Testament Commentary Series; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1995), 289; Philippe H. Menoud, "The Acts of the Apostles and the Eucharist," in *Jesus Christ and the Faith: A Collection of Studies* (trans. Eunice M. Paul; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978), 86-89; Jaroslav Pelikan, *Acts* (Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible; Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005), 60; John B. Polhill, *Acts* (New American Commentary 26; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 119. Richard N. Longenecker states, "It is difficult to believe that Luke had in mind here only an ordinary meal, placing the expression, as he does, between two such religiously loaded terms as 'the fellowship' and 'prayer.'" He later notes that "the breaking of the bread" should "probably" be understood as "subtly connoting the passion of Christ" (*Acts* [The Expositor's Bible Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1995], 85-86). C. K Barrett, in his first volume on Acts, affirms that "the one description covers both a common meal and the Lord's Supper" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 1, *Preliminary Introduction and Commentary on Acts I-XIV* [International Critical Commentary; London: T&T Clark, 1994], 165). However, in his second volume he answers the general question of whether or not Luke's church had a eucharist by claiming Luke "does not say so," and yet affirms that the "breaking of bread" is a "specifically Christian meal" (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, vol. 2, *Introduction and Commentary on Acts XV – XXVIII* [International Critical Commentary; London: T&T Clark, 1998], xcii-xciii). Johannes Munck identifies these merely as "common meals" with no additional comment (*The Acts of the Apostles* [rev. William F. Albright and C. S. Mann; [Anchor Bible; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1967], 22). In an appendix to Munck's work, C. S. Mann simply claims "there is no clear evidence" for identifying these meals as the Lord's Supper. However, he thinks they were likely viewed as having "a quasi-sacramental meaning as in some way manifesting unity" (284).

[60]A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1952), 57. Luke Johnson points out that the household increasingly becomes the center of cultic activity in Acts (*Acts of the Apostles*, 59). Cf. Acts 5:42; 8:3; 11:14; 16:15, 31-32; 18:8; 20:7-8, 20; 28:30.

[61]Cf. the similarity to Luke's phraseology in 1 Cor 10:16: *ton arton hon klōmen*.

[62]As in his Gospel, when Luke describes meals or eat-

ing in Acts, he does not typically use the language of "breaking bread" (cf. Acts 9:9, 19; 10:10, 13-14; 11:3, 7; 16:34; 23:12, 14, 21). This is noted by Menoud, "Acts of the Apostles," 88. For a discussion of Acts 27:35 see n. 107 below.

[63]So M. Max B. Turner, "The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke-Acts," in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation* (ed. D. A. Carson; Zondervan, 1982; reprint, Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1999), 128-33. For a more general defense of the "first day of the week" as bearing significance for corporate Christian worship in the apostolic period, see Richard Bauckham's essay "The Lord's Day" in this same volume.

[64]In one final instance, Paul is reported to "break bread" just prior to being shipwrecked on Malta (Acts 27:35). The terms Luke uses to describe Paul's actions are allusive of Jesus' actions at the Last Supper (*lambanō*, *artos*, *eucharisteō*, *klaō*). This leads some scholars to conclude that Paul has celebrated the Eucharist on this occasion, whether or not the same can be said of all those on board (see esp. C. K. Barrett, "Paul Shipwrecked," in *Scripture: Meaning and Method* [ed. Barry P. Thompson; (Hull): Hull University Press, 1987], 59-63; Larkin, *Acts*, 375-76). Despite the similarity in language, other indicators in the context make a Eucharistic understanding problematic. Most significantly, the meal was eaten with a majority of unbelievers. It does not take place in the context of the worshipping community as with every other instance in Acts of breaking bread. In addition, the emphasis is on eating bread to satisfy physical hunger (27:33-34). Interestingly, Paul distinguishes such eating from the eating of the Eucharist in 1 Cor 11:20-34 (Kistemaker, *Acts*, 937).

[65]Hans Lietzmann, *Mass and Lord's Supper: A Study in the History of the Liturgy* (trans. Dorothea H. G. Reeve; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 204-08. The original German edition was published in 1926 under the title *Messe und Herrenmahl—Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Liturgie*.

[66]Green, *Death of Jesus*, 209-13. See also Oscar Cullman, *Early Christian Worship* (trans. A. Stewart Todd and James B. Torrance; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953), 14-18.

[67]Green, *Death of Jesus*, 210. Green underscores these observations by saying that "while the 'Pauline' Supper is filled with theological content, the 'Lukan' is practically devoid of the same."

[68]See A. J. B. Higgins, *The Lord's Supper in the New Testament* (London: SCM Press, 1952), 56-63; Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 130-33.

[69]Green, *Death of Jesus*, 210-11.

[70]Ibid., 212-13. Green suggests the traditional material included by Luke concerning the Supper may actually work against his own thought (213).

[71]It is often noted that Luke here describes the life of the church in "ideal" terms. See, e.g., Barrett, *Acts I-XIV*, 162; Bruce, *Acts of the Apostles*, 73; Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 268; Johnson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 61.

[72]Seifrid, "Death of Christ," 271.

[73]Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 132. While the narrative itself makes these connections, they would be recognized all the more easily by readers who knew "the breaking of the bread" as a technical term for the Lord's Supper. Barrett argues the gathering at Troas "shows that the expression had become, or was on the way to becoming, a technical term for a specifically Christian meal" (*Acts I-XIV*, 164-65). Considering the other indications that the Lord's Supper is in view, Luke's failure to mention wine should probably be attributed to the fact that this expression identified the meal as a whole. Marshall, however, thinks it is because wine was not universally available (*Last Supper and Lord's Supper*, 132).

[74]According to NA[27], *theou* is attested by 𝔞, B, 614, 1175, 1505, *al*, vg, sy, bo[ms], Cyr., and *kyriou* is supported by P[74], A, C*, D, E, Y, 33, 36, 453, 945, 1739, 1891, *al*, gig, p, sy[hmg], co; Ir[lat], Lcf.

[75]1 Cor 1:2; 10:32; 11:22; 15:9; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13; 1 Tim 3:5, 15. It also occurs three times in the plural: 1 Cor 11:16; 1 Thess 2:14; 2 Thess 1:4.

[76]Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 425-26.

[77]Charles F. DeVine, "The 'Blood of God' in Acts 20:28," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 9 (1947): 396.

[78]Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 589; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 426; Conzelmann, *Acts of the*

Apostles, 175; Kistemaker, *Acts*, 733; Johnson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 363; Polhill, *Acts*, 428; Larkin, *Acts*, 298; C. H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 187. Comparison is made to other substantives that are used to refer to Christ such as *ho agapētos* and *monogenēs* (cf. also *tou idiou huiou* in Rom 8:32). However, Seifrid points out that Luke probably would have included the final noun if this was his intention ("Death of Christ," 270).

[79]Barrett, *Acts XV – XXVIII*, 977, who comments, "It was enough for Luke that when Jesus Christ shed his blood on the cross he was acting as the representative of God; he was God's way of giving life, blood, for the world." Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 680.

[80]Pilgrim, *Death of Christ*, 172-77.

[81]Cf. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, 175.

[82]Similarly, Franklin, *Luke*, 120. And see Beck as cited in n. 33 above.

[83]Ehrman, "The Cup, the Bread," 583.

[84]Used in parallel with *zōogoneō*.

[85]Johnson, *Acts of the Apostles*, 363. Marshall cites Ps 74 (73):2 as a possible parallel: "Remember your congregation, which you have purchased (*ktaomai*) of old, which you have redeemed to be the tribe of your heritage!" (NASB). Although the verb here is *ktaomai*, it "significantly follows a verse in which Israel is likened to a flock" (*Acts*, 334).

[86]Barrett, *Acts XV-XXVIII*, 976. Cf. Morris, *Apostolic Preaching*, 59-60.

[87]Frankly, Ehrman's charge of importing theology into Acts 20:28 when it is not explicitly there seems applicable to his own reading, which fills up the verse with much that is not stated explicitly in either that text or in 5:28.

[88]Joel Green ("'Salvation to the End of the Earth' [Acts 13:47]: God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* [ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 99) draws attention to the "covenantal language" in Acts 20 (*peripoieomai* [Acts 20:28]; cf. Exod 19:5; Isa 43:21; *hagiazō* [Acts 20:32]; cf. Acts 26:18; Deut 33:3).

[89]Haenchen, *Acts of the Apostles*, 597. Haenchen notes a few lines later, "It is the only speech directed to the clergy in Acts and as such corresponds in its own way to the 'bishops' mirror' in I Tim. 3:1ff. and Titus 1:7ff." Similarly Conzelmann states, "This verse [20:28] offers paraenesis for the postapostolic age" (*Acts* 174).

[90]Reginald Fuller writes, "Even if the author is here adopting a traditional formula, the fact he has chosen to incorporate this formula into his composition suggests that he has given its soteriology his stamp of approval ("Luke and the Theologia Crucis," in *Sin, Salvation and the Spirit* [ed. Daniel Durken; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1979], 219). Cf. William J. Larkin, Jr., "Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to His Soteriology," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 328.

[91]Barrett, *Acts XV - XXVIII*, 974. Talbert finds a chiasmus in 20:17-38 with 20:28 falling at the center (*Reading Acts*, 186-87).

[92]As claimed by Pilgrim (*Death of Christ*, 174).

[93]Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles*, 674-75; Seifrid, "Death of Christ," 270.

[94]Neyrey demonstrates numerous parallels between the farewell speeches of Jesus and Paul, noting that they occur in the same context of the narrative of each figure (*Passion According to Luke*, 43-48). See also Steve Walton, *Leadership and Lifestyle: The Portrait of Paul in the Miletus Speech and 1 Thessalonians* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 100-17.