



In der Erforschung des lukanischen Doppelwerks ist einiges in Bewegung geraten, insbesondere hinsichtlich der Fragen nach der Datierung, nach den dem Verfasser vorliegenden Quellen und seiner Kreativität in der Gestaltung seines Werks. Der vorliegende Band versammelt Beiträge von Exegeten und Exegetinnen, die das lukanische Doppelwerk aus einer Vielzahl internationaler, theologischer und exegetischer Perspektiven in den Blick nehmen. Einer Reihe von ihnen ist die Zweiquellentheorie zweifelhaft geworden. Der Band reflektiert und befördert die gegenwärtigen Diskussionen um die angemessenste synoptische Theorie. Als Anhang ist zum ersten Mal in deutscher Übersetzung der klassische Aufsatz von Austin M. Farrer »On Dispensing with Q« beigefügt.

Werner Kahl | Vadim Wittkowsky (Hrsg.)
Das lukanische Doppelwerk in neuen internationalen Perspektiven

Werner Kahl | Vadim Wittkowsky (Hrsg.)

Das lukanische Doppelwerk in neuen internationalen Perspektiven

Luke-Acts in New
International Perspectives



EVANGELISCHE VERLAGSANSTALT
Leipzig www.eva-leipzig.de



Das lukanische Doppelwerk in neuen
internationalen Perspektiven

Luke-Acts in New International Perspectives

Kleine Schriften
des Fachbereichs Evangelische Theologie
der Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main

Band 15

Das lukanische Doppelwerk in neuen internationalen Perspektiven

Luke-Acts in New International Perspectives

Herausgegeben von
Werner Kahl und Vadim Wittkowsky



EVANGELISCHE VERLAGSANSTALT
Leipzig

Bibliographische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der
Deutschen Nationalbibliographie; detaillierte bibliographische Daten
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.dnb.de> abrufbar.

© 2024 by Evangelische Verlagsanstalt GmbH · Leipzig
Printed in Germany

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist
ohne Zustimmung des Verlags unzulässig und strafbar. Das gilt
insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen
und die Einspeicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Das Buch wurde auf alterungsbeständigem Papier gedruckt.

Cover: Kai-Michael Gustmann, Leipzig
Satz: Vadim Wittkowsky, Berlin
Druck und Binden: Beltz Grafische Betriebe GmbH, Bad Langensalza

ISBN 978-3-374-07549-2 // eISBN (PDF) 978-3-374-07550-8
www.eva-leipzig.de

Vorwort

In der Forschung zum Lukasevangelium und zur Apostelgeschichte ist in den letzten Jahrzehnten einiges, was vorher recht fest zu stehen schien, in Bewegung geraten. So ist etwa gut begründet die Datierungsfrage neu aufgeworfen, die sogenannte Zweiquellentheorie in Frage gestellt, die literarische Kreativität und die Theologie des Lukas gewürdigt und sein Verhältnis zur paulinischen Tradition neu bestimmt worden. Hier und da ist zweifelhaft geworden, ob bzw. inwiefern überhaupt von einem lukanischen Doppelwerk zu reden sei. All dies und vieles mehr verdankt sich dem internationalen Austausch exegetischer Fragestellungen, Forschungsperspektiven und -ergebnisse.

Die beiden Herausgeber dieses Bandes können auf eine langjährige Geschichte eigener wissenschaftlicher Auseinandersetzung mit dem Lukasevangelium und der Apostelgeschichte sowie mit dem Synoptischen Problem zurückblicken, der eine als Neutestamentler, der andere als Altphilologe mit Schwerpunkten antik-jüdische Literatur und Neues Testament. Zusammen haben sie in den Jahren 2014 und 2015 an zwei wichtigen Tagungen in Roskilde (Dänemark) teilgenommen und dort ähnliche Standpunkte im Hinblick auf die Beziehungen zwischen den synoptischen Evangelien, insbesondere was die Benutzung des Matthäusevangeliums durch Lukas anbetrifft, vertreten.¹

¹ Die auf der Grundlage der ausgewählten Konferenzbeiträge publizierten Sammelbände sind: Mogens Müller und Jesper Tang Nielsen (Hg.), *Luke's Literary Creativity*, London, Oxford und New York 2016; Mogens Müller und Heike Omerzu (Hg.), *Gospel Interpretation and the Q-Hypothesis*, London, Oxford und New York 2018.

Werner Kahl / Vadim Wittkowsky

Dieser Band versammelt zum einen Beiträge von vor allem osteuropäischen Exegeten und Exegetinnen, die aus ganz unterschiedlichen Perspektiven die beiden Erzählungen, die dem Lukas zugeschrieben werden, in den Blick nehmen. Sie gehen zum Großteil auf Vorträge zurück, die in verschiedenen Seminaren der Internationalen Konferenz der Society of Biblical Literature im Jahr 2017 gehalten wurden, die in den Räumen der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin stattfand.

Zum anderen befassen sich Beiträge explizit mit der Frage der synoptischen Benutzungsverhältnisse. In internationaler Perspektive zeichnet sich hier ein Paradigmenwechsel ab: Die Zweiquellentheorie bedarf einer kritischen Reflexion hinsichtlich ihrer Voraussetzungen, ihrer Tragfähigkeit und ihres Nutzens. Gleichzeitig stellt sich damit die Frage nach möglichen Alternativmodellen. Das hier in mehreren Beiträgen favorisierte Modell geht auf einen mittlerweile als klassisch zu bezeichnenden Aufsatz von Austin M. Farrer aus dem Jahr 1955 zurück: *On Dispensing with Q*. Er wird hier zum ersten Mal in deutscher Übersetzung vorgelegt.

Unser Dank gilt allen Autorinnen und Autoren, die an diesem Band mitgewirkt haben.

Den Band wollen wir dem Andenken an den großen Lukas-Forscher Prof. Dr. Dr. h.c. mult. Petr Pokorný (1933 – 2020) widmen.

Werner Kahl, Frankfurt am Main

Vadim Wittkowsky, Berlin

Februar 2024

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Autoren.....	10
---------------------	-----------

I. DAS LUKANISCHE DOPPELWERK UNTER NEUEN PERSPEKTIVEN

Daniel Ayuch

The Parallel Narrative Strategy in the Synoptic Gospels and Its Message.....	13
A synchronic marco-narrative study of combined pericopes and plots	

Andrey Vdovichenko

How to Judge and Evaluate Luke's Narrative?.....	31
To the Question of Communicative Basis of Any NT Verbal Data	

Bartosz Adamczewski

The Function of the Allusion to Aristophanes' <i>Birds</i> in the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk 16:1–8).....	64
---	-----------

Mary Marshall

Rethinking the Last Supper Again – with Insights from Luke.....	80
--	-----------

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Valeriy Alikin

Breaking of Bread in Luke-Acts.....101

Petr Pokorný

**The Phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό and the Worship
of the Early Church.....132**

Alexey Somov

**“The Son of Man Standing at the Right Hand
of God” (Acts 7:56).....141**

A Cognitive Approach to Interpretation

II. LUKAS MIT UND OHNE Q

Mogens Müller

Luke and His Sources Reconsidered.....165

Werner Kahl

**Das Lukasevangelium als kritisch-kreative
Integration synoptischer Prä-Texte nach dem
Synoptischen Integrationsmodell.....185**

Die synoptischen Grabepassagen (Mk 15,42-16,8 parr.)

Vadim Wittkowsky

Lukan Transfer of Elements.....238

25 Years after the Article by Dominique Hermant

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Rudolf Laufen	
Ist Q noch zu retten?.....	285
Ein Versuch	
 Vadim Wittkowsky	
Zur literarischen Benutzung von Quellen	
in den synoptischen Evangelien:	
Erforschung statt „Rettung“	319
Eine Antwort an Rudolf Laufen	
 ANHANG	
 Austin M. Farrer	
Über den Verzicht auf Q.....	343
 Bibliographie.....	401

Daniel Ayuch

Both scenes confirm that neither Jews are pure nor Gentiles are powerful without knowing the Lord. He teaches them a new order of pureness and power for those who follow and apply the rules of the divine Kingdom.

In Mark, the parallel text example is used to show by comparison that salvation is not completed until the nations are also part of the people of God. Jesus visits first the people of the revelation and guides them in the wilderness. In the second scene, Jesus completes the gathering of his people by including the nations and making them one community.

The six pericopes that were analyzed in this article present the Lord taking the initiative of visiting his people and defeating the culture of weakness and death that was reigning on them. All three Gospels sketch a new understanding of reality that breaks the rules of worldly wisdom and leads to the wisdom of the Kingdom, where the principles of social relationships are redefined with the eyes of faith.

Andrey Vdovichenko

How To Judge and Evaluate Luke's Narrative?

To the Question of Communicative Basis of Any NT Verbal

Luke's narrative points out the main characteristics of the NT authors' writing activity which is better seen from a communicative viewpoint. The now dominating approach introduces the picture of the NT authors' literary activity as not-normalized, showing rather ambiguous features: 1) an impulsiveness and spontaneity; 2) a poor acquaintance with the verbal clichés of the language which they wrote in; 3) inadequate relations between the authors and the audience; 4) absence of a literary tradition to which the authors ascribed themselves. Based on Luke's case, three general reasons for the communicative vacuum can be stated as follow: a structural (Saussurian) methodology of linguistic research, the theory of bilingualism uncritically applied, little attention paid to the audience of the NT texts. The Diaspora Greek-speaking tradition is regarded as a territory of convention among its participants where Semitisms could not exist as "mistakes." More correct evaluation of Luke's (and other NT authors') linguistic phenomena is possible through research of authentic Diaspora communication factors.¹

¹ The research was supported by the RSF grant No. 24-28-00953. The project is carried out at the Institute of Linguistics, RAS.

Andrey Vdovichenko

INTRODUCTION

The author of the third Gospel (i.e. conditional Luke) allows in general terms to define the communicative basis of any NT verbal data. Like any author, he fulfilled the conditions necessary for the interaction between the sender and the recipient in the communicative procedure, and was not an exception to the rule. His case, rather, confirms (and makes it more clearly than the rest of the Gospels) all the main communicative constants of the NT authors' writing activity.

CHARACTERS OF THE LINGUISTIC CONSENSUS

According to the now dominating view on the nature of the NT texts (including Luke), it is common to emphasize their Greek authenticity, which is acknowledged by the most remarkable linguistic research in the field (M. Silva,² G. Horrocks,³ G.H.R. Horsley,⁴ S.E. Porter⁵). Stanley Porter's observation is still rather representative: "In the last twenty years or so, there has been a return to support of the Greek hypothesis of Deissmann and Moulton in the work of Moses Silva and Geoffrey Horrocks. M. Silva has been especially

² M. SILVA, "Bilingualism and the Character of New Testament Greek," *Bib* 61 (1978) 198-219.

³ G. HORROCKS, *Greek: A History of the Language and its Speakers* (London: Longmans, 1997).

⁴ G.H.R. HORSLEY, "The Fiction of 'Jewish Greek'," *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (V. Linguistic Essays. New South Ryde: Macquarie University, 1989) 5-40.

⁵ S.E. PORTER, "The Greek Language of the New Testament," *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (ser. "New Testament Tools and Studies", ed. B.M. METZGER/B.D. EHRMAN; Leiden - New York - Köln, 1997), 99-130.

instrumental in this return because of his close attention to matters of linguistic method. Supported by recent work in the papyri by Horsley, Silva has shown that the linguistic distinction between *langue* (the language system) and *parole* (a particular writer's use of it) clarifies the linguistic situation in Palestine in the first century. Although one's individual *parole* may have had peculiarities brought about through knowledge of a Semitic language, the *langue* in use was clearly Hellenistic Greek. Horrocks recognizes both that the writers of the New Testament, because of their lack of higher education, avoided Atticistic characteristics, and that Aramaic may have been the first language of the majority of them. He also recognizes that there has been a longstanding dispute over which characteristics may or may not reflect Semitic influence. Nevertheless, most of these features, Horrocks maintains, can either be paralleled in the Septuagint, which he views as one of the most important examples of Hellenistic vernacular literature, or in low-level *koiné* (i.e. Hellenistic) Greek texts such as are found in Egypt. Thus, for understanding the Greek of the New Testament, one needs to be most attentive not so much to the Semitic sources, but rather to the Greek of the papyri and other contemporary writers."⁶

The main features tied with the opinion above are:

- a) the linguistic method which is applied to the analytic procedure;
- b) the linguistic situation in Palestine in the first century where the above scholars tend to localize the NT literary activity;

⁶ PORTER, "The Greek Language," 109-110.

Andrey Vdovichenko

c) the lack of higher education of the NT writers who avoided Atticistic characteristics,

d) and for whom (at least for the majority of them) Aramaic may have been the first language (a version of the theory of bilingualism);

e) the evident parallels between the NT writings and the Septuagint;

f) Hellenistic vernacular literature written in low-level *koiné*, as a literary and linguistic context of the NT texts.

THE PROBLEM OF COMMUNICATIVE VACUUM

It is relevant that these theoretical positions (approved *mutatis mutandis* by the leading scholars, see below) introduce a picture of *the NT authors' literary activity* which is *not normalized* from the communicative viewpoint. Thus, in the framework of the now dominating view, the communicative process which was to be realized by the NT writers, shows rather ambiguous features:

1) an impulsiveness and spontaneity (“they wrote the same way as they would have spoken”), despite the fact that the literary process demands a great amount of time (and energy), so it can hardly be accomplished with a lack of time.⁷ In fact the NT authors (like any author), did have the possibility to think over the proper verbal clichés; they acted consciously and freely, not restricted by conditions which are usual for oral speech;

⁷ Thus, samples of bilingualism regarded by Silva and Horsley, are mostly taken from the oral speech or research of the oral speech, e.g. U. WEINREICH, *Languages in Contact* (The Hague, 1953) (Horsley).

2) a poor acquaintance with the verbal clichés of the language they wrote in (“poor educated persisting persons”), despite the fact that such writers could hardly be so numerous and capable of creating a huge literary corpus (including non-canonical Jewish and Christian literature);

3) inadequate relations between the authors (the senders) and the audience (the recipients): the writers, acting consciously and freely, did not pay any attention to the readers (listeners); by making mistakes they disregarded the literary tastes and habits of the audience. The audience, in turn, felt strange about the literary production of such a kind, when meeting authors having rather barbarian and offensive ways of communicative interaction (“Barbarians are writing for Greeks without demonstratively paying attention to them”). That seems to be rather unrealistic;

4) absence of a literary tradition to which the authors ascribed themselves when creating their texts this way (“Nobody and nowhere expected the NT authors to act this way”). That also looks uncertain in the Jewish (Palestinian or Diaspora) traditional context.

In sum, writing activity which is ascribed to the NT authors by the points above (a-f), could not take place other than in a *communicative vacuum*. The semiotic system introduced does not seem to be normalized as a model of generating sense among the key participants of the semiosis: author (a NT writer) – reader/listener (the audience of the NT texts) – secondary interpretant (a modern scholar). Thus, it turns out that the authors did not know well enough the language (the verbal clichés) in which they wrote; the audience did not know the language (the verbal clichés) used by the authors,

Andrey Vdovichenko

and felt rather strange about the barbarian text addressed to them; the secondary interpretants are aware of the language (the verbal clichés) much more than the authentic participants of the actual communicative process.

SAUSSURIAN METHODOLOGY IN TRYING TO SOLVE THE PROBLEM

It is worth noting that an attempt to make the theoretical predisposition more coherent is made by M. Silva who in his famous article aimed to save Deissmann's *status quo* by employing Saussurian methodology.⁸ As a result, he confirmed a rather casuistic formula "one *langue* – different *parole*s (e.g. Biblical style)" as applicable to the NT linguistic situation. However, he was not completely successful in coordinating the relations between Semitisms and the actual communicative process in the NT texts.

Thus, in explaining the phenomenon of the NT language, Silva confirms the idea of Semitisms as irregularities ("mistakes") in a Greek text,⁹ in accordance with Deissmann's and Moulton's viewpoint.¹⁰ The NT texts were "written by Semites,"¹¹ "whose home lay in the East" and whose writings

⁸ M. SILVA, "Bilingualism and the Character of Palestinian Greek," *The Language of the New Testament. Classic Essays* (ed. S.E. PORTER; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 205-226.

⁹ E.g. SILVA, "Bilingualism" 1991, 216: "An individual will make mistakes (*parole*) when speaking a foreign language due to "interference" from his mother tongue, but these mistakes are not regularized, do not become part of the system (*langue*)."

¹⁰ E.g. SILVA, "Bilingualism" 1991, 216: "The syntactical Semitisms of the Septuagint were occasional rather than usual (therefore, not part of the system)."

¹¹ E.g. SILVA, "Bilingualism" 1991, 208.

exhibit definite “birthmarks.”¹² This overall means that in order to demonstrate the *langue* of the NT texts, one should purify them of the traces of the authors’ linguistic and educational background (another possibility to see the NT *langue* is to turn to the writings of Herodotus or Plutarch). In turn, to demonstrate the NT authors’ *style*, one should represent a pure language koine damaged with individual eastern “mistakes” (*parole*). The picture is completed with the fact that the creators of the biblical style (i.e. of the “incorrect” texts) were all poorly educated, rather numerous, too affectionate with the Septuagint and consolidated in their spontaneous practices of writing in a language which they did not know properly.

Therefore, the communicative vacuum, despite Silva’s efforts in employing the Saussurian terminology, still remains: Semitisms when regarded as irregularities do not match the idea of a regular communicative process. In each particular case the Semitic “birthmarks” do not testify to the purity of the koine Greek body, but just the opposite. There is no regular instrument of communication. There are no adequate communicants. So, the ambiguous character of the NT texts (points 1-4, see above) still plays a role in the conceptual model, making it contradictory and unrealistic.

Luke at the very beginning of the story told by the scholars about mistakes, Semitic birthmarks and poor education, doesn’t seem to match the role of the personage. Luke in an obvious way (that is, due to the available undoubted data) does not fit into the concept of Greek authenticity of NT texts

¹² A. DEISSMANN, *The Philology of Greek Bible: Its Present and Future* (London, 1908) 65, in SILVA, “Bilingualism” 1991, 207.

and can not be explained by it. The preface in several lines, which the Evangelist prefixed with his composition, is written in full accordance with the epistolary standards of the (Ionian)-Attic prose, and this fact in itself indicates that the author was completely free to express himself in writing in literary Greek normalized language. However, having shown himself in the preface as a connoisseur of Attic norms and then proceeding to the text of the Gospel itself, he suddenly turns to “a language full of Semitism”, i.e. deviates from the authentic Greek standards and makes a choice in favor of a “damaged” language. Why did he prefer not to create his own work in the “correct” language, though he could? Why did he represent himself a “worse” writer than he really was?

Worth noting that when trying to explain the case of Luke by the theory of compilation of sources, a researcher finds himself in a situation which looks no less strange: the Hellenic educated and well-read author who testified in the preface the ability to write in Greek flawlessly, nevertheless creates his composition by compiling barbarous texts. He demonstrates outstanding writing skills in the field of composition, changes the structure of his sources, however, invariably retains their “language”, and even supplements the text from himself by Semitic traits.

It must be acknowledged that such interpretations come to a conceptual deadlock, the way out of which is recognition that Luke may have been a “deliberate septuagintalizer”¹³. Sparks’ position, among other consequences, increases the distance between the author and the text (that must be recog-

¹³ H.F.D. SPARKS, “The Semitisms of St. Luke’s Gospel” *JTS* 44 (1943), 129–138, p. 131.

nized as realistic and legitimate), but at the same time nullifies the structuralist attempts to present the author as a representative of some kind of "mother tongue". Rather, the role of a "deliberate septuagintalizer" is suitable for someone who seeks to fit into some natural communicative environment and takes into account its authentic properties.

Such an incoherent theoretical panorama makes one think that Luke's writings (as well as any NT texts) were in fact *conventional*, despite the data obtained by the auxiliary linguistic instruments (langue-parole opposition, Semitisms, interference etc.). A NT author could have hardly been addressing nobody, and he could hardly address an audience which was ready to suffer from barbarisms and to correct the author's mistakes everywhere in the text. The sender-recipient interaction would have been impossible in such a hypothetical case. To make the interaction possible (that is the obligatory condition of an explanatory procedure), one should assume that the communicative relations between the authors and the audience were *normalized*.

CONDITIONS OF NORMALIZATION

In trying to represent theoretical conditions of normalization (that is demanded by Luke's case in the most demonstrative way), we may note that a vector which can help the theory to overcome the communicative ambiguity, is obvious in the concept of "Jewish Greek" as a "peculiar language of a peculiar people."¹⁴ This not so successful attempt to conceptualize

¹⁴ M. BLACK, "The Biblical Languages" *The Cambridge History of the Bible* (v. I, ed. P.R. ACKROYD and C.F. EVANS; Cambridge, 1970), 11.

Andrey Vdovichenko

“Jewish Greek” seems, though, to be more constructive from the communicative viewpoint, as it tends to introduce an operational instrument in the *authentic medium of author-reader interaction*, instead of a communicative vacuum involving the points above (1-4).

However, the supporters of a “separate language” are still a minority. Due to the authority of the dominating viewpoint, the NT authors remain in their status of “poor educated” persons who wrote the way they spoke, neglecting their audience as well as any literary tradition with its possible rules and demands.

We may point out three general reasons why the opponents of the Jewish Greek supporters are winning the theoretical *agon* at the present moment. This will make the directions to move in more visible when searching for a more coherent model.

1. In describing the linguistic situation, the *structural (Saussurian, ancient) methodology* is used (see above, point a). From Plato to the Swiss linguist (and even later) it is undeniable that a system of formal and meaningful elements must have definite contours to ensure understanding among the speakers. The *langue*, therefore, becomes the only object to study as a concrete unit consisting of grammar and vocabulary. The meaning strictly corresponds to the form. The latter is charged with the former and *vice versa*. Therefore, the primitive intuition “word–meaning,” or “objective element–definite sense” is realized as an explanatory model. A concrete speaker (writer) is excluded from the descriptive scheme because of the visible uniformity of the speakers’ actions: if the language contains common words and common rules of

combining them, there is no need to regard personal ways of speaking (writing). The "sign-sense" methodology gives exclusive priority to the verbal system.

However, the focus of any sense-generating procedure is the individual semiotic act. It may contain verbal data ("words") or not. In producing and understanding a semiotic act, the sign substratum (including verbal data) is one of the parameters that makes it possible to recreate the content of the act ("what changes the semiotic actor try to cause in mind of conceived audience"¹⁵). The content is based on the actional mode of consciousness of the communicant (semiotic actor), which is explicated by the actor and then recreated by the interpreter according to various parameters, including verbal signs. No sign possesses an autonomous identity, it cannot itself point to something, it acquires the possibility of being a sense (meaning) unit only in a given semiotic procedure in which the actor acts as a signifier. What is produced and analyzed in the natural communicative reality is a case of individual actor's activity. Regardless of the format (which can be word-containing oral or written, gestural, pictographic, musical, combined), semiotic action is always complex, cannot be reduced to any one-channel "sign system" - verbal, graphic, gestural etc. At a moment of communication, only one semiotic action is produced and interpreted on the base of the actional cognitive state of the concrete actor (communicant). Like any sequence of conditionally isolated signs (letters? words? phrases? sentences? etc.), the verbal text gives hints at

¹⁵ Cf.: H.P. GRICE, "Meaning," *The Philosophical Review*, Vol. 66, Nr. 3, 1957, 377-388; P.F. STRAWSON, "Intention and convention in speech acts" *The Philosophical Review*, vol. 73, 1964, Nr. 4, 439-460 etc.

Andrey Vdovichenko

the actional cognitive states of the semiotic actor, which are guessed with varying degrees of success in the interpretation procedure. If some cognitive state of the semiotic actor is not postulated in a sign (whatever is defined as a “sign”), then the procedure for interpreting the “sign” has no strict basis. An author makes a decision to act in conceived communicative conditions in order to make conceived influence (impact) to the audience. The communicant’s purpose to make changes in other minds is the main and the only object of the attention paid by the communicant himself or herself, as well as by the audience and then by the secondary interpretant¹⁶.

It is worth emphasizing that the *langue* has no ability to generate meanings (thoughts) because of its principally un-individual character. Thus, in the common *langue* it is impossible to find a grammatical subject or predicate due to the evident fact that they are the results of a concrete cognitive procedure of an individual speaker (writer) in a concrete act. The speaker (writer) constitutes the parameters of his communicative action, chooses the objects to speak/write about, focuses on certain episodes, tends to achieve his own purposes (i.e. to make somebody know, to ask somebody for something etc.) which are to be understood by the conceivable audience and then by secondary interpretant.

The verbal clichés by themselves cannot have any detectable precise meanings beyond the personal use in the concrete moment of his communicative procedure. Upon the

¹⁶ As to the semiotic act in the written text, see: A.V. VDOVICHENKO, “Nice to See You Again, Author, But Where Is Your “Text” and “Language”? To Verbal Data in Statics and Dynamics” Part I, *Voprosy Filosofii*, Vol. 6 (2018), 156–167; Part II, *Voprosy Filosofii*, Vol. 7 (2018), 57–69 (in Russian).

basis of the concrete individual acts (authentic written texts included) a researcher tries to shape the body of the Saussurian *langue*. This attempt to embrace the communicative typology is always made more or less efficiently while the borders of the typology based on territorial, social, religious, ethnical, individual characteristics can not be drawn strictly. As being the construct, the *langue* does not seem to be a source of actual speech (oral or written). Thus, an authentic communicant when speaking (writing) in his native tongue does not know any *langue* as a system of elements. His knowledge is one of the ways of realizing actual communicative acts with employing verbal formulas (clichés) which he handles as being an authentic speaker (writer). The *langue*, in turn, is created by a secondary interpretant when trying to generalize a hypothetical unified instrument of communication or to adjust the unfamiliar verbal clichés to his own ones. Anyway, this job is done on the basis of conceived communicative situations (localized in the minds of authentic communicants) which make it possible to find a unified wordless ground among the different linguistic habits of the speakers (writers).¹⁷

In this perspective the Saussurian methodology when used as a basis for evaluating actual speech (oral or written), is to be used with caution. The artificial *langue* when applied to authentic texts (the sequences of verbal traces of semiotic acts) is anti-communicative, that is to say, unrealistic, because of the obvious priority of actual semiotic process in the actual communicative realm. Such a secondary auxiliary tool

¹⁷ A.V. VDOVICHENKO, Parting with "language." A critical retrospective of linguistic knowledge (Moscow: PSTGU, 2008; in Russian).

can hardly mark the point of departure in the research procedure. It could rather be the inevitable point of arrival achieved by the theory which prefers to pay little attention to the obvious communicative ground of any verbal text.

Thus, when applying Saussure's dichotomy to the NT texts, Silva in fact had to admit that the actual verbal clichés (known and approved of by the authentic authors) did not satisfy the *langue* known by the scholars. The same procedure is detectable in the rest of attempts made by the scholars above¹⁸ who use the theoretical construct for evaluating the authentic communicative process in the NT linguistic data. While the theoretic imperative by Saussure was that the real verbal communication of the communicants could not be a thing to pay scientific attention to, the practical answer of linguists (who have to deal, anyway, with real writings and real writers) is that the texts were irregular ("Semitized"), the authors were poor educated and "birthmarked," the NT *langue* can be better seen in the works by Polybius, Plutarch or others. As a result, in full accordance with the Saussurian methodology, the authors are neglected and marginalized, the texts are assumed as written in not-language, not-dialect or whatever. Though, the dichotomy (langue-parole) idea is kept safely by secondary interpretants.

¹⁸ E.g. HORSLEY, "The fiction," 31: "To speak of a dialect as a coherent grammatical subsystem of a language it must be possible to demonstrate that it has a consistent syntax, morphology and phonology, which is definitely distinct from and yet related to that language," and PORTER, "The Greek Language," 102: "This Attic-Ionic form of Greek, which we now call Hellenistic Greek, was used both as a written and as a spoken language."

It is worth noting that the theologians and the researchers of other fields (cultural, historic, literary studies) are often more realistic in their approach to the NT data. Thus, to see the wide theological perspective of the NT texts, it is impossible to assume the writers' lack of education. To see the cultural and historic context of them, it is impossible to assume a communicative (cultural and historic) vacuum in the writers' activity. To see the literary features of them, it is impossible to admit the authors' illiteracy. It is more probable that in this controversy between linguistics and other fields, the former is not right due to the general methodology chosen. On the contrary, the rightness of the linguistic party cannot be obvious, except in the Saussurian (structural, unrealistic, anti-communicative) world.

2. The direct consequence of the dominating "sign-sense" methodology is the *theory of bilingualism* which is the most convincing influence in the NT research. The theory derived from the same linguistic model, tends to embrace all the problematic zones of the NT linguistic situation (points *b-f* above). However, the same caution in using it does not seem to be unfounded. The communicative perspective for regarding the NT linguistic data (like any linguistic phenomena) makes this possible and even necessary.

The starting point of bilingualism as an explanatory concept is the admission of a set of languages engaged in a linguistic situation. In accordance with the structural (ancient) rules of the game, the languages must demonstrate definite verbal forms to serve common tools of communication in separate segments of human reality. The concrete forms of grammar and vocabulary are the most important *operanda* to

Andrey Vdovichenko

create the system of a language and, then, to detect the interference phenomena, that is to say, the facts of penetrating among the systems.

However, the authentic communicants were not aware of any systems. They did not have academic works, vocabularies, handbooks and manuals coinciding with those which are in use by modern scholars. Instead, they had definite knowledge of the living communicative process, that is, of “how to do things with words” properly in concrete situations of speaking (writing), in accordance with the audience’s habits and thoughts. The fact that they were creating a written text made them much more careful and precise in using verbal clichés than in oral speech. They acted consciously and purposely in every sentence and in the whole text, having no desire to make mistakes in front of the audience for whom they wrote. Thus, Luke’s narrative shows that the author (capable of writing atticizing epistolary prose in the *Prooimion*) does not feel uncomfortable when shifting to the semitizing way of writing in the rest of the text.

The Semitisms, therefore, could hardly exist in the NT texts as “mistakes,” from the authors’ viewpoint. The sender-receiver interrelations seemed to be normalized for the NT writers.

Two questions, then, are to be posed here, addressed to the theory of bilingualism.

The first one deals with choosing the ground which constitutes the parameters (and the status) of the communicative activity represented in the NT texts. Should the secondary interpretants rely on Saussurian tools (which are helpful in drawing a portrait without seeing the original), or on the

authentic communicants (“informants”) who have definite audience and methods of communicative interaction in mind? While any linguistic description tends to analyze the authentic speaker’s (writer’s) activity (i.e. concrete linguistic data) and tries to reconstruct his sense-generating process, the answer is rather obvious.

It is worth noting that common linguistic sense demands that informants assume the source of any verbal text and, so, of any grammar and vocabulary (“languages”). However, the theory of bilingualism based on the Saussurian ideas tends to act just the opposite way in the NT field: the NT linguistic data testified by the authentic “informants” do not fit the “language” which is artificially created on the base of other (external) linguistic data. The authentic actual texts and their authors are judged by the secondary interpretant while using a matrix (matrixes) which was (were) made of other texts written by other authors. In this way, while fixing forms of different systems in the NT linguistic data, the methodology has to pose several languages (known to a representative of the very methodology) in the mind of a communicant and tries to detect the chaotic processes of mixing them. Such a mechanistic procedure could probably have just a technical meaning, being rather unrealistic with relation to the actual communication in the written text.

The second question for the theory of bilingualism is about the writer-reader (sender-receiver) relations. These aspects can be seen in the case of Josephus Flavius. The Aramaic-speaking author, when composing his extensive writings in literary Greek for high-educated Hellenes, made his texts free

of “Semitisms.”¹⁹ Hereby, the Jewish historian demonstrates: an obvious consciousness and reflection (non-spontaneity) in using verbal clichés; independence from his native tongue in a literary situation; the consensus (which the author has in mind) among the writer and readers as to which ways of writing are possible and acceptable in the given communicative conditions; and finally, the very existence of a literary tradition where the author and reader consider themselves to be at home. These characteristics of a writer’s activity seem to have place in any literary situation.

The theory of bilingualism, however, tends to draw a different picture of the NT literary process. Thus, in accordance with the main ideas of bilingualism, the NT authors did not think about the way that they were writing (instead, “they were speaking while seeing that they were writing”). They were totally dependent on their Aramaic linguistic background (“they did not even realize that they mixed ‘languages’ when trying to write in a non-native language”). They did not think of the possible reaction of the audience (“they tended to speak to nobody on their own quasi-dialect which existed nowhere else, but only in their texts”). They did not know any literary tradition which could make authors obey traditional rules and demands (“the NT writers were *tabulae rasae* towards the literary forms, the Jewish community and religion, the synagogal practices in reading and studying the Law and Prophets”, etc.)

The theory of bilingualism has to create such a rather unrealistic scheme just because of the necessity for explaining

¹⁹ H.St.J. THACKERAY, “An Unrecorded “Aramaism” in Josephus,” *JTS* 30 (1929), 361-370, pp. 364, 369-370.

the NT Semitisms situated in the Saussurian theoretical model. And because of the impossibility for doing this properly in this methodological framework: the "mistakes" in the "Greek" text do not allow for the secondary interpretants to establish (confirm) a complete system of language from the list of languages known before; the real text turns out to be a damaged system; the NT authors are to blame for that, as being on the Greek soil "agrammatoi," "birth-marked" "people from the East," writing the "non-literary," "spoken" "non-language".

Nevertheless, composing extensive texts means having enough time to think of what one is doing. It is impossible to make "mistakes" consciously and purposely in front of the addressee. The very fact that there are an audience and conventional methods of interaction in the given conditions are to be assumed by default. It is worth considering that the NT authors, as being the participants of the cultural and historic situation, were deeply aware of the parameters of the communicative process, that is to say, of the conditions of their act and the ways of performing it.

The Semitisms, therefore, could not be mistakes both for the authors and for the audience. In the sender-receiver realm the NT texts were normalized. If the informants (authors and their audience) did not see mistakes in them, the secondary interpretants must follow the informants. While parting with Semitisms as "mistakes," the theory of the NT bilingualism parts with its theoretical ground. The goal of the linguistic explanatory procedure becomes the parameters of normalization, that is to say, the historic and cultural conditions in which the NT literary practices were conventional.

Andrey Vdovichenko

3. The latter actually leads to the question of the *real audience of the NT texts*. Little attention paid by the theory to the “receiver,” seems to be the third general reason why the system-orientated approach has convincing force at the moment. Even in the frame of the Saussurian theoretical scheme conventionality is the *conditio sine qua non* for establishing a dialect, language or whatever is used commonly by the writer and the readers. If the receiver is definitely known, the communicative behavior of the sender is more understandable and explicable (cp. Josephus’ case). While it can be stated by default that a NT author addressed his texts to some people capable of receiving the message, the question in fact is where and how to find the audience in the historical and cultural reality. To say this in other words, normalized communication in concrete forms must be the key for explaining the peculiarities of the NT linguistic data.

Attempts to determine the audience of the NT texts are not very numerous and definite in the Saussurian trend of NT linguistics. This occurs probably because of the threat which the audience carries to the very concept of mistakes, irregular clichés, mixing languages, poor educated authors, illiterate texts etc. Since the communicative consensus among the authentic participants of the situation is established, the next obligatory step is to find a common communicative practice (that is, a normalized “language,” “dialect” or such) among them. On the contrary, if it is not established, the only possible step is to reconstruct the author’s communicative activity in some arbitrary way.

Thus, Silva’s answer towards the audience is rather uncertain. The scholar does not search for the “receiver” in a special

way. His reasoning, however, deals with several possibilities: the readers (listeners) of the NT writings could be the Hellenes in a general sense (in accordance with Deissmann and others), the Palestinian Jews, or the Greek-speaking synagogue (with reference to M. Black and to H.S. Gehman; with both of them, however, Silva does not agree and does not pay considerable attention to that possibility). The first possibility is presupposed by the idea of koine and by the very methodology which demands the *langue* be a common instrument of communication. The second one, then, is evoked by the necessity to localize a territory where the Greek and Semitic elements could come together to shape the NT "non-language," or "non-dialect." Silva tends to coordinate the relations among the koine and its Palestinian version: "The greater the use of Greek in Palestine, the greater the evidence of Hellenistic influence among the Jews and the lesser the likelihood that they failed to master the common language (as opposed to speaking some 'hybrid' form)." ²⁰ Hereby, it becomes evident that when choosing between two objects (the construct koine and the real authentic data) Silva takes the side of the theoretical abstraction with no hesitancy, despite the fact that the possible Palestinian community "speaking some 'hybrid' form," automatically points out the territory of conventionality, that is, of a Palestinian "language," or Palestinian "dialect," or Palestinian koine (be those detectable or not by the instruments used).

It is also noteworthy that Silva demonstrates the source of the tendency for overestimating the knowledge of Greek in first-century Palestine. The latter becomes the most plausible

²⁰ SILVA, "Bilingualism" 1991, 223.

Andrey Vdovichenko

(for the representatives of Saussurian trend) region to suggest for the NT authors and their Greek-like writings because of too straightforward reasoning: the obvious interference phenomena in the NT texts lead to searching for a place where the “languages were in contact”; the obvious Semitic element demands a Semitic basis strongly associated with the territory of Palestine. Putting aside all factors which overload the picture (the “oral vs literary” difference, two or even three possible sources of “Semitisms” in the NT text, the LXX included) the interpretant comes to the obvious authors’ Palestinian background (even thinking of it by default).

However, the point of misconception here is that first-century Palestine was mostly Aramaic-speaking. The NT authors, creating literary (conscious and conventional) and rather numerous texts, force the interpretant to search for a considerable full-weight audience. In the first-century Hellenistic world such an audience could be precisely the Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews (what is clearly seen from Paul’s and others’ preaching). In first-century Palestine, then, the real measure of Greek seems to be not enough to explain the NT phenomena. The whole corpus of Greek-like literature (and the NT writings as its part) feels tight in the Aramaic borders. The bilingualistic approach, therefore, has to promote and overrate the Greek factor in the actually Aramaic-speaking space.

As a result, the NT texts, deprived of a definite audience and ascribed to semi-Greek and semi-Aramaic writers, remain free of any rules and laws, not-normalized, that is, written by low-educated persons with considerable amount of Palestine-born bilingual mistakes.

How the methodological framework chosen makes a research to follow the erroneous way, one can regard on the concrete episode. Horsley's critical notes²¹ on Thompson's reasoning²² demonstrate the procedure of which way the elements of an author's text become "Semitisms" (individual mistakes) in the theoretical scheme chosen.

In his work Thompson demonstrates plenty of words and forms in Revelation as being "un-Greek,"²³ and due to that their meanings are illustrated by LXX renderings of Hebrew words. The occurrences in Revelation, therefore, may be understood with the same meanings as they have in the LXX. Horsley points out here: "to say that these meanings have carried across from Hebrew does not make them 'un-Greek': we may merely be looking at further lexical instances of bilingual interference."²⁴

We may emphasize that the peculiar character of the occurrences shown by Thompson is obvious for Horsley. The reason for the peculiarity is also undeniable. However, that is not convincing for the scholar. We may see that the words do not become 'un-Greek' for him even in the cases where the authentic author (being involved in the Jewish tradition and deeply aware of the LXX) testifies them as being "un-Greek." To expose their 'un-Greekness' Horsley demands that Thompson "demonstrate that these meanings are intrinsically inappropriate to the Greek words." What does that mean?

²¹ HORSLEY, "The fiction," 35.

²² S. THOMPSON, *The Apocalypse and Semitic Syntax* (Cambridge, 1985).

²³ THOMPSON, *The Apocalypse*, 1-3, 27, 63, 64, 67, 79, 94, 99, etc.

²⁴ HORSLEY, "The fiction," 35.

Andrey Vdovichenko

All this unquestionably points out the main elements of the very approach to research in the frame of Saussurian linguistics. The authentic testimonies of the real communicative practice are depreciated in favor of the language (*langue*) which is postulated by the scholar.

Thus, Horsley makes his position extremely clear in the following: “Thompson’s approach fails to perceive and address the following difficulty: how did the first Christian readers/hearers of Rev., or Diaspora readers of the LXX, understand these Greek words when they met them unless they were already usages current in the *koine*? After all, the LXX was provided for those many Jews who knew no Hebrew, readers who would not be able to ‘check back to their Hebrew version’ to determine how the Greek was to be understood. Yet, though this may have motivated the undertaking of the translation, the result did not always achieve the aim of easy comprehensibility, as T. Muraoka has observed to me (*per litt.* 22/11/88). Thompson’s book provides simply the most recent illustration of the problem of forgetting the situation of the ancient reader.”²⁵

The predisposition to deal with seems to be rather certain from the cultural and historic viewpoint: the first Christian readers/hearers of Revelation and/or Diaspora readers of the LXX (the former found themselves *sub umbraculo* of Diaspora communities until at least the beginning of the 2nd century) were sure to have the peculiar experience of reading, listening to and studying the LXX in Greek-speaking synagogues. Their knowledge of LXX verbal clichés is identical to that of the Law as the Books most important for their every-

²⁵ HORSLEY, “The fiction,” 35.

day life, faith and authenticity. The peculiar textuality of the LXX is conceived as the main feature to differentiate the Sacred Text from any hetero-traditional ones, the Greek literature included. This special linguistic experience strictly separates the Diaspora Jews (the first Christians included) from an ordinary "ancient reader." They might speak koine or any regional variant of Greek as their mother tongue (like their pagan compatriots), but the reading, listening and studying of the Greek-speaking Law in synagogues were the "peculiar linguistic practice of the peculiar people," separated from any other practices in the period. In short, members of religious Diaspora communities shaped the realm of conventionality in which the author and the audience felt themselves at home. This is what Thompson has in fact pointed out.

Horsley, however, has another tuning fork for achieving linguistic harmony. It is evident that the Saussurian language is made the starting point of linguistic reasoning towards the NT texts. Koine tends to embrace all contemporary linguistic phenomena in the NT corpus of literature as well as in other literary and non-literary (e.g. papyrus) corpuses. The anti-communicative methodology demands this artificial construct (shaped on the basis of other texts) to determine the linguistic behavior of the authentic participants and their consciousness despite the obvious peculiarity of their experience, social and religious characteristics etc. Horsley insists on the "intrinsically (in)appropriate" meanings of Greek words independent of the concrete speakers or writers (whose usage, though, must be a source of anything for a secondary interpretant). All Diaspora Jews are strongly considered by the scholar to be "ancient readers" with absolutely identical

Andrey Vdovichenko

language which is known to the interpretant two thousand years later, but not to the authors of the texts at the moment of writing and perceiving. Instead of being in fact an auxiliary means of mnemotechnics and linguodidactics to help the secondary interpretant understand the authentic communicants, the language (*langue*) ruins the reality. The attempts to define the audience are canceled by the Saussurian methodology. As a result, the factual absence of a definite “receiver” (i.e. of the sphere of conventionality) makes it possible to see the authors making mistakes (“lexical instances of bilingual interference”) in their own texts due to not knowing the language they tried to write. In fact they merely did not know the language which was created by a secondary interpretant outside of the cultural and historic reality.

In addition to the three reasons above (which ensure unjustly the acknowledgement of non-literary status of the NT corpus) the possibility of using the anti-communicative linguistic model is certified and enforced by the LXX research. The latter inevitably comes to the conclusion that seems to be evident from the Saussurian viewpoint: the language of the Translation is mostly low-level koine because of the undeniable Semitisms due to, in turn, undeniable interference occurrences from the Hebrew text. Therefore, the same (or similar) phenomena in any other texts (e.g. the NT corpus) have to point out the semitized character of them.

The communicative viewpoint, however, has more nuances and is less schematized. The conceptual basis of communication, as opposed to the Saussurian scheme (see above), presupposes the priority of what the authentic speaker/wri-

ter thinks of the verbal clichés used, despite the analogical, etymological and derivative correlations established in the linguistic data with the objective language as an instrument. That is to say, what the sender thought of his own verbal act is what the act was. The realm of conventionality where the author found himself when writing, tested him much more carefully and adequately than a secondary interpretant centuries later when using auxiliary analytical methods. Thus, any state of a system of language may be acknowledged to be damaged or irregular if being compared with the previous state of the same system. However, this is not the case for authentic participants of linguistic situations. The speakers/writers, when performing concrete verbal acts in conventional conditions, use verbal clichés which they consider appropriate and necessary, without paying attention to the suspicious structural story in each case. They define by themselves what is regular or not in the communicative situation in which they are engaged. In fact, it would have been difficult to convince the Greek-speaking Jews and first Christians (e.g. the author of Letter of Aristeas, Philo, the author of Luke, Saul of Tarsus, etc.) that the Greek Law was full of mistakes made by low-educated translators (who were rather “hierophantai” for them, as concerning Philo, *De Vita Moses*, II, 25-44). What the Diaspora Jews really thought of the methods of writing (of the “appropriate word meanings” included) can be elucidated from their attitude toward their own history, Law and traditional religious practices in Diaspora synagogues. To write the same way as the *hierophantai* did, corresponded only to solemn and sacred communicative contexts, i.e. to texts addressed not simply to “Greek-speaking readers/

Andrey Vdovichenko

hearers,” but to the Greek-speaking Jews (and “God-fearers”) inside the Diaspora synagogues who had special linguistic experience in dealing with the Greek-like Law and were deeply involved in the Jewish tradition.

A Diaspora audience having the attributes above is the only way to avoid seeing Semitisms as “mistakes” in the NT texts and, therefore, to consider “semitized texts” as being normalized in the appropriate communicative conditions. To put communicative relations in working status means to shift, while searching for a “receiver,” from “ancient readers” (“Greeks”, or “users of koine,” “Hellenes,” “common people of Hellenistic age,” etc.) to the Diaspora synagogue as an extraterritorial unity with a peculiar linguistic experience, independent of territorial, social, political and other factors of “language.” Despite of possible local features in their everyday communicative interactions, Greek-speaking Diaspora Jews had only a Greek-like Text to read, listen to and study at Shabbat Torah readings. It was rather reasonable for them to write prophetic texts using LXX as the paradigmatic model. This is what was done by the NT authors who used the traditional means of communication established in the Greek-speaking communities and addressed the solemn traditional peculiar writings to their fellow believers (religious Diaspora Jews). Writing any other texts, however, made them apply to other appropriate samples, taken from other literary traditions, and have another audience in mind, as was Philo’s case.

The process of writing new traditional texts can be regarded in the case of Luke more definitely than in other authors. That could not be a mechanical combining of verbal clichés taken from the source in their original form. The

authors relied on their personal knowledge of the paradigmatic Text and followed their own taste in choosing the method of realizing the communicative purposes in each textual episode.²⁶

Parallel linguistic disposition may be testified *mutatis mutandis* in the practices of modern churches. Thus, in the Russian Orthodox liturgical practice the authors of new texts (e.g. the Troparia to the new Martyrs which suffered during the communist persecutions of the 20th century) use traditional means of communication which are usual for the liturgy. The verbal clichés taken from the Old Slavonic Translation of the Bible considerably differ from any other clichés which could be found beyond liturgical usage, that is, in modern literary, juridical, official or other texts. The authors using them do not think that they are doing something wrong. Their manner of creating texts is deeply rooted in the liturgical tradition. Their Russian-speaking audience does not feel strange when perceiving verbal clichés which are totally outside of the standards of modern Russian, be it oral or literary. Their acquaintance or ignorance of modern (or not so modern) Russian literary samples doesn't have the slightest meaning with relation to the text created. Some of the clichés used are possible in other communicative practices with totally different meanings, some of them are impossible anywhere else, and this does not mean it is necessary to compare different practices and, then, to state the liturgical text irregular, not-normalized, written by low-educated persons etc.

²⁶ For a detailed illustration of Luke's writing process, see: Ch.-W. JUNG, *The Original Language of the Lukan Infancy Narrative* (London – New York: T&T Clark International, 2004).

Andrey Vdovichenko

The “Semitisms” in the modern Old Slavonic text (which come from the paradigmatic Slavonic Bible which, in turn, like LXX, was a result of word-by-word rendering) do not indicate the authors’ Aramaic or Hebraic linguistic background (the authors’ native language is definitely modern Russian). Furthermore, the “Semitisms” are not mistakes in such texts. What grammatists could call bilingualistic (interference) phenomena are in fact the authentic characteristics of the Old Slavonic “language,” or rather of the peculiar linguistic practice for the modern and ancient Orthodox communities on the Slavic territories.

CONCLUSIONS

Luke’s narrative can be described as a communicative practice. His case points out the main characteristics of the NT authors’ activity which is better seen from a communicative viewpoint.

The linguistic method approved by mainstream scholars in the field, strictly demands a language (dialect) to be an instrument for analyzing and evaluating the NT linguistic situation. However, one should assume that the “language” (or “dialect”) is just an auxiliary means used by a secondary interpretant to make the linguistic reality accessible.

Whereas the language-orientated position states the interaction between languages (dialects) and marks mistakes (e.g. “Semitisms”) in the texts, the communicative approach makes a researcher consider the languages (dialects) to be mnemotechnic schemes created on the basis of the communicants’ authentic verbal practices. The participants of the linguistic-cultural reality could have helped future scholars

trying to create a language from what they really had in mind and in front of their eyes in the communicative space, under the condition that they would be trusted and relied on. Thus, the “Semitisms” came into being due to the language-orientated research procedure, while the authentic authors definitely considered a Septuagint-like text to be obligatory characteristics of the peculiar linguistic practice in the separate field of the authentic literary-religious-historical Diaspora tradition, in which the NT authors and their addressees were deeply involved.

The communicative approach (the linguistic aspects of the discrepancy between that one and the language-orientated one are far beyond the format of this article) allows us to eliminate the ambiguous features of the NT writers' activity (cf. points 1-4 above):

1a) the so called “Semitisms” (“interference phenomena”) did not enter the NT text because of the authors' impulsiveness and spontaneity. Like any writer creating such a text, the NT authors didn't write the same way as they could have spoken in oral speech. They had enough time to think over what they did and to choose the proper verbal clichés; what we finally have in the NT texts is a result of labor done consciously and purposely.

2a) the so called “Semitisms” (“interference phenomena”) do not testify to the authors' poor acquaintance with the verbal clichés of the “language” they wrote. They did not want to write any other Greek “language” but that of the LXX (be it a “language,” “dialect,” or just a waste collection of verbal clichés for peculiar communicative actions, that is actually known to any authentic speaker/writer). They created pur-

Andrey Vdovichenko

posely non-Greek (non-classic, non-Attic, non-pagan etc.) textuality by using the Septuagint-like communicative models (in the measure appropriate for the given communicative purposes and their own choices). It was for these reasons that the NT writers could become rather numerous and capable of creating a huge literary corpus (including non-canonical Jewish and Christian literature);

3a) the so called “Semitisms” (“interference phenomena”) do not point out inadequate relations between the authors (the senders) and the audience (the recipients), for the addressee of the NT writers was not just a generalized user of a common Greek language (“Greek reader,” “Antique reader” or “user of koine,” those who could regard the NT authors barbarians writing for Hellenes without demonstratively paying attention to them). The NT authors and readers made up a separate religious unity having a peculiar separate communicative practice (probably strange and unusual for “outsiders”) of reciting and interpreting the Scripture. The “Semitisms” in the sacred Text were not mistakes for the participants of Jewish Sabbath readings and other such forms of interactions. Whereas Josephus avoided the Septuagint-like clichés in his text addressed to the authentic Greek reader (cultural Hellen, “hellenizon”), the NT author, on the contrary, purposely equipped his own text with “Semitisms” as markers of the separate communicative practice. The NT writers’ audience (i.e. Diaspora religious Jews, proselytes and “God-fearers”) didn’t feel strange about the literary production of such a kind;

4a) the Diaspora Greek-speaking tradition was a territory of convention among the participants (religious Jews, prose-

lytes and “God-fearers”). They all together in the communities of Rome, Alexandria, Corinth, Tarsus etc. kept the same Greek-like Text (the earliest “Greek Targum”) for reading and studying the Law, or for helping in understanding and studying the Hebrew Torah. Such a text had to be a little “un-Greek” in order to differ from any representative of the culturally dominant pagan tradition. The experience of using the LXX in the Greek-speaking Diaspora could be rather called ex-territorial, ex-national, going beyond social and even ideological borders. The uniformity of the common Text was a stable ground and a source for the specific character of some other communicative practices, inside the tradition, including the practice of writing new prophetic and didactic texts (the Gospels, Revelation, Epistles, etc.). A correct evaluation of linguistic and other phenomena is possible through the research of authentic Diaspora communication factors taken from the inside.

Bartosz Adamczewski

The Function of the Allusion to Aristophanes' *Birds* in the Parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk 16:1–8)

Among the Synoptic Gospels, only the Gospel of Luke contains the parable of the unjust steward (Lk 16:1–8)¹. Since Christian antiquity, the overall meaning of this parable, especially the moral value of the conclusive statement of the master, who surprisingly praised the unjust steward (Lk 16:8), has been regarded as very unclear².

Various suggested solutions to the riddle of the moral evaluation of the behaviour of the unjust steward can be found in scholarly literature, so there is no need to present them here. What is more important for the understanding of the Lucan parable, although it is not always noticed by biblical scholars, is the fact that it contains numerous literary allusions. In particular, it contains a rather evident allusion to Aristophanes' *Birds*.

¹ This article was previously published in *CoTh* 91 (2021), no. 2, 21–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21697/ct.2021.91.2.01>.

² See, e.g., D. BURKETT, The Parable of the Unrighteous Steward (Luke 16:1–9): A Prudent Use of Mammon, *NTS* 64 (2018) 326–342 (esp. 326, 331); F. J. KING, A Funny Thing Happened on The Way to the Parable: The Steward, Tricksters and (Non)sense in Luke 16:1–8, *BTB* 48 (2018) 18–25 (esp. 18–19).

1. ARGUMENTS FOR THE EXISTENCE OF AN ALLUSION TO ARISTOPHANES' *BIRDS* IN LK 16:3

Biblical scholars generally agree that in order to detect an allusion to another text in a given text in a scholarly persuasive way, a set of criteria for detecting literary borrowing should be applied. Scholars have recently proposed various sets of such criteria³. They may be variously termed, but they generally conceptually overlap with each other. In fact, they are based on a widely agreed-upon idea of what an allusion or an echo consists in, and what makes the detection of an allusion or an echo scholarly plausible. Therefore, there is no need here to argue for a particular set of criteria which would be somehow better than other ones. In this study, the set of criteria recently proposed by Travis B. Williams (*explicit reference, external plausibility, authorial tendency, recurrence, verbal agreement*, including *linguistic similarities* and *thematic similarities*)⁴ will be adopted to the analysis of the allusion to Aristophanes' *Birds* in Lk 16:3.

The statement of the unjust steward from the Lucan parable, namely, that he is not strong enough to dig (σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω: Lk 16:3) linguistically resembles the statement of the sycophant from Aristophanes' play, namely, that he does

³ Cf., e.g., D.R. MACDONALD, A Categorization of Antetextuality in the Gospels and Acts: A Case for Luke's Imitation of Plato and Xenophon to Depict Paul as a Christian Socrates, in: T. L. BRODIE, D.R. MACDONALD/S. E. PORTER (eds.), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles: Explorations in Theory and Practice*, NTMon 16, Sheffield 2006, 211-225 (esp. 212).

⁴ Cf. T.B. WILLIAMS, Intertextuality and Methodological Bias: Prolegomena to the Evaluation of Source Materials in I Peter, *JNT* 39.2 (2016) 169-187 (esp. 179-181).

not know how to dig (σκάπτειν οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι: *Av.* 1432). The *linguistic similarity* between the two texts is evidently close, although not compelling, if analysed in isolation from other levels of the intertextual relationship.

It should therefore be noted that there are also important thematic and contextual connections between the two statements. In both stories, the characters who utter these statements are middle-class men, who act as legal agents, but in order to survive they do something which is not morally honest. Aristophanes' legal agent, the sycophant, evidently abuses the law. He accuses strangers before the Athenian court, and before they appear before the court to defend themselves, he already despoils them of their property. Luke's legal agent, the steward, likewise abuses the law. He decides to diminish, in an apparently legal way, the amount of the debt of his master's debtors in order to be welcomed by them into their homes.

Moreover, the main characters in both stories are not ready to do the alternative, lower-class, and consequently socially shameful job of digging. They claim that they are not trained to dig, but it seems that they are in fact ashamed of doing it. Digging is thus presented in both stories as a morally decent but for some reasons rejected alternative to the actually pursued but morally questionable way of surviving. Therefore, the *thematic similarities* between the two stories are also close enough to postulate the existence of a conscious allusion to Aristophanes' play in the Lucan parable.

However, is it at all plausible that in his Gospel concerning the Jewish Messiah Luke consciously used a play of the pagan Greek comedist Aristophanes? In fact, it has already been

suggested that in his Gospel Luke used motifs which are also present in various classical Greek writings⁵. In particular, the use of Socratic motifs in the Lucan work evidently attracts the attention of numerous scholars⁶. Likewise, quite popular among scholars is the view that Luke knew and used Euripides' *Bacchae*⁷. The use of Aesop's fables in Lk 24:25 as well as Lk 7:24.32 has also been postulated⁸. Moreover, it has been argued that Aristophanes' plays were known to Paul the Apostle⁹. Therefore, it is quite plausible that in his literary activity the well-educated writer Luke knew and consciously used Aristophanes' plays. Accordingly, the criteria of not only *external plausibility*, but also *authorial tendency* and *recurrence* favour the hypothesis of the existence of an allusion to Aristophanes' *Birds* in the Lucan parable of the unjust steward.

For these reasons, the existence of the allusion to Aristophanes' *Birds* in Lk 16:3 has already been postulated by a number of biblical scholars, including Reinhard von

⁵ Cf. M. WOJCIECHOWSKI, *Wpływy greckie w Biblii*, Kraków 2012, 183-185.

⁶ See, e.g., S. REECE, Jesus as Healer: Etymologizing of Proper Names in Luke-Acts, *ZNW* 110 (2019) 186-201 (esp. 197-200); J.A. COWAN, Paul and Socrates in Dialogue: Points of Contact between the Areopagus Speech and the Apology, *NTS* 67 (2021) 121-133; M. KOCHENASH, Reframing Julius' Kindness (Acts 27) as an Extension of Luke's Socratic Characterisation of Paul, *NTS* 67 (2021) 73-84.

⁷ See, e.g., M. KOCHENASH, Better Call Paul "Saul": Literary Models and a Lukan Innovation, *JBL* 138 (2019) 433-449.

⁸ Cf. S. REECE, "Aesop", "Q" and "Luke", *NTS* 62 (2016) 357-377.

⁹ Cf. R.D. GRIFFITH, Paul's Knowledge of Aristophanes, *JSNT* 39.4 (2017) 459-471.

Bartosz Adamczewski

Bendemann¹⁰, François Bovon¹¹, and Michael Wolter¹². Accordingly, the scholarly interpretative tradition also favours the existence of such an allusion.

2. PROBLEMS WITH THE ALLUSION TO ARISTOPHANES' *BIRDS* IN LK 16:3

It should be noted, however, that apart from the evident similarities between the two analysed texts, notable linguistic and thematic differences between them can also be observed. In Aristophanes' comedy, the sycophant does not know how to dig (σκάπτειν οὐκ ἐπίσταμαι: *Av.* 1432). In the Lucan parable, the unjust steward is not strong enough to dig (σκάπτειν οὐκ ἰσχύω: Lk 16:3). If Luke knew and consciously used Aristophanes' play in his Gospel, why did he change the Greek verb from his source? In fact, it seems that both verbs in the respective stories convey the same idea of not being able to dig. If the allusion is analysed in itself, apart from other transformative factors, the reason for Luke's change of the verb is evidently unclear.

Moreover, Aristophanes' sycophant does his immoral job for his whole life. On the other hand, the Lucan unjust steward engages in his immoral activity only when he is dismissed from his previous position. Therefore, although the Lucan steward is at the end of the parable called unjust (Lk 16:8), he

¹⁰ Cf. R. VON BENDEMAN, *Zwischen ΔΟΞΑ und ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium*, BZNW 101, Berlin – New York 2001, 234 n. 85.

¹¹ Cf. F. BOVON, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*, vol. 3, EKK 3/3, Düsseldorf – Zürich – Neukirchen-Vluyn 2001, 76 n. 33.

¹² Cf. M. WOLTER, *Das Lukasevangelium*, HNT 5, Tübingen 2008, 546.

does not seem to be morally corrupt permanently, in contrast to Aristophanes' sycophant. If Luke knew and consciously used Aristophanes' play in his parable, then this transformation of a relatively simple classical character into a narratively evolving Gospel one is also intriguing.

How can these similarities but also differences between Aristophanes' *Birds* and Luke's parable of the unjust steward be adequately explained? Moreover, what is the function of the allusion to *Av.* 1432 in Lk 16:3?

3. SEQUENTIAL REWORKING OF GAL 3:19–21 IN LK 16:1–8

It has recently been suggested that the Gospel of Luke was written as a sequentially organized reworking of the contents of Paul's Letter to the Galatians, so that Luke in a systematic, strictly sequential, but on the other hand highly creative, hypertextual way literarily reworked the contents of this important Pauline letter in his own Gospel¹³.

According to this proposal, the character of the correspondences between the structurally parallel elements in the Lucan Gospel and in the Letter to the Galatians is highly diverse. The evangelist only exceptionally verbatim reproduced the corresponding phrases of the respective fragments of the Pauline hypotext. Usually, Luke illustrated the Pauline ideas from the structurally corresponding sections of the Letter to the Galatians with the use of various, mainly Marcan and scriptural but also classical Greek literary motifs. For this

¹³ See B. ADAMCZEWSKI, *The Gospel of Luke: A Hypertextual Commentary*, EST 13, Frankfurt am Main [et al.] 2016.