

## NOTE

### THE PARABLE OF THE POUNDS AND LUCAN ANTI-SEMITISM

After some years of discussion, scholarly and theological opinion remains divided on the issue of whether Luke-Acts is anti-Semitic. Samuel Sandmel's *Anti-Semitism in the New Testament?* focuses the issue.<sup>1</sup> In this work, one of his very last, Sandmel proceeded through the New Testament, underlining, as it were, all occurrences of what seemed to him to be anti-Semitism. He found in the Gospel of Luke "a frequent subtle, genteel anti-Semitism" which was somewhat in contrast with the same author's more "overt and direct" anti-Semitism in his second volume, the Acts of the Apostles (73). Sandmel indicated, among other things, that Luke's version of Jesus' rejection in his home town of Nazareth, which Luke places at the very beginning of Jesus' public ministry—in contrast to its place in the other Gospels—has undergone a "significant alteration," including Jesus' explanation that both Elijah and Elishah brought salvation to Gentiles and not to their own people.

The incident as it is presented in Luke (4:28–30) suggests that Jesus was rejected by the Jews right at the start of his career and that already then the Jews tried to kill him; also at that very early time it was publicly announced that the benefit to arise from the activities of Jesus was destined for Gentiles. (77)

Further, the parable of the Good Samaritan, since it sets a good Samaritan over against bad Jews, receives an anti-Semitic thrust. "The parable is not in itself anti-Jewish," Sandmel observed, "but in the total context of Luke it does lend itself to a possible alignment with other anti-Jewish passages" (77). Moreover, Luke's version of the parable of the Banquet, (14:15–24), with its twofold invitation to the uninvited and its conclusion, "None of those men who were invited shall taste my banquet," underscores "again the theme of God's rejection of the Jews" (79). Further, "in the account of the healing of ten lepers (17:11–19), a Samaritan, 'a foreigner,' was the only one of these ten who returned to Jesus to praise God for the healing" (80). In the Passion Narrative also—the account of Jesus' arrest, trial, and crucifixion—Luke has made the Jews appear more culpable than they appear in Matthew and Mark (81–85). In this section of the Gospel, Sandmel concluded, "two items are constant: the fidelity of Jesus to Judaism and his innocence of any wrongdoing." Thus "the villainy of the Jews in Luke is not primarily in what Luke says against

<sup>1</sup> Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978. In this work Sandmel expanded observations he had made earlier in "New Testament Attitudes toward Jews," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Supplementary Volume (1976) 477–79.

them. . . . It is rather that the acts and words of the Jews are their own indictment" (85).

A few years earlier, Rosemary Ruether, in her more broadly ranging work *Faith and Fratricide*,<sup>2</sup> had also noted such anti-Semitic aspects of the Gospel of Luke as "the good Samaritan" who is contrasted to "the faithless Jew" in both Lk 10:33 (parable of the Good Samaritan) and 17:16, as well as the fact that the reversal of who is righteous and who unrighteous in the parable of the Banquet has adverse implications for the Jews (84-85). Ruether was more detailed in her exposing of the anti-Semitism of Acts, which we are here leaving out of account; as Sandmel was to note, the Gospel is more subtle than the Acts in its anti-Semitism.

In view of such evidence, Luke's anti-Semitic tendency would appear to be plain; yet, almost coincidentally with the appearance of the works just discussed, two Lutheran scholars published works arguing vigorously *against* the notion that what Hans Conzelmann had called Luke's "sharpness of polemic" against the Jews was anti-Semitism.<sup>3</sup> These authors attempted to demonstrate that Luke maintained a clear continuity between the faithful in Israel in the past and the faithful in Israel in the present (those who became Christians), and one went so far as to assert that Luke was perhaps himself not a Gentile but a Hellenistic Jew. Luke's criticism of the Jews, on this view, was in line with the older prophetic criticism of the prophets' own people, and it was therefore Luke's criticism of the Jews that proved his Jewishness.

Especially in two of the studies in his work *Luke and the People of God*,<sup>4</sup> Jacob Jervell argued that "Luke does not describe a Jewish people who, as a whole, reject the early Christian message, and in which the believing Jews are exceptions" (42), and that Luke's frequent favorable references to Samaritans are in fact favorable references to Jews, since "there ought to be no doubt that Luke regards the Samaritans as Jews" (123). As support for the former position, Jervell lays emphasis especially on the narrative of James's referring in Acts 21:20 to the "many thousands . . . among the Jews of those who have believed" (45); and he finds his opinion about the Samaritans justified by the narrative in Lk 9:51-56, where Jesus, at the outset of his journey to Jerusalem, is rejected by some Samaritans, just as, at the outset of his public ministry (Lk 4:16-30), he had been rejected by some Jews (121). Jervell poses, in other words, the simple syllogism: It is Jews who reject Jesus; Samaritans reject Jesus; therefore Samaritans are Jews.

David L. Tiede then drops the other shoe of this position in his

<sup>2</sup> New York: Seabury, 1974.

<sup>3</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (New York: Harper, 1960) 146.

<sup>4</sup> Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972. The two studies are "The Divided People of God" (41-74) and "The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel" (113-32).

*Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts.*<sup>5</sup> The two rejections in Nazareth and in the Samaritan village are seen as "archetypal encounter[s] in which the prophet's mission in obedience to the divine will stands at odds with the people's willingness to concur" (61). Thus, Lk 13:31-35 also, where Jesus announces that "it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem" and then goes on to lament Jerusalem's earlier persecution of the prophets, "represents the evangelist's use of an available 'scriptural'<sup>6</sup> tradition to emphasize once again that the rejection of the prophet constitutes the culpable error of Israel and Jerusalem, the people of God" (76). For this reason, Luke's "sharpness of polemic" against the Jews (to use Conzelmann's phrase again), far from being anti-Semitism, "derive[s] from *within* [emphasis his] the Jewish scriptural heritage. [It is] not uttered *de novo* against Israel" (81). Luke may even be a Jew himself; Luke's work "is written 'from within' by an author who identified strongly with Jewish tradition, although his theology and perhaps his ethnic origins would have rendered his 'Jewish' identity unacceptable if not inconceivable to many in the synagogue" (15).

While the positions of Jervell and Tiede cannot be debated here in detail,<sup>7</sup> it should not go unobserved that they attest the degree to which the pervasive character of the polemic against the Jews in Luke-Acts has risen in the general scholarly consciousness within the last decade. By being driven to such unlikely positions as holding that the Samaritans are really Jews or that Luke was some kind of Jew himself in order to defend Luke from the charge of anti-Semitism, they actually reveal how clearly Luke's anti-Semitism is now seen.<sup>8</sup> In the remainder of this article, therefore, I should like to attempt a somewhat more detailed examination of the possible anti-Semitism in the Gospel of Luke.

As a starting point, we may recall an article that appeared in this journal a decade and a half ago by J. Dominic Crossan, who sought to deal with the issue of anti-Semitism in the New Testament head on.<sup>9</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

<sup>6</sup> Tiede admits that "the scriptural warrant for the charge that Israel and specifically Jerusalem killed the prophets is extremely thin," but he nevertheless prefers to see the position as "scriptural."

<sup>7</sup> Such a discussion is planned for a larger work.

<sup>8</sup> The works of Jervell and Tiede are not the only works that have sought to rescue Luke from anti-Semitism. The work of the Anglican Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975), ought also especially to be mentioned. The basic flaw in Franklin's reasoning is that he thinks that salvation is continually offered to the Jews in Luke-Acts, right up to the end; but he has failed to see the validity of Conzelmann's view (*Theology* 162-67) that, for Luke, salvation is offered to the Jews only in the *past*, i.e., up until the beginning of the Gentile mission. Jervell also makes this mistake. Like Tiede, Franklin also (79) thinks that Luke's use of Jewish Scripture implies of necessity the attribution of some validity to Judaism. But Luke uses Jewish scripture to *condemn* the Jews.

<sup>9</sup> "Anti-Semitism and the Gospel," *TS* 26 (1965) 189-214.

Crossan stated at the outset that the impulse for his study came from Vatican II and that "the thesis of [the] paper is that the often-repeated statement that the Jews rejected Jesus and had Him crucified is *historically* untenable and must therefore be removed completely from our thinking and our writing, our teaching, preaching, and liturgy" (189). Crossan dealt with more of the New Testament than just Luke-Acts, but our attention here is directed toward his discussion of that work.

In that article Crossan noted that Luke used the general term "the crowds," instead of "Pharisees" or "Scribes and Pharisees" from his source material in the words of the Baptist in 3:7-9, in the Beelzebul controversy in 11:15, and in the request for a sign in 11:29 f. and 12:54-56 (190-92). Such a change obviously nuances those stories in a certain way. Crossan asked: "Is this change from the specific 'Pharisees' to the more general 'the crowds' an example of Lucan anti-Semitism?" and he replied: "The answer must be no" (192); but he provided this rationale for his answer: "If Luke was so writing, he would certainly have done it much more thoroughly." He explained that the change was simply the result of the shift from "Palestinian milieu" to Gentile audience, "where words like 'Scribes, Pharisees, Sadducees' meant" nothing (192). It does appear, however, that it is not hard to argue that Luke did in fact nuance his source material "much more thoroughly" in an anti-Semitic way than Crossan—and, indeed, most analysts of the Gospel—have been willing or able to realize.

The polemic against the Jews is framed by the account of Jesus' preaching at Nazareth (4:16-30)—according to Luke and in disagreement with Matthew and Mark, as we have noted already, the very first episode of Jesus' public ministry—at the conclusion of which, in Luke's account only, the congregation is so violently aroused that it seeks to put Jesus to death, and by the final, but anomalous, rejection of the Jews by God in favor of the Gentiles, as announced by Paul at the end of Acts.<sup>10</sup> Along the way, leaving Acts out of consideration, one may note the following examples of what Conzelmann called Luke's "sharpness of polemic" against the Jews, which examples do not derive either from Mark or from Q.<sup>11</sup> They are all within the Lucan Travel Narrative (9:51-19:27), which should not be surprising, since that is the section of the Gospel in which

<sup>10</sup> Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism* 76 f., 97 f., notes these two events but does not bring them into relationship with each other.

<sup>11</sup> That is, they do not derive from either of Luke's two primary sources. Some years ago a number of scholars favored a theory of the existence of a "Proto-Luke," which was later combined with material from Mark. Many peculiarly Lucan traits were then attributed to Proto-Luke. This theory has now fallen somewhat out of vogue, however, and, since Conzelmann's work (*Theology*), the original compositional and editorial activity of the author of the Gospel has been emphasized.

Luke most emphatically displays his own geographico-theological pattern.<sup>12</sup>

Immediately Jesus enters a Samaritan village (Lk 9:51-56). The Samaritans—who are, of course, representative of Gentiles for Luke<sup>13</sup>—do not receive Jesus; yet Luke provides a justification for their rejection (Jesus was journeying toward Jerusalem), and he has Jesus scold the disciples when they suggest punishment. While this episode has nothing directly to do with the Jews, it is representative of the favored status accorded Gentiles in Luke-Acts, as opposed to the status of the Jews.<sup>14</sup> The next reference to a Samaritan, however, is more pointed; it is in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk 10:29-37). For all that Jesus intended something quite different by this parable, it becomes under Luke's pen an example of the contrast between Jew and Samaritan,<sup>15</sup> i.e., Gentile, and the "Go and do likewise" is then an admonition to behave in a way that distinguishes one from the Jews.

As Luke nears the end of the Travel Narrative, the pace of the theme, Jewish rejection of the gospel/God's rejection of the Jews, quickens. The parable of the Banquet (14:15-24), with its doubled invitation to the uninvited and its final total exclusion of the invited, is almost surely understood in this way;<sup>16</sup> and the closely following parable of the Prodigal

<sup>12</sup> On this point cf. especially William C. Robinson, Jr., "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative," *JBL* 79 (1960) 20-31.

<sup>13</sup> Franklin, *Christ the Lord* 141 f., seems to have seen this point, although Jervell, as noted above, and Tiede, *Prophecy and History* 56 (where Samaritans are called "para-Jewish"), take the opposite view. Conzelmann, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 7, 2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1963) 22, and G. W. H. Lampe, "Acts," in *Peake's Commentary on the Bible*, ed. Matthew Black and H. H. Rowley (London and Edinburgh: Nelson, 1962) §782c, apparently associate Samaritans (in Acts) with Gentiles as distinct from Jews; and C. S. C. Williams, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (Harper's New Testament Commentaries; New York: Harper, 1957) 115, considers Acts 8:5 to mean that the gospel was preached to "half-caste Samaritans" as the "launching" of "evangelization of non-Jews." Without attempting here a detailed analysis, I would cite, as evidence supporting the contention that Luke views the Samaritans as "para-Gentiles," not as "para-Jews," the way in which Samaritans are contrasted favorably to Jews in Lk 10:29-37 and 17:11-19, and that, in Acts, the gospel is preached to Samaritans only after the Jewish rejection emphasized by the stoning of Stephen. Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism* 80, observes that Jews viewed Samaritans as Gentiles; and, similarly, T. H. Gaster, "Samaritans," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4 (1962) 191, explains the Jewish view as being that Samaritans are "at best . . . one degree nearer than Gentiles, but still not . . . full-fledged members of the house of Israel." Cf. further Lampe, *St. Luke and the Church of Jerusalem* (London: Athlone, 1969) 22, who notes that both the Samaritans converted by Stephen and Cornelius' household converted by Peter require the confirmation of the Jerusalem Church and become thereby extensions of it.

<sup>14</sup> Several authors have noted the contrast; cf., e.g., Lampe, "Luke," in *Peake's Commentary* §715 f.

<sup>15</sup> So also Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism* 77.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *ibid.* 78 f.

Son, especially in its secondary, latter part (15:25-32), presents a similar theme: the undeserving son is greatly rewarded while the older son, who "never disregarded the commandment (*entolē*)," is cast *in malam lucem*.<sup>17</sup> The end of the parable of Lazarus and the Rich Man (16:31) points out that those who have the Bible (Moses and the prophets) do not believe;<sup>18</sup> and the narrative of the healing of ten lepers offers the otherwise pointless observation that the one grateful healed person was a Samaritan, i.e., Gentile (17:16).<sup>19</sup>

The climax of this development comes, then, in the parable of the Pounds (19:11-27). A rather complex saying, this parable contains three different and significant aspects: the editorial introduction in v. 11, in which Luke explains that Jesus' nearness to Jerusalem does *not*, as one might think, presage the advent of the kingdom of God; the main body of the parable, which is the Lucan version of what is in Mt 25:14-30 the parable of the Talents,<sup>20</sup> in which the disciples are advised to make the best of it during the Lord's absence so that they may be adequately rewarded at the second coming; and the secondary theme of vv. 12b, 14, 15a, and 27, in which the departing master of the parable is said to be going abroad for the purpose of receiving a kingdom, to be followed by a delegation from among his prospective subjects, who oppose his reign, and to slay his opponents after his accession to the throne. We do not need to be especially concerned with the main body of the parable here, since it represents, both in Luke and in Matthew, advice to the Church, which must persevere during the Lord's somewhat protracted absence. The other two aspects of the parable, however, merit rather closer attention.

Everyone who has studied the parable has pronounced v. 11 editorial, and indeed it is. Normally, however, Luke's nuances get lost in the interpretation. It is true that the verse explains that the kingdom of God was not just about to appear when Jesus reached Jerusalem, but it is a mistake to think that such a statement is pointed at end-of-the-world fanatics in Luke's own day, as it is normally understood;<sup>21</sup> for the editorial statement says that Jesus' approach to Jerusalem does not anticipate the "appearance" of the kingdom of God, and in Luke's day everyone already

<sup>17</sup> Cf. my "Tradition and Redaction in Luke XV. 11-32," *NTS* 15 (1969) 433-38.

<sup>18</sup> So also Sandmel, *Anti-Semitism* 79. <sup>19</sup> Cf. *ibid.* 80.

<sup>20</sup> The most extensive treatment of the parable remains that given by Adolf Jülicher, *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1910; reprint ed., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963) 472-95. The parable has not been the object of close study by most later commentators and interpreters of parables, and writers on Lucan theology have generally overlooked its pivotal role. A reasonably good discussion in English may be found in C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (rev. ed.; New York: Scribner, 1961) 114-21.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. esp. Joachim Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus* (New York: Scribner, 1955) 48, 77.

knew that, because it had been a generation since Jesus had approached Jerusalem, and the kingdom of God still had not "appeared"! What, then, can have been Luke's purpose in writing this introduction to the parable? Do we not need to look rather more closely at the reason he himself plainly states, namely, that the kingdom of God was not about to "appear" just because Jesus was near Jerusalem? Jerusalem is the key; the point is geographical, not temporal, as the many interpreters of this verse ought to have guessed, given Luke's geographical interest;<sup>22</sup> the mistaken notion, according to v. 11, is that the kingdom of God would appear in *Jerusalem*, as Conzelmann, it would seem, has explained.<sup>23</sup> And Luke's opinion would be that anyone ought to know that it would not, because Jesus made his way to Jerusalem (the Travel Narrative), bringing the kingdom of God with him, but departed when he reached Jerusalem rather than causing the kingdom of God to "appear."

The following parable of the Pounds, then, makes it clear *why* Jerusalem has been rejected as the place of the appearance of the kingdom of God.<sup>24</sup> I refer here to the secondary element in the parable—vv. 12b, 14, 15a, and 27—in which the departed man of means is said to have left in order to receive a kingdom. He is followed by a delegation which opposes his rule, and he slays his enemies after he receives the throne. It may well be that, as many interpreters of this parable have noted, the narrative of these verses was in part prompted by the experience of Herod's son Archelaus, who found it necessary to journey to Rome in order to secure his Palestinian reign, and who was opposed in his quest by a Jewish delegation.<sup>25</sup> That knowledge, however, does not help us to understand the parable.<sup>26</sup>

What does it mean to Luke, however, this "throne pretender" motif? Surely that is obvious. Jesus does not cause the kingdom of God to "appear" in Jerusalem but departs for heaven in order to receive the

<sup>22</sup> It is actually quite surprising that no author since Conzelmann—including Conzelmann himself—has seen the relation of v. 11 to Luke's overall geographico-theological plan, since almost all students of Luke-Acts since Conzelmann have recognized the importance of geography.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Conzelmann, *Theology* 74: "Jerusalem has nothing to do with the Parousia"; and the entire section, 73-94.

<sup>24</sup> On the issue of Jerusalem's rejection of her Messiah in Luke, cf. again the discussion referred to in the preceding note, as well as Robinson, *Der Weg des Herrn* (Theologische Forschung 36; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Herbert Reich-Evangelischer Verlag, 1964), who is primarily concerned with this theme.

<sup>25</sup> The similarity is widely noted; cf., e.g., Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden* 486, or Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke* (International Critical Commentary, 4th ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1910) 438.

<sup>26</sup> This secondary element in the parable is variously explained by different interpreters as having been added either by Luke or by the author of his source, and as being an originally independent parable, an independent saying, or Luke's own allegorizing.

kingdom and to return.<sup>27</sup> The Jews reject his claim to rule, and when he returns he will destroy them. *On this point* the book of Acts, which ends on the same note, is merely dénouement. Thus at the climactic end of the Travel Narrative, in which Luke has emphasized his own geographical theology, after he has had Jesus make his way to Jerusalem for ten chapters, bringing with him the kingdom of God (Lk 10:9; 17:21), teaching and performing miracles, sending out advance men (10:1) and watching Satan falling like lightning from heaven (10:18), after he has, in other words, given every indication that the kingdom of God is about to "appear" in Jerusalem, at the climactic moment, just before Jesus' entry into that city, he reverses field and announces that the kingdom of God will not "appear" in Jerusalem, for the Jews have rejected Christ, and he will destroy them when he returns.

At this point it will be instructive to return again to the outset of the Travel Narrative. We recall that, immediately Jesus undertook to travel to Jerusalem, he was rejected by some Samaritans. Luke explained that the rejection was the result of Jesus' intention to travel to Jerusalem, and he noted that Jesus "rebuked" the disciples when they suggested destruction. How different the parable of the Pounds, the conclusion of the Travel Narrative, from that narrative at its beginning! While there was *there* a forgivable excuse for Samaritan rejection, *here* there is none for Jewish rejection. Thus Tiede, who considers the narrative of Samaritan rejection, along with the opening rejection in Nazareth, to be "archetypal" rejections of prophet by people and the parable of the Pounds to be an anticipatory statement of the punishment due Jerusalem for its "critical" rejection of the prophet-king,<sup>28</sup> has overlooked the differences between the two rejections. Such a harmonious notion of rejection of the prophet was hardly Luke's intent. The entire geographico-theological plan of Luke-Acts is predicated on the simple evangelical premise that the Jews rejected Jesus and that the gospel was then taken to the Gentiles, who accepted it. While such a notion is the backbone of Luke's theology, however, it is hardly reliable history. It is, in fact, so patently untrue, as Crossan noted at the beginning of his aforementioned article, that we recognize it for the anti-Semitic lie that it is. Without that lie we would not have Lucan theology.

Interestingly, however, Luke knows of and presents abundant evidence of Jewish *acceptance* of Jesus and of the gospel. It is this fact that Jervell and Tiede have emphasized (but have misunderstood). Up until Jesus' last trial before Pilate, the crowds, with some exceptions, as one author has pointed out, virtually hang on Jesus' every word;<sup>29</sup> and his followers,

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Jülicher, *Gleichnisreden* 486: The "far country" (v. 12) is "not Italy but heaven."

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Tiede, *Prophecy and History* 79.

<sup>29</sup> Walter Radl, *Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Doppelwerk* (Bern: Herbert Lang; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1975) 299-301.

the later leaders of the Christian Church, are of course all Jews. Here it is not possible to avoid bringing forward the evidence of the Acts; for the summary statements in Acts number thousands of Jews, including priests, among the converts to Christianity (Acts 4:4; 5:14; 6:7), and we noted above the statement attributed to James about these thousands (21:20). The Pharisees, further, for all that Luke apparently hates them just as much as does Matthew, are occasionally represented as friendly to Christianity or even to Jesus himself (cf. Lk 13:31; Acts 5:34; 23:9). Luke even knows of Pharisees who are Christians (Acts 15:5).

We are therefore back to Crossan's point: "The often-repeated statement that the Jews rejected Jesus and had Him crucified is *historically* [emphasis his] untenable";<sup>30</sup> and the evidence for that statement is found precisely in that work in the New Testament which most emphatically makes the claim that Crossan finds historically untenable.

It has been suggested that Lucan anti-Semitism is the result of "rejected-suitor syndrome."<sup>31</sup> The evidence, unfortunately, does not support the contention. Luke's Jews who reject Jesus have not rejected Luke's suit. Luke might not even have known any Jews (although I suspect that he knew some "Pharisees" who were Christians). The Jews in the Gospel and the Acts, rather, who reject Jesus and the gospel exist only in Luke's mind—or, to be more precise, in his theology. He needs the theme of mutual rejection; for he considers it necessary to his apologetic programme of persuading the Gentile world that Christianity grew out of Judaism and is in a sense the "true" Judaism, but that it is in fact a Gentile religion and is not Judaism. The Jews thus become for Luke mere theological pawns, not real people at all. The historical fact that all the earlier Christians were Jews is buried under the theological "fact" that *the Jews* have rejected Christ. Jews thus become expendable in the extreme and are sacrificed on the altar of evangelistic interest (Christianity is the religion for Gentiles). It is Luke's dehumanizing categorizing of "the Jews" as obstinate and perverted in the face of God's salvation that one may accurately label anti-Semitic. The Gospel of Luke *is* anti-Semitic, but it is not the fact of Jewish rejection of the gospel that has made it so.

*University of Oregon*

JACK T. SANDERS

<sup>30</sup> Crossan, "Anti-Semitism" 189.

<sup>31</sup> Richard Lowry, "The Rejected-Suitor Syndrome: Human Sources of New Testament Antisemitism," *JES* 14 (1977) 219-32.