

JONATHAN MARSHALL

Jesus, Patrons,
and Benefactors

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament 2. Reihe*
259

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament · 2. Reihe

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (München)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Friedrich Avemarie (Marburg)

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford)

Hans-Josef Klauck (Chicago, IL)

259



Jonathan Marshall

Jesus, Patrons, and Benefactors

Roman Palestine and the Gospel of Luke

Mohr Siebeck

JONATHAN MARSHALL: Born 1978; 2008 PhD; taught courses at Biola University (La Mirada, CA) and Eternity Bible College (Simi Valley, CA); currently Associate Pastor in the Camarillo Evangelical Free Church (EFCA; Camarillo, CA).

e-ISBN PDF 978-3-16-151602-3

ISBN 978-3-16-149901-2

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

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

© 2009 by Mohr Siebeck, Tübingen, Germany.

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

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

Printed in Germany.

For Kimi:

I understand God better because of my delight in you.

“You shall be a crown of beauty in the hand of the LORD, and a royal diadem in the hand of your God. You shall no more be termed Forsaken, and your land shall no more be termed Desolate, but you shall be called My Delight is in Her, and your land Married; for the LORD delights in you, and your land shall be married. For as a young man marries a young woman, so shall your sons marry you, and as the bridegroom rejoices over the bride, so shall your God rejoice over you.”

Isaiah 62:3–5

Acknowledgements

In a work on patrons and benefactors it goes without saying that debts of gratitude must be acknowledged. The present book is a nearly unaltered version of a dissertation presented to Trinity Evangelical Divinity School which I wrote while enjoying a private writer's study afforded by the generosity of my in-laws, Bob and Donna King. Peace and quiet enabled me to speedily work through mounds of materials and I am grateful to them for encouragement and for ignoring me long enough to let me focus. It wasn't easy on any of us, so I thank you for your patience. The dissertation was supervised by Eckhard Schnabel whose expertise in primary and secondary literature refined my thinking and opened up new doors of insight. I am grateful for constant encouragement and support, and especially for pushing me to continue on in the process. David Pao, my second reader, assisted me greatly in first developing the subject of this study and through several conversations got me to think in new (profitable) directions. Willem VanGemeran also deserves recognition for countless graces. I believe we would still be in Chicago slaving away had it not been for his constant work on our behalf.

Several scholars opened random emails from an unknown student and graciously assisted me in this journey. I can only list them here, but their influence on this book runs deeply: Zeba Crook, Jonathan Reed, Mark Chancey, Seth Schwartz, John Nicols, Koenraad Verboven, Stephan Joubert, and Peter Nelson. Thank you for graciously answering sometimes insignificant questions from a complete stranger. Seth Schwartz and John Nicols also allowed me to see some of their work pre-publication which enhanced my thinking. Ron Fay's help with inscriptions is also greatly appreciated.

I should also express gratitude to Jörg Frey, editor of the WUNT II series, for his invitation to publish this dissertation. Henning Ziebritzki, Ilse König, Ilka Waetzoldt, and the editorial staff of Mohr Siebeck Publishing house assisted with details and deadlines. I am humbled to have been helped by such capable people and to be included in the series.

Friends, family, and colleagues collaborated on the editing and formatting of this work and I am grateful for their expertise and generosity. Appreciation goes out to Prof. Peter Balla, Dr. Suzanne Marshall, Kevin Compton, Stefan Lauxtermann, Cara Shelton, and Chris Kelleher. Andy Wilkinson deserves special recognition for teaching a novice everything he

now knows about formatting tricks. I would still be struggling through the process without their help, so I am grateful. Kevin Compton and the library staffs of Trinity International University, Biola University, and Fuller Theological Seminary came to my aid in various ways. They saved me many hours of labor.

Kimi and I got to experience true community and fellowship while I worked on this project because of faithful and funny friends. Thanks to Matt and Sharon Tebbe, Paul and Christy Penley, and Adam and Ann Gustine for making life better. Thanks to my parents, Jay and Suzanne Marshall. I would not be here without their encouragement and many forms of support throughout my life. Thanks to my brothers, Chris and Zac, who have helped me in many ways. Thanks also to my in-laws, Bob, Donna, and Mark King. Their many acts of generosity gave me a place to write, think, and grow.

I thank my wife Kimi for countless gifts and acts of kindness. She brings joy to my life and lightened the burden of a project like this. She helps me to keep sight of reality. I dedicate this book to her because she sacrificed a lot with a smile and a skip in her step that continually brought me out of the fog and into the light. Our wedding Scripture still rings true.

Camarillo, October 2008

Jonathan Marshall

Table of Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	VII
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	XIII
<i>Chapter 1. Introduction</i>	1
1.1 Preliminary Definitions Discipleship, Benefactor, Patron-Client.....	3
1.2 Appropriateness of the Study	7
1.3 Scholarly Setting for the Current Study	11
1.4 Methodology	15
1.5 Aims of This Study.	23
<i>Chapter 2. Benefaction and Patrocinium in First-Century Palestine</i>	24
2.1 Benefaction and Patronage According to Ancient Sources	25
2.1.1 Reciprocity in Ancient Greece	27
2.1.2 Benefaction and Patronage in Hellenistic and Roman Times.....	32
2.1.3 Defining <i>Patrocinium</i> and Benefaction	44
2.1.4 Criteria for Detecting <i>Patrocinium</i> or Benefaction.....	49
2.1.5 Methodology and Focus of Study	52
2.2 Benefaction and Patronage in Palestine	53
2.2.1 Hellenization and Romanization in Palestine: Recent Developments	54
2.2.2 Archaeology and Methodological Developments.....	57
2.2.3 Galilee: Benefaction and <i>Patrocinium</i>	59
Cana	68
Nazareth.....	71
Capernaum.....	73
Tiberias	76
Sepphoris	85
Summary: Galilee, Benefaction, and <i>Patrocinium</i>	91
2.2.4 Jerusalem: Benefaction and <i>Patrocinium</i>	92
2.2.5 Outside of Galilee and Jerusalem: Benefaction and <i>Patrocinium</i>	106
Caesarea Maritima.....	106

Samaria	110
Smaller Cities in Philip's Tetrarchy	112
Gamla	116
Bethsaida	117
Tyre.....	118
2.2.6 Conclusions of the Regional Perspective.....	121
<i>Chapter 3. Benefaction and Patrocinium and the Herodian Rulers</i>	<i>125</i>
3.1 Herod I	125
3.1.1 Education.....	126
3.1.2 Relationship to the Emperor and Rome	126
3.1.3 Public Perception	128
3.1.4 Construction Projects.....	130
3.1.5 Coins	133
3.1.6 Benefactions	134
3.2 Herod Antipas.....	136
3.2.1 Education.....	137
3.2.2 Relationship to the Emperor and Rome	137
3.2.3 Public Perception	139
3.2.4 Construction Projects.....	142
3.2.5 Coins	143
3.2.6 Benefactions	145
3.3 Herod Philip	149
3.3.1 Education.....	150
3.3.2 Relationship to the Emperor and Rome	150
3.3.3 Public Perception.....	151
3.3.4 Construction Projects.....	152
3.3.5 Coins	153
3.3.6 Benefactions	154
3.4 Agrippa I	155
3.4.1 Education.....	156
3.4.2 Relationship to the Emperor and Rome	157
3.4.3 Public Perception.....	160
3.4.4 Construction Projects.....	162
3.4.5 Coins	163
3.4.6 Benefactions	165
3.5 Summary of Personality Perspective	170
3.6 Conclusion.....	172

<i>Chapter 4. Reciprocity, Patrocinium, and Benefaction in the Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:17–38)</i>	174
4.1 Modes of Cultural Transmission in the Ministry of Jesus.....	176
4.1.1 Evidence from Jesus’ Travels and Encounters	177
4.1.2 Evidence from Herodian Family	184
4.1.3 Summary	191
4.2 The Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:17–38).....	191
4.2.1 Introductory Summary (6:17–19):.....	193
<i>Literary Context</i>	193
<i>Linguistic Evidence</i>	196
<i>Cultural Matters</i>	199
<i>Conclusion</i>	201
4.2.2 Blessings and Woes (6:20–26)	202
<i>Literary Context</i>	202
<i>Linguistic Evidence</i>	203
<i>Cultural Matters</i>	204
<i>Conclusion</i>	210
4.2.3 Loving Enemies (6:27–38).....	211
<i>Literary Context</i>	211
<i>Linguistic Evidence</i>	216
<i>Cultural Matters</i>	225
<i>Conclusion</i>	243
4.3 Conclusions for The Sermon on the Plain (Luke 6:17–38).....	245
 <i>Chapter 5. Reciprocity, Benefaction, Patrocinium, and Friendship at Table (Luke 14:1–24)</i>	 248
5.1 Healing the Dropsical Man (14:1–6)	250
5.1.1 Literary Context	250
5.1.2 Linguistic Evidence.....	252
5.1.3 Cultural Matters	253
5.1.4 Conclusion	255
5.2 Wedding Seat Arrangements (14:7–11).....	256
5.2.1 Literary Context	256
5.2.2 Linguistic Evidence.....	257
5.2.3 Cultural Matters	259
5.2.4 Conclusion	264
5.3 Banquet Guest List (14:12–14).....	264
5.3.1 Literary Context	264
5.3.2 Linguistic Evidence.....	265
5.3.3 Cultural Matters	269

5.3.4 Conclusion	272
5.4 Refused Invitations and New Guests (14:15–24).....	273
5.4.1 Literary Context	273
5.4.2 Linguistic Evidence.....	275
5.4.3 Cultural Matters	276
5.4.4 Conclusion	282
5.5 Conclusions for the Table Discussion (Luke 14:1–24).....	284
<i>Chapter 6. Benefaction and Patrocinium at the Last Supper (Luke 22:14–34)</i>	286
6.1 A Passover to Remember (22:14–23)	288
6.1.1 Literary Context	288
6.1.2 Linguistic Evidence.....	291
6.1.3 Cultural Matters	294
6.1.4 Conclusion	299
6.2 Leaders and Disciples (22:24–34)	300
6.2.1 Literary Context	300
6.2.2 Linguistic Evidence.....	303
6.2.3 Cultural Matters	310
6.2.4 Conclusion	314
6.3 Conclusions for the Last Supper (22:14–34)	320
<i>Chapter 7. Conclusion</i>	324
7.1 <i>Patrocinium</i> and Benefaction in First-Century Palestine.....	324
7.2 Patrons, Benefactors, and Discipleship in Luke 6:17–38; 14:1–24; 22:14–34	328
7.3 Fulfillment of the Aims of Research	333
7.4 Prospects for Further Research.....	334
<i>Bibliography</i>	339
<i>Index of Ancient Sources</i>	375
<i>Index of Modern Authors</i>	379
<i>Index of Subjects and Key Terms</i>	381

List of Abbreviations

Translations of Greek and Latin texts are taken from the Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise noted. Most translations have been taken from a standard authority except for those occasions in which such authorities were not immediately available. In those situations the author has facilitated the translation himself. New Testament quotations follow the Nestle-Aland 27th edition. The bibliography, footnotes, and abbreviations follow *The SBL Handbook of Style* (ed. P. H. Alexander et al., 3rd edition 2003). The following list mentions those materials not included in the *SBL Handbook's* list of abbreviations.

<i>CEG</i>	<i>Carmina epigraphica Graeca</i>
<i>CEJL</i>	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
<i>CIIP</i>	<i>Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palestinae</i>
<i>GDI</i>	<i>Sammlung der griechischen Dialekt-Inschriften</i>
<i>GrB</i>	<i>Grazer Beiträge</i>
<i>IGLS</i>	<i>Inscriptions Grecques et Latines de la Syrie</i>
<i>IGR</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae ad res Romanas pertinentes</i>
<i>ILS</i>	<i>Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae</i>
<i>JSHJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Historical Jesus</i>
<i>P.Abinn.</i>	<i>The Abinnaeus Archive: Papers of a Roman Officer in the Reign of Constantine</i>
<i>PKöln</i>	<i>Kölner Papyri</i>
<i>PCairZen</i>	<i>Zenon papyri</i>
<i>P.Mert.</i>	<i>A Descriptive Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the Collection of Wilfred Merton</i>
<i>P.Ryl.</i>	<i>Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library at Manchester</i>
<i>RPC</i>	<i>Roman Provincial Coinage</i>

Chapter 1

Introduction

Benefactors and patrons were a well-known group in the Roman Empire whose presence could not fail to be noted by many of the early Christians. Their monuments could be found scattered throughout major and minor cities or alongside roads as visible reminders of their generosity and the consequent public glory due to them. They were heralded in public at festivals, games, and other ceremonies. Another form of public acclaim could be found in the entourages which loyally followed patrons throughout cities telling of their generosity in part to remain in the group who directly benefited from their benevolence. Much of daily life depended upon their generosity since they built gymnasia, roads, theaters, aqueducts, and temples in addition to providing food and protection against enemies. Christians who inhabited cities like Athens, Ephesus, and Rome would have been exposed to a number of these projects and posses. Inscriptions which outlined the public worth of the giver were set in prominent locations available to be read and evaluated by any literate Christian. Announcements of patronal generosity would likely have been heard by Christian passers-by.

By the second century the ideology¹ which supported this practice had penetrated the ranks of Christianity quite thoroughly.² F. W. Danker mentions several passages in second century Christian literature which adopt the ideology of benefaction in their instruction (1 *Clem* 19:2; 20:11; 21:1; 23:1; 38:3; cf. *EpDiog* 8:11; *EpDiog* 9:5; 10:6; *IgnRom* 5:1). C. A. Bobertz and B. E. Daley explain how patronage transformed and was transformed by the Lord's Supper in Christian communities during the first half-millennium of Christian history.³ A. B. Wheatley addresses the same time

¹ "Ideology" will be used throughout this book according to the fourth definition in the Oxford English Dictionary: "A systematic scheme of ideas, usu. relating to politics or society, or to the conduct of a class or group, and regarded as justifying actions, esp. one that is held implicitly or adopted as a whole and maintained regardless of the course of action." *OED* (2nd ed.; vol. 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 7.622.

² Frederick W. Danker, "Bridging St. Paul and the Apostolic Fathers: A Study in Reciprocity," *CurTM* 15 (1988): 84–94.

³ Charles A. Bobertz, "The Role of Patron in the *cena Dominica* of Hippolytus' Apostolic Tradition," *JTS* [NS] 44 (1993): 170–184; Brian E. Daley, "Position and Patronage

frame, but expands his study to include other facets of patronage and benefaction which influenced Christian identity.⁴ Christians had found a way to function as benefactors and patrons within their own community.

Since benefaction and patronage pervaded the Roman Empire and patronage ideology came early into the Christian community, it comes as no surprise that scholars have turned to the Gospels to discuss their interaction with patronage and benefaction. Palestine was a part of the Roman Empire, so it is natural for some to suppose that its citizens adopted this way of life. J. B. Green claims that patronage had thoroughly penetrated all Mediterranean societies, so, for example, “debt” in Luke “must be understood within the framework of patronal relationships.”⁵ F. W. Danker and H. Moxnes have contributed extensively to discussions of benefactors and patrons especially in Luke-Acts.⁶ Danker describes God and Jesus as benefactors par excellence whose generosity, even to the point of suffering, fulfilled a Greco-Roman ideal and simultaneously challenged the system. Moxnes finds in Luke-Acts the adoption of patronage as a model for discipleship. God’s people, following a transformed version of patron-client relationships, live in a godly way by imitating and overturning common conceptions of patronage. The Pharisees are critiqued because they accepted patronage without any modifications.⁷ After offering a general description of patron-client relationships and discipleship in Luke-Acts, Moxnes suggests that further exegesis would be beneficial for scholars in order to more thoroughly understand these relationships and early Christian appropriation of these Greco-Roman practices.⁸

in the Early Church: The Original Meaning of ‘Primacy of Honour,’” *JTS* [NS] 44 (1993): 529–53.

⁴ Alan Brent Wheatley, “The use and transformation of patronage in early Christianity from Jesus of Nazareth to Paul of Samosata” (PhD diss., University of California at Los Angeles, 1999).

⁵ Joel B. Green, *The Theology of the Gospel of Luke* (NTT; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 114–115.

⁶ Frederick W. Danker, *Benefactor: Epigraphic Study of a Greco-Roman and New Testament Semantic Field* (St. Louis: Clayton, 1982); idem, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke’s Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988); idem, *Luke* (Proclamation Commentaries; Fortress: Philadelphia, 1987); idem, “The Endangered Benefactor in Luke-Acts,” in *The Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers* (Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 20; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981), 39–48; Halvor Moxnes, “Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts,” in *The Social World of Luke-Acts* (ed. Jerome H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 241–268; idem, *The Economy of the Kingdom: Social Conflict and Economic Relations in Luke’s Gospel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988); idem, *Putting Jesus in His Place: A Radical Vision of Household and Kingdom* (Louisville and London: John Knox Press, 2003).

⁷ Moxnes, *Economy*, 101–108.

⁸ Moxnes, “Patron-Client,” 268.

1.1 Preliminary Definitions – Discipleship, Benefactor, and Patron-Client

It is important to begin with some preliminary definitions of major terms adopted in this study (discipleship, benefactor, patron-client). “Benefactor” and “patron” will be expanded upon at length in the next chapter and final definitions will be given (see section 2.1.3). Here some comments will establish a general meaning as well as potential points of distinction.

One of the key terms for this monograph, “discipleship,” can be approached in a variety of ways, but the one adopted in this study is broad and somewhat non-technical. Works on discipleship might approach the subject from a linguistic vantage point. These survey Greek terms such as μαθητής/μανθάνω, οἱ ἀκολουθοῦντες/ἀκολουθέω, ἀπόστολος or μάρτυς.⁹ One might limit the era to include only the time of Jesus,¹⁰ or one may not so limit the discussion.¹¹ One might adopt a redactional approach comparing and contrasting Luke’s presentation with his purported sources or near contemporaries (Mark, Q, L, Matthew, John).¹² P. K. Nelson follows H. Crouzel in his preference for a definition of disciple which includes any person with a relationship and loyalty to Jesus.¹³ This is the sense in which “discipleship” is used in this monograph. According to this use of “disci-

⁹ Nelson provides a good survey of works on discipleship. Peter K. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24–30* (SBLDS 138; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994), 233–235. Those who adopt a linguistic approach include, Brian E. Beck, *Christian Character in the Gospel of Luke* (London: Epworth Press, 1989), 93–94; Paul Kariamadam, “Discipleship in the Lucan Journey Narrative,” *Jeevadhara* 16 (1980): 111–130, 113–114; Rosalie Ryan, “The Women from Galilee and Discipleship in Luke,” *BTB* 15 (1985): 56–59, 56–58; M. Sheridan, “Disciples and Discipleship in Matthew and Luke,” *BTB* 3 (1973): 235–255, 252–254.

¹⁰ Hans Dieter Betz, *Nachfolge und Nachahmung Jesu Christi im Neuen Testament* (Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 37; Tübingen: Mohr, 1967), 40–41.

¹¹ C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (TPINTC; London: SCM, 1990), 99–104; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981), 1:235, 241–251; Heinz Schürmann, “Der Jüngerkreis Jesu als Zeichen für Israel,” *Geist und Leben* 16 (1963): 21–35, 27–34; C. H. Talbert, “Discipleship in Luke-Acts,” in *Discipleship in the New Testament* (ed. Fernando F. Segovia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 62–75, 62.

¹² Richard N. Longenecker, “Taking Up the Cross Daily: Discipleship in Luke-Acts,” in *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament* (ed. Richard N. Longenecker; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 50–76.

¹³ H. Crouzel, “La imitation et la ‘suite’ de Dieu et du Christ dans les premiers siècles chrétiens, ainsi que leurs sources gréco-romaines et hébraïque,” *JAC* 21 (1978): 7–41, 19–21; Nelson, *Leadership*, 234–236. R. N. Longenecker adopts a similar definition of discipleship though he starts with occurrences of the word-group, proceeds primarily from a redactional standpoint, and transitions into a broader definition once the text has opened that opportunity. Longenecker, “Discipleship.”

planship”, specific vocabulary which can be translated as “disciple” need not be present for the discussion to proceed. A description of protocol commensurate with joining the Jesus movement must be present. By investigating the teachings of Jesus given to disciples and potential disciples I hope to discover the particular way that Jesus adopted and/or transformed notions of benefaction and patronage into his expectations of allegiance to him.

Benefactors expressed their ἀρετή through generous acts and were publicly recognized by the beneficiaries of their generosity. P. Veyne defines euergetism (civic benefaction) as “private munificence for public benefit.”¹⁴ Building on Veyne, K. Lomas and T. Cornell explain euergetism as “a means of harnessing the wealth of the elites of the Roman empire to provide the public amenities needed by cities and to provide entertainment for their citizens.”¹⁵ Benefactors built roads, stadia, gymnasia, and temples for the public. In Homeric times, a benefactor might go to battle on behalf of a city. If victorious, he would be publicly lauded as a εὐεργέτης or σωτήρ. Public expression of ἀρετή later developed in the private sphere as benefactors showered their generosity upon smaller groups and individuals. Though terms like ἀρετή, εὐεργέτης, and σωτήρ are common in inscriptions which identify benefactors these are not technical terms for “benefactor.”¹⁶ Rather there is a semantic and thematic field of terms and ideas which connote the activity of benefactors (see section 2.1).¹⁷ Benefactors could inscribe their own merits for public viewing (autobiographical; *OGIS* 383; *IGR* 3.159; *SIG* 814), or they could be heralded by the people (biographical; *OGIS* 90, 458, 666; *SIG* 760; *SEG* 6.672; *IGLS* 5.1998). Inscriptions served as public reminders of the benefactor’s generosity or as reminders to the benefactor that this public appreciated the generosity. Benefactors would be motivated to continue their generosity after recognizing that they would be publicly praised for it.

Patronage can be used in two different yet related ways. In the Roman world *patrocinium* described a relationship between a patron (*patronus*;

¹⁴ Paul Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque: sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique* (L'Univers historique; Paris: Seuil, 1976); ET, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism* (trans. and abridged Oswyn Murray and Brian Pearce; London: Penguin Press, 1990).

¹⁵ Kathryn Lomas and Tim Cornell, “Introduction: Patronage and Benefaction in Ancient Italy,” in *Bread and Circuses: Euergetism and Municipal Patronage in Roman Italy* (ed. Kathryn Lomas and Tim Cornell; London: Routledge, 2003), 1–11, 1.

¹⁶ Danker, *Benefactor*, 323; cf. C. Bradford Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period* (repr. Chicago: Ares, 1974), only 10 of 75 documents investigated contain εὐεργ- terms; F. von Gaertringen, *Inschriften von Priene* (Berlin: Georg Reimer, 1908), only 18 of the first 247 documents contain εὐεργ-terms.

¹⁷ Danker, *Benefactor*, 26–28.

κηδεμών, πάτρων, πατρώνης) and a client (*cliens*; κλίενς or πελάτης). Patrons provided legal and financial aid to their clients and received public honor and loyalty in return. Patrons and clients entered a relationship through the initiative, usually, of the clients who sought from the patron protection and help. Clients could be Roman or non-Roman, but the title *patronus* was preserved for Romans in positions of authority who entered this specific relationship. Building from this practice and these terms, social historians and anthropologists have created the socio-historical category of patronage with respective patrons and clients. For the past twenty-five years R. P. Saller has provided the most prominent definition for both the Roman and socio-historical practice of patronage.¹⁸ As a classicist, Saller builds from investigations of the Roman world, but his definition became a standard definition by which social historians identify patronage in both ancient Roman and non-ancient, non-Roman societies.¹⁹ Saller identifies three descriptions of patron-client relationships: (1) reciprocal in the sense of exchange of goods/services; (2) relational in the sense of a long term relationship, not simply a marketplace transaction; and (3) asymmetrical in the sense of a social distance between the two parties. This definition has been adopted by social historians to describe ancient and modern societies and by New Testament scholars to describe early Christian practices (section 2.1.3).²⁰

Confusion has entered these discussions because of differences in definition between socio-historical patron-client relations and Roman *patrocinium*. K. Verboven clarifies that the *patronus-cliens* relationship which developed *sui generis* in Roman society falls under the “heading” of (socio-historical) patronage, but cannot be fully explained by that category.²¹ The *patronus-cliens* relationship involved specifically Roman prac-

¹⁸ Saller, *Personal Patronage*, 1.

¹⁹ Andrew Wallace-Hadrill, *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London and New York: Routledge, 1989); Peter Garnsey and Richard P. Saller, eds., *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society, and Culture* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987); Luis Roniger, “Modern Patron-Client Relations and Historical Clientelism: Some Clues from Ancient Republican Rome,” *Archives Europeennes de Sociologie* 24 (1983): 63–95; S. N. Eisenstadt and Luis Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends: Interpersonal Relations and the Structure of Trust in Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

²⁰ Moxnes, “Patron-Client,” 243–244; D. A. DeSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2000); Jerome H. Neyrey, “God, Benefactor and Patron: The Major Cultural Model for Interpreting the Deity in Greco-Roman Antiquity,” *JSNT* 27 (2005): 465–492.

²¹ Koenraad Verboven, *The Economy of Friends: Economic Aspects of Amicitia and Patronage in the Late Republic* (Brussels: Latomus, 2002), 12. Unfortunately for NT scholars Verboven decides to address Roman *amicitia*, but not *patrocinium*. His patronage study aligns more closely with the sociological category and he suggests an elaborate study on *patrocinium* is still needed.

tices (e.g., often, though not always, the *salutatio*) that do not obtain in other societies. In order to employ the socio-historical category in other societies, social historians drop some of the necessarily Roman traits of the practice.

Based upon Saller's work it has become commonplace to use socio-historical categories to study Roman society, and for social historians to include Roman society in studies of ancient societies. This has created some confusion because the socio-historical categories of patron and client are not synonymous with the Roman categories of *patronus* and *cliens*. "The [socio-historical] concepts of 'patronage' and 'clientage' indicate a general type of personal relationship that may occur in any society under widely different names and appearances and which is characterised by reciprocity, asymmetry and personal loyalty. *Patrocinium* and *clientele* on the other hand were typically Roman concepts that can only be fully understood within the context of Roman history and culture."²² H. Moxnes, following A. Blok, provides a good example of a socio-historical understanding of patron-client relationship to describe non-Roman relationships.²³ Blok mentions "father-son, God-man, saint-devotee, godfather-godchild, lord-vassal, landlord-tenant, politician-voter, [and] professor-assistant" as patron-client relationships.²⁴ Socio-historical patronage can describe many relationships, but this is quite different than Roman *patrocinium* which described one type of (Roman) relationship.

C. Eilers, in a thorough study of *patrocinium* in the Roman east, confirms Verboven's concern over the confusion of the Roman and socio-historical definitions of patronage.²⁵ He advances this critique by claiming that social historians and anthropologists misunderstand *patrocinium*. For example, social historians misunderstand the specifically Roman nature of *patrocinium*, the criteria which confirm its practice, its transferability to other cultures, and its relationship to other practices (specifically *suffragium* and so-called "literary patronage"). This misunderstanding leads social historians to derive an errant understanding of socio-historical patron-client relationships (see section 2.1.2; 2.1.3). For example, Eilers insists that *patrocinium* was not the relationship through which kingdoms were conferred (*suffragium*), nor did endowed authors identify the en-

²² Verboven, *Economy*, 51. On *patrocinium* and *clientes* see also, Hans-Joachim Gehrke, "Patronus," in *Brill's New Pauly* (ed. H. Cancik and H. Schneider; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 5:154–156; Jens-Uwe Krause, "Patrocinium I. Political," *BNP* (2007), 10:618–620; Andrew W. Lintott, "Cliens, clientes," *BNP* 3 (2003), 3:450–452.

²³ Moxnes, "Patron-Client," 242.

²⁴ Blok, "Variations," 366.

²⁵ Claude Eilers, *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 2–18.

dower as a literary patron.²⁶ Additionally, *patrocinium* did not begin with an overt act of generosity on the part of the superior (a benefaction), but could only begin with an intentional effort by the inferior party to enter a patron-client relationship.²⁷ J. Harrison confirms the confusion created by social historians when they use the “more Roman-sounding” patron-client terminology.²⁸ The use of patron-client terminology in a broad sense is problematic because it may cause the inadvertent importing of a specific aspect of Roman culture which may or may not have been present among the authors and audiences of the NT literature.

Socio-historical patron-client categories can describe a multitude of relationships among which might be *patronus*, *cliens*, or *euergetism*. But it is imperative to properly define and distinguish between socio-historical and Roman forms of patronage. The confusion created by these overlapping definitions motivates the present study to properly define terms and differentiate definitions. To the extent that patron-client relations are in view, this study focuses on Roman *patrocinium*.²⁹ Nevertheless, it will offer suggestions about socio-historical patron-client relations at times. At a certain level socio-historical patron-client relations can be assumed of almost any society because the definition is so general and flexible. *Patrocinium*, on the other hand, cannot be assumed of many cultures. It must be shown to have existed through evidence. It is hoped that by distinguishing the two practices confusion can be mitigated and NT investigations into, especially, the culture of Jesus and the early church in Palestine can be advanced.

1.2 Appropriateness of the Study

There are several reasons which justify a new investigation of patrons, benefactors, and discipleship in Luke. This study will focus on *patrocinium* and benefaction rather than the socio-historical patron-client relationship. As mentioned above, the only work which develops the theme of patron-client relationships and Luke-Acts urges at its end the need for more detailed exegesis of Luke to better substantiate the claim.³⁰ Since Moxnes made that request almost two decades ago no scholar has devoted

²⁶ Eilers, *Roman Patrons*, 2–4, 6, 17.

²⁷ Eilers, *Roman Patrons*, 31–33.

²⁸ Harrison, *Language*, 15.

²⁹ Cf. the approach of John Nicols, “Patrons of Greek Cities in the Early Principate,” *ZPE* 80 (1990): 81–108, 81.

³⁰ Moxnes, “Patron-Client,” 268.

extended attention to its resolution. A monograph devoted to patron-client relationships and discipleship appropriately responds to Moxnes' request.

In a similar vein, the work which focuses on Luke-Acts and benefactors is in need of up-dating. Danker devoted three works to benefactors and Luke-Acts, *Benefactor* (1982), *Jesus and the New Age* (1988), and *Luke* (1976; 1987). His is the only extended treatment of benefactors and Luke available. It has now been two decades since the completion of his last work and no monograph has appeared to improve upon his work. Articles by NT scholars which appear during this interval rarely bring new primary source information into discussion,³¹ and related works which cite Danker do so typically without bringing in newer secondary sources.³² There is need for a focused study on the topic once again in order to evaluate the sustainability of Danker's studies and to assess their applicability to Luke's Gospel.

Advances in scholarly understanding of patrons, clients, and benefactors in the early Roman empire can improve our grasp of these relationships and how they potentially operated in first-century Palestine. At the time of Danker's efforts only one unpublished dissertation had been devoted to the inscriptions of Hellenistic benefactors (Mott 1971).³³ Danker did not incorporate the work of Veyne (1976).³⁴ Moxnes builds largely off of the work of R. P. Saller (1982), S. N. Eisenstadt and L. Roniger (1984), E. Gellner

³¹ E.g., Ian Sloan, "The Greatest and the Youngest: Greco-Roman Reciprocity in the Farewell Address, Luke 22:24–30," *Studies in Religion* 22 (1993): 63–73. Lull adds some literary evidence to his discussion. D. J. Lull, "The Servant-Benefactor as a Model of Greatness (Lk 22:24–30)," *NovT* 28 (1986): 289–305.

³² E.g., Joel B. Green, "'Salvation to the End of the Earth' (Acts 13:47): God as Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 83–106, 87; Nelson, *Leadership*, 150–152; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (BECNT 3; 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 2.1737; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2.1417; Philip F. Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 256.

³³ Charles Mott, "The Greek Benefactor and Deliverance from Moral Distress" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1971); idem, "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10–14 and III 3–7," *NovT* 20 (1978): 22–48. He also mentions Hendrik Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum. Ein Beitrag zum Problem "Moral und Gesellschaft"* (Utrecht: Oosthoek, 1939). Eiliv Skaard, *Zwei Religiös-Politische Begriffe: Euergetes-Concordia* (Avhand-linger utgitt av Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo; Vol 2; Hist.-Filos. Klasse. 1931; No 2. Oslo: Jacob Dybwad, 1932). But Bolkestein focuses on "concern for the poor" and does not deal with epigraphical evidence. Skaard "discusses a few terms and phrases, but shows little interest in Hellenistic inscriptions." Danker, *Benefactor*, 49. Danker apparently overlooked Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque* (1976).

³⁴ Veyne, *Le pain et le cirque*.

and J. Waterbury (1977), and A. Blok (1969).³⁵ These works depend upon earlier classical scholarship including T. Mommsen (1864–1879), E. Badian (1958), M. Gelzer (1969), R. Syme (1939), A. von Premerstein (1937), and L. Harmand (1957).³⁶ These works also depend on the socio-historical and anthropological work of M. Mauss (1967), M. D. Sahlins (1972), K. Polanyi (1968), and P. Bourdieu (1977).³⁷ It appears that Moxnes (1991) overlooked some important classical works that were published just prior to his article,³⁸ but it is also clear that several important works by classicists have appeared after Moxnes and improved our understanding of *patrocinium* and benefaction.³⁹ Responding to the works on patronage by

³⁵ Saller, *Patronage*; Eisenstadt and Roniger, *Patrons, Clients and Friends*; Ernest Gellner and John Waterbury, eds., *Patrons and Clients in Mediterranean Societies* (London: Duckworth, 1977); A. Blok, “Variations in Patronage,” *Sociologische Gids* (1969): 365–378.

³⁶ T. Mommsen, “Das römische Gastrecht und die römische Clientel,” in *Römische Forschungen* (2 vols.; Berlin, 1864–1879), 1.355–390; E. Badian, *Foreign Clientelae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1958); Matthias Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility* (trans. Robin Seager; Oxford: Blackwell, 1969); R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1939); A. von Premerstein, *Vom Werden und Wesen des Prinzipats* (Abhandlungen der bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, philologisch-historische Abteilung; NS 15; Munich, 1937); L. Harmand, *Un aspect social et politique du monde romain: Le Patronat sur les collectivités publiques des origines au Bas-Empire* (Publications de la Faculté des Lettres de l’Université de Clermont, 2nd serv. 2; Paris, 1957).

³⁷ Marcel Mauss, *The Gift: Forms and Functions of Exchange in Archaic Societies* (trans. W. D. Halls; New York: Norton, 1967); Marshall David Sahlins, *Stone Age Economics* (Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1972); Karl Polanyi, *Primitive, Archaic, and Modern Economies: Essays of Karl Polanyi* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1968); Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977). Some classicists build from the classical and sociological studies which informed Saller even if they depart from Saller at points. Phebe Lowell Bowditch, *Horace and the Gift Economy of Patronage* (Classics and Contemporary Thought 7; Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001), 7; Lomas and Cornell, *Bread and Circuses*.

³⁸ P. A. Brunt, “Clientela,” in idem, *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 382–442; J. Touloumakos, “Zum römischen Gemeindepatronat im griechischen Osten,” *Hermes* 116 (1988): 304–324; N. Rouland, *Pouvoir politique et dépendance personnelle dans l’Antiquité romaine: Genèse et rôle des rapports de clientèle* (Brussels, 1979); P. M. Nigdelis, “Ῥωμαῖοι πάτρωνες και ἀναγκαιότατοι καιροί” (παρατηρήσεις στην επιγραφή SEG 32.825 της Πάρου), *Hellenika* 40 (1989): 34–49. If Moxnes had incorporated Brunt he would have heard the critique that Mommsen created his understanding of patronage virtually *ex nihilo*, Brunt, “Clientela,” 401 n. 48.

³⁹ Eilers, *Roman Patrons*; Verboven, *Economy*; Veyne, *Bread and Circuses*; E. Rawson, “The Eastern Clientela of Cladius and the Claudii,” *Historia* 22 (1973): 219–239, reprinted in idem, *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 102–124; R. Duthoy, “Quelques observations concernant la mention d’un patronat municipal dans les inscriptions,” *AC* 50 (1981): 295–305; idem, “Sens et

Eilers (2002), Verboven (2002), Bowditch (2001), Lomas and Cornell (2003), Nauta (2001), and De Rossi (2001), K. Verboven has recently remarked that *patrocinium* is once again “to the fore” in classical studies.⁴⁰ It behooves NT scholarship to avail itself of these advances.

It seems, however, that NT scholars have not availed themselves of the newer classical studies. For some it is not neglect of the sources, but the simple fact that these classical works were written after NT scholars produced their material. Scholars who wrote before the recent outpouring of classical works on patronage could naturally improve their reading through incorporation of this new material. J. B. Green’s commentary on Luke (1997), which explains much of Luke from its “Mediterranean” context and Luke’s attack of the “Roman patronal system”, builds from the same resource base as Moxnes builds.⁴¹ Hanson and Oakman (2000) develop their understanding of Palestinian “pyramids of power” (patronage) from the same socio-historical works.⁴² B. J. Malina and R. L. Rohrbaugh (2003) discuss the Roman patronal system which, they claim, persisted in Jesus’ Palestine building from the same literature.⁴³ However, some scholars have written after these recent studies and demonstrate neglect of better material. Two recent works on patronage and benefaction by NT scholars, J. H. Neyrey (2005) and Y. S. Ahn (2006), neglect to interact with any studies done in the last two decades. They derive their understanding of patronage and benefaction from the same pool of resources from which Moxnes draws.⁴⁴ Neither scholar draws upon the advances in classical

fonction du patronat municipal durant le Principat,” *AC* 53 (1984): 145–156; idem, “Scénarios de cooptation des patrons municipaux en Italie,” *Epigraphica* 46 (1984): 23–48; idem, “Le profil social des patrons municipaux en Italie sous le Haut-Empire,” *AncSoc* 15–17 (1984–1986): 121–154; P. I. Wilkins, “Legates of Numidia as Municipal Patrons,” *Chiron* 23 (1993): 189–206; Nicols, “Patrons of Greek Cities,” 81–108; Alexander Yakobson, *Elections and Electioneering in Rome: A Study in the Political System of the Late Republic* (Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1999).

⁴⁰ Koenraad Verboven, “Review of Claude Eilers, *Roman Patrons of Greek Cities*,” *BMCR* 6.19 (2003). See also, Ruurd Nauta, *Poetry for Patrons: Literary Communication in the Age of Domitian* (Mnemosyne Supp. 206; Leiden: Brill, 2001); Filippo Canali De Rossi, *Il ruolo dei ‘patroni’ nelle relazioni politiche fra il mondo greco e Roma in età repubblicana ed augustea* (Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 159; München: Saur, 2001). John Nicols is currently in discussion with Brill to publish his (long-anticipated) monograph, John Nicols, *The Patronage of Communities in the Roman Empire*. Forthcoming.

⁴¹ Green, *Luke*, 270–271; idem, *Theology of Luke*, 114–115.

⁴² Hanson and Oakman, *Palestine*, 70–86. They add G. E. M. De Ste. Croix, “*Suffragium*: From Vote to Patronage,” *British Journal of Sociology* 5 (1954): 33–48.

⁴³ Bruce J. Malina and Richard L. Rohrbaugh, eds., *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 388–391.

⁴⁴ Neyrey, “God, Benefactor and Patron,” 465–492; Yong Sung Ahn, *The Reign of God and Rome in Luke’s Passion Narrative: An East Asian Global Perspective* (Biblical

studies which have arrived in the past few years. NT scholars have sometimes neglected the best classical works from the previous generation (Brunt, Touloumoukos, Rouland, Nigdelis), and NT scholars continue to ignore more recent classical works which have appeared in the last decade (Eilers, Verboven, Nicols, Bowditch, Lomas and Cornell, De Rossi, and Nauta). A study which incorporates the new developments in the classical study of patrons, clients, and benefactors is needed.

1.3 Scholarly Setting for the Current Study

An investigation of *patrocinium* and benefaction in first-century Palestine, and the potential appropriation of these practices by Jesus and the early Christians, joins a very active conversation about the historical Jesus and his context. The approach of this study follows the example of many recent works which broadly fall into the quest for the historical Jesus. One of the hallmarks of the so-called “Third Quest” is a desire to construct a plausible historical backdrop for the historical Jesus.⁴⁵ S. Freyne explains the problem which created the need to construct a plausible historical context for Jesus.⁴⁶ With Käsemann’s criterion of dissimilarity scholarship finds itself on sure ground about the historical Jesus only when he is completely different from potential influences (e.g., Judaism) and effects (i.e. early Christianity).⁴⁷ There is then no “connecting link” between Jesus, the culture of his day, and the group which grew from his influence.⁴⁸ A new approach was needed which could incorporate points of similarity and dissimilarity between Jesus, his culture, and early Christians.

Interpretation Series 80; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 161–168. One study Neyrey draws from which was not mentioned in Moxnes, Veyne (1990), is more recent but is essentially a translation and revision of his much earlier work (1976). Veyne, *Bread and Circuses* (1990); idem, *Le pain et le cirque* (1976).

⁴⁵ Gerd Theissen and Dagmar Winter, *Die Kriterienfrage in der Jesusforschung: Vom Differenzkriterium zum Plausibilitätskriterium* (Freiburg: Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus, 1997); ET, *The Quest for the Plausible Jesus: The Question of Criteria* (trans. M. Eugene Boring; Louisville: Westminster, 2002); G. Theissen, “Historical Scepticism and the Criteria of Jesus Research: My Attempt to Leap over Lessing’s Yawning Gulf,” *SJT* 49 (1996): 146–175; Seán Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel: Collected Essays* (WUNT 125; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 20–25; Paul Foster, “Educating Jesus: The Search for a Plausible Context,” *JSHJ* 4 (2006): 7–33; Stanley E. Porter, “Luke 17.11–19 and the Criteria for Authenticity Revisited,” *JSHJ* 1 (2003): 201–224.

⁴⁶ Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 22–24.

⁴⁷ E. Käsemann, “Das Problem des historischen Jesus,” *ZTK* 51 (1954): 125–152; ET, “The Problem of the Historical Jesus,” in idem, *Essays on New Testament Themes* (London: SCM Press, 1964), 15–47.

⁴⁸ Käsemann, “Historical Jesus,” 37.

This need has compelled many scholars, including many from archaeological and sociological fields, to search for a plausible historical context for the historical Jesus.⁴⁹ M. H. Jensen is among the recent spate of scholars who combine archaeological research and literary investigation in order to describe the culture of Galilee and, at the broader level, Palestine, during the early Roman period.⁵⁰ Several reasons may be advanced for this de-

⁴⁹ Major works on this topic include: Burton L. Mack, *The Lost Gospel: The Book of Q & Christian Origins* (Shaftesbury, Dorset: Element, 1993); J. D. Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1991); John Dominic Crossan and Jonathan L. Reed, *Excavating Jesus: Beneath the Stones, Behind the Texts* (New York: HarperCollins, 2001); L. Vaage, *Galilean Upstarts: Jesus' First Followers According to Q* (Valley Forge: Trinity Press International, 1994); F. G. Downing, *Cynics and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1992); G. Vermès, *Jesus the Jew* (London: Collins, 1973); B. Meyer, *The Aims of Jesus* (London: 1979); R. Riesner, *Jesus als Lehrer* (WUNT 7; Tübingen: Mohr, 1981); E. P. Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (London: SCM, 1985); Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*; idem, *Galilee: From Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980); idem, *Jesus, a Jewish Galilean: A New Reading of the Jesus Story* (London: T & T Clark, 2004); John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library; 3 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1991–2001); James H. Charlesworth, ed., *Jesus and Archaeology* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006); Richard A. Horsley, *Jesus and Empire: Kingdom of God and the New World Disorder* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003); Mark A. Chancey, *The Myth of a Gentile Galilee* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); idem, *Greco-Roman Culture and the Galilee of Jesus* (SNTMS 134; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005).

⁵⁰ Morten Hørning Jensen, *Herod Antipas in Galilee: The Literary and Archaeological Sources on the Reign of Herod Antipas and its Socio-Economic Impact on Galilee* (WUNT 2.215; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 3–5. Among the scholars who have approached historical Jesus studies in this manner Jensen lists, Meier, *A Marginal Jew*, 167–195; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 85–86; Theissen and Winter, *Die Kriterienfrage*; Tom Holmén, “Doubts about Double Dissimilarity: Restructuring the Main Criterion of Jesus-of-History Research,” in *Authenticating the Words of Jesus* (ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans; New Testament Tools and Studies 28.1; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 47–80; Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 20; idem, “The Geography, Politics, and Economics of Galilee and the Quest for the Historical Jesus,” in *Studying the Historical Jesus: Evaluations of the State of Current Research* (ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 75–122, 75; Jonathan L. Reed, *Archaeology and the Galilean Jesus: A Re-Examination of the Evidence* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 2000); Douglas R. Edwards and C. Thomas McCollough, eds., *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997). After Jensen’s 2006 publication, several new studies have arrived. Markus Cromhout, *Jesus and Identity: Reconstructing Judean Ethnicity in Q* (Matrix: The Bible in Mediterranean Context 2; Eugene: Cascade Books, 2007); Douglas E. Oakman, *Jesus and the Peasants* (Matrix: The Bible in Mediterranean Context; Eugene: Cascade, 2008); Amy-Jill Levine, Dale C. Allison, and John Dominic Crossan, eds., *The Historical Jesus in Context* (Princeton Readings in

velopment. Jensen identifies two. (1) Sean Freyne's monumental work, *Galilee: From Alexander the Great to Hadrian 323 B.C.E. to 135 C.E.: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*, for the first time laid out a quasi-comprehensive depiction of the political, social, economic, and cultural milieu of Galilee.⁵¹ His work became a foundation for many to build upon. (2) Recent developments in archaeology, specifically in regard to methodology and extended access to sites, have produced a situation in which the lives of the non-elite, among whom Jesus matured, may be described. This "New Archaeology," as it is commonly referred to, puts emphasis on ordinary, daily life rather than monumental features (see section 2.4.2).⁵² There is, however, an inherent danger in the process because constructions of Galilee tend to create consequent pictures of Jesus (see next paragraph).⁵³ Aware of this danger, scholars continue to make more precise geographical and chronological distinctions in their investigation of Palestine's cultures. Rather than broad-brush painting of Palestine as a "Mediterranean," "Roman," or "Hellenistic" culture, many have attempted to provide nuance and distinction in terms of the eras and regions investigated and the relative influence of Jewish and non-Jewish cultures. M. Goodman notes the awareness historians and archaeologists now have over the problems of generalizing about the cultures, economies, societies, and religions of regions as vast and variegated as the Mediterranean world.⁵⁴ Advances on many levels provide a remedy to this problem since archaeologists now have access to information about not just regions but sub-regions within the larger provinces. Nuancing and specification in regard to the culture of early Roman Galilee can now be undertaken properly.

Within this new facet of the quest for the historical Jesus several major issues have arisen. M. H. Jensen and J. Reed identify four issues which have been central to the debates, have aroused polarized opinions, but have recently moved toward consensus.⁵⁵ The issues can be summarized as fol-

Religions; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006); Jürgen Zangenberg, H. W. Attridge, and D. B. Martin, eds. *Religion, Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

⁵¹ Freyne, *Galilee: From Alexander the Great to Hadrian*.

⁵² Jensen, *Antipas*, 3, 126–135; Sean Freyne, "Archaeology and the Historical Jesus," in Freyne, *Galilee and Gospel*, 160–182.

⁵³ Reed, *Archaeology*, 8; Freyne, "Geography, Politics, Economics," 76; Sean Freyne, "Galilee and Judea: The Social World of Jesus," in *The Face of New Testament Studies: A Survey of Recent Research* (ed. Scot McKnight and Grant R. Osborne; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2004), 21–35.

⁵⁴ Martin Goodman, "Foreword," in *Religion and Society in Roman Palestine: Old Questions, New Approaches* (ed. Douglas R. Edwards; New York and London: Routledge, 2004), xiii–xvii, xiii. He cites P. Hordern and N. Purcell, *The Corrupting Seas: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000).

⁵⁵ Jensen, *Antipas*, 5–9; Reed, *Archaeology*, 8–9.

lows, with important contributors to each debate in parenthesis (see section 2.4.3): (1) the ethnic identity of the Galileans (R. Horsley, A. Alt, S. Freyne), (2) the cultural and religious climate of Galilee (A. Overman, E. M. Meyers, R. Batey, J. D. Crossan, F. G. Downing, B. L. Mack, M. A. Chancey, J. L. Reed, R. Horsley), (3) the economic situation (H. Moxnes, K. C. Hanson, D. E. Oakman, D. A. Fiensy, J. Pastor), and (4) the political atmosphere (S. Freyne, L. H. Feldman, R. Horsley, S. Zeitlin). It is the second of these questions which is the central concern of the present study. Galilee, and Palestine, has been described as a hotbed for Hellenization or an enclave of Jewish zealots. Either extreme lends itself to a quite different interpretation of the ministry and message of Jesus. Jensen describes this particular issue as “the most intensively debated” among the four, but, as will be argued in the following chapter, material and textual evidence have “largely settled the issue” in favor of those who espouse a more Jewish climate.⁵⁶

Scholarship is concerned with the question of the early Christians and their relationship with Jesus. This question develops because of a deficiency left by the criterion of dissimilarity. Scholars recognized a second problematic result of Käsemann’s criterion of dissimilarity, namely, it left no ground for understanding the movement which emerged from Jesus’ influence. As scholars began to understand the social world of Jesus they were able to understand the movement which developed from his influence. Jensen explains, “One key area of investigation, therefore, is the nature and development of the earliest Palestinian Jesus movement which the historical Jesus is likely to have impressed most with his stamp”⁵⁷ This trend can be seen in numerous works which examine the rise and development of early Christianity from socio-historical and archaeological vantage points.⁵⁸ A study of patrons, clients, and benefactors in first-century Pales-

⁵⁶ Jensen, *Antipas*, 7–8.

⁵⁷ Jensen, *Antipas*, 73.

⁵⁸ E.g., L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough, eds., *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1995); Ekkehard W. Stegemann and Wolfgang Stegemann, *Urchristliche Sozialgeschichte: die Anfänge im Judentum und die Christuskirchen in der mediterranen Welt* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1995); ET, *The Jesus Movement: A Social History of Its First-century* (trans. O. C. Dean, Jr.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999); E. A. Judge, *Social Distinctives of the Christians in the First-century: Pivotal Essays* (ed. David M. Scholer; Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2007); Andrew E. Arterbury, *Entertaining Angels: Early Christian Hospitality in Its Mediterranean Setting* (NTM 8; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2005); Richard L. Batey, *Jesus and the Forgotten City: New Light on Sepphoris and the Urban World of Jesus* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1991); Ismo Dundergerg, Kari Syreeni, and Christopher Tuckett, eds., *Fair Play: Diversity and Conflicts in Early Christianity: Essays in Honour of Heikki Räsänen* (Leiden: Brill, 2002); Richard A. Horsley and Neil Asher Silberman, *The Message and the Kingdom: How Jesus and Paul Ignited a*

tine should improve our understanding of the culture of Jesus and his earliest followers. An investigation of three pericopes in Luke's gospel, wherein Jesus instructs his disciples, should provide insight about their response to their culture and appropriation of his message.

1.4 Methodology

Luke-Acts has been studied from many angles.⁵⁹ Scholars have approached it from literary,⁶⁰ theological,⁶¹ historical,⁶² and socio-historical⁶³ vantage

Revolution and Transformed the Ancient World (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997); Neyrey, *Social World*.

⁵⁹ For bibliography on various approaches to Luke-Acts undertaken before 1994, see Joel B. Green and Michael C. McKeever, *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography* (IBR Bibliographies 8; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994).

⁶⁰ Mikeal C. Parsons, *Luke: Storyteller, Interpreter, Evangelist* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2007); Daniel Marguerat, *First Christian Historian: Writing the "Acts of the Apostles"* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002); C. M. Tuckett, ed., *Luke's Literary Achievement: Collected Essays* (JSNT 116; Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); William S. Kurz, *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993); Loveday Alexander, *The Preface to Luke's Gospel: Literary Convention and Social Context in Luke 1.1–4 and Acts 1.1* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); idem, *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (Early Christianity in Context; New York: T & T Clark International, 2005); Robert J. Karris, *Luke, Artist and Theologian: Luke's Passion Account As Literature* (Theological Inquiries; New York: Paulist Press, 1985); Richard I. Pervo, *Profit with Delight: The Literary Genre of the Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987); Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, eds., *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (BAFCS 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993).

⁶¹ François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950–2005)* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006); I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Authentic Paternoster, 2006); Marshall and Peterson, *Witness to the Gospel; Green, Theology; Jacob Jervell, The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

⁶² C. J. Hemer, *Luke the Historian* (Manchester, England: John Rylands University Library, 1977); Clare K. Rothschild, *Luke-Acts and the Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography* (WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004); Alexander Mittelstaedt, *Lukas als Historiker: zur Datierung des lukanischen Doppelwerkes* (TANZ 43; Tübingen: Francke, 2006); Héctor Sánchez, *Das lukanische Geschichtswerk im Spiegel heilsgeschichtlicher Übergänge* (Paderborner theologische Studien 29; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 2001); Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts, and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSupp 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992).

⁶³ Esler, *Community and Gospel*; Malina and Rohrbaugh, *Social-Science Commentary*; Neyrey, *Social World of Luke-Acts*.