LUKE
Chapter 22

The Plot to Kill Jesus

22 Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew near, which is called the Passover. 2 And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking how to put him to death, for they feared the people.

Luke's account of the passion of Jesus begins with the time notice in 22:1. From this point on, Luke will track the chronology carefully to show the three-day sequence of events: the day of preparation for the Sabbath (ἡμέρα … παρασκευῆς [23:54], from sundown on Thursday to sundown on Friday; 22:14–23:56a), the Sabbath (σάββατον [23:54], from sundown on Friday to sundown on Saturday; 23:56b), and the first day of the week (τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββατῶν [24:1], from sundown on Saturday to sundown on Sunday; 24:1–35). See figure 7. Luke wants the hearer to remember several important points about this sequence. (CC p. 812)

22:1 *Feast of Unleavened Bread … Passover.* "Passover" was used in two different ways: (1) a specific meal begun at twilight on the 14th of Nisan (Lev 23:4–5), and (2) the week following the Passover meal (Eze 45:21), otherwise known as the Feast of Unleavened Bread, a week in which no leaven was allowed (Ex 12:15–20; 13:3–7). By NT times the two names for the week-long festival were virtually interchangeable. (CSB)

Two festivals commemorating God's deliverance (cf Ex 12:1–20; Lv 23:4–6; Nu 28:16–17). The two festivals were frequently regarded as one and the names used interchangeably (Lk 22:7; Ac 12:3–4). (TLSB)

ἤγγιζεν—The adjective ἐγγύς and the verb ἐγγίζω are often used in the context of inaugurated eschatology. (adj.: Lk 19:11; 21:30–31; verb: 10:9, 11; 19:29, 41; 21:8, 20, 28; 22:1, 47; 24:15, 28) Here the verb is used of the approach of the feast of Unleavened Bread, on the first day of which the Passover lamb was slain. This sets the stage for the Last Supper, where Jesus institutes the eschatological feast of the church, and for his death as our Passover Lamb. (CC p. 811)

ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν ἀζύμων ἡ λεγομένη πάσχα—This is the first of three time references in Luke 22. Each one narrows the focus closer to the climactic moment of the meal. The movement is from days before Passover (22:1) to the day (22:7) to the hour (22:14). (CC p. 811)

The day of Passover itself began in the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan, at which time the lambs were slain. That day then lasted until the evening of the fifteenth of Nisan (Ex 12:1–14). The Feast of Unleavened Bread lasted seven days, from the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan until the evening of the twenty-first (Ex 12:15–20). Thus the day of Passover coincided with the first day of the week-long Feast of Unleavened Bread (Mt 26:17; Mk 14:12). The whole week of celebration was sometimes called "Passover" (Lk 2:41; see 2:43) and the Feast of Unleavened Bread included Passover (cf. Acts 12:3–4). Lk 22:1, 7 and Acts 12:3–4 suggest that the two names were used interchangeably. (CC p. 811)

First, the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples occurs on the day of preparation and is part of the passion of Jesus. The Passover meal (22:7–38) begins the three-day sequence that concludes with the Emmaus meal (24:13–35). Second, all the events of the passion occur on the day of

preparation (22:14–23:56a). Because the Sabbath was about to begin soon after Jesus' death, proper burial preparations such as anointing the body could not take place until the Sabbath was over—on the first day of the week. Third, Jesus observes a Sabbath rest in the tomb (implied in 23:55–56). The Sabbath was kept as the Jews would have normally kept it: according to the commandment (23:56b). Fourth, the first day of the week begins Saturday evening, so Jesus' resurrection "on the third day" (9:22; 18:33) could have been any time after sundown on Saturday. Luke tells us that the women came to the tomb "in the deep dawn" (24:1). Fifth, the sequence suggests a new work of creation. Sunday, when Jesus rose from the dead, is the first day (24:1) of the new week and the start of the new era of salvation in Christ. Sixth, the evangelist reports that on Easter the Emmaus meal took place when the end of the day was near (24:29), and therefore it is included in the three-day sequence. Luke's careful time references help the hearer discover significant aspects of these events. (CC pp. 812, 814)

22:2 *the chief priests and the teachers of the law.* See 20:1. (CSB)

Priestly aristocracy representing the Sadducees on the Jewish high Council. (TLSB)

Teachers of the Law connected to the Pharisees (19:47–48; 20:19). (TLSB)

οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς—On the Sanhedrin, the chief priests represent the Sadducees and the scribes represent the Pharisees. Thus, Jesus' opposition from both outside Jerusalem (the Pharisees) and from inside Jerusalem (the Sadducees) begin the plot that will lead to his death. (CC p. 811)

The plot to kill Jesus is not hatched by a lone assassin. Rather, it is agreed upon by Judas *and* the religious leaders of Israel. But Luke also shows us that Jesus' betrayal involves more than the human participants. God and Satan are the ultimate players in this scene. Satan was waiting for his opportune time (4:13), and this is the hour of darkness (22:53). *Apart from Judas' help, the religious establishment is stymied by their fear of the crowds. Satan prompts the availability of Judas. The plan moves forward, at the appointed hour. By showing that Satan initiated the plot against Jesus, Luke raises the passion to a level where the spoils of victory are eschatological.* This accords with OT prophecy. Is 53:12, for example, speaks of the Suffering Servant pouring out his life to death, then apportioning the spoils of his victory. (See further the excursus "The OT Witness to Christ.") (CC pp. 814-815)

how. Jesus' death had been decided. How to kill Him without a riot was the only question. (TLSB)

they feared the people – ἐφοβοῶντο γὰρ τὸν λαόν—At the beginning of the passion, the people are pictured as supportive of Jesus, causing the Jerusalem religious establishment to be afraid to act publicly against Jesus. Therefore, the betrayal must occur apart from the crowd (22:6; ἄτερ ὄχλου). But the people/crowds will turn against Jesus at Pilate's second trial (23:13). However, when Jesus is crucified, they will stand by his cross watching (23:35), and after his death, they will return home beating their breasts (23:48). (CC pp. 811-812)

22:1–2 The Jewish leaders seek Jesus' death. Those who conspire against God's plans ultimately fail, as Pharaoh learned at the first Passover. In Jesus' life, God uses the hostility of His enemies to fulfill the sacrifice of the true Passover lamb, who wrought our salvation. • Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world, have mercy on us. Amen. (TLSB)

Judas to Betray Jesus

3 Then Satan entered into Judas called Iscariot, who was of the number of the twelve. 4 He went away and conferred with the chief priests and officers how he might betray him to them. 5 And they were glad, and agreed to give him money. 6 So he consented and sought an opportunity to betray him to them in the absence of a crowd.

22:3 *Satan entered into Judas.* In the Gospels this expression is used on two separate occasions: (1) before Judas went to the chief priests and offered to betray Jesus (here), and (2) during the Last Supper (Jn 13:27). Thus the Gospel writers depict Satan's control over Judas, who had never displayed a high motive of service or commitment to Jesus. (CSB)

Judas is responsible for his actions, but Satan is a motivator. (TLSB)

Iscariot. Two apostles were named Judas (6:16). The betrayer is identified by "Iscariot," or "man from Kerioth-hezron," his hometown, making him the only apostle from Judea. The others came from Galilee. (TLSB)

εἰσῆλθεν δὲ σατανᾶς εἰς Ἰούδαν—It would appear that this is the "opportune time" referred to at the end of Jesus' temptations (4:13). Satan now becomes an active force in the passion. Judas behaves as he does because Satan has entered him. This does not remove Judas' guilt, but it explains the perversity of his actions in the context of the plan of God for salvation. (CC p. 812)

The theme of this passage, then, is the plot of Judas to betray Jesus into the hands of the Jewish religious establishment at the instigation of Satan and in fulfillment of God's ordained plan. The hearer knows that the passion is about to begin, and that it will end with Jesus' death on the cross. The passion narrative begins with these preparations and the preparations of the disciples in the next passage and ends with the preparations for the burial of Jesus' body by Joseph of Arimathea and the women's preparations to anoint his body on the first day of the week (23:50–56a). But while the human participants are in the forefront, the passage intimates that *God* is governing the sequence of events according to his own timetable in order to accomplish his plan of salvation. (CC p. 815)

number of the twelve – ἐκ τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν δώδεκα—Luke carefully records that Judas was a member of Jesus' select company of twelve disciples who represent the reconstituted Israel. In the OT, Yahweh was betrayed by his unfaithful people too. The theme of unrepentant sinners in the midst of the holy Passover meal begins with this verse. Cf. 21:16 in the eschatological discourse, where Jesus warns of betrayal by relatives and friends. (CC p. 812)

22:4 *chief priests*. Those priests who held leading positions in the temple hierarchy. (TLSB)

officers of the temple guard. All of these were Jews selected mostly from the Levites. (CSB)

τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσιν καὶ στρατηγοῖς—The chief priests are now named alongside the temple police, who have jurisdiction in the temple precincts. (CC p. 812)

betray – παραδῷ—Jesus predicted his betrayal using this verb in 9:44; 18:32. Later references to his betrayal in 22:6, 21, 22, 48 use this same verb. Cf. also 23:25; 24:7, 20. Jesus also spoke of his disciples being betrayed by relatives and friends in the eschatological discourse (21:12, 16). Therefore, the disciples will suffer persecution in the same way their Lord did. The

betrayal of Jesus begins also the eschatological times of affliction for the faithful, continued in Acts. (CC p. 812)

22:5 *they were glad* – ἐχάρησαν—Luke usually uses this word to refer to joy at the eschatological salvation that Jesus brings (cf. Luke 15). Here it refers to the delight of those involved in the treachery surrounding Jesus' death. This is Satanic glee that, for the impenitent, will be turned into horror and eternal shame on Judgment Day. (CC p. 812)

They now knew how (v 2) to put Jesus to death. (TLSB)

money. Judas acts from greed (Mt 26:14–16; Jn 12:6). (TLSB)

22:6 *he consented* – ἐξωμολόγησεν—In the active voice, as here, ἐξομολογέω means "agree, consent," but in the middle voice it means "confess" (Acts 19:18) or "acknowledge" (Lk 10:21). Nevertheless, Judas' consent to betray Jesus is a kind of confession of who he thinks Jesus is. (CC p. 812)

in the absence of a crowd. Judas looks for his chance to deliver Jesus when He is alone. Both Jesus' birth and betrayal come in lonely places. (TLSB)

22:3–6 Prompted by Satan, Judas negotiates the price for Jesus. The Lord would not have us compromise His purposes for earthly gain. When sin assails you, call on Jesus, who redeemed us, not with gold or silver, but with His holy, precious blood. • Lord, make us loyal to You above all. Amen. (TLSB)

The Passover with the Disciples

7 Then came the day of Unleavened Bread, on which the Passover lamb had to be sacrificed. 8 So Jesus sent Peter and John, saying, "Go and prepare the Passover for us, that we may eat it." 9 They said to him, "Where will you have us prepare it?" 10 He said to them, "Behold, when you have entered the city, a man carrying a jar of water will meet you. Follow him into the house that he enters 11 and tell the master of the house, 'The Teacher says to you, Where is the guest room, where I may eat the Passover with my disciples?' 12 And he will show you a large upper room furnished; prepare it there." 13 And they went and found it just as he had told them, and they prepared the Passover.

22:7 *Passover lamb had to be sacrificed.* On the 14th of Nisan between 2:30 and 5:30 P.M. in the court of the priests—Thursday of Passion Week. (CSB)

ἦλθεν δὲ ἡ ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων—On "Passover" and the "Feast of Unleavened Bread," see the textual note on 22:1 and Ex 12:1–20. Luke emphasizes the Last Supper by noting the time progression from "near" to the feast (22:1) to the arrival of the day (22:7) to the arrival of the hour (22:14). (CC p. 816)

Luke's record of the preparations for the Passover parallels his opening of the passion account. His time references show how each passage is one episode in a sequence of events that leads to Jesus' crucifixion. See figure 7. After the time reference to the day of Unleavened Bread, the narrative breaks into a dialog between Jesus and two of his disciples. The record of Jesus' instructions is extensive. In contrast, the report of their execution (22:13) is brief. (CC p. 817)

The Passover frames the passage: it begins with a broad reference to God's mandate for Israel's annual celebration of his redemption (22:7) and concludes with the specific Passover prepared by the disciples of Jesus, in which he will institute the Meal of his redemption of the whole world (22:13). Two words dominate this section of the passion and highlight its theme: "Passover" (τὸ πάσχα; 22:7, 8, 11, 13) and "prepare" (ἑτοιμάζω; 22:8, 9, 12, 13). Since that Passover day preceded a Sabbath, it was also called the "Day of Preparation" (Lk 23:54). (Also Mt 27:62; Mk 15:42; Jn 19:14, 31, 42) (CC p. 817)

lamb had to be sacrificed – ἔδει θύεσθαι τὸ πάσχα—Luke uses the language of divine necessity concerning the Passover rite of sacrificing the lamb. (Here τὸ πάσχα means "the Passover lamb.") δεῖ is common to Luke's passion predictions and statements. (Lk 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 22:37; 24:7, 26, 44)

The theological meaning of the entire passion account is announced by the simple words "on which it was necessary that the Passover lamb be sacrificed" (22:7). The narrative concerns two distinct yet related and parallel events that are taking place simultaneously: a celebration of the Passover according to the old covenant (Exodus 12) and the institution of a new covenant to be commemorated by a new Meal, as Jesus will say: "This cup [is] the new covenant in my blood" (Lk 22:20). The hearer must keep both of these in mind as the narrative progresses. On the one hand, the evangelist is introducing the day on which the Passover lamb was sacrificed in the temple, reporting those things that would normally happen on an ordinary Passover. The feast has arrived (22:1), the Passover lamb must be slain (22:7), and the Passover meal must be prepared and eaten (22:8–13) by God's faithful people. By hearing the narrative with this in mind, the hearer approaches the three days—the triduum—from the perspective of the disciples, who probably expected another Jewish Passover like those they had celebrated in previous years. (CC p. 817)

On the other hand, Luke points to Jesus' death as the sacrificial Passover lamb who fulfills and renders obsolete the sacrifices of the OT. This is the deeper and more important message of the narrative. *This* Feast of Unleavened Bread will be like none other. It falls on the day of Jesus' passion. The Passover lamb whose blood atones for all is Jesus, the Lamb of God, who takes away the sin of the world (Jn 1:29). The disciples prepared for this meal with expectations of celebrating another Jewish Passover with its fixed ritual of remembering God's gracious deliverance out of Egypt. But what the disciples experienced on this night in which Jesus was betrayed was not another Jewish Passover, but *Jesus' Passover,* in which he took the fixed ritual of the Passover Seder and gave everything in this meal new meaning. He gave it *Christological* meaning, as he interpreted the food at the meal, the story of the exodus, the broken bread and the cup of blessing *in terms of himself.* He took the old Passover meal and he made it *his* meal by instituting a new meal that supersedes all previous meals of God's table fellowship. *Jesus is the Passover Lamb the people will now eat in, with, and under bread and wine!* This is *Jesus' Passover* because on this night, the Lamb who must be sacrificed stands on the threshold of the new era of salvation. The old has passed away and the new has come. After this Passover, *Jesus' Passover,* there will be no more need for the Jews to celebrate the Passover because "Christ *our* Passover" (1 Cor 5:7 KJV has been slain, the world has passed over from death to life, and his life-giving flesh is now offered continually in this new Meal of his body and blood. This is the Passover for which all the previous Passovers were preparation and anticipation and the Passover whose sacrifice will be remembered and sung for all eternity: "Worthy is the Lamb who was slain …" (Rev 5:12). (Cf. Rev 5:6, 8, 13; 7:10, 14; 13:8; 15:3; 19:7, 9) (CC pp. 817-818)

22:8 Jesus takes the initiative. The location will not be known to others, including Judas. (TLSB)

sent Peter – ἀπέστειλεν—Jesus' sending of the disciples to prepare the room recalls Jesus' sending of the Twelve (9:1–6) and the seventy (-two) (10:1–20). (CC p. 816)

The account of the preparations for Passover involves more than meets the eye. Jesus shows his omniscience by giving to the disciples instructions whose content and fulfillment show that something miraculously is happening here. *He* is the host of this climactic Passover; as host *he* takes control of the proceedings. By his actions, he shows how everything has been prepared with divine foreknowledge for God's eschatological kingdom to come. (CC p. 818)

Nevertheless, Jesus involves his disciples in the preparations. As leaders in the early church, they will be called upon by their Lord to make preparations for worship each Lord's Day, including worship and the Breaking of the Bread—Holy Communion (Acts 20:7; cf. Acts 2:42, 46). For those later celebrations too, all has been prepared by Jesus with divine forethought. The task of disciples, particularly those who are pastors, is simply to follow Jesus' instructions, trusting his words. (CC p. 818)

go and prepare – πορευθέντες ἑτοιμάσατε—Luke's use of the participle πορευθέντες (functioning as an imperative) before the imperative ἑτοιμάσατε is typical of his style and accents Jesus command to prepare this final feast (cf. 7:22; 13:32). (CC p. 816)

Besides the lamb, the other parts of the meal, including the unleavened bread, bitter herbs with a fruit puree sauce, and wine, had to be obtained. (TLSB)

Passover – τὸ πάσχα—Here τὸ πάσχα means "the Passover feast." (CC p. 816)

22:10 *a man carrying a jar.* It was extraordinary to see a man carrying a jar of water, since this was normally women's work. (CSB)

Women usually carried water. The man would be noticeable. (TLSB)

ἄνθρωπος κεράμιον ὕδατος βαστάζων—It would be unusual for a *man* in Israel at this time to carry a water jar. Cf. Jn 4:7. This suggests a servant role. (CC p. 816)

22:11 The disciples are told exactly what to say. (TLSB)

master. Owner. (TLSB)

The Teacher asks. This form of address may have been chosen because the owner was a follower already known to Jesus. (CSB)

An address in Lk usually used by strangers in speaking to Jesus; perhaps the host was not a believer. (TLSB)

guest room – τὸ κατάλυμα—Mary and Joseph were denied simple hospitality when they were told that there was no guest room for Jesus (Lk 2:7). Now, as Jesus prepares for his death, a guest room is prepared for him and his disciples to celebrate the new meal where God shows his greatest hospitality. (CC p. 816)

Residents regularly welcomed Passover pilgrims. (TLSB)

where I may eat the Passover with my disciples – μετὰ τῶν μαθητῶν μου φάγω—Normally the Passover was to be eaten by an extended family, perhaps with neighbors too if the family was small (Ex 12:3–4). But Jesus has redefined his family to include his disciples—all who hear God's Word and do it (Lk 8:19–21). (CC pp. 816-817)

22:12 *large upper room* – ἀνάγαιον μέγα ἐστρωμένον—This is a large room for dining, furnished with couches so that the diners could recline at the meal. (CC p. 817)

And so the room is chosen, the table is set; all is now ready for Jesus to eat this final Passover with his disciples. These preparations lead to the Meal where Jesus will give to his disciples his very body in broken bread and his very blood in the cup of blessing. At the end of this day Joseph of Arimathea will prepare Jesus' body for burial, and the women will prepare spices and myrrh with which to anoint him after the Sabbath (Lk 23:50–56a). (CC p. 818)

Likely built on the flat roof of the first story, reached by outside steps. (TLSB)

furnished. Supplied with rugs and couches for reclining around a low table. (TLSB)

22:13 *just as he had told them.* It may be that Jesus had made previous arrangements with the man in order to make sure that the Passover meal would not be interrupted. Since Jesus did not identify ahead of time just where he would observe Passover, Judas was unable to inform the enemy, who might have interrupted this important occasion. (CSB)

A crucial meal. Referred to often in vv 1–13. (TLSB)

22:7–13 Jesus directs His disciples in preparing the Passover meal. God foresees our needs and plans for our lives. He invites us to follow as He leads. He always arranges for our eternal welfare. • Praise to You, O Lord. You do all things well for us and our salvation! Grant us sincere hearts and willing feet. Amen. (TLSB)

Institution of the Lord's Supper

14 And when the hour came, he reclined at table, and the apostles with him. 15 And he said to them, "I have earnestly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer. 16 For I tell you I will not eat it, until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God." 17 And he took a cup, and when he had given thanks he said, "Take this, and divide it among yourselves. 18 For I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes." 19 And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, "This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 20 And likewise the cup after they had eaten, saying, "This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood. 21 But behold, the hand of him who betrays me is with me on the table. 22 For the Son of Man goes as it has been determined, but woe to that man by whom he is betrayed!" 23 And they began to question one another, which of them it could be who was going to do this.

22:14–30 It appears that Luke does not attempt to be strictly chronological in his account of the Last Supper. He records the most important part of the occasion first—the sharing of the bread and the cup. Then he tells of Jesus' comments about his betrayer and about the argument over who would be greatest, though both of these subjects seem to have been introduced earlier. John's Gospel (13:26–30), e.g., indicates that Judas had already left the room before the bread and cup of the Lord's Supper were shared, but Luke does not tell when he left.

22:14 *hour came* – Refers to the hour to celebrate the Passover (sundown), but also the time when Jesus' mission moves toward completion. (TLSB)

ἡ ὥρα—Luke has previously recorded two announcements of the *day* on which this meal will be eaten (22:1, 7). He now narrows the focus from the day (ἡ ἡμέρα) to the hour (ἡ ὥρα). Among the synoptic gospels, Luke alone has the reference to the hour (ἡ ὥρα). His intention is to set apart this meal and the hour of reclining at table with the disciples. (Mt 26:20 [ὀψίας δὲ γενομένης] and Mk 14:17 [ὀψίας γενομένης] simply indicate the general time of day by a temporal participial phrase.) As in John (cf. Jn 13:1; 16:25, 32; 17:1), in Luke the time has theological significance, for this is the hour when the whole passion history begins to unfold. (CC p. 819)

This movement from the day to the hour indicates the urgency of the moment, an urgency that is affirmed by Jesus' words in Lk 22:15, where he indicates his deep desire to eat the Passover before he suffers, and in 22:16, where he says that he will not eat it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. The hour of the meal has come, and Luke connects this hour to the imminent suffering of Jesus and to the future eschatological fulfillment of the meal when "the kingdom of God shall come" (22:18). Luke continues these two connections throughout the narrative of the last Passover meal. This hour of the meal connected to Jesus' suffering is the hour when the "power of darkness" will take over (22:53). Satan has already entered Judas (22:3). ὥρα, "hour," also occurs in 1:10; 2:38; 7:21; 10:21; 12:12, 39, 40, 46; 13:31; 14:17; 20:19; 22:59; 23:44; 24:33. See comments at 7:21; 13:31; 22:53; and 24:33. (CC p. 819)

When the hour of this meal comes, Christ's passion has begun. Judas has already been possessed by Satan and has arranged to betray Jesus (22:3–6). The meal is connected with Jesus' suffering, as the next verse indicates (22:15). Luke frames the passion and resurrection of Christ with the time reference ἡ ὥρα, "the hour." In 22:14, the evangelist begins the first day of the three-day sequence—the day of preparation (see figure 7)—with καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡ ὥρα, "and when the hour came." In 24:33, the evangelist's final time reference within the passion and resurrection account brings the third day—the day of resurrection—to a close with "in that very hour" (αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρᾳ). (CC p. 825)

When the passion mystery begins in 22:14, the disciples have not yet grasped the nearness or significance of Jesus' death. Their ignorance will continue until the risen Lord interprets the passion facts to the Emmaus disciples. He will do this through his *teaching* about the significance of his death on the basis of the OT and through *the breaking of the bread,* when he is first known to them as crucified and risen Lord. When the passion mystery ends in 24:33, the Emmaus disciples, having received the teaching of Jesus and the revelation of his identity in the breaking of the bread, return to Jerusalem "in that very hour" with burning hearts and opened eyes. The passion mystery, while still a profound mystery, is then grasped by them in faith because the disciples know and believe that Jesus has risen. They understand that his death and resurrection was in fulfillment of the OT and for the salvation of all people. As in creation, so also in the resurrection, the movement is from darkness to light—from misunderstanding to comprehension, from closed eyes to opened ones. When the three days are over, the new age has dawned, and the eschatological kingdom is celebrated around the Table of Jesus. (CC p. 826)

The view that the Last Supper is a testament emphasizes the relationship between Jesus and the disciples that will continue after his death. By means of the words and actions Jesus will perform, he creates and sustains the community of his disciples—the church. He gives himself to his followers in an eschatological relationship, as 22:16 and 22:18 state. His death on the cross, his

gift of his body and blood in the Supper, and his promise to dine again with his disciples when the kingdom of God comes in all its manifest fullness (22:16, 18) are inseparably linked. (See also 1 Cor 11:26.) (CC p. 826)

Linking it with his imminent death, Jesus transforms the Passover of the old covenant into the meal of "the new testament in my blood" (22:20). In so doing, he speaks of the presence of his body and blood in this new meal (22:19–20). These words imply a new manner of presence distinct from Jesus' normal manner of presence during his earthly ministry, but one that is no less real. The heart of this meal in Luke 22 is the institution of this new "real presence" that will be the mode of the presence of Jesus in all subsequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper. Jesus' Last Supper is part of the larger Lukan theme of table fellowship, but the many unique features of this meal set it apart. (CC p. 826)

reclined at the table. ἀνέπεσεν—Luke uses ἀναπίπτω, one of several words for reclining at a festive meal, here and in 11:37; 14:10; 17:7. This places the Last Supper in continuity with other Lukan festive meals. Luke uses the synonym κατακλίνω in 7:36; 9:14, 15; 14:8; 24:30. (CC p. 819)

the apostles – οἱ ἀπόστολοι—The participants in the meal with Jesus are "the apostles." Luke uses "apostles" and "the Twelve" to refer to the same group (cf. J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 254), as in 6:13, where Jesus chose "twelve" (δώδεκα) from the "disciples" (μαθηταί) and called them "apostles" (ἀπόστολοι). In the account of the Last Supper all three words designate those at the meal: δώδεκα in 22:3, 30, μαθηταί in 22:11, and ἀπόστολοι in 22:14. In Luke 24, the δώδεκα have become ἕνδεκα and are described as ἀπόστολοι in 24:10, right before the Emmaus narrative. (CC p. 820)

22:15 *he said to them* – καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτούς—The Last Supper involves a dialog between Jesus and his disciples. This dialogical aspect of the narrative is important. (Cf. X. Léon-Dufour in *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 60–62, 138–39, and 195–96.) The dialog is dominated by Jesus, who is indicated as the speaker seven times (εἶπεν in 22:15, 17, 25, 34, 35, 36, 38), while the apostles speak only three times: Peter in 22:33; the group in 22:35, 38; and in response to Jesus' words, the disciples discuss among themselves in 22:23 who the betrayer might be. (CC p. 820)

eager desired – ἐπιθυμίᾳ ἐπεθύμησα—By using the dative ἐπιθυμίᾳ to modify ἐπεθύμησα (both noun and verb from the same root), Luke emphasizes the great desire that Jesus had to eat *this* Passover meal with his disciples. See BDF § 198 (6). This kind of Greek construction is common in the LXX as a translation of a Hebrew infinitive absolute together with a finite verb, both from the same root; this Hebrew construction also conveys particular emphasis. (CC p. 820)

As He finishes His work, He will leave them with a new meal, the Lord's Supper. (TLSB)

to eat the Passover – τοῦτο τὸ πάσχα φαγεῖν—Jesus ate the Passover meal with his disciples as well as presiding over and distributing the meal. Jesus is establishing a new covenant and also bequeathing his last will and testament. This meal is featured as *the* central event in Jesus' farewell discourse. Luke has numerous references to the fact that this was a Passover meal (22:1, 7, 8, 11, 13, 15; the only other occurrence of πάσχα in Luke is 2:41). J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 41–88, refutes those who argue that this meal was not the regular Jewish Passover meal. See Jeremias and X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 382, for a bibliography on the Last Supper as a Jewish Passover. (CC p. 820)

Luke's narrative of the institution of the Lord's Supper is arranged as a testament (cf. Heb 9:16–28). It is, to be sure, a new *covenant,* but covenants could be instituted in many ways. This one—the *new* covenant—is instituted in the form of a last will and *testament.* Jacob and Moses are OT examples of leaders who, just before their deaths, gave blessings that also were their last will and testament for the benefit of their heirs, who would become the new leaders of Israel (Genesis 49; Deuteronomy 33). Jesus' Passover is similar in that it too is a testamentary blessing bequeathed to his heirs, who would become the leaders of the new Israel. Moreover, Jesus' institution fulfills the OT promises of a new *covenant* and a new *exodus redemption* as well as the OT promises of eschatological *blessings.* In this farewell discourse, Jesus, the leader and testator, speaks to his disciples, the future leaders and heirs of the testament. (CC p. 823)

before I suffer – πρὸ τοῦ με παθεῖν—Luke uniquely frames the Last Supper with two references to the death of Jesus: in 22:15, where Jesus says he desired to eat the Passover with the disciples "before I suffer," and in 22:37, where Jesus quotes Is 53:12 to refer to his impending death. Both of these are predictions of Jesus' death, and such references to the speaker's death are "a formal characteristic of farewell speeches" (J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke,* 12). Jesus begins the meal by expressing his knowledge that he must die soon and ends the meal by pointing to the necessity of that death as fulfillment of the Scripture. (CC p. 820)

22:16 *I will not eat* – οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτό—The antecedent of αὐτό is the Passover, τὸ πάσχα. Jesus shall not (again) eat "the Passover" until the feast is fulfilled in the kingdom. Textual variants supply "not again" (οὐκέτι). While the best manuscripts omit it here, the context here and 22:18 clearly supply the thought. (CC p. 820)

His death will keep Him from eating the Passover with them again; He does, however, eat with His disciples after His resurrection (24:41–43; Ac 10:41). (TLSB)

until it finds fulfillment.† Jesus yearned to keep this Passover with his disciples because it was the last occasion before he himself was to be slain as the perfect "Passover lamb" (1Co 5:7) and thus fulfill this sacrifice for all time. Jesus would eat no more Passover meals until the coming of the future kingdom. After this he will renew fellowship with those who through the ages have partaken of the Lord's Supper. Finally the fellowship will be consummated in the great Messianic "wedding supper" to come (Rev 19:9). (CSB)

The Passover is fulfilled in Jesus' death, which ushers in God's kingdom; celebration of the Lord's Supper points to the marriage feast of the Lamb in the kingdom of glory (Rv 19:6–9). (TLSB)

ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ—The Passover is the subject of "it is fulfilled." This fulfillment occurs progressively, in a succession of events. The kingdom of God was present (in a more preliminary way) in the OT era through the patriarchs, Moses, the theocracy, the Davidic (messianic) monarchy, and the ministries of the prophets and priests. The OT Passover will be fulfilled when Jesus, the Passover Lamb, is slain. The kingdom of God (whose advent Jesus proclaimed throughout his ministry) will come as the Messiah gives up his life for the world and is raised again. Then Jesus will eat and drink again with disciples after he rises from the dead prior to his ascension (Lk 24:30, 41–43; Jn 21:9–14; Acts 10:41). Jesus will also be with his disciples during the era of the church when they celebrate the Passover anew in the Lord's Supper and receive his body and blood (e.g., Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7; 1 Cor 11:17–34). However, the complete, manifest, and final fulfillment of the Passover and of this verse will be in the eschaton (e.g., Rev 19:6–9). That is why the church still petitions in the Lord's Prayer, "Let your kingdom come" (Lk 11:2). Only in the eschaton will the meaning and significance of the Passover be fully

revealed to all. Until then, the saving power of the cross and the grace and forgiveness given in the Lord's Supper are veiled, hidden from the eyes of the unbelieving world and "visible" only to eyes of faith—"opened eyes" (cf. comments on this Lukan theme at 2:30). (CC pp. 820-821)

Luke juxtaposes eating and drinking, the death of Jesus, and the coming of God's eschatological kingdom. The introduction of the death of Jesus into Luke's Passover account coincides with his eschatological perspective in 22:16 and 22:18. He is the only evangelist who has with the Words of Institution two parallel eschatological verses, and he places one (22:16) before Jesus' words over the cup in 22:17 and the other (22:18) before Jesus' words over the bread in 22:19. This placement casts an eschatological light upon the entire meal. Note the parallel between 22:16 and 22:18: (CC pp. 826-827)

22:16urely I will not **d οὐ μὴ φάγω αὐτὸ ἕως ὅτου πληρωθῇ ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ.**
22:18 οὐ μὴ **πίω** … ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ.
22:16 "Surely I will not **eat** it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God."
22:18 "Srink … until the kingdom of God shall come."

The chief difference between these verses is that one reflects eating and the other drinking, but both of them indicate that Jesus will again eat and drink with his disciples in the kingdom of God. (CC p. 827)

From the perspective of the readers and hearers of Luke in the church, this eating and drinking will embrace both a future and a *present* fulfillment. (CC p. 827)

> There is, moreover, a sense in which … Jesus speaks of the imminence of the kingdom: "Realize that the kingdom of God is near" (21:31; see also 10:11). Yet he does not hesitate to speak of its presence in his own person and acts, "The kingdom of God is among you" (17:21). … Furthermore, he can also speak of certain things being fulfilled in the coming kingdom (22:16, 30). We note here that these specifically Lucan passages dealing with the kingdom have a two-pronged reference, to a present and future aspect of it. (CC p. 827)
>
> But what is this "kingdom of God" in regard to Jesus: the parousia (see Mk 14:62)? his resurrection? According to Luke, Jesus' experience of the kingdom of God is his vindicating resurrection and his establishment as Lord and Christ on David's throne (see Acts 2:36). Lk 22:16 and 18, then, should be seen as predictions of Jesus' vindicating resurrection, balancing the predictions of his death. (CC p. 827)
>
> … in Luke's perspective, Jesus' reigning is not a remote future event, realized only at the parousia as in Mt 25:31–46. Jesus is recorded as saying in Lk 22:29 that God *has given* him a kingdom, which serves as the basis for his transference of authority to the apostles. We are encouraged, then, to think of Jesus' passion, death and resurrection as the context of Jesus' coming into his kingdom. (CC p. 827)

That perspective is confirmed in 23:42–43, where the penitent thief asks Jesus to remember him *when he comes into his kingdom,* and Jesus replies, "*Today* with me you will be in paradise." (CC p. 827)

Thus the church's eating and drinking of the Supper, from Easter to the parousia, is an act of table fellowship celebrating that the kingdom of God *has* come. The Supper is the OT Passover transformed and "fulfilled in the kingdom of God" (22:16). Jesus did eat with his disciples after

the resurrection. The first meal of Jesus with disciples after he comes into his kingdom in his resurrection is the Emmaus meal (24:28–35; see also 24:41–43; Acts 1:4; 10:41). The Emmaus meal differs in important ways from the Last Supper and the church's celebrations of the Lord's Supper. Nevertheless, the Emmaus meal is a connecting bridge between the Last Supper and the continuing table fellowship of Jesus with his disciples described by Luke in Acts. *But it is in the church's celebrations of the Lord's Supper that the fulfillment of Jesus' two words of promise comes.* In Jesus' teaching, including his teaching at and about meals, he described the eschatological future as a (marriage) feast (Luke 5, 7, 14). The Last Supper is related both to the eschatological banquet at the end of time *and* to the Lord's Supper, where the church will repeat Jesus' Words of Institution and celebrate his presence by remembering him. The eschatological perspective of Lk 22:16, 18 looks ahead to the communion of the church at the Table of the Lord, where his body and blood will be present in the bread and wine. (CC pp. 827-828)

In addition, the Last Supper—and each subsequent Lord's Supper—anticipates the wedding feast in the eschaton (e.g., Rev 19:6–9). St. Paul affirms this when he says, "As often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord *until he comes*" (1 Cor 11:26). The Supper anticipates that final day when Christ will feast anew with his disciples after the kingdom of God has come in all its fullness. Several of Jesus' parables also point to that end-time feast (e.g., Lk 14:15–24), but the Supper is far more than a parable because it gives an actual foretaste of the feast to come. (CC p. 828)

The hope of participating in the eternal feast is expressed in a variety of writings.

> In apocalyptic and Talmudic literature as well as in the New Testament there are innumerable variations on the theme of the bread of life which satisfies all hunger; the tree of life, the fruit of which cures the sick; the heavenly manna, which will be the food of the redeemed in the world to come; the water of life—"for he that hath mercy on them shall lead them, even by the springs of water shall he guide them" (Isa. 49:10, cf. Rev. 7:17)—which is given freely and quenches all thirst for ever; the wine of the world to come which is kept for the children of the kingdom; the feast of salvation in the last days, which imparts salvation and life. "Those who serve God unto death, will eat of the bread of the world to come in plenty." "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God" (Luke 14:15). "Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rev. 19:9). (CC p. 828)

> J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* 233–34. He also comments on the efficacy of the meal:
> Jesus, however, not only pronounced the blessing over the bread and the wine, but also added the words which referred the broken bread and the red wine to his atoning death for 'many'. When immediately afterwards he gives this same bread and wine to his disciples to eat and drink, the meaning is *that by eating and drinking he gives them a share in the atoning power of his death* (p. 233; emphasis Jeremias). (CC p. 828)

22:17 *After taking the cup.* Either the first of the four cups shared during regular observance of the Passover meal, or the third cup. (CSB)

Either the first, or probably the second, cup of the Passover (Seder) meal, which ended the teaching aspect of the meal. (TLSB)

δεξάμενος ποτήριον—The taking of a cup is the first action described by Luke at the Passover. The aorist participle δεξάμενος refers to action prior to the main verb, which is εἶπεν. Jewish

practice (as recorded later in the Talmud) included four ceremonial cups of wine in the Passover Seder, each at a different point in the meal (Talmud, *Pesachim,* X, 99b; 108a–b; the four cups are described in 114a; 116a; 117b). If the Talmud's description accurately reflects practice during the NT era (as seems likely), then this cup in 22:17 is most likely the second cup, the cup of redemption, which is filled before the narration of the exodus redemption and the midrash over the food and is drunk at the conclusion of the redemption narrative (Talmud, *Pesachim,* X, 116a). It celebrated the redemption God accomplished for the Israelites in the exodus. It brought to a close the "teaching" part of the Passover service and prepared for the breaking of the bread, which started the main meal. (CC p. 821)

Luke is the only evangelist who preserves in his account two distinct cups of wine (22:17–18 and 22:20). These cups point toward the fuller structure of the Passover meal itself. On the next page is an outline of a full Jewish Passover meal in the left column and a summary of the Lukan account of the Last Supper in the right one. (CC p. 824)

> The full Jewish Passover meal is a historical reconstruction. Its exact form at the time of Jesus is unknown. The earliest primary sources are compiled in the Mishnah, which was committed to writing some two hundred years after the Last Supper, but the traditions reach back centuries earlier. Chapter 10 of the tractate *Pesachim* in the Talmud concerns the Passover meal (folios 99b–121b of the Soncino edition), but the discussion assumes that the reader is already familiar with the liturgical order, and so it does not provide a complete outline. It also bears witness to variations in some of the practices. Therefore, L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 341, is justified in questioning whether it is possible to speak of a single definitive order in use at the time of Jesus or to reconstruct details of the service. Nevertheless, Luke's account, with some background provided by the Mishnah, does indicate the general shape of the Passover Seder that Jesus celebrated. (CC p. 824)
>
> The most thorough study is that of J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* and the Passover outline is adapted from pages 85–86 of that book. For a modern Passover Seder with the Hebrew and an English translation, see, for example, N. Glatzer, ed., *The Passover Haggadah.* (CC p. 824)

Jewish Christians who hear Luke's gospel would be familiar with the Passover, but they might be evangelizing those who are not aware of the Passover structure and do not realize that the institution of the Lord's Supper took place in the context of the Passover meal. The potential problem of Gentile ignorance is illustrated by the congregation at Corinth, where the celebration of the Lord's Supper apparently was held in conjunction with a congregational meal, and the congregation's celebration was plagued with problems and abuses (1 Corinthians 10–11). (CC pp. 824-825)

Given thanks – εὐχαριστήσας—The Passover Seder calls for the giving of thanks over the cup of redemption because God led Israel out of Egypt to the Promised Land. The aorist participle, εὐχαριστήσας, is still part of the subordinate clause before the main verb, which is εἶπεν, "he said." The traditional words of thanks in the modern Passover Haggadah, drawn from the Mishnah (*Pesachim,* X, 116b), begin, "Blessed [are you], O Lord, our God, king of the universe, who redeemed us and who redeemed our fathers from Egypt, and has brought us to this night" (N. Glatzer, ed., *The Passover Haggadah* [New York: Schocken, 1989] 63). (CC p. 821)

divide it among you – λάβετε τοῦτο καὶ διαμερίσατε εἰς ἑαυτούς—The two imperatives λάβετε and διαμερίσατε are the main verbs in the words Jesus spoke after taking the cup and giving thanks. These words indicate the reception and distribution of the cup and imply that all

the disciples drank from it. These words spoken by Jesus are not in the (later) traditional Jewish Passover Seder, and (assuming that they were foreign also to the form of Passover celebrated in Jesus' day) they would have been surprising to the participants. Since each participant had his own cup of wine (filled and drunk a total of four times in the meal), the sharing of the host's cup (the referent of the anaphoric demonstrative adjective τοῦτο, "this") would have been considered improper, perhaps even scandalous. (See J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* 68–70.) (CC pp. 821-822)

22:18 *fruit of the vine* – οὐ μὴ πίω ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀπὸ τοῦ γενήματος τῆς ἀμπέλου—The "fruit of the vine" (meaning "wine") is a phrase in a blessing that could be spoken or repeated at several points in the Seder (Talmud, *Pesachim,* X, 103 a–b; 114a). In the traditional Haggadah, this blessing is spoken just before drinking the cup of redemption: "Blessed [are you], O Lord our God, king of the universe, creator of the fruit of the vine" (N. Glatzer, ed., *The Passover Haggadah,* 65). Jesus says he will not drink from the Passover cup again until after the kingdom of God comes. This parallels Jesus' earlier statement (22:16) that he will not eat the Passover until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God. Regarding the progressive coming of God's kingdom and future occasions when Jesus would eat and drink with his disciples, see the second textual note on 22:16. (CC p. 822)

The Passover liturgy (Seder) addresses God as "Creator of the fruit of the vine." (TLSB)

until the kingdom of God comes. ἕως οὗ ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ἔλθῃ—This expression parallels the one in 22:16 and the interpretation is the same. The kingdom is fulfilled with Jesus' death and resurrection, though the fullness of the kingdom will not be revealed to all until the eschaton. During the era of the church, the kingdom is not recognized by the world even though it comes through the preaching of the Word (8:4–18) and the celebration of the Supper (22:14–20). (CC p. 822)

22:19 *took bread...saying* – Taking, blessing, breaking, and distributing the bread was the duty of the host and began the eating of the Passover meal proper. (TLSB)

καὶ λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς λέγων—Two aorist participles, λαβών and εὐχαριστήσας, indicate secondary actions that preceded the primary action: Jesus broke bread (ἔκλασεν) and gave it (ἔδωκεν) to the disciples. This action of taking unleavened bread (matzah), breaking it, and distributing it to the guests is an expected duty of the host according to the traditional Seder (Talmud, *Pesachim,* X, 114a–116b; N. Glatzer, ed., *The Passover Haggadah,* 65–67). After the second cup of wine—the cup of redemption—is drunk, the participants wash their hands and recite a blessing. Then the host breaks matzah and distributes pieces, and blessings like the following are recited: "Blessed [are you], O Lord our God, king of the universe, who brings forth bread from the earth. Blessed [are you], O Lord our God, king of the universe, who sanctified us with his commandments, and commanded us concerning the eating of unleavened bread" (N. Glatzer, ed., *The Passover Haggadah*, 64–65; cf. Talmud, *Pesachim,* X, 104a–105b; 114b–115a; 117b). (CC p. 822)

At the Last Supper, "having taken bread, after giving thanks, [Jesus] broke [it] and gave [it] to them" (22:19). Luke uses words from the same root (κλάω, κατακλάω, κλάσις) for the breaking of bread in Lk 9:16; 24:30, 35; Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; 27:35. The act of breaking bread calls to mind, both for the disciples at the Last Supper and for the Christians of the early church, all the meals that the disciples had with Jesus, for "at every common meal *the constitution of the table fellowship* is accomplished by the rite of the breaking of the bread." (CC pp. 828-829)

> J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 232; cf. J. Behm, *TDNT* 3:729–30, and X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 22. Thus the phrase "the breaking of the bread" (ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου) comes to stand for the whole meal. (Both J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 115–20, and X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 176, 360, n. 51, however, argue against this position.) The context of the term's use in Luke-Acts suggests that in the early Christian church it recalled the entire table fellowship of Jesus during his ministry. Whenever the early Christians broke bread, they remembered all the meals that Jesus ate. (CC p. 829)
>
> A number of words and events would be recalled by Jesus' action of breaking bread. First, it recalled the breaking of the bread by Jesus at the feeding of the five thousand, the climax of his Galilean ministry (Lk 9:16). The leftover bread signaled the presence of the abundant Creator himself. Second, in turn, this miracle recalled God's feeding of the children of Israel in the wilderness with the manna from heaven. This places Jesus in line with God himself and with Moses, the prophet who visited his people with teaching and miracles and fed them with the bread of life and who also was resisted and rejected by many in Israel. In the Lord's Supper, God's continuing table fellowship meal with his church, the abundance of God's power to effect a new creation comes through the presence of Christ's body and blood with the bread and wine. The old creation was corrupted by sin, which brought death, but the forgiveness of sins and eternal life come through Christ's vicarious atonement—the offering of his body and blood on the cross. (CC 829)
>
> Third, the breaking of the bread also recalls the Lukan petition for daily bread in the Lord's Prayer (11:3), a petition for the earthly bread of today and the eschatological bread of tomorrow. Fourth, the nature of Jesus' table fellowship throughout his ministry was to break bread with all kinds of people, both sinners and those who supposed themselves to be righteous; also the poor, the maimed, the lame, and the blind. Jesus' table fellowship was inclusive because he opened God's kingdom to all people. Fifth, the beatitude unique to Luke in 14:15, "Blessed whoever will eat bread in the kingdom of God," suggests that the ultimate blessedness is to eat bread in the kingdom of God. The references to the coming of God's eschatological kingdom in 22:15–18 and Jesus' giving of his body with the bread in 22:19 both indicate that this blessedness will come through communion with Jesus that he institutes in the Last Supper and that will continue in the church through the Lord's Supper. (CC p. 829)

Yet the Last Supper stands as the most significant meal of Jesus and the most important occasion of his breaking of bread. *This is because it is the only meal in which Jesus identifies the bread as his very body and the (contents of the) cup as his very blood. It is also the only meal that Jesus directs his disciples to repeat.* When the Christian church later breaks bread in celebrations of the Lord's Supper, this is in response to Jesus' Words of Institution at the Last Supper. (CC p. 829)

In the synoptic gospels, Jesus' command "this do in my remembrance" is found only in Lk 22:19b. (St. Paul includes those words spoken over both the bread and over the cup in 1 Cor 11:24–25.) Luke records Jesus' command spoken *over the bread.* This further suggests that in Luke and Acts the bread can represent the whole meal. As the church remembers the liturgical action of Christ at the Last Supper, the celebration of the Sacrament may be called "the breaking of the bread." (CC p. 829)

Bread itself can represent physical and/or spiritual sustenance (cf. Lk 4:4; 14:15). It may be understood as standing for all food, and even for all necessities of physical and spiritual life, as in the Lord's Prayer (11:3 as interpreted by Luther and others). Some OT passages use bread and

wine as metaphors for God's salvation (e.g., Is 55:1–5; Prov 9:1–6). But the bread and wine in the Passover meal and the Last Supper are real, not just metaphorical, and these sacred meals provide spiritual benefits as well as physical nourishment. (CC p. 830)

The bread Jesus used at the Last Supper was unleavened. God had stipulated the use of matzah for Passover to recall the history of his greatest redemptive act for Israel. The unleavened bread was the bread of the exodus: "You shall eat no leavened bread with it [the Passover meal]; seven days you shall eat it with hurried flight—that all the days of your life you may remember the day when you came out of the land of Egypt" (Deut 16:3). The NT comments on the unleavened bread of the Passover in passages such as 1 Cor 5:7–8, applying it to the Christian church in a way similar to Jesus' application in Lk 12:1. Both those passages warn against hypocrisy and impurity as a kind of leaven that should not be found in the body of Christ because they are not found in Christ himself. St. Paul's interpretation is first of all *Christological:* Christ is our Passover sacrifice, our Passover redemption (1 Cor 5:7). Christology then leads to ecclesiology: the unleavened loaves required for the OT Passover foreshadow the purity of the Christian church, which must be purged of scandalous immorality (1 Cor 5:1–8). (CC p. 830)

> So already in the first century AD we can trace the eschatological interpretation of the unleavened bread: on it God had miraculously fed Israel during their journey through the desert, and had thus given a type of the abundance of bread in the Messianic time. It is no accident that in the New Testament the unleavened loaves are also eschatologically interpreted: I Cor. 5:7b-8. … The unleavened loaves are interpreted eschatologically in two ways: as pure dough they represent the purity and truth which characterizes the new world (I Cor. 5:8), and as new dough they symbolize the redeemed community (I Cor. 5:7a). (CC p. 830)

God's provision of unleavened bread in the Passover meal and manna and water in the wilderness coincided with his provision of salvation and life. The exodus event encompassed salvation in both physical and spiritual terms: the people God redeems, he also feeds. God's ability both to save and to feed are represented by the unleavened bread of the Passover and by the manna of the wilderne

> John's gospel is particularly significant in linking Jesus' feeding in the wilderness with the manna miracle, and the discourse on the bread in John 6 contains Jesus' self-designation as "the bread of life." (CC p. 830)

In 1 Cor 10:1–4 St. Paul interprets the exodus and the manna and water provided in the desert *Christologically* and *sacramentally:* Christ is the rock who provided "spiritual food" and "spiritual drink" for those who were "baptized into Moses." (CC pp. 830-831)

This is my body.† Jesus, departing from the regular ritual, identifies this broken bread with His body given on the cross as a vicarious sacrifice. (TLSB)

τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου—Jesus identifies the broken bread as his body. These words are *not* part of the traditional Seder and would have been quite surprising to the disciples. With these startling words, Jesus transforms the Jewish Passover into the meal of the new covenant, the Lord's Supper, in which he gives his very body and very blood (see commentary below). (CC p. 822)

In Luke's account of the Last Supper, the breaking of the unleavened bread is invested with new meaning by the words of Jesus: "This is my body, which is being given on behalf of you" (Lk 22:19).

> The debate over the shorter text (22:19a) and the longer one (22:19b–20) in the Lukan institution narrative is long and complex. See J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* 139–59, for a discussion of this issue and a bibliography. This is the first of nine "Western non-interpolations" (also at Lk 24:3, 6, 12, 36, 40, 51, 52; and Mt 27:49), that is, passages that are omitted in the Western text (D) but are found in other reliable manuscripts. Following B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary,* the longer texts are considered original and are included in the translation in this commentary. See Metzger's discussion on pp. 191–93. Contrast D. E. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," 628, who argues for the shorter text from a table fellowship perspective:
>
> Indeed, since Luke's unique version of the meal in 22:15–19a coordinates so well with the meal themes and literary plan of Luke-Acts as a whole, it seems more likely that this so-called short version of his eucharistic text, which is especially evidenced in the Western tradition of manuscripts, is more authentic than the long version (22:15–20), which is found in the majority of manuscripts. (CC p. 831)

Jesus thereby summarizes his prophetic task: he has come to give his body in vicarious atonement on behalf of all. His words at the table also foreshadow his completion of his prophetic task on the cross. At the table he teaches about the kingdom and performs the miracle of the new era of salvation by offering his body, crucified on behalf of the world, in bread. (CC p. 831)

According to Jesus' words, *the bread is his body.* This is not a parabolic or metaphorical use of language. "Is" (ἐστίν) means "is." The giving of his body with the bread is just as real as the giving of his body into death on the cross. The body (σῶμα; 22:19) of Jesus given in the Supper is the same body of Jesus given into death on the cross, buried, and raised on the third day (σῶμα; 23:52, 55; 24:3, 23). How can this be? It can only be a miracle, greater than the exodus miracles of manna and quail in the old covenant. Jesus is the new prophet in fulfillment of Moses, but greater, as Moses himself promised (Deut 18:15, quoted by Stephen in Acts 7:37). This is the new covenant that embraces and replaces the old one. Jesus' prophetic actions are in keeping with Luke's prophet Christology: Jesus is the teacher and miracle worker who gives his body in the Supper as food for his disciples. He is also the rejected one who gives his body into death on the cross for the life of the world. Therefore, Jesus' giving of his body involves both phases of Lukan Christology. These two phases are set forth programmatically in Jesus' sermon at Nazareth in Lk 4:16–30, developed throughout the gospel, and brought to completion in the Emmaus story in 24:13–35. At the Last Supper, Jesus, by his words and actions, fulfills his prophetic task as he foretells the *continuing presence of his body* for salvation, accomplished through offering his body in substitutionary death for the life of all, in the Sacrament of the Altar. (CC pp. 831-832)

> Jesus' words and actions here combine his office as both prophet and priest. As priest, he himself offers the new Passover sacrifice. X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 84, comments: "The words used by Jesus [at the Last Supper] do not conform to any used at every Jewish Passover meal; they are meant to explain not the ancestral rites repeated at Passover but the present gestures of Jesus who interprets his own behavior after the manner of the prophets." (CC p. 832)

Thus, what makes Jesus' Last Supper—and every Lord's Supper—miraculously different from all other meals are Jesus' words spoken over the bread and the wine. Those words declare the bread and wine truly to be his body and blood, given and shed for the forgiveness of sins (cf. Mt 26:28). (CC p. 832)

given for you.† Referring to his substitutionary sacrifice on the cross. (CSB)

τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον—Only Luke has this language of substitutionary atonement in the words over the bread: Jesus states that his body is given ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, "on behalf of you." The language is reminiscent of the entire sacrificial system of the OT, particularly Leviticus and the atonement offered by the Suffering Servant in Is 52:13–53:12. These words and 22:20 are omitted in the Western text type; see footnote 16. (CC p. 822)

in remembrance of me.† Just as the Passover was a constant reminder and proclamation of God's redemption of Israel from bondage in Egypt, so the keeping of Christ's command would be a remembering and proclaiming of the redemption of believers from the bondage of sin through Christ's atoning work on the cross, available through this sacrament. (CSB)

Focus is on Jesus and His sacrificial death. The Lord's Supper reminds one of Jesus' death and bestows the benefits of His death. "To remember Christ is to remember His benefits. It means to realize that they are truly offered to us. It is not enough only to remember history" (AC XXIV 31–32). (TLSB)

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν—This instruction is only in Luke's account and 1 Cor 11:24–25, where St. Paul links it explicitly with Christ's death and future return (1 Cor 11:26). With these words Jesus institutes the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper *to be repeated* by the church until his return. "Remembrance" alludes to the rich OT background of God remembering (זָכַר) his covenant promises of grace and blessing. (E.g., Gen 9:15–16; Ex 2:24; Lev 26:42, 45; Psalm 106) The Passover meal was an institution to be remembered (זִכָּרוֹן) by Israel (Ex 12:14; cf. Josh 4:7). The proverb is eminently true in the case of Jesus: "The remembrance of a righteous man is for a blessing" (Prov 10:7). See further the commentary below. (CC p. 823)

Luke is the only evangelist to include "this do in my remembrance" in his institution account. (St. Paul records those words, spoken over both the bread and the cup, in 1 Cor 11:24–25.) Among the synoptic gospels, Luke alone records any post-resurrection meals of Jesus with his disciples, and Luke also records—in Acts, his second volume—the regular celebration of the Lord's Supper by the early church (Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7). When the Lord instructs his disciples, "This do in my remembrance," these words establish every Lord's Supper as a "remembrance" (ἀνάμνησις, anamnesis) of Jesus' atoning death and his promise to return again (1 Cor 11:26). (CC p. 832)

The meaning of "anamnesis" can be filled out in two ways. The vital question is whether it is God who remembers us for Christ's sake or we who remember God because of his grace in Christ. Certainly both are true, but God is the one who first remembers his promises in Christ and who prompts our response of remembering in faith. God's grace in Christ precedes and is the cause of the church's remembrance. Every time God showers us with his gifts, it is because he remembers his promises in Christ to save us. That is especially true of the Supper, where the divine gifts are Jesus' own body and blood for the forgiveness of sins. The communicant receives the benefits of Christ's perfect life, atoning death, and new resurrection life. God "remembers" us for Christ's sake as he bestows these gifts. (CC pp. 832-833)

Yet it is also true that the disciples are called by Jesus to celebrate the Supper in remembrance of him. According to X. Léon-Dufour, the call to remembrance at the Last Supper recalls God's covenant promises at creation and at the Passover. God called Israel to "*remember* the Sabbath" because of his rest on the seventh day of creation (Ex 20:8–11) and because he redeemed Israel in the exodus (Deut 5:12–15). Within the liturgical worship of Israel were celebrations that were a remembrance of the great deeds of Yahweh throughout the history of his redemption of his chosen people. This was particularly true at the Passover celebration. While the Mishnah tractate *Pesachim* and extant forms of the Haggadah (the narrative commentary or explanation in the liturgy that accompanied the meal) postdate the NT by several centuries, they contain recitals of God's redeeming activity in the exodus. Note the parallels between the call to remembrance in Exodus and the one in Luke: (CC p. 833)

> X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 110, points out this parallelism. See also J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* 244–49, who discusses the "Palestinian memorial formulae" and comes to a different conclusion than Léon-Dufour: "(1) εἰς ἀνάμνησιν is said *for the most part in reference to God* and (2) it then designates, always and without exception, *a presentation before God intended to induce God to act"* (p. 249; emphasis Jeremias). J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV,* 1401, also draws a similar parallel to the Passover: "*Touto poieite* is a reinterpretation of the *anamnesis* which the Passover meal itself was intended to be: 'that you may remember the day of your departure from the land of Egypt all the days of your life' (Deut 16:3d). As Jesus has substituted himself for the Passover lamb, so the memento of him is to replace the *anamnesis* of the Passover itself." (CC p. 833)
>
> Ex 12:14 καὶ ἔσται ἡ ἡμέρα ὑμῖν αὕτη **μνημόσυνον** [לְזִכָּרוֹן], καὶ ἑορτάσετε αὐτὴν ἑορτὴν Κυρίῳ εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν·
>
> Lk 22:19 τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν **ἀνάμνησιν**.
>
> Ex 12:14 "And this day will be for you a **remembrance/commemoration/memorial,** and you shall celebrate it as a celebration/festival to the Lord for all your generations."
>
> Lk 22:19 "This do for my **remembrance.**"

The time and setting of remembrance, then, is the liturgical feast in which the people of God remember the great acts of God's salvation by *recognizing the saving presence of God in their midst through this very service of remembrance.* The Divine Service, particularly the Supper given to the church by Christ himself, *is the means through which God reminds us of his grace in Christ and actually bestows that grace and its attendant benefits.* These two perspectives on remembrance reflect a biblical theology of worship where God gives, we receive his gifts, and we remember him in faith as we respond in love toward him and toward our neighbor. (CC pp. 833-834)

In worship, as God reminds the church and the church remembers, eternity unfolds in earthly time. As an act of remembering, the Lord's Supper is an eschatological event in which eternity is present because the eternal God is present with his grace, which will usher us into the eternal state. The communicant receives a foretaste of the eternal feast and is joined in "the communion of saints" (Apostles' Creed) with all the faithful—past, present, and future, on earth and in heaven. (CC p. 834)

> X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 109, notes: "The God of Israel thus performs certain acts which of themselves, and not by reason of human imagining, control the flow of time; they have a dimension of eternity that makes them always present to those who remember them." (CC p. 834)

When Jesus says, "*This* do …" the antecedent of τοῦτο ("this") entails important features of the meal. There were many other elements of the Passover meal besides the bread and wine, but Jesus intends his disciples to remember him specifically by recounting his Words of Institution over the bread and wine, and by believing those words, as well as by eating the bread and drinking from the cup. (CC p. 834)

> Cf. X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 109: "The 'this' refers not to the entire meal taken at the Supper, but specifically to the actions and words over the bread and the cup." J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus,* 250, offers this opinion: "τοῦτο refers to the *rite of breaking the bread,* i.e., the rite of grace at table. To be exact, it is scarcely possible that the reference is to the normal table prayer—that would need no special instruction—it is rather to the special grace by means of which the table fellowship of the Messianic community was established, which extolled the salvation activity of God and prayed for its consummation, a prayer which Jesus himself used during his lifetime." (CC p. 834)
> J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV,* 1401, understands "this" as a reference to the action. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke,* 804, says: "τοῦτο will refer to the action of sharing the bread, since the meal came to be known as 'the breaking of bread', perhaps together with the associated words." A. Plummer, *St. Luke,* 497–98, gives a history of the interpretation of τοῦτο. (CC p. 834)

Thus, the church's celebration of the Lord's Supper retains and highlights those distinctive features of the Last Supper. (CC p. 834)

In addition to being a faithful remembrance of the Last Supper, the Lord's Supper is a reminder of the entire table fellowship that Jesus engaged in from his incarnation to his ascension. It recalls and fulfills all the covenantal meals God celebrated with his people in the OT, particularly the Passover meal, in celebration of the first exodus deliverance (cf. "exodus" in Lk 9:31). As an act of divine remembrance, the Lord's Supper is a continuation of the table fellowship of Jesus with sinners. God remembers his new covenant promises and bestows his gifts. And as an act of remembrance by the church, the Supper ties together both memory of Jesus' words and action according to those words: "This *do* in my remembrance" (22:19). (CC p. 834)

> X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 105, claims: "Memory and action are thus the two sides—the internal and the external—of the relationship between God and human beings. God saves human beings—which is certainly a 'memorable' action; when they remember this action, they renew their fidelity to the covenant." (CC p. 834)

22:20 Luke describes only the parts of the meal that are new and which the Church is to continue to observe. (TLSB)

> *after the supper.* Mentioned only here and in 1Co 11:25; see note on 1Co 11:23–26. (CSB)

Third cup of the meal. (TLSB)

took the cup. καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως—The traditional Jewish Seder calls for a third cup of wine after the main meal has been eaten: the cup of blessing. A number of blessing prayers are recited, and the recitation of some of these is probably implied by ὡσαύτως, "likewise," pointing back to the giving of thanks in 22:17. "The main part of the Grace contains four benedictions, the first three very ancient and known long before the destruction of the Temple [A.D. 70], the fourth a supplement by the sages of Jabneh [Jamnia] after the rebellion of Bar Kokhba [A.D. 132–135]

(Berakhot 48b)" (N. Glatzer, ed., *The Passover Haggadah,* 68–69). (An English translation of the benedictions is provided on pp. 69–73, along with other benedictions added later to the Seder on pp. 74–77. Cf. Talmud, *Pesachim,* X, 103a; 106a.) After the bendictions the third cup is drunk. The giving of thanks and drinking of a cup of wine at this point in the meal would be customary, but Jesus' words spoken over it would be completely new and surprising. Jesus identifies the contents of the cup as his true blood. Again Jesus uses the language of vicarious atonement as he says his blood is shed ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, "on behalf of you." (CC p. 823)

for you. In place of you. Therefore, the Lord's Supper "is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ under the bread and wine, instituted by Christ Himself for us Christians to eat and to drink" (SC, p xli). (TLSB)

new covenant. Promised through the prophet Jeremiah (31:31–34)—the fuller administration of God's saving grace, founded on and sealed by the death of Jesus ("in my blood"). See note on 1Co 11:25. (CSB)

A binding relationship of grace based on Christ's shed blood. Jesus clearly identifies the wine as His blood. (TLSB)

Whether or not Jesus' last celebration of the Passover included the four cups of wine in the traditional Seder (see textual notes on 22:17, 18, 20), Luke's description suggests that the cup of 22:17–18 would have been drunk before or during the meal that preceded Jesus' words over the cup in 22:20. That would be consistent with the notice "and the cup, likewise, after the eating of the meal" (καὶ τὸ ποτήριον ὡσαύτως μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι; 22:20). Hence Jesus now speaks over a new (refilled) cup. (See the outline of the Passover meal in the opening comments on this pericope.) The Words of Institution over the bread are separated from those over the wine by the Passover meal. Jesus' words over this cup vary slightly among the synoptic gospels. In Luke, Jesus calls the cup "the new testament in my blood" (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου), whereas in Matthew and Mark, Jesus' words are phrased so that the cup "is my blood of the covenant/testament" (Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24; τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης). Both wordings reflect Ex 24:8, with Matthew and Mark closest to the language of the LXX τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης, "the blood of the covenant." (CC p. 835)

Exodus 24 narrates the ratification of the old/first covenant. In an unusual rite, Moses sprinkled half the blood of the sacrificed offerings on the people. The application of blood formally brought them into the covenant and made them beneficiaries of God's covenant promises. The covenant was then sealed when Moses and the elders ascended Sinai and "ate and drank" a sacred meal in the presence of God (Ex 24:11). The parallels to the Last Supper are clear. The blood of the new covenant is applied to those who drink it in the cup. They are brought into the covenant and receive all its benefits made possible by the sacrifice of Jesus. The new sacred meal too is in the presence of God, since God incarnate is the host and he gives his body and blood with the bread and wine. (CC p. 835)

Luke stresses the "new" testament. "New" is unique to Luke (and 1 Cor 11:25) and alludes to the promise of a new covenant in passages such as Is 42:9–10; 43:18–21; 55:3; 61:8; and Jer 31:31–34, which Jesus fulfills by the shedding of his blood so that sins may be remembered no more. The theme of forgiveness, which recurs throughout these prophetic passages (notably Jer 31:34), is made explicit in Mt 26:28, where Jesus says his blood in the cup is shed "for the forgiveness of sins." The phrasing in Luke accents the cup—literally, "this the *cup*"—whereas Matthew and Mark have only "this," whose antecedent is the cup, but the accent falls on the *blood* of Jesus shed to create the covenant: "this is *my blood* of the covenant/testament" (Mt 26:28; Mk 14:24).

The Lukan accent on the cup may stress the unity of those who partake of the (one) cup, as St. Paul emphasizes in 1 Cor 10:16–17 with regard to the *one loaf.* In Luke, Jesus' words over the cup include the same prepositional phrase he used over the bread as he repeats the substitutionary language of vicarious atonement: "on behalf of you" (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). "Being poured out" (ἐκχυννόμενον; *present* participle) suggests both the pouring from a cup and the blood that pours from the body of Jesus on the cross (cf. Ps 22:14–15). (CC pp. 835-836)

Considered as a whole, Lk 22:20 emphasizes the connection between the death of Christ and the meal. The whole meal is concluded with these words: "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is being poured out on behalf of you." God's plan demanded that God's righteous Messiah shed his innocent blood, as Jesus himself explained to the Emmaus disciples by his teaching on the basis of the OT (24:25–27). Jesus fulfills all the many bloody sacrifices of the OT, including "the blood of the [first] covenant," which was poured out or sprinkled on the people (Ex 24:6–8; cf. Is 52:15, which says the Suffering Servant "will sprinkle many nations"). Jesus completes the long line of suffering prophets who shed their blood in Jerusalem. Yet his suffering and death begin the martyrdom of NT apostles. (CC p. 836)

> Cf. X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 143:
> First, the verb "shed" (Greek *ek-chunno*) is used exclusively, at least in the New Testament, to describe the violent death of a human being. It is taken from the commandment in Genesis [9:6] and is used above all of the death of martyrs and, more particularly, of persecuted prophets or the suffering just man. The same word is used in describing the deaths of Jesus and Paul. In saying that his blood will be shed Jesus thus shows that he is going wittingly to his death. (CC p. 836)
>
> Also in Léon-Dufour, 151, 153–54 (emphasis Léon-Dufour):
> But how did Christians come to speak of a "covenant in blood which is *shed*"? … The prophets had not been satisfied simply to proclaim in words the coming of the Spirit who would transform the people from within; they also remained personally faithful to the divine covenant to the point of shedding their blood for it. … (CC p. 836)
>
> The covenant is always on the horizon; but the means foreseen—the death of the Servant—becomes real only in a limited degree in the life of any given prophet. The development leads therefore to a call for the perfect Servant to make his appearance. … Jesus says, then, that "this cup is the new covenant in my blood which [is] shed for you." The new covenant will be established by the event of his death on the cross. … (CC p. 836)
>
> The fact that blood is shed makes it possible, therefore, to recover the values not only in the tradition of the persecuted prophets and the suffering just man but also in Isaiah's prophecy of the Servant of God which had gradually been banished from the mainstream of [Jewish] tradition. The fulfillment had to come before the prophecy could be understood. (CC p. 836)

Jesus says that his disciples are participants in and beneficiaries of the new testament in his blood as they partake of the cup and thereby drink his blood. The drinking of blood was an extreme offense to the Jews, but through it Christ's death becomes the disciple's life.

> G. Feeley-Harnik, *The Lord's Table,* 145–46, relates the drinking of the cup to the kinship laws: "By drinking the wine that is the blood, the participant 'cuts himself off from his kin' exactly as the law requires (Leviticus 7:27, 17:10–14). But by drinking 'the life of the flesh'

(Leviticus 17:11), he acquires that life. The separation from kin that is synonymous with death is only the prelude to eternal life in Jesus Christ." (CC p. 837)

To accept the cup and drink it is to accept Jesus' suffering and death as the atoning sacrifice for one's sins. To refuse to recognize Christ's body and blood in the Supper is to court condemnation (1 Cor 11:27–30). Sharing in Christ's suffering and death is the only means to glory—in accord with the interpretation that Jesus gives of his death and resurrection in Lk 24:26: "Was it not necessary for the Christ to suffer these things and enter into his glory?" As the church now shares in the death of Christ in the Sacrament of his body and blood, it is bound together as the new creation, the body Christ. The words over the cup bring the action at the meal to a close by focusing on the death of Jesus—the very topic of the following five dialogs of Jesus with his disciples at the table (22:21–38). (CC p. 837)

In conclusion, Jesus' great desire to celebrate "*this* Passover" (22:15) with his disciples is to "unite himself in spirit with all of Israel as it celebrates the memory of its deliverance from Egypt." Jesus joins himself to God's people as he provides a greater salvation through a new "exodus" (9:31). He reinterprets the Passover events in terms of himself as the fulfillment of Israel's redemption, for he is the Passover Lamb whose sacrificial death now does away with all other sacrifices. His flesh and blood replace the roasted lamb in the meal. His new covenant of forgiveness and eschatological hope is "radically different, newly created, unexpected, just like the new earth and the new heavens." By his death and resurrection, Jesus leads God's people in victory procession from the old era of salvation into the new, transforming the old creation into the new one. This transformation is eschatological, embracing the past Passover meal, the Last Supper of Jesus, and the institution of the Lord's Supper—the new meal of the church by which he will feed his disciples, strengthen and preserve them to life everlasting. All three meals anticipate the final eternal feast (Rev 19:6–9; Is 25:6–8). (CC p. 837)

Thus Jesus' Last Supper with his disciples is presented by the evangelist as the new meal of the new era of salvation. The Last Supper of Jesus—and subsequent celebrations of the Lord's Supper—is different from all other meals, for Jesus gives his body with the bread and his blood with the wine. The miraculous provision of these gifts in the Supper bestows forgiveness of sins and new life with God, based on Christ's death. This communal meal is Jesus' new Passover by which he establishes a new community that will celebrate this meal in remembrance of his death and resurrection and in anticipation of his return. The Last Supper is the climax of Jesus' table fellowship with his disciples. Indeed, it is the most important meal of all God's table fellowship from Eden to the parousia. Its greatest significance lies in what it bestows: the real presence of Christ, his very body and blood, offered up in death on a cross and now given with the bread and wine for the forgiveness of sins and life eternal. (CC pp. 837-838)

in my blood – Also unique to the Last Supper is Jesus' teaching about himself as the sacrificial, Passover Lamb in fulfillment of the OT—the final fulfillment of the exodus deliverance (cf. "exodus" in Lk 9:31). Jesus' impending death signals the beginning of the new, eschatological era of salvation. By stating that the bread is his body "which is being given on behalf of you" (22:19) and the cup is the new testament in his blood, Jesus is interpreting the Passover meal *as a prophecy of what he will do—in a greater way—on the cross, and then in the church's celebration of his Supper.* Those Israelites who ate the first Passover, with the blood of the lamb smeared on their doorways, were in fact spared from God's judgment; they then participated in the exodus deliverance from bondage. Those who now feast at the Table of the Lord receive the benefits earned by his crucified body and shed blood: with his body and blood they also receive deliverance from divine wrath, freedom from bondage to evil, and safe passage to the new promised land (cf. Hebrews 4). (CC p. 832)

22:21 Sharing in food, ministry, prayers, and confession of faith with someone you intend to betray is the worst sort of hypocrisy (cf Ps 41; Ob 7). In Lk, Judas was present with Jesus at the meal. Luther: "Now the partakers of this broken bread are not only the worthy, but also Judas and the unworthy" (AE 37:354). (TLSB)

but – πλήν—This adversative (an adverb used as a conjunction) provides a dramatic contrast between the Words of Institution and the betrayal by Judas. It occurs again in the next verse (22:22) and in 22:42. In each of these verses the contrast lies in the tension between Jesus' own *voluntary* offering of his life, as emphasized in the Words of Institution, and *external* forces that lead Jesus toward death: Judas, the betrayer (22:21–22), and the Father's will (22:42). (CC p. 840)

table – τραπέζης—Luke's use of τραπέζης here and in 22:30 accents the table fellowship character of this meal. Matthew and Mark use τρύβλιον. X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,* 235, also recognizes the difference between the evangelists and highlights Luke's table fellowship emphasis. He observes that Luke stresses "the terribly contradictory situation of the traitor." G. Feeley-Harnik, *The Lord's Table,* 86, makes this comment on 22:21: "Refusal to eat together severs the relationship (1 Samuel 20:34). Those who do not eat or drink together are without any obligation to one another, if not actually enemies. The worst kind of traitor is the traitor with whom one has shared food (Psalms 41:9; Obadiah 1:7; Matthew 26:21; Mark 14:[18]; Luke 22:21; John 13:18, 24–27)." (CC p. 840)

Immediately following upon the Words of Institution, with their promise of forgiveness and life through the shed blood and the body of Jesus given into death, Jesus speaks of his betrayer. (In Matthew and Mark this occurs before the institution narrative.) The act of betrayal is emphasized by the use of παραδίδωμι, "betray," twice within the context of the Supper itself: in 22:21 (ἡ χεὶρ τοῦ παραδιδόντος με, "the hand of the one who is betraying me") and in 22:22 (πλὴν οὐαὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ ἐκείνῳ δι' οὗ παραδίδοται, "nevertheless, woe to that man through whom he is betrayed"). Jesus announces to the apostles his knowledge of the betrayal plot. He says it will be accomplished by one in the fellowship of the Twelve, but that this grievous violation of table fellowship has been ordained (22:22). He pronounces a woe upon the betrayer, and the disciples discuss who of them it might be. The betrayer is not named, however, even though Luke gives the fullest account of Judas' role. (CC p. 843)

> J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke,* 20, comments: "The story of Judas serves several functions: (a) as agent of Satan (22:3), Judas indicates that the forces of evil rose up against God's Holy One, indirectly attesting to Jesus' closeness to God and his innocent suffering; (b) his role is the fulfillment of Scripture (Acts 1:16); thus his treachery is not outside God's knowledge or control; (c) Judas functions as a foil to Peter and to the faithful followers of Jesus." (CC p. 843)

The words about the betrayer (and the following dialogs as well) take place while Jesus and the disciples are still at the meal in the upper room (ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης, "on the table"; 22:21). The mention of the betrayer reinforces that this is a meal with sinners, conforming to the inclusive character of Jesus' table fellowship throughout his ministry. Even—precisely—at the Last Supper, weak and inconstant sinners are present.

> Luke may locate the words about the betrayer here, after the Supper, because they fit in with the other four dialogs in this pericope between Jesus and his disciples. Luke's reference after the meal to the betrayer may or may not suggest the "communion of Judas," but it certainly

> reminds the hearer—as does the prediction of Peter's denial—that the disciples are here as sinners, not as unwavering saints. Likewise, there may be hypocrites and unbelievers in the external fellowship of the church. See X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 235, on the "communion of Judas." Matthew and Mark portray Jesus as referring to his betrayer prior to the meal, hinting that Judas was *not* present for the meal itself. (CC p. 843)

Jesus' woe here (22:22) echoes his woes against the Pharisees and lawyers (11:37–54), thus placing the betrayer in the same category with the religious establishment—Judas' co-conspirators (22:1–6). (CC p. 843)

> The chief priests generally were Sadducees, while the scribes and lawyers were associated with the Pharisees. (CC p. 843)

22:22 *that man* – τὸ ὡρισμένον—Jesus alludes to the Father's eternal plan of salvation—the plan that requires (δεῖ; 22:7, 37 *et passim*) his betrayal and death. The phrase here supports this commentary's practice of referring to Jesus' "destiny" of crucifixion in Jerusalem. This plan was "destined" from eternity (Eph 1:3–14) and includes the doctrine of predestination or election (Eph 1:5; see comments on Lk 8:4–15). (CC p. 840)

The preordained necessity of Jesus' death is indicated by his statement that the Son of Man "journeys in accordance with what has been destined" (κατὰ τὸ ὡρισμένον πορεύεται; 22:22). Luke has used πορεύομαι, "to travel, journey," to refer to Jesus' journey to Jerusalem, the city of his destiny. (CC p. 844)

> J. Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 166, writes: "Underlying this perspective [the movement of Jesus from Galilee to the Jerusalem] is … 22:22 about the Son of Man going his way … 'as it has been determined.' This clearly relates the geographic movements of Jesus to a theological preoccupation." (CC p. 844)

τὸ ὡρισμένον, "what has been destined," suggests God's preordained plan for Jesus. The parallels in Mt 26:24 and Mk 14:21 have ὑπάγει καθὼς γέγραπται, the Son of Man "goes away as it has been written," which stresses the fulfillment of (written) Scripture. This is part of Jesus' teaching of the inexorable necessity of his death, which he must accomplish in Jerusalem. Betrayal by one in table fellowship with him is part of God's plan (Ps 41:9; Jn 13:18). (CC p. 844)

determined, but woe. Within the Father's plan of salvation, Judas remained responsible for his act. God did not force Judas to sin. (TLSB)

22:23 *they*. The apostles. (TLSB)

22:14–23 During Passover, Jesus institutes the Sacrament of His body and blood, by which He brings forgiveness to His people. To neglect the Lord's Supper is to ignore the forgiveness Christ earned for us. "My body, which is given for you" and "this cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in My blood"—these words say it all! • "In this memorial of Thy death, O Lord, Thou dost Thy body and Thy blood afford: Oh, may our souls forever feed on Thee, And Thou, O Christ, forever precious be." Amen. (*LSB* 640:2). (TLSB)

Who Is the Greatest?

24 A dispute also arose among them, as to which of them was to be regarded as the greatest. 25 And he said to them, "The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them,

and those in authority over them are called benefactors. 26 But not so with you. Rather, let the greatest among you become as the youngest, and the leader as one who serves. 27 For who is the greater, one who reclines at table or one who serves? Is it not the one who reclines at table? But I am among you as the one who serves. 28 "You are those who have stayed with me in my trials, 29 and I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom, 30 that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

22:24 *dispute among them* – The question of the betrayer contrasts with the argument about who is the "greatest." Ironic, in view of Jesus' offering of His body and blood. (TLSB)

φιλονεικία—This is the word's only occurrence in the NT, and it means "dispute, argument." The noun φιλόνεικος occurs at 1 Cor 11:16. (CC p. 840)

"Service," διακονία, in imitation of Christ who served humanity to the point of death, will be a mark of the ministry of the apostles. Incredibly, immediately following Jesus' giving of himself to his disciples in body broken and blood poured out, the disciples are arguing among themselves about who is greatest. They have not grasped what Jesus has said and what he is about to do. (CC p. 844)

Now, at the brink of Jesus' passion, the allure of greatness dominates the disciples' thoughts. They do not understand that Jesus' prophetic Messiahship involves suffering as well as teaching and miracles. (They will continue in this misunderstanding until after the resurrection, when Jesus opens up the Scriptures and explains their fulfillment in his suffering and death.) But he now gives them one more thing to remember when they begin their ministry after Pentecost: he reiterates that the kingdom comes through sacrifice and is maintained through service. The Christological principle whereby the disciples represent Christ and speak his words (10:16) will give the disciples power (24:49) to proclaim the Gospel message which at this point they do not understand. First, they must become like children, like the youngest, for only in this way will they embody the message of the kingdom that is marked by humility, sacrifice, and service. "Lambs in the midst of wolves" (10:3)—that's what kind of greatness and leadership lies ahead for them! Then—and only then—will it be true that "the one who hears you hears me" (10:16). (CC pp. 845-846)

The disciples' behavior indicates not only that they are sinners, but that they have not yet understood the order of the kingdom, the necessity of Jesus' suffering before glory. Lk 22:24–28 anticipates Jesus' prophecy that the disciples will fall away because of the scandal of the cross (22:31–34). (CC p. 846)

greatest – μείζων—See comments at 9:48. This comparative and the comparative νεώτερος in 22:26 function as superlatives, a common phenomenon in Hellenistic Greek. "Greatest" announces the theme of 22:24–27 and is repeated in 22:26–27. (CC p. 840)

22:25 Jesus defines greatness through leadership and service. (TLSB)

exercise lordship. Leaders in this world are served, giving orders for others to fulfill. (TLSB)

benefactors. A title assumed by or voted for rulers in Egypt, Syria and Rome as a display of honor, but frequently not representing actual service rendered. (CSB)

Honorary title combining respect and authority, given to princes and other leaders. (TLSB)

The foil to this teaching is the "the kings of the Gentiles" (22:25), an illustration of "leadership" and "greatness" according to the world. ("Gentiles" here simply means "pagan," "worldly," "sinners outside the people of God.") The normal practice of ignorant sinners (ancient and modern) is to seek to be the greatest and lord it over each other. The disciples' behavior falls into that category when they aspire to that sort of greatness and leadership at the Last Supper. The very question the disciples are asking at this Supper in 22:24 (ἐγένετο δὲ καὶ φιλονεικία ἐν αὐτοῖς, τὸ τίς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζων, "and an argument also happened among them—the issue of who of them seems to be greatest") places them in the same category as Gentile sinners (and Pharisaic sinners; cf. 14:1–24). Therefore, this scene confirms that, even—precisely—in this final meal before his passion, Jesus' table fellowship is with sinners. (CC p. 846)

> P. Minear, "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology," 327, says: "Luke, and every Christian reader, would see this [22:24–27] as a picture of transgressors, of men who at this very moment had not begun to understand the rule concerning service and greatness. Jesus understands their lack of understanding, but he eats with them; he serves them, knowing that they had not yet begun to understand what service meant." (CC p. 846)

22:26 *one who serves.* Jesus urges and exemplifies servant leadership—a trait that was as uncommon then as it is now. (CSB)

Jesus contrasts greatness in the world (being served) and in the Church (serving). (TLSB)

μείζων … νεώτερος, ἡγούμενος … διακονῶν—The similar passages Mt 20:25–28 and Mk 10:42–45 contrast μέγας … διάκονος and πρῶτος … δοῦλος and end with the Son of Man present "to serve" (διακονῆσαι). νεώτεροι were "obliged to perform the lowliest service (cf. Ac 5:6)" (BAGD) s.v. νέος, 2 b β). Ironically, the history of Israel is full of examples where God selected a younger brother over an older one to continue the messianic line: Jacob over Esau (Gen 25:23); Judah over his older brothers (Gen 49:8–12); David over his older brothers (1 Sam 16:6–13); etc. Also John the Baptist served his younger relative—Jesus! Cf. Lk 1:36–45. (CC p. 840)

youngest. The one with the least claim over others (9:46–48). "Christ rebukes this error of the apostles and teaches that there shall not be lordship or superiority among them. Instead, the apostles would be sent forth as equals to the common ministry of the Gospel" (Tr 8). (TLSB)

The contrasts here are between the greatest and the youngest (ὁ μείζων/ὁ νεώτερος), the leader and the servant (ὁ ἡγούμενος/ὁ διακονῶν). Humanly speaking, the youngest would honor the greatest, and the servant would defer to the leader. But from Jesus' perspective, according to the Gospel theme of the Great Reversal, the youngest and the servant have greater esteem in the kingdom of God, because of their humility and the service they render. The issue is not just one's actual standing, but what one *confesses* about oneself, as in Jesus' similar sayings about sinners and the righteous (5:31–32): all need to *confess* that they are abject sinners, no matter how much more "righteous" they may be than others (judged externally by outward conformity to God's Law or human laws). So also, those who are the "greatest" and the "leaders" in the church are to have the *attitude* and *behavior* of those who are the youngest and the servants. Jesus does not extol (what the world calls) "leadership skills" as most important for those in the ministry. Hence ordination liturgies speak not of leadership but service. On the other hand, this does not mean that those in the ministry are to neglect the "greater" tasks of their office for the sake of menial work. For example, in Acts 6:1–7, the apostles delegate to others the care of widows so they can

continue to devote their energies "to prayer and to the *service* [διακονίᾳ] of the Word" (Acts 6:4). This attitude too is the desire of a servant to be faithful in the tasks appointed by the Master (cf. 1 Cor 4:1). (CC pp. 844-845)

22:27 *who reclines at the table* – Appropriate for honored guests. (TLSB)

ὁ ἀνακείμενος—See 14:7–24, where Jesus discusses among the Pharisees those who take the honored place at the table and tells the banquet parable. Reclining at the table was appropriate for honored guests at feasts. Jesus says that in the kingdom, one should not behave as an honored guest but as a servant, because Jesus is among them as "one who serves." (CC p. 840)

but I am among you – Jesus emphasizes His own example. (TLSB)

ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι—This is a modified "I AM" saying that includes between the ἐγώ and the εἰμί a statement of Jesus' real presence, ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν. See comments at 21:7–11 and 24:39. (CC p. 840)

Finally, Jesus ties this teaching to his presence and ministry in their midst as the great "I AM" of the OT: "I am in the midst of you [ἐγὼ δὲ ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν εἰμι] as the one who serves" (22:27).

> The Lord's words here are reminiscent of what he says in Jn 13:14–16. In comparison to Mk 10:45 and Mt 20:28, the major difference in Lk 22:27 is the absence of an explicit reference to the atonement. (See H. Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke*, 201, and D. E. Smith, "Table Fellowship as a Literary Motif in the Gospel of Luke," 631, for a discussion.) The common bond between these passages, however, is the concept of serving (διακονέω) that characterizes the essence of Jesus' ministry. Jesus' ministry of service is ultimately to be understood as his atoning sacrifice, for he has just said, "This is my body, which is being given on behalf of you" (22:19) and "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is being poured out on behalf of you" (22:20). See P. Minear, "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology," 327, and J. Fitzmyer, *Luke I–IX*, 220. Jesus' full explanation of the significance of his death as ὁ διακονῶν, "the one who serves" (22:27), is reserved for the colloquium with the Emmaus disciples in 24:25–27. (CC p. 846)

The one who gives his body in bread and his blood in the cup of the new testament reiterates that his atoning presence as servant will be always in their midst. During his trials, he will be asked if he is the "Son of God," and he will respond "I AM" (22:70; ἐγώ εἰμι). After the resurrection he will give his disciples the greeting of peace and tell them "I AM myself" (24:39; ἐγώ εἰμι αὐτός). Jesus' language here and in the rest of the passion is part of Luke's vocabulary for the real presence of Jesus. This theme first appeared in the annunciation to Mary by the angel Gabriel, who said, "The Lord is with you" (1:28). One of the major themes of the gospel is the shift in God's presence from the temple in Jerusalem to the infant in Mary's womb, and continuing in the person of Jesus, the servant who serves at the ongoing feast of the church. Jesus will continue to be present in the midst of his church through the Divine Service, serving his disciples as they dine at their Lord's Supper. (CC pp. 846-847)

one of you who serves – Even at this critical moment of Jesus' final teaching before his betrayal, the disciples misunderstand the nature of Jesus' destiny in Jerusalem and their calling as heirs of his ministry. Jesus responds to their dispute by speaking of greatness in the kingdom of God in terms of service—*table* service: "For who is greater, the one who reclines [at table] or the one who serves?" (Lk 22:27; τίς γὰρ μείζων, ὁ ἀνακείμενος ἢ ὁ διακονῶν…). This conforms to

Jesus' promise of the Great Reversal (e.g., 13:30; 14:11; 18:14). This reversal concerns one's status in ministry *now:* the humble servant who serves at God's table is actually greater now, even though the world considers him most inferior now. The reversal also concerns the future, when Jesus, the Servant, will gird himself and serve those who now are servants but who will be treated like masters then (12:37). To the surprise of many, reversal reaches its eschatological goal when even sinners and Gentiles will sit at table in the kingdom of God with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but many of Jesus' Jewish hearers will not (13:28). The axiom "some are last who will be first, and some are first who will be last" (13:30) likewise concerns the future public verdict of God. (CC p. 845)

The dispute about who is the greatest recalls a previous discussion by the disciples on this same topic at the conclusion of the Galilean ministry. In that situation, Jesus took a child in his arms and said to them, "Whoever receives this child in my name receives me, and whoever receives me receives the one who sent me; for the one being least among all you, this one is great" (9:48). That response to his disciples foreshadowed the Christological principle Jesus first announced at the beginning of his journey to Jerusalem when he sent out the seventy (-two) as "lambs in the midst of wolves" and told them that "the one who hears you hears me" (10:3, 16). (CC p. 845)

22:28 *in my trials.* Including temptations (cf. 4:13), hardships (9:58) and rejection (Jn 1:11). (CSB)

The disciples were loyal despite rejection and opposition. (TLSB)

πειρασμοῖς—This is the same word used in 4:13 of Jesus' temptations; in 8:13; in the Lord's Prayer (11:4); and in 22:40, 46, where the disciples *fail* to stay awake with Jesus in his time of trial. Cf. also 22:31. (CC p. 841)

As though to correct their delusions of grandeur about their coming greatness, Jesus elaborates on what is appointed for one called into his ministry. ὑμεῖς, "you," plural and emphatic, attaches these words especially to the addressees: "As for *you, you* are …" (22:28). (CC p. 847)

First, Jesus describes them as those who "have remained with me in my trials." But when did that take place? The perfect tense of the participle indicates completed action. The disciples have journeyed and stayed with Jesus during his rejection by the religious leaders of Israel up until this moment. They will soon abandon him during the most severe trial: his passion. But they will also be gathered, forgiven, strengthened, and commissioned after the resurrection. Luke's hearers would think also of the post-Pentecost perseverance of the apostles, as they proclaim the Gospel and face trials that are similar to some endured by Jesus. The mutual presence of Jesus with his church and his church remaining with and in him is foundational for the apostolic mission of Acts. (CC p. 847)

Therefore, Jesus, the omniscient Lord, likely has in view the entirety of the disciples' lives, not just their lives up to this point. Moreover, especially in light of their imminent abandonment of Jesus at his arrest, it must be stressed that their faithfulness is only the product of his grace. He will forgive their unfaithfulness, and his own perfect obedience and faithfulness to his Father will be imputed to them through faith in him. In light of this grace that forgives, restores, and strengthens disciples, they are viewed as loyal in their identification with Jesus even in his trials, and they will also inherit the kingdom he is about to receive. (CC p. 847)

22:29i *I assign to you...a kingdom.* The following context (v. 30) indicates that this kingdom is the future form of the kingdom. (CSB)

Jesus promised the apostles they would share the glory given by the Father. (TLSB)

The kingdom that Jesus now appoints to the disciples *is the same kingdom* that is appointed for him by the Father (22:29; βασιλείαν, "a kingdom," is the object of both διατίθεμαι, "I appoint," and διέθετο, "appointed"). This is the same kingdom Jesus has preached and taught throughout his ministry. He instructed his disciples to proclaim that the kingdom is near (10:9, 11) and to pray for the kingdom to come (11:2). While the kingdom will come in all its fullness only at Christ's return, Jesus will be enthroned in glory after his death and resurrection. (CC pp. 847-848)

22:30 *that you may eat and drink* – ἵνα ἔσθητε καὶ πίνητε ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης μου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ μου—From the perspective of inaugurated eschatology, this kingdom is present and active in the world, and the table in the kingdom is that of the Sacrament of the Altar. The kingdom is appointed to the disciples so that they might benefit from the food of the kingdom, the very body and blood that Jesus instituted just moments before. (CC p. 841)

The purpose for the establishment of that kingdom is communion with God, fellowship at the King's table. Lk 22:30 is yet another reference to table fellowship in this scene: "in order that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom." This dialog is closely associated with the Words of Institution, which came before. (CC p. 848)

> X. Léon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread,*236, says concerning 22:24–30: "The exhortation has two parts which correspond to the two aspects of the one mystery of Christ. Service to the brethren (22:24–27) corresponds to his death, and the prospect of coming glory which gives strength to the disciples of Jesus (22:28–30) corresponds to his resurrection." (CC p. 848)

The eschatological dimension of this table fellowship of Jesus with his disciples links this section to the eschatological prospect of 22:16, 18 and earlier words about eating in the kingdom of God (13:29–30 and the beatitude of 14:15). (CC p. 848)

This eating and drinking at his table in his kingdom already begins with Jesus' post-resurrection meals, starting at Emmaus (24:28–35; see also John 21; Acts 1:4; 10:41). While Jesus will be seated at the right hand of the Father after his ascension, his kingdom is already inaugurated by his death and resurrection, since he rises in glory. The kingdom is present whenever and wherever the King is present, and so when Jesus reveals himself in the breaking of the bread at Emmaus, the disciples realize that they have started to eat and drink at Jesus' table in his kingdom. (CC p.848)

> J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke,* 27, emphasizes the present aspect to the exclusion of the future sense here: "The faithful apostles are commissioned to 'eat and drink at my table in my kingdom' (22:30a). Although there is a New Testament tradition of future eschatological life with Jesus at a messianic banquet, this is not the sense of the Lukan text here. Luke relates that Jesus continued to eat and drink with his apostles and close associates after his resurrection (Lk 24:30–35, 41–43; Acts 1:3–4)." (CC p. 848)

The apostles will be gathered, instructed, absolved, and commissioned into the Lord's ministry. They will be appointed as stewards of the mysteries of God (1 Cor 4:1; cf. Lk 8:10; Eph 3:9), and they will serve to the church the eschatological Meal of the new era of salvation—the Lord's Supper (Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7). At the Supper, the apostles—and those in subsequent generations in

the apostolic ministry, as well as those to whom they minister—will dine at Jesus' Table in God's kingdom, anticipating the final end-time banquet (Is 25:6–9; Rev 19:6–9). Jesus' use of the present tense "I appoint" (διατίθεμαι; Lk 22:29) indicates his imminent action of appointing this kingdom for them. They are soon to be instructed in the nature of this kingdom on the road to Emmaus (24:13–27), and they will recognize the King when he breaks bread with them (24:30–31, 35). (CC p. 848)

In light of 22:28, it must be repeated that those to whom this kingdom is appointed are those who persevere with Jesus through his trials. This is not a requirement of perfect obedience, for then no fallen human could enter the kingdom. Rather, the examples of the apostles show men who denied their Lord at his arrest, but who then (with the exception of Judas) were forgiven and restored by the risen Christ. Only after the coming of the Spirit will apostles exhibit joy in suffering for the sake of Jesus' name and faithfulness to the point of death. (E.g., Acts 4:13, 21, 31; 5:17–42; 7:54–60; 16:22–25) (CC pp. 848-849)

In the ministry of the apostles, the spirit of perseverance with Jesus in his death is apparent in their preaching of the scandal of his death as part of the proclamation of the kingdom. Thus the theology of the cross marks one who is appointed for the kingdom. This relates to the messianic passion secret in Luke. Jesus repeatedly instructed his disciples not to declare him to be the Messiah until after his passion, death, and resurrection (9:18–22, 36; cf. 9:43–45; 18:31–34). The scandal of the cross will become the center of the church's proclamation in 24:44–49 after Jesus clarifies the significance of his death to the Emmaus disciples (24:25–27). It is only after the resurrection that the disciples understand the kerygma. And only after Jesus teaches them and the Spirit comes upon them are they capable of proclaiming the kerygma and are willing to suffer for the kerygma. Only then will they start to be conformed to Jesus' statement that they have continued with him in his trials. (CC p. 849)

> J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1415, offers this insight on 22:24–30 and its relationship to the Emmaus narrative:
>
> [Jesus] instructs his apostles to look for community with him *in glory* rather than distinction in earthly rank. Community in that sphere will depend not on who is greatest among them in mortal esteem, but on their perseverance with him in his trials. His words, in effect, foreshadow the coming passion, and more so the words that he will address to the disciples on the road to Emmaus, "Was not the Messiah bound to suffer all this before entering into his glory?" (24:26). (CC p. 849)

At the kingdom's banquet, the apostles sit at privileged places with the King of heaven. (TLSB)

sit on thrones. As they shared in Jesus' trials, so they will share in his rule (2Ti 2:12). (CSB)

Jesus notes the honors given to the loyal apostles, who will become leaders in the Church (Ac 6; 15). The 12 apostles correspond to the 12 tribes of Israel. (TLSB)

judging. Leading or ruling. (CSB)

the twelve tribes of Israel.† Suffering, preaching, the cross, eating and drinking at Jesus' table—these all belong together for the apostles. So also does "you will sit [καθήσεσθε, future indicative] on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel" (22:30). This refers not to condemning old, unbelieving Israel, but to the responsibility of shepherding and oversight in the new Israel,

the church. This is the Lukan equivalent to Jesus giving to Peter the keys of the kingdom in Matthew (16:19) and his bestowal of the office of the keys upon the disciples in John (20:22–23). The OT judges were saviors and deliverers who led the people of God to repentance and faith (e.g., Judg 2:10–23; the LXX uses the verb κρίνω, "to judge," for their leadership [e.g., Judg 10:2–3]). So too the apostles and pastors in the apostolic ministry will "judge" in the following way: "The Gospel requires of those who preside over the churches that they preach the Gospel, remit sins, administer the sacraments, and, in addition, *exercise jurisdiction*, that is, excommunicate those who are guilty of notorious crimes and absolve those who repent." Entrusted with the responsibility to apply Law and Gospel, to absolve or retain sins, and to preside at the Supper, the apostles—and those who serve as their successors in Jesus' ministry—will lead the new Israel to gather around the Table of the Lord in his kingdom. (CC pp. 849-850)

22:24–30 Jesus points His arguing apostles to true greatness in serving others, promising they will share His honor. Today, we often expect recognition for our service to the Church and feel slighted when ignored. Yet, we have the Lord's promise that He always sees and will reward our service. Our greatest treasure remains how He serves us, forgiving our sins by grace. • Thank You, Lord, for all You have done for me. May I show my gratitude in service to You and to Your people. Amen. (TLSB)

Jesus Foretells Peter's Denial

31 "Simon, Simon, behold, Satan demanded to have you, that he might sift you like wheat, 32 but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail. And when you have turned again, strengthen your brothers." 33 Peter said to him, "Lord, I am ready to go with you both to prison and to death." 34 Jesus said, "I tell you, Peter, the rooster will not crow this day, until you deny three times that you know me."

22:31 *Simon, Simon* – Σίμων Σίμων—Jesus begins with Peter's old name, repeating it twice for emphasis, to warn him of Satan's attacks. (CC p. 841)

Peter's Semitic name, before he was designated "Peter"soon Peter will falter. The repetition of the name expresses pity (13:34; 2Sm 19:4. (TLSB)

Satan demanded – ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς—Satan, who has entered Judas, will also test each of the Eleven. Jesus allows this to take place but promises to turn the disciples back to himself through Peter's efforts. Peter will help convince the others when Jesus rises from the dead (Lk 24:34). In an OT parallel, in Job 1–2 Satan requests permission to test Job—and receives it. Then after God himself restores Job (Job 38:1–42:6), Job in turn helps to restore his three friends to God (Job 42:7–10). (CC p. 841)

Satan demanded. As with Job, the Lord gave His permission. (TLSB)

sift you. Satan wanted to test the disciples, hoping to bring them to spiritual ruin. (CSB)

you. Gk plural. Lit, "all of you." All the disciples will be tested. (TLSB)

τοῦ σινιάσαι ὡς τὸν σῖτον—The disciples will be tested when Jesus is arrested. This will be a form of judgment, a separation of wheat and chaff—an image common in the OT prophets. (Cf. Is 30:28; 40:24; 41:2; Jer 13:24; Amos 9:9) (CC p. 841)

To separate the grain from the chaff, a time of testing. (TLSB)

22:32*i have prayed...faith may not fall* – Singular, referring to Peter. Jesus intercedes for him, and His prayer is stronger than Satan. Peter will stumble, but not lose his faith entirely. (TLSB)

ἐγὼ δὲ ἐδεήθην περὶ σοῦ … ἡ πίστις σου … σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας στήρισον τοὺς ἀδελφούς σου—Peter is singled out by the use of the singular: Jesus prayed for Peter; Peter's faith; Peter's return to faith; and Peter's strengthening of the other disciples. Jesus uses the language of faith (ἡ πίστις) and conversion (ἐπιστρέφω, "turn, return, repent"). (CC p. 841)

turned again – ἐπιστρέψας—This word can mean an actual physical return (Lk 2:39; Acts 15:36); a turn in posture (Lk 17:4; Acts 9:40); a spiritual turning to the Lord in the initial repentance of Gentiles (Acts 14:15; 15:19); the return of Jews to their ancestral faith through faith in Jesus, the promised Messiah (Lk 1:16–17; Acts 3:19; Jews and Gentiles in Acts 26:18, 20). It is common in the LXX as a translation of שׁוּב, "to return; to repent." Peter had confessed Jesus as the Christ (9:20), but he will fall away and deny Christ. Here, this term of conversion does imply that Peter will actually fall from grace and need to be returned to faith. (CC p. 841)

Repentance will show Peter's renewed faith. (TLSB)

strengthen your brothers – He will become the rock once again, fortifying his fellow disciples. (TLSB)

Jesus now commissions Peter as leader of the disciples. After the scandal of the crucifixion causes them all to stumble (interrupting their constancy in remaining with Jesus in his trials [22:28]), Peter will be returned to faith and will be responsible for strengthening (restoring that constancy). Peter will deny Jesus three times. His falling away comes after Satan's request to sift all the disciples like wheat (ὁ σατανᾶς ἐξῃτήσατο ὑμᾶς; "you" is plural in "Satan asked concerning you …" [22:31]). Jesus prayed for Peter (22:32; περὶ σοῦ, "concerning you"; here "you" is singular) so that his faith (ἡ πίστις σου, "your faith"; "your" is singular) may not fail. When Peter returns (σύ ποτε ἐπιστρέψας; "when you [singular] have returned"), he will strengthen his brothers (plural). The relationship described here is between Peter and the other disciples, and Peter is set apart as the leader, *even though he also will deny Jesus.* Peter is certainly portrayed as a sinner who falls from the faith. But he is also described as one who will be moved by his Lord to return (ἐπιστρέψας), repent of his fall, and receive the forgiveness of sins. The main focus here is not on Peter's denial, but on his return to faithfulness and his leadership in strengthening the other disciples. As in 5:27–32; 7:36–50; 19:1–10, Luke portrays a sinner at the table of Jesus who (now and later) receives the forgiveness of sins at Jesus' table (cf. also John 21). (CC p. 850)

When does this return and forgiveness of Peter take place? In Acts 1–11, Peter has taken his place as leader in the church; he proclaims the Gospel with boldness and strengthens the brethren. But is there an earlier moment of restoration by Jesus? Peter appears once more in the passion narrative in Lk 22:54–62, where he fulfills Jesus' prophecy by denying him three times. After that, the only other times Simon Peter appears in Luke are in 24:12, at the conclusion of the resurrection narrative, and in 24:34, at the conclusion of the Emmaus story. One of the reasons for Peter's leadership in the church is because he, like the other apostles, was a witness to the resurrection. Luke and Jn 20:1–10 give Peter special prominence in the resurrection account by recording Peter's running to the tomb and marveling at what had happened (Lk 24:12). That incident is a prelude to Luke's reference to him at the conclusion of the Emmaus story: "In reality, the Lord has risen and has appeared to Simon" (24:34). Taken together, these two references indicate Peter's restoration to his status as leader of the church in fulfillment of 22:32.

Peter's appearance at the tomb and Christ's appearance to Peter frame the Emmaus meal in 24:12 and 24:34. J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke,* 35, discussing 22:31–34, says:

> When next we hear of Peter, he is with the brethren in the upper room on Easter night, a recipient of a personal vision of the risen Jesus which he has already shared with them (24:34). The "turning" appears to be accomplished, and the "strengthening" already begun. Peter's "strengthening" is connected not only with his eyewitness announcement that he has seen the Lord (24:34), but especially with the vigorous role which Peter takes in Acts 1–11. Jn 21:1–23 provides a more detailed account of Peter's restoration, supplementing the information supplied by Luke. (CC p. 851)

The risen Christ will restore Peter, bringing about his repentance and conversion, forgiving his sins. The return of Peter is crucial for Luke-Acts since Peter will be the prominent leader of the apostolic mission in Acts 1–11. (CC pp. 850-851)

22:33 *to go with you* – πορεύεσθαι—Peter promises to remain faithful to Jesus in his journey to the cross. The irony is that Peter will deny Jesus shortly. (CC p. 841)

Peter's impulsive reply matches his confident nature. (TLSB)

to prison and to death. Peter was unaware how these words would later prove true (Ac 12:1–5; Jn 21:18–19). (TLSB)

22:34 Rooster's crow points to the coming dawn. Before morning, Peter will deny even knowing Jesus. (TLSB)

Peter – Πέτρε—In telling Peter of his denial, Jesus switches from "Simon" (22:31) to "Peter," his new name of honor and endearment, which reminds Peter of his office (Lk 5:1–11; 6:14). This switch may be recalled by Peter as an indication of Jesus' promise that Peter will exercise his office when he will turn (return, repent) and strengthen the brethren. (CC p. 841)

this day – σήμερον—In Luke, "today" often signals present realities with eschatological significance. (Lk 2:11; 4:21; 5:26; 13:32–33; 19:5, 9; 22:61; 23:43) Peter, who will deny Jesus "today," is contrasted to the thief on the cross, who "today" will be with Jesus in paradise (23:43). (CC p. 841)

deny...know me – με ἀπαρνήσῃ εἰδέναι—The epexegetical (Additional explanation or explanatory material.) infinitive (cf. BDF § 394) explains the way in which Peter will deny Jesus: he will deny knowing Jesus. The idea of knowing is part of the Lukan language of faith (see ἐπιγινώσκω in 1:4; 24:16, 31). (CC p. 842)

22:31–34 Jesus warns a self-confident Peter that he will deny his Lord, but also assures him of His intercession. "Therefore let anyone who thinks that he stands take heed lest he fall" (1Co 10:12). Jesus, who interceded for Peter, is even now at the right hand of God interceding for us (Rm 8:34; Heb 7:25). • Lord Jesus, pray for me, that my faith in You remains steadfast to the end. Amen. (TLSB)

Scripture Must Be Fulfilled in Jesus

35 And he said to them, "When I sent you out with no moneybag or knapsack or sandals, did you lack anything?" They said, "Nothing." 36 He said to them, "But now let the one

who has a moneybag take it, and likewise a knapsack. And let the one who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one. 37 For I tell you that this Scripture must be fulfilled in me: 'And he was numbered with the transgressors.' For what is written about me has its fulfillment." 38 And they said, "Look, Lord, here are two swords." And he said to them, "It is enough."

22:35 *I sent you...lack anything* – Jesus contrasts the earlier mission of the Twelve (9:1–6) and of the Seventy-two (10:1–20) with their new situation. The hospitality received then would not necessarily await them in the future. (TLSB)

ἀπέστειλα ὑμᾶς ἄτερ βαλλαντίου καὶ πήρας καὶ ὑποδημάτων—Jesus is referring to the sending (ἀποστέλλω in 9:2; 10:1 as in 22:35) of the Twelve (9:1–6) and the seventy (-two) (10:1–20) without provisions. The language here is closer to that of the sending of the seventy (-two) than of the Twelve. (CC p. 842)

Jesus' final words to the disciples seem to reverse the instructions he gave in 9:1–6; 10:1–12, when he sent the Twelve and the seventy (-two) respectively to preach the kingdom of God and to heal. Then he sent them without provisions so they would have to depend on God to sustain them through the gifts offered by their host families, much as a pastor is supported by his congregation (cf. 10:6). Is Jesus changing his mind? Is he instituting a new pattern for mission? Why does Jesus now instruct his disciples to provide for themselves and even arm themselves for violent conflict by selling their garment and buying a sword? (CC p. 851)

In Acts, the disciples hold everything in common, renouncing their individual possessions (Acts 2–4). They willingly endure persecution and offer no armed resistance (Acts 5, 7, 8, 12, 16, 17, 19). Therefore, they are following the pattern of Jesus' instructions in Luke 9 and 10. Jesus' words here about the sword were not taken as literal instructions for the apostolic mission. (CC p. 851)

22:36 *but now* – Emphatic signal of their new situation after the resurrection. (TLSB)

ἀλλὰ νῦν—The situation now at the time of the passion is entirely different from the context of the first commissioning of the Twelve and the seventy (-two) because Jesus will be taken from them. Similarly, the conditions in which the church will minister call for careful planning and precautions against dangers. (CC p. 842)

However, Jesus' words most certainly do apply to missions. While Jesus was with the disciples during his earthly ministry, they were protected from deprivation of life's necessities (e.g., the feeding of the five thousand [9:10–17]) and from violent persecution. That period of physical safety is drawing to a close. When Jesus is arrested, the lives of the disciples will be in jeopardy too. In subsequent church history, the disciples must plan carefully and take precautions if they are to complete their work as God intends (cf. 6:46–49; 14:28–30). They will face spiritual enemies and physical need, assault, and martyrdom. They must equip themselves in all respects for the battle ahead. When St. Paul urges Christians to arm themselves with the full armor of God (Eph 6:10–20), he recognizes that the true enemies are spiritual, and so the essential weaponry is too. Yet even though the kingdom of God does not come by the sword, physical provisions for the labor of ministry and the bodily necessities of those who serve will be required. (CC pp. 851-852)

a moneybag… a knapsack. Cf. previous instructions (9:3; 10:4). Until now they had been dependent on generous hospitality, but future opposition would require them to be prepared to pay their own way. (CSB)

ὁ ἔχων βαλλάντιον ἀράτω, ὁμοίως καὶ πήραν—Jesus completely reverses the conditions of the previous commissionings. Instead of proceeding without provisions (9:3; 10:4), the disciples are to take what they will need. (CC p. 842)

buy one. An extreme figure of speech used to warn them of the perilous times about to come. They would need defense and protection, as Paul did when he appealed to Caesar (Ac 25:11) as the one who "bears the sword" (Ro 13:4). (CSB)

To give up a necessary garment for a sword indicates hostility and persecution are at hand (Ac 8:1–3; 9:1–2; 12:1–5). Jesus likely speaks figuratively, as shown by His brusque reply in v 38. (TLSB)

καὶ ὁ μὴ ἔχων πωλησάτω τὸ ἱμάτιον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀγορασάτω μάχαιραν—In the sending of the Twelve (9:3), Jesus prohibited them from taking two tunics or shirts (χιτῶνας). Now Jesus again modifies his previous instructions with the command to sell the coat or outer garment (ἱμάτιον) and buy a sword. The hearer asks, "Why a sword?" The hostility of Satan and the world is about to be unleashed on the vulnerable band of disciples. (CC p. 842)

22:37 *numbered with the transgressors.* Jesus was soon to be arrested as a criminal, in fulfillment of prophetic Scripture, and his disciples would also be in danger for being his followers. (CSB)

Jesus will die a shameful death between two criminals. (TLSB)

writtn about me – τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί—This final use of δεῖ before the resurrection suggests that this is the final passion prediction. It, like the one in 18:31–34 (where τελέω is also used), is tied to the OT. Jesus must fulfill what the OT says about him and, moreover, the entire prophetic pattern of the whole OT. See the excursus "The OT Witness to Christ." (CC p. 842)

its fulfillment – τέλος ἔχει—The meaning is ambiguous; τέλος can mean "end" in the sense of fulfillment or "end" in the sense of termination, abolishment. Perhaps both are in view here: Jesus will *fufill* the Scriptures, but this involves the *end* of his earthly life. Cf. Rom 10:4, where Christ is the "end" (τέλος) of the Law—both as its fulfillment and as the termination of its reign of condemnation. (CC p. 842)

Jesus is speaking with great irony. The disciples have exhibited a pattern of misunderstanding throughout their sojourn with him. They still do not comprehend the kingdom—that the things of God are opposite from the things of people. In this respect, they are sinners who think about their own needs and do not trust the Lord of the harvest to provide. They have been sent as messengers of peace, but like Jerusalem (Lk 19:42), they do not yet truly understand the things that make for peace, as shown by the two swords they have in their possession at Passover. They are among the transgressors whom Jesus came to save. (CC p. 852)

> P. Minear, "Some Glimpses of Luke's Sacramental Theology," 328–29, claims: "Their [the disciples'] possession of the swords indicates their transgression. 'He was reckoned with transgressors' has its fulfillment in this very scene. Two swords are enough to prove it. The swords become the two witnesses which must be heard, according to

> Deuteronomy, before a man is judged guilty. 'It is enough.' " Cf. also J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke,* 42. (CC p. 852)

A key to this final dialog is 22:37, the quotation from Is 53:12. This citation is a pointer to all of the fourth Servant Song in Isaiah (52:13–53:12). The quotation is framed by references to Jesus' fulfilling the prophecies of the Suffering Servant, accenting the centrality of this verse:

> "For I say to you, this that is written is necessary *to be fulfilled* [τελεσθῆναι] in me the [verse], 'And with transgressors he was reckoned,'
> for in fact that which concerns me *has an end* [τέλος ἔχει]."

This is Jesus' final passion prediction before he is handed over by his betrayer to sinful men. This is also the only direct quote from the Isaian Suffering Servant Songs in any of the gospels' passion narratives. In vocabulary and content, the character of this passage is like that of other passion predictions and statements. It describes the necessity of the death of Jesus in fulfillment of Scripture: "For I say to you, this that is written is necessary to be fulfilled in me." The use of δεῖ, "it is necessary," places it alongside the three passion statements in 24:7, 26, 44. Jesus' death as the fulfillment of Scripture anticipates the teaching of Jesus on the road to Emmaus in 24:25–27 and his commission to the disciples in 24:44–49. Who are the "transgressors" (ἀνόμων, "lawless ones," reflecting פֹּשְׁעִים, "rebels, lawbreakers, covenant violators")? The two swords suggest that the apostles were afraid and so brought swords to defend themselves by violence. Hence, the apostles are among the "transgressors." But this citation primarily sets the stage for the passion that is to follow. From this moment on, Jesus will be "reckoned with transgressors." These precise words conform to Luke's view of Jesus as the suffering, righteous prophet who comes to identify with sinful humanity, place himself in solidarity with sinners, and die on behalf of all, crucified between two malefactors. (CC pp. 853-853)

Luke's narrative of the Last Supper begins in 22:15 with a reference to the passion and ends in 22:37 with a reference to his end or goal (τέλος). Luke's extended passion and resurrection narrative is framed by two meals: the Last Supper (22:14–38) and the Emmaus supper (24:13–35). Jesus' discourses at the Last Supper focus on his impending death. But in them are words of promise, intimations of future eating, drinking, strengthening, and judging—all of which are possible *because of his death:*

> Thus far this [Last Supper dialogs] seems a rather bleak picture. What about … the feasting, the rejoicing of the earlier suppers? This picture, however, is not wholly dismal, for it is in the very context of these dialogues that Jesus promises to these transgressors that they will sit with him at his table in his kingdom. He appoints them to thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel (22:28–30).
> The continuity of ministry is here: "You are those who have continued with me." But this is continuity in his trials, in his temptations, temptations by the same tempter. Yet he has prepared for them a table in the midst of their enemies. He has eaten with them. In eating with them, he has pledged their health, their salvation: "Take this cup and divide it among yourselves."
> To Luke the symbolic center is taken by Jesus as the *diakonos* ["servant"], fulfilling his *diakonia* ["service"]. "He was reckoned with transgressors." Only so could his destiny be fulfilled. Not simply because transgression is an inevitable element in [fallen] human life, but because transgression must be overcome before there can be joy and celebration. And how can it be overcome except by forgiveness? How can Jesus save transgressors except by eating with them? (CC p. 853)

22:38 *"… two swords." "Is that enough."* Sensing that the disciples had taken him too literally, Jesus ironically closes the discussion with a curt "That's plenty!" Not long after this, Peter was rebuked for using a sword (v. 50). (CSB)

Travelers commonly carried swords, or large knives (cf vv 50–51; 6:27–29). (TLSB)

ἱκανόν—This is another ambiguous thought. Jesus could be understood as saying that two swords are "enough" for his and the disciples' ministry. Or, more likely, he is fed up with the disciples' misunderstanding of his ministry and theirs. They take Jesus literally and intend to use swords, as Peter does in 22:49–50. Hence Jesus says in effect, "I have had enough!" Cf. Mk 14:41. (CC p. 842)

Jesus ends the discussion and dismisses them. (TLSB)

22:35–38 Jesus warns His disciples about the hostile times they will face, similar to His own rejection. No disciple, including us, will avoid some of the hostility that Jesus faced. "Yet He bore the sin of many, and makes intercession for the transgressors" (Is 53:12). • When we experience hostility, Lord, keep us focused on what You have borne for us. Amen. (TLSB)

Jesus Prays on the Mount of Olives

39 And he came out and went, as was his custom, to the Mount of Olives, and the disciples followed him. 40 And when he came to the place, he said to them, "Pray that you may not enter into temptation." 41 And he withdrew from them about a stone's throw, and knelt down and prayed, 42 saying, "Father, if you are willing, remove this cup from me. Nevertheless, not my will, but yours, be done." 43 And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him. 44 And being in agony he prayed more earnestly; and his sweat became like great drops of blood falling down to the ground. 45 And when he rose from prayer, he came to the disciples and found them sleeping for sorrow, 46 and he said to them, "Why are you sleeping? Rise and pray that you may not enter into temptation."

22:39 *came out* – The emphasis in Lk deals with the disciples as a whole (does not single out Peter, James, and John), and the focus is on Jesus' agony. (TLSB)

ἐπορεύθη—"Journeyed" shows that Luke considers this part of Jesus' journey to his destiny of crucifixion. Even though he is in Jerusalem, he has not yet reached his final goal. (Cf. Lk 9:51; 13:22, 32; 17:11; 19:28; 22:37) He will reach that goal "on the third day" (13:32). (CC p. 854)

The introduction gives the usual framework of place and persons. From Luke's earlier careful time references (22:1, 7, 14), the reader knows that it is late in the evening on the day of preparation for the Sabbath. (This is Friday, but that part of Friday that is after sundown on what today is called Thursday.) All of Jesus' passion suffering and even his death will take place on this day. The place is not in Jerusalem, but on the Mount of Olives. There is no mention in Luke of Gethsemane or a garden. The evangelist has already informed the hearer that it was Jesus' practice to go to the Mount of Olives during the night of Great Week (the early church's name for Holy Week; cf. 21:37). Of course, Jesus is at the center of this passage, but the evangelist is careful to note that also (καί) the disciples "followed [ἠκολούθησαν] him," suggesting faithful discipleship (cf. the same verb in 5:11, 27, 28; 9:23). These disciples are those who—so far —"have remained with [Jesus] in [his] trials" (22:28). Unlike Matthew and Mark, Luke does not mention any disciples by name but suggests that the whole event involved all of them as a group (cf. Mt 26:37: "Peter and the two sons of Zebedee"; and Mk 14:33: "Peter and James and John").

Jesus continues to give his disciples instructions on discipleship even as he is experiencing his own suffering. (CC p. 857)

custom. Jesus had recently been staying overnight there (cf 21:37); therefore, Judas knew where to find Him. (TLSB)

Mount of Olives. See 21:37; Jn 18:2. Matthew specifies Gethsemane (Mt 26:36), and John, an olive grove (Jn 18:1). The place apparently was located on the lower slopes of the Mount of Olives. (CSB)

This hill would scarcely have been so called if its groves had not been outstandingly luxuriant in comparison with the surrounding land and the olives not of economic importance for the city. Oil was probably the only export of Jerusalem. Gethsemane, which was located on the Mt of Olives, means an oil or perfume press. (Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus – Joachim Jeremias – page 7)

22:40 *the place*. Gethsemane. (TLSB)

pray that – Jesus frames the event with this admonition, repeated in v 46. (TLSB)

προσεύχεσθε—Four of the nineteen occurrences in Luke of this verb for prayer are in this pericope (22:40, 41, 44, 46; the noun προσευχή occurs in 22:45). The *present* imperative implies continuing action: "keep praying." Jesus himself prayed for an extended period (22:41). See also how Jesus' "rising up" in 22:45 is to be imitated by the disciples in 22:46. See comments at 1:10; 11:1–2; 21:36 regarding the vocabulary for prayer. (CC p. 854)

temptation. Here refers to severe trial of the kind referred to in vv. 28–38, which might lead to a faltering of their faith. (CSB)

A trial of faith, a real danger as Satan wants to sift them like wheat (v 31). "God tempts no one," but all disciples are to pray "that God would guard and keep" them (SC, Sixth Petition, p xxxviii–xxxix). (TLSB)

μὴ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς πειρασμόν—The exhortation to keep praying "not to come into temptation" and the similar phrase in 22:46 reflect the petition Jesus taught in 11:4: μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν, "do not bring us into temptation." (CC p. 854)

The prayer that is in focus here is *petitionary prayer,* the kind of prayer that Jesus taught his disciples with the Lord's Prayer (11:1–4). Jesus taught them to petition the Father, as he himself does before his arrest. While Jesus and his praying are the main focus of this section (C—22:42), his words to the disciples are the chief interest in the Lukan frame (A—22:40 and A'—22:46). Luke surrounds Jesus' prayer to his Father with Jesus' two commands to the disciples: "Keep praying [προσεύχεσθε] not to come into temptation" (22:40; similarly 22:46). This is almost exactly like the petition in the Lord's Prayer where Jesus instructed them to pray, "Do not bring us into temptation" (11:4). They will be severely tested as they watch Jesus enter his passion. The temptation they face is to be scandalized by what will soon happen to Jesus, that is, to abandon the faith because of fear and/or offense that leads to hypocritical denial of him. (CC p. 858)

22:41 *a stone's throw*. C 30 yd, distant enough for privacy, yet near His companions. (TLSB)

knelt down. Showing His emotional intensity. Usually, Jews stood when praying. (TLSB)

prayed – προσηύχετο—This imperfect suggests that Jesus' prayers were ongoing and lasted for some time. (CC p. 854)

Jesus does not go far from his disciples, for a stone's throw would only be about thirty yards, and apparently Jesus was close enough for them to hear his prayer. Second, here Jesus prays on his knees, not according to the usual Jewish custom of standing up. This is a sign of Jesus' great humility and the burden of suffering he is about to endure. Third, after Jesus experiences agony in prayer (22:44), he rises (ἀναστάς [22:45]). This action foreshadows his resurrection from the totality of his suffering on the third day. ἀνίστημι, "to rise, stand up" is the same verb used for Jesus' resurrection in 24:7, 46 and of resurrection also in 8:55; 9:8, 19. Finally, when Jesus returns to the disciples, their "sleeping from sorrow" (22:45) is a sad indication of their own grief, fear, and misunderstanding of what is about to happen. As when they were found to have two swords (22:38), they already stand condemned of having quickly succumbed to temptation. Perhaps this is why Jesus not only questions them on why they sleep but also commands them to rise up (as he did) and pray (some more) in order that they might not enter (further) temptation. (CC pp. 858-859)

22:42 *this cup.* The cup of suffering (Mt 20:22–23; cf. Isa 51:17; Eze 23:33). (CSB)

For Jesus, the cup is the suffering He must bear, full of God's wrath on all people's sin. In His true humanity, He experienced dread at the thought of His impending suffering. (TLSB)

The petition employs the forceful second-person imperative "Take this cup from me" instead of a softer third-person imperative (such as "May this cup pass by me") or optative. The cup here is the cup of suffering and death that is associated with Jesus' ordained destiny in Jerusalem.

> The prophets often refer to God's anger against sin as a "cup" and warn that God will make offenders drink the cup, that is, suffer punishment for their sin, e.g., Is 51:17, 22; Jer 25:15, 17, 28; 49:12; 51:7; Ezek 23:31–33; Hab 2:16; Pss 11:6; 75:8 (MT 75:9); Lam 4:21. Sinless Jesus is to drink the cup of God's wrath against the sin of the whole world. Most commentators see the cup in this way as well, e.g., L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 351; R. Stein, *Luke,* 558; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke,* 831; J. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53,* 1084; J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV,* 1439, 1442. (There are even suggestions of an allusion here to Jesus' baptism in his own blood at 12:50 [i.e., Marshall, Nolland, Fitzmyer].) A smaller number of OT verses speak of a *gracious* "cup" supplied by God: Jer 16:7; Pss 16:5; 23:5; 116:13. (CC p. 859)

The passion is at the center of Jesus' petition. And what Jesus is requesting of the Father is that this appointed cup of destiny be removed. *The whole purpose of Jesus' ministry, and of the Gospel, is at stake in this request.* None of the evangelists indicates Jesus' motives, but it is clear that at the moment when the passion is to start in earnest, Jesus petitions the Father to remove the suffering. Behind this petition lies the same temptation that Satan earlier set before Jesus in the wilderness: that Jesus be "Son of God" without going to the cross (4:1–13). It is a testimony to the fullness of Jesus' incarnation, his having been made "like his brethren in every respect" (Heb 2:17), that he asks his Father to take his destiny—the cross—away from him. Every human naturally—and without sin—may utter the same kind of prayer to avoid suffering. (CC p. 859)

not my will but your be done – Jesus would gladly be spared, should it be the Father's will. Yet, He accepted God's will unconditionally. (TLSB)

Surrounding Jesus' petition are references to the will of the Father. Jesus begins his prayer "if you [the *Father*] are willing" and ends "not my *[Jesus']* will, but may yours [the *Father's*] happen." Jesus subordinates his desire to have the cup taken away to his desire to fulfill the Father's will, and that will of the Father calls for Jesus to drink the cup to the very bottom. (CC p. 860)

It is of the nature of petitionary prayer that the petitioner make a request. Even though God knows all wants before they are even spoken, he invites his children to speak to him about their wishes. But human wishes do not become *prayers* by being addressed to God. It is also of the nature of prayer that it is communication in a relationship of faith, trust that God is the wise and faithful giver of gifts. And so, the will of the Father takes precedence over the will of the Son. (CC p. 860)

From the beginning of the gospel, the Father's will has been expressed in a plan of salvation that has been wrapped in the language of necessity or destiny: Jesus must go the way the Father has ordained for him to accomplish the world's redemption (the divine δεῖ, "it is necessary"). This was first expressed in Jesus' baptism, where the Sonship of Jesus was announced and he embarked on the public fulfillment of the Father's plan. After an extended period of teaching and miracles, Jesus announced, "It is necessary [δεῖ] that I proclaim as Good News the kingdom of God, because for this purpose I was sent" (Lk 4:43). His destiny in Jerusalem was reiterated in the passion predictions (9:22, 44; 18:31) and the travel notices (9:51; 13:22; 17:11; 19:28), as well as crucial passages that highlight this destiny in metaphorical language (12:50; 13:32–33). In his final dialogs with his disciples at the Passover table, he began by announcing that "the Son of Man journeys in accordance with what has been destined" (22:22). (CC p. 860)

The will of the Father is clear, and Jesus shows his disciples that the ultimate purpose of prayer is *not* to change the will of the Father, but to ask that the Father's will be done and to ask for our will to be conformed to the Father's. In earlier teachings about prayer, Jesus suggested that the petitioner might change the will of God, at least in the sense of moving God from inactivity to action (e.g., 11:5–13; 18:1–8; for an OT example, cf. 2 Ki 20:1–6). Here, however, Jesus teaches his disciples about the posture of faith when prayer does *not* result in divine intervention. This teaching complements, rather than contradicts, the earlier instruction. God will surely act to accomplish his will. The question is whether this will happen sooner or later—soon enough to prevent or end the petitioner's suffering or only after the petitioner's suffering and death. Here Jesus' prayer reveals how the faithful subordinate their desire for immediate deliverance to the greater will of God for the salvation of all people. Suffering may be a necessary part of the divine plan to bring salvation to the ends of the earth. (Cf. Is 42:1–4; 49:4–6; 50:4–11; Acts 9:15–16) (CC pp. 860-861)

Jesus comes through this last temptation as the faithful and obedient Son, willing to fulfill the Father's plan. The will of the Father is that the Son must suffer and die. Atonement must be made, and sufficient sacrifice to God can only be offered by God's Son. Martyrdom cannot be avoided. (CC p. 861)

> C. Talbert, *Reading Luke,* 212–18, entitles the section from 22:39 to 23:25 "A Model for Martyrs." Talbert says: "Luke portrays the death of Jesus as a martyrdom, the unjust murder of an innocent man by the established powers due to pressure of the Jewish leaders" (p. 212). I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke,* 828, likewise sees Jesus' death as that of a martyr, particularly in his struggle here with the will of the Father: "As for Jesus himself, it may be fair to say that the real struggle takes place here, rather than later: as martyr, Jesus here faces up to this fate, and, having done so, he is able to go through what lies ahead with comparative equanimity." (CC p. 861)

22:43 *An angel.* Matthew and Mark tell of angels ministering to Jesus at the close of his fasting and temptations (Mt 4:11; Mk 1:13), but Luke does not. Here Luke tells of the strengthening presence of an angel, but the other Gospels do not. (CSB)

An angel came to strengthen Him, that He might complete His mission in accord with His Father's will (cf Dn 10:18–19; Mk 1:13). (TLSB)

ὤφθη δὲ αὐτῷ ἄγγελος … —B. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary,* 177, argues that 22:43–44 was "a later addition" to Luke, but UBS[4] and Nestle Aland[27] place these verses in the text in brackets because of their inclusion in some ancient manuscripts. There is considerable textual evidence for omission (P^{75} ^{1}א A B and 1071*). An argument can be made for their inclusion on the basis of structure and content (see commentary below; cf. also W. Arndt, *Luke,* 448–49, for a defense of authenticity on both manuscript and intrinsic evidence). The commentators are split as to whether these verses belong in the text or not. Those arguing for inclusion include L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 351; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke,* 831–32; J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke,* 55–57; those against include R. Stein, *Luke,* 559; J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV,* 1444; J. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53,* 1080–81.

ἄγγελος—On angels ministering to Jesus, see Mk 1:13. On their assistance, see Mt 26:53. Angels appear to people in Luke's gospel also in 1:11–20, 26–38; 2:9–15; 24:23. Additional references to angels are found in 2:21; 4:10; 9:26; 12:8–9; 15:10; and 16:22. Human messengers are denoted by ἄγγελος in 7:24, 27; 9:52. (CC pp. 854-855)

The angelic ministration to Jesus here parallels the same after his wilderness temptation in Mark's account: "and angels were ministering to him" (Mk 1:13). The strengthening Jesus receives from heaven above accompanies his fervent prayer to the Father, and the dripping of sweat like blood to earth beneath reveals the depth of his agony.

> L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke,* 351–52, 354–55, among others, suggests that Luke uses an athletic metaphor of wrestling here to describe the kind of struggle Jesus engages in with Satan and his Father:
> Luke presents Jesus as the spiritual athlete. He enters the *agon* ["agony, struggle"] of prayer before God, … releasing his deep desire to live and avoid suffering, and accepting what has been determined for him. …
> The angel strengthening Jesus is like a trainer, urging on his 'eager prayer.' The profuse sweat falling to the ground in globules so great they foreshadowed the blood he was to shed tells us that this prayer/wrestling is an anticipation of a still harder victory the next day on the cross (pp. 354–55). (CC p. 862)

Jesus, strengthened by the angel, endures this "bloody" agony and so returns to the disciples as the same victorious Lord who withstood temptation in the wilderness. Jesus, martyr and victim, the new Adam come to do what the old Adam could not do, is now ready for the final conflict that culminates in the cross. In his struggle with his ordained destiny, Jesus has shown himself to be the faithful and obedient Messiah, submitting to the path the Father has determined for him. *From this moment on, Jesus is at peace with his destiny.* For the hearer, there is now no question about Jesus' obedience unto death, even death on a cross. As in the wilderness, so now Jesus shows that he truly is the Son of God. He will be victorious over Satan, even though that victory comes through suffering and a cross. He is both substitute for all the race of Adam and the model for his disciples. (CC pp. 861-862)

22:44 *being in agony* – Intense struggle or anxiety, the only occurrence of this word in the NT. (TLSB)

ἀγωνίᾳ—This is the only occurrence of ἀγωνία in the NT. Jesus' "agony" is a conflict that engages the physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual dimensions of humanity, as is indicated by the intense prayer and the sweat like drops of blood. The verb ἀγωνίζομαι occurs in 13:24, "*struggle* to enter in through the narrow door," suggesting the conflict that goes with repentance. However, Jesus, the sinless Son of God, has no need of repentance. His divine nature grants him foreknowledge of the events about to unfold. On one side of the conflict stand his natural human desire to avoid the physical torture of the scourging and crucifixion and his desire as the beloved Son of God to avoid the spiritual torment of being forsaken by the Father. Those desires conflict with the sinless Son's desire to obey perfectly his Father's will. As the divine Son, he has the ability to elude capture and thwart suffering (cf. 4:29–30; 22:51). But Jesus empties himself by not making use of this divine ability. His determination to carry out his appointed mission takes precedence over his desire to avoid physical and spiritual torment. The conflict is resolved on the side of obedience. (CC p. 855)

more earnestly – ἐκτενέστερον—The neuter comparative of the adjective ἐκτενής is used as an adverb (BAGD s.v. ἐκτενῶς). ἐκτενῶς is used in the LXX to describe prayer in Jonah 3:8; 3 Macc 5:9; cf. Acts 12:5. (CC p. 855)

drops of blood. Probably perspiration in large drops like blood, or possibly hematidrosis, the actual mingling of blood and sweat as in cases of extreme anguish, strain or sensitivity. (CSB)

The inner agony finds physical expression. The phrase may compare the drops of sweat with globules of blood. However, severe stress may cause the blood vessels of the skin to break, mixing the blood with sweat (hematidrosis). (TLSB)

22:45 The impending tragedy brought the disciples to emotional exhaustion. (TLSB)

22:46 *rise and pray* – His final words of instruction are for his weak disciples and for all generations of Christians who struggle with the Father's call to life through death with Christ: "Keep praying in order that you may not come into temptation" (22:46). All who are baptized into Christ are baptized into his death, in order that they may also share in his resurrection (Rom 6:1–11; see the excursus "Baptism in Luke-Acts"). The only path to resurrection life is through the cross. So each follower of Christ must pray earnestly not to fall prey to the temptation to despise the cross and the way of suffering, for only by remaining in that way does the baptized believer remain a follower of Jesus (Lk 9:23–27, 57–62). (CC p. 862)

Jesus again admonishes His disciples to pray, now that He is strengthened and prepared to do His Father's will. (TLSB)

22:39–46 While the disciples sleep, Jesus, in prayerful agony, shrinks from His coming ordeal and yet submits to His Father's will. Without focus on Jesus and His agony in the garden, we easily succumb to temptation. Yet, He comes to us, again and again, to strengthen us against temptation. • "Go to dark Gethsemane, All who feel the tempter's pow'r; Your Redeemer's conflict see, Watch with Him one bitter hour; Turn not from His griefs away; Learn from Jesus Christ to pray." Amen. (*LSB* 436:1) (TLSB)

Betrayal and Arrest of Jesus

47 While he was still speaking, there came a crowd, and the man called Judas, one of the twelve, was leading them. He drew near to Jesus to kiss him, 48 but Jesus said to him, "Judas, would you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" 49 And when those who were around him saw what would follow, they said, "Lord, shall we strike with the sword?" 50 And one of them struck the servant of the high priest and cut off his right ear. 51 But Jesus said, "No more of this!" And he touched his ear and healed him. 52 Then Jesus said to the chief priests and officers of the temple and elders, who had come out against him, "Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs? 53 When I was with you day after day in the temple, you did not lay hands on me. But this is your hour, and the power of darkness."

22:47 *While he was still speaking*. Ties in closely with the preceding. (TLSB)

leading. Judas knew exactly where to go. (TLSB)

there came a crowd. They were sent by the chief priests, elders (Mt 26:47) and teachers of the law (Mk 14:43), and they carried swords and clubs. Included was a detachment of soldiers with officials of the Jews (v. 52; Jn 18:3). (CSB)

Once again, the evangelist supplies in his opening framework the information the hearer needs to understand the story. The hearer already knows that it is Friday, the Day of Preparation (when the Passover is eaten), and that the place is the Mount of Olives. The previous scene is abruptly interrupted. Luke tells us that "while he [Jesus] was still speaking, behold a crowd," that is, as he was speaking to his disciples on the Mount of Olives about the need to pray in view of the coming temptations, a crowd of people suddenly appeared. The hearer has been accustomed to think of the crowd as consisting of those who are favorable to Jesus' teaching, but this crowd is composed of chief priests, captains of the temple guard (attendants to the chief priests), and elders. Included are two of the three groups that make up the Sanhedrin; only the Pharisaic scribes are not mentioned.

> Why the scribes are not said to have taken part in Jesus' arrest is a mystery, especially since they were involved in the plot (22:2) and the trial of Jesus by the Sanhedrin (22:66). (CC p. 865)

to kiss him. This signal had been prearranged to identify Jesus to the authorities (Mt 26:48). It was unnecessary because Jesus identified himself (Jn 18:5), but Judas acted out his plan anyway. (CSB)

Frequently used in greeting, particularly from disciple to teacher. (TLSB)

φιλῆσαι—"Kiss," "as a special indication of love" (BAGD s.v. φιλέω, 2). This is an infinitive of purpose. See Lk 7:38; 1 Ki 19:18; and Ps 2:12 for a kiss as an act of worship and Lk 15:20 for a kiss as a sign of deep love. A kiss was a common expression of love in the early church. (Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Thess 5:26; 1 Pet 5:14) (CC p. 863)

But there is one more person to introduce: Judas the betrayer. The hearer already knows that Judas is one of the Twelve (22:3), but the evangelist repeats that here to accent that one of Jesus' most intimate associates betrays him. This heightens the scandal and humiliation of this betrayal. But even more importantly, the hearer knows that Satan is present in the person of Judas (22:3). As Judas and his crowd confront Jesus and his disciples, the cosmic battle between God and Satan is joined. Luke uses the same Greek word as for the approach of the kingdom/eschaton to

describe Judas' entrance: he "*drew near* [ἤγγισεν] to Jesus in order to kiss him." A kiss is a sign of familial belonging, of respect, obedience, communion, love. To betray with a kiss is the deepest of ironies. There is no love here, for this deed is done by children of Adam under *Satan's* power. Thus Jesus' word at the end of the passage, while addressed to the arresting mob (ὑμῶν, "you," is plural), ends with a reference to *Satan:* "this is your hour and *the power of darkness*" (22:53). Under the perspective of that spiritual encounter, Jesus has three different exchanges: first with Judas, then with his disciples, and finally with those who arrest him. In each scene, the hearer learns something more about Jesus as he faces betrayal and arrest and how what is happening is a fulfillment of Jesus' own prophecies. (CC p. 865)

22:48 *with a kiss* – An expression of affection used to betray—the ultimate hypocrisy! (TLSB)

Jesus had predicted that one of the Twelve would betray him (22:21–23), and now that prophecy is coming true. Jesus is in complete control of the scene. Luke focuses on the words and actions of Jesus. Unlike Matthew (26:49) and Mark (14:45), Luke does not record Judas' words or the actual kiss. Judas merely appears at the front of the crowd that wants to arrest Jesus. In that way Luke hints that the confrontation ultimately is not between Jesus and Judas, but between Jesus and Satan. By the will of the Father, which Jesus has accepted, the power of darkness will have its hour. Jesus, whose face was set toward Jerusalem from the beginning of the travel narrative (Lk 9:51), remains calm and serene in the face of "what was going to be" (22:49). (CC p. 865)

The words of Jesus focus on *betrayal* and the hypocritical gesture of love: "Judas, with a kiss do you betray the Son of Man?" (22:48). Jesus' question emphasizes what Luke has already suggested—the supreme irony that an expression of love should be used to betray the Son of Man to death. In the ancient world, a kiss was a common greeting between those who shared fellowship and intimacy.

> E.g., Gen 27:26–27; 33:4; 45:15; Ex 18:7; 1 Sam 20:41. Cf. Lk 7:38, 45; 15:20. See also G. Stählin, φιλέω κτλ., *TDNT* 9:118–27, 138–46. Paul and Peter end some of their letters exhorting Christians to greet one another with a "holy kiss" to express mutual love in Christ (cf. Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12; 1 Thess 5:26; 1 Pet 5:14). Jesus had sent his seventy (-two) disciples out on the catechetical road to preach the kingdom and heal and to give the greeting of peace (Lk 10:5). In liturgies of the early church, the "kiss of peace" brought the liturgy of the catechumens to an end as a sign of reconciliation between the baptized before they received the eternal flesh of the Son of God in the Eucharist. (CC p. 866)

But this kiss is one of betrayal, the ultimate hypocrisy (cf. 12:1). It can rightly be called "the kiss of death," for it not only leads to Jesus' death but also is a sign of the death of the one who places the kiss. ("Woe to that man through whom he is betrayed" [22:22].) Jesus accepts this act of betrayal without a struggle, with the divine composure of the Son who has chosen to faithfully take the course set before him by the Father. (CC pp. 865-866)

22:49 *around him* – τὸ ἐσόμενον—The force of the future participle must be expressed in English in relationship to the verb that rules it (ἰδόντες). (CC p. 863)

strike with swords – Likely asked by one who carried a sword (cf v 38). They were falling into the temptation of avoiding the Father's will. (TLSB)

A dialog now ensues between Jesus and "those about him" (22:49). Surely these are the eleven disciples. (At some previous point Judas must have removed himself to join the arresting crowd;

see comments on 22:21–23.) The Eleven have followed Jesus from the Passover banquet to the Mount of Olives and were near him as he prayed. These are Jesus' supporters who remain with him in his trials (see comments on 22:28). But their question and their actions show that they are falling into temptation: "Lord, shall we strike with a sword?" (22:49). Their will is to resist and avoid the will of the Father. In this trial, the disciples fail miserably; they are overcome by the power of darkness. Jesus' prediction comes true: two swords are enough to condemn the disciples as transgressors who misunderstand the Father's plan and fall into temptation (22:38). One of the disciples (the impetuous Simon Peter according to Jn 18:10) cuts off the right ear of the slave of the high priest. The violence that will mark this day begins as Jesus' supporters attempt to defend him against his enemies. The hearer of the gospel cannot help but see the folly of Jesus' supporters, who serve Satan and not their Lord as they attempt to thwart Jesus' destiny. (CC p. 866)

22:50 *one of them struck.* Without waiting for an answer. (TLSB)

the servant of the high priest. Malchus by name; Simon Peter struck the blow (Jn 18:10). (CSB)

A trusted member of the high priest's household. (TLSB)

cutting off his right ear – τὸ οὖς αὐτοῦ τὸ δεξιόν—"His ear, the right one" accents the fact that only Luke among the synoptic gospels reports which ear was cut off (cf. Jn 18:10). (Luke is also the only synoptic gospel to record that it was the "right" hand of a man that was withered and that Jesus healed on the Sabbath [Lk 6:6].) I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke,* 837, speculates that Luke includes this as "a historical detail of interest to a doctor." (CC p. 863)

22:51 *no more* – Jesus forbade further resistance. (TLSB)

ἐᾶτε ἕως τούτου—This difficult phrase could mean "stop! No more of this" (BAGD)s.v. ἐάω, 2), referring to the disciple's act of violence, or perhaps "Leave it alone at this point" or "Let even this go," referring to the mob's intent to seize Jesus. (CC p. 863)

Jesus' answer is curt: "Let it be at this point" (Lk 22:51). Despite attempts to soften Jesus' words or even understand them as a commendation of the disciples' efforts, Jesus is chastising his disciples: "Stop! Enough!" Violence is not the way to fight evil, and at this time God will permit a (temporary) victory by Satan. The bloody, earless slave represents the kind of kingdom the confused disciples would have brought if Jesus had permitted them to continue their ignorant endeavors. The pathetic scene captures the depth of the disciples' failure to understand the nature of Jesus' messianic mission. The passion of Jesus is where God's eschatological wrath will be poured out—on him. Even John the Baptist had to struggle to understand that (see 7:18–35). (CC p. 866)

TOUCHED – ἁψάμενος—See comments at 5:13, where Jesus touches an unclean leper and he is cleansed (cf. also 7:14; 8:43–47). Only Luke records the touching of the slave's ear and the healing. (CC p. 864)

healed him. Jesus rectified the wrong done by his follower. No faith on the part of Malchus was involved, but to allow such action would have been contrary to the teaching of Jesus. (CSB)

Jesus manifested His compassion and power even here. (TLSB)

That mercy and compassion are the essence of Jesus' ministry comes through in Luke's simple report that "having touched the ear, he [Jesus] healed him" (22:51). Only Luke records the healing of the slave's ear. Jesus' action here is consistent with the portrait of Jesus earlier throughout the gospel: the Creator come to his creation as a man to bring about a new creation. From the beginning, Jesus came to release all creation from the bondage of its fallenness (see comments on 4:18–19), and now, at the moment of arrest and the coming of the power of darkness, Jesus again shows compassion, even on his enemies. The preaching of the Gospel by Jesus and his disciples always included demonstrations of that Good News in healing those who were held in bondage by sickness, sin, or Satan. At this moment, Jesus fulfills his own exhortations to his catechumens in the Sermon on the Plain: "Love your enemies, do good to those who hate you" (6:27; cf. 6:35). Jesus is in such complete control of the situation that he takes one last opportunity to teach his disciples through his own actions on how to "become merciful, just as [their] Father is merciful" (6:36). Jesus heals also the wounds inflicted by his foolish and misguided disciples. (CC p. 867)

22:52 *out as against a robber* – Some Roman soldiers were also present (Jn 18:3). (TLSB)

ὡς ἐπὶ λῃστήν—The Greek word order places this at the beginning of the sentence for emphasis. (CC p. 864)

Luke mentions Jesus' arrest in passing: having arrested him, they next led him to the house of the high priest (22:54). Luke records Jesus' words to the mob composed of chief priests, their temple guards, and lay elders: "As against a robber did you come out, with swords and clubs? Daily when I was with you in the temple, you did not stretch out your hands against me" (22:52–53). By treating Jesus as a robber, they place him in a category in which they themselves belong.

> The real thieves are the chief priests who allowed the temple to become a place for bandits. L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, 353, suggests that Jesus shows a sense of humor in his words: "There is some humor in Jesus' observation, since there is obvious overkill involved in their coming out with clubs and swords against a teacher. It also makes them look undignified in contrast to the philosophical calm of Jesus." The word for "robber" or "bandit" (λῃστής) is used three other times in Luke, twice in the parable of the Good Samaritan (10:30, 36) and at the cleansing of the temple where Jesus describes the temple as "a cave of robbers" (19:46). (CC p. 867)

The hearer knows how carefully the evangelist has recorded Jesus' teaching in the temple and the reason why the religious authorities did not arrest him in the temple: the people were transfixed by Jesus' teaching (19:48; 21:38), and so the authorities were afraid of them (20:19; 22:2)! But on the Mount of Olives and under the cloak of darkness, Jesus' enemies are able to avoid the people's wrath and arrest Jesus. (CC p. 867)

22:53 *this is your hour*. It was the time appointed for Jesus' enemies to apprehend him, the time when the forces of darkness (the powers of evil) would do their worst to defeat God's plan. (CSB)

Satan's hour, when his power is evident. This darkness would be broken with the resurrection. (TLSB)

Jesus' betrayal opens with the appearance of Judas, into whom Satan has entered. It closes with Jesus' summation that those who have come to arrest him are simply envoys of Satan: "this is your [Satan's] hour and the power [ἐξουσία] of darkness" (22:53). The hearer will recall that the

scribes sent spies to deliver (παραδοῶναι) Jesus over to the authority (ἐξουσίᾳ) of the governor (20:20). The fulfillment of those desires is now taking place—and more. Darkness will come over all the earth for three hours before the death of Jesus (23:44). The eschatological hour has arrived with its cosmic battle between the forces of darkness and Jesus, the source of light (cf. Lk 2:32; 8:16; 11:33–36; 12:3; 16:8). The passion of Jesus, which began with the Last Supper, intensifies as Jesus is led to a series of four trials. It is night (cf. Jn 13:30), the hour given to the prince of darkness. (CC pp. 867-868)

not lay a hands on me – οὐκ ἐξετείνατε τὰς χεῖρας—"To stretch out the hands" is to raise them up against (ἐπί) someone in order to cause them harm. The Greek phrase is the usual LXX translation of the common Hebrew phrase נָטָה יָד. (CC p. 864)

22:47–53 Judas betrays Jesus with a kiss, and Jesus, in mercy, heals the servant's severed ear. The conflict between Jesus and the forces of darkness escalates. This darkness still would surround us. Yet, God used the night of betrayal to overcome the darkness and usher in His everlasting light. • May Your light, O Christ, disperse the night of Satan, that we remain faithful to You. Amen. (TLSB)

Peter Denies Jesus

54 Then they seized him and led him away, bringing him into the high priest's house, and Peter was following at a distance. 55 And when they had kindled a fire in the middle of the courtyard and sat down together, Peter sat down among them. 56 Then a servant girl, seeing him as he sat in the light and looking closely at him, said, "This man also was with him." 57 But he denied it, saying, "Woman, I do not know him." 58 And a little later someone else saw him and said, "You also are one of them." But Peter said, "Man, I am not." 59 And after an interval of about an hour still another insisted, saying, "Certainly this man also was with him, for he too is a Galilean." 60 But Peter said, "Man, I do not know what you are talking about." And immediately, while he was still speaking, the rooster crowed. 61 And the Lord turned and looked at Peter. And Peter remembered the saying of the Lord, how he had said to him, "Before the rooster crows today, you will deny me three times." 62 And he went out and wept bitterly.

22:54 *seized him* – συλλαβόντες δὲ αὐτόν—While earlier in Luke συλλαμβάνω means "conceive" (1:24, 31, 36; 2:21), "help" (5:7), or "catch" (5:9), here and in later Lukan contexts it has the legal meaning "arrest" (Acts 1:16; 12:3; 23:27; 26:21). Cf. BAGD 1 a α and 2 a; "seize" (RSV, NIV) ignores the legal context of the trials. Jesus is arrested and will be charged with crimes. (CC p. 869)

high priest's house house. A large residence where the Jewish Council interrogated Jesus during the night. (TLSB)

εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως—Matthew tells us that the high priest was Caiaphas (Mt 26:57). John records that Jesus first was brought to Annas, who was the father-in-law of Caiaphas, the high priest (Jn 18:13), and then Jesus was brought to Caiaphas (Jn 18:24). (CC p. 869)

The participants in this episode now include the arresting party from the previous scene (chief priests, soldiers, and elders), Jesus, the high priest, Peter, and some unnamed people sitting around a fire. The *place* of denial is the courtyard of the high priest's house, a space for those about to enter the house or those waiting for someone to come out. (See figure 8 for the general location of Caiaphas' house in south Jerusalem.) Peter stopped outside the house and joined some

persons who were gathered around a fire and who apparently were waiting for further orders or for the drama to unfold. Jesus had been taken into the house but was visible to Peter at the time of his third denial.

> Perhaps Jesus was on a balcony, perhaps the doors were open, or perhaps Jesus was at that moment being led into or through the courtyard. See W. Arndt, *Luke,* 452. (CC p. 872)

Jesus may have heard Peter's denials, but on numerous other occasions, Jesus shows his divine ability to discern inaudible thoughts, (Lk 2:35; 5:22; 6:8; 9:46–47; 24:38) so Jesus' knowledge of Peter's words could be due to Jesus' divine omniscience. The *time* for this scene is the predawn night. Peter and Jesus were in the vicinity of this courtyard for over an hour (22:58–59). (CC p. 872)

This is the final scene before Jesus is beaten and sent to trial. He has *allowed* himself to be arrested. He is in control of his destiny: the cross, where he will drink the cup according to his Father's will (22:42). But all those around Jesus, even Peter, are in the grip of "the power of darkness" (22:53). Peter follows Jesus only from a distance. John (18:15–16) records that another disciple (John?) followed too, but Luke mentions only Peter. The Lukan introduction ends with Peter selecting a seat "in the middle of them" (22:55). After choosing the company of Jesus' opponents, Peter will deny Jesus three times. (CC p. 872)

following at a distance – As with his distance from Jesus in Gethsemane, Peter remained close enough to observe, yet distant enough to be safe. (TLSB)

ἠκολούθει μακρόθεν—This is the usual verb for a disciple following Jesus. It occurs seventeen times in Luke, and except for 22:10, always refers to following *Jesus.* But here μακρόθεν suggests a reluctant disciple who is distancing himself from his leader. He is becoming more like those who hesitate to follow Jesus (9:57–62; 18:22–23). In contrast, when first called to follow, Peter and other disciples acted decisively and without hesitation (5:11, 27–28; 18:28). (CC p. 869)

22:55 *they*. Some servants gathered to learn of the interrogation. (TLSB)

22:56 *servant girl* – She kept watch at the gate to the courtyard (cf Jn 18:16–17) and was certain that Peter had been with Jesus. (TLSB)

περιαψάντων—Contrast the light given by Jesus (Lk 2:32; 8:16; 11:33–36; 12:3; 16:8) with the light that those in darkness kindle for themselves (cf. Is 50:11). Peter selects a seat in the middle of them; contrast Ps 1:1. (CC p. 869)

Each moment of denial is similar to the other two, but each one is different. The first challenge is from a female slave, but the second and third are from men.

> Mark (14:69–70) continues with the same woman making the second accusation, while Matthew (26:71–72) refers to another woman making the second accusation, and John (18:25) simply says, "They said to him …" Matthew (26:73) and Mark (14:70) refer to bystanders (plural) questioning Peter the third time, while Luke (22:59) and John (18:26) attribute the third challenge to a single man. However, it is not difficult to reconcile these different gospel accounts. First, all agree that a female slave prompted the first denial. Second, Mk 14:69 says that the female slave then told bystanders about Peter's identity,

> prompting his second denial, and it is possible that among the bystanders who became engaged in the dialog with Peter were "another woman" (Mt 26:71) and "another man" (Lk 22:58). With Peter now the subject of the group's discussion, Matthew (26:73) and Mark (14:70) can attribute the third challenge to "bystanders" (plural), while Luke (22:59) and John (18:26) single out one of those speakers (a man) as the one who precipitated Peter's third denial. J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1460, comments: "The Lucan form of the story has made the accusation of Peter even more official than the Marcan, by showing Peter challenged not only by a servant-girl, whose testimony might be questioned, but even by … two male witnesses (recall Deut 19:15 …)." Whether or not Fitzmyer accurately identifies Luke's motivation, Luke and each of the other evangelists leave no doubt that at least three witnesses were involved. (CC pp. 872-873)

In each instance, Peter uses the vocative address: γύναι, "woman" (22:57), or ἄνθρωπε, "man" (22:58, 60). (CC p. 872)

The first denial (22:56–57) comes after a female slave is able to study Peter's features in the light of the fire. Her careful observation (ἀτενίσασα) prompts her question and Peter's denial. This visual contact and its result are both balanced and contrasted with Jesus' purposeful gaze upon Peter (ἐνέβλεψεν) at the end of the passage (22:61), which leads to Peter's remorse (22:62). The question she puts to Peter accuses him of being "with" Jesus: "Also this man was with him" (σὺν αὐτῷ; 22:56). Similar is the third accusation: Peter was "with him" (μετ' αὐτοῦ; 22:59). However, the second charge has the added nuance of linking Peter with the other disciples as well as with Jesus: Peter is "one of them" (ἐξ αὐτῶν; 22:58), i.e., one of the disciples. Therefore Peter denies his association both with Jesus and with his fellow disciples—fellow brothers of Jesus (8:19–21). (CC p. 873)

in the light – πρὸς τὸ φῶς—Luke adds this detail, which helps explain why this woman was able to identify Peter. She could study his features in the man-made light. (CC p. 870)

22:57 *denied* – ἠρνήσατο—The verb lacks an object, so it is unclear whether Peter denied that he had been with Jesus (22:56), denied that he knew Jesus (22:57), or denied Jesus in a broad or general sense. But in any case, Peter repudiated Jesus. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 842, notes: "ἀρνέομαι can mean 'to refuse to recognize' or 'to abandon, deny solidarity with' ([E. E.] Ellis, [*The Gospel of Luke*,] 260); the former meaning is primary, but the ambiguity allows the term to be applied to cases of apostasy in the church." This word has occurred in two crucial passages. A disciple must deny himself and take up his cross in order to follow (ἀκολουθείτω) Jesus (9:23). Even more important is 12:9: "But the one who denies [ἀρνησάμενος] me before men will be denied before the angels of God." (CC p. 870)

The actual wording of each of Peter's three denials is distinct. To the woman who accuses him of being "with" Jesus, he denies (in an absolute sense; see textual note on 22:57) and says that he does not know Jesus. Is there a difference between denying that he was with Jesus (22:56), denying that he knew Jesus (22:57), and making an absolute, blanket denial? Different nuances are involved, but regardless of the precise force of 22:57, it is the opposite of confessing that Jesus is "the Christ of God" (9:20). To the man who charges that Peter was "one of" the disciples, Peter states plainly, "I am not" (22:58). Here Peter flatly denies that he is a disciple of Jesus and thereby Peter denies his bond with his fellow disciples through his Lord. The hearer notes the irony in Luke's depiction of this scene, as Peter *follows* Jesus (the language of discipleship; see textual note on 22:54) from afar and then denies that he is a disciple, or follower. Finally, to the man who charges Peter of being "with" Jesus because he is a Galilean, Peter retorts, "Man, I do not know what you are saying" (22:60). This response is similar to the first one, the one given the

woman, but this time Peter professes complete ignorance of what is being said about his relationship to Jesus rather than just unfamiliarity with Jesus himself. This third denial is also the broadest because Peter denies even being from the same region—Galilee—as Jesus. Peter does not admit to even being a neighbor or fellow countryman of Jesus. (CC pp. 873-874)

I do not know Him. Peter panics and refuses to acknowledge Jesus, thus fulfilling Jesus' prophecy (v 34). (TLSB)

The sequence then is this: first an absolute denial and a claim not to know Jesus, then the denial of being one of Jesus' disciples, then finally a broad denial that he has any knowledge at all about any kind of relationship to Jesus. There can be no mistaking that Peter "denied" Jesus (ἠρνήσατο; 22:57), and thus Peter comes under Jesus' own condemnation: "But the one who *denies* [ἀρνησάμενος] me before men *will be denied* [ἀπαρνηθήσεται] before the angels of God" (12:9). (CC p. 875)

22:58 Peter says, in essence, I don't know Him, and you don't know me. (TLSB)

you – σύ—In Greek, the pronoun is unnecessary, but here it is included and placed at the beginning for emphasis. (CC p. 870)

22:59 A third person insists, probably tipped off by Peter's distinctive Galilean accent (Mt 26:73). (TLSB)

about an hour later – καὶ διαστάσης ὡσεὶ ὥρας μιᾶς—Luke carefully chronicles the passing of time. See comments at 22:1, 7, 14. This reference helps the hearer recognize the time that elapses between the arrest and the cock crow. The "hour" of Jesus' enemies (22:53) is also the time when Jesus is denied. (CC p. 870)

he too is a Galilean. Recognized by his speech (Mt 26:73) and identified by a relative of Malchus, the high priest's slave (Jn 18:26). (CSB)

καὶ γάρ—Peter's place of origin is another factor in identifying him with Jesus and the Twelve. Matthew explains that Peter's accent (Mt 26:73) identified him as a follower of "Jesus of Galilee" (Mt 26:69). (CC p. 870)

The sequence then is this: first an absolute denial and a claim not to know Jesus, then the denial of being one of Jesus' disciples, then finally a broad denial that he has any knowledge at all about any kind of relationship to Jesus. There can be no mistaking that Peter "denied" Jesus (ἠρνήσατο; 22:57), and thus Peter comes under Jesus' own condemnation: "But the one who *denies* [ἀρνησάμενος] me before men *will be denied* [ἀπαρνηθήσεται] before the angels of God" (12:9). (CC p. 875)

22:60 *speaking...rooster crowed* – καὶ παραχρῆμα ἔτι λαλοῦντος αὐτοῦ ἐφώνησεν ἀλέκτωρ—Luke's phrasing emphasizes that while Peter was denying that he knew Jesus *for the third time,* the cock crowed. The participle of attendant circumstance (λαλοῦντος) indicates action simultaneous to the action of the main verb. (CC p. 870)

This segment is marked by the crowing of the cock, which is mentioned twice: first, the actual event itself (22:60b) and in Jesus' prophecy, which Peter recalls (22:61). Jesus' words at the Last Supper are being fulfilled. Moreover, their fulfillment is not at all dependent on the cooperation

of the disciples. Jesus' words come true despite the disciples' unfaithfulness and even in Peter's very denial of him. But Jesus himself remains ever faithful and his words are true. (CC p. 876)

Satan is sifting the disciples like wheat, as Jesus had prophesied at the conclusion of the Last Supper (22:31). First came the disciples' sorrowful slumber and violent response to Jesus' arrest (22:45, 49–50). Now Peter, who had boldly declared his readiness to face prison or even death (22:33), has fulfilled Jesus' prophecy of threefold denial (22:34). Within *hours* ("today," σήμερον; 22:61) Peter has failed the test. He is not ready to face any consequences for his association with Jesus; in fact, he is so fearful that he will not even acknowledge that he knows Jesus or is one of his disciples. (CC p. 876)

22:61 *The Lord … looked at Peter.* Peter was outside in the enclosed courtyard, and perhaps Jesus was being taken from the trial by Caiaphas to the Sanhedrin when Jesus caught Peter's eye. (CSB)

Jesus was near, perhaps being led from the high priest to some place of detention. (TLSB)

ὁ κύριος—On Luke's use of "Lord" for Jesus. (CC p. 870)

ἐνέβλεψεν—This verb implies a purposeful look of nonverbal communication, not just a casual glance. (CC p. 870)

Only Luke records the look of Jesus, which reminds Peter of Jesus' teaching at the table.

> I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke,* 839, sees in this meeting of the eyes the cosmic struggle between God and Satan: "The scene reaches its climax in the confrontation of the denier by the One who has been denied. Thus the roles of Satan as accuser and Jesus as defender of Peter (22:31f.) are depicted in the actual narrative." (CC p. 876)

Jesus' look is a call to repentance. Yet the fact that Jesus visually searches out and finds Peter recalls the "lost and found" Gospel theme in Luke (e.g., Luke 15). Therefore the look also holds the promise of an absolution, which will reach fulfillment when the risen Christ visually appears to Simon (Lk 24:34; cf. Mt 28:10). Jesus had promised to pray for Peter (Lk 22:32). And Peter, when his eyes meet those of Jesus, does what all catechumens must do: he remembers the word of the Lord; he remembers what Jesus had promised. And the hearer of the gospel too knows that the dominical Word is true and efficacious, calling sinners to repentance and also absolving them. The Word accomplishes conversion and catechesis. And the whole purpose of Luke's gospel is captured in this marvelous scene (see comments at 1:1–4). Only after repentant Peter is absolved and restored will he be able to fulfill the second part of Jesus' prophetic instructions: he will turn and strengthen his brother disciples (22:32). Peter, the repentant sinner forgiven by the risen Christ, will assume a role of leadership in reminding the brethren of all Jesus said and did. (CC p. 876)

> *Peter remembered.* The words spoken by Jesus (v. 34). (CSB)

ὑπεμνήσθη—This compound verb occurs only here in Luke, but it is part of Luke's theme of prophecy and fulfillment. God remembers his promises and brings them to pass, (Lk 1:54, 72; cf. 23:42) and people are called to remember God's promises and their fulfillment in Jesus. (Lk 22:19; 24:6, 8; cf. 16:25; 17:32)

before the rooster – τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου—Peter will also "remember" (ἐμνήσθην) "the word of the Lord" (τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου) when he recalls that Jesus said "John baptized with water, but you shall be baptized with the Holy Spirit" (Acts 11:16). Lk 22:61 and Acts 11:16 are the only two verses in the Lukan corpus where "the word of the Lord" is remembered. (CC p. 870)

22:62 *went out and wept bitterly* – Jesus had prayed about this moment (v 32). Peter's tears of contrition signal his spiritual recovery. (TLSB)

καὶ ἐξελθὼν ἔξω ἔκλαυσεν πικρῶς—Some manuscripts omit this verse, but the majority of scholars accept it as part of Luke's text. This is one of the few places where Luke agrees with Matthew (26:75) against Mark (14:72). (CC p. 870)

Peter's bitter tears are an expression of his heartfelt sorrow that he has so quickly rejected his Lord. The tears may well show that Peter also realizes that Jesus' words about Jesus' own rejection and death would soon be fulfilled, just as his prediction of betrayal and denial had now come to pass. Remembrance of the Word begins the process of repentance. Bitter tears of contrition precede restoration to faith. Peter's restoration begins here (see comments at 22:31–34). The captive Lord leads Peter to repentance without supplying additional words, for Peter has already heard "the word of the Lord" (τοῦ ῥήματος τοῦ κυρίου; 22:61). (CC pp. 876-877)

22:54–62 During Jesus' interrogation, Peter denies Jesus three times. But Jesus' word and look bring Peter to tears and to repentance. Self-preservation is never justification for denying our Lord and His tie with us. Jesus ever looks at us in love to call us to repentance, forgiving our sins. • Lord, look on me this hour with Your forgiving love. Amen. (TLSB)

Jesus is Mocked

63 Now the men who were holding Jesus in custody were mocking him as they beat him. 64 They also blindfolded him and kept asking him, "Prophesy! Who is it that struck you?" 65 And they said many other things against him, blaspheming him.

Ongoing abuse, administered by the temple officers and high council's servants. This, along with the behavior of Herod and his soldiers (23:11) and of the soldiers at the cross (23:36), fulfills Jesus' prophecy of His Passion (18:32–33). (TLSB)

As Luke has done throughout the passion narrative, he shapes his report of these events to highlight certain aspects of history for the hearer.

> R. Stein, *Luke*, 567, n. 67, best summarizes the differences between Luke and the other synoptic gospels:
> In his abbreviated account Luke omitted: the summoning of witnesses (Mark 14:55–60); Jesus' saying about the destruction of the temple, which appears later in Acts 6:14 (Mark 14:57–58); Jesus' silence (Mark 14:61a); the ceremonial tearing of the high priest's garment as an act of condemnation (14:63); Jesus' being condemned for blasphemy (14:64a); the official verdict (14:64 b, c); and the second meeting of the Sanhedrin (15:1a). (CC p. 882)

Before the evangelist turns to the four trials of Jesus, he records the mocking and beating of Jesus. Luke is telling us something by placing this scene of humiliation as the preface to the trials. The behavior of the soldiers calls into question the integrity of the Sanhedrin's trial and so should

be rightly seen as a preface to the Jewish council's activity. The imperfect verbs intimate that the abuse of Jesus has been going on since the arrest. But Luke reports it in this transitional passage to signal to the hearer that a shift has taken place in the narrative. No longer is the testing (and failure) of the disciples in view. Now Jesus—and only Jesus—is the focus of the narrative. (CC pp. 882-883)

22:63 *him* – αὐτὸν … αὐτῷ—Although Peter is the last person mentioned (weeping bitterly in 22:62), the hearer of the gospel knows that it is Jesus, not Peter, who is being held, mocked, and beaten. In the Emmaus account αὐτός will function as a designation for Jesus; see comments at 24:13–35. (CC p. 878)

22:63-64 *mocking...beat...kept asking* – ἐνέπαιζον … δέροντες … ἐπηρώτων—The two imperfects and the present participle (δέροντες) refer to repeated action: they kept on asking Jesus while they kept on mocking and beating him. These actions probably have been going on intermittently since Jesus' arrest, also during the time of Peter's denials (cf. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, 846). Jesus predicted this abuse in 18:32 with ἐμπαίζω (used also here in 22:63) and two other synonyms. (CC p. 878)

The trials of Jesus begin with a signal to the hearer that the Sanhedrin has already reached its own verdict. Since Jesus is mocked and beaten, the Jewish religious establishment must consider Jesus to be guilty. In the Lukan narrative "the men who were holding him" (22:63) are part of the same group that arrested Jesus (22:54), i.e., "the chief priests and captains of the temple and elders" (22:52). The armed men who actually carried out the arrest, and who also detained and beat Jesus, would be the "captains of the temple," but they are agents of the chief priests and elders, who supervise and thereby condone the entire episode. But the focus here is on Jesus. (CC p. 883)

Jesus himself had predicted this mocking in the final passion prediction (18:32). The beating inflicted upon him was also foreshadowed in the treatment of the first worker in the parable of the workers in the vineyard (20:10), and there the violence culminated in the death of the son (20:15). In fact, the rejection of Jesus has been a consistent Lukan theme from the start (e.g., 2:34–35) and a consistent element in Jesus' teaching ever since his discourse on John the Baptist, the forerunner of the Christ, about whom Luke comments: "But the Pharisees and the lawyers rejected the plan of God for themselves, not being baptized by him" (7:30). (CC p. 883)

22:64 *prophesy* – Jesus had been often recognized as a prophet (7:16; 9:8, 19; 13:33; 24:19). (TLSB)

προφήτευσον— This verb implies that Jesus' opponents considered him to be guilty of (falsely) claiming to be a prophet. The messianic title to which this alludes, "the Prophet," would be the first of five titles in this pericope. Four explicit titles occur in 22:67, 69–70. See the textual notes and commentary below. (CC p. 878)

The blindfolding of Jesus to see if he can "prophesy" who is hitting him is ironic, for the hearer knows that Jesus has already prophesied the temptations and failings of the disciples, as well as his own mocking, beating, and humiliation. Jesus' ability to discern and reveal the thoughts of others is a recurring theme in Luke. (Lk 2:35; 5:22; 6:8; 9:46–47; 11:17; 24:38) Throughout the gospel, Jesus claims and accepts the title "Prophet". (Lk 4:24; 7:16, 39; 9:8, 19; 13:33; 24:19) He is the prophet like Moses promised in Deut 18:15–20. (CC p. 883)

Thus, to ask Jesus to "prophesy" about his own torturers is the height of the mocking. This shows the depravity of his accusers, and the depths of humiliation he willingly endured. But there is

more: his mockers continued to heap on Jesus words that were blasphemous. By saying they were "blaspheming" (22:65), Luke is preparing his audience to hear the following charges in the same ironic way. Jesus *is* "the Christ" (22:67) and "the Son of God" (22:70), just as he is the Prophet, so the explicit repudiation of Jesus' claim to those titles by the Sanhedrin in 22:66–71 will also constitute blasphemy. The words spoken against him are blasphemous since they are against the Father's anointed Son (see comments at 3:21–22). The rejection of Jesus as God's final, eschatological prophet is now coming to completion (Cf. Lk 4:22–30; 6:22–23; 9:22, 44; 11:47–54; 13:31–35; 18:31–34; 20:9–19) as Jesus himself had predicted (9:22; 17:25; 18:32–33; cf. 24:25–27, 44–49). (CC pp. 883-884)

22:65 *said many other things against him* – βλασφημοῶντες—This verb sometimes denotes slanderous or insulting speech of one human against another, thus the RSV "reviling him." But in the NT and the LXX it usually has the technical meaning of religious blasphemy. Here it is Jesus, the Christ, the Son of God, who is being insulted, and it is because of his claim to divinity that he is being abused. J. Nolland, *Luke 18:35–24:53*, 1100, asks suggestively: "Is the behavior of the guards merely insulting, or does Luke from his Christian perspective consider their words to be in fact blasphemous?" This pericope contains four divine titles for Jesus: "the Christ" (22:67); "the Son of Man" (22:69); "the Son of God" (22:70); and "I AM" (22:70). Jesus' divinity is a prominent issue here. (βλασφημέω is found only three times in Luke's gospel: 12:10; 22:65; 23:39. In Luke the noun βλασφημία occurs only in 5:21.) The use of the verb in 23:39 is most similar to its use here. A good example of what constitutes blasphemy is found in 2 Kings 19, with βλασφημέω in the LXX of vv 4, 6, 22. The king of Assyria ridiculed Israel's God and denied God's ability to save his people, Israel. Similarly, the thief who blasphemes Jesus in Lk 23:39 will deny Jesus' ability to save. (CC pp. 878-879)

blaspheming. Can imply insulting speech of one person to another, but usually, as here, indicates ridicule of God. (TLSB)

22:63–65 Jesus is mocked as a prophet by those holding Him. Previously accused of blasphemy, Jesus, the Son of God, is now blasphemed. Today, we mock Jesus whenever we withhold the honor that is rightfully His as God's Son. Yet, "when He was reviled, He did not revile in return," that He might bear "our sins in His body on the tree" (1Pt 2:23–24). • Grant us, dear Savior, true confession of our sins and of faith, that we may always honor You as our Messiah and the Son of God. Amen. (TLSB)

Jesus Before the Council

66 When day came, the assembly of the elders of the people gathered together, both chief priests and scribes. And they led him away to their council, and they said, 67 "If you are the Christ, tell us." But he said to them, "If I tell you, you will not believe, 68 and if I ask you, you will not answer. 69 But from now on the Son of Man shall be seated at the right hand of the power of God." 70 So they all said, "Are you the Son of God, then?" And he said to them, "You say that I am." 71 Then they said, "What further testimony do we need? We have heard it ourselves from his own lips."

The first trial begins with an introduction that provides the hearer with the time of the trial—dawn; the participants in the trial—the Sanhedrin; and the place of the trial—the council chamber of the Sanhedrin. This (22:66) is the only reference to the Sanhedrin (by either name, συνέδριον or πρεσβυτέριον) in Luke. Only Luke has πρεσβυτέριον, "council of the elders, Sanhedrin,"

> Elsewhere in the NT πρεσβυτέριον occurs only in Acts 22:5, denoting the Jewish legal authorities with power to authorize arrest and imprisonment, and in 1 Tim 4:14, denoting the church leadership in a Christian community that has the authority to ordain. P. 884)

and describes it as composed of *both* chief priests and scribes. These groups represent the two main Jewish parties, the Sadducees and the Pharisees, respectively. Jesus appears here before a full representation of Israel.

> First-century Judaism, of course, had other groups, including the Herodians (Mt 22:16; Mk 3:6; 12:13), the Essenes, the Therapeutae, and the Zealots, but these smaller groups are not significant participants in the story of Jesus. For information on the Essenes, the Therapeutae, and the Zealots, see E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ,* 2:555–606. (CC p. 884)

The same people responsible for the mocking and beating of Jesus will now question him. But the purpose of this account is *not* to describe the workings of the legal system of Israel, but to present further evidence for the second phase of Luke's prophet Christology: rejection. (CC p. 884)

22:66 *when day came.* Only after daylight could a legal trial take place for the whole council (Sanhedrin) to pass the death sentence. (CSB)

A night trial of Jesus was held at the high priest's house (Mt 26:57; Mk 14:53; Jn 18:12–13). However, a night trial's verdict was invalid. (TLSB)

assembly of the elders. Jewish ruling Council (Sanhedrin) with control over internal Jewish matters. (TLSB)

their council. An early morning meeting to validate the decision of the previous night. (TLSB)

τὸ πρεσβυτέριον … τὸ συνέδριον—The πρεσβυτέριον refers to "the highest Jewish council in Jerusalem … called συνέδριον" (BAGD s.v. πρεσβυτέριον, 1; cf. also G. Bornkamm, πρέσβυς κτλ., TDNT 6:654). In Luke's terminology, there is a difference between the πρεσβυτέριον and the συνέδριον. The first refers to the assembly of the Sanhedrin itself, while the second refers to the council chamber. D. R. Catchpole, *The Trial of Jesus,* 191–92, offers the following convincing arguments for that view: (1) A reference to the council already occurred in πρεσβυτέριον; (2) συνέδριον is used in a local sense in Acts; (3) εἰς does not mean "before"; (4) after Jesus was first taken into the high priest's house (22:54), a change in locale is indicated by ἀπήγαγον, "led (away)" (22:66). But regardless of this distinction in terminology, it is clear that the trial of Jesus is before the official religious court of Israel, the Sanhedrin, composed of both chief priests and scribes. Generally, the chief priests would be Sadducees and the scribes would be Pharisees. See further the excursus "The Opponents of Jesus in Luke." (CC p. 879)

22:67 *they said* – λέγοντες—Note that throughout this trial before the Sanhedrin, the accusers of Jesus are indicated by the plural and not the singular. The plural implicates the entire council in Jesus' death, not just the high priest. See also πάντες in 22:70. (CC p. 879)

If you are the Christ. This demand is related to a question asked later: "Are you then the Son of God?" (v. 70). (CSB)

Had Jesus claimed to be the Christ, as they understood it, they would have had a charge to take to Pilate. In Lk, Jesus does not directly refer to Himself as "the Christ" until after His resurrection (24:26). (TLSB)

ὁ χριστός—This is the first explicit messianic title in this pericope. On Luke's use of this title, see comments at 2:1–20. This title has occurred only six times in Luke's gospel up to this point, (Lk 2:11, 26; 3:15; 4:41; 9:20; 20:41) but it will appear five times after this first trial. In 23:2, 35, 39 Jesus is mocked for having claimed to be "the Christ," while in 24:26, 46 the risen Jesus himself explains that "the Christ" had to suffer and die before entering his glory. (CC p. 879)

This narrative revolves around the two charges leveled against Jesus, and only Luke divides them in such a way that the titles used of Jesus throughout the gospel are now the reason he is condemned. The first inquiry is whether he is "the Christ" (22:67). This is the first explicit messianic title in the pericope ("the Prophet" was implied in 22:64). Of course, the hearer knows that at Jesus' birth an angel announced that Jesus is the "Savior, who is *Christ* the Lord" (2:11) and that at the climax of his Galilean ministry Peter confessed that Jesus is "*the Christ* of God" (9:20). Jesus began his public ministry by quoting Is 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has *anointed* [ἔχρισεν, whence 'Christ'] me" (Lk 4:18; similarly Heb 1:9; Acts 4:27; 10:38). However, this title, "the Christ," will not be heard from the *lips of Jesus* until *after the resurrection*, when he explains to the Emmaus disciples Scripture's prophecy that it was necessary "for *the Christ* to suffer these things and enter into his glory" (24:26). Thus after he ushers in the new creation, Jesus will again speak of himself as the one anointed by the Father through the Spirit to accomplish this re-creation in fulfillment of 4:18. (CC pp. 884-885)

will not – They did not want an answer on His terms, but would interpret it to their own ends. (TLSB)

οὐ μή—This phrase "with the aorist subjunctive [πιστεύσητε] or future indicative … is the most definite form of negation regarding the future" (BDF§ 365). (CC p. 879)

Why doesn't Jesus simply answer yes to the question whether he is the Christ? His answer follows a familiar pattern. When John's disciples asked, "Are you the Coming One" (a messianic title; 7:19–20), Jesus did not merely say yes. Rather he performed miracles testifying to his messiahship and cited supporting Scripture. In 20:1–8, the chief priests, scribes, and elders—the same parties now assembled to judge Jesus—had questioned the source of Jesus' authority. Rather than plainly telling them that he was the Son of the Father, Jesus pointed them to John's baptism, which they had rejected. The ministries of John and Jesus were manifestations of God, but the religious establishment rejected them both. (CC p. 885)

believe me – πιστεύσητε—This and related words for "believe" and "faith" are relatively rare in the synoptic gospels. Luke uses this verb for believing only nine times in his gospel, (Lk 1:20, 45; 8:12, 13, 50; 16:11; 20:5; 22:67; 24:25) and he only uses the noun πίστις, "faith," eleven times. (Lk 5:20; 7:9, 50; 8:25, 48; 17:5, 6, 19; 18:8, 42; 22:32) Matthew uses them eleven and eight times, respectively; Mark, fourteen and five. In contrast John's gospel has the verb ninety-eight times but lacks the noun. (CC p. 879)

Jesus takes a similar tack here. He does not directly answer their question, but says, "If I tell you [that I am the Christ], you will surely not believe" (22:67).

> Cf. the similarities here to Jer 38:15: "If I tell you, will you not be sure to put me to death? And if I give you counsel, you will not listen to me." From Jesus' first sermon in

> his hometown of Nazareth, where he was rejected as a prophet (4:16–30), the people were reluctant to believe that Jesus was the Messiah. The accusation later placed against the Emmaus disciples holds true both for John's disciples and for the religious establishment who asks Jesus whether he is the Christ: they are slow to believe all that the prophets have spoken (24:25). (CC p. 885)

Jesus has already provided abundant evidence through his words and deeds, but they do *not* believe he is the Christ. They won't change their minds on the basis of his response. Their tacit approval of the mocking, beating, and blaspheming of Jesus shows that they had already made up their minds while Jesus was teaching in the temple. He in fact *did* ask them in 20:41, 44, and he gave them the key to his identity when he quoted Psalm 110 (Lk 20:42–43): "The Lord said to my Lord, 'Sit at my right hand, until I place your enemies a footstool for your feet.' " Implicit in this passage is that the Christ, the Son of David, will be exalted to the Father's right hand. Jesus' response to the Sanhedrin here is an answer from God's Word as fulfilled in himself, and it also alludes to Ps 110:1: "But from now on the Son of Man will be *sitting at the right hand* of the power of God" (Lk 22:69). (CC p. 885)

22:68 They refuse a serious discussion of Jesus as Messiah; their minds are made up. He did ask them once (20:41), but to no avail. (TLSB)

you will not answer – οὐ μὴ ἀποκριθῆτε—This is another aorist subjunctive negated by οὐ μή; see textual note on 22:67. (CC p. 879)

22:69 *son of man* – To avoid any political misunderstanding, instead of "Christ," Jesus uses "Son of Man," the term He usually uses of Himself. (TLSB)

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου—This is the second explicit messianic title for Jesus in his passion. See comments at 5:24. Here the reference is to his future position in glory. (CC p. 879)

In making this statement, Jesus introduces the second explicit messianic title in this trial, "the Son of Man" (22:69; 22:64 implied the title "the Prophet" and 22:67 had "the Christ"). Throughout the gospel Jesus used the title "Son of Man" especially in association with his passion (Lk 9:22, 44, 58; 12:10; 18:31; 22:22, 48; 24:7) and his exaltation and glorious return. (Lk 6:5; 9:26; 12:8, 40; 17:24, 26, 30; 18:8; 21:27, 36; 22:69) The Son of Man, who now is suffering, will be exalted to the right hand of the Father, for he is crowned as King when he is vindicated by the Father in the resurrection. (And it is indeed true that the "passion" predictions in 9:22 and 18:31–33 are also "passion and resurrection" predictions!) At the right hand of the power of God, Jesus becomes the judge—and the criterion of judgment for all people: "But I say to you, everyone who confesses me before men, the Son of Man will also confess him before the angels of God; but the one who denies me before men will be denied before the angels of God" (12:8–9). So Jesus' answer to the Sanhedrin summarizes a full Christology latent with Gospel promise for those who confess Jesus, but also replete with dire Law for those who condemn him. (CC pp. 886-887)

right hand of the power of God. Jesus points to His heavenly enthronement: His resurrection and ascension (Eph 1:20–21; Heb 1:3) (TLSB)

right hand. In Israelite thought, the right hand was the favored one. As such, it symbolized the place of privilege or strength. The chief court official was seated at the king's right hand as a symbol of his power and authority. The term can describe God's chosen servant (e.g., King David. (TLSB p. 843)

22:70 *they all said* – εἶπαν δὲ πάντες—See the textual note on the plural λέγοντες in 22:67. (CC p. 880)

Son of God – To claim He was Messiah was bad enough, but to claim divinity was blasphemy. Yet, this was the undeniable truth (1:32–35; 3:22; 9:35; Mt 14:33).

ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ—This is the third explicit messianic title in this pericope. On Luke's use of this title, see 1:32, 35; 3:22, 38; 4:3, 9, 41; 8:28; 9:35; 10:22. (CC p. 880)

The first charge is introduced by a *plural* participle, "saying" (22:67; λέγοντες), which implies that the entire Sanhedrin is involved. The evangelist makes this explicit by introducing the second charge with "all said" (22:70; εἶπαν δὲ πάντες; cf. also "the entire multitude of them" [23:1]). Luke has consistently portrayed the religious establishment as unified in its rejection of Jesus. When the questions or charges are set side by side, one sees that in the minds of Jesus' accusers, the titles "the Christ" and "the Son of God" are equivalent in that an affirmation of either one would make Jesus guilty of the highest religious offense. When Jesus responded to the first charge, he replied with the title "the Son of Man," making these three distinctive titles parallel in this narrative of the first trial. (CC p. 887)

> Clearly, the titles "the Christ," "the Son of Man," and "the Son of God" have different nuances. But they are by no means at odds with one another. Perhaps R. Stein, *Luke,* 571, puts it best: "Although the titles Son of Man, Christ, and Son of God are not synonyms but portray separate functions and roles, they are related in the sense that they refer to the same person." This is Luke's point: *the one person Jesus* is *at the same time* the Messiah, the Son of Man, and the Son of God. This also pertains to "I AM" (22:70) understood as a messianic title. (CC p. 887)

Earlier in the gospel and also here Luke has used each of these titles carefully to develop his Christology (see textual notes on 22:67, 69, 70). (CC p. 887)

The question "Who exactly is Jesus?" is on the minds not only of the Sanhedrin, but also of the evangelist as he shapes this scene to teach the catechumen that Jesus is at the same time "the Christ," "the Son of Man," and "the Son of God."

> J. Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV,* 1462, offers this penetrating insight:
> The emphasis in the Lucan interrogation scene is christological. Luke uses the occasion to affirm once again who Jesus is: "Are you the Messiah [the Christ]?" (v. 67). "You are, then, the Son of God?" (v. 70). These questions, posed by the supreme Jewish authorities, echo the double angelic announcement in the infancy narrative about the child to be born: One who would sit upon "the throne of his father David" and would "be called Son of God" (1:32, 35). Thus the child "marked for the fall and the rise of many in Israel" and destined "to be a symbol that will be rejected" (2:34) becomes the Jesus who is interrogated by authorities of his own people about his messiahship and divine sonship. What was foreshadowed in the infancy narrative, where the chords were first struck (1:32, 35; 2:11, 26), reaches with crescendo its climax in this scene, having been orchestrated in various ways in the Gospel up to this point (recall 3:15; 9:20; 20:41—3:22; 4:3, 9, 41; 8:28; 9:35). Faint echoes of it will again be heard in the Gospel's coda (23:2, 35, 39; 24:26)—and often in the Lucan second volume, where Jesus himself will become the preached one: not merely Messiah, and Son of God, but even the Son of Man standing at God's right hand (Acts 2:32–33, 36; 7:55). (CC pp. 887-888)

He is also “the Prophet”—the title implied in 22:64. “Luke has called attention here to the foundational confession of Jesus by his Church.” (CC pp. 887-88)

you say that I am – Your words, but they are true. “I AM” can be a divine title (Ex 3:13–14; Jn 6:35). (TLSB)

ὑμεῖς λέγετε—ὑμεῖς is emphatic. As can be seen by the reaction in 22:71, Jesus’ answer is affirmative. He does not deny that he is the Son of God; he affirms that the words of his accusers are true. Therefore he implies that “the Christ” (22:67), “the Son of Man” (22:69), “the Son of God” (22:70), and “I AM” (22:70) are all titles that pertain to himself. (CC p. 880)

I am – ἐγώ εἰμι—This is the fourth explicit messianic or divine title for Jesus in this section. It follows “the Christ” (22:67), “the Son of Man” (22:69), and “the Son of God” (22:70). “The Prophet” was also implied in 22:64. In Luke-Acts this phrase, “I am,” occurs eleven times. Some of the later occurrences are in declarations of the speaker’s human identity: Peter in Acts 10:21 and Paul in Acts 22:3; 26:29. The first instance is spoken by the angel: “I am Gabriel” (Lk 1:19). The second instance, which is the last occurrence before 22:70 and also the closest to it, shows unmistakably that the phrase by itself can be a messianic claim: “For many will come in my name, saying, ‘I AM’ and ‘The appointed time has drawn near’ ” (21:8). There “my name” (also in 21:12, 17) could be the name of Jesus himself, or it could be “the Son of Man” (21:27), but either way, it is a messianic claim. (Cf. the more extensive use of “I AM” in John’s gospel, where it occurs twenty-four times, notably in Jn 8:24, 28, 58.) Jesus will also affirm his identity with this phrase, ἐγώ εἰμι, in Lk 24:39; Acts 9:5; 22:8; 26:15; and with it he assures Paul of his presence in Acts 18:10. The phrase hearkens back to Ex 3:13–15; 6:1–8. In that connection, it is a claim of divinity, a claim to be Yahweh, the saving God who reveals himself particularly in the exodus deliverance and also throughout the OT. The use of the phrase in Acts 18:10 parallels Ex 3:12: Yahweh/Jesus is with Moses/Paul to deliver them personally, and, through those individuals, to save his whole people. (CC p. 880)

In Lk 22:70 on the lips of Jesus, the phrase “I AM” is a messianic claim, a claim of divinity, and also an affirmation that Jesus is “the Christ” (22:67), “the Son of Man” (22:69), and “the Son of God” (22:70). It also affirms that Jesus is “the Prophet”—the title implied in 22:64. Moreover, Jesus seems to allude to another aspect of the title “I AM” that is evident in Exodus 3, in the exodus event and wilderness wanderings, and throughout the whole OT: “I AM,” the God of Israel, is questioned, doubted, and rejected by many. Jesus’ second reply (Lk 22:70) suggests that his rejection by his accusers—the full Sanhedrin, representing Israel—is itself a kind of testimony that he is “I AM.” See further the commentary below. (CC p. 880)

As in Jesus’ first response, he adds an astonishing new self-revelation as part of his affirmative reply: “You yourselves are saying that I AM” (22:70; ἐγώ εἰμι). (Jesus will give a similar reply to Pilate in 23:3. Cf. 22:27, where Jesus says, “*I am* in the midst of you as the one who serves.”) As Jesus faces the court representing all Israel, he simply throws their words accusation back at them—with proof: “*You* are the ones saying it, and it is true: I AM!” The arrest, the mocking, the beating, the one-sided interrogation—all this demonstrates *from the OT* that Jesus is indeed “I AM”—Yahweh come as Messiah to save his people (see textual note on 22:70). The *rejection* of him actually *affirms* that he is the true Christ, the Savior promised to the people of Israel, who constantly questioned, complained, and rejected their God (e.g., Isaiah 7). In that way—*by their unbelief*—they are “saying”—confirming—that Jesus is “I AM.”

By claiming the divine title "I AM," Jesus indirectly affirms too that he is the Son of God. His birth as "the son of Adam/man, the son of God" (3:38); the Father's voice at his baptism, "You are my Son" (3:22), repeated at his transfiguration (9:35); his teaching; his miracles; and now these very events that are bringing about his "exodus" (9:31) in Jerusalem all testify that he is the great "I AM"—he is the Lord's Christ, the Son of Man and the Son of God. And the reaction of the Sanhedrin (22:71) shows that they understood Jesus' second reply as an affirmation that Jesus was indeed claiming these divine titles for himself. (CC p. 888)

22:71 *We have heard.* The reaction to Jesus' reply makes clear that his answer was a strong affirmative. Mark has simply, "I am" (Mk 14:62). It was blasphemy to claim to be the Messiah and the Son of God—unless, of course, the claim was true (see note on Mk 14:64). (CSB)

They understood Jesus to accept the title "Son of God." Next, they must seek His death through Pilate. (TLSB)

The first trial of Jesus ends with the entire Sanhedrin saying, "Why do we still have need of testimony? For we ourselves have heard from his mouth" (22:71). The other gospels record that witnesses came forward to testify against Jesus (cf. Mt 26:60–61; Mk 14:56–59). But Luke deems it sufficient to include only the testimony of Jesus, the only witness.

> J. Neyrey, *The Passion according to Luke*, 72, accents how Jesus is the *only* witness and that "the importance of Jesus' remarks to the assembly lies in their character as the solemn testimony (*martyrion*) of Luke's Church." Neyrey goes on to develop this: "In Luke, Jesus is the sole and chief *witness* to God's Christ. And his witnessing, which is solemnly given to Israel's official court, is formally rejected. … according to Luke, then, Jesus is for the Church a model of an official witness to the Gospel. He embodies also the pattern of rejection on earth and vindication in heaven" (p. 75). (CC pp. 88-889)

However, during the course of Jesus' ministry, testimony to his identity has been provided by many witnesses: God the Father (3:21–22; 9:28–36); the Spirit (3:22; cf. 12:12); Moses and Elijah (9:30–31); Peter (9:18–20); the Twelve (9:1–6); the seventy (-two) (10:1–12, 17–20); and others. Later Jesus will open the eyes of the disciples to see that the entire OT bears witness to him (24:25–27, 32, 44–47), and he will say to them, "You are *witnesses* of these things" (24:48; μάρτυρες; cf. μαρτυρίας in 22:71). (CC pp. 888-889)

Ironically, again, the Sanhedrin is actually correct when they ask, "Why do we still have need of testimony? For we ourselves have heard from his mouth" (22:71). There is no lack of witnesses, no need for further testimony. What Jesus has provided is sufficient, abundantly so. All that is needed is to recognize the evidence, to see the truth, to confess that Jesus is the Christ. But this the Sanhedrin refuses to do. Their eyes are closed. And so the judges are judged in their judgment of Jesus. For they did not believe him even when he gave unambiguous testimony about who he is. Rather, by their words and actions, they are showing that he is exactly who they assert he is not: the Christ; the Son of Man; the Son of God; the great I AM. The long-suffering God of the OT, rejected by his people, has become incarnate and is now rejected one final time. What they have heard from his mouth is an indictment on them, for they have now reached the climax of Israel's rejection of him as Simeon prophesied when he held the infant Jesus in his arms: "Behold, this child is destined for the fall and resurrection of many in Israel, and for a sign spoken against" (2:34). The fall of Israel is now personified in the religious leaders who are about to bring Jesus to the Roman authorities with charges that will lead to his death. The theological titles at the center of this first trial will be heard with overtones of political rebellion when Jesus appears before Pilate (23:1–5). (CC p. 889)

22:66–71 Jesus, before the Council, points to His exaltation. He acknowledges that He is the Son of God and is condemned. We can never force Jesus into our definitions of Messiah. It is for us to receive Him for who He is, as described in Scripture. Jesus, condemned for us, is the promised Messiah and Son of God, who now is seated in glory at God's right hand. • Jesus, You are the Christ, Son of God in glory. Grant that this confession may always be ours. Amen. (TLSB)