AGAIN NOT Q: LUKE 7: 18-35 AS AN ACTS-ORIENTATED TRANSFORMATION OF THE VINDICATION OF THE PROPHET MICAIAH (I KINGS 22:1-38)

T. Brodie

It has already been indicated elsewhere that two texts which are frequently attributed to Q (Luke 7:1-10 and 9:57-62) may in fact be explained more reliably as Luke's reworking of parts of the Elijah-Elisha narrative[1].

The purpose of the present article is to indicate that the same is true for Luke's account of the relative roles of John and Jesus (Luke 7:18-35). Though often attributed to Q (it is found in Matt 11:2-19 and consists largely of Jesus' words)[2],

---

1 T. L. Brodie, 'Not Q but Elijah: The Saving of the Centurion's Servant (Luke 7:1-10) as an Internalization of the Saving of the Widow and her Child (1 Kgs 17:1-16),' *IBS* 14 (1992) 54-71; idem, 'Luke 9:57-62: A Systematic Adaptation of the Divine Challenge to Elijah (1 Kings 19),' *SBL Seminar Papers 1989* (ed. D. J. Lull; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989) 237-45.

2 As well as being regarded as coming from Q, Luke 7:18-35 is also regarded at times as reflecting early traditions and the historical Jesus; see, for instance, J. Lambrecht, 'Are you the one who is to come, or shall we look for another? The Gospel Message of Jesus Today,' *LouvStud* 8 (1980) 115-28; W. Wink, 'Jesus' Reply to John. Matt 11:2-6/Luke 7:18-23,' *Forum* 5 (1989) 121-28; L. E. Vaage, 'Q and the Historical Jesus: Some Peculiar Sayings (7:33-34; 9:57-58, 59-60; 14:26-27),' *Forum* 5 (1989) 159-76. But other authors indicate the need for caution in attributing some of the sayings of Luke 7:18-35 to Jesus; see, for instance, W. J. Cotter, 'Children Sitting in the Agora. Q(Luke) 7:31-35,' *Forum* 5 (1989) 63-82.
For a comparison of Luke 7:18-35 with the Gospel of Thomas, and for a discussion of some of the rhetorical features of Luke's text, see R. Cameron, 'What Have You Come Out To See? Characterization of John and Jesus in the Gospels,' *Semeia* 49 (1990) 35-69.

this passage turns out to be a reworking of the account of the vindication of the prophet Micaiah (1 Kings 22:1-38) - a text which falls within the Elijah-Elisha narrative.

To say that part of Luke 7 depends on the Elijah-Elisha narrative is not new. Earlier articles have shown not only that 7:1-10 depends on the Elijah-Elisha story but that the same is true for all the rest of Luke 7 (Luke 7:1-10 depends on I Kgs 17:1-16; Luke 7:11-17 on 1 Kgs 17:17-24; and Luke 7:36-50 on 2 Kgs 4:1-37)[3]. The dependence of Luke 7:18-35 on 1 Kings 22 is simply the last piece in the puzzle of Luke 7.

Given the other articles about Luke's sources in chap. 7, it does not seem necessary at this point to repeat all the preliminary arguments about Luke's practice - inspired partly by the rhetorical practice of *mimesis* (Latin, *imitatio*) - of deliberately and systematically reshaping texts from the Septuagint, especially from the Elijah-Elisha narrative[4].

---

3 See, by T. L. Brodie, 'Not Q but Elijah;' 'Towards Unravelling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7.11-17 as an *Imitatio* of I Kings 17.17-24,' *NTS* 32 (1986) 247-67; 'Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation,' *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-85

4 On imitation in general, see G. C. Fiske, *Lucilius and Horace. A Study in the Classical Theory of Imitation* (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1920; reprinted, Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1971; G. N. Knauer, *Die Aeneis und Homer* Hypomnemata 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964; T. M. Greene, *The Light in Troy. Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry*, New Haven: Yale University, 1982. For summaries of imitation and Luke's use of it, especially in reworking the Elijah-Elisha narrative, see Brodie, 'Luke 7.11-17,' 247-48; 'Luke 7,36-50,' 459-66; 'Not Q but Elijah,' 55-56.

The Texts: Introductory Analysis

1 Kings 22

The story of Micaiah (1 Kgs 22:1-38) is an interlude - a shifting of the focus away from Elijah.

At first sight this interlude may seem to have little to do with the surrounding Elijah-centred material. It begins with Ahab's warlike ambition to wrest Ramoth-gilead from Aram (22:1-4), and ends with Ahab's death - killed by a chance arrow which pierces his disguise and his armour, and which, despite his effort at further disguise (he remains standing), drains his blood into his chariot (22:29-38).

But as often happens in biblical narrative, apparent interludes are integral to the story. The interlude concerning Judah and Tamar (Genesis 38), for instance, is integral to the Joseph story[5]. Likewise, Ahab and Aramean wars are integral to the Elijah-Elisha narrative; in varying ways they are woven through large parts of it. Furthermore, the death of Ahab, when taken in conjunction with the death of his successor Amaziah (2 Kings 1), forms a foil for the fate of Elijah: struck by different accidents, the two kings sink down (one draining down into his bloodied chariot, the other falling from his balcony into his death bed), but Elijah is taken up to heaven in a chariot of fire (2 Kings 2)[6]. Besides, the essence of 1 Kings 22 is not about war but about prophecy and its fulfilment, and about the difference between true and false prophecy. Hence

---

5 R. Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981) 5-17.

6 For some details on the role of Amaziah's fall and death (2 Kings 1) as foil for the ascent of Elijah (2 Kings 2) see T. L. Brodie, 'The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1,1-2,6),' *Bib* 70 (1989) 96-109, esp. 100-101.

Simon de Vries places this chapter under the heading *Prophet against Prophet*[7].

The importance of prophecy is introduced by Jehoshaphat - the king of Judah, who accompanies Ahab, and who, unlike the disguised king of Israel, wears his royal robes. Jehoshaphat wants honesty, openness, and so when faced with all the false prophets who predict success, he insists on calling a true prophet, 'a prophet of the Lord.' So they send a messenger for Micaiah.

When Micaiah comes, he stands against the pressure of the royal court with its pliant prophets, and he announces dramatically and poetically that Israel will be scattered shepherdless - leaving God's word to bring them home.

In the event, Micaiah's prophetic word is vindicated.

Luke 7:18-35: Aspects of Unity, Content and Structure

The Lukan text (7:18-35) also is a form of interlude. The emphasis shifts from Jesus, the central character of the surrounding episodes, to John. But the passage has implications also for the larger character of Jesus; and most of the text consists of Jesus' words. Hence, while Luke imitates something of the OT effect of an interlude, the encompassing role of the larger character (which in the OT is enigmatically hidden) comes out more clearly.

The emphasis on John is one of the factors which brings out the unity of the text. In Talbert's words, the passage is 'held together by the focus on John'[8].

---

7 *Prophet Against Prophet. The Role of the Micaiah Narrative in the Development of Early Prophetic Tradition*, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

8 C. H. Talbert, *Reading Luke. A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Third Gospel* (New York: Crossroad, 1986) 84.

The full dimensions of the text's unity are complex and orderly. The passage falls into three parts[9], and each part looks at an aspect of John - his question to the healer (7:18-23), his positive prophetic role (24-30), and the negative reaction to him (7:31-35). In simplified terms, therefore, the entire text deals with wondrous healings, positive speaking, and negative reactions.

Apart from dealing with John, these three parts share a further and deeper unity: each contains some element of division or confrontation, and together they portray an overall movement from harmony to a divisive confrontation which is intensifying.

At first (in 7:18-23) the division or confrontation is scarcely perceptible; in fact it is mentioned as something which hopefully will not occur (7:23, 'And blessed is the one who is not scandalised in me').

Then, in the positive address (7:24-30), it emerges clearly - but only in the closing verses which contrast the receptive people and tax-collectors with the rejection which comes from the Pharisees and lawyers (7:29-30).

Finally, in the account of the negative reactions (7:31-35), the sense of confrontation is uppermost.

The sense of increasing confrontation or division governs not only the content but also the form. The allusion to scandal at the end of the first part (7:23) contains a mild break in style; it is a beatitude ('And blessed are they...'), and as such involves a change in form, but - in a feature which is very rare in a beatitude[10] - it is tied to what precedes by 'and' ('And blessed...'); the gap is bridged. Thus content and form correspond: the scandal is something which hopefully will not

---

9 See esp. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1981) 662. Note also R. J. Karris, 'The Gospel According to Luke,' *NJBC* 43:96-98.

10 Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 668.

happen, and the break in style is something which is bridged. Division is evoked but avoided.

At the end of the second part, however, 'the Greek text is a bit awkward'[11] and the break is quite clear: the last two verses ('And all the people hearing...,' 7:29-30) are so out of joint with what precedes that translators sometimes place them in a separate paragraph (NEB) or in parenthesis (RSV).

In the third part (7:31-35), when virtually the whole text deals with some form of rejection, division or confrontation, the disjuncture is equally great - it effects not just the final verse(s) but the whole text; the whole text breaks away to some degree from the preceding parts (from 7:18-30) - causing the UBSGNT to put in its only paragraph division in 7:18-35, and the Jerusalem Bible its only new heading.

Yet division is not the last word. Despite increasing confrontation Luke's central emphasis is positive. Not only is the initial allusion to scandal covered over as it were by a beatitude (7:23), but the second picture of division contains the picture of all the people and the tax-collectors as glorifying/justifying (δικαιόω) God (7:29-30). And even the final section closes with a similar positive idea - 'wisdom is vindicated/justified (δικαιόω) by all her children' (7:35)[12].

Luke's text (7:18-35), therefore, is a well-constructed three part whole in which even the disjunctures contribute to the overall unity - to a picture which advances from healing and positive speaking to increasing dividedness. It is a picture which, despite its negativity, ultimately vindicates God and God's wisdom.

---

11 Ibid, 675.

12 On the role of δικαιόω in Luke 7:29,35, see esp. Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 84-85.

Luke 7:18-35: Continuity with Luke-Acts

While Luke 7:18-35 has its own distinctness, it is so written that it is in narrative continuity with the larger narrative of Luke-Acts. It builds on what precedes and, above all, it prepares for what lies ahead.

It forms a unity, first of all, with the rest of chap. 7. On the one hand, it looks back to Luke 7:1-17. Its opening verse refers to what has preceded ('all these things,' 7:11), and, like the first verse of the preceding episode, it uses the phrase οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, 'his disciples' (7:18; cf. 7:11). More substantively, the initial emphasis in Luke 7:18-35, concerning many wondrous healings, including the raising of the dead (7:21-22), is like an expansion or intensification of the accounts of the healing of the centurion's servant (7:1-10) and the raising of the widow's son (7:11-17). Luke 7:18-35 also continues the climactic idea of the prophet being accepted by all the people (7:26,29; cf. 7:16).

On the other hand, Luke 7:18-35 looks forward and prepares for the subsequent part of chap. 7. The sense of scandal and of division, especially division or contrast between the sinners (tax-collectors) and the Pharisees (7:23,29-30), establishes the broad background for the scandal of Simon the Pharisee and for the contrast between that Pharisee and the forgiven woman (7:36-50, esp. 7:39,44-46)[13]. And the broad idea of the rejection of the prophet (7:31-34) is likewise illustrated in Simon (7,39.44-46).

As well as being in close knit unity with the rest of the chapter, Luke 7:18-35 is also in continuity with much of Luke-Acts.

Continuity with what precedes chap. 7 is found, for instance, in the following:

---

13 For further details of this continuity, see Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 84-85.

- The implication of someone coming (7:19; cf. 3:16).
- The sense of waiting or expecting (7:19-20; cf. 3:15).
- The Isaian healings (7;21-22; cf. 4:17-18; Isa 61:1)[14].
- The desert (7:24; cf. 1:80; 3:2).
- Sending of an angel; birth; women; kingdom (7:27-28; cf. 1:26-27,31,33,42).
- All the people being baptised (7:29; cf. 3:21).
- John's abstention from wine (7:33; cf. 1:15).

The continuity of 7:18-35 with what follows Luke 7 is focused largely on Acts. The picture of Jesus speaking, including the reference to the unresponsive Jewish authorities (Pharisees and lawyers; cf. 'this generation'), prepares the way for much that happens in Acts, especially for the speeches of Peter.

The idea that part of Luke 7 should be a preparation for Acts finds initial backing in the very first episode of that chapter: the picture of the centurion and Jesus (Luke 7:1-10) prepares the way for the picture of Cornelius and Peter (Acts 10).

Furthermore, the broad three part sweep of Luke 7:18-35 (*wonders/healings*, followed first by *positive witness* and then by an *increasing sense of confrontation*) corresponds to the broad patterns of Peter's activities, especially in Acts 2-5. The first such pattern, with great emphasis on the miraculous and virtually no confrontation (except a final ominous reference to 'this perverse generation,' 2:40), occurs in Acts 2. The second, with more obvious confrontation, is in Acts 3:1-

---

14 On the close relationship of the healings in Luke 7:21-22 to those in Isa 61:1, see Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 668, and esp. R. C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts. A Literary Interpretation. Vol 1: The Gospel According to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 78-80.

4:22. And the third, in which confrontation becomes acute, is in Acts 4:23-5:42[15].

In addition, there are more detailed links, among them the following:

- 'And they announced' (καὶ ἀπήγγειλαν) (7:18; Acts 4:23).
- Calling (προσκαλέω)...disciples (7:18; Acts 2:39; 5:40).
- Waiting/expecting (προσδοκάω) (7:19; Acts 3:4).
- Coming/arriving (παραγενόμενοι) (7:20; Acts 5:21,22,25).
- Hour (7:21; Acts 2:15; 3:1; 5:7).

---

15 A full analysis of the relationship of Luke 7:18-35 to Acts 2-5 would be disproportionate in an article which is primarily focused on the relationship with 1 Kings 22, but certain aspects may be noted briefly.

Luke 7:18-35 and Acts 2 share some basic features:

(A) An initial emphasis on wonders/miracles (Luke 7:18-23; Acts 2:1-20; with just a suggestion of scandal or scepticism, Luke 7:23; Acts 2:13).

(B) Positive testimony (to John and Jesus, Luke 7:24-28; to Jesus, Acts 2:22-36), and people's reactions (divided in Luke [7:29-30]; united in Acts [2:37-41] but with a reference to 'this perverse generation').

(C) The question of unity: contrasting pictures of division (Luke 7:31-35) and harmony (Acts 2:42-47).

In the case of Acts 3:1-4:22 there is a more obvious sense of division. The text again starts with a miracle (Acts 3:1-10), but instead of one harmonious speech and response, there are two speeches and there two responses, interwoven but diverse - one involving the people (Acts 3:11-26; 4:21-22), the other the authorities (4:1-20).

In Acts 4:23-chap. 5 the initial emphasis is again on something wondrous (the place shakes, 4:23-31) and later there are many more wonders and healings (4:12-16). But the sense of division is much greater; it is intimated earlier, even amid the different wonders, on a matter of property (4:32-5:11). And eventually, when the apostles are arrested and beaten, and when Peter's speech becomes curt and short, this sense of division becomes explosive (5:17-42).

- Multiple healings (7:21-22; Acts 5:12-16).
- The lame walk (7:22; Acts 3:1-9).
- This is what is written/said (in scripture) (7:27; Acts 2:16).
- The kingdom of God (7:28; Acts 1:3,6).
- 'All the people' (πᾶς ὁ λαὸς)(7:29; Acts 3:9,11).
- Hearing and being baptised (7:29; Acts 2:37,38,41).
- Contrast between people and authorities (7;29-30; Acts 5;26).
- God's plan (βουλή.....θεοῦ)(7:30; Acts 2:23; 5:38-39).
- 'This (perverse) generation' (7:31; Acts 2:40).
- All her children (7:35; Acts 2:39, '...your children and all...').

While the significance of some details is questionable, the overall conclusion is reasonably clear: one aspect of the language of Luke 7:18-35 is its continuity with Acts 2-5.

Thus there is a triple affinity between Luke 7:18-35 and Acts 2-5: in content (wonders; positive witness; negative division/ confrontation - amid God's plan), in structure (threefold, intensifying), and in language. The John-related text (7:18-35) is a capsule form of what is to follow in Acts.

This kinship with Acts 2-5 casts light on a further feature of Luke 7:18-35, namely its general similarity to a speech or sermon. Acts 2-5 is heavily coloured by the speeches of Peter, and it is appropriate that Luke 7:18-35, in foreshadowing Peter's speeches, should itself consist largely of speechlike material. This speechlike or sermonlike quality has tended to reinforce the impression that Luke 7:18-35 comes from Q, but the relationship with Acts 2-5 provides a less conjectural explanation of that quality.

Luke 7:18-35: Relationship with 1 Kgs 22:1-38

However great the continuity of Luke 7:18-35 with Luke-Acts, it has its own distinctness, and this distinctness has

its own sources. (The centurion story [Luke 7:1-10], for instance, despite its continuity with Acts 10, depends significantly on 1 Kgs 17:1-16). One of the distinctive sources of Luke 7:18-35 is the story of Micaiah.

The central link between Luke 7:18-35 and 1 Kgs 22:1-38 is again the idea of confrontation - the idea highlighted in De Vries's title *Prophet Against Prophet*. The confrontation is that which results from God's word, and which, despite rejection by some, is vindicated.

Thus, in order to build a text which in multiple ways will prepare for an account of God's word issuing in confrontation (Acts 2-5), Luke draws on an OT text which dealt with that very topic.

As with other texts from the Elijah-Elisha narrative, Luke has left aside the ancient setting (in this case a war) and has given a modernised christianised version which places greater emphasis on what is positive and internal.

Instead of showing, for instance, how the falsifying of God's word leads to violence (exemplified in the false prophet Zedekiah), he shows the other, positive, side of the coin - how God's true word/revelation brings peaceful healing (as seen in Jesus). Correspondingly, the picture of going forth to war is replaced by the picture of going out into the desert.

The shift to what is more internal, closer to the human heart, is reflected sharply in one dramatic adaptation. Instead of tracing the roots of perversity to a distant drama in the high heavens (the heavenly host talking back and forth, 2 Kgs 22:19b-23), Luke pictures this perversity as if it were coming from ordinary life, implicitly from an internal disposition - the unresponsiveness which is reflected in the children calling to each other in the marketplace (Luke 7:31-32). Thus Luke has changed a perversity which originates in the highest heavens to one which emanates from the lowliest human arena.

Both texts (1 Kgs 22:1-38 and Luke 7:18-35) contain one declaration which is particularly prophetic and poetic - Micaiah's vision of scattered Israel being sent home in peace by God's word (1 Kgs 22:17), and Jesus' description (taken from Mal 3:1) of John as God's angel who prepares the way (Luke 7:27). In each case, God helps people on their way, but Luke uses a picture which plays down the negative (the scattering) and which contributes to his emphasis on the fulfilling of scripture. (The uniqueness of these texts within their respective contexts is highlighted in the Jerusalem Bible - in the poetic layout).

The overall relationship between 1 Kgs 22:1-38 and Luke 7:18-35 is summarised in the accompanying outline. (cf. page 14) Generally Luke follows the order of the OT texts but on two occasions he combines[16] texts which are inherently related - the three texts which in various ways flow from Zedekiah's violence (22:10-14,24-25,34-35), and two texts about going to war (Micaiah's make-believe recommendation to go, and the actual going, 22:15,29-33).

Furthermore, Luke has relocated the final scene of the washing so that it is the conclusion not of the entire passage but simply of its second part (7:29-30 - concluding 7:24-30). (Variations on such relocating of concluding verses occur also in other parts of Luke)[17]

---

16 For another example of Luke's combining or fusing of related texts, see Brodie, 'Luke 7,36-50,' 476-77.

17 In reworking 2 Kgs 1:1-2:6 and 2 Kings 5, Luke transposes some of the concluding verses to a much earlier position in his own text; see Brodie, 'Luke 9:51-56,' 101; and, 'Towards Unravelling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40,' *Bib* 67 (1986) 41-67, esp. 48.

Questioning the Lord, Repetitiously

Refrain: ask the Lord (κυριον).	John sends to the Lord (κυριον).
Two questions:	One complex question, twice:
Do I go or (ἤ) hold back? Is there a prophet of the Lord? (22:1-9)?	Are you the one [prophet?] to come or (ἤ) do we wait for another? (7:18-20).

Fruits of False Prophecy and True: Violence and Healing

	In that hour:
Zedekiah prophesied goring	Healing...and granting sight.
Micaiah: I tell what God says.	Tell what you have seen.
Zedekiah hit, and the king was hit, in that day (22:10-14,24-25,34-35).	Healing, the blind see...(7:21-23).

Going Forth: The Pliant Prophet and the Courtly Clothing

When Micaiah comes:	When the messengers go:
Should I go up/forth...?	What did you go out...?
Micaiah is pliant: Go up/forth.	A reed shaken by the wind?
And the kings went up	A man in fine clothing? Such
one in royal clothing (22:15,29-33).	are in royal courts (7:24-25).

True Prophecy - About God Guiding People on Their Way

Micaiah speaks as a real prophet
in the name of the Lord,
I have seen
  Israel scattered, shepherdless
  And God said 'Let each go
  home'
Did I not tell...Hear the word
(22:16-19a).

A prophet, more than a prophet
it is written,
Behold
  I send my angel before you
  to prepare your way
  before you
I say to you
Pronouncement on John (7:26-28).

God's word fulfilled
in baptising...baptising
(7:29-30).

Sitting and Talking to One Another
(Images from Complementary Worlds)

God sitting in the heavenly court:

some say this and some say that
(22:19b-23).

Children sitting in the marketplace,
calling to one another
(7:31-32).

Eating, Drinking, Rejection - and Vindication

Micaiah's rejection;

his eating and drinking.
God's word will be vindicated.
(22:26-28).

John, Jesus, eating and drinking;
both rejected.
Wisdom is justified/vindicated.
(7:33-35).

God's word fulfilled
in washing...washing (22:36-38).

Detailed Analysis

1. *Questioning the Lord, Repetitiously (1 Kgs 22:1-9; Lk 7:18-20)*

In the first scene the two kings express their readiness to conquer Romoth-gilead, thus expanding the kingdom of Israel. But before embarking on this expansion they decide to 'ask the Lord (τὸν κύριον).' First the king of Israel asked the assembled prophets, 'Should I go to war...or refrain?' and, when the answer was a glib yes, the other king asked, 'Is there here no prophet of the Lord?' Then, after these two questions, they decide to call Micaiah.

The context in Luke is also one of expansion - not military but evangelical: the previous episode had concluded by telling that 'this word,' concerning 'a great prophet,' went out to all of Judaea 'and all the surrounding territory' (Luke 7:16-17). And it is precisely within this context that John calls two disciples and sends them to 'the Lord' (τὸν κύριον) to ask, 'Are you the one who is coming or should we wait for another?'

The meaning of 'the one who is coming' is unclear. On the one hand, it is in continuation with the coming one announced earlier by John (in Luke 3:16). On the other, in a tension that is typical of Luke's expanding text - a text full of the dynamics of prophecy and fulfilment - it builds on the preceding explicit reference to Jesus as a great prophet (7:16,18), it has affinities with the idea of the prophet-like-Moses (Deut 18:18; cf. John 6:14), and it leads into the account of healings which imply the coming of the eschatological prophet[18]. In other words, the messengers'

[18] See I. H. Marshall, *Commentary on Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 292: 'The combination of OT allusions indicates that the future era of salvation has arrived, but this is

question may have started with a fairly narrow presupposition about the one to come, but, like prophecy leading to something fuller, it opens the way to a greater reality - to the presence of the eschatological prophet. Thus, like the kings' messenger, but much more so, John's two disciples are on their way to a true prophet from God.

The affinities between the texts may be outlined thus,

Context: Israel's Expansion	Context: spread of the word.
	Calls (προσκαλέω) two disciples;
Refrain: ask the Lord (κύριον)	sends them to the Lord (κύριον)
Two questions:	One complex question, repeated:
Do I go or (ἤ) hold back?	Are you the coming one[prophet?]
Is there a prophet of the Lord?	or (ἤ) do we wait for another?
Call (καλέω) Micaiah.	

The affinities involve four areas - substance, action (plot), form, and detail. The substantive link is the quest for the true prophet of God. As it happens, in both texts this quest occurs in a context which in different ways suggests an imminent expansion of God's kingdom - the ancient kingdom of Israel and the gospel kingdom of the word - and this situation of expansion or movement generates a sense of uncertainty about what to do, about whether to go with the momentum or hold back.

The actions or plots are very different at one level - the OT action is set in war and the other in profound peace - yet

---

especially linked with the function of Jesus as the eschatological prophet.'

they involve a fundamental similarity: the one who, amid his followers, is hesitating, decides to call ([προσ]καλέω) (a) messenger(s) and to send him/them to the person who apparently is the true prophet of the Lord.

There are links also in form. Both texts use questions - questions which are specifically either/or in nature - and both use repetition. The OT has a repetitive refrain about asking the Lord (1 Kgs 22:5,7,8) and it also has two questions. Luke has a single question, but it is asked twice, repetitively - a repetitive pattern which 'gives the words a distinct rhythm'[19].

Finally, there is a curious link in detail, the OT reference to asking 'the Lord' helps explain the rather surprising reference to Jesus as 'the Lord' (Luke 7:19).

But while thus maintaining manifold continuity with the OT text, Luke has also made important adaptations. As so often in his reworking of the OT, he has shifted the emphasis from an external drama, an external kingdom and its wars, to a world in which the focus falls more clearly on what is positive and more internal (the kingdom inaugurated by Jesus).

Furthermore, despite omitting many dramatic elements - the armies and wars - he manages not only to build a drama of his own but to do so in a way which is vivid and memorable. (He achieves this in large part through the single striking question, which, for greater effect is repeated).

In addition, he has adapted the whole both to the general tradition of Jesus and in particular to the requirements of his own narrative. The sending of two messengers, for instance, rather than one, involves an adaptation to a general pattern in Luke-Acts (cf. Luke 10:1; 22:8; Acts 3:11; 8:14). And the designation of these messengers as 'his disciples' likewise accords with one of Luke's larger patterns (as seen,

---

[19] Tannehill, *Luke-Acts. Vol. 1*, 79; see H. Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50* (HTKNT 3/1; Freiburg 1969) 411.

for instance, in the preceding episode, 7:11). Even the key word προσ-δοκάω, 'wait,' while it contains a close echo of the OT idea of refraining/holding back (1 Kgs 22:6), fits in also with other Lukan episodes (Luke 3:15; Acts 3:5).

2. *The Fruits of False Prophecy and True: Violence and Healing (1 Kgs 22:10-14,24-25,34-35; Luke 7:21-23)*

Both texts now move from the messenger(s) to a scene of prophecy - in the OT to the prophets Zedekiah and Micaiah, and in Luke, to the eschatological prophet.

The OT text begins with violence: the false prophet Zedekiah uses iron horns to symbolise the goring of the Syrians until they are finished (1 Kgs 22:10-12), and then - following an interlude in which the focus switches to the messenger and in which Micaiah says that he will tell what (ἃ) the Lord says (1 Kgs 22:13-14) - the picture comes back later to intensified Zedekiah-related violence: Zedekiah's hitting (ἐπάταξεν) of Micaiah and the enemy's hitting (ἐπάταξεν) of the king (22:24-25,34-35).

Luke's scene begins not with violence but with peace (the picture of peaceful healing, 7:21), and then - following an interlude in which the focus switches to the messengers and in which they are told to tell what (ἅ) they have seen [the Lord doing] (7:21a) - the picture returns to being one of further, intensified, healing (7:22-23).

Thus instead of moving from violence to intensified violence, Luke moves from peace (healings) to intensified peace. In doing this he combines the three violent scenes of the OT text, and in giving a NT equivalent (an opposite) he seeks, as with the questions in the previous scene, a greater sense of repetition. In approximate outline:

	In that hour:
Zedekiah prophecies goring.	*Peaceful healing.*

The messenger goes.	The messengers are told to go.
Micaiah, I tell what God says.	Tell what you have seen/heard:
Zedekiah hit; king is hit, in that day.	*Further peaceful healing.*

Here as earlier there are multiple links. The substantive issue is the nature and testing of prophecy. The OT shows the violent bankruptcy of prophecy which is false. Luke, with an eye to Acts 2-5, shows the other side of the same coin - the peaceful and healing nature of prophecy which is true.

Furthermore, despite the adaptation from war to peace, there is continuity also in the actions and form: a picture of dramatic activity (concerning wounding/healing) first gives way to an image of the journeying messenger(s) and later switches back to a more intense version of the same activity.

Finally, in the timing (of war, 1 Kgs 22:25,35; of peace, Luke 7:21), and in the one activity which is shared, that of speaking to the journeying messengers (1 Kgs 22:13a,14; Luke 7:22a) there are links of detail:

OT: καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος ὁ πορρευθεὶς...(13a)
καὶ εἶπεν..ἃ (14)
τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ...ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (25,35)
NT: ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῃ ὥρᾳ
καὶ...εἶπεν...πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε...ἃ (22a)
OT: And the messenger who was going...
And he said...whatever [the Lord tells]
that day...in that day
NT: In that hour
And...he said...Go tell...whatever [you see the Lord doing]

Luke's use of 'hour' (rather than 'day') helps to prepare the way for the emphasis on 'hour' in Acts (2:15; 3:1; 5:7).

3. *Going Up/Out: The Pliant Prophet and the Courtly Clothing (1 Kgs 22:15.29-33; Luke 7:24-25)*

When Micaiah first arrives (ἔρχομαι) and the king asks his question, Micaiah plays the role advised by the messenger - that of the pliant court prophet: he tells the king to go up, to go forth to war (1 Kgs 22:15).

In Luke too, as the messengers go (ἀπέρχομαι), there is a question about going forth - not up (to war) but out (to the desert). And there is also the image of the pliant prophet - the reed shaken by the wind.

In other words, the pliant prophet who says to go forth (OT) has been replaced by going forth to see the pliant prophet (NT).

When, subsequently, the king of Judah does go forth, he goes very explicitly, in royal clothing (1 Kgs 22:29-33). And Luke immediately speaks of going forth to see someone in fine clothing - clothing found in royal courts (Luke 7:25).

Thus where the OT had spoken repeatedly of going forth to a war, Luke speaks repeatedly of going forth to a scene of peace - the desert.

Again Luke has combined related texts. The two images of going forth, though separated in 1 Kings 22 (22:15,29-33), have been distilled and brought together in the NT.

And once again, as in the two previous episodes, Luke builds repetitively and memorably: instead of a question about going forth and a statement about going forth, he gives two similar questions ('What did you go out...to see?...But what did you go out to see?').

There are also links of detail:

OT: [Opening words] καὶ ἦλθεν...(15)

εἰ ἀναβῶ εἰς...πόλεμον (15)
καὶ ἀνέβη...εἰς...εἰς τὸν... (29-30)

βασιλεὺς....πρὸς....βασιλέα....καὶ σὺ ἔνδυσαι τὸν ἱματισμόν. (30)

NT: [Opening word] ἀπελθόντων...(24)

τί ἐξήλθατε εἰς τὴν ἔρημον...(24)
τί ἐξήλθατε ...(25)
ἄνθρωπον..ἠμφιεσμένον..ἐν..ἱματισμῷ..ἐν..βασιλείοις (25)

OT: [Opening words] And he came...

Will I go up to...war?

And the king...the king...went up to...to the...to the

King...to...king, You wear your robes

NT: [Opening word] As-they-were-going...

What did you go out to the desert...?

But what did you go out...?

A man clothed in robes...in kings' courts

The word ἱματισμός, 'clothing/apparel/robes,' is relatively rare (32 times in the OT, 5 in the NT). Rarer still is the explicit reference to an inherent link between wearing ἱματισμός, and being kings or in kings' courts. Apart from the parallel text in 2 Chr 18:29 and two debatable Solomon-related

texts (1 Kgs 10:5,25 [parr. 2 Chr 9:4,24]), the nearest one comes to it is in the royal wedding song (Ps 44[45]:8-12).

4. *The True Prophet Reveals God's Voice Showing the Way (1 Kgs 22:16-19a; Luke 7:26-28)*

The king now tells Micaiah to stop playing the pliant prophet and to speak the truth in the name of the Lord - in other words, to speak as a real prophet (1 Kgs 22:16). And Luke in turn switches from the image of someone pliant and soft to that of 'a prophet and more than a prophet' (7:26).

Then come two pictures of true prophets - the text's description of Micaiah (1 Kgs 22:17) and Jesus' description of John (Luke 7:27).

They begin by implying that the true prophet is based on God. Micaiah speaks 'the truth *in the name of God.*' And John is foretold in God's written word (he is 'the one of whom *it is written*'). Thus Luke keeps the sense of someone who is grounded in God, but he expresses that groundedness through one of his favourite patterns - emphasis on the fulfilment of scripture.

Then come the key texts. Micaiah has a vision of Israel being scattered and of God intervening to say that they should be allowed to '*go home in peace*' (1 Kgs 22:17). John's role also (two balanced repetitive phrases, quoted from Mal 3:1) implies that God helps people on a journey: John is God's 'messenger...who *prepares the way...*' (Luke 7:27). Thus in different ways both prophets communicate the message about God helping people find their way, but Luke omits the negative emphasis on scattering and adapts the idea of God guiding people to his pattern concerning the fulfilling of scripture.

Luke's text then gives a pivotal pronouncement about John: he is greater than all yet less than anyone in the kingdom of God (7:28). However, apart perhaps from the introductory 'I say to you' (7:28a; cf. 1 Kgs 22:18-19a, 'Did I not say to

you...?' 'Hear the word...'), this pronouncement does not seem to reflect 1 Kings 22. Apparently it comes from some other source or inspiration.

The most important links between these texts are the sudden emergence of the picture of a true prophet and the consequent picture of God as intervening to help people on their way. But there is also a very distinctive link in the form of the texts - in the way the poetic prophetic statements stand out.

5. *God's Word Fulfilled in the Washing/Baptising (1 Kgs 22:36-38; Luke 7:29-30)*

Having inserted the pivotal pronouncement about John's status, Luke now makes a radical adaptation. He takes the final OT scene, about the washing of the blood-stained chariot and the harlots washing in the blood-stained pool, and uses it as a starting-point for speaking about another kind of washing - baptism, the washing which was accepted by all the people and the tax-collectors but not by the Pharisees and lawyers.

In both texts the image of washing is used twice. In the OT 'they washed (ἀπένιψαν) the chariot' and 'the harlots washed' (ἐλούσαντο)(1 Kgs 22:38). In the NT 'all the people and tax-collectors justified God, having being baptised (βαπτισθέντες) with John's baptism, but the Pharisees and lawyers rejected God's plan for them, not having been baptised (μὴ βαπτισθέντες) by him.' Once again, while adapting his source, Luke forges a text which is clearly repetitive.

What is central to these texts is not just the repeated image of material washing but the fact that this washing fulfils the word or plan of God. The OT washing happened 'in accordance with the word that the Lord had spoken' (1 Kgs

22:38). And the NT washing 'justified God,' in other words, vindicated[20] God.

Luke, however, has adapted the two washing references to form a contrast - thus preparing the way for later contrasts, including that between the two thieves (Luke 24:39-43) and especially the contrast in Acts between the people, who accepted baptism, and the Jewish authorities, who were in friction with God's plan (Acts 2:37-42; 4:1-4; 5:21,26,38).

In different ways both texts are final or have something of a closing role. This is clear in the OT; the washing closes the basic story. But even in Luke, where the larger passage will continue as far as 7:35, some authors and editors (though not all) regard the contrast between those who accepted baptism and those who did not as an interim conclusion[21] .

In any case, the essential link is that of a process of washing which, whatever its limitations, fulfils God's word or plan.

There are also some linking details. There is a correspondence between the OT text's opening picture of the army's *herald telling everyone go home* (1 Kgs 22:36) and Luke's opening reference to *all the people hearing* (7:29); these two pictures may perhaps be two sides of the same coin. More precisely, the repeated phrase εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ... εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ... ('to his own...to his own...,' 1 Kgs 22:36) helps explain the perplexing phrase εἰς ἑαυτοὺς ('for themselves'? Luke 7:30). Luke's curious wording is sometimes regarded as reflecting Aramaic[22], but, as often in Luke, it seems best to see

---

20 On δικαιόω as meaning 'to vindicate', see Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 84.

21 UBSGNT; Jerusalem Bible; Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 670.

22 Marshall, *Luke*, 299.

is wording not as a semitism but as a Septuagintism - one which, as occurs occasionally, involves a form of word play[23].

6. *Sitting and Speaking Back and Forth to Each Other: Israel's Failure Explained in Images from Opposite Worlds - from God's Heavenly Court (1 Kgs 22:19b-23) and from the Human Playground (Luke 7:31-32)*

Having spoken of Israel's failure, its defeat, Micaiah goes on to give the root of that failure, and he places the root in God - in a decision taken in the heavenly court to use lying prophets to deceive Israel's king (1 Kgs 22:19b-22).

Luke, however, in looking for some parable to explain the failure or fall of the later Israel (the Jewish refusal of the gospel) places the root not in God but in the human will - in a stubbornness which is exemplified on a children's playground (in the way the children refuse to respond to what is called, 7:31-32).

Theologically, failure and evil can be attributed either to some factor outside human control, a factor which

---

[23] For other instances in which Luke plays with the wording of his OT source, see Brodie, 'Luke 7,36-50,' 473; idem, 'Acts 8,9-40,' 61.

The full details of the relationship between the washing texts (1 Kgs 22:36-38; Luke 7:31-32) seem to be extremely intricate, and eventually could deserve an article to themselves. There are two main dynamics that need to be unravelled - the transforming of the images (into NT equivalents); and the rearrangement (and duplication) of the elements to suit Luke's repetitive pattern.

The question of the transforming of the images can scarcely be worked out without first knowing what the OT images meant in themselves, particularly the images of the king dying and the dogs lapping (1 Kgs 22:37-38). The reference to the king dying, for instance, may appear to be a simple cold fact of history, but if it is part of an artistic counterbalance to Elijah's ascent then it belongs to a whole other world of meaning.

ultimately touches God, or it can be attributed to human factors. The OT gives one view and Luke gives the other. Again Luke has given the other side of the coin, and again he places the emphasis on a factor that is more internal, closer to the human makeup.

The two scenes - the heavenly court and the children's playground - have a fundamental similarity. The heavenly court is a *chorus-contra-chorum* arrangement, with God 'sitting' (καθήμενον) on the throne and all the heavenly host ranged to God's left and right. And in that situation 'one said one thing and another said another' (1 Kgs 22:20). In the marketplace the children are 'sitting (καθημένοις) and calling to one another.'

Obviously the children's song ('We played...We wailed...') has its own sources and resonances[24], quite independently of I Kings 22.

Yet Luke manages to echo something of the details of the heavenly conversation. In inquiring about how to bring down Israel's king (22:20-21), God had asked two questions (one fairly long, one short): 'Who...?' and 'By what...?' (Τίς...Εν τίνι...). And when Jesus is wondering how to describe the later Israel's failure, he introduces his parable by asking two questions (one relatively long, one short): 'To what...?' and 'To what...?' (τίνι...τίνι, ..). As ever, Luke manages, even in such minuscule echoes, to build more precise repetition[25].

---

24 For an interpretation of the children sitting in the marketplace as implying a court scene - an adult process of judgement - see W. J. Cotter, 'The Parable of the Children in the Marketplace, Q(Lk) 7:31-35: an Examination of the Parable's Image and Significance,' *NovTest* 29 (1987) 289-304.

25 The indebtedness of Luke's introductory formula, τίνι...τίνι, to the Τίς....ἐn τίνι of 1 Kgs 22:20-21 does not rule out further indebtedness to other sources, such as those reflected in the rabbinical use of τίνι...τίνι, (cf. Str-B, 2.8).

7. The Food-and-Drink Implications of Speaking God's Word: A Picture of Rejection and Vindication (1 Kgs 22:26-28; Luke 7:33-35)

When Micaiah's word is rejected he is imprisoned by two men and has to 'eat the bread (ἐσθίειν...ἄρτον) of affliction and the water of affliction.' Yet Micaiah's final statement is that God's word to him will be vindicated ('If you return...the Lord has not spoken through me').

Luke describes the eating and drinking habits of both John and Jesus: 'John...came neither eating bread (ἐσθίων...ἄρτον) nor drinking wine...The Son of Man came eating and drinking...' And both were rejected. Yet Luke's final statement is that wisdom is vindicated.

Again Luke has used repetition. He has taken the account of the eating and drinking of Micaiah and applied it in varied but repetitive ways to both John and Jesus. In the case of John, for instance, the idea of drinking is adapted to the angel's message that John would not drink wine (Luke 1:15).

In both cases (1 Kgs 22:26-28; Luke 7:33-35) this eating and drinking is linked with the speaking of the word of God and with rejection.

Furthermore, in both cases the final statement is of vindication: God's prophetic word to Micaiah will be shown to have been true (1 Kgs 22:28), and wisdom will be justified by 'all her children' (Luke 7:35). In concluding this speech Luke is following Micaiah's final statement about the vindication of God's word, but he is also preparing for the conclusion of Peter's speech - about the fulfilment of God's word/promise to 'your children and to all...' (Acts 2:39). Thus, in a single brief phrase, about vindication and all the children, he has managed to dovetail the closing words of both Micaiah and Peter.

Conclusion

As always in comparing Luke with an OT text, some links are debatable or inadequately analysed, and insistence on such weak links, whether by someone proposing literary dependence or someone opposing it, tends to obscure the key issue: are there links which are strong, links which go beyond the range of coincidence? If something is to be proved in court, for instance, it is often not necessary or advisable to insist on every piece of evidence, strong or weak. All one needs are a few arguments or pieces or evidence which are sufficiently strong. Even one may sometimes be sufficient.

In the case of Luke 7:18-35 and 1 Kgs 22:1-38 there are a few arguments which are strong:

1. *The Context*. Everything else in Luke 7 depends on the Elijah-Elisha narrative. Given the unity of the chapter, this creates a situation where there is some likelihood that the same is true of Luke 7:18-35. In fact the context is such that the burden of proof begins to shift towards someone who wants to hold otherwise.

2. *The Manifold Similarities*. The similarities begin with the central theme of confrontation (based on God's vindicated revelation) and then continue through a wide range of links - from the content and order of the various parts to the persistent presence of small similarities of detail.

3. *The Coherence of the Differences*. Though the differences are great, they are not inexplicable or jumbled. On they contrary they can be understood as based on adaptations to the larger patterns of Luke-Acts and as coming from transformational strategies which are consistent and coherent - particularly strategies aimed at producing a text which is positive, internalised, christianised, and memorable (repetitive).

The easiest way, therefore, to account for the data is through a straightforward conclusion: Luke, an acknowledged *littérateur*, used a literary method.

What remains unexplained is how Matthew came to have a variation on the same text (Matt 11:2-19). This question is important - but premature; it must wait until further evidence is gathered. Otherwise discussion about it will become lost in a larger inconclusive debate about synoptic relationships in general.

What can be said, however, is that the explanation of Luke 7,18-35 given here, while it is difficult - one has to work with it rather than pull it ready-made out of the air - is also grounded in known scriptural reality. As such it is ultimately more satisfactory and far less conjectural than the appeal to Q.

T. Brodie

Summary

Luke's interlude concerning John and the vindication of God's wisdom (Luke 7:18-35) depends partly on the interlude which occurs in the Elijah-Elisha narrative concerning Micaiah and the vindication of God's prophetic word. The dependence is shown by context, persistent similarities, and by the coherence and intelligibility of the differences. Luke, however, has given the adapted text a three part structure which fits the pattern of his own narrative, particularly the triple pattern of the miracles, speeches and confrontations of Acts 2-5. The relationship of Luke 7:18-35 to 1 Kings 22 and Acts 2-5 explains it much more reliably than does the appeal to Q.

Father Tom Brodie is an Irish Dominican from County Clare and has taught Scripture in the West Indies and in the U.S.A. (especially at Aquinas Institute, St. Louis). At present he is lecturing at Cedara Theological Institute, Natal, South Africa.