There have been numerous attempts to unravel the problems of Luke's account of the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke 4:16–30). One of the central problems in the passage is the relationship between v 22 and vv 28-9: in v 22 Luke apparently indicates a positive first response in the synagogue to Jesus' words ("all bore witness to him and were amazed at the words of grace which proceeded out of his mouth"); in vv 28-9, at the end of the episode, there is total hostility to Jesus ("all in the synagogue were filled with wrath"). What is the significance for Luke of a positive first response to Jesus that turns into a murderous rage? What causes the change of heart? Or is there a change of heart?

The present study confines its interest to the words Πάντες έμαθεντο αὐτῷ (v 22a). It is the conviction of the writer that an adequate understanding of these words goes a long way towards providing a proper perspective for viewing the disparate responses to Jesus in Luke 4:16-30, and thus makes a significant contribution to our appreciation of Luke's purpose in the pericope.

The study proceeds by first assessing the adequacy of some of the suggestions which have been put forward concerning v 22a. A fresh approach is then developed to an understanding of Luke's intention at this point.

J. Jeremias has focused scholarly attention on the words Πάντες έμαθεντο αὐτῷ with his attempt to resolve the apparent inconsistencies in Luke's

account by understanding the words to mean “they bore witness against him.” On this understanding ἐθαύμαζον, “they were amazed” (v 22), registers opposition to what is strange. The strange thing opposed is a message that stresses the mercy of God (τοίς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, “the words of grace”—v 22), and has no mention of eschatological vengeance on the Gentiles. (The quotation in vv 18-19 from Isa 60: 1-2 ends with “the year of the Lord’s favor.” Isa 60:2 continues “the day of vengeance of our God [on the Gentiles”).

Thus, according to Jeremias, there is no change of attitude: “from the outset unanimous rage was their response to Jesus.”

The reconstruction is attractive, and has gained the support of K. H. Rengstorf and W. Grundmann. However, there are strong arguments to be levelled against Jeremias’s view. I draw attention to the objections raised by H. Anderson and D. Hill. These are not here reproduced, but cumulatively they create a good deal of difficulty for Jeremias’s case. To these I would add the following considerations.

(1) The mood of Luke 4:23 is not that of unanimous rage. It may be all of critical, cynical and unbelieving, but it is not to be classed with the fury that led to the attempt to Lynch Jesus.

(2) On Jeremias’s reconstruction the people are furious, not because Jesus spoke of God’s grace, but because he spoke only of God’s grace. This emphasis must be imported into the text which says only that “words of grace…. proceeded out of his mouth.”

(3) χάρις elsewhere in Luke is a very dynamic concept, and it seems unlikely that he would use it here to refer to God’s-mercy-as-subject-matter. If he were to have used χάρις in this way we should at least have expected τοίς λόγοις περί τῆς χάριτος, “words concerning grace.”

If we are to follow Jeremias’s negative understanding of πάντες ἐμαντρέων αὐτῷ what are we to make of these words?

The JB translates “he won the approval of all.” The NEB speaks of a “general stir of admiration.” These translations presumably correspond to the uses of μαντρέω listed by BAG (p. 494) under the meanings, “testify favorably, speak well (of), approve (of),” and in particular to the third of these. It is however questionable whether μαντρέω ever bears the sense “approve (of).” Certainly none of the references cited by BAG support this meaning. Even the sense “speak well (of)” is only attested in a limited way. We do not find the word meaning “speak well of” in the sense of “say kind things about,” but only in the sense “give a good report about.” The evidential sense of the word’s legal usage never seems to be entirely present. There is always a sense of establishing something by the testimony. If then, we need to find something to be supported by the synagogue-congregation’s testimony then three possibilities are: (1) that Jesus’ claim to be the messianic prophet is correct; (2) that Jesus’ known character supports his credibility; (3) that the φήμη, “report,” of Luke 4:14 which has also reached Nazareth is correct. The first of these cannot really be squared with the development of the episode, but Leaney, who claims that Luke has produced an “impossible story,” seems to opt for this view. He suggests that here the people “testified to (Jesus’) special gift and claim,” which must mean an acceptance of Jesus’ claim. This give us an almost Johannine sense for μαντρέω of “witness...to the nature and significance of (Jesus’) person.”

Luke is, however, not inclined towards using μαντρέω in this way. Apart from Acts 23:11 there is no example in Luke/Acts of the verb used to designate the religious witness of a believer to Christ or the gospel, and even in Acts 23:11 the use of μαντρέω does not stand in its own right as a reference to religious witness, but only in so far as it is Luke’s shorthand for the fuller form which occurs in the previous and parallel clause concerning witness in Jerusalem, i.e., shorthand for διομαντρέσαι τά περί ἐμοί, “to testify about me.” This religious use of μαντρέω is particularly unlikely at Luke 4:22, for the context there means that the word would lack the “orientation to evangelization” which “distinguishes the term from δομολογεῖ.” Moreover, that μαντρέων αὐτῷ is followed by καὶ ἐθαύμαζον suggests that we are
account by understanding the words to mean "they bore witness against him." On this understanding ἐδήσαμεν, "they were amazed," registers opposition to what is strange. The strange thing opposed is a message that stresses the mercy of God (τοῖς λόγοις τῆς χάριτος, "the words of grace"—v. 22), and has no mention of eschatological vengeance on the Gentiles. (The quotation in v. 18-19 from Isa 60: 1-2 ends with "the year of the Lord's favor." Isa 60:2 continues "the day of vengeance of our God [on the Gentiles]."

Thus, according to Jeremias, there is no change of attitude: "from the outset unanimous rage was their response to Jesus."

The reconstruction is attractive, and has gained the support of K. H. Rengstorf and W. Grundmann. However, there are strong arguments to be levelled against Jeremias's view. I draw attention to the objections raised by H. Anderson and D. Hill. These are not here reproduced, but cumulatively they create a good deal of difficulty for Jeremias's case. To these I would add the following considerations:

(1) The mood of Luke 4:23 is not that of unanimous rage. It may be all of critical, cynical and unbelieving, but it is not to be classed with the fury that led to the attempt to Lynch Jesus.

(2) On Jeremias's reconstruction the people are furious, not because Jesus spoke of God's grace, but because he spoke only of God's grace. This emphasis must be imported into the text which says only that "words of grace...proceeded out of his mouth."

(3) χάρις elsewhere in Luke is a very dynamic concept, and it seems unlikely that he would use it here to refer to God's-mercy-as-subject-matter. If he were to have used χάρις in this way we should at least have expected τοῖς λόγοις περὶ τῆς χάριτος, "words concerning grace."

If we are not to follow Jeremias's negative understanding of πάντες ἐμαυτούς αὐτῷ what are we to make of these words?

The JB translates "he won the approval of all." The NEB speaks of a "general stir of admiration." These translations presumably correspond to the uses of μαυτρύω listed by BAG (p. 494) under the meanings, "testify favourably, speak well of (of)," and in particular to the third of these. It is however questionable whether μαυτρύω ever bears the sense "approve of." Certainly none of the references cited by BAG support this meaning. Even the sense "speak well (of)" is only attested in a limited way. We do not find the word meaning "speak well of" in the sense of "say kind things about," but only in the sense "give a good report about." The evidential sense of the word's legal usage never seems to be entirely absent. There is always a sense of establishing something by the testimony.

If then, we need to find something to be supported by the synagogue-congregation's testimony then three possibilities are: (1) that Jesus' claim to be the messianic prophet is correct; (2) that Jesus' known character supports his credibility; (3) that the φήμη, "report," of Luke 4:14 which has also reached Nazareth is correct. The first of these cannot really be squared with the development of the episode, but Leany, who claims that Luke has produced an "impossible story," seems to opt for this view. He suggests that here the people "testified to (Jesus') special gift and claim," which must mean an acceptance of Jesus' claim. This gives us almost Johannean sense for μαυτρύω of "witness...to the nature and significance of (Jesus') person." Luke is, however, not inclined towards using μαυτρύω in this way. Apart from Acts 23:11 there is no example in Luke/Acts of the verb used to designate the religious witness of a believer to Christ or the gospel, and even in Acts 23:11 the use of μαυτρύω does not stand in its own right as a reference to religious witness, but only in so far as it is Luke's shorthand for the fuller form which occurs in the previous and parallel clause concerning witness in Jerusalem, i.e., shorthand for διαμαυτρύθησα τὰ περὶ ἰμῶν, "to testify about me." This religious use of μαυτρύω is particularly unlikely at Luke 4:22, for the context there means that the word would lack the "orientation to evangelization" which "distinguishes the term from διαμολογεῖν." Further, that μαυτρύους αὐτῷ is followed by καὶ ἐδήσαμεν suggests that we are


dealing here with something less than acceptance of Jesus’ Christological claims, since for Luke θαυμάζω always refers to something less than or not yet as developed as a proper belief in Jesus.15 I find myself then, unable to follow Leaney.

The second possibility, that the people are providing a character reference for Jesus,16 requires us to rest heavily on the “where he had been brought up” of Luke 4:16. It is more imaginative than likely and does not seem to find support among the commentators.17 What perhaps tells most decisively against this understanding is the presence at the end of the verse of the question “Is not this Joseph’s son?” However we understand these words, they do not constitute the “testimony” and cannot follow after a testimony which is itself based on what the people know of Jesus as an ex-resident of Nazareth. Such a testimony would need to follow rather than anticipate this question.

The third possibility has the largest measure of support.18 As Plummer has it, “They bore witness to Him, not that what he said about Himself, but that what rumour had said respecting his power as a teacher, was true.” For support we have the “report” of Luke 4:14 and the “words of grace proceeding out of his mouth” of v 22, at which the people marvel. But really it seems quite artificial to make this sharp distinction between what Jesus is saying and his manner of expressing it, while the “words of grace” must have as part of their essential content that the day of fulfilment of God’s gracious purpose has arrived precisely because the people find themselves addressed by the messianic prophet. In any case, surely it is incredible that Jesus’ momentous claim can be left to one side, while they comment on Jesus’ powers of oratory? I am inclined to agree with Loisy on aurait été frappé de sa prétention plus que de charmé de sa parole.19

Eltester offers us a further possibility on the basis of what he sees as a parallel use of μαρτυρέω in Praedicatio Petri.20 The text reads: ἔξελέξαμεν ἃς δώδεκα . . . εὐαγγελίσασθαι . . . ὧν οὖν ἠκούσατε καὶ πιστεύετε ταῦτα, οὐκ θεοσκέταις ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔχοντες ἀπόλογον ἕπειτ’ οὐκ θεοσκέταις.21


16Cf. A. Schlatter, Die Evangelien nach Markus und Lukas (Schlatter Erläuterungen zum Neuen Testament 2; Stuttgart: Calwer, 1947) 203.

17A. George ("La Predication de Jésus dans la Synagogue de Nazareth.") BVC 59 [1964] 21 may be an exception.


20Preserved in Clem. Alex. Str. 6.6.48. (Misprinted as 5.48 in Eltester, "Israel," 138.)

21Quoted from ΒΙΒΛΙΟΘΗΚΗ ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ ΠΑΤΕΡΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΩΝ ΣΥΓΓΡΑΦΕΩΝ, Vol 8 (Athens: ΑΠΟΣΤΟΛΙΚΗ ΔΙΑΚΟΙΝΩΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ ΤΗΣ

Ellester22 argues that the Nazareth folk are qualified as witnesses by both hearing (“in your hearing” [v 21], “the words of grace” [v 22]) and seeing Jesus (“the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed on him” [v 20]). It is not clear to me whether Eltester understands that the people μαρτυρέω merely by their seeing and hearing Jesus or whether their particular act of witness is to wonder at the words which proceed from Jesus’ mouth.23 In any case Luke’s main point will be to emphasize that the Jews have been given every opportunity to see and hear Jesus, and in this way Luke wants to prepare for the emphasis on the guilt of the Jewish people to be found in the Acts speeches.24 If Eltester means that the people μαρτυρέω by seeing and hearing Jesus then it is evident that he understands μαρτυρέων in Praedicatio Petri as a reference to witnessing (=hearing) the apostolic preaching. This understanding of Praedicatio Petri cannot be sustained. The activity involved in μαρτυρέων must be contemporary with the hypothetical alternative εἰπών οὐκ ἰθανάμενες. But the setting for this unavailable ἀπολογία25 must be the day of reckoning and not the day of hearing the preacher, so the activity involved in μαρτυρέων is what hearing the preaching puts people in the position of having to do on the day of reckoning. On that day they can admit to having witnessed (=heard) the apostolic preaching, but they cannot witness (=hear) it.26 Thus Eltester’s appeal to Praedicatio Petri would be invalidated. Without this support Eltester would be proposing a sense for μαρτυρέω which is not attested elsewhere and is neither demanded nor encouraged by the Lukan context.

If on the other hand Eltester means that the people μαρτυρέω by wondering at Jesus’ words, then an act of giving testimony is involved, and Eltester must be understanding μαρτυρέων in Praedicatio Petri in some
other way. We may consider for Praedicatio Petri the three possibilities: (1) They bear witness to the truth of the apostolic preaching. (2) They bear witness to the content of the apostolic preaching. (3) They bear witness about themselves, that they heard the apostolic preaching.

The first could have a stronger or weaker sense, both of which fall outside the normal lexical range for μαρτύρεως. It could denote religious witness by those not committed to the religious conviction involved or the weaker sense of simply admitting the truth of the matter. Besides the lexical difficulties neither of these possibilities has any particular claim to fit the Praedicatio Petri context. It is not obvious why unbelievers should be testifying to the apostolic message in the judgment day; and while they must certainly concede its truth in the judgment, the activity designated by μαρτυρομένους is seen in Praedicatio Petri to follow from their having heard the preaching, in a manner not accounted for by this understanding.

The second alternative would seem to have no point in the Praedicatio Petri context and we may set it aside. If Eltester allows one of these suggestions, it must be the third. ("Auch die Bürger von Nazareth haben gehörzt und sie räumen das sogar ein." 27) If the reference is to bearing witness to having heard the apostolic preaching, then it is so as a testimony against themselves, 28 as at Matt 23:31, i.e., testimony "that we heard (and are thus guilty)." That the emphasis falls on such a confession of guilt 29 is supported by Clement's paraphrase in the following paragraph, τὴν κλασσάν δικαίαν ἐνεα... ὁμολογήσουμεν, "they will confess... the judgment to be just."

Now it is not at all easy to import this emphasis on a self-condemning admission into the Lukan context. Even if it is true (with Eltester) that Luke emphasizes the exposure of the Jews to Jesus' teaching and presence to prepare for the emphasis on the guilt of the Jewish people to be found in the episode rather than something that belongs properly to Luke's recounting of the episode. The thought would run: amazement indicates that they have in fact heard and that what they heard registered. It is reprehensible to hear and not believe (since the message is [self-evidently] true). It will soon appear that the Nazareth folk do not respond with belief, therefore their amazement testifies to their guilt, since their failure to believe is not from failing to hear.

It may be fairly objected that this is too subtle for Luke. It is certainly too compressed to be unprepared for. The infancy narratives bear witness to great reversals to follow in the train of the coming of the Messiah, but there is not yet any theme of Jewish rejection of Jesus and the gospel. At this point the Nazareth folk have not even themselves rejected Jesus to make it possible for Luke to stress their guilt in this way. 30 I therefore conclude that the use of μαρτυρομένους in Praedicatio Petri cannot help us with the sense of that verb at Luke 4:22.

A suggestion which we may salvage from the discussion of Eltester's treatment of Luke 4:22a is the possibility that with εὐαρτύνουσα we are dealing with a Lukan perspective which is not visible from within the episode's own horizon. To repeat from above, "the Lukan perspective on an episode rather than something that belongs properly to Luke's recounting of the episode." The first of our original set of possibilities for εὐαρτύνουσα was testimony "that Jesus' claim to be the messianic prophet was correct." Can it be suggested that Luke considers that the amazed response stands as testimony to Jesus despite the rejection which follows? 31 The amazement of the Nazareth folk makes its contribution to the evidence which is meant to bring Theophilus to faith in Jesus.

Luke seems to set quite a store on testimony which is not "from faith to faith," i.e., he has a concern for the secular evidence for Christianity. This note is set from the prologue where "The secular character of the language is very noticeable." 32 Flender's comments that Luke "does not water down the gospel message but points to its human exterior. The story of Jesus is not a myth but a real event and the usual means of historical research can check it." 33 A. A. Trites in an article, "The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts," finds much the same emphasis there. To quote from his conclusion: 34

The frequent use of legal language in connection with real courts of law is germane to Luke's presentation and part of his theological intention. The claims of Christ are being debated, and Luke intends by the use of lawcourt scenes and legal language to draw attention

28A more neutral "we agree that we heard" would render the following οἷς Εξόντες δικαιογίαι εἴπον: οἷς θεοσφάγες: tautological.
29It is assumed that to hear is to know. A failure to believe is not a failure to be convinced that something is true but rather a culpable refusal to respond to what is known to be true and has been placed immediately before one's attention in the proclamation.
30Eltester, "Israel," 111.
31I.e., "making a self-condemning admission."
32The use of the imperfect εὐαρτύνουσα tells against this understanding since their amazement can only become a testimony against them after they have rejected Jesus, an event which is still future from the perspective of Luke 4:22a.
33Not that they are presented as prepared to see their own response as testimony to Jesus, but that it stands as such in Luke's eyes and for his readers.
35Flender, Luke, 63-64. See the whole discussion, 62-66.
to this fact. The messiahship and Lordship of Jesus are in dispute, and this challenges Luke to demonstrate these claims by many convincing proofs. (ἐν πολλοῖς τευχήροις i 3; cf. Jos. Ant. 5.39). An important part of his task is the presentation of the courtroom evidence in such a way that it will bear witness to Christ.

In this light I draw attention to Luke's concern to "document" the public impact of Jesus.

(1) Luke is concerned to point out that Jesus' activity is not only known by those present on a particular occasion, but that its impact is such that reports spread far and wide (Luke 4:14-15; 4:37; 5:15; 7:17; [8:39]).

(2) Luke emphasizes both the number of people attracted to hear and see Jesus (5:15; 6:17; 8:4; 11:29; 12:1) and also the range of places from which they come (5:17; 6:17; 8:4).

(3) Luke stresses the general recognition of the "good" done by Jesus. (Note the use of δόξαῖον θείων, "to glorify God," to express this in Luke 5:26; 7:16.) The idea is present constantly in the healing accounts and cf. Acts 4:16; 10:38.


Now none of this in Luke is directly a matter of people becoming disciples. It is not the beginnings of faith that Luke documents. He is concerned rather to tell us something about Jesus and not something about him which may only be discerned by the eye of faith. The public are in some sense Luke's "impartial" witnesses, since Jesus' ministry makes its impact on them all alike whether they be those who are committed to discipleship (Luke 19:37), or those who reject him in murderous rage (4:22) or those who cold-bloodedly set out to trap him in the political machinations of the day (20:26).

Such a role for these "public witnesses" finds further support in Luke's general failure to show any interest in what might be, for the people involved, the aftermath to their having been so impressed by Jesus. This is especially acute with regard to the favorable attitude by the people to Jesus (see n.37). They simply remain as the approving public (19:48) right up to Jesus' arrest. We want to ask, isn't that an impossible position to remain in. But Luke is not conscious of any tension that needs resolving in terms of faith or rejection, since his framework at this point is not that of personal response to Jesus but rather that of "impartial" witness. Along with the approving crowd, the disciples are there as well (more widely or more narrowly viewed)60 but with no thought of transition from the one to the other. This same phenomenon is exhibited at Acts 5:13-14. The people are there as well (cf. Acts 2:47), and also the range of places from which they come (5:17; 6:17; 8:4).

37Setting aside for a moment notes of specific amazement (which may have critical overtones and in any case merely denote the extraordinary), Luke has a generally favorable attitude maintained towards Jesus by the people (as opposed to the various classes of leaders) through the gospel as a whole. [11:27]; 13:17; 18:43; 19:48; 21:38; 22:6; [29:27]; 23:48. Luke 22:13 is exceptional in associating the people with the chief priests and rulers. A. George ("Israel dans l'oeuvre de Luc," RR 75 [1968] 504 and n.54) following G. Rau ("Das Volk in der lukanischen Passionsgeschichte. Eine Konjekturn zu Lk 23:13,") ZNW 56 [1965] 41-51) and P. Winter (On the Trial of Jesus; 2d ed. revised and edited by T. A. Burkill and Geza Vermes; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974) 141 n.23 = (1961) 301 n.23 eliminates the exception by reading τοῦ λαοῦ, "of the people," for καὶ τῶν λαῶν, "and the people." This move is criticized by W. Radl (Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Duppeverk [Europäische Hochschulschriften 23:49; Bern-Frankfurt: Lang, 1975] 303). In 23:4-5 there is a vaguer reference to multitudes associated with the chief priests. 38 It is the "human exterior" of the gospel to which Flender (Luke, 63) draws attention.

39We should also note how Luke has the crowds present for teaching which is addressed to the public, and in any case merely denote the extraordinary), Luke has a generally favorable attitude maintained towards Jesus by the people (as opposed to the various classes of leaders) through the gospel as a whole. [11:27]; 13:17; 18:43; 19:48; 21:38; 22:6; [29:27]; 23:48. Luke 22:13 is exceptional in associating the people with the chief priests and rulers. A. George ("Israel dans l'oeuvre de Luc," RR 75 [1968] 504 and n.54) following G. Rau ("Das Volk in der lukanischen Passionsgeschichte. Eine Konjekturn zu Lk 23:13,") ZNW 56 [1965] 41-51) and P. Winter (On the Trial of Jesus; 2d ed. revised and edited by T. A. Burkill and Geza Vermes; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974) 141 n.23 = (1961) 301 n.23 eliminates the exception by reading τοῦ λαοῦ, "of the people," for καὶ τῶν λαῶν, "and the people." This move is criticized by W. Radl (Paulus und Jesus im lukanischen Duppeverk [Europäische Hochschulschriften 23:49; Bern-Frankfurt: Lang, 1975] 303). In 23:4-5 there is a vaguer reference to multitudes associated with the chief priests. 38 It is the "human exterior" of the gospel to which Flender (Luke, 63) draws attention.

40There seems to be some movement in Luke's use of the term μακάριος, "blessed." 41We may compare the significance of public reputation for Paul at 2 Cor 8:21.


44Eltester, "Israel," 138.

man standing at the right hand of God” (Acts 7:56) is a testimony spoken by a man of faith to be received by faith. This was not visible to the Council members. But things which are “visible” are of some importance to Luke and make their contribution to the witness through which Luke means to bring Theophilus to faith in the Christ.

Luke is free to use μαρτυρεῖω in Luke 4:22 for this kind of “impartial” witness to what has a place in secular history because he has not claimed the word to express the religious witness of believers (see the earlier discussion). For Luke, such witness is not unimportant to faith, since the impact of Christ in secular history points beyond itself to the genuinely divine event to be perceived.

It is appropriate that Luke should indicate in this first incident which he records from the ministry of Jesus, the significance he intends in material on the impact of Jesus, to follow throughout the gospel.66 Luke makes this connection at the beginning to alert his readers so that they can appreciate the cumulative weight of this kind of testimony to Jesus as the course of the gospel unfolds.

To reach this understanding for ἐμαρτύρων we have obviously assumed a relationship between the activity involved in ἐμαρτύρων and that involved in θαύμαζον. To be more exact, the activity of the first verb is achieved and defined by means of the activity of the second verb. This could be so if we have in ἐμαρτύρων αὐτῷ καὶ θαύμαζον an example of colloquial parataxis.47 There is an example of such parataxis at Luke 6:48, though the relationship between the two verbs is different there. Matt 8:14 is closer, but the verbs there are simple participles.

Another possibility is an epexegetical use of καί.48 BDF recognize a category of “explicative” uses of καί which are “always used to particularize.” Of the list 1 Cor 8:12 is of special interest to us. We read there ἐμαρτάνοντες εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνεδρείαν αὐθεντουσάς εἰς χριστὸν ἐμαρτάνετε, “sinning against your brothers and wounding their conscience, which is weak, you sin against Christ.” The particular way in which the brothers are sinned against is by the wounding of their consciences.

A third possibility is to assimilate this Lukan usage to the common tendency in NT narrative to duplicate words for speaking (e.g., ἀποκρίνομαι καὶ λέγω, “answer and say”; μαρτυρεῖω καὶ λέγω, “bear witness and say”; ἐρωτάω καὶ λέγω, “ask and say”). This usage tends to be rather pleonastic, but it can achieve a certain emphasis, and of interest to us is that the relationship between the two verbs is that which we are suggesting for Luke 4:22a. The answer (or testimony etc.) is given in what is said. In the Luke 4 context ἐνθωμαίζει functions analogously to a verb of speaking and it may be against this background that we should set the Lukan usage here. For a non-pleonastic example of this usage we can compare John 1:15, ἰδίνης μαρτυρεῖ πρὸς αὐτόν καὶ κέρκργεν, “John bore witness to him and cried.” For our purposes it is not necessary to decide between these suggestions. It is sufficient if we have been able to demonstrate that it is a natural reading of Luke 4:22a to understand the witness borne as finding its expression in the amazement expressed at the words of Jesus.

Finally, what is the relationship between the response to Jesus in Luke 4:22 and the murderous rage of vv 28-9? Luke is not concerned to show us that the one response turns into the other. Here is no good beginning turned sour. Rather, it would be better to say that Luke wants his readers to see that even people so inimical to the claims of Jesus that they seek his death, nevertheless, cannot but be impressed by the words of this imposing figure. The response of v 22 has nothing to do with the beginnings of Christian faith. It is registered to tell us something about Jesus and not something about the spiritual state of the hearers. The impact of Jesus’ words on these people stands in Luke’s eyes as evidence (witness) for the authenticity of this Christ and his message precisely because they are about to be revealed as implacably opposed to Jesus. Their very rejection of him underlines the impartiality of their witness to him. And in Luke’s understanding such “impartial” witness—the objective, visible-in-history impact of Jesus—has a not insignificant contribution to make to that witness through which Luke means to bring Theophilus to faith in the Christ.

ἐνθωμαίζει... καί ἐμαρτύρει... It is doubtful whether these examples should be thought of in terms of epexegetical καί rather than Semitic parataxis.

50Luke 13:15; Mark 7:28; John 1:48, etc.


53It is even more frequent to have one verb in participial form.