

Blažej Štrba

Joshua's leadership into the Promised Land epitomized in Luke 23:42

Introduction

Twenty-two years ago Giovanni C. Bottini described the good thief's plea in Luke 23:42 as a humble prayer that implies a faith in the messianic salvific power of Jesus.¹ Some later studies realized a uniqueness in the use of the name Jesus in the thief's plea, but did not discuss this narrative device.² Only recently has the typology of Joshua in Jesus of Nazareth become a real issue in biblical scholarship.³ J.C. de Vos and S. Koch seek to prove that there is no direct relation between Joshua and Jesus in New Testament. Even though Koch has refrained from any positive evaluation of the programmatic use of the name *Jesous* in the New Testament,⁴ he has left the question open as to whether or not this unique form of address in the vocative Ἰησοῦ should be explained as refer-

¹ Bottini, *Introduzione*, 177. Cf. also Büchele, *Der Tod Jesu*, 50. About the salvific aspect of the whole narrative Luke 22–23, see Bottini, “Il valore salvifico”, esp. 93–95.

² Tremolada, *E fu annoverato*, 212 n. 122: “Si noti la pronuncia del *nome* proprio Ἰησοῦς e non di una qualifica”. Cf. anche Bottini, “Is 52,13–53,12”, esp. 58–60. Bovon, *Lukas*, IV, 468, supposes that the differences in textual traditions reflect “die Tatsache, dass der Text sehr oft erzählt worden ist”. Ruiz Freites, *El carácter salvífico*, 206, does not investigate why Luke in his passion narrative uses this unique case in the NT and gives a straightforward explanation that the evangelist “indica le extrema confianza del malhechor, quien está pidiendo la *salvación*”. Artyushin, *Raccontare la salvezza*, 331–332, is interested basically in the “seeing” theme and thus he does not even address the issue of the name “Jesus”.

³ Van Aarde, “Jesus as Joshua”; Štrba, “Warum”; de Vos, “Josua und Jesus”; Koch, “Mose sagt”.

⁴ Koch, “Mose sagt”, 547–552. It is interesting that the author does not deal with Jude 5 (ὅτι Ἰησοῦς λαὸν ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου σώσας), where the Editio Critica Maior of the Catholic Letters, as well as NA²⁸ prefer the reading of Alexandrinus, Vaticanus, and some textual families 33, 81, as confirmed by the Vulgate. De Vos, “Josua und Jesus”, 538, dedicates a paragraph to Jude 5 and insinuates that the author of the letter had the preexistent Christ in mind. He explains this passage as a typology of the Exodus and quotes Justin Martyr as one who presented actually Joshua as one who led the people out of Egypt. However, Joshua as the leader of the Israelites of Egypt was well known from LXX Josh 24:31 (ὅτε ἐξήγαγεν αὐτοὺς ἐξ Αἰγύπτου).

ring “auf einen spirituellen Einzug in Jesu βασιλεία als ein gelobtes Land angespült wird”.⁵

There is no doubt that Jesus of Nazareth would have been addressed during his life-time simply by his personal name “Jesus”, יֵשׁוּעַ in Aramaic (Ἰησοῦς in Greek texts). Yet, in the entire New Testament there is only one instance where Jesus is addressed by his personal name only. The second of the two criminals, crucified with Jesus, addresses the Nazarene on the cross directly as Ἰησοῦ “Jesus” (Luke 23:42) without giving him any further title.⁶ This uniqueness calls for attention especially in the work of Luke when seen within a chain of only six instances of the vocative “Jesus”. The first four have an additional qualifying title: “Jesus of Nazareth” (4:34); “Jesus, Son of the Most High God” (8:28); “Jesus, Master” (17:13); “Jesus, Son of David” (18:38). The fifth instance is our case 23:42 (with only “Jesus”) and the sixth uses the name of Jesus with the most important designation “Lord Jesus” (Acts 7:59).⁷ In the first four cases, the appositions serve to identify an appositive – the name of Jesus. In the last case, the name of Jesus is in the second place, however, not as apposition but as the proper name κύριε Ἰησοῦ.⁸ The absence of identifying apposition in the criminal’s invocation is a remarkable rhetorical device especially for the reader.

There is scholarly consensus that Luke draws words, texts, themes and theology from the LXX.⁹ I assume that the typology of *leadership* into the Promised Land, by the crossing of the Jordan, may be helpful as a narrative prototype for understanding why Luke presents the good thief with such an extraordinary address. In other words, Joshua’s leadership into the Promised Land became a theological archetype for the understanding of the death of Jesus and his going into his kingdom on the one hand, and the words of the dying criminal in Luke 23:42 on the other hand.

First I present Luke’s unique use of the vocative of the name “Jesus”. Second, the typology the Joshua’s leadership will be expounded. Third, early Christian writings will be examined and consulted. The concluding consideration will stress the importance of Joshua’s role for the theology of Jesus’ leadership into his heavenly kingdom (cf. 2 Tim 4:18).

⁵ Koch, “Mose sagt”, 541-542; cf. de Vos, “Josua und Jesus”, 524.

⁶ The other instances of the vocative Ἰησοῦς in direct speech are always accompanied by some title or appellative; cf. Mark 1:24 // Luke 4:34; Mark 5:7 // Luke 8:28; 17:13; Mark 10:47 // Luke 18:38; Acts 7:59; Rev 22:20.

⁷ C.K. Rowe concluded that the development of the identity of Ἰησοῦς as κύριος within the Lukan work has one movement with two directions: “The directions within this movement are, looking from Acts to the Gospel, the portrayal of the heavenly Lord as a human figure, and, looking from the Gospel to Acts, the portrayal of the human figure as the heavenly Lord” (Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 207).

⁸ Blass - Debrunner - Rehkopf, *Grammatik*, § 260.

⁹ Recently Zugmann, “Lukas liest LXX”, with further literature.

Luke's unique use of the name "Jesus" in 23:42

a) Luke's use of the name "Jesus" in the vocative

It has already been shown that in Luke's gospel there are both the formal correspondence and the unity of acts between the character of God and that of Jesus.¹⁰ This may corroborate the gradual understanding of Jesus as portrayed by the three duplets of the vocative addresses of "Jesus", mentioned above. The first two (4:34; 8:28) refer to the two men, both with an unclean demon (one within the religious and another one within the rustic context) who reject Jesus. The second duplex (17:13; 18:38) witnesses to the faith (of one Samaritan among the ten lepers and of one blind man) that Jesus has the power to cure. The third duplex (23:42; Acts 7:59) is represented by those – the evildoer and Stephen – whose invocations witness to such faith that expresses the belief in life with Jesus after death.¹¹ Out of these six cases, the evildoer's address to Jesus requires a particular attention; his address with vocative Ἰησοῦ *without* a qualifying title calls for explanation.

The author of the third gospel purposely used stylistic devices regarding the meaning of the name "Jesus" already in the narrative of the healing of the blind man at Jericho (18:38-43). There the blind man's double cry (vv. 38, 39) affirms that Jesus at Jericho evokes in the mind of the people Joshua conquering this city, yet, he differentiates Ἰησοῦς of Nazareth from Ἰησοῦς the conqueror, Joshua.¹² My aim is to show that in the case of 23:42 Luke even by a small stylistic device, mediates outstanding theology.¹³ I will treat the text in its final form.¹⁴ Within the positive speech of the criminal, I will focus on his unique use of the name Jesus, trying to uncover why this uniqueness occurs at this point in Jesus' life.

¹⁰ Schürmann, *Lukasevangelium*, I, 403; Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology*, 120-121.

¹¹ Cf. Sellner, *Das Heil Gottes*, 348-349.

¹² Štrba, "Warum", 43-59.

¹³ I presume that the style is a carrier of a message and is at the service of the overall theme. Farkaš, *Naratívne umenie*, 83-88, has shown how Luke's style links the narrative from Zacchaeus to Calvary.

¹⁴ I will treat the text from the rhetorical point of view, rather than focusing on the genesis of the text. Berger, *Exegese*, 90, has identified the style as the category of the event of communication (Mitteilungsgeschehen) and defined as "Unter *Stil* versteht man in der neueren Forschung das Prinzip der Auswahl sprachlicher Mittel, die den Rezipienten und der rhetorischen Wirkabsicht entsprechen sollen. Stil entspricht damit dem rhetorischen Prinzip des 'aptum', der Anpassung an die Bedingungen des Mitteilungsverhältnisses". Though in a different direction, Kowalski, "Stil", esp. 124-127, has also argued for a more differentiated attention, from the perspective of exegesis, to the style of Luke's gospel. I would like to thank Prof. Beate Kowalski for the remarks she made on an earlier version of the present essay.

b) Textual witnesses of the good thief in Luke 23:42

The strong textual witnesses¹⁵ confirm the reading “and he [the good criminal] said, ‘Jesus, remember me’”. The other manuscripts¹⁶ add “Lord”, changing the address completely from “Jesus” to “Lord”, i.e. “he said to Jesus: ‘Lord, remember me’”.¹⁷ J.A. Fitzmyer interpreted this change, as “an effort to avoid having Jesus addressed by his name”.¹⁸ He suggests that the criminal’s unusual use, not of “Lord” but of “Jesus” alludes to the kingship of Jesus.¹⁹

Modern authors have not yet explained satisfactorily why the most ancient and distinguished textual witnesses preserve this unique address “Jesus” for the Crucified One only in this case. The general agreement emphasizes that by this episode Luke presents the salvific aspect of Jesus’ death. Whether “Jesus promises him [to the criminal] salvation here and now”²⁰ or his kingdom corresponds to a purely heavenly reality into which one enters only after death,²¹ is arguable. It is safe to say that the content of Luke 23:42 conveys few different perspectives on the kingdom.²² However, the kingdom is not the only major distinctive issue of the verse.²³

Though L.T. Johnson²⁴ and D.L. Bock²⁵ recall that the use of the personal name “Jesus” is striking, as far as I am aware, only K. Stock has tried to explain a little more the reason for the literary *hapax* of the vocative “Jesus” in the criminal’s plea. He proposed to read in Luke’s presentation a great closeness and confidence²⁶ between the dying thief and dying Jesus.²⁷

¹⁵ \mathfrak{P}^{75} \aleph B C* L and some Sahidic and at least five Bohairic manuscripts.

¹⁶ A C² W Θ Ψ (070) *f*^{1.13} 33 and the majority of the Koine manuscripts; supported by the Latin and Syriac versions.

¹⁷ Cf. NA²⁷, 240. However, according to the uncial D, the criminal used neither “Jesus” nor “Lord” in direct address (εἶπεν αὐτῷ· μνήσθητί μου ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ).

¹⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, II, 1510.

¹⁹ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, II, 1508.

²⁰ Marshall, *Luke*, 870-873.

²¹ Wolter, “Reich Gottes”, esp. 550-551.

²² Cf. Schreiber, “Ars moriendi”, 286.

²³ Pace Ahn, *The Reign of God*, 198, who deals only very little with our verse.

²⁴ Johnson, *Luke*, 378-381.

²⁵ Bock, *Luke*, II, 1856.

²⁶ Stock, *Il racconto della passione*, 537.

²⁷ Brown, *The Death*, II, 1005-1008, similarly addressed this issue but dedicates to it much less space than to the issue of the famous textual problem of “into” εἰς *versus* “in” ἐν the kingdom. The manuscripts \aleph C* read ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ σου. Recently Sellner, *Das Heil Gottes*, 336-338, has given a new solution to the problem of the textual problem of “into” εἰς *versus* “in” ἐν the kingdom. However, he has not even mentioned the problem of the unique address “Jesus”. Previously Eckey, *Lukasevangelium*, II, 950-951, mentioned it but did not deal with it.

c) *The unique address within the context*

Our literary *hapax* in Luke 23:42²⁸ supports a definite interest in Luke's presentation of the two "evildoers". Whether Luke took as a base for 23:39-43 a previous Aramaic narrative²⁹ or used his own material,³⁰ does not affect the fact, that the dialogue of the crucified is one of the most important passages of the Lukan work.³¹ Moreover, Luke has presented positively both the character of the good thief and his speech on purpose.³² For the former (presentation of one evildoer) we may compare the versions of the two synoptics, having both thieves reviling Jesus.³³ For the latter (emphasis on the evildoer's speech) it is sufficient to compare the criminal's address with that of the dying Stephen as described in Acts 7:59:

| | |
|------------|---|
| Luke 23:42 | Ἰησοῦ, μνήσθητί μου ὅταν ἔλθῃς εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν σου. |
| Luke 23:46 | πάτερ, εἰς χειρὰς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. |
| Acts 7:59 | κύριε Ἰησοῦ, δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου. |

Stephen's words "receive *my spirit*" δέξαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου at the end of his speech evoke the last words of the dying Jesus "I commend *my spirit*" παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου (Luke 23:46) rather than those of the dying criminal. However, Stephen's address, unambiguous and with no other textual variants – "Lord Jesus" κύριε Ἰησοῦ (Acts 7:59) – evokes the criminal's invocation Ἰησοῦ "Jesus". Thus the two dying believers in Jesus cry with great confidence to the same Jesus.³⁴ Though Stephen had not received such a sure promise from Jesus as did the criminal, the martyr's further prayer (Acts 7:60: "Lord, do not

²⁸ As Mark 15:32 and Matt 27:44, the parallels to Luke 23:39-43 show. Cf. Aland (ed.), *Synopsis*, 486-487.

²⁹ García Pérez, "El relato".

³⁰ Bovon, *Lukas*, II, 445.

³¹ Tremolada, *E fu annoverato*, 212.

³² Patella, *The Death*, 107-142, has shown that even the Lukan (and Johannine) account(s) Luke 23:44-49 of the death of Jesus in its primitive form provide the basis of the accounts in Matthew and Mark.

³³ Luke as a skillful theologian has interwoven very carefully in the context of the Passion narrative other two characters more positively in respect to Matthew or Mark – Simon of Cyrene (Luke 23:36) and Joseph of Arimathea (23:50-56). Luke's Simon seems to be elaborated independently of Mark's presentation; see Bøe, *Cross-Bearing*, 198-220. Joseph of Arimathea is a masterpiece of narrative unifying a figure that combines practice of Jewish piety and the classical hellenistic category of esteem; see Müller, "Josef von Arimathäa".

³⁴ The difference in their addresses seems to reflect the speaker's standpoint, in view of the fact of the resurrection and early confession that the risen "Jesus" is the "Lord" (cf. 1 Cor 12,3).

hold this sin against them”) makes it plausible that his death imitates that of his master Jesus (cf. Luke 23:33) and thus that he is going to *enter* into “heaven” (cf. Acts 7:56, 59). As J.A. Fitzmyer states: “His request is a plea for a gracious remembrance, for he can do nothing at this point to merit it”.³⁵

Such a unique positive description of the good thief in Luke’s narrative merits to be rewarded in by the Lukan Jesus. Indeed, Jesus’ answer starting with the phrase “truly (truly) I say to you” (Luke 23:43) that appears more than 74 times in the NT, is unique in Luke’s gospel.³⁶ Whereas it appears twice in the direct speech of Jesus to Peter – before the betrayal (Matt 26:34 // Mark 14:30 // John 13:38) and before the final calling in John 21:18, twice in John’s gospel to Nicodemus (3:5, 11) – Luke uses it more clearly in a positive context. Moreover, the emphatic function of the personal pronoun ἀμήν σοι λέγω “truly, to you I say” underscores the uniqueness of Jesus’ oath.³⁷ Whereas other synoptics let Jesus foretell Peter’s denial, Luke uses it to foretell the happy end of the criminal. There are also good contextual grounds for affirming that the criminal’s unique address was a deliberate intention of the writer of the third gospel.

Luke’s gospel presents both the two disciples on the way to Emmaus and also even the eleven at the end of Jesus’ earthly life, as having hoped that Jesus is going to restore the “kingdom to Israel” (Luke 24:21; Acts 1:6). The following argument is a simple presupposition, namely that the Israelite living under the Roman Empire could easily link the name “Jesus” Ἰησοῦς (= ישוע) with the person of Joshua Ἰησοῦς (= יהושע) son of Nun. The reason rests on the issue of the land of Israel as their inheritance. For every occupied people, the heroes from the past are gladly remembered. Joshua had conquered the Promised Land from the majority of Canaanite nations (cf. Josh 6–12) and thereafter apportioned it to the Israelites (cf. Josh 13–21). The author of the third gospel perceived that the very same name Ἰησοῦς for the two protagonists Jesus and Joshua was confusing for the disciples. In their understanding of Jesus’ role till the very last moment of Jesus’ presence among them, it was seen through the militant victorious perspective, as Luke 24:21 and Acts 1:6 confirm.

This presupposition of the misunderstanding of Jesus’ role by his followers, partially based on the name Ἰησοῦς, is supported by the fact that all three synoptics actually give particular importance to the topographical indication – Jesus approaches Jericho. Indeed, all three gospels have no great interest in any toponym in the chapters preceding the narrative of the healing of the blind man at Jericho. But when Jesus approaches Jericho, Mark strangely uses two sentences within one single verse to indicate that Jesus with his disciples *entered*

³⁵ Fitzmyer, *Luke the Theologian*, 208.

³⁶ Stovell, “Seeing the Kingdom of God”, 445.

³⁷ Stock, *Il racconto della passione*, 98-99.

Jericho and *left* it (Mark 10:46; cf. Matt 20:29). Luke has Jesus cure the blind man *before* he enters Jericho and thus says with more sophistication (Luke 18:35-43) what is evident from Mark's phrase: Jesus does not conquer Jericho.³⁸ All the synoptics dissociate Jesus of Nazareth from Joshua the conqueror of the city Jericho. Indeed, Luke lets Jesus be a herald of salvation even for the inhabitants of Jericho (19:9). Once Luke has clarified that the name Jesus is not to be misunderstood as carrying connotations of Joshua – the conqueror, the name can be used later again plainly and without further specification. At this point I would propose a positive explanation of the unique address “Jesus”, that has its basis on the specific role of Joshua the son of Nun.

The typology of leadership

The Book of Joshua describes the military conquest only in some chapters (Josh 6–12). Strictly speaking, only some of these chapters narrate the war stories.³⁹ The rest of the book presents important themes such as the apportioning of the Land (Josh 13–21) or the service to the Lord (Josh 22–24). G. Fischer considers the crossing over the Jordan (Josh 3–4) as the crucial event of the Book of Joshua.⁴⁰ Indeed, the Jordan crossing forms the theological inclusion between the exodus from Egypt and eisodos into the Promised land.⁴¹ In this section I will briefly outline the leadership of Joshua at the event of the Jordan crossing. Joshua's leadership indeed provides a model for the criminal's address.

a) *The leadership of Joshua*

Elsewhere I have argued⁴² that the primary role of Joshua is not the military leadership in the conquest but the leading of the people into the Promised Land. Joshua's inception into the leadership role operates on three different levels. Though Moses presents Joshua as the candidate who will succeed him in Num 27:22, it is the priest Eleazar who installs Joshua before the Israelites in 27:23 – *a priestly installation*. It is only in Deut 3:28 that Moses tells the people that Yahweh himself commanded him to commission Joshua, which he executes very precisely, in Deut 31:7-8 (in accordance with Num 27:19) – *a mosaic installation*. The third installation of Joshua takes place in the Tent of Meeting

³⁸ Cf. Štrba, “Warum”, 43-59.

³⁹ De Vos, “Josua und Jesus”, 535, also states that the Book of Joshua is much more peaceful than it is generally assumed.

⁴⁰ Fischer, *Theologien*, 59.

⁴¹ Štrba, *Take off your sandals*, 331-335, 339-340. Cf. Krause, *Exodus und Eisodus*, 400-402.

⁴² Štrba, *Take off your sandals*, 129-287.

(Deut 31:23), and except for Moses and the reader, nobody witnesses how and to what role Yahweh commissions Joshua – *a divine installation*. It is this last installation that provides Joshua with the same authority as Moses, because the first leader Moses could have given to the second leader Joshua only a part of his authority (cf. Num 27:20). Just as Moses recalls in Deut 31:1-8 that the initial purpose of Yahweh's first revelation (cf. Exod 3:8) was still not fulfilled, so the narrator presents the preparation of the new leader so carefully that also the reader will realise that Joshua, in his role as leader will also enjoy the same assistance from Yahweh (Deut 31:23; Josh 1:5) as did Moses (Exod 3:12).⁴³

This fact of the *entry* of the Israelites into the Promised Land under Joshua's leadership as described in Josh 3–4 has been taken for granted for a long time, with broad exegetical consent, as simply an initial act of the conquest. Although Josh 18:1 describes the land as “conquered”, the fact is that Joshua was never charged by a command of the Lord *to conquer the land*, but was divinely installed *to bring the Israelites into the land* (Deut 31:23; cf. Josh 1:2). As Moses was sent to lead the people out of Egypt, in a one-to-one dialogue with Yahweh, so Joshua was charged directly by Yahweh and in the presence of Moses alone to lead the people into the Promised Land. Evidently, it is not only the parallel leading roles that put Joshua on the same level as Moses, but Yahweh's promise of his personal assistance which assures to both leaders the same authority. The reader knows this before the Israelites become aware of it. The importance of this role and this event is confirmed in Josh 3:7: “And the LORD said to Joshua, ‘This day I will begin to exalt you in the sight of all Israel, that they may know that, as I was with Moses, so I will be with you...’”. On the basis of this leadership in crossing over the Jordan, Yahweh had decided to make him as great as Moses, which the people themselves recognized *post factum* (4:14).⁴⁴

The unique role of Joshua – to lead the people into the Promised Land – makes an explicit literary link to the decision of the Lord in Exod 3:8 where the Lord's revelation consists principally in his “coming down”⁴⁵ to *deliver the people from Egypt (exodus)* and to *lead them into the good land (eisodos)*. In Exod 3:10 Yahweh charges Moses to bring the Israelites out of Egypt, but he never charges him with the second part of his decision. Only after the installation of Joshua in Deut 31:23 does Yahweh charge Joshua in Josh 1:2 with the second part of his own initial decision. Thus the Lord's salvific project (cf. Exod 3:7-10) was accomplished under the leadership of Joshua after the crossing over of the Jordan (Josh 4:14).

⁴³ Štrba, *Take off your sandals*, 121-169.

⁴⁴ Štrba, *Take off your sandals*, 272-281.

⁴⁵ As in Gen 11:7; 18:21, this verb expresses a divine decision to enter into the history of his people.

b) The criminal's address – an expression of the typology

I presume that the unique event of the entry into the Promised Land – being both of literary and great theological importance (cf. the old promise of the land given in Gen 12:7) – was perceived and particularly reflected on by the author of the third gospel. Luke's careful understanding of this distinctive role of Joshua allowed him to underline a distinguished role for Jesus of Nazareth by adopting the typology of the *eisodos into the Promised Land* of which Joshua is the best model. It is safe to state that the "evildoer" on the cross, at the moment of his death, is the only person in the NT whom the theologian Luke allows to express this high typology of *eisodos* when he addresses Jesus simply by name. The criminal's thoughts are no longer about the conquest of the land. His only concern was the *eisodos* into Jesus' kingdom and not to renew the (kingdom of) Israel (cf. Acts 1:6; Luke 24:21). Indeed, he *crosses over* from earthly life into everlasting life, according to Jesus' promise, on the same day. Jesus also needs not think about the conquest of his own kingdom; he, however, leads the pleading criminal into it.

Early Christian writings

Finally, a short presentation of the well-known ancient Christian writers⁴⁶ supports our assumption that the criminal's address helps to understand Jesus' *leading* role at the very moment of his death. This theological idea of leading into Jesus' kingdom that lies behind our literary *hapax* of Luke 23:42 could be supported on the basis of the larger context of the New Testament writings (cf. John 10:40; Acts 3:22-23; 7:37; 1 John 5:6; Heb 4:8, etc.). The fact is that this typology was recognized by early Christian texts like the *Letter of Barnabas*,⁴⁷ Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone*⁴⁸ or Tertullian's *Adversus Marcionem*,⁴⁹ although the later Church Fathers focused more on other aspects.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ Cf. Noort, "Joshua", esp. 199-215.

⁴⁷ The author of *Barnabas* (dated to the period 80-130 C.E.) has primarily a spiritual interpretation of Scripture but he interprets some events recorded in the OT typologically. Cf. Loman, "The *Letter of Barnabas*", 252-254. In spite of the fact that the *Letter of Barnabas* uses the lexeme *typos* 13 times, one should hesitate to qualify as anachronistic this Letter as employing the typological reading of the OT; cf. Ostmeier, "Typologie und Typos", 122-123.

⁴⁸ Justin (ca. 100-165) was probably the first to develop the typological reading of the text of the OT in contrast to the literal interpretation. Ostmeier, "Typologie und Typos", 123, however, warns against a too simplistic qualification of the exegesis of the Apostolic Fathers as typology: "Τύπος ist bei Justin alles andere als ein Terminus technicus". For more about Justin's typological reading, see Simonetti, *Biblical Interpretation*, 19-26.

⁴⁹ Cf. Quasten, *Patrology*, II, 273-276.

⁵⁰ Among many, the faith of the thief or the significance of the incident for the baptism; cf.

For the author of the *Letter of Barnabas*, the parallel between the prophet Ἰησοῦς son of Nun as prefigurement and Ἰησοῦς son of God as fulfillment is evident (*Barn.* 12:8-9). It works on the *figura* of Joshua as a victorious warrior (against Amalek) and spy of the Promised Land, and the reality of Jesus' victory on the cross (12:2-7). But the author had also a *clear presupposition of the figura of the entry* into the Promised Land (already in 6:8-19, where the prophet Moses introduces this issue); on this *figura* he presented other parallels of Jesus with (the figure of) Joshua. Jesus, son of God would, accordingly, lead into and apportion the inheritance of the divine land.

Justin linked both the figure (or *typos*) of Joshua and his name in the OT to *Jesus* in the NT who "is our *Messiah* (Christ)" (Ἰησοῦς ἐστὶν ὁ χριστὸς ἡμῶν; *Dial.* 113:1). The motif of Joshua's leadership and his apportioning of the land (132:3) is of major importance for the understanding of *Jesus*, the Christ and his resurrection (113:3-4). Consequently, according to Justin, the *typos Joshua* is preferable (49:6-8; 75:1-3; 113; 120:3 [Joshua "brought your fathers out of Egypt"(!); cf. *Dial.* 132:3; LXX Josh 24:31]) to the *typos Moses* (*Dial.* 90:4; 111:1-2; 131:4).

Tertullian (155/160-ca. 225), refuting the dualism between the image of God in the OT and the NT, claimed in his treatise *Adversus Marcionem* that the *Messiah* had appeared here on earth in the person named *Iesus* (*Adv. Mar.* 3:16,1-3; 4:7,11). For the Jews – he continues in a similar vein to Justin (cf. *Dial.* 49) – the *Messiah* is rather more like *Elijah* than *Joshua*. Tertullian's reading of the figure of *Joshua*, however, like Justin's, is evidently typological and he developed the Christological explanation based on the *typos Joshua* leading into the Promised Land (*Adv. Mar.* 3:16,4-7).⁵¹

Concluding considerations

The early Christian writings apply the typology of *Joshua*, who leads the Israelites into the Promised Land, to *Jesus'* leadership of his people into the heavenly kingdom. Their readings fit admirably into the scene of the crucifixion according to Luke's version. The theology of *eisodos* expressed by this biblical typology

Widdicombe, "The Two Thieves".

⁵¹ *Adv. Mar.* 3:16,3-5: "Cum successor Moysi destinaretur Ausus filius Naue, transfertur certe de pristino nomine et incipit uocari Iesus... Hanc prius dicimus *figuram* futuri fuisse. Nam quia Iesus Christus secundum populum, quod sumus nos nati in saeculi desertis, *introducitur erat* in terram promissionis melle et lacte manantem, id est uitae aeternae possessionem, qua nihil dulcius, idque non per Moysen, id est non per legis disciplinam, sed per Iesum, per euangelii gratiam, prouenire habebat... ideo is uir, qui in huius sacramenti imagines parabatur, etiam *nominis dominici* inauguratus est *figura*, Iesus cognominatus" (SC 399: 144-146 [italics mine]; cf. PG 2: 371BC).

gives a plausible explanation why the dying man may call upon Jesus, simply by name alone. Without running the danger of being misunderstood by his listeners (or by the implied reader of Luke's gospel), the criminal's address presents Jesus as the one who saves others by leading them through his own death to his kingdom.⁵² The literary *hapax* of the name "Jesus" in Luke 23:42 therefore finds in this way a reasonable understanding and supports the theological explanation of Jesus' *soteriological*⁵³ mission already before his actual death and resurrection.

By way of naming the Crucified, Luke anticipates and verbalizes the very role of Jesus himself. In fact, the criminal is the only one whose request refers explicitly to Jesus' kingdom and is the only one who is granted the favorable answer: an unconditioned promise – to be with Jesus in his kingdom. Such a reading of the criminal's address sheds also further light on the name *Jesus* and on the understanding of his divine mission towards humans.

Blažej Štrba

Comenius University in Bratislava, BaĎín, Slovakia

Bibliography

- Ahn Y.-S., *The Reign of God and Rome in Luke's Passion Narrative. An East Asian Global Perspective* (BIS 80), Leiden - Boston 2006.
- Aland K. (ed.), *Synopsis quattuor evangeliorum. Locis parallelis evangeliorum apocryphorum et patrum adhibitis*, Stuttgart 1996¹⁵.
- Artyushin S., *Raccontare la salvezza attraverso lo sguardo. Portata teologica e implicazioni pragmatiche del «vedere Gesù» nel Vangelo di Luca* (Tesi Gregoriana: Serie Teologia 203), Roma 2014.
- Berger K., *Exegese des Neuen Testaments. Neue Wege vom Text zur Auslegung* (UTB 658), Heidelberg 1977.
- Blass F.W. - Debrunner A. - Rehkopf F., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen (1896) 1976¹⁴.
- Bock D.L., *Luke. II: 9:51–24:53* (BECNT 3b), Grand Rapids MI 1996.
- Bøe S., *Cross-Bearing in Luke* (WUNT II/278), Tübingen 2010.
- Bottini G.C., *Introduzione all'opera di Luca. Aspetti teologici* (SBF. Analecta 35), Jerusalem 1992.
- "Il valore salvifico della morte di Gesù secondo Lc 22–23. Un confronto con Is

⁵² Cf. Girard, *De Luc à Théophile*, 109; Grilli, *L'opera di Luca*, I, 134.

⁵³ Luke uses 4 times the verb σῶζω with reference to the crucified Jesus; cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke the theologian*, 212.

- 52–53”, *Theologica*. Annali della Pontifica facoltà teologica della Sardegna (Cagliari 1994) 87–110.
- “Is 52,13–53,12 nel racconto della passione di Lc 22–23”, *LA* 47 (1997) 57–78.
- Bovon F., *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. 4. Teilband: *Lk 19,28–24,53* (EKK III/4), Neukirchen-Vluyn - Düsseldorf 2009.
- Brown R.E., *The Death of the Messiah: From Gethsemane to the Grave. A Commentary on the Passion Narratives in the Four Gospels* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library), II, New York etc. 1994.
- Bücheler A., *Der Tod Jesu im Lukasevangelium. Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23* (FThS 26), Frankfurt a.M. 1978.
- de Vos J.C., “Josua und Jesus im Neuen Testament”, in Noort (ed.), *The Book of Joshua*, 523–540.
- Eckey W., *Das Lukasevangelium. Unter Berücksichtigung seiner Parallelen*. Teilband 2: *Lk 11,1–24,53*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2006².
- Farkaš P., *Naratívne umenie evanjelistu Lukáša* [Narrative art of the evangelist Luke], Bratislava - Nitra 2007 (in Slovak).
- Fischer G., *Theologien des Alten Testaments* (NSK.AT 31), Stuttgart 2012.
- Fitzmyer J.A., *Luke the Theologian. Aspects of His Teaching*, New York - Mahwah NJ 1989.
- *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. II: X–XXIV (AB 28A), Garden City NY 1985.
- García Pérez J.M., “El relato del Buen Ladrón (Lc 23,39–43)”, *EstBib* 44/3–4 (1984) 263–304.
- Girard M., *De Luc à Théophile. Un évangile fait sur mesure pour notre temps* (Parole d’actualité 8), Montréal - Paris 1998.
- Grilli M., *L’opera di Luca*. I: *Il Vangelo del viandante* (Collana biblica), Bologna 2012.
- Johnson L.T., *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina 3), Collegeville MN 1991.
- Koch S., “„Mose sagt zu ‚Jesus‘“ – Zur Wahrnehmung von Josua im Neuen Testament”, in Noort (ed.), *The Book of Joshua*, 541–554.
- Kowalski B., “Stil in der neutestamentlichen Exegese. Definition, Methodik und Konkretisierung am Beispiel des Lukasevangeliums”, *PzB* 12 (2003) 105–128.
- Krause J.J., *Exodus und Eisodus. Komposition und Theologie von Josua 1–5* (VT SS 161), Leiden 2014.
- Loman J., “The Letter of Barnabas in Early Second-Century Egypt”, in A. Hilhorst - G.H. van Kooten (ed.), *The Wisdom of Egypt. Jewish, Early Christian, and Gnostic Essays in Honour of Gerard P. Luttikhuisen* (AJEC 59), Leiden - Boston 2005, 247–265.
- Marshall I.H., *The Gospel of Luke. A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC), Exeter 1978.
- Müller C.G., “Josef von Arimathäa und die Grablegung Jesu (Lk 23,50–56)”, in C.G. Müller (ed.), „Licht zur Erleuchtung der Heiden und Herrlichkeit für dein Volk Israel“. Studien zum lukanischen Doppelwerk (BBB 151), Bonn 2005, 179–198.
- Noort E., “Joshua: The History of Reception and Hermeneutics”, in H.F. van Rooy - J.C. de Moor (ed.), *Past, Present, Future. The Deuteronomistic History and the Prophets* (Oudtestamentische Studiën / Old Testament Studies 44), Leiden 2000, 199–215.
- Noort E. (ed.), *The Book of Joshua* (BETL 250), Leuven etc. 2012.

- Ostmeyer K.-H., "Typologie und Typos: Analyse eines schwierigen Verhältnisses", *NTS* 46 (2000) 112-131.
- Patella M., *The Death of Jesus. The Diabolic Force and the Ministering Angel: Luke 23,44-49* (Cahiers de la RB 43), Paris 1999.
- Quasten J., *Patrology. II: The Ante-Nicene Literature after Irenaeus*, Utrecht 1953.
- Rowe C.K., *Early Narrative Christology. The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (BZAW 139), Berlin - New York 2006.
- Ruiz Freites G.A., *El carácter salvífico de la muerte de Jesús en la narración de San Lucas. Estudio exegético de Lc 23,33-49 desde la perspectiva soteriológica lucana*, Città del Vaticano 2010.
- Sellner H.J., *Das Heil Gottes. Studien zur Soteriologie des lukanischen Doppelwerks* (BZNW 152), Berlin - New York 2007.
- Schreiber S., "„Ars moriendi“ in Lk 23,39-43. Ein pragmatischer Versuch zum Erfahrungsproblem der Königsherrschaft Gottes", in C. Niemand (ed.), *Forschungen zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt. Festschrift für Albert Fuchs* (Linzer Philosophisch-Theologische Beiträge 7), Frankfurt a.M. - Bern 2002, 277-297.
- Schürmann H., *Das Lukasevangelium. I. Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1,1-9,50* (HThKNT 3/1), Freiburg i.Br. etc. 1969.
- Simonetti M., *Biblical Interpretation in the Early Church. An Historical Introduction to Patristic Exegesis*, Edinburgh 1994.
- Stock K., *Il racconto della passione nei vangeli sinottici. Seconda parte (ristampa)*, Roma 1992.
- "Jesus der Retter nach Lk 23,35-43", in *La salvezza oggi. Congresso Internazionale di Missiologia* (Studia Urbaniana 34), Roma 1989, 531-541.
- Stovell B.M., "Seeing the Kingdom of God, Seeing Eternal Life: Cohesion and Prominence in John 3:1-15 and the Apocryphal Gospels in Terms of Metaphor Use", in S.E. Porter - A.W. Pitts (ed.), *The Language of the New Testament. Context, History, and Development* (Linguistic Biblical Studies 6), Leiden - Boston 2013, 439-467.
- Štrba B., *Take off your sandals from your feet! An exegetical study of Josh 5,13-15* (ÖBS 32), Frankfurt a.M. etc. 2008.
- "Warum steht in Lk 18,38 ἐβόησεν?", *BN* Heft 128 (2006) 43-59.
- Tremolada P., "E fu annoverato fra iniqui". *Prospettive di lettura della Passione secondo Luca alla luce di Lc 22,37 (Is 53,12d)* (AnBib 137), Roma 1997.
- van Aarde A., "Jesus as Joshua, Moses en Dawidiese messias in Matteus", *Scriptura* 84 (2003) 453-467.
- Widdicombe P., "The Two Thieves of Luke 23:32-43 in Patristic Exegesis", in F. Young et alii (ed.), *Studia Patristica. XXXIX: Papers presented at the Fourteenth International Conference on Patristic Studies held in Oxford 2003. Historica, Biblica, Ascetica et Hagiographica*, Leuven etc. 2006, 273-277.
- Wolter M., "„Reich Gottes“ bei Lukas", *NTS* 41/4 (1995) 541-563.
- Zugmann M., "Lukas liest LXX. Septuaginta-Rezeption und -Mimesis des dritten Evangelisten", *PzB* 23 (2014) 41-63.

