

***"In the Vicinity of Jericho":
Luke 18:35 in the Light of its
Synoptic Parallels***

STANLEY E. PORTER
THE UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD
SHEFFIELD, ENGLAND

At Luke 18:35, the author (called Luke for purposes of clarity) has apparently redacted his source, Mark 10:46 (par. Matt 20:29), quite heavily.¹ Mark's relevant wording reads: "And they came (ἐρχονται) to Jericho. And as he was going out (ἐκπορευομένου) from Jericho and his disciples and a great multitude, the son of Timaeus, Bartimaeus, a blind beggar, was sitting beside the road." Luke retains very little of the wording, using instead ἐγένετο δε ἐν τῷ ἐγγίξειν αὐτὸν εἰς ἱεριχώ. Worth noting are the following changes. First, Mark's two directional references indicating going away from Jericho—"out" (ἐκπορευομένου) and "from" (ἀπό)—are completely eliminated in Luke. Second, although the phrase εἰς ἱεριχώ is retained, in Luke it follows a different verb from the one in Mark, coinciding with

1. For the sake of discussion and in light of the majority of scholarly opinion, I assume that the Markan version is redacted by Luke. That this is reasonable for this passage is seen in the light of Lukan differences regarding language, phrasing and geography, where Matthew and Mark are in closer harmony than the more distinctive Lukan account (see below for discussion of details). This is not the position of all, however. For example, H. Riley posits that Mark conflates his Matthean and Lukan sources (B. Orchard and H. Riley, *The Order of the Synoptics: Why Three Synoptic Gospels?* [Macon: Mercer Univ. Press, 1987] 70-71). Although this perhaps fits R. Bultmann's analysis in which he posits that the Synoptics tend to add details (*History of the Synoptic Tradition* [Oxford: Blackwell, 1968] 213, 316), this is far from certain. If Luke's account does not have a sense of motion, then conflation has not occurred. The presumption rests with those who see Matthew as abbreviating his Markan source to only one directional indicator, and Luke as changing his reference to a spatial indicator. Movement from Luke's verb of location to two similar accounts with verbs of motion is very unlikely (see below for arguments to support the above analysis of Luke). That the sources and directions of influence in the Synoptic accounts are complex is demonstrated by B. Chilton, *Profiles of a Rabbi: Synoptic Opportunities in Reading About Jesus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989) esp. parts 1 and 2.

changes in number. Luke introduces ἐγγίζω in place of Mark's verb of motion, ἔρχονται. Third, Luke introduces his distinctive ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ plus infinitive phrasing.²

According to traditional interpretation of this verse, Luke apparently contradicts Mark and Matthew.³ Mark tells of Jesus' healing of Bartimaeus on the way out of Jericho, an understanding which Matthew at 20:29-34 appears to follow. But as Haenchen states, "Nach Mk spielt sich diese Heilungsgeschichte ab, als Jesus Jericho verlässt, nach Lk (18,35), als sich dieser Stadt nähert."⁴ As a consequence, there have been numerous attempts either to bring these two accounts into some meaningful harmony or to explain why it is that Luke so clearly stands against his apparent source. It must be recognized, however, that McNeile's position—that Luke's relation to Mark "admits of no harmonization"⁵—has carried the day with the majority of scholars.

A few of the proposed solutions warrant mention, nevertheless.⁶ Augustine simply argued that there were two separate healing accounts, with one blind man healed on entrance and the other on exit (Augustine, *Quaest. Evang.* ii.48). This solution eliminates the apparent directional discrepancy, while suggesting a whole new set of problems focused upon the very similar wording of the two accounts throughout the rest of the pericope. This solution has not commended itself to many, if any, major recent commentators.

Calvin proposed that the blind man, Bartimaeus, saw Jesus on the way into the city of Jericho but was unable to attract his attention. On Jesus' way out of the city, with the help of a friend, he did attract Jesus' attention and was healed.⁷ Consequently, the healing actually occurred on the way out of Jericho. Whereas Mark and Mat-

2. S. E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the NT, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (New York: Peter Lang, 1989) 120-26, esp. 124. This kind of construction occurs in 54 of its 63 instances in Luke-Acts, and 38 of these in the gospel. Parallel references occur at Luke 1:8; 9:33; 11:27; 17:14; 24:51 with the present infinitive and 24:30 with the aorist infinitive.

3. I am not concerned with the difficulty over how many were healed. This problem is not nearly so difficult as the one treated in this paper.

4. E. Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu* (Berlin: Topelmann, 1966) 370. See also G. N. Stanton, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Univ. Press, 1989) 151.

5. A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1915; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1980) 291; contra (too facilely?) Z. C. Hodges, "The Blind Men at Jericho," *BibSac* 122 (1965) 328.

6. See A. Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (5th ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1901) 429-30; cf. idem, *An Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Matthew* (1915; rpt. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1982) 282-83.

7. J. Calvin, *A Harmony of the Gospels Matthew, Mark and Luke* (vol. 2; trans. T. H. L. Parker; ed. D. W. Torrance and T. F. Torrance; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972) 278; and tentatively F. Godet, *A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke* (New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1887) 415.

they only mention the blind man upon the occasion of his healing, Luke mentions that the blind man was present on both Jesus' entrance and his exit. This theory has recently been revived by C. L. Blomberg, utilizing redaction criticism:

Probably Luke has just abbreviated Mark, as he does consistently elsewhere, leaving out the reference to the departure from Jericho. Mark after all begins his passage in agreement with Luke, by reporting that Jesus first came to Jericho, but his style is somewhat inelegant in stating that "they came to Jericho and as he is going out of Jericho . . ." (Mk. 10:46). Luke therefore improves the style by excising the latter clause, so that one must not press him to mean that the miracle narrated in 18:36-43 occurred immediately after the action of verse 35. Luke simply records Jesus' arrival, Mark presupposes his entrance into and exit from the town, which Luke omits, and then both describe the healing as Jesus was on his way out. The blind man would have sat by the roadside, as beggars customarily did, all the while (18:35), but would only have realized the significance of the passing visitor when crowds were accompanying him upon his departure (18:36). The type of gap which must be presupposed between verses 35 and 36 is hinted at by Luke's omission of any mention of crowds as Jesus was entering, and is consistent with the type of literary abridgement which occurs throughout the gospels. . . .⁸

But this interpretation surely is strained, since one must infer a period of time when Jesus was in Jericho, even though the text of Luke does not make reference to it. No one reading Luke's gospel by itself would be able to imagine this as the sense of the passage.

A third solution is that there were two known Jerichos a few miles apart.⁹ Archaeological evidence is clear that the site of New Testament Jericho (Tulul Ab el-'Alayiq), which was enhanced and built up by Herod, is different from the site of Old Testament Jericho (Tell es-Sultan; cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 4.459; cf. *Ant.* 15.96-103, 106-7).¹⁰ This theory holds that all three Gospel writers place the healing event on Jesus' trip between the Old Testament site and the New

8. C. L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels* (Leicester: IVP, 1987) 128-29; cf. also G. L. Archer, *Encyclopedia of Bible Difficulties* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982) 332-33.

9. P. Ketter, "Zur Lokalisierung der Blindenheilung bei Jericho," *Bib* 15 (1934) 411-18; Godet, *Luke*, 415; N. Geldenhuys, *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951) 467; W. F. Arndt, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1956) 387; tentatively D. A. Carson, "Matthew," 435, and W. L. Liefeld, "Luke," 1006, *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. F. E. Gaebelin; vol. 8; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981).

10. On New Testament Jericho see J. L. Kelso and D. C. Baramki, *Excavations at New Testament Jericho and Khirbet En-Nitla* (New Haven: ASOR, 1955) esp. 5-19; J. B. Pritchard, *The Excavations at Herodian Jericho*, 1951 (New Haven: ASOR, 1958) esp. 56-58.

Testament site. Mark and Matthew speak of Jesus' walking away from the Old Testament city and Luke speaks of Jesus' walking toward and into the New Testament city. This theory is damaged by the lack of any clear evidence that the long-abandoned Old Testament site was even known as the city of Jericho, despite the presence of an important perennial spring. The evidence to this point indicates that it was probably merely a tell, at best only sparsely populated.¹¹ There is the further difficulty that any reader of the text would have had difficulty knowing which site was being referred to in any one of the accounts.

A fourth solution is that Luke 18:35 was originally part of the Zacchaeus story, which is unique to Luke, but that Luke interposed the healing of the blind man and wrote a new introduction at 19:1.¹² This solution is implausible, since it posits that the Lukan ἐγένετο construction was part of pre-Lukan material.

A fifth solution is that

The alteration may have been made simply to accommodate the Zacchaeus incident which takes place in Jericho, and which Luke wishes to place after the healing of Bartimaeus as a climax to the series of incidents. At the same time, Luke avoids separating the Zacchaeus story from the following parable, which also comes from his non-Markan material. . . .¹³

This solution is perhaps enhanced if one recognizes the movement of Luke's gospel: Jesus is traveling toward Jerusalem, his city of destiny. Any movement which does not point toward this final goal, especially in relation to Jericho, a city so near to Jerusalem, is eliminated.¹⁴ Of course this solution may well explain why Luke has done what he does but it does not reconcile the apparent contradiction. For many this is in fact not a problem.¹⁵

11. See K. M. Kenyon, *Digging up Jericho* (London: Benn, 1957) 264; idem, "Jericho," *Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (ed. M. Avi-Yonah; Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1976) 2.564, followed by most archaeologists since. For a recent survey see J. R. Bartlett, *Jericho* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) chaps. 6 and 7.

12. T. Schramm, *Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine Literarkritische and Redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1971) 143-44. He follows B. S. Easton, *The Gospel According to St. Luke* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1926) 277.

13. I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 692.

14. See J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1985) 1211. C. F. Evans (*St. Luke* [London: SCM, 1990] 657) notes that Jericho is the first town mentioned by Luke since 9:51, and is not actually on the natural or direct route from Galilee to Judea via Samaria, except if the Markan account (see esp. 10:1) is being followed; cf. E. P. Sanders and M. Davies, *Studying the Synoptic Gospels* (London: SCM, 1989) 39-40.

15. See e.g., M. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* (2 vols.; Sheffield: JSNT, 1990) 2.672-74.

Since the meaning appears clear in Luke 18:35, few have taken time to examine in detail the particular wording of the important Lukan introduction to the healing pericope. The Lukan introduction in 18:35 by all accounts sets the stage for Luke's description of the miraculous healing, as well as bringing the Lukan account into apparent conflict with Mark and Matthew. Perhaps one of the reasons that commentators have not pursued the linguistic issues is the disparaging comment made by Plummer in his commentary. He claims that "The translation, 'When He was not far from Jericho,' i.e. as He had just left it (Grotius, Nösgen), is perhaps the worst device for harmonizing Lk. with Mt. and Mk. The meaning of ἐγγίζειν is decisive; and there is the εἰς in addition."¹⁶ But as most scholars are all too well aware, the exact meaning of ἐγγίζειν is open to some debate, as is the sense of εἰς. I do believe, however, that Plummer is correct that ἐγγίζειν does not mean "he had just left." Instead, I wish to argue that, at least as far as Luke is concerned, ἐγγίζω is not exclusively or even primarily a verb of motion, as it is usually interpreted; in some of its instances it is a verb of location, either in time or in space. Luke 18:35, therefore, speaks of location, not movement. Not only is this analysis compatible with evidence found in the standard lexica, but this sense can be widely substantiated by examination of the evidence in Luke-Acts, including use of the verb in so-called kingdom passages, use of the verb in other passages, and use of the preposition εἰς.

The spatial locational sense of ἐγγίζω is supported by a brief statement in H. Preiske's entry in TDNT. He says that "A very different use of ἐγγίζειν and ἐγγύς as indications of time and space is also to be found, esp. in Lk. and Jn. Ἐγγίζω is used a. with the dat. to indicate place and movement . . . or with εἰς . . .," where he cites Luke 18:35.¹⁷ Much of the difficulty which has bedeviled examination of ἐγγίζω has come about because of its theological significance, in particular with reference to the issue of the coming of the kingdom. On the one hand, C. H. Dodd argued vociferously for so-called realized eschatology, claiming that ἐγγίζω and φθάνω are both verbs which indicate arrival.¹⁸ On the other hand, W. G. Kümmel and more recently A. J. Mattill argue for the sense in the New Testament of imminence though not arrival, claiming that ἐγγίζω and φθάνω are both verbs which indicate that something is at hand though not fully

16. Plummer, *Luke*, 430; cf. J. Reiling and J. L. Swellengrebel, *A Translator's Handbook on the Gospel of Luke* (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 611: "eggizō eis followed by the name of a town means 'to approach,' 'to come into the neighborhood of.'"

17. H. Preiske, ἐγγύς, *TDNT* 3 (1964) 331-32.

18. C. H. Dodd, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (rev. ed.; New York: Scribners, 1961) 28-30.

present.¹⁹ This is not the place to venture any proposals regarding the concept of the kingdom, except to say that recent discussion has arrived at what amounts to a more widespread consensus: there are statements in the gospels, including Luke's gospel, which are compatible with the kingdom as present (e.g., Luke 11:20; 17:21) and the kingdom as still expected (e.g., Luke 11:2; 13:28-29).²⁰

This debate has some relevance for the discussion of this article, since Luke 10:9, 11 are the two places in the gospel where ἐγγίζω is used in terms of kingdom. Luke 10:9 is paralleled by Matt 10:7, and may well pick up Mark 1:15, which Luke omits in his parallel (Luke 4:15). Luke reads (at vv. 9 and 11): ἤγγικεν [ἐφ' ὑμᾶς v. 11 omits] ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. This passage has been discussed numerous times. Although Fitzmyer suggests that Luke 10:9 is the same as Mark 1:15, he resists the force of the Markan passage, as well as the Lukan passage. He says with reference to the Lukan passage that the kingdom "has drawn near to you," that is "in the very preaching of it by the disciples sent out by Jesus." This seems to imply a present reality, although Fitzmyer claims to follow Kümmel, James Robinson and others in understanding it to mean "has approached, has drawn near."²¹ The Markan passage precedes the statement that the kingdom is come with the words πεπλήρωται ὁ καιρὸς. As Robinson recognizes, v. 15 consists in an announcement of what has happened: πεπλήρωται, ἤγγικεν But the exclusive use of the perfect tense (v. 15) to announce the nearness of a future eschatological consummation is worthy of note. For even though we must understand ἤγγικεν to mean "has drawn near" rather than "has come," it still refers to something having taken place: the times have shifted, the kingdom is now near because it has moved from a vague distance to a near position, a shift which has already taken place.²²

19. W. G. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment: The Eschatological Message of Jesus* (London: SCM, 1957) esp. 19-25; A. J. Mattill, Jr., *Luke and the Last Things: A Perspective for the Understanding of Lukan Thought* (Dillsboro, North Carolina: Western North Carolina Press, 1979) 71-76, 168-76.

20. See as recent examples: R. H. Stein, *The Method and Message of Jesus' Teachings* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1978) esp. 68-74; D. C. Allison, Jr., *The End of the Ages Has Come: An Early Interpretation of the Passion and Resurrection of Jesus* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 101-14; G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Kingdom of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986) 71-218; R. O'Toole, SJ, "The Kingdom of God in Luke-Acts," *The Kingdom of God in 20th-Century Interpretation* (ed. W. Willis; Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, 1987) esp. 154-55, 157-59.

21. Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 848, with bibliography; cf. Kümmel, *Promise and Fulfilment*, 23-24, although his argument regarding whether two different Greek verbs would have translated the same original Aramaic behind Luke 10:9 and 11:20 is beside the point.

22. J. M. Robinson, *The Problem of History in Mark* (London: SCM, 1957) 24, with bibliography (unchanged in Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982, 72).

Much easier is Hengel's simple translation: "The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is here."²³ Regarding Luke 10:9 and 11, Marshall relies upon Mark 1:15 and Luke 11:20, where a parallel is found. He believes that the point of Luke 10:9 and 11 is the same as 11:20: "the power of the kingdom has drawn near to those to whom it is being preached and may be received by them if they respond to the message. . . . In Mk. 1:15 the nearness is more temporal, whereas here it is more spatial."²⁴ This linkage of temporal and spatial proximity is worth noting. This evidence creates at least the possibility that ἐγγίζω may be used with the sense of spatial or locational proximity in Luke 18:35.²⁵

An examination of the other places where ἐγγίζω appears in Luke-Acts is now in order.²⁶ First I will treat several examples which appear to have an arguably evident spatial locational sense.²⁷ Second I will discuss several more difficult examples. Third I will mention Luke 18:40. It is not necessary for me to prove that ἐγγίζω has a clear spatial locational meaning in every instance, only that there are enough clear cases so that it can be recognized that the locational sense is one of the legitimate senses of the word.

Luke 7:12 (no parallels). Luke narrates that Jesus went (ἐπορεύθη) to the city of Nain, and his disciples and a crowd went (συνεπορεύοντο) with him. ὥς δὲ ἤγγισεν τῇ πύλῃ τῆς πόλεως, the dead body of the widow's son was carried by. Use of ἐγγίζω follows use of two verbs of motion. The use of the aorist, ἤγγισεν, after ὥς, along with the dative object, following two verbs of motion, is certainly compatible with the idea that Jesus was located at the gate when the body was brought by. Use of the aorist form of ἐγγίζω after ὥς is uniquely Lukan.²⁸

23. M. Hengel, *Studies in the Gospel of Mark* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) 53 and note 82.

24. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 422, with bibliography; cf. also idem, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zonder van, 1970) 133-34. Allison agrees (*End of the Ages*, 104).

25. Cf. the statements in D. E. Hiebert, *Mark: A Portrait of the Servant* (rev. ed.; Chicago: Moody, 1979) 262: "still others hold that Luke's language simply means that Jesus was 'near' or in the vicinity of Jericho when the healing took place"; and 262 note: "The original in Luke could quite literally be rendered 'in his being near unto the city.' This would agree with either an entry or a departure from the city." He does not give evidence for his informal references.

26. Luke-Acts contains 23 of the 40 instances of ἐγγίζω in the New Testament.

27. Examples with potential temporal locational senses include: Luke 21:8 (par. Mark 13:6; Matt 24:5); Luke 21:20 (no meaningful parallels); Luke 21:28 (no meaningful parallels).

28. See Plummer, *Luke*, 198. In this instance, Plummer claims that the καί introducing the apodosis of ὥς δὲ ἤγγισε "must be omitted in translation" since the translation with "then" would be "too strong."

Luke 15:25 (no parallels). In the parable of the prodigal son, Jesus reportedly says that the older son was in the field and, ὡς ἔρχόμενος ἤγγιχεν τῇ οἰκίᾳ, heard the music and inquired of his father. Use of ἔγγιζω. follows a verb of motion, a dependent adverbial participle. Following the verb of motion, the aorist form after ὡς and preceding the dative object is certainly compatible with the idea that the older brother was located near the house when he heard the music.²⁹

Luke 19:29 (par. Mark 11:1; Matt 21:1). The Markan parallel reads καὶ ὅτε ἔγγιζουσιν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα εἰς Βηθφαγὴ καὶ Βηθανίαν This usage helps to demonstrate a spatial locative sense for ἔγγιζω. Although the sense of "drawing near" might be plausible, in light of the fact that Jerusalem is still a ways off, it is better to see the author as saying that they were now in the area of Jerusalem, etc. Luke seems to understand his source in this way. He substitutes a verb of motion to cover the entire trip to Jerusalem, but uses ἔγγιζω as part of a typically Lukan construction³⁰ to describe their proximity to Bethphage and Bethany: ἐπορεύετο ἔμπροσθεν ἀναβαίνων εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. καὶ ἐγένετο ὡς ἤγγισεν εἰς Βηθραγὴ καὶ Βηθανία (Luke 19:28-29). That this verb is one of spatial proximity is reinforced by Marshall's observation that in fact "Bethany was further away from Jerusalem than Bethphage."³¹ With this verb Luke introduces nothing which distracts from his depicting Jesus as heading toward Jerusalem.

Luke 19:37 (no parallels at this point). In describing Jesus' "triumphal entry," Luke says that as he went (πορευομένου) the crowd was strewing their garments in the road. ἔγγιζοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἤδη πρὸς τῇ καταβάσει τοῦ ὄρους τῶν ἐλαιῶν, they began to praise him. Since Jesus' movement is established by the preceding verb of motion, and the following clause establishes what the crowd did at a certain place, ἔγγιζω at this point, along with the locative phrase, could well have a locational sense: "when Jesus was located there, at the descent."³²

Luke 22:47 (par. Mark 14:45; Matt 26:49). In Mark and Matthew the verb equivalent to ἔγγιζω is a verb of motion.³³ Mark and Matthew narrate that Judas came with a crowd, and then they include a body of descriptive material before stating that Judas came up to

29. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke 1—IX* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1981) 658, recognizes a spatial sense for ἔγγιζω.

30. Contra Schramm, *Lukas-Stoff*, 145-46.

31. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 712. If Plummer (*Luke*, 445) is correct that Bethphage is not a village but a whole district which includes Bethany, then the point is even better made.

32. See Plummer, *Luke*, 447, who takes the πρὸς phrase as epexegetic, rendered "at the descent."

33. Cf. C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Gospel According to St. Mark* (Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1977) 437, who notes that the verb of motion "can be defended as referring to Judas' arrival at the place as opposed to his actually approaching Jesus."

Jesus, spoke to him, and then kissed him. Luke, however, has abbreviated Mark to the simple sequence that Judas was going before (προήρχετο) the crowd καὶ ἤγγισεν τῷ Ἰησοῦ φιλησαι αὐτόν, and then Jesus spoke to Judas. Luke relies upon the verb of motion found in Mark 14:43 (par. Matt 26:47). With the dependent infinitive (of purpose?), ἔγγίζω may very well be locational, i.e., Judas was there to kiss Jesus. This is true even if Judas does not actually kiss him, being interrupted by Jesus' statement.³⁴

Luke 24:15 (no parallels). On the road to Emmaus the narrator says that, while the travelers were talking and discussing, Jesus ἐγγίσας συνεπορεύετο with them. ἔγγίζω is used as a dependent aorist participle, here preceding a verb of motion, and makes better sense as a verb of location than as one of motion. Jesus must be proximate to them before he can join along with them.³⁵

Luke 24:28 (no parallels). Further on in the Emmaus narrative, it says that καὶ ἤγγισαν εἰς τὴν κώμην οὗ ἐπορεύοντο. ἔγγίζω is best seen as a verb of spatial location to avoid the redundant use of verbs of motion. As Marshall suggests, it could well be rendered "they arrived at" the village where they were going.³⁶

These examples are characterized by several features. One of the most pronounced is that ἔγγίζω is found in the syntactical environments of verbs of motion, although this is not required for the sense. In several of the cases, in fact, interpretation is made far more difficult if ἔγγίζω is seen as a verb of motion. As a verb of spatial location, it often describes the consequence of a previous movement. This is not to deny that ἔγγίζω has a relationship to verbs of motion, since location may well imply movement toward a position. But the sense of motion is not central. With respect to a spatial locational sense, the following examples seem decisive: Luke 7:12: "when he was located at the gate of the city"; 19:29: "when he was in the vicinity of Bethphage and Bethany"; and 24:28: "they were near the village where they were going."

The same results can be found for the book of Acts.³⁷ Acts 9:3: This construction is noteworthy on several accounts. First, ἔγγίζω is used after a verb of motion, and second, the construction with ἐγένετο is altered so that the verb of motion in the ἐν τῷ phrase is placed before the finite verb: ἐν δὲ τῷ πορεύεσθαι ἐγένετο αὐτόν ἐγγίσειν τῇ Δαμασκῷ. 22:6: More regular is this passage in which Paul is

34. See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 835. There are a number of textual variants which try to establish that Judas did kiss Jesus, but since some of the language interposed echoes Mark 14:44, harmonization is probably the explanation.

35. Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, 552: "He overtook them."

36. Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 897.

37. Acts 7:17 is not treated, since it has a potential temporal locational sense.

reported as narrating the same event as described in 9:3: ἐγένετο δέ μοι πορευομένω καὶ ἐγγίζοντι τῇ Δαμασκῷ. The spatial locational sense avoids redundancy with the verb of motion. 10:9: A verb of motion also precedes ἐγγίζω in this narrative: ὁδοὶ πορούντων ἐκείνων καὶ τῇ πόλει ἐγγιζόντων. Whereas the construction might mean that Cornelius's servants were on their way *and* approaching the city, it might instead mean that Cornelius's servants, having gone on their way, were now in the vicinity of the city when Peter went up on his rooftop. 21:33: τότε ἐγγίσας ὁ χιλιάρχος ἐπελάβετο αὐτοῦ. Whereas the chiliarch certainly approached Paul before taking hold of him, the larger context casts doubt upon the sense of motion of ἐγγίζω. Verse 32 says that the chiliarch was already in motion down toward the crowd. It makes better sense, therefore, to see ἐγγίζω as a verb of location, since it was only when the chiliarch was in the vicinity of Paul that he could grab him. 23:15: In their plot to kill Paul, the Jews reportedly told the chief priests that ἡμεῖς δὲ πρὸ τοῦ ἐγγίσει αὐτὸν ἑτοιμοί ἐσμεν τοῦ ἀνελεῖν αὐτόν. The NASB, for example, translates this "and we for our part are ready to slay him before he comes near *the place*," supplying "the place." This is perhaps correct, but the sense of urgency is better maintained if ἐγγίζω is a verb of location.

Several examples in Luke are more difficult, in large part because they do not have verbs of motion at hand or such clear spatial locational indicators in their contexts. But these verses also can be explained along locational lines for ἐγγίζω.

Luke 12:33 (par. Matt 6:20). Matthew uses διορύσσουσιν instead of ἐγγίζω. There are two ways of looking at the parallels between the Lukan and Matthean versions. On the one hand, the parallelism may be between Matthew's "where neither moth nor rust consumes" and Luke's "no moth destroys," and Matthew's "where thieves do not break in and steal" and Luke's ὅπου κλέπτῃς οὐκ ἐγγιζει. On the other hand, the parallelism may be between Matthew's "where thieves do not break in" and Luke's ὅπου κλέπτῃς οὐκ ἐγγιζει, and Matthew's "and steal" and Luke's "and no moth destroys." In either case, the immediacy of the warning is made clearer if ἐγγίζω is understood as locational, i.e., with the thief at hand, nearby.³⁸

Luke 15:1 (no parallels). The transitional nature of this usage without synoptic parallels is difficult.³⁹ But the context gives credence to the locational sense. In v. 2 the Pharisees and scribes are said to be grumbling over Jesus' being with the tax collectors and

38. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke X—XXIV*, 983, who translates: "where no thief gets near to it. I.e. to steal it."

39. Cf. W. R. Farmer, "Notes on a Literary and Form-Critical Analysis of Some of the Synoptic Material Peculiar to Luke," *NTS* 8 (1961-62) 303, who claims that the phrase at the beginning of the section is not Lukan.

sinner. With this the complaint, it makes sense that in v. 1 Luke says that the tax collectors and sinners ἦσαν . . . αὐτῷ ἐγγίζοντες . . . ἀκούειν αὐτοῦ. They were located near Jesus for the purpose of (or possibly resulting in) their hearing him.

Luke 19:41 (no parallels). The transitional nature of this usage without synoptic parallels is difficult. The phrasing is typically Lukan (ὡς ἤγγισεν). Although the sense of motion might be present, the following construction allows for the locational sense: "seeing the city, he wept over it, saying" The implication is that only as he was in the vicinity could he observe.

Luke 22:1 (par. Mark 14:1; Matt 26:2). The parallels to Luke establish that at the time of Jesus' reported instructions to his disciples the passover was two days away. Neither Mark nor Matthew uses ἐγγίζω, Mark having ἦν and Matthew γίνεται. Whereas Luke may have introduced ἐγγίζω to mean that the passover was approaching, there is another explanation. Luke uses a more expressive locative verb than ἦν or γίνεται and eliminates the specific temporal indicator, placing the chief priests and the scribes' machinations within the proximate time period of the passover.

A final concluding example makes the spatial locational sense almost certain for Luke 18:35; the example is Luke 18:40. It is surprising that more attention has not been drawn to the presence of ἐγγίζω within the story of the healing itself. After the blind beggar is told that Jesus of Nazareth is passing by (παρέρχεται), he begins to shout until those in front of him rebuke him. But he continues crying out σταθεῖς δε ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν ἀχθῆναι πρὸς αὐτόν. ἐγγίσαντος δε αὐτοῦ ἐπηρώτησεν αὐτόν . . . The genitive absolute almost assuredly has to be taken as "when he [the blindman] was near," not "when or while he was approaching." First, Jesus is already near the beggar when the beggar begins shouting (note the preceding verb of motion). Second, Jesus is speaking to the blind beggar, something not easily imagined from much of a distance in light of the circumstances. The synoptic accounts (Mark 10:50-51; Matt 20:32) have motion by either of the parties stopped before the dialogue begins.

The third issue concerns the preposition εἰς, and how it could be compatible with a spatial locational sense. When analyzing the prepositions, one must not fall victim to a simple gloss. The spheres to which the prepositions apply often have broad overlap. For instance, the prepositions ἐν, εἰς and πρὸς have a wide semantic overlap.⁴⁰ Whereas ἐν is often used locatively, this does not mean that other prepositions cannot be used with the same general sense as well.

40. See C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of NT Greek* (2d ed.; Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1959) 67-69.

And this sense is well-established for εἰς. Cranfield, for example, argues that during the hellenistic period εἰς. in many contexts had lost its directional sense, so that it is used synonymously with ἐν.⁴¹ One need not go so far as to eliminate the directional sense to note that sic can be used locationally: for example, Matt 5:39: strike on (εἰς) the cheek; 27:30: strike on (εἰς) the head; Mark 8:23: spat on (εἰς) his eyes; 11:8: garments were strewn in (εἰς) the road; 13:3: he was sitting in (εἰς) the Mount of Olives; 13:9: you will be struck in (εἰς) synagogues; 13:16: the one who is in (εἰς) the field (par. Matt 24:18 with ἐν); Luke 9:61: those in (εἰς) my house; 11:7: they are in (εἰς) bed; Luke 14:10: sit in (εἰς) the lowest place; John 1:18: in (εἰς) the bosom of the father.⁴² BAGD in fact cite Luke 18:35 with the meaning "in the vicinity of, near, to."⁴³

The analysis of these passages in Luke-Acts indicates that whatever one might think of the sense of motion connected to ἐγγίζω, there are distinct cases in which a spatial locational sense is paramount. These are indicated especially clearly in contexts where ἐγγίζω is used in relation to a verb of motion, although the locational sense is found in other contexts as well. In these instances, the sense of motion often results in a strained or forced understanding.

Having established that ἐγγίζω may have a spatial locational sense, as the result of motion toward a place, is only one part of the task which has been set by this article. Application of this sense to Luke 18:35 must also be made. Those who have noted Luke's description of Jesus' determination to enter Jerusalem appear to be on the right track at this point. Luke is arranging his material to enhance the picture of Jesus heading toward his destiny. For whatever reason, Luke also wants to include the story of Zacchaeus, probably already associated with Jericho in the tradition. In Mark, Luke also finds the story of the healing of the blind man which occurred on the way out of Jericho. Luke must make two major decisions. The first is where to place these pericopes in relation to each other. The second is how to deal with the sense of direction in Mark which does not help convey the sense of Jesus always pushing toward Jerusalem. Luke's solutions are two as well. To begin, he puts the healing peri-

41. Cranfield, *Mark*, 52 on Mark 1:9. Grammarians differ on the amount of overlap between εἰς and ἐν, although virtually all admit that overlap is present.

42. *BAGD*, 228 1.c, also cite several papyri: P.Ryl. 145.13 (38 A.D.): he gave many blows to (εἰς) every part of his body; P.Teb. 39.32 (114 B..C.): they injured my wife on (εἰς) the right hand; and Arrian, *Anab.* 2.26.4: hit on (εἰς) the head; N. Turner (*Syntax*, vol. 3 of *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by J. H. Moulton [Edinburgh: Clark, 1963] 254) lists P.Oxy. 929.13 (2d-3d cent. A.D.): all these things were in (εἰς) the brown tunic.

43. *BAGD*, 228, 1.b. They also cite Matt 21:1; Mark 11:1; and Luke 19:29 (see above on all three).

cope before the story of Zacchaeus, since the Zacchaeus episode is climactic for his purposes. Zacchaeus is arguably more pointed morally than either of the two preceding stories—the rich ruler (Luke 18:18-30) and the healing of the blind beggar—both of which Luke has apparently drawn from his Markan source. The Zacchaeus story illustrates that a rich man, in fact a chief sinner among rich men, can receive salvation, a salvation which results in tangible and demonstrable repentance. The thematic order, according to Goulder, is "faithless rich man, faithful poor man, penitent rich man."⁴⁴ Schweizer goes further and suggests that Luke sees in Zacchaeus an "outstanding example" of discipleship.⁴⁵ To answer the second question, regarding the sense of direction, Luke redacts the directional words from the Markan account, substituting phrasing which is typically his own. But the phrasing which he utilizes, as has been established above, is not phrasing which makes ἐγγίζω mean "after he came out from Jericho" or "as he was approaching Jericho." And it is not phrasing which brings Luke's account into contradiction with Mark and Matthew. Instead, Luke uses what is for him a verb of location which leaves the directional sense unspecified: "when he was in the vicinity of Jericho." This allows him to place it before the Zacchaeus episode.

An apparent problem might be found in Luke 19:1, however. The verse begins: καὶ εἰσελθὼν διήρχετο τὴν Ἰεριχὼ. Luke 18:35 might speak of Jesus' entrance into Jericho, with Luke 19:1 picking up with the healing outside of the city and completing Jesus' entry into the city. This is not the only interpretation of the relation between Luke 18:35 and 19:1, however. There are other explanations as well. A first possible explanation is that Luke has simply taken over his source, which began with the words of motion. Luke then redacts Mark for placement of the healing pericope before the Zacchaeus episode, leaving the Zacchaeus pericope as he found it. A second possible explanation is that Luke uses the verb of direction "toward" to pick up the thread of Jesus' destined trip to Jerusalem. Perhaps realizing that this redaction of the healing pericope requires him to change the Markan directional sense to a neutral one, and not wanting to introduce a factual contradiction (i.e., to say that the healing occurred on the way into Jericho when he knew that it had not), Luke now reiterates the

44. Goulder, *Luke*, 2.678; also 2.675-78. See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 694-95; Haenchen, *Der Weg Jesu*, 370: "Lukas will die Zacchäusgeschichte erzählen, die in Jericho ihren Schauplatz hat und damit endet, dass Jesus einen Tag in Jericho bleibt und hier, im Hause des Zacchäus, die Parabel von den Minen erzählt. Sie steht in innerem Zusammenhang mit der Erzählung von Zacchäus—jedenfalls wenn man diese so versteht und berichtet, wie Lukas, und sie bereitet (19,11!) den Einzug in Jerusalem vor."

45. E. Schweizer, *The Good News According to Luke* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1984) 288.

sense of purpose in Jesus' traveling through Jericho on his way to Jerusalem. A third possible explanation is that the grammatical structure may give some indication of what Luke is doing. He uses the aorist participle preceding the finite verb.⁴⁶ The preceding participle often refers to antecedent action, but the time-frame in which this action occurs is not specified. Luke uses the aorist participle before the finite verb in the sense of "having at some time entered," followed by indication that Jesus then passed through Jericho. The participle is almost required for tight grammatical structure. Luke establishes the chronology of Jesus' passing through the city so that he can have him meet Zacchaeus on the way out. And a fourth possible explanation simply recognizes that the two pericopes are not chronologically ordered but arranged in relation to each other because of their mutual placements at Jericho. To demand harmony at every point of chronological detail may simply be asking too much.

In conclusion, I argue that the apparent contradiction of Luke 18:35 with Mark 10:46 and Matt 20:29 is caused by failure to appreciate the semantic range of Luke's use of ἐγγίζω. This may be a verb of motion for Luke, but it seems much more likely that it is primarily a verb of location. Thus Luke 18:35 should be rendered "when he was in the vicinity of Jericho."

46. See Porter, *Verbal Aspect*, 377-87.