Aural-Performance, Conceptual Blending, and Intertextuality:
The (Non-)Use of Scripture in Luke 24.45-48[1]

Frederick S. Tappenden
University of Manchester

> Contrary to the assumptions of historical criticism, a text's substantial
> and multifaceted investment in tradition does not suggest intertextuality
> in the sense of scanning through multiple, physically accessible scrolls
> but, more likely, accessibility to a shared *cultural memory*.[2]

In Lk. 24.36-49, after being revealed to Cleopas and his traveling partner during a meal in

Emmaus, Jesus appears for the first time to the eleven and their companions. After encouraging

these disciples and even eating in their presence, Jesus goes on to expound the scriptures.[3] From

vv. 44-46a, Luke's gospel reads as follows:

> Then he said to them, 'These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you—that
> everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled.'
> Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, and he said to them, 'Thus it is written,
> … .' (NRSV)

---

[1] An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Greater Vancouver Biblical Colloquium at
Vancouver School of Theology, Vancouver BC, in March 2009. I wish to extend much appreciation to Thomas R.
Hatina, J. R. C. Cousland, and Steve Black who all provided many helpful comments during this study's infancy.

[2] Werner H. Kelber, *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the
Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (VPT; Bloominton, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1997), p. xxiii; emphasis
original.

[3] The present study will use the phrase *scriptures of Israel* or the shorter *scriptures* to refer to what is
otherwise a dubious category. The terms Old Testament and Hebrew Bible are both directly avoided so as to avoid
anachronism and further because, in the case of the latter, Luke tends to rely upon septuagintal traditions. Though
the adjective septuagintal will be used to refer generally to Greek scriptural traditions, the term Septuagint is
avoided so as to avoid any notion of a defined 1st century collection of such scriptures. Conversely, the phrase
scriptures of Israel (or simply *scriptures*) is utilized in a broad sense, referring to those Jewish traditions that carry
religious authority for Luke and his implied readers (Cf. Kenneth D. Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts:
Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* [JSNTSup, 282; London: T & T Clark, 2005], pp. 1-2).

It is worth pausing at the end of v. 46a to discuss the discursive flow of the passage thus far. Throughout the gospel's final chapter the scriptures of Israel stand at the centre of the reader's attention. As a unit, Lk. 24 records a higher concentration of scripture related terminology than any other chapter in the gospel.[4] On two separate occasions, Jesus is with his disciples opening the scriptures to them (cf. vv. 25-27 and 44-49). Likewise, the moment of scriptural interpretation becomes, for Cleopas and his companion, one of the primary ways in which the risen Christ is made known to them (v. 32; cf. vv. 30-31). Despite this, no specific scriptural passages are ever cited, and only a few vague allusions or echoes can be found. The closest that the reader actually comes to encountering the scriptures themselves seems to be Jesus' statement οὕτως γέγραπται in v. 46a. Of the 25 passages in Luke's gospel that contain scriptural citations,[5] 18 are introduced by a formula similar to what is found here in v. 46a (12 of which use γράφω).[6] This prominent use of introductory formulae, coupled with the ubiquitous scriptural focus of Lk. 24, strongly suggests that the Lucan audience would have naturally expected Jesus to cite, or at least allude to, a specific scriptural text following the οὕτως γέγραπται of v. 46a. Such is not the case; rather, Jesus goes on to say (up to v. 48):

> Thus it is written, that the Messiah is to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day, and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. (NRSV)

Rather than citing or alluding to a scriptural tradition, Jesus recounts (in compressed form) the events of the Lucan narrative (Gospel and Acts). Though the reader of Luke's gospel arrives at v. 46a expecting a scriptural citation, their attention is instead redirected toward the content of early Christian belief as recorded in the Lucan narrative.[7]

---

[4] Cf. 24.25, 27, 32, 44, 45, and 46, all of which use scripture related terminology (cf. Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* [JSNTSup, 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994], Appendix D – Introductory Formula and Terms for Scripture Appearing without Old Testament Quotations in Luke). In addition, B. J. Koet contends that Lk. 24 contains several technical terms for scriptural interpretation that would have been specifically connected with the activity of scriptural interpretation in the Second Temple period. Though Koet overstates his case at times, the presence of such terminology would undoubtedly draw the reader's attention towards the scriptures themselves (cf. B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* [SNTA, 14; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989], pp. 56-72).

[5] As listed in the Index of Quotations: New Testament Order of the *UBSGNT⁴*.

[6] Those passages with introductory formulae that use γράφω are 2.23; 3.4; 4.4, 8, 10, 17; 7.27; 10.26; 19.46; 20.17, 28; and 22.37. Cf. Kimball, *Exposition*, Appendix C – Introductory Formulas Preceding Old Testament Quotations in Luke.

[7] For similar occurrences, see Lk. 18.31 and perhaps 21.22.

The focus of the present study will be an examination of this linguistic convergence between scriptural expectation and the Lucan narrative. In order to accomplish this, the chapter is divided into three sections. The first section will conduct a socio-historical analysis of the way in which textual knowledge would have been both acquired and conceptualized within the 1st century C.E. Special attention will be paid to both Diaspora synagogual and early Christian ecclesial contexts, particularly highlighting the aural-performative nature of 1st century notions of text and reading. The second section, which will comprise our primary textual analysis, will utilize cognitive linguistic theories of conceptual blending as a framework within which to read Lk. 24.45-48. Drawing on the work of Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, it will be argued that 24.45-48 (re)produces a mental space within which the scriptures of Israel and the Lucan narrative are fused in the creation of a new meaning structure. Because this space is rooted within the reading community's experience of scripture, specifically being framed in relation to the aural-performative contexts outlined in section one, the blend created in Lk. 24.45-48 thus functions not as an abstract hermeneutical principle but rather as a carrier of communal identity. The final section of this chapter will further explore such hermeneutical significance in relation to the septuagintal style of the Lucan narrative. It will be argued that the conceptual blend prompted by Lk. 24.45-48 becomes strengthened as it is continually activated through subsequent aural-performative readings of both the Lucan narrative (in the ecclesia) and the scriptures of Israel (in the synagogue). With respect to Luke's gospel, such ongoing strengthening happens directly as a result of the narrative's septuagintal style, thus reinforcing the blend as being hermeneutically meaningful (intertextually speaking) not only within the immediate literary context of ch. 24 but also (and more significantly) in relation to such ongoing aural-performative contexts.

Texts and Reading as Aural-Performative Events in the 1st Century C.E.

Give the present study's interest in 1st century C.E. reading practices, it is natural to begin with a discussion of Luke's implied readers. The term implied reader(s) is used to refer not only to the audience that the Lucan author (hereafter referred to as Luke) had intended his work for, but also more generally to the type of audience that would find the Lucan narrative particularly

meaningful.[8] Since the Lucan narrative (i.e., Luke-Acts) serves as the primary source by which such reconstructions can be established, only two fairly general points will be considered.

First, it is presumed that the implied Lucan readers were scripturally literate – that is to say, such reading communities had a working and established knowledge of the scriptural traditions of Israel.[9] Given that this audience seems to have been located somewhere in the Diaspora, such scriptural knowledge would have primarily been acquired through the reading of the Torah and the Prophets within the synagogue. The existence of a trans-Mediterranean Jewish institution most frequently referred to as either a συναγωγή or προσευχή in the 1st century C.E. is certain; describing and characterizing this institution (referred to hereafter simply as synagogue) is more problematic. Though synagogue establishments met a number of non-liturgical needs for Diaspora Jewish communities,[10] a general scholarly consensus exists that the activity of Torah- (and likely Prophet-)reading was a central practice within synagogue meetings across the Mediterranean.[11] For instance, Lee I. Levine notes:

> By the first century, a weekly ceremony featuring the communal reading and study of holy texts had become a universal Jewish practice. It was a unique liturgical feature in the ancient world; no such form of worship was known in paganism … . It was indeed *sui generis* for an entire community to devote regular meetings to such an activity.[12]

In this way, Torah reading is one of the distinguishing features (if not *the* distinguishing feature) of the synagogue throughout the Mediterranean world.[13]

---

[8] Whether the gospels were written for specific or general reading communities is a much-disputed issue in recent scholarship (see, for instance, the essays in Richard Bauckham [ed.], *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience* [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998].). Since the interests of the present study centre upon the implied reading communities of Luke's narrative (as defined above), it is not necessary to further specify the historical make-up of such communities (e.g. were they comprised of Gentiles sympathizers to Judaism, Hellenistic Jews, or perhaps a mixture thereof). This is largely because the present study is primarily interested in exploring how Luke's narrative would have been heard amongst the type of reader that would find it meaningful (i.e., the implied reader).

[9] Cf. Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Traditions in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), pp. 104-5; and William S. Kurz, S.J., *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993), pp. 13, 16.

[10] For example, synagogues functioned as places for social gatherings, political meetings, judicial rulings, and even hospitality.

[11] The list of sources dating from the 1st century C.E. in which Torah-readings are linked to synagogual contexts is impressive; for only a small selection, see the following: Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.175; *Ant.* 16.43; Philo, *Embassy* 156-157; *Dreams* 2.127; *Good Person* 81-83; *Hypothetica* 7.12-13; *Moses* 2.215-16; and the Theodotus Inscription (*CII* 2, no. 1404).

[12] Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), p. 139.

[13] Cf. Anders Runesson contends: 'the activity which is mentioned most often and which is emphasised as characteristic of institutions named in synagogue terms is … torah reading. As it happens, public torah reading and

Though the origins of public Torah-reading are not fully known, Anders Runesson contends that from the outset (perhaps the 5th/4th century B.C.E. post-exilic Yehud) these public readings were tied to various *causae* (e.g. as a response to *causae* of crisis), thus resulting in their natural integration into lived social and cultural patterns.[14] Though it is unclear precisely when Torah-reading came to be integrated within the 7-day cycle-of-nature *causa*, Runesson argues that by the Hellenistic period it had become a regular weekly practice that also spread to the Diaspora in the 3rd/2nd century B.C.E.[15] Such widespread expansion doubtless created a plethora of reading practices and customs. Though it may be possible to demonstrate a three-and-a-half-year reading cycle within 1st century C.E. Palestine (based on early layers of tannaitic material),[16] such a specific regiment cannot be confidently projected to the Diaspora generally. Nonetheless, by the 1st century C.E. the ritual of Torah-reading had become firmly established as a regular and consistent aural-performative event throughout the Mediterranean, tied specifically to a cycle-of-nature *causa* based on weekly intervals.

Within 1st century C.E. Diaspora synagogues, scriptural readings may have been delivered from memory or more likely would have commenced as the performance of written texts.[17] Such texts would have likely been septuagintal; Emanuel Tov notes the likelihood of Greek texts being used for Diaspora Torah-readings as early as the 3rd century B.C.E., certainly from the 1st century B.C.E. onward.[18] Benjamin G. Wright's contention that the *Letter of*

---

teaching are also the activities which can claim the longest uninterrupted continuity in the history of the synagogue' ('Persian Imperial Politics, the Beginnings of Public Torah Readings, and the Origins of the Synagogue', in Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm [eds.], *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001* [ConBNT, 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003], pp. 63-89 [67]; cf. Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* [ConBNT, 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001], pp. 191-193).

[14] Runesson, *Origins*, pp. 237-476. See especially Runesson's anthropological discussion of *causae* as they relate to the integration of ritual practices (*Origins*, pp. 42-60).

[15] On the 7-day reading cycle, see Runesson, *Origins*, pp. 305-20 (esp. 309-10). On the spread of the practice to the Diaspora, see Runesson, *Origins*, pp. 441-46.

[16] Cf. Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah', in Steven Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (BSHJ; London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 44-56; and Levine, *Ancient Synagogue*, p. 140. Runesson contends that this reading cycle be extended only to 1st century C.E. proto-rabbinic groups, and thus it does not reflect practices in Palestine more broadly (cf. *Origins*, pp. 196-207).

[17] Several sources give evidence to the presence of Torah and even Prophet scrolls within 1st century synagogues. For Palestine, in addition to the two biblical scrolls discovered buried beneath the floor of the Zealot synagogue at Masada, a number of textual sources provide further evidence – cf. Josephus, *J.W.* 2.291-92 and Lk. 4.16-30 which respectively place 'the book of the law' and an Isaiah scroll within Palestinian synagogual contexts. As for the Diaspora, though the evidence is more meager, it is safely assumed that Diaspora synagogues also housed Torah scrolls (cf. Acts 13.15; 17.10-11).

[18] Emanuel Tov, 'The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogue', in Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers*

Aristeas was written to ideologically legitimate the Pentateuch as an independent scriptural text (vis-à-vis the Hebrew) further corroborates this, thus strongly suggesting that 1st century C.E. Diaspora synagogues had primarily adopted septuagintal texts (certainly the Torah and likely the Prophets too) for their aural-performative liturgical readings.[19]

To call this event *aural*-performative is to affirm that such public readings were orientated toward auditory acquisition; thus, Martin S. Jaffee notes that 'the consumption of a literary text [in the Second Temple Period] was not commonly a matter of an individual reader communing silently with a text in a moment of privacy' but rather was 'connected to ritualized, public ceremonies.'[20] Within such an oral-aural context, texts such as the Torah, the Prophets, and even Luke's gospel itself would not have been thought of as pieces of papyrus with letters written on them. Rather, these texts would have been conceptualized as aural-performative events, fundamentally rooted in the reading community's collective experience; to again cite Jaffee, in such a context 'the book *was* its oral declamation and aural appropriation (rather than its mere material copy).'[21] Returning to Luke's implied readers, to claim that such communities were scripturally literate is to affirm that they knew the (septuagintal) scriptures as aural-performative events, ritually tied to a 7-day cycle-of-nature *causa* that happened within synagogual contexts. Whether these reading communities continued to be involved with the synagogue is another issue. Though some have proposed that Luke's narrative presumes a community excluded from the synagogue,[22] such a situation should not be projected onto all readers of Luke's narrative. Indeed, it is likely that in the late 1st century C.E. some Lucan readers are still involved in their local synagogue, taking part in Torah- and Prophet-readings on

---

Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001 (ConBNT, 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), pp. 237-59 (251).

[19] Benjamin G. Wright III, 'Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo', in Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS, 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 47-61. Such an assertion does not preclude the possibility that the Pentateuch was originally interlinearly orientated toward a Hebrew *Vorlage* (cf. Albert Pietersma, 'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint', in Johann Cook [ed.], *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch Aibi-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible Et Informatique 'From Alpha to Byte.' University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000* [Leiden: Brill, 2002], pp. 337-64).

[20] Martin S. Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 16 and 17 respectively.

[21] Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, p. 18; emphasis original.

[22] Cf. Philip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS, 57; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 46-70 (esp. 53-58).

the Sabbath day, and subsequently attending the ecclesia and taking part in readings of the Lucan narrative (likely on the first day of the week).[23]

The second noteworthy aspect of Luke's implied readers is that such communities were certainly located within ecclesial contexts. Though information regarding early Christian liturgical practices is limited, it is clear that such gatherings centred upon the celebration of a ritual meal – i.e., the Eucharist. Coming together to share a meal was a common occurrence in the ancient world. Dennis E. Smith contends that the banquet was a standard cultural practice expressed variously in many different strata of Greco-Roman society.[24] Such social gatherings typically consisted of a two-course meal,[25] the second of which (the συμπόσιον) provided an opportunity for hosts to entertain their guests in various ways – e.g. party games, philosophical conversations, and even dramatic entertainment such as music, dancers, and/or the reading of literary works.[26] Of course, the choice of entertainment depended upon the audience and type of banquet being attended. Though the central feature of the ecclesia was undoubtedly the Eucharist, texts such as Luke's gospel would have naturally found their aural-performative existence within such settings, thus functioning as post-meal entertainment and likely being accompanied with teaching and/or preaching too.[27]

In his recent monograph *Reading Acts*, William David Shiell examines a number of ancient sources (primarily literary and artistic [frescos, engravings, etc.]) so as to envisage the way in which early Christian texts would have been delivered within ecclesial banquet settings.[28] Central to Shiell's treatment is the recognition that audiences did not actually engage with the physical text itself (i.e., the manuscript); rather, individuals with reading capabilities functioned

---

[23] The linking of ecclesia meetings to the first day of the week is supported by Acts 20.7-12 and seems to be directly tied to the time of Jesus' resurrection (cf. Mk 16.2, 9; Mt. 28.1; Lk. 24.1; and Jn 20.1, 19); see also, Rev. 1.10; *Did.* 14.1; and Ign. *Magn.* 9.1 (cf. David E. Aune, 'Worship, Early Christian', *ABD*, pp. 6.973-89 (esp. 6.979-80).

[24] Cf. Dennis E. Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), pp. 1-6.

[25] Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, pp. 27-31; cf. pp. 20-38 for other banquet practices. Though the Greeks traditionally practiced a two-course meal, under the influence of the Romans (who practices a three-course meal) this was expanded to include an appetizer, known as the πρόπομα (cf. Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, p. 27).

[26] For a full discussion, see Smith, *Symposium to Eucharist*, pp. 34-38.

[27] Cf. Aune, *ABD*, p. 6.983. On the public reading of early Christian texts within ecclesial gatherings see Acts 15.31; Col. 4.16; 1 Thess. 5.27; 1 Tim. 4.13; and Rev. 1.3.

[28] William David Shiell, *Reading Acts: The Lector and the Early Christian Audience* (BibIntS, 70; Boston: Brill, 2004). For Shiell's treatment of the banquet setting as it relates to early Christian communities, see pp. 116-33.

as lectors who stood between the audience and the text.[29] In this way, the aural performance of these texts was a dynamic interaction between lector and audience; lectors would gesture and vocally inflect the texts while audiences would likewise respond in characteristic ways (e.g. laughter).[30] Within the ecclesia, such lectors would function as intermediaries between audience and text, making the textual traditions of the emerging Christian movement accessible to the community as a whole. To *read* a text within such a cultural context was to *hear* it aurally performed. As Shiell notes, it is not surprising that in ancient rhetoric 'terms for reading a text, reciting a memorized work, and declaiming a text could be used interchangeably'[31]; thus, ἀκούω and ἀναγινώσκω are often used synonymously.[32] As Jaffee rightly notes:

> The characteristic organs of the literary life were the mouth and the ear, and its main textual reservoir was the memory. Literary culture was commonly delivered orally and received aurally, the memory serving as the connector between mouth and ear.[33]

This is not to say that people did not read texts in private, but rather to affirm that for the vast majority of people in the ancient world, the act of reading was thought of as an aural-*performative* event in which they took part; 'listeners *read* the text through the performance of [a] lector.'[34]

In summary, to presume that Luke's implied readers were both scripturally literate and also tied to the ecclesia is to affirm that their knowledge of both scripture and Luke's gospel was explicitly tied to the reading contexts of synagogue and ecclesia respectively. What emerges from this brief overview is the recognition that notions of text and reading are inseparable in the 1st century C.E., and further that texts such as the Torah, the Prophets, and Luke's gospel were thought of not as physical manuscripts but rather as aural-performative events. Such events were

---

[29] The term lector is used here simply to refer to a social actor who performs a specific function within 1st century C.E. reading contexts. It therefore does not imply a specific church office (as it came to in the 4th century C.E. – cf. Shiell, *Reading Acts*, pp. 1-2). Such lectors may have been people of high social standing, though were most commonly slaves that had been specifically trained for such purposes (Shiell, *Reading Acts*, pp. 14-33 [esp. 24-27]). It was common for slave owners to acquire (or even train) slaves for literary tasks (such as reading); in this way, Loveday Alexander notes: 'education (even literacy) is in this sense the "property" of the elite – something they may own and deploy – without necessarily being exhibited in their own persons' (Loveday C.A. Alexander, *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* [ECC; LNTS, 298; London: T & T Clark, 2005], p. 234 nt. 11).

[30] For a categorized table of these aural-performative interactions, see Shiell, *Reading Acts*, pp. 91-100.

[31] Shiell, *Reading Acts*, p. 104.

[32] For specific examples, see Shiell, *Reading Acts*, p. 107; cf. Paul J. Achtemeier, '*Omne Verbum Sonat: The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity*', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 3-27 (15-16).

[33] Jaffee, *Torah in the Mouth*, p. 18.

[34] Shiell, *Reading Acts*, p. 105; emphasis added.

fundamentally rooted within communal settings that included specific locales (e.g. a home or specific synagogue building), specific time periods (e.g. either the Sabbath day or the first day of the week), certain social actors (e.g. lectors, interpreters, and sometimes hosts) and even non-reading activities (e.g. in the synagogue, non-liturgical activities; in the ecclesia, a meal). In all these ways, scriptural knowledge came via aural-performative experience; to recall a text was to recall the reading event.

Conceptual Blending and Lk. 24.45-48

As stated in the introduction of this paper, the present analysis of Lk. 24.45-48 will commence primarily along cognitive linguistic lines, specifically drawing upon conceptual blending theory (hereafter referred to as CBT).[35] The purpose of utilizing this theoretical method is to examine the way in which the linguistic construction of 24.45-48 (re)produces certain mental representations, thus resulting in shared communal meaning amongst Luke's implied readers – as István Czachesz, drawing upon Dan Sperber's notion of the Epidemiology of Culture, notes: '[early Christian] written and oral texts [can be classified] as public representations, which were caused by mental representations, and evoke further mental representations in their readers and listeners.'[36]

In 2002, Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner published their seminal work *The Way We Think* in which they both outlined and also applied CBT to several different domains of human existence. According to Fauconnier and Turner, 'conceptual blending is a general, basic mental operation with highly elaborate dynamic principles and governing constraints; … [it is] fundamental to all activities of the human mind.'[37] In this way, conceptual blending is foundational to human thinking, communication, and perception (including such activities as reading and listening). Drawing on various schemas and conceptual metaphors that are stored in

---

[35] This is not the first study to apply theories of cognitive science to the study of Christian origins. Of particular note is Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, and Risto Uro's edited volume *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (BibIntS, 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007), which includes two essays that sepcifically utilize CBT (Hugo Lundhaug, 'Conceptual Blending in the *Exegesis of the Soul*', pp. 141-60 and Vernon K. Robbins, 'Conceptual Blending and Early Christian Imagination', pp. 161-95). In addition, see also István Czachesz, 'The Transmission of Early Christian Thought: Toward a Cognitive Psychological Model', *SR* 36 (2007), pp. 65-83 and Bonnie Howe, *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter* (BibIntS, 81; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

[36] Czachesz, 'Transmission', p. 68.

[37] Gilles Fauconnier and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

long-term memory, conceptual blending happens on-the-fly as human communication and discourse unfolds, creating mental spaces that are built-up in working memory, cross-mapped with one another through vital relations, and blended together so as to create an emergent mental space within which new meaning resides. To say that conceptual blending happens on-the-fly is to affirm that it largely happens beneath the surface of conscious thought (i.e., at the unconscious level) and in such a timely manner that one has no idea of the complexities their mind has just accomplished. Once a blend emerges within conscious thought it is said to have achieved Human-Scale, thus becoming intelligible and consciously perceived. When continually strengthened through ongoing activation, such Human-Scale blends can become entrenched within long-term memory, thus becoming stable conceptual networks that enable ongoing meaning creation. The following discussion will outline those aspects of CBT that are of most importance in analyzing Lk. 24.45-48. I refer the reader to Diagram 1 in the Appendix of this chapter where the blend discussed has been mapped.

Mental Spaces:

       Mental spaces are 'small conceptual packets constructed as we think and talk, for purposes of local understanding and action. They are very partial assemblies containing elements, structured by frames and cognitive models.'[38] It is within these unconscious mental spaces that thought primarily occurs. On a physiological level, Fauconnier and Turner contend that the elements within each mental space correspond to activated neuronal assemblies that operate within working memory. Such mental spaces are often partial in their content (i.e., they can have any degree of specificity) and are thus built-up (i.e., structured) externally.[39] There are several different ways that a mental space can be built-up – two are of particular interest. First, mental spaces can be structured according to conceptual frames that are stored in long-term memory. Though some conceptual frames are root metaphors that are shared by all humans, others are culturally determined and thus reflective of one's specific cultural milieu. Second, mental spaces can also be built-up through immediate experience. In such cases the content of the discourse is structured in relation to the immediate situation within which one presently exists.

---

[38] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 102.
[39] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 102-5.

Mental spaces are organized within conceptual networks which always consist of at least two input spaces and one blended space.[40] The two input spaces correspond to the two domains being blended. The blended space is where emergent structure is created. Conceptual networks are typically structured according to certain patterns – i.e., simplex networks, mirror networks, single-scope networks, or double-scope networks.[41] Of interest for the present analysis is the mirror network, which is so called because all the mental spaces share the same organizing frame. This mean that, though the content of these spaces will be (to one degree or another) partial, they will all be structured by the same organizing pattern.

 The mental spaces created in Lk. 24.45-48 are as follows: Input 1 – *Scripture Reading*; Input 2 – *Luke-Acts Reading*; and the Blended Space – *Jesus reads Luke-Acts* (see Diagram 1). Since these spaces are integrated to form a mirror network, the common frame Aural-Performative Reading structures them all. The following discussion will examine the input spaces, returning to the blended space below.

Input 1 – Scripture Reading: Since the linguistic cue that conceptually prompts Input 1 is the οὕτως γέγραπται of 24.46a, I have thus given this space the label *Scripture Reading*. As argued above, though the phrase οὕτως γέγραπται does not always introduce scriptural citations, the discursive flow of Lk. 24 creates the expectation that scripture will indeed be cited. Input 1 is primarily concerned, then, with the scriptures, focusing the audiences attention thereon. Given this focus, the frame that would most naturally structure this space is that of Aural-Performative Reading. As noted above, texts in the 1st century C.E. were known as aural-performative events; to think of scripture was not to think of the physical manuscript but rather to recall the reading event. Such an event was fundamentally communal, consisted of several actors (e.g. the lector[s] and interpreter[s]), and was orientated toward the text and its interpretation. By extension, the frame Aural-Performative Reading would call forth a structure with elements such as Locale (in this case, the Synagogue), Occasion (Sabbath day), Community, Non-Reading Activities (i.e., other synagogual activities), Interpreter(s), Interpretation/Discussion, Lector(s), and of course Reading (in this case, the Scriptures – i.e.,

---

[40] In addition to the mental spaces just mentioned, all conceptual networks will also have a fourth mental space, commonly referred to as the generic space (cf. Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 41 and 47). Mapped within this space are those elements that are common to the two inputs. For the sake of space I have intentionally omitted discussion of the generic space.

[41] For a discussion of these networks, see Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 119-35; see also pp. 337-45.

Torah, the Prophets, and perhaps the Psalms [cf. v. 44]). Though this input is organized according to the general frame Aural-Performative Reading, such typological specifics would naturally be completed according to the events of the synagogue (See Diagram 1).

Input 2 – Luke-Acts Reading: I have given the title *Luke-Acts Reading* to Input 2, largely due to the content of Jesus' discussion with the disciples. In vv. 46b-48 Jesus cites a compressed version of the Lucan narrative, highlighting such events as the Christ's suffering and resurrection, as well as the proclamation of the gospel from Jerusalem to all the nations. Even though only a few events from the broader Lucan narrative are mentioned, these specific references have the effect of calling forth the text of Luke's gospel and Acts. As with scripture, because such texts would be known as aural-performative events, Input 2 would also be most naturally organized according to the frame Aural Performative Reading, specifically sub-structured in relation to the ecclesia. This latter point is further corroborated by two other pieces of evidence. First, the broader discursive context of ch. 24 evokes the ecclesia setting (cf. v. 30), thus allowing the frame to naturally organize such elements as the eleven and their companions (v. 33), the communal meal (vv. 41-43), the first day of the week (v. 1),[42] and even Jesus himself (who appears in v. 36). Second, beyond the narrative level, at the moment of the text being read the audience themselves are in the ecclesia, hearing the Gospel (and perhaps Acts too). In this way, the specifics of Input 2 are filled out by the present experience of the community, hearing the text aurally performed within the context of early Christian worship (again, see Diagram 1).

Vital Relations:

According to Fauconnier and Turner, vital relations are conceptual connections that are established between the components of various mental spaces.[43] Physiologically speaking, they link mental spaces through neurobiological binding (e.g. co-activation).[44] Vital relations are extremely important to CBT; within a conceptual network, these relations not only connect the components of the input spaces (what are called outer-space relations), but they also compress

---

[42] Though, by Jewish calculation, the first day of the week is technically over by the time the disciples arise to return to Jerusalem (i.e., the sun has gone down), this seems unimportant to Luke (cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, S.J., *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [AB, 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1985], p. 1568). Indeed, John Nolland suggests that Luke desires to 'contain the action of Luke 24 within the scope of Easter Day' (*Luke 18:35–24:53* [WBC, 35C; Dallas: Word Books, 1993], p. 1206).

[43] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 92-102.

[44] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 102.

down into inner-space relations within the blended space itself.[45] Vital relations are not random

connections; rather, they are characterized by specific types of correspondence – Fauconnier and

Turner list 15 in total, those of interest for the present study are Identity, Time, Space, Role, and

Analogy.[46]

As can be observed in Diagram 1, several vital relations link the elements of each Input

space together. The geographical locales of synagogue and house are linked via the vital relation

of Space, just as the temporal locations of Sabbath day and Easter Day are linked via Time. Of

more interest, however, are the vital relations between community/the 11 disciples and especially

lector–interpreter/Jesus and scripture/early Christian text. Each of these will be discussed

individually.

The vital relation that connects community to the 11 disciples and their companions is

that of Identity. On the level of the narrative, prior to their present encounter with the risen

Christ, these same disciples had been with Jesus in the synagogues, presumably hearing the

scriptures read aloud. More importantly, beyond the narrative the implied Lucan reader would

have also had a similar experience of previously (perhaps still) being actively involved in the

synagogue, regularly hearing scriptural readings and acquiring scriptural knowledge. In this

sense, the vital relation Identity that links these two communities exists because those who are

presently in the ecclesia are also those who have participated in the synagogue. The blend

created here in 24.45-48 is not just an abstract hermeneutical principle that the Lucan community

is to adopt; rather, it is rooted within their communal sense of identity, linking their experience in

the synagogue to their experience in the ecclesia, and vice-versa.

The vital relation that links both lector and interpreter to Jesus is that of Role.

Fauconnier and Turner note that Roles always have values, and that such vital relations link-up

an element in one mental space 'to another element that counts as its value.'[47] In the present

conceptual network, Jesus comes to take on the Roles of scripture reader and interpreter within

the blended space. That Jesus is the interpreter of scripture is made clear in v. 45,[48] but the

presentation of Jesus as one who is orally delivering a scriptural passage (as the discursive build-

---

[45] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 92-93; cf. pp. 309-52.
[46] For other vital relations, see Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 93-102.
[47] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 98.
[48] Given the similar use of διανοίγω in v. 32 where the sense of opening is directly tied to the scriptures (cf. Acts 17.3), the reference to Jesus διήνοιξεν αὐτῶν τὸν νοῦν in v. 45 seems to be best understood as a reference to scriptural interpretation (cf. Koet, *Five Studies*, pp. 60-62).

up to v. 46a suggests) means that he is also functioning as the reader of scripture. Such a role is not foreign to the Lucan Jesus; just as in 4.18-19, Jesus is again cast (sub-consciously) as one who reads the scriptures. This role is of vital significance once the blend is elaborated.

Finally, the vital relation that links scripture with Christian text is that of Analogy. According to Fauconnier and Turner, Analogy is a vital relation that is drawn between two input spaces that share a common frame structure.[49] Such is the case with the conceptual network described here, where both Input spaces are structured according to the same Aural-Performative Reading frame. Given the shared structure between these two inputs, the connection of the reading elements in each space is natural. How this connection elaborates (in the blend) is another issue that will be discussed in detail below.

Projection, Compression, and Emergent Meaning:

Once the input spaces have been created and vital relations established, various elements are then projected onto and compressed within the blended space, resulting in the creation of emergent structure.[50] Three concepts are of particular importance here.

Projection refers to the mapping of the relevant input elements to the blended space. Not all elements need to be projected, but only those that are necessary for meaning construction.[51] What is mapped in Diagram 1 are those projections that are most pertinent to the conceptual structure that is (re)produced by 24.45-48.[52] As can be seen, several features of both input spaces are projected onto the blended space, though the majority comes from Input 2. Because the focus of the pericope is upon the recitation and interpretation of the scriptures, the organizing structure that frames the blended space is the same as that which structured the two inputs (i.e., Aural-Performative Reading), thus completing the mirror network. As a result, Jesus (projected from Input 2) appears within the blended space as both reader and interpreter of the scriptures (both Roles that are projected from Input 1). That the Roles come from Input 1 is not

---

[49] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 99.

[50] I have spoken of this as a linear process largely for ease of explanation. In reality, conceptual blending is a much more dynamic process that happens on-the-fly, so to speak, such that 'input formation, projection, completion, and elaboration all go on at the same time' (Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 72).

[51] In the process of constructing a blend, Fauconnier and Turner contend that the human mind 'may make several parallel attempts to find suitable projections, with only the accepted ones appearing in the final network' (*The Way We Think*, pp. 71-72).

[52] Because of this, some elements (such as Meal) are not projected to the blended space for the simple reason that, within the context of 24.45-48, they are not immediately important (even though they play a prominent role in both the framing of these mental spaces as well as the broader narrative as a whole [cf. Lk. 24.30-35]).

insignificant. Jesus here is reading and interpreting *scripture*, just as would be done within the synagogue (as he indeed has done in 4.16-30). What emerges in the blend, however, is the performance of these synagogual activities within the gathering of the 11 and their companions on Easter Day, thus resulting in the compression of these separate aural-performative events into a singular moment in time.

Compression is a key aspect of CBT and refers to the human cognitive ability to compress that which is otherwise variable and diffuse down into manageable, intelligible, and meaningful conceptual units, always with the goal of achieving Human-Scale.[53] Once vital relations are established, compression happens as the various elements of each input space are projected to the blend. Concerning the present study, compression permeates all aspects of the blend (re)produced by 24.45-48. For instance, contrary to the discursive anticipation of the broader chapter, scripture is never actually utilized in the blend; rather, *all* the scriptures (cf. vv. 27 and 44) are compressed into the singular referent οὕτως γέγραπται (v. 46a). Further, the moment of interpretation is also compressed into a single moment – rather than actually interpreting several scriptural passages (an event that would take a significant amount of time), compression enables Jesus to interpret *all* the scriptures at one moment. Likewise, in place of citing scripture, Jesus instead recites a compressed account of the Lucan narrative (vv. 46b-48). In all these instances, the compression of several otherwise diffuse input elements achieve Human-Scale within the blend, thus becoming intelligible within the singular moment *Jesus reads Luke-Acts*.

At several points in the above discussion the phrase emergent structure has been used. This refers to meaning that emerges within the blended space. It occurs at Human-Scale and is often recognized in a moment or 'flash of comprehension.'[54] Such meaning is unique to the blended space, not being found within either input individually. As such, it is only when blended spaces are properly composed, completed, and elaborated that meaning can be created.[55] Some emergent structure within the blend created in Lk. 24.45-48 has already been mentioned; one more point must be made.

It has been demonstrated that in the blended space Jesus reads a compressed account of the Lucan narrative in place of scripture, thus fusing these two domains of thought together. As

---

[53] Cf. Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 113-15; cf. pp. 312-28.
[54] Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 44.
[55] Cf. Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, pp. 42-44.

suggested above, the outer-space relation that connects the scriptures to Luke's narrative is that of Analogy (see Diagram 1). Analogy is one of the most common vital relations made within conceptual networks and is often compressed down into inner-space vital relations of Identity and Uniqueness. Such is the case with the blending of the scriptures with Luke-Acts. Though these two textual traditions are, in their outer-space relation, only analogous to one another (i.e., they are distinct texts that are read aloud within distinct communities), in their inner-space relation they are fused together: Jesus reads Luke-Acts where it was expected that he would read scripture. The outer-space relation of Analogy is compressed into both Identity and Uniqueness within the blended space, thus creating an emergent structure within which the scriptures of Israel share a unique identity with the Lucan narrative. The transference of meaning between these two domains is therefore established as fundamentally interconnected – *Jesus reads Luke-Acts* does not result in the loss but rather the fulfillment of meaning (cf. v. 44),[56] even though the precise nature of such fulfillment is not made clear within the blend created here.

Though couched in theory-specific terminology, it is not a new observation that Lk. 24.45-48 creates an emergent structure within which the scriptures of Israel and the Lucan narrative are blended. Such a fact is not a shortcoming of the present analysis but rather demonstrates the degree to which this blend achieves Human-Scale and further (re)produces mental representations within subsequent reading communities. What is distinct about the present analysis is the emphasis placed upon the aural-performative settings that both frame the conceptual network and also constitute the *Sitz im Leben* within which such texts would be continually encountered. Faucconier and Turner note that emergent meaning is never confined to the blended space alone but is projected back onto each input space individually, thus strengthening the vital relations that connect the individual elements to one another.[57] One significant feature of the blended space is that the emergent structure therein is not found in either input space – i.e., the synagogue is not the aural-performative locale for the Lucan narrative, nor is the ecclesia the aural-performative locale for the scriptures.[58] As a result, that which is (re)produced in 24.45-48 is projected back onto the sub-structural organizing frames of synagogue and ecclesia. By implication, when a reader of Luke's gospel subsequently hears the

---

[56] See, for example, Lk. 1.1, 20; 4.21; 18.31; 22.37; 24.44; Acts 1.16; 3.18; and 13.29.

[57] Cf. Fauconnier and Turner, *The Way We Think*, p. 44.

[58] Cf. David E. Aune, following Walter Bauer, notes: 'there is no clear evidence that the OT was read in Christian worship before ca. A.D. 155' (*ABD*, 6.983).

scriptures being read in the synagogue, the Lucan narrative is recalled; alternatively, when they hear the Lucan narrative read in the ecclesia, the scriptures are recalled. Thus, the blend is continually strengthened through the audience's ongoing aural-performative experiences of these texts, a hermeneutical dynamic that is further corroborated by the stylistic character of Luke's narrative, which will be examined next.

Intertextuality and Luke's Septuagintal Style

One of the long-standing debates within Lucan scholarship concerns the extent to which Luke's gospel sounds septuagintal, thus giving the narrative a distinctly scriptural ring. Whether it be Luke's use of septuagintal constructions such as καὶ ἐγένετο / ἐγένετο δὲ or καὶ ἰδοὺ, or simply the subtle and nuanced way in which scriptural passages are echoed, Luke's gospel seems to be stylistically scripturalized.[59] Such a feature is all the more striking when one considers the literary style of the gospel's prologue. As James M. Dawsey, following E. Norden, notes: 'the reader, from the very beginning, is made aware that the story could have been told in excellent Attic style, but was not.'[60] Though the claim to Atticism may be a bit strong, the diversity of Luke's stylistic abilities is no doubt apparent.[61]

That such a characteristic of Luke's gospel exists is widely noticed; explaining this characteristic has been a matter of much discussion.[62] To one degree or another, the scholarly

---

[59] Examples from Lk. 24 alone include the following. On καὶ ἐγένετο / ἐγένετο δὲ see vv. 4, 15, 30, 31, and 51. Cf. Stanley Porter contends: 'The fact that ἐγένετο constructions appear almost exclusively in Luke … seems to argue that Luke captures the flavour of the LXX (enhancement) by using these constructions stylistically' (Stanley E. Porter, *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* [SBG, 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1989], p. 125). On καὶ ἰδοὺ see vv. 4, 13, and perhaps 49 (though p75 and codex D read καὶ ἐγὼ, Codices A, B, and C support the presence of ἰδοὺ in v. 49; the alternate word order of codex W adds further support). On echoes, v. 31 (for instance) seems to contain several possible echoes. Fitzmyer notes that the phrase ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν imitates a similar septuagintal phrase that uses the cognate ἀφανίζω (cf. Judg. 21.16; Job 2.9b – *Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1568). Concerning the same verse, Luke Timothy Johnson suggests that the language of eyes being opened, thus resulting in some form of recognition, echoes the moment of Adam and Eve's eyes being opened in the garden, resulting in the recognition of their nakedness (cf. Gen. 3.7 – *The Gospel of Luke* [SP, 3; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991], pp. 396-97). Conversely, Fitzmyer suggests that the notion of eyes being opened is a septuagintal expression, citing 2 Kgs 6:17 as evidence (*Luke X–XXIV*, p. 1568).

[60] James M. Dawsey, *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986), p. 19.

[61] Cf. Alexander, who argues that Luke's gospel shows no tendency toward Atticism, or Classicism for that matter, but is rather written in the form of Standard Hellenistic Prose (Alexander, *Ancient Literary Context*, pp. 240-42 and 250-51).

[62] In addition to the theory that Luke has intentionally imitated the Greek scriptures (addressed above), two other scholarly explanations have been traditionally put forth. First, some suggest that Luke's gospel reflects a broader Jewish Greek dialect, one which may have been used for liturgical purposes in the synagogues (see, for instance, Fred L. Horton Jr., 'Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts', in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives*

consensus seems to be that Luke is (in some way) imitating or stylizing his gospel upon the Greek scriptural tradition.[63] Though scholars diverge on the exact reason why this is done, it is commonly thought of as a conscious and indeed intentional act on the part of the Lucan author. In this way, scholars naturally proceed from the text of Luke's gospel back toward the Lucan author himself. But this is not the only way to proceed. It is equally important to look forward from the text toward Luke's implied readers, assessing the degree to which Luke's septuagintal stylization may in fact hermeneutically impact the reading experience.

The need for this approach is nicely highlighted by an examination of Loveday Alexander's recent treatment of Luke's language. In principle, Alexander contends that the Lucan author practices some form of *imitatio*, thus consciously emulating the Greek scriptural tradition. Unlike others who hold this position, Alexander is rightly critical of approaching the problem as a purely 'literary phenomenon', something that she notes results in viewing Luke's gospel as an 'unusually intensive form of intertextuality.'[64] To be certain, Alexander's treatment is historically orientated toward situating Luke's Greek socio-linguistically within the Greco-Roman world; thus she notes, Luke's language 'tells us something about the literary matrix in which Luke wants to locate his account of Christian origins.'[65] It is surprising, then, that Alexander makes very little mention of the degree to which this 'literary matrix' was aural-performative, rooted at the popular level not in private study but rather in communal reading-events that were likely ritualized, certainly performative, and which were fundamentally aurally orientated. In the end, Alexander's analysis is conducted primarily from the standpoint of the author and not the reader. Though Alexander is absolutely correct that Luke's style must be examined as more than a mere literary device, her treatment, though careful and very thorough, is still quite orientated towards the 'literary phenomenon.' Indeed, a more thorough integration

---

on Luke-Acts [Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978], pp. 1-23). Second, others suggest that Luke's gospel is a translational work (either in part or as a whole), thus stemming from underlying Semitic sources. Though this theory has fallen out of popularity in modern scholarship, see: Charles Cutler Torrey, *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937); cf. Matthew Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946).

[63] This view asserts that Luke consciously *imitates* the Greek scriptures, perhaps with the intention of emulating these texts much like his contemporaries emulate great writers such as Plato or Homer. On this view, see, for instances, the classic essay: H. F. D. Sparks, 'The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1943), pp. 129-38 and more recently Johnson, *Luke*, pp. 12-13; François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1– 9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), p. 3; and Thomas L. Brodie, 'Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources', in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 17-46.

[64] Alexander, *Ancient Literary Context*, p. 245.

[65] Alexander, *Ancient Literary Context*, 251.

of the Lucan text within its aural-performative setting might actually illuminate Luke's scriptural imitation as being hermeneutically significant precisely because it is an 'unusually intensive form of intertextuality.'

Much depends, of course, on what one means by intertextual, or the term this study prefers, intertextual echo. To speak of intertextual echoes is to utilize two terms that are both broadly understood and often vaguely defined.[66] Of interest for the present study is the recent move by some interpreters to anchor Luke's intertextual echoes within the author's conscious intent.[67] According to such readings, the meaning produced by scriptural echoes is directly tied to the specific intentions of the Lucan author himself. One recent example of this is Kennith Litwak's monograph *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* in which he places the following limitation (among others) on what constitutes an intertextual echo:

> Some studies find echoes based on a single word, such as 'holy' or 'overshadow.' A single word is not generally enough to justify asserting the existence of an intertextual echo or allusion. I cannot of course disprove that Luke had a given text in mind, but if such an approach is adopted, I could certainly find a great many texts that Luke could have had in mind, which probably were not specifically in view.[68]

For the purposes of historical inquiry, Litwak's criteria is both sound and understandable; hermeneutically speaking, however, such a truncation is unnecessarily limiting, implicitly traveling from the text back toward the author, thus resulting in the locus of meaning being pushed farther and farther away from the aural-performative context of early Christian reading.[69] Such a move implicitly disregards the degree to which meaning is contextually constructed between reader(s) and text(s). Though such a move may be required for historical inquiry, hermeneutically speaking it is not necessarily prudent.

Though not always recognized, the term intertextuality has its roots in poststructuralist approaches toward literary criticism, specifically the work of Julia Kristeva and Roland

---

[66] Cf. Stanley E. Porter, 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology', in Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup, 148; SSEJC, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 79-96.

[67] Cf. Litwak, *Echoes*, pp. 47-65.

[68] Litwak, *Echoes*, pp. 64-65.

[69] Though Litwak does acknowledge that some intertextual echoes are unconsciously placed within the text, and further that the Lucan audience plays a role in the meaning-making process (see Litwak, *Echoes*, pp. 54 and 60 respectively), these (albeit brief) discussions seem at odds with his more foundational commitment to authorial intent. As such, the notion of an unconscious echo plays a very marginal role in Litwak's overall study. Indeed, one wonders what value an unconscious intertextual echo might have within an author-centred approach?

Barthes.[70] According to Thomas R. Hatina, one of Kristeva's aims was to put forth a new kind of hermeneutic which was neither author nor text centred, but which placed the locus of meaning upon the reading event;[71] "[texts] become open-ended and infinite in their relation with all other texts. Intertexts are viewed as only existing in the actual communicative process – always oscillating, being experienced only in an activity."[72] Both the emergence of intertexts and the construction of meaning happen, therefore, within the moment of reading, in the interaction between reader(s) and text(s). Within the cultural context of the 1st century C.E., such interaction is less about individual readers engaging physical manuscripts and rather more centred upon an aural-performative event. As such, the concept of an echo (as an audible sound) is strikingly appropriate when speaking of the way in which intertexts are recalled within such *aural*-performative settings. On the one hand, though many of the scriptural echoes within the Lucan narrative are doubtless intended by the author, not all are, nor do they need to be.[73] In practice, echoes always emerge within reading contexts, recognized when readers *hear* them upon the lector's lips. Indeed, throughout a text's ongoing aural-performance it is inevitable that some echoes will only emerge within the context of subsequent reading communities. The idea of intertextual echoes reconfigures the modern interpreter's sense of what and how texts *mean*, forcing the locus of meaning away from the isolated text, (certainly away from the supposed author), instead placing it directly upon the *reading experience*. Within a 1st century context, intertextual echoes have a programmatic aural-performative function that stretches beyond the narrative itself and instead reaches out into the reading situation of the community (when and wherever they may be).

In what sense, then, does the notion of intertextual echoes illuminate Luke's septuagintal style, this 'unusually intensive form of intertextuality', as being hermeneutically significant? The answer lies in direct relation to the conceptual blend discussed above. As has been

---

[70] For an excellent overview of intertextuality, and critique of its miss-application within New Testament studies, see Thomas R. Hatina, 'Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?', *BibInt* 7 (1999), pp. 28-43.

[71] Hatina, 'Intertextuality', p. 30.

[72] Hatina, 'Intertextuality', p. 31.

[73] This is not to say that writers like Luke do not have specific purposes in mind, nor that their writings bear the hallmarks of such intentions (indeed, the Lucan author infused his writing with a septuagintal style, something that seems to be an intentional move on the part of the author). On this point, the present study aligns with Litwak's contention that 'Luke is not merely "imitating LXX style" for effect. Rather, he is taking up the Scriptures of Israel, causing the voices of Scripture to sound out in a new way and in a new context' (Litwak, *Echoes*, p. 53). It is to say, however, that such intentionality is not always discernable, and even when it may be, meaning is always contextually determined.

demonstrated, on the level of narrative discourse, Lk. 24.45-48 (re)produces a conceptual blend in which the scriptures of Israel share a unique identity with the Lucan narrative. Though the blend is explicitly (re)produced at the moment of 24.45-48 being read, it is (more importantly) reinforced throughout the ongoing aural-performance of Luke's gospel. As the community reads about Jesus' birth, ministry, passion, and resurrection, Luke's scriptural style constantly and consistently runs-the-blend, resulting in the ongoing (re)production of the blended space. In this way, Luke's septuagintal style intertextually recalls scriptural memories, sometimes drawing the reader's attention to specific passages, other times open-endedly echoing any number of scriptural intertexts. Conversely, we should not presume that such reinforcement happens only within the ecclesia, as it is not unlikely that some readers of Luke's gospel are still participating in the synagogue. As the Torah and Prophets are read on the Sabbath, the events of the Lucan narrative are likewise intertextually echoed, thus sustaining meaning across aural-performative contexts. Luke's septuagintal style, therefore, does indeed function as an 'unusually intensive form of intertextuality', not because it is a literary phenomenon but rather an aural-performative one. The ongoing reading of both the gospel and the scriptures continually prompt new and spontaneous intertextual echoes of each other.

Conclusion

Though originally addressing issues of gospel composition and social memory theory, Werner H. Kelber's quotation at the outset of this chapter can rightly be applied to the interrelation of Jewish and early Christian textual traditions. Kelber reminds the modern reader that 1st century texts were rooted in aural-performative contexts, being both experienced and retained in collective and ultimately individual memory. Just as the gospel writers drew upon such memories when composing their narratives, so to do readers of these gospels utilize memory in constructing meaning. It has been the intention of this study to explore aural-performative aspects of how such shared cultural memories would be both acquired and subsequently recalled in relation to linguistic cues embedded within Luke's gospel. It has been argued that Lk. 24.45-48 (re)produces a conceptual blend in which the scriptures of Israel share a unique identity with the Lucan narrative. Through Luke's septuagintal style, this blend is continually reinforced and strengthened via the ongoing aural performance of the gospel within the ecclesia. In this way, Luke's septuagintal style is seen as being hermeneutically meaningful to the extent that it

facilitates ongoing conceptual blending (and this quite apart from the Lucan author's intentions in emulating the Greek scriptural tradition). The hermeneutical principle embedded within Lk. 24.45-48 is significant not because it serves as an abstract interpretive principle, but rather because it is both conceptually ground at the individual level (i.e., as an emergent structure that through continual activation becomes more and more entrenched within each reader's long-term memory) and socially enacted at the cultural level (i.e., being prompted through the ongoing aural performance of the gospel and the scriptures). In this way, through the interaction of Luke's septuagintal style with the Lucan reader in the context of on-going aural performances, Luke's gospel comes to embody this hermeneutical principle. As reading audiences hear and watch the gospel being performed by a lector, the blend is continually elaborated and the vital relations of Identity (for the community) and Uniqueness (for Luke's relation to the scriptures) are further strengthened, thus progressing towards the entrenchment of this conceptual network as a communally shared cognitive structure rooted within each individual reader. Viewed in this way, though it is obvious that Luke's narrative in involved in a conceptual shift that re-orientates one's understanding of what and how the scriptures *mean*, what emerges from the present analysis is a new understanding of how and why Luke's gospel is successful in doing so. Luke 24.45-48 prompts a conceptual structure that sustains Christian identity across reading communities; the more Luke's gospel is read, the more this identity is reinforced vis-à-vis other 1st century interpreters of the scriptures.

Bibliography

Achtemeier, Paul J., '*Omne Verbum Sonat:* The New Testament and the Oral Environment of Late Western Antiquity', *JBL* 109 (1990), pp. 3-27.

Alexander, Loveday C.A., *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (ECC; LNTS, 298; London: T & T Clark, 2005).

Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audience* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998).

Black, Matthew, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946).

Bovon, François, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1–9:50* (trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002).

Brodie, Thomas L., 'Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources', in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), pp. 17-46.

Czachesz, István, 'The Transmission of Early Christian Thought: Toward a Cognitive Psychological Model', *SR* 36 (2007), pp. 65-83.

Dawsey, James M., *The Lukan Voice: Confusion and Irony in the Gospel of Luke* (Macon, Ga.: Mercer University Press, 1986).

Esler, Philip Francis, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS, 57; Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Traditions in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

Fauconnier, Gilles, and Mark Turner, *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities* (New York: Basic Books, 2002).

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., S.J., *The Gospel According to Luke X–XXIV: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB, 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1985).

Freedman, David Noel (ed.), *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1992).

Hatina, Thomas R., 'Intertextuality and Historical Criticism in New Testament Studies: Is There a Relationship?', *BibInt* 7 (1999), pp. 28-43.

Horton, Fred L., Jr., 'Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts', in Charles H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1978), pp. 1-23.

Howe, Bonnie, *Because You Bear This Name: Conceptual Metaphor and the Moral Meaning of 1 Peter* (BibIntS, 81; Leiden: Brill, 2006).

Jaffee, Martin S., *Torah in the Mouth: Writing and Oral Tradition in Palestinian Judaism, 200 BCE – 400 CE* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP, 3; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991).

Kelber, Werner H., *The Oral and the Written Gospel: The Hermeneutics of Speaking and Writing in the Synoptic Tradition, Mark, Paul, and Q* (VPT; Bloominton, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1997).

Kimball, Charles A., *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup, 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994).

Koet, B. J., *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (SNTA, 14; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989).

Kurz, William S., S.J., *Reading Luke-Acts: Dynamics of Biblical Narrative* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993).

Levine, Lee I., *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000).

Litwak, Kenneth D., *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup, 282; London: T & T Clark, 2005).

Lundhaug, Hugo, 'Conceptual Blending in the *Exegesis of the Soul*', in Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, and Risto Uro (eds.), *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (BibIntS, 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 141-60.

Luomanen, Petri, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, and Risto Uro (eds.), *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (BibIntS, 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

Nolland, John, *Luke 18:35–24:53* (WBC, 35C; Dallas: Word Books, 1993).

Pietersma, Albert, 'A New Paradigm for Addressing Old Questions: The Relevance of the Interlinear Model for the Study of the Septuagint', in Johann Cook (ed.), *Bible and Computer. The Stellenbosch Aibi-6 Conference. Proceedings of the Association Internationale Bible Et Informatique 'From Alpha to Byte.' University of Stellenbosch 17-21 July, 2000* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), pp. 337-64

Porter, Stanley E., *Verbal Aspect in the Greek of the New Testament, with Reference to Tense and Mood* (SBG, 1; New York: Peter Lang, 1989).

——'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament: A Brief Comment on Method and Terminology', in Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders (eds.), *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup, 148; SSEJC, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), pp. 79-96.

Robbins, Vernon K., 'Conceptual Blending and Early Christian Imagination', in Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen, and Risto Uro (eds.), *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science* (BibIntS, 89; Leiden: Brill, 2007), pp. 161-95.

Runesson, Anders, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* (ConBNT, 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001).

——'Persian Imperial Politics, the Beginnings of Public Torah Readings, and the Origins of the Synagogue', in Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001* (ConBNT, 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), pp. 63-89.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., 'The Early History of Public Reading of the Torah', in Steven Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue* (BSHJ; London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 44-56.

Shiell, William David, *Reading Acts: The Lector and the Early Christian Audience* (BibIntS, 70; Boston: Brill, 2004).

Smith, Dennis E., *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003).

Sparks, H. F. D., 'The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel', *JTS* 44 (1943), pp. 129-38.

Torrey, Charles Cutler, *Our Translated Gospels: Some of the Evidence* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1937).

Tov, Emanuel, 'The Text of the Hebrew/Aramaic and Greek Bible Used in the Ancient Synagogue', in Birger Olsson and Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *The Ancient Synagogue from Its Origins until 200 C.E.: Papers Presented at an International Conference at Lund University, October 14-17, 2001* (ConBNT, 39; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003), pp. 237-59.

Wright, Benjamin G., III, 'Translation as Scripture: The Septuagint in Aristeas and Philo', in Wolfgang Kraus and R. Glenn Wooden (eds.), *Septuagint Research: Issues and Challenges in the Study of the Greek Jewish Scriptures* (SBLSCS, 53; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), pp. 47-61.