

Naked Bible Podcast Transcript

Episode 205

The Sword and the Servant with David Burnett

March 3, 2018

Teacher: Dr. Michael S. Heiser (MH)

Host: Trey Stricklin (TS)

Guest: DB

Episode Summary

The enigmatic “two swords” passage of Luke 22:35-38 that famously features Jesus’ command to the disciples, “the one who has no sword must sell his cloak and buy one” (22:35), has long plagued biblical interpreters. Scholars have attempted to explain this passage in many ways. Some have suggested that Jesus was speaking figuratively, not speaking of buying literal swords, but alluding to the future persecution of the disciples. Some suggest Jesus was preparing them to take up swords to defend themselves after his departure, preparing them for bandits along the way. Along these lines, still others suggest Jesus was referring more generally to the time of trial to come after his resurrection. This passage has even featured prominently in modern debates regarding Christian positions on guns and violence, some evangelical voices going as far to suggest that Jesus by implication encourages the right to brandish and use fire arms. As such, this text has factored into discussion of Christian ethics. In this episode David Burnett returns to the podcast and offers a new approach, one that reframes the passage through a careful treatment of the text within its wider narrative context and Luke’s use of scripture.

Transcript

TS: Welcome to the Naked Bible Podcast, Episode 205: The Sword and the Servant with David Burnett. I'm the layman, Trey Stricklin, and he's the scholar, Dr. Michael Heiser. Hey, Mike, how are you doing this week?

MH: Pretty good, pretty good. Another busy week, but I've been looking forward to having David back on.

TS: Absolutely. Every time there seems to be some good topics to be had. So I'm excited about this episode, as I'm sure everybody else is.

MH: Yeah, this one will be in the Gospels. We just spent a lot of time in Hebrews and, of course, we do topical things. A lot of them get oriented toward the Old Testament, so it will be nice to actually pick up something in the Gospels.

Well, we're glad to have David Burnett back with us. David, most of the audience is going to be familiar with you. But for those who aren't... Our audience keeps growing, so there's going to be people out there who have never heard you. So tell people a little bit about who you are, where you're at. Those who do know you will get at least a bit of an update.

DB: All right. I'm David Burnett. It's good to be back with you guys. I am a Ph.D. student in Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity at Marquette University. I am also a teaching assistant in the theology department here. Mike was my thesis reader in my Masters, and we've been friends for many, many years. I enjoy being on the Naked Bible Podcast! Let's see... updates. Well, coursework is insane! I don't recommend Ph.D. to many people, unless you want to go insane. [laughter]

MH: There you go. That about summarizes it! It messes up your life for awhile.

DB: That's right. One of my advisors (Dr. Andrei Orlov—expert in apocalyptic literature and early Jewish mysticism) has... It's famed at Marquette! He has moments of insanity, where we are just dealing with some really enigmatic texts and he opens it up and we sort of give our best interpretations of it and our most esoteric interpretations of it. That's our little moments of insanity. So that sort of comprises my life up here.

MH: Along with probably thousands of pages of reading, too.

DB: Yeah, I don't even want to talk about it. [laughs]

MH: There's that. People don't realize what really gets dumped on you. And nobody even thinks about it. That's just what you do—or what you're supposed to do, anyway!

DB: You try to get it all in, you know, but...

MH: Yeah, you try.

Well, we're going to return to the Gospels here. I know you've spent a lot of time in the Gospels. We're going to be in Luke, at least primarily. But what you're going to say is going to cast a wider net than that. So why don't you get us started here?

DB: Absolutely. This study is sort of coming off of a paper that I gave in the Synoptic Gospel section at the Society of Biblical Literature in 2015. The paper

was entitled "The Sword and the Servant: Reframing the Function of the Two Swords of Luke 22:35-38 in Narrative Context." We're dealing with a text that is incredibly difficult and it's incredibly controversial because of how it's been used over the centuries—how it's been received by the Church and in the wider sort of public, especially as it pertains to Christian ethics. If your listeners are not familiar with this text, we'll just go ahead and read it and then talk about some of the issues surrounding it and why this is such a controversial passage. The text is from Luke 22, if you're looking at a Bible. It's in Luke 22:35-38. It says:

³⁵ And he said to them, "When I sent you out with no moneybag or knapsack or sandals, did you lack anything?" They said, "Nothing." ³⁶ He said to them, "But now let the one who has a moneybag take it, and likewise a knapsack. And let the one who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one. ³⁷ For I tell you that this Scripture must be fulfilled in me: 'And he was numbered with the transgressors.' For what is written about me has its fulfillment." ³⁸ And they said, "Look, Lord, here are two swords." And he said to them, "It is enough."

5:00

So this passage is a difficult one. It's been interpreted many, many different ways. It is set within the wider context of the Last Supper—Christ's last Passover in Luke (that starts up at the top of 22). This whole issue of selling your cloak and buying a sword and the two swords here of verse 38... when Jesus says to them, "it's enough"... It seems pretty enigmatic to tell someone that if they don't have a sword, to buy one. And then when they show two swords, he says "it's enough," when you've had other ethics given earlier in Jesus' ministry and on his journey (either in his preaching ministry or on his journey to Jerusalem). It seemed that he's taught some sort of contradictory teachings to that. Loving your enemy... this kind of teaching. Laying down your life. It seems like quite a jump to say, "Okay, now buy a sword."

So popular interpretations of this text have ranged over the centuries, and there are some sort of common ones. Some of the common interpretations are that what Luke is talking about here about "when I sent you out, but now..." that he uses is referring to this change in time period. This is in verse 36 of chapter 22. This comes from a famous (at least in modern history in biblical scholarship) Luke scholar named Hans Conzelmann, who has argued that this is referring to the change of times. When Christ was with the disciples and then when he's gone is sort of this time of travail. This is actually a pretty dominant interpretation of this passage—that during the time they were with him they experienced great miracles and close fellowship, but now it's sort of turned over to the wolves as he will die, be resurrected, and ascend to heaven. And so this "taking up swords" is sort of a notion of defense. Some go as specific as to say there will be brigands along the way and they'll have to defend themselves in their travels out to reach the empire for Jesus with the gospel. That's a pretty common interpretation—that

the taking up of the sword actually refers to this move of defense. It's to keep them alive as they're on their way preaching the gospel.

Another interpretation has been that the swords are symbolic. Some early patristics took this interpretation. But even with modern commentators this is still quite popular. This "taking up of the sword" or the two swords are sort of symbolic of the general suffering of the Church after Christ's ascension. So the need for swords is kind of a metaphor for the trial that they are going to go through. This interpretation is still very popular because it explains the later text in this context in Luke, when the disciples take out a sword and cut off the ear of the high priest's servant. We'll look at that. Jesus rebukes them. It's kind of funny that if you're telling people to take up a sword now and once they do he rebukes them... it seems sort of contradictory. So people have hovered around that interpretation. It's been pretty popular with commentators and articles and even Church Fathers, that this is symbolic.

Now, this text has also been used in pop culture quite frequently—this "sell your cloak and buy a sword." We know especially within American evangelicalism this is used a *lot*. This text is referred to all the time. Do one Google search and you'll find endless uses of this text. Some of those have been popularized by some evangelical leaders to defend the right to bear firearms in the gun debates that go on in the United States. "Well, Jesus said to sell your cloak and buy a sword, so obviously, we're to defend ourselves. Go buy guns now." I wish I was kidding about this, but this has been Tweeted and posted and written on and spoken on from countless pulpits and platforms, whether it be churches or schools.

10:00 **MH:** It's a little odd to sort of have to... I don't know. This is just me, but if I'm thinking about the Second Amendment, I'm not thinking about the New Testament. You know what I mean? There's a clear path to the one, but why do we... ? I guess I can imagine why people would want to link the Second Amendment to something in the Bible or whatever, but it's kind of odd. But I could see people doing it.

DB: Yeah, I think this is a problem. As we get into the passage, we'll see how deep this problem goes. But the problem is sort of surface readings of texts (like proof texting) that happens a lot within sort of more popularized American evangelicalism.

MH: It's just really odd to me. What's wrong with saying, "Hey, it's the Constitution. We have the Second Amendment and it's the law of the land. It's the Constitution." Why do we have to go beyond that? But anyway, I don't want to veer off into that. It's just odd to my ear when we have a clear path to an argument about the law of the land. Why do we have sprinkle a Bible verse on it? Why isn't the law of the land good enough? Because that's what it is! It's in place.

DB: Right. But when this topic comes up in conversation, it's generally "what Christians should do."

MH: Oh, okay. Yeah.

DB: I can give examples if you want them, but I want to protect the guilty.

MH: No, we don't want to take your time for that.

DB: So let's dig into this text. I actually take quite a different interpretation of this passage. The call to sell your cloak and buy a sword is actually a prophetic enactment of the disciples' denial of Jesus. This interpretation of selling your cloak and buying a sword actually is part of an enacted denial of Jesus—a prophetic enactment of denial of Jesus (a prediction of denial). This is actually taken up before, coming from a 1964 article. It does not actually frame the text within its narrative context. They sort of keep it immediately and refer to the passage after it, but there is a structural element to this wider Lukan passage that sort of frames it where it makes sense. But you have to juxtapose it over and against what's going on in Matthew and Mark. So this is an issue of the Synoptic problem, but much more so, an issue of narrative criticism.

When talk about narrative criticism, when we take a text like this, we want to frame it within the actual structure of the story of that author and the unique voice or theology of that particular author and see what he's doing here.

MH: The Synoptic problem often turns out to be the Synoptic solution.

DB: Yeah! [laughter] Often, you can get lost in trying to figure out which source is first and to completely miss the boat that these narratives are written stylistically and structurally with intent.

MH: Right. Every author has an agenda, and agenda is not a bad word.

DB: Exactly. They're performative. These texts are performed. These texts are read openly and publicly and they're meant to be memorized and performed. The actual structure of the story is very important. There are a lot of unique elements in this wider story of the Last Supper and then Jesus' arrest and... I'm just going to go ahead and call it "the disciples' denial tradition." In Synoptic perspective if you look at all three, there are a lot of differences in Luke that are not in Matthew and Mark. Matthew and Mark are relatively uniform in these stories. There are differences between them, but structurally and thematically, and even in the scriptures they use, they're pretty uniform. Luke veers off quite a bit. We're going to see that in these unique passages, my interpretation actually makes sense when you frame it within the context of the narrative as a whole. So let's just get into it.

15:00

Right here when Jesus is addressing the disciples, this is at the Last Supper. The immediate section that frames this story in 22:35-38... especially if you're looking at a text right now it will really help you see this. From verse 31 of chapter 22 to verse 62, you have sort of a chiasmic structure of the story. Now, I *hate* using that term because this is one of the most overused terms in New Testament studies.

MH: It's like "typology."

DB: Yes! It drives me *nuts*. That's why I hate saying it. When I realized this and had it confirmed by *multiple* scholars before I said anything and then tested it at SBL (and it was received well)... There was actually a woman scholar in the back (I can't remember her name—I wish I could) who was telling me about lots of chiasmic structures through Luke that are used to frame the narrative. There have also been great studies on the construction of Luke's narrative in reference to kingdoms, like Samuel and Kings in our Bibles. In the Septuagint, they're called 1-4 Kingdoms. In those texts, you frequently have in the Elijah/Elisha stories, sort of chiasmic narrative structures going on. Luke is using the Elijah/Elisha template a lot in the construction of his narrative, so it would be pretty common to see this, especially when you're writing with a pseudo-Septuagintal writing style using *egeneto* ("in the days of...") to break every section, just like you're reading Kingdoms. It's really interesting.

MH: Luke is known for that. For the readers who don't know what chiasm is or a chiasmic structure, in the course of storytelling (we'll say here) or in the course of the writer laying out an episode or episodes, you'll have a point-by-point kind of narrative sequence of events or items. It includes things that are said and things that happen. And then at some point, there will be a particular kind of hinge point, and then from that point on the story will mirror element by element the elements that have gone up to that event. So Luke might say ten things and then there will be a climax and then the next ten things that he says later will be mirror-images of what he has said before, in opposite sequence. So the term comes from the letter *chi*, like an X. You have something leading to a middle point, then you hit the hinge point, then it goes back in the other direction. I don't know if that helps, but people can look it up. That's what we're talking about with a chiasm or chiasmic structure.

DB: Yeah, let me illustrate what I mean here because, again, I don't want people to write it off. I've tested this with quite a few voices and what we're finding is...

MH: They're in scripture.

DB: There are quite a few in Luke, as well. All of chapter 1 is kind of a woman-center text, where you have Mary and Elizabeth meet in the middle. Richard Bauckham in the *Gospel Women* book has a great chapter on how the whole Gospel starts that way. So this is a common Lukan way of structuring stories. Again, this helps in performance. You sort of see what the central focus is of a

discourse or a speech, and then it allows you to focus sort of the center of its attention. The structure I'm proposing is when you look up chapter 22, verses 31-34 is where you have like the A. So if you were label this A, B, C, and then you'd go B¹ and then A¹, like they refer back up to those similar points, this is how it's structured. "A" would be Jesus foretelling Peter's denial. He foretells Peter's denial in verses 31-34, As he addresses the whole disciples sitting at the table, he zooms in on Peter. And then there's Satan's demand for him in verse 31:

Simon, Simon, behold, Satan has demanded to have you all...

He wants to try all of them, and he says:

But I've prayed for you [singular] that your faith may not fail. And when you've turned again, strengthen your brothers.

And then Peter says to him:

"Lord, I'm ready to go with you both to prison and to death!"

So there's this sort of positive acknowledgement from Peter after Jesus addresses Peter's status, and then Jesus follows by this foretelling of his denial, saying in verse 34:

³⁴Jesus said, "I tell you, Peter, the rooster will not crow this day, until you deny three times that you know me."

20:00

So that's the A—that's the first part. Then when you move on into B, you see Jesus address the group. Jesus foretells the *disciples'* denial. This is what I'm proposing for this particular section—our problematic section about the two swords. So he moves from addressing Peter, which again... Just to frame this for you, the start of this story (Satan asking to sift them like wheat), you're not going to find this in any other Gospel. This is unique to Luke, and there's a reason for that. So why is this material only in Luke and not any other Gospel about Satan wanting to sift them? Well, you have to rewind back in Luke's Gospel to sort of get the setting here. We know from the Synoptic Gospels, if you're familiar with them (Matthew, Mark, and Luke), that you have a temptation narrative of Jesus, right? After he's baptized by John in the wilderness, he's led out by the Spirit and he's tempted by Satan. In that temptation, we have some common elements. In the temptation narratives in Matthew 4 and Mark 1, we have angels that come to minister to Jesus. Satan is tempting him, he overcomes the temptation, and then angels come to minister to him. Well, in Luke, you have Jesus tempted by Satan, offering him the kingdoms of this world, but at the end of the trial, interestingly, there are no angels that come to minister to him, as in Mark and Matthew. Luke actually leaves it for this story that we're looking at today. He puts it at the end of

his Gospel, where he has a single angel ministering to him. But here in the temptation in Luke 4, the narrator (the actual storyteller) says that Satan left him until an opportune time. So that's a unique feature to Luke, where before Satan just flees from Jesus. He has overcome him, he flees, and he sort of doesn't show up in Matthew and Mark. But the author of Luke says "he left him until an opportune time."

MH: Luke is foreshadowing something.

DB: Exactly. And that opportune time, guess what? It's our present passage: Luke 22, right at the beginning of the Last Supper when they're preparing for the last meal. It's fascinating. So Luke 22 starts:

Now the Feast of Unleavened Bread drew near, which is called the Passover. ²And the chief priests and the scribes were seeking how to put him to death, for they feared the people.

So they're wanting to put Jesus to death. And then it says:

³Then Satan entered into Judas called Iscariot, who was of the number of the twelve.

And that's when he betrays him. So for Luke's narrative, this time of the Supper is now the opportune time. So Satan actually is incarnate in Judas in Luke, and he actually betrays Jesus over. So what you're finding in Luke is this is sort of a cosmic confrontation in Luke. This is where Satan himself is actually in Judas, coming head-to-head with the messiah (where the presence of God is). And so you're seeing a cosmic clash here. Luke is framing his narrative (this narrative at the meal—this sort of unique material he's bringing up) as a great temptation. Satan has left him in the first temptation until the opportune time. Now he's come, and in this context in Luke, the story is framed as the great temptation where Satan is there, but it's going to tempt the whole bunch. This temptation or trial is now not just Jesus, it's with the twelve. So they're being brought into this.

Now, if you know Luke's Gospel very well, there are hints the entire way through the Gospel leading to this point, right? He's told his disciples in chapter 9 to take up their cross and follow him. He mentions this again in the cost of discipleship section in 14:27. But in chapter 12, he actually says:

³⁷Blessed are those servants whom the master finds awake when he comes. Truly, I say to you, he will dress himself for service and have them recline at table, and he will come and serve them.

So this notion of the disciples being awake when he comes and he'll serve them at a table... This is going to be important for the table scene later in Luke 22, and

then the prayer scene where he finds them sleeping. And he's reclining at the table with them beforehand. So this is some interesting foreshadowing going on. You also see this prominently in Luke earlier (in Luke 12:4-12), where he mentions not to fear the ones that will kill the body and that if they persevere, he will acknowledge them before the angels. So the one that speaks against the Son of Man could be forgiven, but the one who blasphemes the Holy Spirit will not. They're going to deny Jesus and they're going to be forgiven. These are sort of foretellings of things to come. They're going to go through these trials. They're going to be brought into temptation. Even the Lord's Prayer... The Lord's Prayer is critical for this in Luke 11:1-4. How does it end? "Lead us not into temptation." This is the same word, back to the temptation in Luke 4—the *peirasmos*—the trials, the temptations. In some manuscripts, it even adds in the Lord's Prayer, "but deliver us from the evil one." Scholars mostly think that's an addition because the longer versions tend to assimilate Matthew's version of the prayer, but we don't know for sure.

The point is, the prayer itself is about not being led into temptation. Everything's leading to this great temptation in Luke. It's right here at the meal. Satan has his opportune time. This is the great temptation. That's how this story is actually structured—the A and the B. Jesus foretells Peter's denial (Satan has asked to sift them), but when you turn... So he assumes they're turning. Even the denial of the Son of Man, remember, could be forgiven, as Jesus has said earlier in the Gospel. But now he turns in 22:35-38 to the disciples as a whole. So you move from one to the whole group. You move from your A to your B.

³⁵ And he said to them [plural], "When I sent you out with no moneybag or knapsack or sandals, did you lack anything?"

This refers back to the sending out of the 12 and the sending out of the 70 or 72.

MH: I was just going to bring that up—the 70, especially, is interesting here.

DB: It is because he mentions the stuff that he tells the 70, assuming that the disciples would have been told the same thing back in Luke 9. Again, there's a similar structure here. He addresses the disciples' previous status just like he addressed Peter's previous status. He says, "You weren't lacking anything." And then they have a positive response, too: "No, we lacked nothing!" When they were actually sent out—empowered to preach the Kingdom and to cast out demons—they weren't lacking anything. But now he says... That's the critical point. Now you have the foretelling of their denial in the same way he just foretold Peter's denial. Mind you, in Luke he is very specific. Back in verse 34, he tells you exactly what Peter is going to do, right?

³⁴ Jesus said, "I tell you, Peter, the rooster will not crow this day, until you deny three times that you know me."

Well, he's going to do the same thing here. Now, addressing the disciples, he says:

³⁶He said to them, "But now let the one who has a moneybag take it, and likewise a knapsack.

These are the things that they did not need. It's like they're going to operate in such a way where they didn't need things. They weren't lacking anything and they were still accomplishing the proclamation of the Kingdom—victory over demons. It's really important to remember.

MH: Is he saying, "Okay now, fellas, go ahead and take the things you don't need." In other words, "Go ahead, turn to your own self-sufficiency." Is that the point?

DB: Well, the point is, he's telling them exactly what's about to happen.

MH: They're *going* to do those things. They're going to do this. It's imperatival in the Greek. But this is an enactment. This is a prophetic enactment of the scene. You think of it as a play or a drama... You're giving them this dark scene that's about to take place. You just said exactly how Peter is going to deny you, even though he responded positively. Now the group has responded positively, like "We weren't lacking anything!" And he says:

"But now let the one who has a moneybag take it, and likewise a knapsack. And let the one who has no sword sell his cloak and buy one."

Now, did they need a sword when they were sent out before? No! They had power. They could proclaim to the spirits and they would leave. They would preach the Kingdom. They even healed. But now, it's like, "You're to sell your cloak and buy one." So the cloak is one of the few things he told them to bring! [laughs] Again, this is side of an upside-down reversal of what's happened earlier. They had the power to address this earlier, but now they're going to rely on other things. They're going to sell their cloak and buy a sword. And this is the lynch-pin, verse 37:

³⁷For I tell you that this Scripture must be fulfilled in me...

30:00

So he's basing what's happening with the selling of the cloak and buying a sword—the very thing they need—for the things that they don't need? And taking up a sword that they did not need? He says this is why: it's to fulfill a scripture. It says:

‘And he was numbered with the transgressors.’ For what is written about me has its fulfillment.

This is a quotation from Isaiah 53:12. Now, this is a very important text because this does not feature in Mark and Matthew. Often in Christian theology when we think of Isaiah 53, it's "Oh, the Suffering Servant—this is Jesus." You sort of assume that it features in all the Gospels. Well, you could argue that yes, at times it's alluded to—sometimes, maybe, clearly and sometimes unclearly. But this is the only one of the three Synoptics that actually quotes it explicitly. Mark and Matthew actually have another text they're relying on in this story: Zechariah 13. So in the disciples' denial tradition (as we'll call it, just for the sake of argument here) in Mark and Matthew's telling of it, they use Zechariah 13. Jesus is at the meal... For example, in Mark he says, "The scriptures are being fulfilled" and then he refers to the previous quotation of Zechariah 13:7, which says:

I will strike the shepherd and the sheep with be scattered.

Then later, in his arrest—in the immediate context of the disciples' denial story—they left him and fled in verse 50 when he gets arrested. So there are common elements in these stories across the tradition. So in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, the common elements you see in each one of these stories are, one, you have the prediction of Peter and the disciples' denials. So you have that prediction in Matthew and Mark. You just sort of lose track of that in Luke because it sounds unique. But in Matthew and Mark, they both predict both of their denials. The second thing is they both fail to pray in the next scene, when they're taken out to the garden to pray. We'll get to that. Three, there's a taking up of swords in each one, and then Jesus being arrested. These are the common elements in each one. But if you notice when you look at the Mark 14 and Matthew 26 accounts, in both of those texts, Jesus says the scripture at the meal, just like we have in Luke. But in Luke it's Isaiah 53. He says the Zechariah 13 text at the meal in Mark and Matthew ("strike the shepherd and the sheep with scatter"). In both of those texts, it's very clear that the fulfillment of that scripture is talking about when the crowd comes to arrest Jesus, the disciples left him and fled. So the "fulfillment of scripture" motif in these disciple denial stories always happens within the immediate context of his arrest. That's very important because what people do when they see this text in Luke... Let's fast-forward back to Luke. When they seek Luke use Isaiah 53 ("and he was numbered with the transgressors"), what is the number one interpretation of this passage that you hear all the time?

MH: People are going to be thinking that's when he's put on the cross between the two thieves.

DB: Bingo! That is the dominant interpretation. What they do is... This is actually really interesting if we pay close attention to it. The reason for people to assume this is later scribes... Once we have a four-fold Gospel canon, we know for sure that later scribes in multiple later manuscripts (none of the early manuscripts have this) actually took this Isaiah 53:12 ("and he was numbered with the transgressors") passage and they put it in Mark 15:28 when Jesus is crucified next to two robbers. This term is really important. It'll come up later in the Luke text.

MH: So you're going to suggest "being numbered with the transgressors" here in Luke is not about the crucifixion event, it's about the scattering. And the whole point of it would be something like, "I'm taken like any common criminal. I'm numbered among the transgressors," or something like that. Is that correct? Like an arrest?

SB: It's more specific than that in Luke. In Luke, it's actually the taking up of the sword. So the transgressors (the ones who are breaking the law) are those who take up the sword.

MH: Oh, oh, oh, oh, oh... okay.

SB: You see?

MH: Yep.

35:00

SB: So the transgressors in Luke's context are going to be the ones who actually take up the sword. More importantly, that's the group. But Peter will deny him. Already what we find here in this use of Isaiah 53 here in Luke... This will explain a lot. I would argue that it will explain all of the unique material that we find in Luke's telling of the arrest story—the Last Supper, the prayer, and the arrest story. You can find the themes of the unique material right in Isaiah 53, like when he tells Peter that he has prayed on his behalf that his faith may not fail. If Isaiah 53 is behind this overall passage, kind of like Midrash where you're compiling pieces of a story to sort of fill in Isaiah 53, so you're taking Synoptic tradition and you're sort of casting it in light of Isaiah. What do we find the servant doing in Isaiah 53? What does he do? He intercedes on behalf of who? The transgressors! He intercedes on their behalf. So if you have Isaiah in your mind, which any Jew would have in their mind at this period...

MH: The ones who forsake him (or who are going to be tempted to forsake him) are the transgressors.

SB: Exactly! This is the great temptation for Luke! Satan is here, they're going into the trial... He even tells them before the meal—right before we get to this passage—that you were with me in my trials and my Father has prepared a kingdom for you. It's the same term.

MH: If we think of "transgressor" maybe in terms of being unfaithful or faithless, that might help some listeners. Again, our minds immediately go to the crucifixion scene.

SB: Right. But it's only these later manuscripts that put that Isaiah verse in 15:28. If you look in your Bibles in Mark 15, you'll see... Any modern Bible will sort of take verse 28 out. They'll just have verse 27, verse 29, and they'll take 28 out. Normally, it's put down in a note because no early manuscripts have it.

MH: ESV has done that. For those of you who are using ESV, if you go to Mark 15:27 and just look at the numbers, you'll have verse 27, then it goes to verse 29. So verse 28 is not there, and you'll get a footnote in ESV:

Some manuscripts insert verse 28: *And the Scripture was fulfilled that says, "He was numbered with the transgressors"*

This is just like what happens... Maybe people are more familiar with John chapter 5, with the angel and the pool and all that stuff. It's the same kind of phenomenon here.

DB: There are good reasons for that. This is probably a later scribal harmonization—that's a popular theory. I have my own views on why, but it's definitely a later harmonization. They're seeing connection with the language of robbers, because Luke uses that language of robbers in this scene, we'll see. So people assume that in Matthew and Mark, it says he's crucified next to these robbers, and it uses the term *lestes*. These robbers or brigands—that's the term used in Matthew and Mark. So they sort of assume that this "counted amongst the robbers" must be what he's talking about. But Luke doesn't use that term in the crucifixion. Luke just uses *kakourgos* (meaning literally "workers of bad" or criminals). That's the term he uses. He doesn't use "robbers" for those hanging on either side of him on the cross, because the term "robber" for him in his narrative will function very specifically. We'll see that in the following scene.

And so when he speaks of "numbered with the transgressors," it's these who are taking up the sword. This is to fulfill scripture. Look in verse 38. Right after he says "what is written about me has fulfillment:

³⁸**And they said, "Look, Lord, here are two swords." And he said to them, "It is enough."**

Now, this is a toughie, right? First of all, you have the twelve that he's addressing. What the heck are you going to do with two swords? You sure as heck aren't going to take on Rome with two swords.

MH: Right. He's not meaning, "That'll do; that's sufficient." That's not what he's getting at.

DB: Right! He's not like, "You've got the right amount! You just needed two!" That's obviously not what's going on here. There's obviously something else. But why two? If you're familiar with the Luke story in general, or just Jewish storytelling in general, what do you need to validate that someone is actually a transgressor? You need...

MH: Two or three witnesses.

40:00

DB: You need two witnesses! [laughter] You see? You need two or three witnesses to validate that you are actually a transgressor! And so the whole point of this—just like in the A structure, he foresees Peter's denial. Then he zooms in, B, to the whole group and he tells them, "This is what you're going to do. Now you're going to do *this* because the scripture has its fulfillment in me." And what did we see in Matthew and Mark? Both of those texts have that scriptural fulfillment going on with Zechariah, and both of them are fulfilled in the arrest scene. So let's keep going in Luke and see if that actually works out.

MH: It's his way of saying, "Okay, we don't have a lone wolf acting here." It's kind of his way of saying, "The bunch of you approve. You're all in this together. You're assenting to what's going on here."

DB: Right. There are a lot of narrative features that stick out, like the positioning of characters. Like the character's position. Peter is real close to him, "I'll go with you to prison unto death!" He wants to go right there with him, right? And then the disciples are like, "We didn't need anything! We did exactly as you told us." But now they're going to do the opposite of that. They're saying, "Look, here we have two swords." And he says, "That's enough." So the thing that they didn't need before now is going to be the thing that makes them transgressors. They're going to be counted with the transgressors. So Jesus must be counted with the transgressors. The transgressors here are those who take up the sword, and we'll see this.

That's where you move on to the prayer scene. This is the very center of the narrative section. The immediate narrative section is the prayer. What are they praying? Not to be led into temptation. This is the crux! This is the C. So if A is foretelling Peter's denial, B is foretelling the disciples' denial, right smack in the middle we have this prayer that they are not led into temptation. That's what they actually prayed. And what does he say? Verse 40:

⁴⁰And when he came to the place, he said to them, "Pray that you may not enter into temptation."

This is the prayer that he taught them to pray before: "Lead us not into temptation!" So this is part of the Lukan theme. Satan has waited for this opportune time, now he's literally coming in Judas, and he's telling them to pray that they're not led into temptation, and then Jesus is alone praying. He's the last one. So right here in verse 43, you have this interesting Lukan addition again:

⁴³And there appeared to him an angel from heaven, strengthening him.

So there's that angel strengthening him tradition from the temptation, but Luke has saved it for the very end. All throughout Luke, this is a really interesting theme that people miss because they don't pay attention to narrative. Throughout Luke's narrative, the ones that are with him are always sort of recognized by the angels of heaven, right? "If you acknowledge me before the Father, you'll be recognized before the angels of heaven." "The angels of heaven rejoice when you find the lost one." You know, there's all this sort of being aligned with the angels that means you're in the right place. Crispin Fletcher-Louis has an interesting monograph on Luke and angels in this respect. The point being, the angel is ministering to Jesus. The others are not praying the prayer, and so we already at this climatic section find them sleeping. This is exactly what he sort of alluded to back in chapter 12 about "Blessed are the servants whom the master finds awake when he comes." So this idea is that you want to be awake, you want to be able to pray that you're not led in temptation and you can be successful in the trial, but what we have is a failure, and immediately that's how the story turns.

And you even have a little sort of a mini-chiasm. He tells them to pray, they don't pray, and then it's like he has to reiterate it in verse 46:

⁴⁶and he said to them, "Why are you sleeping? Rise and pray that you may not enter into temptation."

So it's like, "Okay, we get it Luke. This is the center. We get what you're doing here." And then while he was still speaking... boom! You have this sort of narrative hinge. You've created this huge tension, and the narrator is just like, "Immediately..." While they're speaking, there came a crowd. So here comes the crowd, and who is leading them? Judas! But we know from Luke this is *literally* Satan. So Satan has literally come to face him. This is the great temptation. Will they fail?

MH: It is really interesting that Luke inserts the detail about the angel here, especially with that.

DB: Isn't it? It just makes it so much clearer.

MH: And omits it at the temptation.

DB: Yeah, and omits it at Luke 4, that's right! It's sort of...

MH: And he just moves it to right here.

45:00

DB: Yeah, he moves it all the way up. He's sort of walking you through it. If you've been paying attention in Luke to all this temptation narrative, then you'd get it. You would catch it—especially in the Lord's Prayer. The disciples are like, "Teach us how to pray!" and it's like, "This is how you do it." And now they're found not praying at the moment they need to be. So this is where the hinge happens. You've got your A, you've got your B, and this is the C. And then... boom! You've got your B¹—back to the disciples. What happens?

So Judas comes in this scene for the betrayal to kiss them, and verse 49... here it is:

⁴⁹ And when those who were around him saw what would follow, they said...

Now, this is very important. It's a *they* here. This is the disciples. This is not Peter. So many times when we're not listening to an actual narrative, our minds naturally try to harmonize things. And so we missed crucial points in the narrative that sort of teach us what's going on in the story. So you don't want to take John's gospel, for example, that says Peter does it and impute it onto Luke because you'll lose the framework. So in Luke's, it's the group ("they") when he addressed the "they"—the disciples—about the swords. It says:

...they said, "Lord, shall we strike with the sword?"

Notice. It doesn't say just "and one of them" or "and one" or "and Peter." It says "and one of *them*," so it's talking about like the solidarity of the group. They're sort of all on this board there, like "Shall we all strike with the sword?" So one of them comes up and strikes with the sword.

⁵⁰ And one of them struck the servant of the high priest and cut off his right ear.

And Jesus said... He does *not* say, "Ok good, that's why you got the swords. You're ready now." No! It's the opposite! [laughs]

⁵¹ But Jesus said, "No more of this!"

He rebukes them, and he touches his ear and heals him. Now again, we find a unique passage only to Luke in no other Gospel—not even John. This is really surprising. Not even John includes the healing of the servant's ear. Now why is this? Why is it we find the healing of the ear only in Luke? It's not in Mark. It's not a Matthew. Because again, if we think about store framing this story... If I was

right that Isaiah 53 is behind the framing of this story, just like Zechariah 13 was behind the story of Matthew and Mark... So in Isaiah 53... How does healing take place in Isaiah 53? Does the healing of Israel and the healing of the nations take place by the servant picking up the sword and slaughtering all his enemies, and then the great healing comes? No! It says “by his stripes we are healed.” Isaiah 53. This is the notion. He's drawing the themes.

MH: It's quite a contrast.

DB: Right. This is what Luke is doing. He's doing sort of Jewish exegesis of Isaiah 53 and structuring his narrative with it. It's the healing comes when they give *up* the swords, when they give *up* to the enemy. So not only does Jesus not take the sword against his enemy, he literally *heals* his enemy. This is night-and-day, upside-down different. This is exactly what he (in the prediction of the disciples' denial) has said. They were lacking nothing when he sent them out, and they were going to take the very few things they had and sell them for the things that they did not need. And so this is exactly what's happening—the taking up of the sword. And so they strike and he heals them. Hopefully you're hearing the Isaiah imagery here.

MH: Yeah, they're trusting in their own means—what they think they're going to need. That's the transgression there. [laughs] That's the transgression.

DB: Right! And those texts... People knew Isaiah backwards and forwards back then. They knew the Servant Songs. The Servant Songs are used *all the time* in context of Israel's redemption. And if you're if you think Isaiah 53:8-9 are leading up to that in verse 12, what do they say? This is Isaiah 53:8-9. It says:

**⁸By oppression and judgment he was taken away;
and as for his generation, who considered
that he was cut off out of the land of the living,
stricken for the transgression of my people?**

So *his* people are the ones transgressing. That's the focus of the text. It's not talking about, “Oh, all you horrible nations” and “Oh, total depravity and everyone's a sinner.” That's not what it's talking about. It's talking about the transgression of his own people. And then it says in verse 9:

**⁹And they made his grave with the wicked
and with a rich man in his death,
although he had done no violence.**

50:00

Luke is just capitalizing on this theme. “Though he had done no violence” and “counted with the transgressions of his people.” So his own—*his own people*—are taking up the sword now. And if it's not thick enough, listen to what he says here. Because Jesus addresses the crowds right after he heals them. In 52 he says:

⁵²Then Jesus said to the chief priests and officers of the temple and elders, who had come out against him, “Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs?”

So who are the ones carrying the swords here?

MH: It's the Israelites. [laughs] The chief priests and the officers of the temple.

DB: Yeah, but even more so for the sake of the narrative, it's "with Satan!" That's Luke's point! In the temptation back in chapter 4, what is Satan offering him? He's offering him the kingdoms of the world! He takes him up to the temple itself, which in Jewish cosmology (which your listeners sure know) is the pinnacle of the whole world. He's offering them the entire world, and he's staying faithful to the end, overcoming the temptation. He's promised the kingdoms of the world, because how did the kingdoms of the world secure that power? This is very important for Jewish apocalyptic thought, because Jewish apocalyptic is running rife through Luke, especially with all the Satan stuff and the casting out of demons and spirits. In Jewish apocalyptic, war and violence was attached to the fallen angels in the corruption of the world. Your listeners probably know this well.

MH: Sure, it's the Watchers.

DB: Exactly! It's these fallen angels that in some traditions are led by Azazel or Shemyaza or Belial or Mastemah or, in this case, Satan—the chief of them all who offers them all the kingdoms. So in the fallen angels traditions, they taught them the making of weapons and shields—weapons of warfare, right? Because in Genesis 6, that was what brought judgment on the world. It was filled with violence. That's the whole point. It was filled with violence and wickedness. And this is what Isaiah 53 is literally turning upside-down. It's saying that the one who had no violence in him is the servant who will lead to the healing of the people. And how does he do it? Not through the sword, but by his own stripes, through his own torment, and by his own trial. So this is the point of Luke. He's saying, "You've come at *me* as against a robber, with swords and clubs." So the ones bearing the swords are literally Satan's armies in Luke. That's the image. These people with swords are being led by Satan to conquer the Lord's anointed. And so when the disciples take up their swords, what is the symbolism here in the narrative? Whose side are they on? You see it?

MH: Mm, hmm.

DB: Jesus is now left alone—the righteous one.

MH: I'm sure you're going to have some commentators talk about the provocation here to lead to the Messiah's death, but the question remains the same. Whose side are they on?

DB: Whose side are they on?

MH: They become sort of part of this inverted picture.

DB: See, the structure is flawless here, though. So the disciples have denied, just as he predicted—just as he enacted prophetically.

MH: People who... I'll put myself in here, too. As you read through the passage, the common thing that would float through your mind when you say "denial" is you would sort of parse that through Peter. Peter's denial is verbal. But what we have here is a denial by behavior.

DB: That's right. If the A is verse 31-34 (prophesying Peter's denial), and then the B is prophesying the disciples' denial (exactly what would take place—the taking up of swords), which is exactly what they do. So the C would be the prayer not to be led into temptation (verse 39-46). That's the crux. So then we're back at this B¹. Verse 47-53 is a pericope in and of itself and is the disciples' denying.

MH: And the mirror to A is going to follow with Peter's verbal denial.

55:00

DB: Exactly! If I'm wrong, then... Well, I can't be wrong [laughter] because the narrative bears this out. No, listen! The narrative bears this out. Mark and Matthew do something different here. Mark and Matthew, immediately following this scene, have Jesus taken to Caiaphas' house. And then they have the whole scene there. Following that scene, Peter denies. Luke rearranges the material because it doesn't fit his thing.

MH: Right. He goes right to the verbal denial.

DB: Yes! He goes immediately to Peter's denial in verse 54-62. So this is a perfect chiasm. Again, forget with the "Oh, chiasms! Oh, oh!" Okay? I hate it, too. But this is right in your face. This is meant to be performative. This is meant to be climactic. All the material is catered to Isaiah 53, which is what you would expect to see if Luke is departing from the use of Zechariah 13 and reframing it with this text. So this is exactly what you have in verse 54-62: Peter denies three times, just like Jesus said. So the structure is perfect.

Now, remember up above here when the disciples denied. What does he call them—those who come with the swords and clubs? He calls them "robbers," right? He said:

"Have you come out as against a robber, with swords and clubs?"

This is the irony in Luke: The ones who should be fearing the sword are the robbers. They're the evil-doers. But now they've treated Jesus like a robber. This term is very crucial in Luke because it's only used two other places. One of those is in the Good Samaritan. What was the point of the Good Samaritan parable? The robber is the one that leaves the man beaten and left for dead on the side of the road. It's the robber—the *lestos/lestas*. And what's the point of the Good Samaritan parable? Again, this is only unique to Luke. You don't have the Good Samaritan in Matthew or Mark. This is part of Luke's narrative. So Luke is using this story to lead to these climaxes. And in the Good Samaritan parable, the point is, "Who will be the neighbor to the man who is among the robbers?" His own people (again the same theme from Isaiah) pass the guy by who was left with the robbers. So who's going to be there with him? Who's going to care for the guy that's taken away by the robbers? You see? The whole parable itself is geared toward this climax in the end. It's like, "You've come at me as if I was the robber, with the swords and clubs!" You see? So who's going to be left with the guy that's beaten up by the robbers? *They're* the robbers! And if you don't know that they are the robbers, you've got to fast-forward to the only other time this *leston* term is used: in 19:46 at the cleansing of the temple. We all know this one really well. When Jesus is in the temple, what does he say? He chases out those who are selling and he says:

"...you have made it a den of robbers."

It should be a house of prayer for all nations (from Isaiah 56), and then he quotes from Jeremiah 7 and says "you have made it a den of *leston*"—of robbers. This is the theme going into our arrest scene in Luke. Now they've come against him as if he was the robber. You see? So it's this climactic scene, where we know who the robbers are, but now we know who the one who is going to be beat up and left for dead is—it's Jesus himself. Who will be with him? Who will actually persevere, pray that they're not led into temptation, and overcome the trial? None of them. He's left by himself. So the narrative has positioned Jesus just like Isaiah's servant—the righteous one (*hadikaïos*). We even know this... This is so powerful! When you get to Luke's crucifixion of Jesus and he is crucified, you have the centurion who (in Matthew and Mark) is the first one to recognize that he is the Son of God. In Matthew and Mark, they proclaim, "Surely he's the Son of God." In Mark it could be "a Son of God." That's the point—this irony that the centurion is the first one to proclaim it. But in Luke, you don't have that. In Luke you have the centurion say, "Surely he's the righteous one" (*hadikaïos*)—the guy from Isaiah.

MH: He puts the words of Isaiah 53 into his mouth.

1:00:00

DB: Exactly! So Luke is purposely structuring the whole story this way. If you're not paying attention to these cues, you're going to rip this text out of its context (like many interpreters have), and you're going to interpret that pericope by itself and miss the weight of the story. You miss the tension of the story. The disciples deny him and Peter denies him, and he goes at the cross alone. Now, this is the same Jesus who told those same disciples that they were to take up his cross and follow him. He has told them, "When you are delivered up, the Spirit will give you the words to say. If you do not deny me before the Father, you'll be recognized with the angels." All the themes have been running to this climax—the great temptation in Luke. This is how the text needs to be read. So to take up the sword for Luke literally meant joining on the side of Satan.

MH: Yeah, it was a betrayal.

DB: It was a betrayal of Jesus. If this was just a one-off sort of "Oh, well, David, maybe that's just talking about how Jesus had to accomplish his atonement, so this wasn't a battle. It was just about the atonement, and it wasn't meant for ethics for all time or anything." Really? Then what do we have in Acts, where the faithful stand before the rulers and are brought to trial? This is what happens, as Jesus says in the text: "When you turn, Peter..." What happens in Acts? The same Peter that's betraying him and leaving him is the same one boldly preaching to the faces of the ones who killed him. And when the Spirit comes, just like Jesus said, the Spirit led them through temptation. So this whole thing is that they are able to become martyrs in Acts. You have Stephen saying the very words of Jesus, and you have the Son of Man recognizing him—acknowledging him. It's just like the parables of Luke: "They'll be recognized in heaven." And you have Stephen as the martyr, not taking up swords, but actually saying the words of Jesus and being stoned outside the camp—that kind of an image. And heaven is recognizing it, just like the Gospel of Luke had said. So you see that this "taking up of swords," then, is literally the opposite of what Jesus is...

MH: We would expect that, given it's Luke and Acts. [laughs] Same author, you know?

DB: Bingo. Volume Two. These things go throughout. There are great works on the narrative unity of these two. I know there are problems, but these are definitely to be read as two books: Luke 1 and Luke 2. This is what my proposal is, and I think this makes sense of the entire narrative.

MH: It makes sense out of the structure. We may need to... It might be a good idea (and I can produce this, unless you already have it)...

DB: I haven't.

MH: I was going to say we can put the chiasm on the episode page and people can reference that.

DB: The handout I gave out when I gave this paper back in 2015... I'll send the PDF to y'all, and everyone can have it for free. We'll just put it up on the website. This is being developed into an article that I hope to get published this summer. So I have some publishers I'm talking to right now. It's not in publication yet. Coursework is eating my life away. When I actually have a free moment, I'll get to this and try to get it to the publisher. But for now, you can have the outline that I gave as handouts at SBL, and it actually has the chiastic structure. I also have an outline of the unique elements of the Lukan story in their relation to Matthew and Mark.

MH: If we could summarize as we wrap up... Basically, the argument in a nutshell is that Luke is tracking on Isaiah 53. In his presentation of the elements of Isaiah 53 in the episodes that we've just talked about, he structures that presentation chiastically so that your attention is drawn first to Peter, then to the disciples, then you get the prayer, then it's back to the disciples, then back to Peter with the denials. To me, it makes good sense structurally. I have to ask myself if the structure alone was there, is that persuasive? Probably. But when you add Isaiah 53 into it... It would be different if everybody else uses Isaiah 53. Then it looks more accidental. But this is very intentional to have Luke just defer... "I'm not going to use these passages because I've got something else that I want to draw attention to. We're going to track on Isaiah 53 and the whole interplay with the robbers and the transgressors and the violence and the non-violence, all that." That is a pretty compelling package.

1:05:00

DB: Yep. As a reminder to cap it off, the whole scriptural fulfillment motif that's being used is used in Matthew and Mark with Zechariah, and it is immediately fulfilled in his arrest. So this is the same model of scriptural fulfillment that's being used, but it's a different text with a different theme. It's still the overall same message. You still have...

MH: Nobody's changing the story. It's just how things are presented and what the author has in mind—the nuances he wants to get across.

DB: The theological point cannot be overstated—that for Luke, salvation comes by the righteous one—the one faithful to death, even death on the cross. And for that reason, he's given a name above every name. This is just like Philippians 2. I'm quoting Philippians 2, but this is the theology of Luke. It's the faithfulness unto death, not taking up a sword against his enemies, because Jesus believes that at the coming of the Spirit, it's enabled him to live this life and God will vindicate him in resurrection. This is the ethics that go forth into Acts—that those who have been empowered with the Spirit no longer fear death because they have seen their master raised from the dead and he has sent them power from on high,

which we oh-so-forget about. It empowers them for this life so that they face the same people that crucified Jesus to their face without any fear of death. They've brought no swords, they've brought no weapons, because they know the same God who raised their Lord from the dead is the same God that will vindicate them. This is the same ethic you see in Paul in Romans 12-13. It's the same ethic you see. "Brothers, never seek to avenge yourselves. The government is the avenger, but brothers, you never seek it." What do you do to your enemies? You beat 'em up! You take up your guns and fight 'em! NO! He says, "What do you do to your enemies? You clothe them and feed them because, guess what? That's the only thing that ultimately heaps coals on their head." It's not swords. This is the whole point in Luke: that Jesus taught them not to fear the one that has the power to take the body, but fear the one that has the power to cast you into Hades (or Gehenna, or whatever). That's the point. That's Luke's theology. We can't shy away from it. You have to face it head-on and deal with it because it is a tough call for Christians. I know this is a difficult thing.

MH: It's a tough call for Christians in developed countries and in the West. If you're in the Third World or the Underground Church or something like that, this is where you're at because that's literally where you're at! [laughs] We feel conflict with it because we're not in such an immediately disadvantaged situation like they are. So for modern Christians in the West, this is a hard message.

DB: Christian witness hinges on this, Mike. In response to our enemies, how do we beat them? Do we beat them by joining the nations and taking up our arms against them? Or do we beat them by the witness of the cross—by fidelity to God, even to the willingness of death? It's unlocking through faith the very power of God! That's the point in Luke. It's all about the Spirit. It's the power of God.

MH: I'll tell you what I think of. Consider the context, like if you're in Iraq or Iran or someplace like that. You hear... I know people who have been both peripherally and fairly immediately involved in situations where you have believers in these countries, and they live with the reality of ISIS and the Islamic State/Islamic Supremacy and all that. For lack of a better way to put it, you actually have direct divine intervention. They don't have anything else to trust. These stories about "Jesus came to me in a dream and told me to leave Islam and be a preacher..." and they do it! They suffer tremendous costs doing it. It's for real. You get these situations where people respond in this way and they are willing to put their own lives on the line—the lives of their own families—to be a witness. The whole Church is... Thousands and thousands of people wind up becoming Christians because they see these people do the insane thing of being willing to die. In response to a person's story, then the gospel gets preached. We look at it and it's hard to evaluate every situation over there, but I know a few people, like I said, either peripherally or pretty close to the situations. It's like, "This is what we were told to do. We believed in Jesus. We left Islam, and we were told to go out and preach." And they were willing to do it unto death. These amazing things

1:10:00

come out of it. But that's a really hard message for somebody in the modern world and in the West.

DB: It is tough. I was just going to say, I have to be honest about my own struggles with it. I'm just trying to do good, historical, narrational exegesis of a difficult passage, but then once you're past that and you see it in its context, you can't un-know that. You're forced to deal with it. We know from Christian history that this sort of text has been taken and twisted and reused to justify violence—to justify taking up the sword, an act of violence on one's enemies. This same text! And so I think Christians in the West (I can only speak from my own culture)... It's time for Christians to start looking at this text differently and to look at it in its context and stop using it to bolster violence. Stop using it to justify violence. That has to end. I hope I can do my part. So if anyone is needing material. If you've heard this and wonder, "What do I do with this text? Jesus is saying to buy a sword." Send them the podcast. Send them the outline. Whatever it takes. I want to be a contribution here in this way, because it has wrecked me having to deal with this passage. And trying to be faithful to this is even harder. We need each other, we need to be honest with the text...

MH: In little ways...

DB: Let the text be the text, you know? Let the text speak. Let it say what it's going to say and then you deal with it. Don't try to take it and woo it and try to make it mean something that it does not mean. Quite the opposite. Stop trying to make it sound the opposite! All right, rant over. [laughter]

MH: Well, thanks for being with us. It's fascinating. You listen to the podcast and you've been on before. We especially gravitate toward intertextuality—how scripture uses scripture. This is a good episode for that, really being able to track with Luke—to think his thoughts after him and his method after him and where that goes. I especially like stuff like that. So thanks for sharing that with us. We'll make sure people get access to the outline and whatever else you can send us on the episode page.

DB: Well, I appreciate you. I'm glad to be on, and I'll for sure do it again. We'll have some more fun.

MH: All right, thanks a lot. Be well.

DB: Thanks guys.

TS: All right, Mike. Another good episode. I don't know why I bought these two swords now. I guess I'm going to have to...

MH: [laughing] That was premature.

TS: Yeah. I have bought these two swords here, thinking I was doing the right thing, but...

MH: Did you save the receipt?

TS: Yes.

MH: That's good. Then you should be all right.

TS: I only go two, so it should be good.

MH: [laughs] Well, I'm glad we did the topic. It's a tough one—a tough discipleship topic, but that's what happens sometimes with scripture. You've got to look at what it says and then struggle with it.

TS: Well, we want to thank David Burnett for coming back on to the show, and we want to thank everybody else for listening to the Naked Bible Podcast. God bless.

Bonus Material:

TS: All right, David, before you go, I have a proposal, too, about the two swords that you might need to think about. That is that three is just too many.

MH and DB: [Laughing]

DB: Oh, Trey! [Laughter]

TS: That's all I got! That's all I got. You've only got two hands... Three is too many. Just consider that. I know you're doing a lot of work with it. Just want to throw that out there. If I can help you develop that, just let me know.

DB: Your piercing insight...

MH: That was bad. [laughter]

DB: We need some drums to do the [drum sounds].

