

DRAFT

Samaritans in Luke and the Sins of Evangelical Commentaries
 Stone-Campbell Journal Conference 2019: Synoptic Gospels Study Group
 Presented by Stewart Penwell

The goal of this paper is to call attention to a shift in our understanding of the Samaritan people and particularly as it applies to the Gospel of Luke. For example, previous generations of scholars used terms such as “half-breeds” to describe Samaritans in the Gospel narrative.¹ Yet, as it should be known, the term “half-breed” is a modern concept (with a racist history no less) and, therefore, is entirely inappropriate to describe the views of the first-century. An example of this shift is evident in Craig Keener’s second edition of *New Testament Backgrounds* on Acts 8:26. Keener’s first edition states: “Samaritans were considered half-breeds”² whereas his second edition states: “Samaritans were not considered fully Jewish.”³ The difference is perhaps subtle but it is nevertheless of particular importance for how we discuss ancient ethnic categories as well as modern racial categories. Consequently, this paper will highlight the evangelical treatment on Samaritans by David Garland and Daryl Bock in order to offer cautions as well as corrections for how we understand the Samaritan people and Jesus’s interactions with them as it applies to the Gospel message.

The Usual Suspects (or SusTexts): Evangelicals Love their Proof-Texts

David E. Garland, in one of the more recent Evangelical Commentary on the Gospel of Luke, contains an “In Depth” segment on “Jews and Samaritans: An Adversarial History.” Garland’s section is the newest iteration of the same set of citations from primary source texts. Starting

¹ For example, R. C. Foster uses the term “Hybrid Race” for Samaritans in his *Studies in the Life of Christ: Introduction, the Early Period, the Middle Period, the Final Week* (Joplin, MO: College Press, 1995), 384.

² Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*, First Edition (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1993), 345.

³ Craig S. Keener, *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*, Second Edition (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014), 343.

DRAFT

with 2 Kings 17 and Ezra 4, Garland concludes, as is a custom among Evangelicals, that the Samaritanism “was a syncretistic mixture of paganism and Yahwism.”⁴ Of course, the syncretistic mixture of Samaritan religion was different than the Judeans’ religion which was pure Yahwism and is also why the Judeans were *not* sent into Babylonian exile. Albeit this is a dramatic overreaction,⁵ but it nevertheless serves to underline one of the major issues facing Evangelical interpretations; namely, a Judean centric viewpoint that literally demonizes the Samaritan people without including a broader historical perspective concerning Judeo-Samaritans relations.

Garland continues by noting several what he calls “claims” of the Samaritan people in Josephus. For example, Garland rightly observes that “the Samaritans argue that not all of the inhabitants were deported in 722 B.C.E. . . . The Samaritans claimed to be the descendants of these native Israelites.”⁶ However, what Garland has called a “claim” is actually historically plausible if not, in fact, probable. Population studies have shown that not all Israelite-Samaritans were deported just as not all Judeans were deported to Babylon.⁷ Furthermore, archaeological evidence also reveals that when there was a sharp decline in household idols in Judea that the exact same decline is evidenced in Samaria,⁸ which suggests to me, that the Judeans’ and the

⁴ David E. Garland, *Luke: Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*, vol. 3 (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012), 443.

⁵ It is actually *reductio ad absurdum*—“a method of proving the falsity of a premise by showing that the logical consequence is absurd” (*Fowler’s Concise Dictionary of Modern English Usage*, ed. Jeremy Butterfield [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016]).

⁶ Garland, *Luke*, 443.

⁷ According to Paul Stenhouse, “the reduction in population could be as high as 14%—leaving 86% of the pre-exilic population still in place” (“The Chronical of Abū ‘l-Faṭḥ and Samaritan Origins: 2 Kings, 2 Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah Viewed Through the Prism of Samaritan Tradition” in *The Samaritans and the Bible: Historical and Literary Interactions between Biblical and Samaritan Traditions* [ed. Jörg Frey, Ursula Schattner-Rieser, Konrad Schmid (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 308]).

⁸ Needs citation.

DRAFT

Samaritans' religion shared more in common than has been traditionally thought to have been the case.

After this section, Garland then continues with the statement: “The vitriolic Jewish hostility toward Samaritans is easily documented.”⁹ Garland’s primary example is Sirach 50:25–26 that states:

Two nations my soul detests, and the third is not even a people: Those who live in Seir (שֵׁעִיר/Σαμάρεια/Seir), and the Philistines, and the foolish people that live in Shechem” (NRSV).

As with all proof-texts, the problem with the “easily documented” is that they are not always so straight forward.¹⁰ The first people referenced in the Hebrew and Latin text of Sirach are “those who live in Seir” meaning the Idumeans of Edom. However, in place of שֵׁעִיר/Seir, the Septuagint reads “on Mount Samaria” (ὄρει Σαμαρείας; Sir. 50:26 NETS) and, therefore, makes a distinction between those who live on Mount Samaria and those who live in Shechem. So, which group are the Yahwistic Israelite–Samaritans? Yitzhak Magen “concludes that the chief city of the Samaritans in the Hellenistic period was the city on the top of Mt. Gerizim, much of which he excavated in recent years. If this hold true, Ben Sira’s phrase ‘the foolish people that live in Shechem’ may not refer to the Samaritans at all.”¹¹

Conspicuously absent from Garland’s “easily documented” texts, is 2 Maccabees that “still sees the Jews and the Samaritans as one nation.”¹² Antiochus IV Epiphanes “left governors

⁹ Garland, *Luke*, 443.

¹⁰ The Philistines are either a reference to Israel’s past, the people David fought, or to Sirach’s present for the “Jews in Palestine who accepted Hellenism and paganism” (John Snaith, “Sirach,” *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* ed. by James D. G Dunn and J. W Rogerson [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004], 797).

¹¹ Reinhard Pummer *The Samaritans: A Profile* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016), 49.

¹² Pummer, *The Samaritans*, 49.

DRAFT

to oppress the [Jewish] people (γένος): at Jerusalem, Philip, . . . and at Gerizim, Andronicus”

(5:22–23 NRSV). Then, in 2 Maccabees 6, the Jews and Samaritans are shown as belonging together in same people group when Antiochus

sent an Athenian senator to compel the Jews to forsake the laws of their ancestors and no longer to live by the laws of God; also to pollute the temple in Jerusalem and to call it the temple of Olympian Zeus, and to call the one in Gerizim the temple of Zeus-the-Friend-of-Strangers (2 Macc 6:1–2 NRSV).

Here we observe 2 Maccabees implies that the Jews had a temple in Jerusalem as well as one on Gerizim.

Nonetheless, this overlooked reference from 2 Maccabees easily transitions to Garland’s next point about John Hyrcanus’s destruction of the Gerizim temple in Josephus’s accounts in *J.W.* 1.2.6 §63 and again in *Ant.* 13.9.1 §256. Garland notes that “according to Josephus [*Ant.* 13.275)], this blow was delivered to repay the Samaritans for injuries inflicted on some colonists in Marisa.”¹³ Garland concludes from Hyrcanus’s conquest of Samaria and destruction of the Samaritan temple, that this “was a form of what might be called ‘ethnic cleansing’ today.”¹⁴

Yet, similar to the reference in Sirach, we must caution against assuming that every mention of “Samaria/Samaritans” means the Yahwistic people the “Samaritans.” In the passage Garland cites, Josephus relates that Hyrcanus attacked the city of Samaria, specifically the one later renamed Sebaste by Herod, and that Hyrcanus hated the Samaritans (i.e. the inhabitants of that city) for their action against Marisa (13.275). Garland has overlooked the fact that “the city of Samaria . . . at that time were inhabited mostly by Gentiles. Thus, the hatred of John Hyrcanus is not directed against the Samaritans, but the Greeks of Samaria, and the passage is not relevant

¹³ Garland, *Luke*, 443.

¹⁴ Garland, *Luke*, 443.

DRAFT

to Josephus' view of the latter."¹⁵ The take away from this passage is that not every inhabitant of a region is a member of the same ethnic group.

The remaining texts from Garland's "In Depth" section will be addressed in the following section on Daryl Bock's portrayal of the Samaritans in Luke. In closing this section, however, I want to call attention to Garland's closing remarks: "The point is that the modern reader should interpret the Samaritan's appearance in the parable in light of bitter ethnic conflicts in the modern world to grasp its shock value."¹⁶ Sadly, as we have just examined, the preoccupation among evangelicals is to make misleading claims about the Samaritans in order to inflate this shock value.

The Samaritans in Luke's Gospel

There are three occurrences of the label "Samaritan" in the Gospel of Luke. The first (9:52) and last (17:16) involve Jesus's and his disciples' interactions with Samaritan(s) while the second (10:33) occurs in a parable. The first encounter between Jesus and the Samaritans starts Luke's travel narrative (Luke 9:51–19:48) when Jesus "set his face to go to Jerusalem" (9:51). For Jesus's first stop, he sent messengers ahead of him to make arrangements for lodging in a Samaritan village (9:52). The Samaritans, however, did not receive Jesus as a guest "because his face was set toward Jerusalem" (9:53). In response to the Samaritans, the disciples James and John ask "to command fire to come down from heaven and consume" the Samaritan village (9:54). Rather than reprimanding the Samaritans, Jesus instead "turned and rebuked" his

¹⁵ Reinhard Pummer, *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 208.

¹⁶ Garland, *Luke*, 444.

DRAFT

disciples for what they had said and “then they went on to another village [in Samaria?]” (Luke 9:54–56).¹⁷

Bock frames the Samaritans in this pericope in three particular ways. First, Bock states: “the Samaritans were a mixed race of Israelite and non-Israelite blood, who were despised by many pure-blooded Israelites because they believed that the Samaritans compromised the faith.”¹⁸ Second, Bock iterates the frequent assumption that “many Jews preferred to lengthen their journey and go around [Samaria].”¹⁹ For some reason, Bock cites Josephus *J.W.* 2.12.3§232 to support this claim²⁰ when, quite frankly, it demonstrates the opposite that the route through Samaria was the primary road Galileans traveled to and from Jerusalem.²¹ Third, Bock asserts: “The two people shared little in common but a history of division.”²² Bock’s statement, however, is categorically not true given that 1) Jews and Samaritans share more in common with one another than with Gentiles and 2) Gentiles usually could not distinguish between them. Bock concludes from this one Samaritan village not receiving Jesus that “All races reject [Jesus’s] ministry.”²³ In fact, Bock heavily emphasizes this “rejection” because “it shows that such

¹⁷ Other ancient authorities read “rebuked them, and said, ‘You do not know what spirit you are of, for the Son of Man has not come to destroy the lives of human beings but to save them.’ Then” (NRSV).

¹⁸ Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (BECNT 3; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 1994), 2.969. Bock cites: 2 Kings 17:30–31; Ezra 4:2; John 4:9; Luke 17:18; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.4.9 §§114–119; 11.8.6 §341; 12.5.5 §257.

¹⁹ Bock, *Luke*, 2.969.

²⁰ The singular event is recorded twice by Josephus in *Ant.* 18:30; 20:118//*J.W.* 2.232. Yet, also see the Gospel of John’s parenthetical aside in **John 4:8** where there is an absence of Samaritan hostility when the disciples went into the Samaritan city of Sychar to buy food.

²¹ This was their custom according to Josephus *Ant.* 20.118. Commentators have frequently stated that Jews circumvented Samaria to get to Jerusalem by taking the Jordan Valley Route rather than Central Ridge Route that went through Samaria. However, there is no primary source material to support this claim.

²² Bock, *Luke*, 2.970. Once again Bock cites the same reference Josephus, *Ant.* 20.118–23; *J.W.* 2.232–33.

²³ Bock, *Luke*, 2.969–970.

DRAFT

rejection is not limited to Jews or to Israel or to its leadership. Rejection of Jesus is widespread.”²⁴

In response let me first suggest that it is better to say “all segments of Israel reject Jesus’s ministry” than to speak of “all races.” Second, I am not sure that this is really the point Luke is making here. In this account, the Samaritan villagers show only an aversion towards the traveling Judeans but it is James and John who display open hostility. For this reason, Luke 9 highlights the disciples’ ethnocentrism before the Christ-event (death/resurrection) and this perhaps serves as a foil for the Samaritan mission in Acts 8. As we will see in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Jesus does not condone wholesale negative categorization towards non-Judeans and, for this reason, James and John are the ones to receive Jesus’s rebuke and not the Samaritan villagers.

The second reference to Samaritans in Luke is in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37). The parable is a response to the lawyer’s question “Who is my neighbor?” (10:29). The lawyer is asking a question about boundaries: “Where does one draw the line?” Who are our neighbors (i.e. Judean-Israelites) and who are excluded (i.e. non-Israelites). In response to the lawyer’s question, Jesus begins the parable with a man leaving Jerusalem heading towards Jericho. On his way the man was attacked by robbers “who stripped him, beat him, and went away, leaving him half dead” (10:30). Fortunately for the man both a priest and a Levite come along but, unfortunately, they both passed him by on the other side of the road. Until the introduction of the Samaritan, the parable centers on the question of whether the priest and Levite were justified in not treating the half-dead man as a neighbor.²⁵

²⁴ Bock, *Luke*, 2.970.

DRAFT

When the Samaritan is introduced in the parable Bock portrays the Samaritans in the worse possible light in order to make Jesus's comparison with the priest and Levite all the more jarring. In particular, Bock states:

For a Jew, a Samaritan was among the least respected people. Eating with Samaritans was equated with eating pork (*m. Seb.* 8.10; *b. Sanh.* 57a). Such people were unclean and to be avoided. The Samaritan would be the last type of person the lawyer would expect to be the climactic figure who resolves the story.²⁶

Yet, Bock presents a *decidedly* one-sided reading of the rabbinic traditions concerning Samaritans.²⁷ In fact, the very passage that Bock cites from the Mishnah reveals more than one opinion concerning Samaritans. For, in the very next line of *m. Seb.* 8.10, Rabbi Akiva is asked what Rabbi Eliezer meant that the “one who eats bread [baked by] Samaritans is like one who eats pork” to which Rabbi Akiva responded, “Shut up [dummies]! I will not tell you what R. Eliezer meant by this.”²⁸ Furthermore, concerning Bock's assertion that Samaritans were unclean, note Rabbi Simeon ben Gamaliel's statement: “Every precept which Cutheans [i.e. Samaritans] have adopted, they observe it with minute care, [even] more than the Israelites” (*b. Qidd.* 76a).

²⁵ Philip Esler, “Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory,” *BibInt* 8.4 (2000): 341.

²⁶ Bock, *Luke*, 2.1031.

²⁷ According to Lawrence Schiffman, “a number of Tannaitic passages regarding the Samaritans . . . reveal an ambivalent attitude towards them on the part of the Tannaim” (“The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakah,” *JQR* 75.4 [1985]: 349). Concurrent with Schiffman's conclusion, Nathan Schur also observes: “The Samaritans are also mentioned at great length in the Talmudic literature. The line taken there is not a consistent one and shows a slow change taking place in the Jewish attitude towards them” (*History of the Samaritans* [Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992], 47).

²⁸ Klyne Snodgrass rightly observes that “the extreme statement of Rabbi Eliezer in *m. Seb.* 8.10 is explicitly rejected by Rabbi Akiva in the same passage” (*Stories with Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008], 347). Similarly, in regards to *m. Seb.* 8.10, Ingrid Hjelm comments that “R. Akiva was a former pupil of R. Eliezer (First-Second Century CE) and he did not want to speak with disrespect about his teacher, as the continuation in *m. Seb.* 8.11 clearly shows” (*The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000], 105n.7).

DRAFT

Next, Bock infers that the lawyer “cannot bring himself to say ‘Samaritan’” and concludes from this that “the Lawyer has seen the point, but has yet to break through his prejudice.”²⁹ How could Bock possibly know that the lawyer could not “bring himself to say ‘Samaritan’”? This is rather an inference read into the text. An inference that is drawn out of the wholesale negative portrayal of Judeo-Samaritan relations which is *explicitly* done for its shock value but is not actually in the text nor in the immediate background.

Rather than purity shaming the Samaritan in light of rabbinic traditions in order to sharpen the contrast with the priest and Levite, which Bock has indeed done, it is prudent to focus on the point of the parable; namely, on *being* a neighbor rather than categorizing *who* is a neighbor. This is made evident by Jesus’s rephrasing the question from “Who is my neighbor” (10:29) to “Which of these three, do you think, *was a neighbor* to the man who fell into the hands of the robbers?” (10:36). The lawyer’s answer to who was a neighbor demonstrates that the neighbor is not someone who must be loved (because they are members of the Judean-Israelites), but the neighbor is “the one who showed him mercy” (Luke 10:37).³⁰

The priest and the Levite represent the initial concern of the lawyer who is interested in categorizing who his neighbors are in light of Lev 19:18. The Samaritan, presumably, represents Jesus’s concern which is identifying yourself as a neighbor and then “do likewise” (10:37) in light of Lev 19:18.³¹ This portrayal of the Good Samaritan’s actions is concurrent with the final occurrence of “Samaritan” in Luke’s Gospel.

²⁹ Bock, *Luke*, 2.1034.

³⁰ Michel Gourgues, “The Priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan Revisited: A Critical Note on Luke 10:31–35,” *JBL* 117.4 (1998): 712.

³¹ According to Paul Stenhouse the Parable of the Good Samaritan, “put simply, the message of the parable, intended for the lawyer and the bystanders, would run something like this: ‘You ask questions about the meaning of the Torah. Then, when they are answered you ask yet another question. Instead of talking about the Torah, dissecting it and weakening its effects on people’s lives, observe it, as the Samaritan does. Be like the שֹׁמֵר. Do this

DRAFT

The final occurrence of Samaritans in the Gospel of Luke is 17:11–19 where Jesus heals the ten lepers. Jesus is on his way to Jerusalem and, while passing between Samaria and Galilee (17:11),³² he encounters and heals ten lepers. Only one of the ten returned to thank Jesus “and he was a Samaritan” (17:16). In addition to Luke identifying the healed leper as a Samaritan is Jesus’s statement in Luke 17:18: “Was none of them found to return and give praise to God except this foreigner (ἄλλογενής)?”

Once more Bock continues his wholesale negative characterization for the purpose of sharpening the contrast by describing the Samaritan as “an ‘outsider,’ a despised Samaritan (αὐτός is emphatic: ‘And *he* was a Samaritan’). A ‘schismatic’ or, at the least, someone distant from covenant promise.”³³ Bock confirms this negative characterization by noting that ἄλλογενής in the LXX “often means ‘pagan’ or ‘heathen’.” Well, this is sort of true but ἄλλογενής in the LXX means “of another race, foreign; stranger; [and even] layman.”³⁴ In other words, ἄλλογενής means “foreigner” as in “not one of us” and not, as Bock leads his readers to believe, “foreigner” with all of the negative religious connotations of either “pagan” or “heathen.”

and you shall live” (“Who Was the Man Who Fell Among Robbers on the Jericho Road?,” in *Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of the Société d’Études Samaritaines: Helsinki, August 1-4, 2000: Studies in Memory of Ferdinand Dexinger* [Paris: Librairie orientale Paul Geuthner, 2005], 203).

³² Klyne Snodgrass, “I have found no evidence other than implication for the frequent assumption that Jews went around Samaria” (*Stories with Intent*, n.71). According to Carl G. Rasmussen it was “After crossing the Valley of Esdraelon, heading south, [that] Jewish pilgrims entered Samaria at Ginae. It was probably in this area, ‘along the border between Samaria and Galilee’ (Luke 17:11), that Jesus met and healed ten lepers, one of whom was a Samaritan (vv. 12–19)” (Zondervan Atlas of the Bible, [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010], 215). Also see Gustaf Dalman, *Sacred Sites and Ways: Studies in the Topography of the Gospels* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1935), 210–211. Dalman astutely observes that Luke 17:11 cannot reference the Jordan Rift/Valley Route to Jerusalem since that route passes through “the district of Scythopolis . . . , and in that case it could not be considered as a route along the Galilean-Samaritan frontier” (211).

³³ Bock, *Luke*, 2.1403

³⁴ “ἄλλογενής,” Johan Lust, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie, eds. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Rev. ed. (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2003), 27. The NASB translates ἄλλογενής as “layman” 9x: Exod 29:33; 30:33; Lev 22:10, 12, 13; Num 1:51; 3:10, 38; 16:40.

DRAFT

Bock does rightly note that ἀλλογενής in Luke 17:18 is a *hapax legomenon* and draws attention to its use on the Temple inscription that warned foreigners from entering the inner precincts.³⁵ For some reason, rather than cite the actual inscription, Bock cites the Josephus passages that reference the temple inscription but Josephus does not use ἀλλογενής but ἄλλοεθνής [“another nation”] (*Ant.* 15.417) and ἄλλόφυλος [“another tribe”] (*J.W.* 5.194) for the temple inscription.³⁶ Apparently close counts in horseshoes, hand grenades, and comments about Samaritans. Nevertheless, the point stands that this Samaritan, who cannot enter the inner-courts of the Jerusalem Temple, returns to praise Jesus.

Jesus’s identification of the Samaritan as a foreigner presents the same comparison as in the parable of the Good Samaritan in which the proper response this Samaritan “foreigner” contrasts the other nine (presumably Judean “insiders”). The Gospel of Luke does not portray the Samaritans as foreigners in the same sense as gentiles but rather acknowledges that the Samaritans are non-Judean Israelites.³⁷

Accordingly, the Gospel of Luke the label “Samaritan” represented a category for particular people group of foreigners and outsiders. Yet, this “Samaritan” category for Luke, as well as for Matthew 10:5b–6 and Acts 8:5–25 disclose, was also not the same as gentile

³⁵ For the Jerusalem Temple Warning Inscription see Jack Finegan, *The Archeology of the New Testament: The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), 197. See Philo’s comments: “Still more abounding and peculiar is the zeal of them all for the temple, and the strongest proof of this is that death without appeal is the sentence against those of other races [πάντας τῶν οὐχ ὁμοεθνῶν] who penetrate into its inner confines. For the outer are open to everyone where they come from” (*Embassy*, §212 [F. H. Colson LCL]).

³⁶ Josephus references the temple inscription but “the word denoting the foreigner in the inscription is ἀλλογενής [“another race”] and the words used by Josephus are ἄλλοεθνής [“another nation”] (*Ant.* 15.417) and ἄλλόφυλος [“another tribe”] (*J.W.* 5.194). These three words are used in the Septuagint to translate the Hebrew נכרי ‘foreigner’” (Jan Dušek, *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes* [Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012], 116).

³⁷ We know Luke presumes Samaritans are Israelites because this Samaritan was on his way to see a priest as prescribed by Torah; albeit, presumably on Mt. Gerizim.

DRAFT

outsiders. It was a *tertium quid*. In his Gospel, Luke particularly uses the label “Samaritan” as a foil for the Judean ethnic identity and its boundary line separating them (the insiders) from gentiles (outsiders) and the Samaritans (those in between). Luke’s portrayal of Jesus’s interaction with Samaritans reveals the broadening of the tacit Judean boundary line.

Conclusion

“It is hard to reverse such traditional hostility”³⁸ Bock writes concerning Jews and Samaritans. Yet, this is perhaps equally true regarding scholarly constructions of the Judeo-Samaritan relationship in the Bible. Indeed, based upon the “easily documented” vitriolic hostility provided by Garland’s and Bock’s commentary on Luke, a reader could get the impression that Jesus and the disciples were lucky to escape with their very lives from the Samaritan village in Luke 9. The highly stylized portrayal of the Samaritans serves to intensify “its shock value.”³⁹ So, allow me to connect this with a statement by A-J Levine: “If to get a good message you need to make Judaism look bad, then you don’t have a good message.”⁴⁰ This is the point. Not only is presenting same set of proof-texts for generations bad historical research, it also (at least potentially) continues racist reasoning that humanity has breeds and that moral characteristics are connected to notion of “sharing blood.”⁴¹ The purpose of this paper is *not* to denigrate Evangelicals but rather to point out that we can do better; that we *must* do better.

³⁸ Bock, *Luke*, 2.970.

³⁹ Garland, *Luke*, 444.

⁴⁰ Amy-Jill Levine and Elizabeth Palmer, “Knowing and Preaching the Jewish Jesus,” *The Christian Century*, 13 March 2019, <https://www.christiancentury.org/article/interview/knowning-and-preaching-jewish-jesus>.

⁴¹ Bock states: “the Samaritans were a mixed race of Israelite and non-Israelite blood, who were despised by many pure-blooded Israelites because they believed that the Samaritans compromised the faith” (*Luke*, 2.969).

DRAFT

Bibliography

- Dalman, Gustaf. *Sacred Sites and Ways: Studies in the Topography of the Gospels*. New York: Macmillan, 1935.
- Dunn, James D. G, and J. W Rogerson. *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.
- Dušek, Jan. *Aramaic and Hebrew Inscriptions from Mt. Gerizim and Samaria between Antiochus III and Antiochus IV Epiphanes*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2012.
- Esler, Philip. “Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory.” *BibInt* 8.4 (2000): 325–57.
- Finegan, Jack. *The Archeology of the New Testament: The Life of Jesus and the Beginning of the Early Church*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Frey, Jörg, Ursula Schattner-Rieser, and Konrad Schmid, eds. *The Samaritans and the Bible : historical and literary interactions between biblical and Samaritan traditions*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.
- , eds. *The Samaritans and the Bible : historical and literary interactions between biblical and Samaritan traditions*. Berlin; Boston: De Gruyter, 2012.
- Garland, David E. *Luke: Zondervan Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament*. Vol. 3. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.
- Gourgues, Michel. “The Priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan Revisited: A Critical Note on Luke 10:31-35.” *JBL* 117.4 (1998): 709–13.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- Keener, Craig S. *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. Second Edition. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2014.
- . *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament*. First Edition. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 1993.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Levine, Amy-Jill, and Elizabeth Palmer. “Knowing and Preaching the Jewish Jesus.” *The Christian Century*, 13 March 2019.
<https://www.christiancentury.org/article/interview/knowning-and-preaching-jewish-jesus>.

DRAFT

- Pummer, Reinhard. *The Samaritans: A Profile*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2016.
- . *The Samaritans in Flavius Josephus*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Rasmussen, Carl. *Zondervan Atlas of the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2010.
- Schiffman, L. H. “The Samaritans in Tannaitic Halakhah.” *JQR* 75.4 (1985): 323–50.
- Schur, Nathan. *History of the Samaritans*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1992.
- Shehadeh, Haseeb, Ferdinand Dexinger, Société d’études samaritaines, and International Congress. *Proceedings of the Fifth International Congress of the Société d’études Samaritaines: Helsinki, August 1-4, 2000 : Studies in Memory of Ferdinand Dexinger*. Paris: P. Geuthner, 2005.
- Snodgrass, Klyne. *Stories With Intent: A Comprehensive Guide to the Parables of Jesus*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2018.