

Act Surprised

Luke 1:26-38

Pierre Cannings, Ph.D.

I. From Perplexed to Presence v.28-29

a. Favored One

i. Favor to cause to be the recipient of a benefit, *bestow favor on, favor highly, bless*

1. Eph 1:6- full of grace *which thou hast received'*
2. The participle indicates that Mary has been especially favored by God in that he has already chosen her to be the mother of the Messiah (1:30)
3. She had not been chosen for this task because she possessed a particular piety or holiness of life that merited this privilege.
4. Here as in Judg 6:17; 2 Sam 15:25 (cf. 1 Sam 1:18) the issue is God's gracious choice, not Mary's particular piety (cf. Gen 6:8); for unlike Luke 1:6, nothing is made of Mary's personal piety either before or after this verse. The emphasis is on God's sovereign choice, not on human acceptability
5. 1:28–31. **The angel** said that **Mary** was **highly favored** (*kecharitōmenē*, a part. related to the noun *charis*, "grace"; the verb *charitoō* is used elsewhere in the NT only in Eph. 1:6). Also Mary had **found favor** (*charis*, "grace") **with God**. Obviously God had bestowed a special honor on her. She was a special recipient of His grace.

ii. The Lord is with You

1. The greeting conveys the message ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. This is an OT greeting (Jdg. 6:12; Ru. 2:14), meant as a statement rather than a wish (Ἐστίν is to be supplied). It prepares the recipient for divine service with the assurance 'The Lord will help you'
2. **The Lord is with you.** Compare Judg 6:12; Ruth 2:4. This is not a wish ("may the Lord be with you") but a statement and refers to God's mighty power being present and upon Mary.

b. Perplexed – Confused She was both upset and puzzled.

- i. Perplexed - But the rabbinic evidence is late and scanty, and Mary's wonder was occasioned more by the character of a greeting which

addressed her in such exalted terms, and implied that, like the great men of OT times, she was chosen to serve God and to be empowered by him

- ii. Pondered - reckoned up different reasons," is in itself against this. The verb is confined to the Synoptic Gospels (5:21, 22; Mk. 2:6, 8):

II. From Fear to Favor v.30

- a. No Need to be Afraid
 - i. Fear to be in an apprehensive state, *be afraid*, in the sense *become frightened*
 - 1. Neither Zacharias nor Mary are accustomed to visions or voices: they are troubled by them.
 - 2.
 - ii. You have found favor
 - 1. God will deal with you kindly
 - a. *Do you see an inconvenience as a blessing*
 - b. 30 Gabriel's reply is similar in form to 1:13–17 and has a poetic character; it fills out the message in v. 28. For μὴ φοβοῦ, see 1:13. εὐρίσκω χάριν is equivalent to the common OT phrase *māṣā' hēn* (Gn. 6:8; Jdg. 6:17; 1 Sa. 1:18; 2 Sa. 15:25), and signifies the free gracious choice of God who favours particular men and women; the stress is on God's choice rather than human acceptability
 - c. Here as in Judg 6:17; 2 Sam 15:25 (cf. 1 Sam 1:18) the issue is God's gracious choice, not Mary's particular piety (cf. Gen 6:8); for unlike Luke 1:6, nothing is made of Mary's personal piety either before or after this verse. The emphasis is on God's sovereign choice, not on human acceptability.

III. From Questions to Humility v.38

- a. Bondservant –
 - i. *Bondslave- female slave, bondwoman* of women claimed by God w. δοῦλοι Ac 2:18
 - 1. As an oriental expression used by one of humble station in addressing one of a higher rank or a deity Lk 1:38, 48 (1 Km 1:11);
- b. Done According to you Word
 - i. 38 The scene closes with Mary's humble acceptance of the will of God. δούλη
 - ii. **38 I am the Lord's servant.... May it be to me as you have said.** Compare 1 Sam 1:18. Whereas Zechariah and Elizabeth provide an example for the reader of true discipleship in their obedience to the commandments and

regulations of the OT (1:6), Mary is exemplary because of her submission to God's will.

Word Studies

Perplexed – confused

Pondering - **to think or reason carefully, esp¹. about the implications of someth².**, *consider, ponder, reason*³

Fear- **to be in an apprehensive state, be afraid**, the aor⁴. oft⁵. in the sense **become frightened**⁶

Bondslave- female slave, bondwoman of women claimed by God w⁷. δοῦλοι Ac 2:18 (cp⁸. Jo 3:2); IPo⁹ 4:3.

¹esp. esp. = especially

²someth. someth. = something

³ William Arndt et al., [A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 232.

⁴aor. aor. = aorist

⁵oft. oft. = often

⁶ William Arndt et al., [A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1060.

⁷w. w. = with

⁸cp. cp. = compare, freq. in ref. to citation fr. ancient texts

⁹IPol IPol = Ignatius to Polycarp—List 1

- As an oriental expr¹⁰., used by one of humble station in addressing one of a higher rank or a deity **Lk 1:38, 48** (1 Km 1:11); ¹¹

Blessed - **to bestow a favor, provide with benefits**¹²

¹⁰expr. **expr.** = expression

¹¹ William Arndt et al., [A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 259.

¹² William Arndt et al., [A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 408.

Word Studies

Favored - **to cause to be the recipient of a benefit, bestow favor on, favor highly, bless**¹³

Highly favoured (κεχαριτωμενη [kecharitōmenē]). Perfect passive participle of χαριτω [charitoō] and means endowed with grace (χαρις [charis]), enriched with grace as in Eph. 1:6, *non ut mater gratiae, sed ut filia gratiae* (Bengel). The Vulgate *gratiae plena* “is right, if it means ‘full of grace which thou hast received’; wrong, if it means ‘full of grace which thou hast to bestow’ ” (Plummer). The oldest MSS. do not have “Blessed art thou among women” here, but in verse 42.

Perplexed- confused

Cast in her mind (διελογιζετο [dielogizeto]). Imperfect indicative. Note aorist διεταραχθη [dietarachthē]. Common verb for reckoning up different reasons. She was both upset and puzzled.

¹³ William Arndt et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1081.

Afraid - **to be in an apprehensive state, *be afraid***, the aor¹⁴. oft¹⁵. in the sense **become frightened**¹⁶

Favor - Grace. Same root as χαίρω [*chairō*] (rejoice) and χαρίτω [*charitoō*] in verse 28. To find favour is a common O. T. phrase. Χαρίς [*Charis*] is a very ancient and common word with a variety of applied meanings. They all come from the notion of sweetness, charm, loveliness, joy, delight, like words of grace, Luke 4:22, growing grace, Eph. 4:29, with grace, Col. 4:6. The notion of kindness is in it also, especially of God towards men as here. It is a favourite word for Christianity, the Gospel of the grace of God (Acts 20:24) in contrast with law or works (John 1:16). Gratitude is expressed also (Luke 6:23), especially to God (Rom. 6:17). **With God** (παρα τῷ Θεῷ [*para tōi theōi*]). Beside God.

Jesus – Isaiah 7:14 **JESUS CHRIST** (ca. 5/4 BC–AD 30/33). According to the New Testament, Jesus Christ is the incarnate Word of God, the Creator and Savior of the world, the founder of Christianity, and the sinless exemplar of its principles and practices. “Jesus”—His personal name—is the Greek equivalent of the Hebrew “Jeshua” (or “Joshua”). In Matthew 1:21 the name was divinely appointed, “for He will save His people from their sins.” Since the name was common in His lifetime, He was usually referred to in a more specific way, such as “Jesus of Nazareth” (John 1:26; Schaeder, “*Nazarēnos, Nazōraiōs*,” 874–79). “Christ,” the anointed one, is a title that acknowledged that He was the expected Messiah of Israel. In the Gospels, Jesus is usually identified as “the Christ.” After Peter’s sermon at Pentecost in Acts 2:38, He was usually referred to as “Jesus Christ.” This composite name joins the historic figure with the messianic role that prophetic expectation and early Christianity knew that He possessed.¹⁷

¹⁴aor. **aor.** = aorist

¹⁵oft. **oft.** = often

¹⁶ William Arndt et al., [*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*](#) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 1060.

¹⁷ J. Lanier Burns, [*“Jesus Christ,”*](#) ed. John D. Barry et al., *The Lexham Bible Dictionary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham Press, 2016).

Great - to being above standard in intensity, *great*¹⁸

Kingdom no end- Shall be no end (οὐκ ἔσται τέλος [ouk estai telos]). Luke reports the perpetuity of this Davidic kingdom over the house of Jacob with no Pauline interpretation of the spiritual Israel though that was the true meaning as Luke knew. Joseph was of the house of David (Luke 1:27) and Mary also apparently (Luke 2:5).

House of Jacob - Of the nation of Israel, *the descendants of Jacob*¹⁹

Conceive in thy womb (συλλημψη ἐν γαστρι [sullēmpsēi en gastri]). Adding ἐν γαστρι [en gastri] to the verb of 1:24. Same idiom in Isa. 7:14 of Immanuel. **Jesus** (Ιησουν [Iēsoun]). As to Joseph in Matt. 1:21, but without the explanation of the meaning. See on Matthew.

Luke 1:32

The Son of the Most High (υἱος ὑψιστου [huios Hupsistou]). There is no article in the Greek, but the use of Most High in verse 35 clearly of God as here. In Luke 6:35 we find “sons of the Most High” (υἱοι ὑψιστου [huioi Hupsistou]) so that we cannot insist on deity here, though that is possible. The language of 2 Sam. 7:14 and Isa. 9:7 is combined here.

Luke 1:35

Shall overshadow thee (ἐπισκιάσει [episkiasei]). A figure of a cloud coming upon her. Common in ancient Greek in the sense of obscuring and with accusative as of Peter’s shadow in

¹⁸ William Arndt et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 623.

¹⁹ William Arndt et al., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 464.

Acts 5:15. But we have seen it used of the shining bright cloud at the Transfiguration of Jesus (Matt. 17:5=Mark 9:7=Luke 9:34). Here it is like the Shekinah glory which suggests it (Ex. 40:38) where the cloud of glory represents the presence and power of God. **Holy, the Son of God** (άγιον υιός θεου [*Hagion huios theou*]). Here again the absence of the article makes it possible for it to mean “Son of God.” See Matt. 5:9. But this title, like the Son of Man (Ο υιός του ἀνθρώπου [*Ho huios tou anthrōpou*]) was a recognized designation of the Messiah. Jesus did not often call himself Son of God (Matt. 27:43), but it is assumed in his frequent use of the Father, the Son (Matt. 11:27; Luke 10:21; John 5:19ff.). It is the title used by the Father at the baptism (Luke 3:22) and on the Mount of Transfiguration (Luke 9:35). The wonder of Mary would increase at these words. The Miraculous Conception or Virgin Birth of Jesus is thus plainly set forth in Luke as in Matthew. The fact that Luke was a physician gives added interest to his report.

Luke 1:36

Kinswoman (συγγενις [*suggenis*]). Not necessarily cousin, but simply relative.

Luke 1:37

No word (οὐκ ῥῆμα [*ouk rhēma*]). ῥῆμα [*Rhēma*] brings out the single item rather than the whole content (λογος [*logos*]). So in verse 38.²⁰

²⁰ A.T. Robertson, [*Word Pictures in the New Testament*](#) (Nashville, TN: Broadman Press, 1933), Lk 1:26–37.

b. The Prophecy of Jesus' Birth (1:26–38)

The story of the announcement of the birth of Jesus is told in a manner very similar to that of the preceding narrative, but the interest centres on the mother of the child. Mary, a girl betrothed to a descendant of David, is informed of God's choice of her to bear a child named Jesus who will be called the Son of the Most High and will reign over Israel as the Davidic Messiah. His birth will be due to the influence of the Holy Spirit upon Mary, so that her child will indeed be God's Son. The fact that Mary's cousin Elizabeth has already conceived a child by supernatural means will act as confirmation to Mary of the angelic message.

The forms of the two narratives are so similar that it cannot be doubted that they have been consciously arranged to bring out the parallelism between them (A. George, 'Le parallèle entre Jean-Baptiste et Jésus en Lc 1–2', in Descamps, 147–171). Most scholars hold that the present story has been modelled on that of John (see the list in Wink, 60 n. 1; Schürmann, I, 59), but the opposite view, that the story of John was modelled (by Luke) on that of Jesus, is defended by Benoit, *Exégèse*, III, 193–196. Since, however, the story of John displays a greater dependence on OT types, it is unlikely that it was modelled on that of Jesus. On the other hand, the story of the annunciation of Jesus displays such a wealth of individual features that it cannot be regarded simply as an imitation of the story about John, and it is, therefore, best to postulate mutual dependence between the two stories (Wink, 71f.). Accordingly, the origin of the present narrative cannot be settled simply by consideration of its form.

The story itself is of such a character that it must be based upon information ultimately supplied by Mary herself, or be a theological construction, or be a combination of the two. Although the whole pericope has been regarded as a Lucan composition (Burger, 132–135), it is more probable that some tradition lies behind it. If the link with the story of John is secondary, vs. 36f. will be an addition to the original form. Many scholars have argued that vs. 34f. are an interpolation (by Luke or an earlier hand), introducing the motif of the virgin birth into an older

story (A. Harnack^{21*}; V. Taylor^{22*}; Bultmann, 321f.; Luce, 88f.). The integrity of the narrative was maintained by Machen, 119–168, but more recently it has been argued that the christology in vs. 34f. differs from that in vs. 31–33: Luke is said to have combined two separate traditions, using v. 34 as a literary joint and himself creating v. 35 on the basis of a traditional motif (G. Schneider^{23*}; cf. J. Gewiess^{24*}).

Since the motif of the virgin birth is pre-Lukan (see note²⁵ at end of this section), the narrative is based on tradition, and since this motif is present in the earlier part of the narrative (1:27, 31), one reason for regarding vs. 34f. as an addition disappears. Since, further, it is questionable whether there is a christological difference between vs. 31–33 and 34f., the other main reason for suspecting that two traditions have been linked loses its force. It is less easy to

^{21*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{22*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{23*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{24*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

²⁵note See bibliography for 1:5–2:52, especially A. Harnack, V. Taylor, E. Norden, M. Dibelius, J. McHugh. Machen, 119–168, 280–379; S. Lyonnet, ‘Χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη’, Bib. 20, 1939, 131–141; Barrett, 5–24; G. Delling, TDNT V, 826–837; J. P. Audet, ‘L’annonce à Marie’, RB 63, 1956, 346–374; E. Schweizer, H. Kleinknecht (*et al.*), TDNT VI, 332–451, especially 339–343, 402; J. B. Bauer, ‘Monstra te esse matrem, Virgo singularis’, *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 9, 1958, 124–135 (as summarised in NTA 3, 1958–59, no. 367); id. ‘Philologische Bemerkungen zu Lk. 1, 34’, Bib. 45, 1964, 535–540; M. Zerwick, ‘“... quoniam virum non cognosco” Lc 1:34’, *Verbum Domini* 37, 1959, 212–224, 276–288 (summarised in NTA 4, 1959–60, no. 667); O. Michel und O. Betz, ‘Von Gott gezeugt’, in W. Eltester (*et al.*), *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche* (für J. Jeremias), Berlin, 1960, 3–23; E. Brunner-Traut, ‘Die Geburtsgeschichte der Evangelien im Lichte ägyptologischer Forschungen’, ZRGG 12, 1960, 97–111; J. Gewiess, ‘Die Marienfrage Lk. 1:34’, BZ 5, 1961, 221–254; A. Strobel, ‘Der Gruss an Maria (Lc 1:28)’, ZNW 53, 1962, 86–110; Voss, 62–83; P. Benoit, ‘L’annonciation’, in *Exégèse*, III, 197–215; E. Schweizer (*et al.*), TDNT VIII, 334–397, especially 376f., 381f.; G. Schneider, ‘Lk. 1, 34–35 als redaktionelle Einheit’, BZ 15, 1971, 255–259.; Vermes, 213–222.

be certain about the significance of v. 34 as a literary device. On the whole, it is probable that the narrative should be regarded as a unity, but it shows signs of theological shaping.^{26*}

(26) The reference to the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy (cf. 1:36) and the employment of the same heavenly messenger (1:19) link the story of the annunciation to that of John's conception. (The similar story of Gabriel announcing the birth of R. Ishmael (Beth ha-Midrash 2:65, in S²⁷B II, 98f.) is late and irrelevant (Grundmann, 55 n.)). Modern versions rightly translate πόλις as 'town', rather than 'city'; Luke uses it frequently, and even of villages. The description τῆς Γαλιλαίας (4:31) is added for the benefit of non-Palestinian readers who would probably never have heard of so insignificant a village as Nazareth (2:4, 39, 51; 4:16^{28*}; Acts 10:38^{29*}). The name is variously spelled, modern editors preferring Ναζαρέθ (see P. Winter, ' "Nazareth" and "Jerusalem" in Luke chs. 1 and 2', NT³⁰S 3, 1956–57, 136–142). The site

^{26*} See bibliography for 1:5–2:52, especially A. Harnack, V. Taylor, E. Norden, M. Dibelius, J. McHugh. Machen, 119–168, 280–379; S. Lyonnet, 'Χαῖρε κεχαριτωμένη', Bib. 20, 1939, 131–141; Barrett, 5–24; G. Delling, TDNT V, 826–837; J. P. Audet, 'L'annonce à Marie', RB 63, 1956, 346–374; E. Schweizer, H. Kleinknecht (*et al.*), TDNT VI, 332–451, especially 339–343, 402; J. B. Bauer, 'Monstra te esse matrem, Virgo singularis', *Münchener Theologische Zeitschrift* 9, 1958, 124–135 (as summarised in NTA 3, 1958–59, no. 367); id. 'Philologische Bemerkungen zu Lk. 1, 34', Bib. 45, 1964, 535–540; M. Zerwick, ' "... quoniam virum non cognosco" Lc 1:34', *Verbum Domini* 37, 1959, 212–224, 276–288 (summarised in NTA 4, 1959–60, no. 667); O. Michel und O. Betz, 'Von Gott gezeugt', in W. Eltester (*et al.*), *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche* (für J. Jeremias), Berlin, 1960, 3–23; E. Brunner-Traut, 'Die Geburtsgeschichte der Evangelien im Lichte ägyptologischer Forschungen', ZRGG 12, 1960, 97–111; J. Gewiess, 'Die Marienfrage Lk. 1.34', BZ 5, 1961, 221–254; A. Strobel, 'Der Gruss an Maria (Lc 1:28)', ZNW 53, 1962, 86–110; Voss, 62–83; P. Benoit, 'L'annonciation', in *Exégèse*, III, 197–215; E. Schweizer (*et al.*), TDNT VIII, 334–397, especially 376f., 381f.; G. Schneider, 'Lk. 1, 34–35 als redaktionelle Einheit', BZ 15, 1971, 255–259.; Vermes, 213–222.

²⁷SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

^{28*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

^{29*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

³⁰NTS *New Testament Studies*

of Nazareth in the Galilean hills has long been known, but only recently has inscriptional evidence of its identity been found (Finegan, 27–33).

(27) παρθένος (1:27b^{31*}; Acts 21:9^{32*}; Mt. 1:23; *et al.*) means a young, unmarried girl, and carries the implication of virginity. In view of 1:34 this implication is undoubtedly present here, a view which is strengthened by the probable allusions to Is. 7:14 here and in v. 31. In the LXX the sense of virginity in the word is strong (G. Delling^{33*}). This fits in with the fact that Mary was still merely betrothed to Joseph (μνηστεύω, 2:5; Mt. 1:18^{34*}). Betrothal could take place as early as 12 years old and usually lasted for about a year (S³⁵B II, 373–375, 393–398). Although it was regarded as equally binding as marriage, the girl having the same legal position as a wife, it was not normal for intercourse to take place during this period (S³⁶B I, 45–47; II, 393; Jeremias, *Jerusalem*, 364–367). We do not know how old Mary was; she was not yet living with Joseph, but he is mentioned at this stage because of his Davidic descent which is important for what follows. It has been argued that originally there was no mention of him here, and that Mary is regarded as a descendant of David (Dibelius, *Botschaft*, I, 13f.; Hauck, 24; Voss, 68), but this is improbable.

Luke uses ἀνήρ much more frequently than the other Evangelists (27x; Acts, 100x; Mt., 8x; Mk., 4x; Jn., 8x); they make greater use of ἄνθρωπος (Lk., 95x; Acts, 46x; Mt., 112x; Mk., 56x; Jn., 60x). ἀνήρ is used specifically of a husband, but here simply for ‘man’ (cf. 6:6/8). The name Ἰωσήφ (2:4, 16; 3:23; 4:22; also 3:24, 30^{37*}) means ‘May he (God) add (sons)’; it is used here as part of the historical tradition rather than because of its adventitious symbolical value.

^{31*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

^{32*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

^{33*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{34**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

³⁵SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

³⁶SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

^{37*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

οἶκος, 'house', often means 'household, family' in Lk. (1:33, 69; 2:4; *et al.*; Hawkins, 44). David's descendants are here regarded as one large family or household (1:69; 2:4; 1 Sa. 20:16; 1 Ki. 12:19; 13:2; O. Michel, TDN³⁸T V, 129f.). Had the phrase been meant to refer to Mary, it would have had to be differently constructed. It is meant to show how Jesus was the 'son of David' through Joseph as his legal 'father' (3:23; Mt. 1:16). It does not, therefore, contradict the fact of the virgin birth (*contra* Luce, 87). Nevertheless, Origen and others have held that the phrase was meant to refer to Mary, whose Davidic descent is asserted in Protev. Jac. 10:1; Ign. Eph. 18:2, Justin, Dial. 43, 45, 100, 120.

Μαριάμ (also spelled Μαρία, 1:41; 2:19; Μαριάμ (μ) η in Jos.; cf. B³⁹D 53³; M⁴⁰H II, 144f.) was a common name, the equivalent of *miryam* (Ex. 15:20f.) and said to mean 'exalted one' (possible etymologies in Lagrange, 27f.).

(28) Gabriel is pictured as appearing to Mary indoors (εἰσελθών). His greeting falls into three parts. The opening Χαῖρε is the normal form of address in the NT and in Greek usage. In a Jewish context it will represent *s̄lām* (Schmid, 41), or possibly Aramaic *haday* (H. Gressmann, in Klostermann, 13). A. Strobel^{41*} argues that it was specifically a morning greeting. Roman Catholic commentators especially have seen more in the word, and have linked it with Zp. 3:14; Zc. 9:9 (cf. La. 4:21; Joel 2:21) where the daughter of Zion is bidden to rejoice at the coming of salvation (S. Lyonnet^{42*}). On this basis Mary can then be identified as the daughter of Zion (Sahlin, 183–185; Laurentin, 64–71, 148–161). Schürmann, I, 43f., argues that no Greek reader would have understood the familiar greeting in such a way, and that further echoes of the OT passage in question would be expected (see also H. Conzelmann, TDN⁴³T IX, 367). It is just possible that the use of *χαίρω* in the LXX of these passages has influenced the present verse,

³⁸TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

³⁹BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁴⁰MH J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard and N. Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh, I, 1906; II, 1929; III, 1963; IV, 1976

^{41*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{42*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

⁴³TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

and the continuation in Zc. 9:9 ('Your king is coming to you'; cf. Mt. 21:5, Jn. 12:15) is certainly relevant here. But a typological identification of Mary with the daughter of Zion is nowhere explicit, and it would tend to distract attention from the coming Messiah to the mother.

χαριτώ is 'to bestow favour upon', 'to bless' (Eph. 1:6^{44*}; cf. Sir. 18:17). The participle indicates that Mary has been especially favoured by God in that he has already chosen her to be the mother of the Messiah (1:30). There is no suggestion of any particular worthiness on the part of Mary herself (1:30 note). The Vulgate rendering, *gratia plena*, is open to misinterpretation by suggesting that grace is a substance with which one may be filled, and hence that Mary is a bestower of grace. S. Lyonnet^{45*} saw a connection between this verse and Jdg. 5:24 where Jael is described as 'most blessed' (εύλογηθείη; cf. Ps. 45:2 (44:3); Dn. 9:23), but this is far fetched. (The addition of εύλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν at the end of the verse in many MSS is based on 1:42; Metzger, 129).

The greeting conveys the message ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. This is an OT greeting (Jdg. 6:12; Ru. 2:14), meant as a statement rather than a wish (ἐστίν is to be supplied). It prepares the recipient for divine service with the assurance 'The Lord will help you' (H. Gressmann). It does not, therefore, indicate the moment of conception (as in Sib. 8:459–472, in NTA I⁴⁶l, 740), a thought excluded by the future tenses in 1:35.

(29) Gabriel's message was strange and perplexing, and Mary's response paves the way for its elucidation. (This does not, however, mean that we have simply a literary device, since it would have been easier to omit v. 28 altogether). Διαταράσσω^{47*}, 'to perplex, confuse', is a literary variant for ταράσσω (1:12); probably fear is implied (cf. v. 30). So Mary began to ponder (διαλογίζομαι, imperfect; 3:15; 5:21f.; 12:17; 20:14^{48*}) what sort of greeting she had heard. Ποταπός, 'of what kind' (7:39^{49*}), is Hellenistic for ποδαπός. Luke uses the optative

^{44**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{45*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

⁴⁶ NTA II E. Hennecke, *New Testament Apocrypha* (translated by R. M. Wilson, *et al.*), London, 1963, 1965

^{47**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{48*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

^{49*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

frequently: 1. It is used, as here, in an indirect question after a governing verb in the past tense, and corresponds to the indicative in direct speech (3:15; 8:9; 18:36; 22:23; Acts 17:11; 21:33; 25:20). 2. It is used with ἄν, corresponding to a potential optative or deliberative subjunctive in direct speech (1:62; 6:11; 9:46; 15:26; Acts 15:24; *et al.*; in some cases the MSS vary over the inclusion or exclusion of ἄν). 3. It is found in wishes (1:38; 20:16). Other NT writers scarcely use the optative. See B⁵⁰D 384–386; M⁵¹H III, 118–133.

It is sometimes said that Mary's surprise was because it was not customary for a man to give a greeting (ἀσπασμός, 1:41, 44; 11:43; 20:46^{52*}) to a Jewish woman. But the rabbinic evidence is late and scanty (S⁵³B II, 99), and Mary's wonder was occasioned more by the character of a greeting which addressed her in such exalted terms, and implied that, like the great men of OT times, she was chosen to serve God and to be empowered by him (W. C. van Unnik, 'Dominus Vobiscum: The Background of a Liturgical Formula', in A. J. B. Higgins (ed.), *New Testament Essays*, Manchester, 1959, 270–305).

(30) Gabriel's reply is similar in form to 1:13–17 and has a poetic character; it fills out the message in v. 28. For μὴ φοβοῦ, see 1:13. εὔρίσκω χάριν is equivalent to the common OT phrase *māšā' hēn* (Gn. 6:8; Jdg. 6:17; 1 Sa. 1:18; 2 Sa. 15:25), and signifies the free gracious choice of God who favours particular men and women; the stress is on God's choice rather than human acceptability. On χάρις (2:40, 52; 4:22; 6:32–34; 17:9^{54*}; not in Mt. or Mk.) see H. Conzelmann, TDN⁵⁵T IX, 372–402, especially 392f.

(31) The wording of the annunciation closely resembles Gn. 16:11f., καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ ὁ ἄγγελος Κυρίου, Ἰδοὺ ἐν γαστρὶ ἔχεις καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἰσμαήλ

⁵⁰BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁵¹MH J. H. Moulton, W. F. Howard and N. Turner, *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh, I, 1906; II, 1929; III, 1963; IV, 1976

^{52*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

⁵³SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

^{54*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

⁵⁵TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

... οὗτος ἔσται ... (cf. Jdg. 13:5), but it also reflects Is. 7:14, ἵδοὺ ἡ παρθένος ἐν γαστρὶ λήμψεται καὶ τέξεται υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ Ἐμμανουὴλ. The text has been adapted to the present context, ἡ παρθένος having been shifted to v. 27. The annunciation is regarded as the fulfilment of Is. 7:14. The phrase συλλήμψῃ ἐν γαστρὶ is a conflation of Isaiah's phrase ἐν γαστρὶ λαμβάνειν and the more usual LXX usage of συλλαμβάνειν absolutely; cf. 1:24. Sahlin, 104–113, argues that συλλαμβάνω means 'to be pregnant' rather than 'to conceive', so that the angel is telling Mary that she is already pregnant (cf. Gn. 16:11; Jdg. 13:3–7). But the change of tense from Gn. 16:11 and the unlikelihood of Mary having become pregnant during her period of betrothal speak against this view. Mary is not told precisely when she would conceive her son (but see 1:34 note).

As in the case of John, the child's name is given by God. The fact that the mother is to confer the name may possibly be an indication that the child will have no human father (Schürmann, I, 46f.), but in view of Gn. 16:11 the point cannot be pressed. The name Ἰησοῦς corresponds to Hebrew *yəhôšua'* or *yēšûa'*, and was a common Jewish name up to the beginning of the second century AD; thereafter both Jews and Christians ceased to call their children by it. Its meaning, 'Yahweh saves', was seen to be deeply significant (Mt. 1:21), and although Luke does not expressly draw attention to it, it is hard to believe that he was not aware of it (2:11; on the name see S⁵⁶B I, 63f.; W. Foerster, TDNT⁵⁷T III, 284–293; Jeremias, *Theology*, I, 1 n.).

(32) The child's greatness (cf. 1:15) is to be seen in the lofty title that will be assigned to him; the passive form (κληθήσεται) indicates, as often, divine action (Jeremias, *Theology*, I, 9–14). But the title is more than a name; it indicates the true being of the person so called. The title is equivalent to the more common 'Son of God'.

Οὗτος ὁ ὄψιστος is a title for God found frequently in the LXX, where it is equivalent to 'ēl 'elyōn (Gn. 14:8), and in Jewish literature (A⁵⁸P II, 850), from whence it was taken over in the NT (1:35, 76; 6:35; 8:28 par⁵⁹. Mk. 5:7; Acts 7:48; 16:17; Heb. 7:13 see G. Bertram, TDNT⁶⁰T VIII, 614–620).

⁵⁶SB H. L. Strack und P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München, 1956³

⁵⁷TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁵⁸AP R. H. Charles (ed.), *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English*, Oxford, 1913

⁵⁹par. is parallel to

⁶⁰TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

The title is frequently said to be Hellenistic (Hauck, 24; Schürmann, I, 48 n. 57), but, while it is true that the title was used for Greek deities, it had a Semitic background; the Hebrew equivalent occurs half a dozen times in the Dead Sea Scrolls (1QS 4:22f.; *et al.*). The phrase ‘son(s) of the Most High’ is found in Est. 16:16 LXX; Ps. 82:6 (81:6); Dn. 3:93 LXX (παῖδες); Sir. 4:10; and the singular form ‘son of the Most High’ has now been attested in Aramaic in 4Q 243 (4Q ps Dan Aa) 2:1 (J. A. Fitzmyer, ‘The Contribution of Qumran Aramaic to the Study of the New Testament’, NT⁶¹S 20, 1973–74, 382–407, especially 391–394; there are several parallels of language between this text and Lk. 1:32–35, but it is too early to assess their significance, beyond making the obvious point that they confirm the Palestinian character of the language and thought here).

The context suggests that we are to think of a title given to the Messiah. In 2 Sa. 7:14 (cf. Pss. 2:7; 89:36f.; 4QFlor. 1:10f.) the father-son relationship is used to express the divine care extended to David’s son and his corresponding obligation of obedience to God. It is often thought that we have here a description of a human Messiah standing in an adoptive relationship to God, and that this stands in contrast with the idea of a ‘metaphysical’ sonship found in v. 5. If so, the two verses represent two divergent christological conceptions which have been joined together secondarily (Schürmann, I, 49). Other explanations, however, are possible. E. Schweizer (TDN⁶²T VIII, 376f., 381f.) thinks that in the present verse we have a Lucan formulation, intended to contrast Jesus with John who is merely the ‘prophet of the Most High’ (1:76). In fact, there is reason to suppose that more than a merely adoptive relationship is being set forth. The mention of divine sonship *before* Davidic messiahship suggests that the latter is grounded in the former and should be interpreted in terms of it. The clear allusion to Is. 7:14 in v. 31 also suggests that something more than adoption is in mind. Clearly Luke himself intended 35 to be an elucidation of v. 32 in view of the common use of ὥψιστου. In christological content vs. 32 and 35 stand close together; the concept of divine sonship, stemming from OT royal ideology, has undergone a transformation of meaning. The use of ὥψιστος may well be Lucan in view of the usage elsewhere, and it may be that he has adopted this term to avoid a possible misunderstanding of ‘Son of God’ in terms of pagan concepts or to give a contrast with 1:76.

The status of Mary’s son is now developed in terms of accession to the throne of David his father. The use of κύριος ὁ θεός without a genitive following (as in 1:16) is unusual (cf. Acts 3:22 v. 1.). For ὁ θρόνος Δαυίδ see Acts 2:30; 2 Sa. 3:10; 7:13, 16; Is. 9:7 (cf. Ps. 89:3f.; 132:11f.;

⁶¹NTS *New Testament Studies*

⁶²TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

Is. 16:5 and also Ps. 45:6, cited in Heb. 1:8; O. Schmitz, TDN⁶³T III, 160–167; E. Lohse, TDN⁶⁴T VIII, 478–488; Burger). The use of πατήρ indicates that the child will be the royal messiah inasmuch as he is descended from David—hence the significance of the earlier reference to Joseph's descent.

(33) The messianic nature of the child's rule over Israel is confirmed by the prophecy that it will be eternal. The thought is based on Is. 9:7 (cf. Mi. 4:7). Βασιλεύω with ἐπί (instead of a simple genitive) imitates Hebrew *mālak 'al* (B⁶⁵D 177; the verb is rare in the Gospels: Mt. 2:22; Lk. 19:14, 27). ὁ ὥικος Ἰακώβ is a synonym for Israel (Ex. 19:3; Is. 2:5; *et al.*) εἰς τοὺς αἰώνας is a less common synonym for εἰς τὸν αἰώνα (1:55), both meaning 'for ever' (H. Sasse, TDN⁶⁶T I, 197–208, especially 198–200). The eternity of the rule of David's line is taught in 2 Sa. 7:13, 16; Is. 9:7; Ps. 89:3f., 28f.; 132:11f.; cf. Mi. 4:7 Dn. 7:14; 2 Bar. 73. In the OT the thought is sometimes of a continuing line of kings (1 Ki. 8:25; Ps. 132:12), but here the Messiah himself is to reign for ever. The present verse says nothing about the commencement of the reign. There is nothing to suggest that the thought is of the parousia (Hahn, 247f.; Schürmann, I, 49: *contra* E. Lohse, TDN⁶⁷T VIII, 485 n. 47). The Jewish hope was of a kingdom in this world, but by NT times this was taking on transcendental features, described in terms of everlastingness and the return of paradise upon earth. The early church clearly associated the reign of Jesus with his resurrection and exaltation and linked this with the Davidic promises (Acts 2:30–36). This will have been Luke's understanding of the matter, but he is also conscious that the kingdom of God could be said to have arrived in the ministry of Jesus, so that the exaltation was the open recognition of One who had already acted in his earthly life with kingly power as the representative of God.

(34) Just as Zechariah asked for some explanation of how the angelic promise could be true in virtue of his and his wife's age (1:18), so now Mary asks how the angelic promise will come

⁶³TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁶⁴TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁶⁵BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁶⁶TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁶⁷TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

true in view of her circumstances. (This parallelism alone is sufficient to justify rejection of the poorly attested variant 'ἰδοὺ ἡ δούλη κυρίου· γένοιτο μοι κατὰ τὸ ὄρημά σου. It is found only in b (cf. the omission of v. 38 by b e), but nevertheless was accepted by Streeter, 267f.; H. Vogels, 'Zur Textgeschichte von Lc. 1, 34ff.', ZNW⁶⁸ 43, 1951–52, 256–260). Mary's perplexity arises from the fact that (ἐπεί⁶⁹*; Acts, 0x) she has no sexual relationship with any man. For γινώσκω in this sense see (of a man) Mt. 1:25; Gn. 4:1, 17; 1 Sa. 1:19; *et al.*; and (of a woman) Gn. 19:8; Jdg. 11:39; 21:12. The tense is strange, since the verb is normally used of the actual act of intercourse. It must mean 'I do not have a husband with whom I have sexual relationships'. Many Roman Catholic scholars have argued that the phrase expresses a vow of virginity: 'I have resolved not to know a man' (Laurentin, 176–188; Stuhlmueller, 122f.—listing earlier supporters). It is impossible to see how the text can yield this meaning. The evidence from parallels cited by Laurentin is irrelevant. It refers purely to chastity outside marriage, refusal to contract a second marriage (Jdt. 16:22), abstention from intercourse in special circumstances, and the practice of the Therapeutae. Easton, 9, commented: 'No writer with a knowledge of Jewish psychology could have thought of a vow of virginity on the part of a betrothed Palestinian maiden'; the rejoinder that Mary constitutes a special case (Benoit, *Exégèse*, III, 205) will convince only those who have other reasons for adopting this interpretation of the text.

Mary's question is puzzling, since, if the promised child is to be a descendant of David, she is already betrothed to a member of the house of David and can expect to marry him in the near future and bear his child. 1. It may be that Mary is thinking of an immediate conception and asks how this can be possible since she does not yet (οὐ equivalent to ὄπτω) know a husband (Ellis, 71; Thompson, 53f.; and earlier scholars). J. B. Bauer⁷⁰* has strengthened this view by noting that in 1:31 ἰδοὺ συλλήμψῃ may translate Hebrew *hinnāk hārāh*, which would refer to the imminent future; he further suggests that ἄνδρα should be translated 'my husband', so that Mary is asking how she can bear a son of Davidic descent before marriage to her intended husband. 2. Vermes, 218–222, argues that παρθένος refers to a girl who has not yet attained to puberty ('Who is accounted a *bethulah*? She that has never yet suffered a flow, even though she was married', Nid. 1:4; cf. t. Nid. 1:6; p. Nid. 49a). Such a girl might conceive while still a 'virgin' in respect of menstruation, i.e. at the time of her first ovulation. Vermes argues that this was the case with respect to Mary, who cohabited with Joseph while still a 'virgin' in this sense. The

⁶⁸ ZNW *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*

⁶⁹* All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

⁷⁰* The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

present verse will then mean ‘How can this be for I have not yet begun to menstruate? Should I nevertheless marry in spite of seeming not yet ready?’ This situation could then have been misunderstood by the early church in terms of virginity with respect to sexual intercourse. But this hypothesis gives an impossible meaning to the present verse; it clashes with Mt. 1:25; and it depends on a possible meaning of virgin which would have been unintelligible to Greek readers. 3. If Mary realised that a virginal conception was intended, she could have been asking how this was possible without her having a normal sexual relationship with a husband (Geldenhuys, 80; Morris, 73). On this view, Mary must have understood the allusion to Is. 7:14 in v. 31 to imply a virgin birth. But it is doubtful whether an ordinary Jewish reader would have understood Is. 7:14 in this sense; more probably it would have been taken to mean that a young woman who was as yet unmarried would shortly marry and bear a son (G. Delling, TDNT⁷¹T V, 883). The Christian understanding of the verse was surely made in the light of the event or as a result of a revelation. 4. J.-P. Audet^{72*} similarly suggests that Mary is asking how it is possible for her to have a child and yet fulfil the prophecy of virginity; he argues that ἔττει should be taken elliptically (B⁷³D 360²; 456³), giving the sense ‘Comment cela se fera-t-il, puisque, alors (dans ce cas) je ne dois pas point connaitre d’homme?’ But grammatically this is far from easy. 5. Many recent writers, finding it impossible to make the question historically and psychologically credible on the lips of Mary, have concluded that it is a literary device by Luke to prepare the way for the announcement of the Spirit’s activity in the next verse (cf. 1:24; J. Gewiess^{74*}; Schürmann, I, 49–52; G. Schneider^{75*}). On this view the question serves to emphasise that the child will have no human father.

A decision between these alternatives is not easy. The issue has been clouded by the fact that the information in v. 27 about Joseph’s Davidic descent is provided for the reader and cannot be assumed to have been immediately present in Mary’s mind. Again, a literary device is strictly unnecessary, since v. 35 could follow straight on from v. 33 (or v. 31) with a linking γάρ.

⁷¹TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

^{72*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

⁷³BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

^{74*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

^{75*} The work cited is listed in the bibliography at the end of the introduction to the relevant section of the commentary.

Certainly the question serves to introduce the angelic explanation, and, since the scene makes no pretence to being a verbatim account of what happened, it is possible that the question should be regarded as part of Luke's retelling of the event.

(35) In conjunction with v. 34 the angel's statement indicates that the child is to be conceived without human agency. The Holy Spirit, here equated in poetic parallelism with the power of God (1:17 note; W. Grundmann, TDN⁷⁶T II, 300), is to be the agent, as is appropriate in the new creation (Ps. 104:30; cf. Mt. 1:18, 20; Ellis, 74). ἐπέρχομαι, 'to come upon' (11:22; 21:26; Acts 1:8; 8:24; 13:40; 14:19; Eph. 2:7; Jas. 5:1^{77*}), is used of the Pentecost event (Acts 1:8); behind the phrase here may lie Is. 32:15 v. 1. (ἔως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ' ὑψηλοῦ). This background makes it unlikely that the word is used as a euphemism for sexual intercourse, a usage which in any case is not elsewhere attested (J. Schneider, TDN⁷⁸T II, 680f.). ἐπισκιάζω is 'to cover' (9:34 par⁷⁹. Mk. 9:7; par⁸⁰. Mt. 17:5) or 'to overshadow' (Acts 5:15^{81*}). It is used of God's presence resting on the tabernacle in the cloud (Ex. 40:35 (29)) and metaphorically protecting his people (Pss. 91:4 (90:4); 140:7 (139:8)). God's powerful presence will rest upon Mary, so that she will bear a child who will be the Son of God. Nothing is said regarding how this will happen, and in particular there is no suggestion of divine begetting (Creed, 20). Daube's attempt (27–36) to find a background in Ru. 3:9 founders on the lack of any verbal link. Sahlin, 123–139, broadens the discussion by reference to other passages where *săkan* expresses the idea of divine protection; see further S. Schulz, TDN⁸²T VII, 399f.

⁷⁶TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

^{77**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

⁷⁸TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁷⁹par. is parallel to

⁸⁰par. is parallel to

^{81**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

⁸²TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

ὅτιό, ‘wherefore’, introduces the result (7:7^{83*}; Acts, 8x; with καί, as here, Acts 10:29; 24:26). τὸ γεννώμενον is ‘the child’, neuter by analogy with τέκνον (B⁸⁴D 138¹); the present participle has a future reference (cf. 13:23; 22:19, 20, 21; B⁸⁵D 339²; Jeremias, *Words*, 178f.; Black, 131f.). The addition ἐκ σοῦ (C* Θ al it sy^p Ir^{lat} Ad (Epiph)) was probably made to achieve symmetry with the earlier part of the verse (WH App⁸⁶. 52; Metzger, 129f.). The child will be called, i.e. shall be (as in 1:32) ἅγιος, ‘holy’ (4:34 par⁸⁷. Mk. 1:24; Jn. 6:69; Acts 3:14; 4:27, 30; 1 Jn. 2:20; Rev. 3:7; cf. Jn. 10:36). Here the sense is ‘divine’ (Ps. 89:5, 7) or ‘Gottgehörig’ (Grundmann, 58), rather than that the first-born is holy to Yahweh (2:23; Ex. 13:12), or that the child, like Samson, is dedicated to God (Jdg. 13:7 v. 1.), or that the child is free from the slur of illegitimacy (cf. perhaps 1 Cor. 7:14). There may be the thought that, as the One begotten by the Holy Spirit, the child will be holy as the bearer of the Spirit (O. Procksch, TDNT⁸⁸T I, 101; cf. Schürmann, I, 53f.). The description culminates in the phrase ὑιὸς θεοῦ, here undoubtedly in its full sense of one begotten by God.

The syntax is disputed. 1. ‘The child shall be called holy, the Son of God’ (R⁸⁹V; RS⁹⁰V; NE⁹¹B mg; TN⁹²T; Leaney, 83; detailed defence in Schürmann, I, 54f.). 2. ‘The holy child shall be called

^{83*} All the occurrences of the word in Lk. are listed (in some cases, all the occurrences in Acts are similarly noted).

⁸⁴BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁸⁵BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

⁸⁶WH App. Ibid. B. F. Westcott and F. J. A. Hort, *The New Testament in Greek*, London, 1881 *Appendix*

⁸⁷par. is parallel to

⁸⁸TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

⁸⁹RV *Revised Version*

⁹⁰RSV *Revised Standard Version*

⁹¹NEB *New English Bible*

⁹²TNT *Translator’s New Testament*

the Son of God' (R⁹³V mg; NE⁹⁴B; TE⁹⁵V; NI⁹⁶V; Barcla⁹⁷y; Lagrange, 35f.; Hauck, 25). But καλέομαι usually follows the predicate. 3. Sahlin 129–136, argues that ὑιὸς Θεοῦ should be omitted as superfluous. (He also argues that behind γεννώμενον lies Hebrew *nôšēr*, and that Jesus was originally portrayed here as a Nazirite; cf. 2:22–24; 4:34; E. Schweizer, TDN⁹⁸T VIII, 376f. But, if this motif is present, it is better found in the use of ἄγιος, as in Jdg. 13:7 v. 1.)

(36) Without being asked for confirmation of the prophecy, the angel proceeds to supply it (for καὶ ἰδού, cf. 1:20, 31). συγγενίς^{99*} is a rare form for συγγενής, 'a female relative', not necessarily a cousin. Mary's relationship to Elizabeth suggests that she too may have been of priestly descent (1:5). The fact of her pregnancy, now in its sixth month, is to be a sign to Mary that God can do the impossible. γήρει is an Ionian dative from γῆρας^{100*}, 'old age'. καὶ οὗτος is Lucan (Hawkins, 42), as is καλούμενος with a name or description (*ibid.*) Black, 53, 100, finds Aramaic influence in καὶ αὐτή (*casus pendens*; cf. 8:14f.; 12:10, 48; 13:4; 21:6; 23:50f.) and the use of αὐτή (proleptic pronoun; cf. 10:7).

(37) The angel explains how it has been possible for the barren Elizabeth to become pregnant, and hence how it will also be possible for Mary to conceive her son: God is at work, and nothing is impossible for him. The wording is based on Gn. 18:14, μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ῥῆμα; (*h^ayippālē` mēyhwh dābār*), but the thought is a common one (Job 10:13 LXX par¹⁰¹. 42:2; Je. 32:27; Zc. 8:6; Mt. 19:6 par¹⁰². Mk. 10:27 par¹⁰³. Lk. 18:27). οὐ ... πᾶς is a

⁹³RV Revised Version

⁹⁴NEB New English Bible

⁹⁵TEV Today's English Version (1966 edition)

⁹⁶NIV New International Version

⁹⁷Barclay W. Barclay, *The New Testament: A New Translation*, London, I, 1968

⁹⁸TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

^{99**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

^{100**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

¹⁰¹par. is parallel to

¹⁰²par. is parallel to

¹⁰³par. is parallel to

Semitic expression, meaning οὐδείς (Acts 10:14; *et al.*; B¹⁰⁴D 302¹). ἀδυνατέω is ‘to be impossible’ (Mt. 17:20^{*105*}). The MSS vary between παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ (κ*¹⁰⁶B D L W) and παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (A C Θ pl; T¹⁰⁷R). The better-attested genitive is closer to the meaning of the Hebrew (cf. Je. 32:17 MT; Schlatter, 166), and is used as evidence for a Hebrew original in Lk. 1–2 by P. Winter, NT¹⁰⁸S 1, 1954–55, 115f. It is also possible that Luke was using a non-LXX text (Schürmann, I, 57 n. 116). ὄντα (19x; Acts, 14x) may mean ‘word’ or occasionally ‘thing’ (cf. Hebrew *dābār*). Hence we may translate ‘nothing will be impossible for God’, or ‘no word from God will be powerless’ (Grundmann, 54; similarly, NE¹⁰⁹B t; Tasker, 417, claims that this sense of ὄντα is required if we adopt the genitive case. But the meaning of the preposition is sufficiently flexible to allow either case to stand with the generally accepted translation). Schürmann, I, 57, thinks that the verse is meant to defend the virgin birth not just to Mary but to critics in Luke’s day who said that it was impossible.

(38) The scene closes with Mary’s humble acceptance of the will of God. δούλη (1:48; Acts 2:18^{*110*} (LXX)) and its masc. equivalent are forms used by men in addressing their superiors, especially by righteous men addressing God (1 Sa. 1:11; 25:41; 2 Sa. 9:6; 2 Ki. 4:16; K. H. Rengstorf, TDN¹¹¹T II, 268, 273). κυρίου can be used without the article since it is tantamount to a proper name. γένοιτο μοι ..., a wish expressed by the optative (1:29 note), is based on Gn. 21:1; 30:34 LXX; cf. Lk. 2:29. Luke often notes the arrival and departure of heavenly beings (2:17; Acts 10:7). Nothing is said about the fulfilment of the angelic promise; we are left to infer from Mary’s willingness to obey God that the miraculous conception by the Spirit (not by the angel) ensued.

The narrative of the annunciation contains various linked motifs: 1. The promise of the coming of the Davidic Messiah and the establishment of his eternal reign. 2. The promise of the

¹⁰⁴BD F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (translated by R. W. Funk), Cambridge, 1961

^{105**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

¹⁰⁶B Baptist source

¹⁰⁷TR *Theologische Rundschau*

¹⁰⁸NTS *New Testament Studies*

¹⁰⁹NEB *New English Bible*

^{110**} All the occurrences of the word in the NT are cited.

¹¹¹TDNT G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (ed.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (translated by G. W. Bromiley), Grand Rapids, 1964–76

birth of a child who will be called 'the Son of God' as a result of the coming of the Spirit upon Mary. 3. The fulfilment of the prophecy in Is. 7:14, seen as the birth of a child to a virgin who has not known a husband. Each of these motifs is expressed in OT terminology, and we have not observed any linguistic features which demanded other sources. In particular, motifs 1. and 2. are thoroughly in line with OT thought, and, if the motif of the virgin birth be bracketed off, the idea of God acting to assist in the normal process of birth is a familiar one; the case of John, where the parents were previously barren and the child is marked out for a special destiny, falls within this pattern, and the way in which this motif is used in close parallelism with the story of the birth of Jesus indicates that we are moving in this circle of ideas. It has, indeed, often been thought that originally the story of the birth of Jesus was a story of how God assisted at the birth of the child of Mary and Joseph; see Vermes, 218–22, for a recent form of this theory. But in its present form the action of God in the story is not that of working through a natural process but is a new, creative act of a supernatural character. There is no parallel to this in the OT, unless Is. 7:14 was originally understood in this way. In any case, Luke's language remains that of the OT. Even if this is so, however, we have still to seek the origin of the ideas thus expressed.

The motif of the virgin birth is not a Lucan invention. The same ideas are present in the independent narrative in Mt. 1–2; here too the birth of Jesus is seen as a fulfilment of Is. 7:14 and takes place by the Holy Spirit without the intervention of Joseph (Mt. 1:18–25). Although there is no other clear evidence of the tradition of the virgin birth in the NT (but a number of hints which are consistent with the tradition, e.g. Mk. 6:3), it can be safely assumed that the story is older than the Gospels. The silence of the NT writers may be due to the intimate character of the story which, if true, can have come only from the close family circle of Jesus.

The language used to describe the birth of Jesus is thus similar to that used elsewhere in the NT. Even when heavenly explanations are given by the voice of God or of angels (e.g. at the baptism), the language used is human and biblical, the ideas utilised being drawn from OT tradition. Existing human imagery is used to explain the significance of what is happening, since otherwise communication would be impossible.

From a literary point of view it is clear that the narrative as a whole bears the stamp of Lucan editing. But it is also clear that the ideas expressed are unlikely to have originated with Luke himself, although they would have been congenial to his outlook. It is probable that traditional material has been utilised, and the question is whether this tradition simply represents the church's attempt to express the significance of Jesus by means of a haggadic narrative, or whether a historical event lies beneath the symbolism. An answer to this question depends partly on whether the birth narrative presupposes the development of the church's christology (see Hahn, 304–308). But the concept fits in with the filial consciousness of the

historical Jesus and with his consciousness of the presence of the Spirit. It appears to be independent of the general trend of christological development in the early church.

A further problem is the fact that the story does not seem to have influenced early Christian thinking about Jesus (cf. Vögtle, 43–54); this would suggest that the story was not known because it was created only at a late date. Luke, however, expressly states that there was a ‘birth secret’ (2:19, 51), and in any case it is unlikely that what was known only to a comparatively small group of people would have been widely remembered and had an influence some thirty years later. The objection, therefore, is not decisive.

The form of the narrative is obviously not a crucial factor as regards its historicity. Those who are prepared to accept the possibility of angelic visitations will see no difficulty in a story couched in such terms. Those who deny the possibility will declare the story to be imaginative. But there is perhaps a third possibility. In this narrative the writer is striving to express the ineffable in human terms. It is not surprising if human language breaks down under the strain and recourse must be had to the language of symbolism. The writer has used terms drawn from the biblical tradition to describe a secret and mysterious event. It remains possible that this language, while mythological in colouring, bears witness to some real event which cannot be described in literal terms and which remains veiled in mystery. Historical and literary investigation can take us thus far and no further.

26–38. *The Annunciation of the Birth of the Saviour*¹¹²¹

The birth of the Baptist is parallel to the birth of Isaac; that of the Messiah to the creation of Adam. Jesus is the second Adam. But once more there is no violent breach with the past. Even in its revolutions Providence is conservative. Just as the Prophet who is to renovate Israel is taken from the old priesthood, so the Christ who is to redeem the human race is not created out of nothing, but “born of a woman.”

26. εἰς πόλιν τῆς Γαλιλαίας ἡ ὄνομα Ναζαρέτ. The description perhaps implies that Lk. is writing for those who are not familiar with the geography of Palestine. There is no reason for

¹¹²¹ “It has been argued that the different modes in which God is recorded to have communicated with men, in St. Matthew by dreams and in St. Luke by Angels, show the extent of the subjective influence of the writer’s mind upon the narrative. But surely those are right who see in this difference the use of various means adapted to the peculiar state of the recipient. Moreover, as St. Matthew recognizes the ministry of Angels (28:2), so St. Luke relates Visions (Acts 10:9–16, 16:9, 18:9, 10).... It is to be noticed that the contents of the divine messages (Matt. 1:20, 21; Luke 1:30–33) are related conversely to the general character of the Gospels, as a consequence of the difference of character in those to whom they are addressed. The promise of Redemption is made to Joseph; of a glorious Kingdom to the Virgin” (Wsctt. *Int. to Gospels*, p. 317, 7th ed.). See Hastings, *D.B.* 1. p. 93.

believing that he himself was unfamiliar with it. Comp. ver. 39, 4:31, 7:11, 8:26, 9:10, 17:11, 19:29, 37, 41.

Galilee is one of many geographical names which have gradually extended their range. It was originally a little “circuit” of territory round Kadesh Naphtali containing the towns given by Solomon to Hiram (1 Kings 9:11). This was called the “circuit of the Gentiles,” because the inhabitants were strangers (1 Mac. 5:15, Γαλ. ἀλλοφύλων). But it grew, until in the time of Christ it included the territory of Naphtali, Asher, Zebulon, and Issachar (*D. B.*¹¹³¹¹⁴² 1. p. 1117). For a description of this region see *Jos*¹¹⁵. *B. J.* 3:3. 1–3. *Nazareth* is mentioned neither in O.T. nor in *Josephus*, but it was probably not a new town in our Lord’s time. The site is an attractive one, in a basin among the south ridges of Lebanon. The sheltered valley is very fruitful, and abounds in flowers. From the hill behind the town the view over Lebanon, Hermon, Carmel, the Mediterranean, Gilead, Tabor, Gilboa, the plain of Esdraelon, and the mountains of Samaria, is very celebrated (Renan, *Vie de J.* p. 27). It would seem as if Mt. (2:23) was not aware that Nazareth was the original home of Joseph and Mary.

The form of the name of the town varies much, between Nazareth, Nazaret, Nazara, and Nazarath. Keim has twice contended strongly for Nazara (*J. of Naz.*, Eng. tr. 2. p. 16, 4. p. 108); but he has not persuaded many of the correctness of his conclusions. WH¹¹⁶ consider that “the evidence when tabulated presents little ambiguity” (2. App. p. 160). Ναζαράθ is found frequently (eight out of eleven times) in Codex¹¹⁷ Δ, but hardly anywhere else. Ναζαρά is used once by Mt. (4:13), and perhaps once by Lk. (4:16). Ναζαρέθ occurs once in Mt. (21:11) and once in Acts (10:38). Everywhere else (Mt. 2:23; Mk. 1:9; Lk. 1:26, 2:4, 39, 51; Jn. 1:46, 47) we have certainly or probably Ναζαρέτ. Thus Mt. uses the three possible, forms equally; Lk. all three with a decided preference for Nazaret; while Mk. and Jn. use Nazaret only. This appears to be fairly conclusive for Nazaret. Yet Scrivener holds that “regarding the orthography of this word no reasonable certainty is to be attained” (*Int. to Crit. of N.T.* 2. p. 316); and Alford seems to be of a similar opinion (1. *Prolegom.* p. 97). Weiss thinks that Nazara may have been the original form, but that it had already become unusual when the Gospels were written. The modern town is called *En Nazirah*, and is shunned by Jews. Its population of 5000 is mainly Christian, with a few Mabometans.

27. ἐμνηστευμένην. This is the N.T. form of the word (2:5): in LXX we have μεμνηστευμ. (Deut. 22:23). The interval between betrothal and marriage was commonly a year, during which

¹¹³*D. B.* Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, 2nd edition.

¹¹⁴² Smith’s *Dictionary of the Bible*, 2nd edition.

¹¹⁵ *Jos.* *Josephus*.

¹¹⁶ WH. Westcott and Hort.

¹¹⁷ Δ. Cod. Sangallensis, sæc. ix. In the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

the bride lived with her friends. But her property was vested in her future husband, and unfaithfulness on her part was punished, like adultery, with death (Deut. 22:23, 24). The case of the woman taken in adultery was probably a case of this kind.

Ἐξ οἴκου Δαυείδ. It is unnecessary, and indeed impossible, to decide whether these words go with ἀνδρί, or with παρθένον, or with both. The last is the least probable, but Chrysostom and Wieseler support it. From vv. 32 and 69 we may with probability infer that Lk. regards Mary as descended from David. In 2:4 he states this of Joseph. Independently of the present verse, therefore, we may infer that, just as John was of priestly descent both by Zacharias and Elisabeth, so Jesus was of royal descent both by Mary and Joseph. The title “Son of David” was publicly given to Jesus and never disputed (Mt. 1:1, 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 20:30, 31; Mk. 10:47, 48; Lk. 18:38, 39). In the *Test. XII. Patr.* Christ is said to be descended from *Levi* and *Judah* (*Simeon* 7.); and the same idea is found in a fragment of Irenaeus (*Frag.* 27., Stieren, p. 836). It was no doubt based, as Schleiermacher bases it (*St. Luke*, Eng. tr. p. 28), on the fact that Elisabeth, who was of Levi, was related to Mary (see on ver. 36). The repetition involved in τῆς παρθένου is in favour of taking ἐξ οἴκου Δαυείδ with ἀνδρί: otherwise we should have expected αὐτῆς. But this is not conclusive.

28. χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη.¹¹⁸¹ Note the alliteration and the connexion between χαῖρε and χάρις The *gratia plena* of the Vulg¹¹⁹. is too indefinite. It is right, if it means “full of grace, *which thou hast received*”; wrong, if it means “full of grace, *which thou hast to bestow*.” From Eph. 1:6 and the analogy of verbs in -όω, κεχαριτωμένη must mean “endued with grace” (Eccl. 28:17). *Non ut mater gratiæ, sed ut filia gratiæ* (Beng¹²⁰.). What follows explains κεχαριτωμένη, for with μετὰ σοῦ we understand ἔστι, not ἔστω (comp. Judg. 6:12). It is because the Lord is

¹¹⁸¹ The *Ave Maria* as a liturgical address to the Virgin consists of three two of which are scriptural and one not. The first two parts, “Hail, *Mary* full of grace; the Lord is with thee,” and “Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb” (ver. 42), are first found in the *Liber Antiphonianus* attributed to Gregory the Great; and they were authorized as a formula to be taught with the Creed and the Lord’s Prayer, c. A.D. 1198. The third part, “Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and at the hour of death,” was added in the fifteenth century, and was authorized by Pope Pius v. in 1568.

¹¹⁹Vulg. Vulgate.

¹²⁰Beng. Bengel.

with her that she is endued with grace. Tyn¹²¹., Cov¹²²., and Cran., no less than Wic¹²³. and Rhem¹²⁴., have “full of grace”; Genev. has “freely beloved.” See Resch, *Kindheitsev.* p. 78.

¹²¹Tyn. Tyndale.

¹²²Cov. Coverdale.

¹²³Wic. Wiclid.

¹²⁴Rhem. Rheims (or Douay).

The familiar εύλογημένη σὺ ἐν γυναιξίν, although well attested (¹²⁵A ¹²⁶C ¹²⁷D ¹²⁸X ¹²⁹Δ Π, Latt¹³⁰. Syrr¹³¹. Aeth¹³². Goth¹³³., Tert¹³⁴. Eus¹³⁵.), probably is an interpolation borrowed from ver. 42:

¹²⁵A A. Cod. Alexandrinus, sæc. v. Once in the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria; sent by Cyril Lucar as a present to Charles 1. in 1628, and now in the British Museum. Complete.

¹²⁶C C. Cod. Ephraemi Rescriptus, sæc. 5. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the following portions of the Gospel: 1:2–2:5, 2:42–3:21, 4:25–6:4, 6:37–7:16, or 17, 8:28–12:3, 19:42–20:27, 21:21–22:19, 23:25–24:7, 24:46–53.

These four MSS. are parts of what were once complete Bibles, and are designated by the same letter throughout the LXX and N.T.

¹²⁷D D. Cod. Bezae, sæc. vi. Given by Beza to the University Library at Cambridge 1581. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

¹²⁸X X. Cod. Monacensis, sæc. ix. In the University Library at Munich. Contains 1:1–37, 2:19–3:38, 4:21–10:37, 11:1–18:43, 20:46–24:53.

¹²⁹Δ Δ. Cod. Sangallensis, sæc. ix. In the monastery of St. Gall in Switzerland. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

¹³⁰Latt. Latin.

¹³¹Syrr. Syriac.

¹³²Aeth. Ethiopic.

¹³³Goth. Gothic.

¹³⁴Tert. Tertullian.

¹³⁵Eus. Eusebius of Cæsarea

¹³⁶κ ¹³⁷Β ¹³⁸Λ, Aegyptt¹³⁹. Arm¹⁴⁰. omit.

29. Here also ἰδοῦσα (A), for whteh some Latin texts have *cum audisset*, is an interpolation borrowed perhaps from ver. 12. It is not stated that Mary saw Gabriel. The pronominal use of the article (ἢ δέ) is rare in N.T. (Acts 1:6; Mt. 2:5, 9). It is confined to phrases with μέν and δέ, and mostly to nom. masc. and fem.

διεταράχθη. Here only in N.T. It is stronger than ἐταράχθη in ver. 12. Neither Zacharias nor Mary are accustomed to visions or voices: they are troubled by them. There is no evidence of hysterical excitement or hallucination in either case. The διελογίζετο “reckoned up different reasons,” is in itself against this. The verb is confined to the Synoptic Gospels (5:21, 22; Mk. 2:6, 8); Jn. 11:50 the true reading is λογίζεσθε.

πποταπός In N.T. this adj. never has the local signification, “from what country or nation?” *cujas?* (Aesch. *Cho.* 575; Soph. *O.C.* 1160). It is synonymous with πτοῖος, a use which is found in Demosthenes; and it always implies astonishment, with or without admiration (7:39; Mt. 8:27; Mk. 13:1; 2 Pet. 3:11; 1 Jn. 3:1). In LXX it does not occur. The original form is πποδαπός, and may come from πποῦ ἀπό; but -δαπος is perhaps a mere termination.

εἴη. It is only in Lk. in N.T. that we find the opt. in indirect questions. In him it is freq. both without ἀν (3:15, 8:9, 22:9, 22:23; Acts 17:11, 21:33, 25:20) and with ἀν (6:11; Acts 5:24, 10:17). In Acts 8:31 we have opt. with ἀν in a direct question. Simcox, *Lang. of N. T.* p. 112; Winer¹⁴¹. 41:4, 100, p. 374

30. Μὴ φοβοῦ Μαριάμ, εὔρες γὰρ χάριν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ. See on ver. 13. The εὔρες χάριν Θ. explains κεχαριτωμένη. The phrase is Hebraic: Νῶε εὔρεν χάριν ἐναντίον Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ (Gen. 6:8; comp. 18:3, 39:4). See on 4:22.

¹³⁶κ κ Cod. Sinaiticus, sæc. iv. Brought by Tischendorf from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; now at St. Petersburg. Contains the whole Gospel complete.

¹³⁷Β B. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. 4. In the Vatican Library certainly since 1533¹ (Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul 3, etc.*, p. 86).

¹³⁸Λ L. Cod. Regius Parisiensis, sæc. viii. National Library at Paris. Contains the whole Gospel.

¹³⁹Aegyptt. Egyptian.

¹⁴⁰Arm. Armenian.

¹⁴¹Win. Winer, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (the page refers to Moulton's edition).

συλλήμψῃ. For the word see on ver. 24, and for the form comp. 2:21, 20:47; Acts 1:8, 2:38, 23:27; Jn. 5:43, 16:14, 24. In Ionic we have fut. λάμψομαι. Veitch, p. 359; Win¹⁴². v. 4f, P. 54.

ἐν γαστρὶ καὶ τέξῃ υἱόν, καὶ καλέσεις τὸ ὄνομα. The same wording is found Gen. 16:11, of Ishmael, and Is. 7:14 of Immanuel. Comp. Gen. 27:19 of Isaac, and Mt. 1:21 of Jesus. In all cases the καλέσεις is not a continuation of the prophecy, but a command, as in most of the Ten Commandments (Mt. 5:21, 27, 33; comp. Lk. 4:12; Acts 23:5, etc.). Win¹⁴³. 43:5, 100, p. 396. The name Ἰησοῦς was revealed independently to Joseph also (Mt. 1:21). It appears in the various forms of Oshea, Hoshea, Jehoshua, Joshua, and Jesus. Its meaning is “Jehovah is help,” or “God the Saviour.” See Pearson, *On the Creed*, art. 2. *sub init.* p. 131; ed. 1849. See also Resch, *Kindheitsev.* pp. 80, 95.

32. οὗτος ἔσται μέγας. As in ver. 15, this is forthwith explained; and the greatness of Jesus is very different from the greatness of John. The title υἱὸς Ὑψίστου expresses some very close relation between Jesus and Jehovah, but not the Divine Sonship in the Trinity; comp. 6:35. On the same principle as Θεός and Κύριος Ὑψιστος is anarthrous: there can be only one Highest (Eccl. 7:15, 27:26, 19:17, 24:2, 23, 29:11, etc.). The κληθήσεται is not a mere substitute for ἔσται: He not only shall be the Son of God, but shall be recognized as such. In the *Acta Pauli et Theclæ* we have Μακάριοι οἱ σαβόντες Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ὅτι αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ ὑψίστου κληθήσονται (Tischendorf, p. 239). For τὸν θρόνον Δαυείδ Comp. 2 Sam. 7:12, 13; Is. 9:6, 7, 16:5.

Δαυείδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ. This is thought to imply the Davidic descent of Mary; but the inference is not quite certain. Jesus was the heir of Joseph, as both genealogies imply. Comp. Ps. 132:11; Hos. 3:5. There is abundant evidence of the belief that the Messiah would spring from David: Mk. 12:35, 10:47, 11:10; Lk. 18:38, 20:41; 4 Ezra 12:32 (Syr¹⁴⁴. Arab. Arm¹⁴⁵.); Ps. Sol. 17:23, 24; Talmud and Targums. See on Rom. 1:3.

33. βασιλεύσει ... εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. Comp. “But of the Son he saith, God is Thy throne for ever and ever” (Heb. 1:8, where see Wsctt¹⁴⁶.); also Dan. 2:44, 7:14; Jn. 12:34; Rev. 11:15. The eternity of Christ’s kingdom is assured by the fact that it is to be absorbed in the kingdom of the Father (1 Cor. 15:24–28). These magnificent promises could hardly have been invented by a writer who was a witness of the condition of the Jews during the half century which followed

¹⁴²Win. Winer, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (the page refers to Moulton’s edition).

¹⁴³Win. Winer, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (the page refers to Moulton’s edition).

¹⁴⁴Syr. Syriac.

¹⁴⁵Arm. Armenian.

¹⁴⁶Wsctt. Westcott.

the destruction of Jerusalem. Indeed, we may perhaps go further and say that “it breathes the spirit of the Messianic hope before it had received the rude and crushing blow in the rejection of the Messiah” (Gore, *Dissertations*, p. 16). Comp. vv. 17, 54, 55, 68–71, 2:38.

The constr. βασιλεύειν ἐπί c. *acc.* is not classical. We have it again 19:14, 27.

34. Πῶς ἔσται τοῦτο. She does not ask for *proof*, as Zacharias did (ver. 18); and only in the form of the words does she ask as to the mode of accomplishment. Her utterance is little more than an involuntary expression of amazement: *non dubitantis sed admirantis* (Grotius). In contrasting her with Zacharias, Ambrose says, *Hæc jam de negotio tractat; ille adhuc de nuntio dubitat*. It is clear that she does not doubt the fact promised, nor for a moment suppose that her child is to be the child of Joseph.

ἐπεὶ ἄνδρα οὐ γινώσκω Comp. Gen. 19:8; Judg. 11:39; Num. 31:17. The words are the avowal of a maiden conscious of her own purity; and they are drawn from her by the strange declaration that she is to have a son before she is married. It is very unnatural to understand the words as a vow of perpetual virginity, or as stating that such a vow has already been taken, or is about to be taken. It is difficult to reconcile οὐκ ἔγινωσκεν (imperf., not aor.) αὐτὴν ἔως (Mt. 1:25) with any such vow.¹⁴⁷¹

35. Πνεῦμα ἄγιον ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ. It may be doubted whether the article is omitted “because Holy Spirit is here a proper name”; rather because it is regarded impersonally as the creative power of God. Comp. καὶ πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἐπεφέρετο ἐπάνω τοῦ τοῦ ὄδατος (Gen 1:2): the two passages are very parallel. See on ver. 15. Both πνεῦμα and ἄγιον have special point. It is spirit and not flesh, what is holy and not what is sinful, that is to produce this effect in her. With ἐπελεύσεται ἐπὶ σέ Comp. Acts 1:8. Excepting Eph. 2:7 and Jas. 5:1, the verb is peculiar to Lk. (11:22, 21:26; Acts 1:8, 8:24, 13:40, 14:19).

δύναμις Ὑψίστου ἐπισκιάσει σοι. For δύναμις see on 4:14; for ἐπισκιάσει comp. the account of the Transfiguration (9:34), and for the dat. comp. the account of Peter’s shadow (Acts 5:15). It is the idea of the Shechinah which is suggested here (Exod. 40:38). The cloud of glory signified the Divine presence and power, and it is under such influence that Mary is to become a mother.

διό. This illative particle is rare in the Gospels (7:7; Mt. 27:8); not in Mk. or Jn.

¹⁴⁷¹ H. Lasserre renders *puisque je n'ai nul rapport avec mon mari*, and explains that ἄντρος *signifie mari, époux; et la phrase marque la voeu de virginité conjugale fait par Marie* (pp. 265, 564, ed. 1887). It is impossible that ἄνδρα, without either article or possessive pronoun, can mean “my husband.”

τὸ γεννώμενον ἄγιον κληθήσεται υἱὸς Θεοῦ. “The holy thing which shall be born shall be called the Son of God,” or, “That which shall be born shall be called holy, the Son of God.” The latter of these two renderings seems to be preferable. Comp. ἄγιον τῷ κυρίῳ κληθήσεται (2:22); Ναζωραῖος κληθήσεται (Mt. 2:23); υἱοὶ Θεοῦ κληθήσονται (5:9); ἐλάχιστος κληθήσεται and μέγας κλ. (5:19). In all cases the appellation *precedes* the verb. The unborn child called ἄγιον as being free from all taint of sin. *De hoc Sancto idem angelus est locutus*, Dan. 9:24 (Beng¹⁴⁸.). The ἐκ σοῦ, which many authorities insert after γεννώμενον, is probably an ancient gloss, derived perhaps from Mt. 1:16: ¹⁴⁹κ ¹⁵⁰Α ¹⁵¹Β ¹⁵²Γ ¹⁵³Δ and most versions omit.

The title “Son of God,” like “Son of Man,” was a recognized designation of the Messiah. In *Enoch*, and often in 4 Ezra, the Almighty speaks of the Messiah as His Son. Christ seldom used it of Himself (Mt. 27:43; Jn. 10:36). But we have it in the voice from heaven (3:22, 9:35); in Peter’s confession (Mt. 16:16); in the centurion’s exclamation (Mk. 15:39); in the devil’s challenge (4:3, 9); in the cries of demoniacs (Mk. 3:11, 5:7). Very early the Christian Church chose it as a concise statement of the divine nature of Christ. See on Rom. 1:4, and Swete, *Apost. Creed*, p. 24. For ἄγιον see on Rom. 1:7. The radical meaning is “set apart for God, consecrated.”

36. καὶ ιδοὺ ἐλεισάβετ ἡ συγγενίς σου. Comp. ver. 20. Mary, who did not ask for one, receives a more gracious sign than Zacharias, who demanded it. The relationship between her and Elisabeth is unknown.

¹⁴⁸Beng. Bengel.

¹⁴⁹κ κ Cod. Sinaiticus, sæc. iv. Brought by Tischendorf from the Convent of St. Catherine on Mt. Sinai; now at St. Petersburg. Contains the whole Gospel complete.

¹⁵⁰Α A. Cod. Alexandrinus, sæc. v. Once in the Patriarchal Library at Alexandria; sent by Cyril Lucar as a present to Charles 1. in 1628, and now in the British Museum. Complete.

¹⁵¹Β B. Cod. Vaticanus, sæc. 4. In the Vatican Library certainly since 1533¹ (Batiffol, *La Vaticane de Paul 3, etc.*, p. 86).

¹⁵²Γ C. Cod. Ephraemi Rescriptus, sæc. 5. In the National Library at Paris. Contains the following portions of the Gospel: 1:2–2:5, 2:42–3:21, 4:25–6:4, 6:37–7:16, or 17, 8:28–12:3, 19:42–20:27, 21:21–22:19, 23:25–24:7, 24:46–53.

These four MSS. are parts of what were once complete Bibles, and are designated by the same letter throughout the LXX and N.T.

¹⁵³Δ D. Cod. Bezae, sæc. vi. Given by Beza to the University Library at Cambridge 1581. Greek and Latin. Contains the whole Gospel.

"Cousin," started by Wiclif, and continued until RV¹⁵⁴. substituted "kinswoman," has now become too definite in meaning. The kinship has led artius to represent the two children as being playmates; but Jn. 1:31 seems to be against such Companionship. It has also led to the conjecture that Jesus was descended from both Levi and Judah (see on ver. 27). But Levites might marry with other tribes; and therefore Elisabeth, who was descended from Aaron, might easily be related to one who was descended from David. This verse is not evidence that Mary was not of the house of David.

The late form συγγενίς (comp. εύγενίς), and the Ion. dat. γήρει for γήρα (Gen 15:15, 21:7, 25:8), should be noticed; also that οὗτος being the subject, the noun has no article. Comp. 21:22. The combination καὶ οὗτος is peculiar to Lk. (8:41?, 16:1, 20:28). The relative ages of Jesus and of John are fixed by this statement.

We may take καλούμενη as imperf. part., "Used to be called." This reproach would cease when she reappeared at the end of the five months (ver. 24). καλούμενος with appellations is freq. in Lk.

37. οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ πᾶν ῥῆμα. The negative and the verb are to be closely combined and taken as the predicate of πᾶν ῥῆμα. We must not take οὐκ without πᾶν. This is plain from Gen 18:14: μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ῥῆμα; i.e. "Hath God said, and can He not do it?" or, Is anything which God has promised impossible? RV¹⁵⁵. here has "be void of power" for ἀδυνατεῖν; but it is doubtful whether the verb ever has this signification. Of things, it means "to be impossible" (Mt. 27:20); and of persons, "to be unable"; in which case, like δυνατεῖν (Rom. 14:4; 2 Cor. 9:8), it is followed by the infin. That "be impossible" is the meaning, both here and Gen 18:14, is probable from Job 42:2 οἴδα ὅτι πάντα δύνασαι, ἀδυνατεῖ δέ σοι οὐθέν; and from Zech. 8:6, where ἀδυνατήσει is used of a thing being too hard for man but not too hard for God; and from Jer. 32:17, where both Aquila and Symmachus have οὐκ ἀδυνατήσει for οὐ μὴ ἀποκρυβῇ of LXX. We render, therefore, "From God no word shall be impossible." The idiom οὐ ... πᾶς, in the sense of "all ... not," i.e. "none," is probably Hebraic. Comp. Mt. 24:22. It is less common in N.T. than in LXX (Exod. 12:16, 43, 20:16; Dan. 2:10, etc.), Win¹⁵⁶. 26:1, p. 214; Blass, Gr. p. 174

38. Ἰδού ἡ δούλη κυρίου. That Ἰδού is not a verb, but an exclamation, is manifest from the verbless nominative which follows it. Comp. 5:12, 18. "Handmaid" or "servant" is hardly adequate to δούλη. It is rather "bondmaid" or "slave." In an age in which almost all servants were slaves, the idea which is represented by our word "servant" could scarcely arise. In N.T. the fem. δούλη occurs only here, ver. 48, and Acts 2:18, the last being a quotation.

¹⁵⁴RV. Revised Version.

¹⁵⁵RV. Revised Version.

¹⁵⁶Win. Winer, *Grammar of N.T. Greek* (the page refers to Moulton's edition).

γένοιτό μοι κατὰ τὸ ρῆμά σου. This is neither a prayer that what has been foretold may take place, nor an expression of joy at the prospect. Rather it is an expression of *submission*,—“God’s will be done”: τίναξ εἰμι γράφομενος. ὁ βούλεται ὁ γραφεύς, γραφέτω (Eus¹⁵⁷.). Mary must have known how her social position and her relations with Joseph would be affected by her being with child before her marriage. There are some who maintain that the revelation made to Joseph (Mt. 1:18–23) is inconsistent with what Lk. records here; for would not Mary have told him of the angelic message? We may reasonably answer that she would not do so. Her own inclination would be towards reserve (2:51); and what likelihood was there that he would believe so amazing a story? She would prefer to leave the issue with regard to Joseph in God’s hands. Hastings, *D.C.G.* art. “Annunciation.”

ἀπῆλθεν ἀπ’ αὐτῆς ὁ ἄγγελος. *Ut peracta legatione.* Comp. Acts 12:10; Judg. 6:21.

On the whole of this exquisite narrative Godet justly remarks: “*Quells dignité, quelle pureil, quelle simplicité, quelle déliatesse dans tout ce dialogue! Pas un mot de trop, pas un de trop peu. Une telle narration n'a pu émaner que de la sphère sainte dans laquelle le fait lui-même avait eu lieu*” (1. p. 128, 3ème ed. 1888). Contrast the attempts in the apocryphal gospels, the writers of which had our Gospels to imitate, and yet committed such gross offences against taste, decency, and even morality. What would their inventions have been if they had had no historical Gospels to guide them?

Dr. Swete has shown that the doctrine of the Miraculous Conception was from the earliest times part of the Creed. Beginning with Justin Martyr (*Apol.* 1:21, 31, 32, 33, 63; *Try.* 23, 48, 100), he traces back through Aristides (J. R. Harris, p. 24; Hennecke, p. 9; Barnes, *Canon. and Uncanon. Gospp.* p. 13), Ignatius (Eph. 19; Trall. 9.; Smyr. 1.), the Valentinians, and Basilides, to S. Luke, to whom these Gnostics appealed. The silence of S. Mark is of no weight; his record does not profess to go farther back than the ministry of the Baptist. In the Third Gospel we reach not merely the date of the Gospel (A.D. 75–80), but the date of the early traditions incorporated in these first chapters, traditions preserved (possibly in writing) at Jerusalem, and derived from Mary herself.

The testimony of the First Gospel is perhaps even earlier in origin, and is certainly independent. It probably originated with Joseph, as the other with Mary (Gore, *Bampton Lectures*, p. 78; *Dissertations on Subjects connected with the Incarnation*, pp. 12–40). Greatly as the two narratives differ, both bear witness to the virgin birth (Swete, *The Apostles’ Creed*, ch. 4.).¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁷Eus. Eusebius of Cæsarea

¹⁵⁸ Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to S. Luke*, International Critical Commentary (London: T&T Clark International, 1896), 20–27.

Context

Having just described the announcement of John the Baptist's birth, Luke proceeded with a description of the announcement of Jesus' birth. This account is tied to the first not only by the parallelism between the two accounts but also by the mention of the sixth month (1:26) and of two of the main characters from the previous account: the angel Gabriel (1:26ff.) and Elizabeth (1:36–37). An even more important tie between the accounts is that the whole significance of John the Baptist's ministry, as pointed out in 1:17, is found in his preparation for the One coming after him who was more powerful than he (3:16). The parallels between the two accounts are found both in content and form.³¹⁵⁹⁹

¹⁵⁹³⁹ Cf. the following: the setting, 1:5–7 and 26–27; the angelic greeting, confusion, and reassurance, 1:11–13a and 28–30; the angelic message, 1:13b–17 and 31–33b; the problem, 1:18 and 34; reassurance through a sign, 1:19–20 and 35–37; and the miraculous conception, 1:21–24 and 38. For further discussion see Brown, *Birth of the Messiah*, 292–98; C. H. Talbert, *Reading Luke* (New York: Crossroad, 1988), 18–21.

This passage assumes and builds upon the previous one. The mighty work God has done in John the Baptist's conception would be surpassed by an even greater miracle in the virginal conception of Jesus, God's Son. The mighty work God foretold he would do through John the Baptist's ministry would be surpassed by an even greater work through his Son's ministry. Whereas John would be "great in the sight of the Lord" (1:15), Jesus would be great without qualification (1:32) and would be called the Son of God (1:35).

Much research has been expended in an attempt to explain the origin of the story Luke reported here. It is clear from the first chapter of Matthew as well as the traditional nature of the material in Luke 1–2 that Luke did not create all this material. In the past attempts have been made to explain the origin of the virgin birth story by proposing that the early church borrowed mythical material from pagan sources. Yet it is clear today that one cannot explain the virgin birth traditions as originating from pagan sources. There are simply no clear pagan parallels.⁴¹⁶⁰⁰ The Jewish nature of the virgin birth traditions also make this theory most improbable.⁴¹⁶¹¹ Attempts have also been made to see the virgin birth traditions as originating from Jewish myths. Yet we find no evidence anywhere of a Jewish expectation that the Messiah would be born of a virgin.⁴¹⁶²² If one is open to the possibility of God entering into history and being able to transcend the "laws of nature," it is not difficult to believe that the God who raised

⁴¹⁶⁰⁰ In fact the vast majority of alleged parallels involve a sexual relationship between a "god" and a human woman. The virgin birth traditions, on the other hand, are completely asexual. Furthermore, the early church's antagonism toward paganism makes a direct dependence most unlikely.

⁴¹⁶¹¹ For comparative materials to the virgin birth, see T. D. Boslooper, *The Virgin Birth* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 135–86. R. E. Brown (*The Virginal Conception and Bodily Resurrection of Jesus* [New York: Paulist, 1973], 62) gives a helpful summary of these comparisons when he states that "the story of Jesus' conception has, in fact, taken a form for which, to the best of our knowledge, there is no exact parallel or antecedent in the material available to the Christians of the first century who told of this conception" and that the alleged parallels "are not really similar to the nonsexual virginal conception that is at the core of the infancy narratives, a conception where there is no male deity or element to impregnate Mary." Although dated, J. G. Machen's *The Virgin Birth of Christ* (New York: Harper, 1930) is still useful in this area.

⁴¹⁶²² Isaiah 7:14 was not interpreted in the intertestamental period as teaching a messianic virgin birth. It is much more likely that after the origination of the virgin birth traditions, Isa 7:14 began to be used to support the traditions rather than that it created this tradition.

his Son from the dead and empowered him to do many mighty miracles could have sent him into the world by the miracle of the virgin birth.

Comments

1:26 In the sixth month. This refers not to the sixth month of the year but to the sixth month of Elizabeth's pregnancy as indicated by 1:36.

Nazareth, a town in Galilee. The qualifying phrase was to help Luke's intended readers, who were non-Palestinian, understand Nazareth's location.

1:27 To a virgin. Luke clearly emphasized that Mary was a virgin (not just a "girl" as in the NEB) both before and after conception (1:34–35). For Luke's tendency to pair men and women, see comments on 13:19.

Pledged to be married. Marriage consisted of two distinct stages: engagement followed by the marriage itself. Engagement involved a formal agreement initiated by a father seeking a wife for his son. The next most important person involved was the father of the bride. A son's opinion would be sought more often in the process than a daughter's. Upon payment of a purchase price to the bride's father (for he lost a daughter and helper whereas the son's family gained one) and a written agreement and/or oath by the son, the couple was engaged. Although during this stage the couple in some instances cohabited, this was the exception. An engagement was legally binding, and any sexual contact by the daughter with another person was considered adultery. The engagement could not be broken save through divorce (Matt 1:19), and the parties during this period were considered husband and wife (Matt 1:19–20, 24). At this time Mary likely was no more than fifteen years old, probably closer to thirteen, which was the normal age for betrothal.

A descendant of David. This describes Joseph, not the virgin as is evident from Luke's reintroduction of Mary ("the virgin's name") immediately following this description. If it referred to Mary, Luke could simply have said "a descendant of David whose name was Mary." By this comment Luke was preparing his readers for what he would say in 1:32–33. The importance of the Davidic descent of Jesus is evident from 2:4; 3:23–38 (cf. Matt 1:1–17; Rom 1:3; 2 Tim 2:8). Compare 2 Esdr 12:32, where the Messiah is equated with the Son of David.

Mary. Luke made nothing of the etymology of this name ("exalted one").

1:28 Greetings. "Hail" (RSV) was a normal form of address in the NT and the Greek world. Some have sought to see in this greeting a special emphasis to "rejoice" (*chaire*, cf. Luke 1:14), but Luke's readers would not have understood this as anything more than a normal greeting.

You who are highly favored. Mary had been “graced” by God in that she had been chosen to bear God’s Son (1:31, 35). She had not been chosen for this task because she possessed a particular piety or holiness of life that merited this privilege. The text suggests no special worthiness on Mary’s part.⁴¹⁶³³ Some scholars have argued that behind the Greek term for “highly favored” lies a Hebrew word that translates into the name “Hannah” and that there may therefore be an echo here of Samuel’s miraculous birth to Hannah. Luke, however, made nothing of this, and Theophilus would never have picked up a subtle play on words in Hebrew. The Latin Vulgate translated this “full of grace” (*gratia plena*).

The Lord is with you. Compare Judg 6:12; Ruth 2:4. This is not a wish (“may the Lord be with you”) but a statement and refers to God’s mighty power being present and upon Mary.⁴¹⁶⁴⁴

1:29 Mary was greatly troubled. Compare 1:12. Mary’s surprise was not primarily because it was not customary for a man to greet a woman but because it was not customary for an *angel* to greet a woman.

1:30 Do not be afraid. This parallels 1:13.

You have found favor with God.⁴¹⁶⁵⁵ Here as in Judg 6:17; 2 Sam 15:25 (cf. 1 Sam 1:18) the issue is God’s gracious choice, not Mary’s particular piety (cf. Gen 6:8); for unlike Luke 1:6, nothing is made of Mary’s personal piety either before or after this verse. The emphasis is on God’s sovereign choice, not on human acceptability.

1:31 You will be with child. For the combination of *conceive*, *bear*, and *call*, which we find in this verse, see Gen 16:11; Judg 13:3, 5; Isa 7:14; Matt 1:21. For other instances in which women “name” their child or are told the name of their child, see Gen 16:11; 30:13; Judg 13:24; 1 Sam 1:20.

You are to give him the name Jesus. This means “He shall be called Jesus.” (Cf. Matt 1:25, where Joseph named him “Jesus” as a sign of his legal adoption.) This is fulfilled in Luke 2:21.

Jesus. Although heaven-given names usually have etymological significance, nothing is made of this by Luke. Contrast, however, Matt 1:21.

¹⁶³⁴³ Some manuscripts add “blessed are you among women,” which is found in 1:42; but it is not to be read as original here.

¹⁶⁴⁴⁴ See W. C. van Unnik “*Dominus Vobiscum*: The Background of a Liturgical Formula” in *New Testament Essays*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins (Manchester: University Press, 1959), 270–305.

¹⁶⁵⁴⁵ Cf. Gen 6:8; 18:3; Judg 6:17; 1 Sam 1:18; 2 Sam 15:25.

1:32 Here Luke began a fivefold description about “who” Jesus is.

He will be great. This greatness contrasts with the rest of humanity, which is not great, and also with the greatness of John the Baptist, whose greatness was not “absolute” but qualified with “in the sight of the Lord” (Luke 1:15). Thus Jesus and John were both alike (“great”) and different (Jesus’ greatness is an unqualified greatness). This adjective functions not as a name but rather indicates his being and nature.⁴¹⁶⁶⁶

He ... will be called the Son of the Most High. This means “will be the Son of God.” This is evident from Matt 5:9 and Luke 6:35, where “will be called” in Matthew has the same meaning as “will be” in Luke (cf. also Rom 9:7; Heb 11:18; Gen 21:12). “Most High” is a circumlocution for God (Luke 1:35, 76; 6:35; Acts 7:48). Once again Jesus is shown to be greater than John the Baptist, for John is described as a “prophet” of the Most High (Luke 1:76) whereas Jesus is described as “Son” of the Most High. The mention of Jesus’ divine sonship before mention of his Davidic messiahship in the next part of the verse indicates that the latter is grounded in the former and that Jesus’ messiahship should be interpreted in terms of his sonship.

The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David. Clearly 2 Sam 7:12–13, 16 and Jesus’ role as Israel’s Messiah are in view here. Compare Luke 1:69; 2:4, 11; Acts 2:30 for this same emphasis. Jesus’ Davidic descent already has been alluded to in Luke 1:27, where Joseph is described as “a descendant of David.”

1:33 He will reign over the house of Jacob. Like the previous description, this description depicts Jesus as the awaited Messiah. Thus, like David, he is the King of Israel.⁴¹⁶⁷⁷ The “house of Jacob” was a traditional term to describe Israel (Exod 19:3; Isa 2:5–6; 8:17; 48:1).

Forever. The eternal rule of the Davidic kingship is taught in 2 Sam 7:13, 16; Pss 89:4, 29; 132:12; Isa 9:7, but in this verse it is the final Davidic King, the Messiah, who will reign forever. Compare also Dan 7:13–14, where one “like a son of man” is given an everlasting kingdom.

His kingdom will never end. This may be an allusion to Isa 9:6 (LXX) or to Dan 7:14. The kingdom of God that is realized in the coming of Jesus and is to be consummated at the parousia will continue forever.

1:34 How ... since I am a virgin? Literally *since I know no man*. Although technically Joseph was Mary’s husband (see comments on 1:27), no sexual consummation had as yet taken place

¹⁶⁶⁴⁶ Marshall, *Luke*, 67.

¹⁶⁷⁴⁷ Cf. Luke 19:14, 27; 19:38 (Luke alone of the Synoptic Gospels uses the title “King” here); 23:2 (this is unique to Luke); 23:3; 23:37 (unique to Luke); 23:38; Acts 17:7.

(cf. Matt 1:25). The word “know” is used to describe the sexual act.⁴¹⁶⁸⁸ Attempts to interpret the Lukan account as portraying a normal birth by a virgin who will give birth in a normal way, i.e., by later sexual intercourse with her husband, are impossible since the angelic message had not mentioned Joseph or the normal marital relationship. Furthermore, since it would be natural to assume that a young woman would in the marital relationship bear children, the angelic message is interpreted by Mary as meaning that she, as she was then, i.e., as a virgin, was to bear a son; and she asked, “How?” That this was to be a virgin birth⁴¹⁶⁹⁹ is also confirmed by the fact that, since Jesus is greater than John the Baptist, his birth must also be greater. If John’s birth was miraculous but Jesus’ birth was the result of a normal sexual relationship, then the whole parallel between 1:5–25 and 1:26–38 breaks down at this point. Jesus’ birth had to be greater than that of John the Baptist, and this requires us to understand his birth as a virgin birth. Luke told his readers this to prepare them for 1:35.

Attempts to interpret Mary’s words in this verse as expressing a vow of perpetual virginity (several early church fathers)⁵¹⁷⁰⁰ are incorrect. (Such explanations clash with Matt 1:25, which implies that after the birth of Jesus, Joseph and Mary had a normal husband-wife relationship.) Although Luke and Matthew both clearly affirmed that Jesus’ conception was miraculous in that Mary was a virgin when she conceived, what is most important in the NT teaching of the virgin birth (or virginal conception) is not the manner in which God sent his Son but the fact that he sent him. To use later terminology we might say that what is of primary importance is not the virgin birth but the incarnation. In other words it is not the “how” but the “what” of Christmas that is most important.

Mary’s question should not be understood as reflecting the same kind of doubt Zechariah possessed (Luke 1:18), since there is present no rebuke as in 1:19–23.

1:35 The Holy Spirit will come upon you. For similar wording see Acts 1:8. Whereas John the Baptist was filled with the Spirit from his mother’s womb (Luke 1:15), Jesus was conceived by the Spirit, and this witnesses to his being greater than John.

¹⁶⁸⁴⁸ Cf. Gen 4:1, 17, 25; 19:8; Judg 11:39; 21:12; 1 Sam 1:19; Matt 1:25.

¹⁶⁹⁴⁹ Technically it is more correct to talk about the virginal conception than the virgin birth. Technically speaking, *virgin birth* refers to the Gnostic doctrine that Mary remained physically a virgin after Jesus’ birth, i.e., that her physical organs (the hymen) remained intact. The dangerous corollary of this doctrine is a docetic Christology. A Christ “born” in this fashion would have passed through the birth canal and hymen as a spirit would rather than as a flesh-and-blood baby would.

¹⁷⁰⁵⁰ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 348–49.

And the power of the Most High will overshadow you. This sentence stands in synonymous parallelism with the preceding one. Luke was fond of referring to the Spirit's influence as "power" (see comments on 1:17). For "overshadow" cf. 9:34. There is no allusion here to the shekinah glory "overshadowing" Mary.

So. "So" (literally *Therefore*) is causal and has been explained in two ways: (1) Jesus is God's Son because of the Spirit's activity in causing the virgin birth,⁵¹⁷¹¹ and (2) Jesus is holy because of the Spirit's activity.⁵¹⁷²² According to John's Gospel, Jesus was God's Son before creation (John 1:1–3), so that the manner of his birth would have nothing to do with his nature or being. Yet it is dangerous to read into our passage John's teaching on preexistence, since Luke did not explicitly teach this theological concept in Luke-Acts. A determining factor in this issue involves how the rest of this verse should be translated.

The holy one to be born shall be called the Son of God. The other possible way of translating this sentence is "the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God" (footnote in NIV; RSV). Both are grammatically possible; but in light of Luke 2:23, where there is a similar construction,⁵¹⁷³³ "holy" is the object of the verb. Thus the marginal translation of the NIV and the RSV is better. If we have "holy" and "Son of God" here, we have a better parallel to the twofold description in 1:32, where we have "great" and "Son of the Most High." It is better therefore to understand the Spirit's activity as resulting in the Son of God's being called, i.e., being (see comments on 1:32) "holy." In light of 2:23 the term "holy" is best interpreted as designating not a particular ethical quality (as in Acts 3:14) so much as indicating that the Son of God was to be dedicated or set aside for a unique, divine purpose. Each firstborn male (Luke 2:23) was consecrated to God. This does not mean that the firstborn possessed a moral or ethical quality over his brothers at birth. Rather he was dedicated to God in a unique way because God had a special claim on the firstborn (cf. 2:23). In a similar way the Son of God through his conception by the Spirit was set apart by God for a divine task. In this sense "holy" is related to "anointed," which also points out that God set apart (and equipped) his Son for a particular task (cf. how "anointed" and "holy servant" are closely related in Acts 4:27). For Jesus as "holy," cf. Luke 4:34; Acts 3:14; 4:27, 30.

One should not read into this verse the thought that since Jesus was not conceived through sexual intercourse he was as a result "uncontaminated" by such a natural birth. Rather, Luke

¹⁷¹⁵¹ So Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 351.

¹⁷²⁵² Talbert, *Reading Luke*, 19.

¹⁷³⁵³ A nominative participle and the term *holy* preceding the verb *shall be called*.

sought to teach that since Jesus' birth was entirely due to the "overshadowing" of the Holy Spirit, Jesus would be uniquely set aside for God's service, i.e., he would be "holy."

Son of God. At times this title is a synonym for Messiah/Christ (4:41; Acts 9:20, 22). We find a similar paralleling of the title "Son of God" and of the Davidic Messiah in Rom 1:3–4. Yet Jesus cannot be described simply in messianic terms such as the Son of David. He is more than this, and the title "Son of God" carries with it other implications as well.⁵¹⁷⁴⁴ The title does not demand an ontological sense of preexistence, but it allows for this.⁵¹⁷⁵⁵

1:36 Sixth month. Compare 1:26. Elizabeth's conception of John the Baptist when she was past childbearing age reveals God's miraculous power and confirms the angelic message to Mary. God already had done the impossible in Elizabeth's case so that the problem Mary raised in 1:34 is insignificant.

1:37 For with God nothing will be impossible. Compare Gen 18:14 (LXX), where the same expression is found; cf. also Matt 19:26; Job 42:2; Zech 8:6 for the same thought. This refers primarily to Mary's conceiving as a virgin, but it also alludes to Elizabeth's conceiving referred to in the previous verse.

1:38 I am the Lord's servant.... May it be to me as you have said. Compare 1 Sam 1:18. Whereas Zechariah and Elizabeth provide an example for the reader of true discipleship in their obedience to the commandments and regulations of the OT (1:6), Mary is exemplary because of her submission to God's will.

¹⁷⁴⁵⁴ This title will be affirmed by Jesus in Luke 2:49; 10:22; 22:70; by God in 3:22; 9:35; by demons in 4:41; 8:28; indirectly by Satan in 4:3, 9; and by Paul in Acts 9:20; 13:33.

¹⁷⁵⁵⁵ Some scholars have argued that 1:34–35 is a later insertion into this account. Yet without these two verses the parallelism between 1:26–38 and 1:5–25 would be destroyed. The announcement pattern would clearly be broken, for the objection (cf. 1:34 and 1:18) and reassurance (cf. 1:35 and 1:19–20) that are integral to such a scene would be lacking. It would also destroy the great-greater parallelism established between John the Baptist and Jesus, for without a virginal conception Jesus' birth would not have been greater than John's. On the contrary it would have been inferior! It should also be noted that we find in 1:35 the same names for God ("Most High" and "God") that we find in 1:32. When we also realize that the title "Son of God" found in 1:34–35 does not have Greek mythological connotations but is essentially a synonym for the Messiah of 1:32–33, any alleged conflict between these two passages disappears. In our present text 1:34–35 is an integral part of the account and not simply an insertion.

Then the angel left her. Luke frequently concluded an account with such a departure (cf. 1:23, 56; 2:20; 5:25; 8:39; 24:12).

The Lukan Message

Although the present account involves a conversation between the angel Gabriel and the virgin Mary, the key figure in this section is clearly Mary's future offspring—Jesus, just as the key figure of the previous section was Zechariah and Elizabeth's future offspring—John the Baptist. As might be expected, Luke used this section dealing with Jesus' conception to reveal Christological insights to his readers. He did this through the same reliable messenger from God which the reader already met in 1:5–25. The angel Gabriel, coming from God's presence (1:19), informs us of what we should know about Jesus of Nazareth. Luke in no way minimized John the Baptist's greatness in describing Jesus. Rather he showed that whereas John was great, Jesus is greater still. This is shown in several ways. John was "great in the sight of the Lord" (1:15), but Jesus is "great" (1:32), and his greatness is unqualified. Whereas John is later described as "a prophet of the Most High" (1:76), Jesus is the "Son of the Most High" (1:32). Whereas John's birth was miraculous and had OT parallels, Jesus' birth was even more miraculous. John's conception, like that of Isaac, Samson, and Samuel, was miraculous; but Jesus' conception was absolutely unique. It was not just quantitatively greater; it was qualitatively different. Whereas John's task was to prepare for the Coming One (1:17, 76–79), Jesus is the Coming One who will reign forever (1:33); and whereas John was filled with the Spirit while still in the womb (1:15), Jesus' very conception would be due to the Spirit's miraculous activity in a virgin (1:35–37).

Various aspects of the Lukan Christology that appear in this passage are Jesus as the Son of God (1:32, 35), Jesus as the Davidic Messiah (1:32–33) and King whose reign is eternal (1:33), and Jesus as the Holy One (1:35). Jesus' greatness described in our text is not due to any human achievement on his part. The greatness of Mary's son is not a result of his human striving. In light of this account no adoptionist Christology can be found in Luke. Jesus is the Messiah and Son of God from birth. In fact he was this before birth as 1:41–45 indicates. Luke sought to show his readers that Jesus, who was already well known to them, was born in a unique way and was already Son of God, Christ, and King before his birth.

Several other Lukan emphases also appear in this account. These involve the Holy Spirit once again acting in history and his association with the power of God (1:35). We also have present a model of Christian obedience in Mary's acquiescence to the divine will (1:38). Finally, as in 1:5–25, we are not dealing with the literary genre of myth here. On the contrary Luke was

using the literary form of historical narrative and expected his readers to understand that he was recalling history. (See comments on 1:5–25, “The Lukan Message”).¹⁷⁶

The introduction of Mary and Joseph (1:26–27).

1:26–27. **In the sixth month**, that is, when Elizabeth was in her sixth month of pregnancy, **God sent ... Gabriel to Nazareth.**

Mary had not yet had sexual contact with a man, for Luke called her a **virgin** (*parthenon*; cf. 1:34) and noted that she was **pledged to be married to ... Joseph** (cf. 2:5). In Jewish culture then a man and woman were betrothed or pledged to each other for a period of time before the actual consummation of their marriage. This betrothal was much stronger than an engagement period today, for the two were considered husband and wife except that they did not live together till after the wedding.

b. The angel’s announcement of Jesus’ birth to Mary (1:28–38).

1:28–31. **The angel** said that **Mary** was **highly favored** (*kecharitōmenē*, a part¹⁷⁷. related to the noun *charis*, “grace”; the verb *charitoō* is used elsewhere in the NT only in Eph. 1:6). Also Mary had **found favor** (*charis*, “grace”) **with God**. Obviously God had bestowed a special honor on her. She was a special recipient of His grace.

Gabriel’s admonition (Luke 1:30–31) was the same as to Zechariah: **Do not be afraid, for you will have a Son** (cf. v. 13). As with John (v. 13b), the naming was by the angel (v. 31).

1:32–33. The angel predicted five things about Mary’s Son.

1. **He will be great.**

2. **He will be called the Son of the Most High** (cf. v. 76). The Septuagint often used the term “Most High” (*hypsistou*) to translate the Hebrew ‘elyôn (cf. v. 76). Mary could not have missed the significance of that terminology. The fact that her Baby was to be called the “Son of the Most High” pointed to His equality with Yahweh. In Semitic thought a son was a “carbon copy” of his father, and the phrase “son of” was often used to refer to one who possessed his

¹⁷⁶ Robert H. Stein, *Luke*, vol. 24, The New American Commentary (Nashville: Broadman & Holman Publishers, 1992), 80–87.

¹⁷⁷part. participle

“father’s” qualities (e.g., the Heb. trans¹⁷⁸. “son of wickedness” in Ps. 89:22 [KJ¹⁷⁹V] means a wicked person).

3. He will be given **the throne of His father David**. Jesus, as David’s descendant, will sit on David’s throne when He reigns in the Millennium (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:3–4, 28–29).

4. **He will reign over the house of Jacob forever**. Jesus’ reign over the nation Israel as her King will begin in the Millennium and continue on into the eternal state.

5. **His kingdom will never end**. These promises must have immediately reminded Mary of the promise of Yahweh to David (2 Sam. 7:13–16). David understood the prophecy as referring not only to his immediate son (Solomon) who would build the temple, but also to the future Son who would rule forever. David stated that Yahweh had spoken of the distant future (2 Sam. 7:19). Mary would have understood that the angel was speaking to her of the Messiah who had been promised for so long.

1:34–38. **Mary** did not seem surprised that the Messiah was to come. Rather, she was surprised that she would be His mother since she was **a virgin** (lit., “since I do not know a man”). But **the angel** did not rebuke Mary, as he had rebuked Zechariah (v. 20). This indicates that Mary did not doubt the angel’s words but merely wanted to know how such an event would be accomplished. The answer was that **the Holy Spirit** would creatively bring about the physical conception of Jesus (v. 35). This miraculous conception and Virgin Birth of Jesus Christ was necessary because of His deity and preexistence (cf. Isa. 7:14; 9:6; Gal. 4:4).

Like Zechariah, Mary was given a sign: **Elizabeth ... is going to have a child**. Mary affirmed her part in her Son’s subsequent birth by assenting to the plan of God: **May it be to me as You have said**. She willingly submitted to God’s plan, calling herself **the Lord’s servant** (*doulē*, “slave”; cf. Luke 1:48).

¹⁷⁸trans. translation, translator, translated

¹⁷⁹KJV King James Version

Big Facts

Luke 1:26-38

Introduction:

Attention: It's all about context. Sometimes we don't care about the story and the characters we just cut off for the solution.

Subject: The history of Jesus' birth is just as important as his coming to earth. His arrival is vital but his fulfillment is critical. He confirmed the historical facts by being born.

Scripture: Luke 1:26-38

Body: In every story characters matter too. If you don't the significance of the story then you will miss there role and the part they play.

I. Your Place in History v. 27-30

- a. A Virgin
 - i. Engaged – betrothed to Joseph

- 1. Joseph
- 2. Descendent of David
- ii. Mary
- b. Favored One
 - i. Favor to cause to be the recipient of a benefit, **bestow favor on, favor highly, bless**
 - 1. Eph 1:6- full of grace *which thou hast received*"
 - 2. The participle indicates that Mary has been especially favored by God in that he has already chosen her to be the mother of the Messiah (1:30)
 - 3. She had not been chosen for this task because she possessed a particular piety or holiness of life that merited this privilege.
 - 4. Here as in Judg 6:17; 2 Sam 15:25 (cf. 1 Sam 1:18) the issue is God's gracious choice, not Mary's particular piety (cf. Gen 6:8); for unlike Luke 1:6, nothing is made of Mary's personal piety either before or after this verse. The emphasis is on God's sovereign choice, not on human acceptability
 - ii. The Lord is with You
 - 1. The greeting conveys the message ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. This is an OT greeting (Jdg. 6:12; Ru. 2:14), meant as a statement rather than a wish (ἐστίν is to be supplied). It prepares the recipient for divine service with the assurance 'The Lord will help you'
 - 2. **The Lord is with you.** Compare Judg 6:12; Ruth 2:4. This is not a wish ("may the Lord be with you") but a statement and refers to God's mighty power being present and upon Mary.
- c. Perplexed – Confused She was both upset and puzzled.
 - i. Perplexed - But the rabbinic evidence is late and scanty, and Mary's wonder was occasioned more by the character of a greeting which addressed her in such exalted terms, and implied that, like the great men of OT times, she was chosen to serve God and to be empowered by him
 - ii. Pondered - reckoned up different reasons," is in itself against this. The verb is confined to the Synoptic Gospels (5:21, 22; Mk. 2:6, 8):
- d. No Need to be Afraid
 - i. Fear to be in an apprehensive state, **be afraid**, in the sense **become frightened**
 - ii. You have found favor
 - 1. God will deal with you kindly
 - a. **Do you see an inconvenience as a blessing**

The past matters. I take notes with my pen to listen to details because it helps in the present counseling

II. His Place in History v. 31-33

a. Bear a Son

i. Name His Jesus

1. Jesus Greek equivalent of the Hebrew "Jeshua" (or "Joshua"). In Matthew 1:21 the name was divinely appointed, "for He will save His people from their sins.
2. Christ," the anointed one, is a title that acknowledged that He was the expected Messiah of Israel. In the Gospels, Jesus is usually identified as "the Christ." After Peter's sermon at Pentecost in Acts 2:38, He was usually referred to as "Jesus Christ." This composite name joins the historic figure with the messianic role that prophetic expectation and early Christianity knew that He possessed.
 - a. **Isaiah 9:6 (NAS):** For a child will be born to us, a son will be given to us;
 - b. **Isaiah 7:14 (NAS):** Therefore the Lord Himself will give you a sign: Behold, a virgin will be with child and bear a son, and she will call His name Immanuel.
3. The name Ἰησοῦς corresponds to Hebrew *yəhôšúa'* or *yēšūā'*, and was a common Jewish name up to the beginning of the second century AD; thereafter both Jews and Christians ceased to call their children by it. Its meaning, 'Yahweh saves', was seen to be deeply significant (Mt. 1:21), and although Luke does not expressly draw attention to it, it is hard to believe that he was not aware of it

b. He will be Great

i. Great- **Great - to being above standard in intensity,**

1. As in ver. 15, this is forthwith explained; and the greatness of Jesus is very different from the greatness of John.
2. The mighty work God has done in John the Baptist's conception would be surpassed by an even greater miracle in the virginal conception of Jesus, God's Son.
3. Thus Jesus and John were both alike ("great") and different (Jesus' greatness is an unqualified greatness). This adjective functions not as a name but rather indicates his being and nature.

ii. Son of the Most High- The language of 2 Sam. 7:14 and Isa. 9:7 is combined here

1. Christ seldom used it of Himself (Mt. 27:43; Jn. 10:36). But we have it in the voice from heaven (3:22, 9:35); in Peter's confession (Mt. 16:16); in the centurion's exclamation (Mk. 15:39); in the devil's challenge (4:3, 9); in the cries of demoniacs (Mk. 3:11, 5:7). Very early the Christian Church chose it as a concise statement of the divine nature of Christ.

2. “Most High” is a circumlocution for God (Luke 1:35, 76; 6:35; Acts 7:48). Once again Jesus is shown to be greater than John the Baptist, for John is described as a “prophet” of the Most High (Luke 1:76) whereas Jesus is described as “Son” of the Most High. The mention of Jesus’ divine sonship before mention of his Davidic messiahship in the next part of the verse indicates that the latter is grounded in the former and that Jesus’ messiahship should be interpreted in terms of his sonship

iii. Throne of His father David

1. The use of πατέρ indicates that the child will be the royal messiah inasmuch as he is descended from David—hence the significance of the earlier reference to Joseph’s descent. (33) The messianic nature of the child’s rule over Israel is confirmed by the prophecy that it will be eternal. The thought is based on Is. 9:7 (cf. Mi. 4:7). βασιλεύω with ἐπί (instead of a simple genitive) imitates Hebrew *mālak ‘al* Mt. 2:22; Lk. 19:14, 27). ὁ ὄικος Ἰακώβ is a synonym for Israel (Ex. 19:3; Is. 2:5; *et al.*)
 - a. *Isaiah 11:1 (NAS): Then a shoot will spring from the stem of Jesse, And a branch from his roots will bear fruit.*
2. The title “Son of David” was publicly given to Jesus and never disputed (Mt. 1:1, 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 20:30, 31; Mk. 10:47, 48; Lk. 18:38, 39). The importance of the Davidic descent of Jesus is evident from 2:4; 3:23–38 (cf. Matt 1:1–17; Rom 1:3; 2 Tim 2:8).
3. These promises must have immediately reminded Mary of the promise of Yahweh to David (2 Sam. 7:13–16). David understood the prophecy as referring not only to his immediate son (Solomon) who would build the temple, but also to the future Son who would rule forever. David stated that Yahweh had spoken of the distant future (2 Sam. 7:19).

c. He will reign

- i. Over the house of Jacob – House of Jacob - Of the nation of Israel, the descendants of Jacob
 1. Like the previous description, this description depicts Jesus as the awaited Messiah. Thus, like David, he is the King of Israel. The “house of Jacob” was a traditional term to describe Israel (Exod 19:3; Isa 2:5–6; 8:17; 48:1).
- ii. Kingdom will have no end
 1. The eternity of the rule of David’s line is taught in 2 Sa. 7:13, 16; Is. 9:7; Ps. 89:3f., 28f.; 132:11f.; cf. Mi. 4:7 Dn. 7:14; In the OT the thought is sometimes of a continuing line of kings (1 Ki. 8:25; Ps. 132:12), but here the Messiah himself is to reign for ever
 - a. *Isaiah 9:7 (NAS): There will be no end to the increase of His government or of peace, On the throne of David and over his kingdom, To establish it and to uphold it with justice and*

righteousnessFrom then on and forevermore.The zeal of the Lord of hosts will accomplish this

2. He will be given **the throne of His father David**. Jesus, as David's descendant, will sit on David's throne when He reigns in the Millennium (2 Sam. 7:16; Ps. 89:3-4, 28-29)
 - a. 2 Samuel 7:14-16 (NAS): will be a father to him and he will be a son to Me; when he commits iniquity, I will correct him with the rod of men and the strokes of the sons of men, 15 but My lovingkindness shall not depart from him, as I took it away from Saul, whom I removed from before you.16 "Your house and your kingdom shall endure before Me forever; your throne shall be established forever."
3. The Jewish hope was of a kingdom in this world, but by NT times this was taking on transcendental features, described in terms of everlastingness and the return of paradise upon earth. The early church clearly associated the reign of Jesus with his resurrection and exaltation and linked this with the Davidic promises (Acts 2:30-36). This will have been Luke's understanding of the matter, but he is also conscious that the kingdom of God could be said to have arrived in the ministry of Jesus, so that the exaltation was the open recognition of One who had already acted in his earthly life with kingly power as the representative of God
4. The eternity of Christ's kingdom is assured by the fact that it is to be absorbed in the kingdom of the Father (1 Cor. 15:24-28)
 - a. Daniel 7:13-14 (NAS): kept looking in the night visions, And behold, with the clouds of heaven. One like a Son of Man was coming, And He came up to the Ancient of Days And was presented before Him. 14 "And to Him was given dominion, Glory and a kingdom, That all the peoples, nations and men of every language Might serve Him. His dominion is an everlasting dominion Which will not pass away; And His kingdom is one, Which will not be destroyed.
5. This may be an allusion to Isa 9:6 (LXX) or to Dan 7:14. The kingdom of God that is realized in the coming of Jesus and is to be consummated at the parousia will continue forever. At times this title is a synonym for Messiah/Christ (4:41; Acts 9:20, 22). We find a similar paralleling of the title "Son of God" and of the Davidic Messiah in Rom 1:3-4. Yet Jesus cannot be described simply in messianic terms such as the Son of David. He is more than this, and the title "Son of God" carries with it other implications as well.

III. History Will be Made

- a. Nothing will be impossible - This is plain from Gen 18:14: μὴ ἀδυνατεῖ παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ ὁ ἔργον; *i.e.* “Hath God said, and can He not do it?” or, Is anything which God has promised impossible? “be void of power”
 - i. Compare Gen 18:14 (LXX), where the same expression is found; cf. also Matt 19:26; Job 42:2; Zech 8:6 for the same thought. This refers primarily to Mary’s conceiving as a virgin,
- Bondslave -The scene closes with Mary’s humble acceptance of the will of God. δούλη

Conclusion: When the couples see their story they will recognize all things are possible.