

Luke 5:39—What are the Old Wine and the New Wine Mentioned Here?

Mineko Honda

Abstract

Many interpreters interpret Luke 5:33-29 as parables to declare the newness and superiority of Jesus' good news, and hence the newness and superiority of Christianity over against the Judaism, which is old and legalistic and therefore to be superseded by Christianity.

However, Luke's Gospel¹⁾ stresses that Jesus fulfills God's promise in the Old Testament, and there is no comment by Jesus himself in this Gospel that implies he is against Judaism. By looking at Luke's idea of Jesus' ministry as fulfillment of the Old Testament on one hand and reassessing what must have been new teaching in the first century, Flusser and Young suggest that we should interpret the old wine as the traditional Jewish faith, in which Jesus put himself, and the new wine as the radical teaching at that time advocated and practiced by only a part of Jewish people, such as represented by the Pharisees in Luke's Gospel. This interpretation looks more natural than the first one. However, it is not satisfactory because it fails to pay adequate attention to the newness of Jesus' ministry.

The third possible interpretation, which we make in light of Mark 7:1-9 is to interpret the new patch of cloth and wine as Jesus' ministry, the old cloth and old wineskin as the tradition of the elders, which, the Pharisees held as the "old" tradition. Jesus was criticising too much adherence to this. Yet then, the "old wine" which is to be valued as "better" in verse 39, when first read, seems perplexing. Readers are forced to rethink what in fact is the old wine. The majority of people in the first century still held the older traditional way of observing Judaism better than the innovative Pharisaic ways. Luke shows Jesus to be in this "old wine" tradition, suggesting his ministry is the fulfillment and perfection of that Old Testament tradition and promises.

Luke 5:33-39 ³³ They said to him, "John's disciples often fast and pray, and so do the disciples of the Pharisees, but yours go on eating and drinking." ³⁴ Jesus answered, "Can you make the guests of the bridegroom fast while he is with them?" ³⁵ But the time will come when the bridegroom will be taken from them; in those days they will fast." ³⁶ He told them this parable: "No one tears a patch from a new garment and sews it on an old one. If he does, he will have torn the new garment, and the patch from the new will not

match the old. ³⁷ And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the new wine will burst the skins, the wine will run out and the wineskins will be ruined. ³⁸ No, new wine must be poured into new wineskins. ³⁹ And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, "The old is better." (NIV)

I Our problem to solve and aim of this paper

Jesus' parabolic words in Luke 5:33-35 are put in a context of his apologetics for his teaching and practices, made against the Pharisaic criticisms, especially, against their accusation of his allowing his disciples not to observe fasts as often as the Pharisees and John the Baptist's disciples.

While the meaning of the parable of the wedding and bridegroom in vv. 33-35 seems quite clear, that is, it is to show how it should be impossible for his disciples to fast while Jesus is present among the them, the meaning of vv 36-39 is not so, and mainly two interpretations have been offered.

Until quite recently, and perhaps even now, the dominant interpretation has been that the new garment and the new wine refer to Jesus' movement of the kingdom of God, while the old garment and the old wineskins refer to Judaism. For instance, I. H. Marshall says, as to v. 27, "[t]he real point is the incompatibility of the two pieces of cloth, and the contrast of new and old is implicit.[...] To take only part of Jesus' message is to spoil the whole of it, and even a part of it is incompatible with the old life of Judaism." He says the point of the parable of the new wine and the old wineskins is "essentially the same." "To attempt to contain the gospel within the bounds of Judaism will only destroy both. But the saying goes further and makes the positive point: the gospel is radically new (cf. F. Hahn, 30) and must be allowed to express itself in its own way."²) On this interpretation, he interprets v.39 as an irony, "The verse expresses the viewpoint of those who are content with the old, because they think it is good, and make no effort to try the new. It is thus an ironical comment on the Jews who refused to taste the 'new wine' of the gospel which was not hallowed by age."³) J. A. Fitzmyer also sees "the real point" of vv. 36-37 "to be the incompatibility of the old and the new," and reads v. 39 as an irony, using a proverbial saying which is obvious to everyone: "The proverb used by Jesus is a wry comment on the effect that clinging to the old has on those who have closed their minds to his message about the new economy of salvation.[...] On the face of it, the saying would support Jewish rejection of Jesus' preaching. But by its irony the saying carries just the opposite meaning."⁴) In the same vein, A. A. Just comments on the two parables that "the new garment and the new wine have the same point: the arrival of the new era of salvation in Jesus. What is happening in the ministry of Jesus is qualitatively, radically *new*. It cannot be appended to or contained in the old."⁵) As to v. 39, he, too, sees this as an irony, agreeing with Marshall who says this is "an ironical comment on the Jews who refused to taste the 'new wine' of the gospel which was not hallowed by age."⁶) R. C. Tannehill is also in the same line of interpretation, though he does not use the word "irony" or "ironic", when he says, "The newness includes Jesus' claim to forgive

sins (5:24), his sharing in parties with tax collectors and sinners, and also his attitude toward the Sabbath (6:1-11). On all these points there are conflicts with the scribes and Pharisees, who here represent the old. Jesus, in Luke, is insisting that his community be allowed to adopt the new ways of acting that fit their new situation. The statement in verse 39, found only in Luke is probably a sober recognition of continuing opposition because of the strong tendency to stick with the old.”⁷⁾ Similarly, L.T. Johnson comments that the three parabolic aphorisms in vv. 36-39 “illustrate the distance between the kingdom proclaimed by Jesus and the religious perceptions of his contemporaries.” Jesus’ message is the new garment and new wine. “Worse than useless to try to match it to the old forms of piety and politics. Such a compromise between this *novum* and the conventional leads to the loss of what is new and the destruction of what is old.[...] The final parabolic statement—found only in Luke—reminds us again of the capacity of this message to repel as well as to attract, and the way in which the visitation of the prophet creates a division within the people. Those who are most accustomed to the old wine will not even taste the new; the old, they say, is good enough. To drink the new wine offered at Jesus’ banquet, to wear the new garment for his wedding feast, one must have a new heart, go through *metanoia*, a change of mind, such as that shown by tax-agents and sinners.”⁸⁾ B. Byrne also sees the new wine as Jesus’ new kingdom in his comment on Luke 7:18-28 where he says John “belongs to those of the previous age who have difficulty adjusting to the “new wine” of the kingdom.”⁹⁾

However, there are some who frankly admit it is difficult to interpret the old wine in v. 39 as the Judaism represented by the first century Pharisees and the new wine as Jesus’ kingdom, for, it is a truism that the old wine is better than new wine, and, therefore, even as an irony, a metaphor which uses old wine negatively is hard to be accepted. Thus, C. H. Talbert suggests to interpret the new cloth and wine/the old garment and skins in vv. 36-38 and the new wine/the old wine as referring to different things. His suggestion is that “The difficulty in interpreting 5:39 is due to our attempt to understand “old” and “new” in the same way in vs. 39 and in vss. 36-38. In vs. 39 “old” should be paraphrased “good” and “new” by “inferior,” because here the inferior system of the Pharisees and Baptists.”¹⁰⁾

D. Flusser and, agreeing with him, B. H. Young maintain that the new patch of the garment and the new wine refer to the John Baptist and the Pharisees in Jesus’ times who had introduced new fast days and extra regulations into their religious practices. Compared to their “new” way of observing the law, the Judaism that Jesus was in was “old” and therefore “better.”

In this paper, we shall assess the viability of these two opposite interpretations with their respective merits and difficulties, and by way of conclusion, hope to offer an interpretation which will possibly be more naturally accepted than either of these. In order to do that, we shall also take the parallel passages in Mark 2:21-22¹¹⁾ into consideration.

II The old garment, the old wine and old wineskins=Judaism vs. the new garment, new wine=Jesus' kingdom

We have already seen several examples of this interpretation, that is, to see the old wine and old wineskins as representing Judaism and the new garment and new wine as representing Jesus' kingdom. Here, therefore, we do not need to describe this further. The merit of this type of interpretation is that it accords with the new aspects of Jesus' ministry in Judaism, such as healing people with the serious skin disease by directly touching them, or to share table fellowship with those who are regarded as sinners and marginalized in the society. It also seems to fit with Jesus' declaration in Luke 16:16: "The Law and the Prophets were proclaimed until John. Since that time, the good news of the kingdom of God is being preached [...]" Yet, on the other hand, this seems to be sheer contrary to Luke's scheme to present Jesus as the fulfillment of God's promise to Israel, that is, Jewish people. At the beginning of Luke's Gospel, in the revelation by the Angel Gabriel to Mary, the baby to be born, i. e. Jesus, is presented to be the Davidic Messiah who will fulfill the prophecy of Nathan to King David. As God promised David through Nathan, "I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever. I will be his father, and he will be my son" (2 Sam 7:13-14; cf. Ps 2:7),¹²⁾ it is said of Jesus, "^{1:32} He will be great and will be called the Son of the Most High. The Lord God will give him the throne of his father David,³³ and he will reign over the house of Jacob forever; his kingdom will never end" (Luke 1:32-33).

Secondly and more importantly, Luke presents that arrival of the King Messiah as fulfillment of God's promise to the People of Israel, to bring them salvation. Simeon, a righteous and devout man who had been waiting to see the consolation of Israel, led by Holy Spirit, recognizes in the baby Jesus God's "salvation," that God have prepared "in the sight of all people,³² a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to [God's] people Israel." The same way, a prophetess Anna sees in Jesus the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38). The theme of salvation and redemption is again apparent in 4:17 where Jesus reads from the scroll of Isaiah, "^{7:18} 'The Spirit of the Lord is on me, because he has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to proclaim freedom for the prisoners and recovery of sight for the blind, to release the oppressed,¹⁹ to proclaim the year of the Lord's favor.'^{note13)} ²⁰ Then he rolled up the scroll, gave it back to the attendant and sat down. The eyes of everyone in the synagogue were fastened on him,²¹ and he began by saying to them, "Today this scripture is fulfilled in your hearing" (Luke 7:18-21). From the first of his Gospel, therefore, Luke makes it clear that he is presenting Jesus event as the fulfillment of the Old Testament prophecies. This point is stressed again in the last chapter, where the risen Jesus appeared to two of his disciples. As the disciples do not recognize it is Jesus himself, he tells them, "How foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken! [...]"²⁷ And beginning with Moses and all the Prophets, he explained to them what was said in all the Scriptures concerning himself" (Luke 24:25, 27). Thus, Luke starts and concludes his Gospel, stressing that Jesus event has been the fulfillment of the OT

prophesies and promise of God. Anyway, Luke's Jesus never says he would abolish or supersede the law, but rather, even when he says, "The Law and the Prophets were proclaimed until John," stresses on its permanent importance: "It is easier for heaven and earth to disappear than for the least stroke of a pen to drop out of the Law" (Luke 16:16-17) .

Reading Luke's Gospel this way, and admitting the continuity of the Old Testament prophesies and Jesus event, it does not seem proper to interpret the new patch of garment and new wine as Jesus' message and activities, regarding them as not fitting Judaism, which is the people Israel's religion.

Besides, as we have noted being pointed out by some interpreters, it is obvious that the old wine is better than new wine, and it is contrary to our imagination and sensibility to accept that the old wine is meant to express something actually inferior, even if it were meant to be an irony. Even the first-century listeners or readers of Luke's Gospel would hardly have taken it or understood it as an ironical expression to criticize the stubbornness of the Jewish fundamentalists.

Moreover, this interpretation fails to distinguish between the Jewish people in general on one hand and the Pharisees and John the Baptist's followers on the other.

III The old garment, the old wine and old wineskins=Judaism and Jesus' kingdom vs. the new garment, new wine=radical movement of the Pharisees and John the Baptist

Against the first view, then, D. Flusser¹⁴⁾ and also his former student B. H. Young argue that the patch from new garment and new wine should be interpreted as the radical movement and practice of John the Baptist and the Pharisees in the first century.

Flusser, while admitting "It is true that there are New Testament passages, in which the new content of Christianity stands in contrast to the old message of Judaism: see Rom. 7:6 and Hbr. 8:13 (cf. Ep. 4:22-24 and Col. 3:9-10)," points out that such passages occur all in "the second, 'Pauline' stratum of Christianity"¹⁵⁾ and argues that here, a patch from a new garment and new wine in vv. 36-37 refer to the newly introduced twice-a-week fast days practiced by the Pharisees.

The question touches on the special fast days of John's disciples and the Pharisees—and not the days of fasting of the Jewish liturgical year, e.g. the biblical Day of Atonement. We only know that "John came, neither eating nor drinking" (Mt. 11:18), but nothing particular about John and his disciples' fasts. The Pharisees' fasts must assuredly be those which were observed twice weekly, on Mondays and Thursdays (see Luke 18:12 and Didache 8:1). It is impossible to know, how many accepted these fasts; even today there are Jews who fast twice a week, but I personally do not know such persons. Jesus and his disciples did not practice this custom, which was introduced in order to bring the people to repent. Repentance is one of the important components of Jewish fasting, and this was surely also one of the aims of the particular fasts of John's disciples and of the Pharisees. Jesus

compared this practice in instituting new fasts with a new patch and new wine. He considered such a reform as basically ineffective¹⁶.

B. H. Young, agreeing Flosser to see that in Luke 5:33-39 “Jesus is questioned concerning the additional fasts introduced to the Jewish liturgical calendar by John the Baptist and the Pharisees,” and that in an answer to their criticism, Jesus was arguing against their radical ways of reformation.

Jesus was spear heading a renewal movement within the Judaism of his day. His approach to reform was much less radical than the Pharisees or John the Baptist, though all of them desired a return to the people’s spiritual heritage. The fasting of John’s disciples and the Pharisees was one way to call for revival. The disciples of Jesus apparently did not observe these additional fasts. Jesus answers the question about fasting with two parables. The form of these two parables and their Hebrew background are firmly rooted in the teaching of Jesus.[...] The emphasis on the old wine indicates that all the talk about fasting may not be the answer for the true spiritual renewal. In modern times, however, Jesus’ saying about the old wine has been overlooked and sometimes emphasis has wrongly been focused on the new wine. No one should forget that when it comes to wine, the old is better than the new. Jesus seems to speak about the rich Hebrew heritage of Judaism in his day with the highest esteem¹⁷.

In this interpretation the old wine “refers to the ancient faith and practices of the Jewish people.”¹⁸

He [i.e Jesus] did not teach that Judaism should be abolished.[...] On the contrary, when he says that the old wine is better, he is upholding the finest contributions of ancient Judaism and seeking wholehearted reform from within. The old wine is the Judaism of his time. It is best¹⁹.

The greatest advantage of this interpretation may be that it does not contradict Luke’s emphasis that Jesus event is the fulfillment of God’s promise to the people Israel that was given them through the prophets in the Old Testament, though Young seems to be a little inconsistent at the last part of the above remark. If Young sees Jesus movement as a “reform” of Judaism from within, he is admitting that Jesus thought it necessary for the Judaism of his time to undergo reformation. Perhaps, Jesus in Luke 5:39 means that the Judaism of his time is better than the Pharisees’ way, though it is to be better still and perfected in the fulfillment of God’s promise and salvation.

On the other hand, it has also some difficulties. First of all, if the remark was directed to the Pharisees as a criticism, its point would not be understood by the Pharisees themselves, for they would not have been thinking their way as “new” no more than the present radical

conservatists or fundamentalists think themselves as “new.”

Secondly, this interpretation ignores the newness of some conspicuous aspects of Jesus movement which are also apparent in this Gospel, such as Jesus’ sharing table-fellowship with those who are regarded as sinners—as is recorded just before our text! —(5:29-32), healing of the diseases that are regarded as unclean by direct touching by hand (5:13), and most of all, resuscitation of the dead (7:14-15; 8:54-55).

IV An interpretation, taking Mark’s parallel text into consideration.

Is there any other possible interpretation? One possibility is perhaps to interpret the new garment and wine as Jesus’ movement while the old garment and wineskins as the sayings of the elder which was highly regarded and practiced by many of the Pharisees of the first century. This interpretation comes naturally from Mark’s parallel text which Luke must have used as the original of our text:

^{2:21}No one sews a patch of unshrunk cloth on an old garment. If he does, the new piece will pull away from the old, making the tear worse. ²² And no one pours new wine into old wineskins. If he does, the wine will burst the skins, and both the wine and the wineskins will be ruined. No, he pours new wine into new wineskins.”(Mark 2:21-22)

This passage is not accompanied by “the old [wine] is better” saying. On the other hand, in Mark, there is a conspicuous passage that Luke has omitted in his Gospel where Jesus criticises the Pharisees’ too much adherence to “the tradition of elders,” that is the oral tradition in addition to the written law in the Old Testament:

^{7:1} The Pharisees and some of the teachers of the law who had come from Jerusalem gathered around Jesus and ² saw some of his disciples eating food with hands that were “unclean,” that is, unwashed. ³ (The Pharisees and all the Jews do not eat unless they give their hands a ceremonial washing, holding to the tradition of the elders. ⁴ When they come from the marketplace they do not eat unless they wash. And they observe many other traditions, such as the washing of cups, pitchers and kettles.) ⁵ So the Pharisees and teachers of the law asked Jesus, “Why don’t your disciples live according to the tradition of the elders instead of eating their food with ‘unclean’ hands?” ⁶ He replied, “Isaiah was right when he prophesied about you hypocrites; as it is written: ““These people honor me with their lips, but their hearts are far from me. ⁷ They worship me in vain; their teachings are but rules taught by men.’ ⁸ You have let go of the commands of God and are holding on to the traditions of men.” ⁹ And he said to them: “You have a fine way of setting aside the commands of God in order to observe your own traditions! (Mark 7:1-9)

In this passage, Mark generalizes the Pharisees observing the oral law to “all the Jews” as if

the custom was generally accepted by most of the general people as well as by the especially pious Pharisees. However, it is pointed out, “Technically, only ‘the Pharisees,’ who sought to create ‘in everyday life the conditions of purity required in the Temple’ (Neusner, *NTS* 22[1975-76] 494, 2; idem, *JAAR* 43[1975]25), and Essenes, who appear to have rigorously applied the purity provisions of the priests (Exod 30:17-21; 40:12) to the laity, were so concerned about purity.[...] “All the Jews” reflects the accepted practice of generalizing about a group. Mark uses $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ this way in 1:5, 32, 33; 6:33; 11:11”²⁰⁾ As to the matter of washing hand, Neusner demonstrates it was still a controversial matter within the Pharisees and was not anyway an accepted practice by all the Jews. Witherington III remarks that the Pharisees “in a sense believed in a real priesthood of all believers, and therefore all Jews were called to priestly cleanness,”²¹⁾ and this was in the background of their washing hands when the the laity in general saw it unnecessary to do so. Jesus was not against any general practice of Judaism, but against that of the Pharisees, and that, only a part of them.

In this vein, we can interpret Luke 5:36-39 that Jesus is advocating his ways, such as sharing table-fellowship with sinners and not fasting as often as the Pharisees depicted by the Gospel authors do, comparing the kingdom of God whose arrival he is proclaiming to the new garment and new wine. In this, the old garment and the old wineskins are to be interpreted as the tradition of the elders and what the Pharisees saw as of the age-long worth and validity.

When the Lukan Jesus goes on to say, “And no one after drinking old wine wants the new, for he says, ‘The old is better,’” however, readers will feel perplexed. Yet, I should suggest that this effect on readers is intentional by the author. Readers—and in this context, the Pharisees who are the listeners of Jesus words—are forced by this paradoxical saying to rethink what, in reality, is the true old wine. In Mark, the Pharisees are told “You have a fine way of setting aside the commands of God in order to observe your own traditions!” (7:9). It is made clear that what Pharisees are insisting on as “old tradition,” that is, “the tradition of the elders,” is not in fact the true old tradition, and that the real good old tradition expressed in the Bible (i.e. the Bible for Jesus, which is the Old Testament for the Christians) is what is represented by Jesus. However, Luke has omitted this Markan passage so that readers have to think the answer by themselves. Yet, still, every reader at the time of Luke would have agreed that the commandments of God, which were written in the Old Testament, especially in the book of Moses and the prophets, were “the old” and “better” laws than the oral laws, which were merely the tradition of elders. This is Jesus’ point in v. 39, and this interpretation accords with the passages both preceding and following this passages, where Jesus’ acts contradict the tradition of elders while according with the spirit of the Old Testament that stresses God’s mercy.

V Conclusion

Thus, by interpreting Luke 5:36-29 in light of Mark 7:1-9, we can understand the new wine and new garment as Jesus’ new movement, and the old garment and old wineskins as what the Pharisees in the first century called the tradition of the elders. The “old wine” which looks

perplexing when taken to refer to the same thing as the old garment/winskins would make readers contemplate what is the real old wine, making them reinterpret and identify “the old wine” with the Jewish religious tradition and belief in the Old Testament itself, whose promise Luke believes Jesus is fulfilling. Jesus’ kingdom of God is in a sense new, but at the same time, rooted in the real Old Testament belief, which is “better” than the tradition of elders. Luke’s Jesus is suggesting here that while his kingdom is like new wine, which cannot be contained or regulated by the tradition of the elders, it is in accord with the real old wine, which is in continuation of the real Biblical tradition, shared with majority of ordinary people in the first century, and which fulfills the God’s promise in the Old Testament, that is THE Bible for the people Israel. Jesus’ kingdom is new, and at the same time, as the perfection of the old wine, which will be really “good.”

End Notes

- 1) The name of the author of the Gospel of Luke is actually not known. However, in this paper, we use the generally used name “Luke” to refer to the author, assuming also that the author was a male, to make the discussion simpler.
- 2) I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: The Paternoster Press, 1978), pp. 227-228. Hahn’s article that Marshall is referring to her is F. Hahn, “Die Bildworte vom neuen Flcken und vom jungen Wein”, *EvT* 31(1971), pp. 357-375.
- 3) Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 228.
- 4) Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-X, The Anchor Bible 28 (The Anchor Bible)*, Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1981). pp. 601-602.
- 5) Arthur A. Just Jr., *Luke, 1:1-9:50* (Concordia Commentary Series) (Saint Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1996), pp. 248-249.
- 6) Just, *Luke*, p. 249. Quotation is from Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke*, p. 228 as we see above.
- 7) Robert C. Tannehill, *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1996.) , p. 109
- 8) Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Sacra Pagina Series 3) (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991), pp. 99-100.
- 9) Byrne, Brendan. *The Hospitality of God: A Reading of Luke’s Gospel* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000), pp. 71-72.
- 10) Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Luke: A Literary and Theological Commentary*, rev ed. (Macon, Georgia: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), p. 67.
- 11) There is a parallel passage also in Matthew 9:14-17. Yet we shall discuss only Mark’s passage, which is, according to general scholarly agreement today, one of the sources used by Luke.
- 12) Tannehill, *Luke*, p. 49; About the Jewish expectation for a Davidic royal Messiah, cf. also Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), pp. 35-57.
- 13) This quotation is mixture of Isaiah 61:1-2 “The Spirit of the Sovereign LORD is on me, because the LORD has anointed me to preach good news to the poor. He has sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim freedom for the captives and release from darkness for the prisoners, ² to proclaim the year of the LORD’s favor and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all who mourn, and a part of Isaiah 58:6 “to set the oppressed free “with a slight change, with a part of 58:6 inserted between 61:1 and 2 , omitting Two phrases are omitted: “to bind up the brokenhearted” and “the day of vengeance of our God.” As Fitzmyer says, “The omission of the former is of little consequence; but the latter is a deliberate suppression of a negative aspect of the Deutero-Isaian message” (Joseph A. Fitzmyer. *The Gospel according to Luke I-X*, p. 532).
- 14) David Flusser, “Do You Prefer New Wine?” *Immanuel* 9 (1979), 26-31.

- 15) Flusser, "Do You Prefer New Wine?" p. 28.
- 16) Flusser, "Do You Prefer New Wine?" p. 28.
- 17) Brad H. Young, *Jesus the Jewish Theologian* (Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995), p. 156.
- 18) Young, *Jesus the Jewish Theologian*, p. 156.
- 19) Young, *Jesus the Jewish Theologian*, p. 157.
- 20) Robert A. Guelich, *Mark 1-8:26* (Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 34A) (Dallas, Texas: Word Books, publisher, 1989). pp. 363-364; Guelich's reference is to Jacob Neusner's articles "First Cleanse the Inside," *New Testament Studies* 22 (1975), pp. 486-495 and "The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism" *Journal of the American Academy of Religion* vol. 43, no. 1 (Mar., 1975), pp. 15-26.
- 21) Ben Witherington III, *The Gospel of Mark: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), p. 224.

要 旨

ルカによる福音書5:39における「古いぶどう酒」と 「新しいぶどう酒」は何に言及しているのか

本 多 峰 子

ルカによる福音書5:36-29は、しばしば、イエスの弟子がファリサイ派の人々やヨハネのように断食を守らないことを非難されたイエスが、結婚式の時に花婿がいるのに断食はできないはずだ、との弁明をしたのに続いて、自分の教えが全く新しいものでユダヤ教とは合わないし、ユダヤ教には納まらないとの意味で語った譬えだと解釈される。そして、39節は、古いユダヤ教にしがみついて新しいイエスの神の国を味わおうとさえない頑迷さを皮肉っている、と解釈される。しかし、問題はルカが自分の福音書を旧約聖書の約束の成就として提示していること、古いぶどう酒は明らかに良いイメージであって、それを否定的な意味で解釈させようとするのは無理があるのではないかということである。

ヤングやクロッサンはこうした見方に反対して、イエスが「新しいもの」と言ったのは、イエスの教えのことではなく、イエス当時のファリサイ派や洗礼者ヨハネの教団が、旧約の律法に定められているよりも過度に多くの戒めを守るようになり、それを人々にも要求するようになっていたことを指しているのだろう、と解釈する。そして、そのような大改革よりも、むしろ、古くからのユダヤ教の生き方のなかで宗教改革をしようとしたのがイエスのやり方で、そのような古くからのユダヤ教の方を人々が「古いものが良い」と感じているのを肯定しているのだと言う。この読みは、古いぶどう酒の方が良いというという自然な読みをねじ曲げる必要がなく、最初の読みよりはよいと考えられるが、それでも、イエス運動の新しさや、まだ当時のユダヤ教には改革の必要があるとイエスが考えていたからこそ彼の改革運動があったことを考えると、そのままでは受け入れることができない。

そこで、この箇所をマルコ7:1-9のファリサイ派批判、すなわちファリサイ派の人々は「昔の人の言い伝え」にこだわって本当の信仰から外れている、との批判を考慮に入れて読むと、ルカ5:36-39のイエスは、36節から38節で自分の宣教する神の国が新しいぶどう酒にたとえられる画期的なものであることを示しながら、39節で、ファリサイ派の「古い教え」が本当に、より良いものなのか、真に良いぶどう酒は、何であるかを読者に考え直させることで、ファリサイ派の人々のいわゆる古い教えよりも良いと一般の人に思われている、真の古来の信仰、真の古いぶどう酒の伝統、を肯定することで、イエス自身がその伝統の中にいることを印象付け、彼の運動がそれを成就するものであることを示しているのであると理解することができる。