

LUKE'S CONCEPTION OF PROPHETS

LUKE'S CONCEPTION OF PROPHETS
CONSIDERED IN THE CONTEXT OF SECOND TEMPLE LITERATURE

By
DAVID MILLER, B.A., M.A.

A Thesis
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements
for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

© Copyright by David Miller, October 2004

ABSTRACT

The fresh assessment of Luke's conception of prophets undertaken in this thesis is doubly warranted, both by recent scholarly debate about Second Temple Jewish beliefs concerning prophets and by ongoing discussion about Luke's terminology for prophets. The results of the thesis shed light not only on the role of prophets in Luke-Acts, but also on the author's familiarity with beliefs about prophets held by (other) Second Temple Jewish writers.

The results also challenge contemporary scholarship regarding Luke's Christology and his conception of salvation history. Luke does not distinguish prophets according to the period of salvation history to which they belong, nor does he suggest that prophecy had ceased. Instead, the prophets in Luke's infancy narrative join with the biblical prophets as they anticipate the time of fulfillment initiated by Jesus' birth. Luke was aware of expectations concerning the return of Elijah, but there is little evidence in Luke-Acts or in Second Temple literature for a belief in the "prophet like Moses" understood as an independent eschatological figure. Luke limits Jesus' prophetic role to his earthly life, subsuming it under the all-encompassing category of royal Messiah.

Luke attributes a fairly consistent but not unique range of characteristics to prophets. Though non-prophets sometimes "prophesy," the title "prophet" is reserved for individuals who served as prophets over an extended period of time. While the events of Pentecost led to an increase in prophetic activity among Jesus' followers, Luke does not portray all believers as prophets. That Luke does not identify members of the Twelve or the Seven as "prophets" points to a shift in focus: In Luke, Jesus is portrayed against the

background of Scripture and first century Jewish life as one who functioned as a prophet and as the Messiah. In Acts, as exalted Messiah and Lord, Jesus becomes the primary background against which Luke's story of the church is told.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was carried out with the assistance of two Ontario Graduate Scholarships and a doctoral fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I am grateful to the provincial government of Ontario and to the federal government of Canada, whose commitment to scholarship in the humanities and social sciences made it possible for me to complete this thesis without incurring financial debt.

Other debts of a less tangible nature remain outstanding. The least I can do is to acknowledge some of them here. My supervisor, Stephen Westerholm, cheerfully undertook the not-so-cheerful task of reading several drafts of each chapter. His gracious encouragement helped me to persevere, and his careful criticism did much to improve the style and substance of my work. Adele Reinhartz, Anders Runesson and Eileen Schuller also made time in their busy schedules to read and comment on an early draft of three chapters as well as on a complete draft of the whole thesis. I have benefited greatly from their suggestions, challenges and support. I am well aware that it is not possible to repay my readers—except perhaps by seeking to emulate the consistently high standards of scholarship and character they display. (Of course, I take full responsibility for any errors that remain.)

The Canadian Friends of Hebrew University and the Bat Kol Institute made possible a wonderful year of study in Israel, during which time I began work on what is now the second chapter of my thesis and the first chapter of my marriage to Tenyia. Needless to say, Tenyia has done much to make "work" on both chapters a pleasant

experience.

My interest in biblical scholarship was first seriously engaged while a student at Briercrest College. My decision to pursue this interest further owes much to the good influence of my former teacher and current colleague, Wes Olmstead.

My interest in the Bible was first inspired by my parents, John and Helen Miller, whose lives embody what it means to hear the word of God. It is to them that this thesis is dedicated.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter One: Introduction	1
The Use of Second Temple Jewish "Background"	7
How to Tell a Prophet When You See One	9
Evaluating the Formative Role of Scripture	15
Of Authorship, Tradition and Redaction	17
Chapter Two: Eschatological Prophets and Prophecy in Second Temple Judaism	20
The Existence of Prophets in the Second Temple Period	21
An Absence of Prophets	26
Prophets and the Past	31
The Title "Prophet" Applied to Contemporary Figures	32
Inspired Experiences	35
Conclusion	38
Eschatological Prophets	41
The Eschatological Elijah	42
Elijah in Ben Sira 48	46
Elijah in 4Q521	49
Conclusion	52
The Prophet Like Moses	53
Deut 18:15-19 and Past Prophets	56
Deut 18:15-19 and "The Prophet"	57
The "Sign Prophets"	60
Excursus: The Prophet like Moses and "Signs and Wonders"	67
Conclusion	72
The Isaianic Messenger	74
All God's People	80

Conclusion	82
Chapter Three: Prophets in Luke-Acts	84
Prophets from the Past	86
Past Prophets as Message Bearers	86
The Identity of Past Prophets	88
Abel and Zechariah as Prophets	88
Moses as a Prophet	92
David as a Prophet	94
The Activities of Prophets	96
Conclusion	96
Prophets as Characters in Luke-Acts	97
Anna the Prophetess	98
John the Baptist	100
Jesus as Prophet	102
Jesus as Prophet and Messiah	102
The Popular Response to Jesus as a Prophet	112
Agabus and the Prophets from Jerusalem	115
Paul, Barnabas, and the Prophets at Antioch	117
Judas and Silas	119
Towards a Definition of "Prophet"	123
Prophets and Those who "Prophesy"	126
Other Central Characteristics of Prophets	136
Other Possible Prophets	140
Simeon	140
Philip's Daughters	143

Zechariah.....	144
Are the Twelve and the Seven also Among the Prophets?	146
Evidence of Prophetic Characterization.....	146
Jesus as the Background to Acts	151
The Role of Prophets in the Early Jesus Movement.....	156
Conclusion	158
Chapter Four: Prophets and the Three-fold Division of Salvation History	160
Did Prophecy Cease?	162
The Case for an Intertestamental Period	166
Comparing Prophets in the Distant and More Recent Past.....	167
Distinguishing Features of the Biblical Prophets.....	168
Distinguishing Features of Prophets During Jesus' Ministry and After Pentecost .	173
Similarities in the Portrayal of Prophets	176
Conclusion	186
Chapter Five: The Eschatological Elijah in Luke-Acts.....	191
The Elijah of 1 and 2 Kings	193
Elijah and the Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:25-26)	193
The Widows of Zarephath and Nain (Luke 7:11-17).....	195
Fire from Heaven (Luke 9:51-56).....	201
Calling Disciples (Luke 9:57-62).....	202
Perverting the Nation (Luke 23:2)	203
The Ascension and the Giving of the Spirit.....	203
The Elijah of Malachi	210
The "Coming One" and Malachi 3.....	213

The Identity of the "Coming One"	217
Jesus as the Messianic Lord.....	219
Restoring Israel	224
The Nature of Elijah's Return	228
Conclusion	233
Chapter 6: From "Prophet like Moses" to Exalted "Lord"	236
Evidence for a Moses-Jesus Typology	239
Stephen's Speech.....	239
The "Raising Up" of the Prophet Like Moses	243
Circumstantial Arguments	247
Parallels between Jesus and his Disciples.....	250
The Call to Repentance and the Pattern of Rejection	251
The Promise of Abrahamic Blessing	255
Conclusion	258
The Exodus	259
Minor Allusions in the Context of the Transfiguration	261
Jesus' Exodus	265
Signs and Wonders	270
The Relation of "Wonders and Signs" to the Joel Quotation.....	272
"Signs and Wonders" or "Wonders and Signs"	278
"Signs and Wonders," "Wonders and Signs," and Moses.....	283
Persecution.....	288
Redemption.....	293
Jesus as Messiah, Prophet like Moses and Isaianic Servant	297
The Significance of Moses-Jesus Parallels in Luke.....	297
The Isaianic Servant and the Prophet like Moses	304
Conclusion	311

Conclusion	314
Prophecy and Luke's Theology	315
Prophecy in Luke and Second Temple Literature: A Preliminary Comparison	317
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	320

ABBREVIATIONS

With the following exceptions, abbreviations follow the table of abbreviations in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Alexander, Patrick H., John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley A. Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen, Editors; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999):

<i>BEGS</i>	Foakes Jackson, F. J., and Kirsopp Lake, Editors. <i>The Beginnings of Christianity Part I: The Acts of the Apostles</i> . 5 vols. Especially <i>Vol. I: Prolegomena</i> (F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, eds.); <i>Vol. IV: English Translation and Commentary</i> (Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury); <i>Vol. V: Additional Notes to the Commentary</i> (Kirsopp Lake and Henry J. Cadbury, eds.). London: Macmillan, 1920-1933. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
<i>EDSS</i>	Schiffman, Lawrence and James C. VanderKam, eds. <i>Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls</i> . 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
<i>HALOT</i>	Koehler, Ludwig, Walter Baumgartner, and Johann Jakob Stamm. <i>The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Study Edition</i> . Translated by M. E. J. Richardson. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
<i>HJP</i>	Vermes, Geza, Fergus Millar, Matthew Black, and Martin Goodman, eds. <i>The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ</i> by Emil Schürer. Rev. ed. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1973, 1979, 1986, 1987.
<i>W-O</i>	Waltke, Bruce K., and M. O'Connor. <i>An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax</i> . Winona Lake, In.: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

A NOTE ON TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS

Where possible (and unless otherwise noted) Hebrew and, in most cases, English citations of the Dead Sea Scrolls are from volumes in the series, *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert*. Greek and English citations of Josephus and Philo are from volumes in the *Loeb Classical Library*. The Hebrew text of Ben Sira is cited from *The Book of Ben Sira: Text, Concordance and an Analysis of the Vocabulary* (Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language and the Shrine of the Book, 1973).

Quotations from the Hebrew Bible, Apocrypha and New Testament are normally cited (with occasional minor modifications) from the *Revised Standard Version* or from the *New Revised Standard Version*.

Chapter One: Introduction

As Luke's special interest in prophets is widely acknowledged, it is remarkable how little attention has been directed toward Luke's own beliefs and assumptions about prophets *per se*. To be sure, Luke's portrayal of Jesus as a prophet has been revisited again and again;¹ there is an extensive body of literature on the role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts which touches on prophecy;² there are studies on Luke's literary aims as they relate to prophets and prophecy, including those that investigate how Luke uses the motif

¹ P. Dabek, "Siehe es erschienen Moses und Elias," *Bib* 23 (1942): 175-89; Theodore R. Carruth, "The Jesus-As-Prophet Motif in Luke-Acts" (Ph.D., Baylor University, 1973); Franz Schnider, *Jesus der Prophet* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973); Glenn Roger Greene, "The Portrayal of Jesus As Prophet in Luke-Acts" (Ph.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975); Ulrich Busse, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus. Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977; repr., 1979); Joseph G. Kelly, "Lucan Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue," *JES* 21 (1984): 688-708; Paul Frederick Feiler, "Jesus the Prophet: The Lucan Portrayal of Jesus As the Prophet Like Moses" (Ph.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1986); Robert J. Miller, "Elijah, John, and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," *NTS* 34 (1988): 611-22; Brigid Curtin Frein, "The Literary Significance of the Jesus-As-Prophet Motif in the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles" (Ph.D., St. Louis University, 1989); David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989); Gottfried Nebe, *Prophetische Züge im bilde Jesus bei Lukas* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989); Judith M. Schubert, "The Image of Jesus As the Prophet Like Moses in Luke-Acts As Advanced by Luke's Reinterpretation of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 in Acts 3:22 and 7:37" (Ph.D., Fordham University, 1992); Jack Dean Kingsbury, "Jesus As the 'Prophetic Messiah' in Luke's Gospel," in *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck* (eds. A. J. Malherbe, and W. A. Meeks; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993), 29-42.

² Heinrich von Baer, *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1926); Geoffrey W. Lampe, "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke," in *Studies in the Gospels* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 159-200; F. F. Bruce, "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles," *Int* 27 (1973): 166-83; Gonzalo Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit force de l'église* (trans. José J. Romero and Hubert Faes; Paris: Cerf, 1975); Jacob Jervell, "Sons of the Prophets: The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles," in *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (ed. Jacob Jervell; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 96-121; O. Mainville, *L'Esprit dans l'oeuvre de Luc* (Montreal: Fides, 1991); Robert P. Menzies, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991); James B. Shelton, *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991); William H. Shepherd, Jr., *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit As a Character in Luke-Acts* (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1994); Max B. Turner, *Power From on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "The Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. Jozef Verheyden; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999), 165-83; Ju Hur, *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001); Edward J. Woods, *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001).

of prophecy and fulfillment to advance his narrative,³ those that explore Luke's portrayal of biblical prophets,⁴ and those that examine his characterization of major figures after the pattern of biblical prophets.⁵ Finally, both specialized studies⁶ and broader surveys⁷ turn to Luke-Acts as a window on prophecy within the early Jesus movement. Yet it remains the case that these studies do not directly consider what Luke believed prophets were. Even those studies that concentrate on prophets in Luke-Acts⁸ do not analyze Luke's own use of technical terminology for the light it sheds on his conception of

³ David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980); François Bovon, "Effet de réel et flou prophétique dans l'oeuvre de Luc," in *A cause de l'Evangile* (Paris: Cerf, 1985), 349-59; Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987); John T. Squires, *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993); Brigid Curtin Frein, "Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfilment," *NTS* 40 (1994): 22-37; Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

⁴ Jean Daniel Dubois, "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne," *RHPR* 53 (1973): 155-76; François Bovon, "La figure de Moïse dans l'oeuvre de Luc," in *La figure de Moïse* (ed. R. Martin-Achard; Geneva: Éditions labor et fides, 1978), 47-65; Markus Öhler, *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im Neuen Testament* (Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997); John D. Lierman, "The New Testament Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism" (Ph.D., Cambridge University, 2002).

⁵ Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977); David P. Moessner, "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses in Acts," *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 203-212; Richard J. Dillon, "The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses According to the Discourses of Acts," *NTS* 32 (1986): 544-56; Thomas L. Brodie, "Luke the Literary Interpreter: Luke-Acts As a Systematic Rewriting and Updating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative" (S.T.D., Pontifical University of St. Thomas Aquinas, 1987).

⁶ E. Earle Ellis, "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday* (eds. W. Ward Gasque, and Ralph P. Martin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 55-67.

⁷ Edouard Cothenet, "Prophétisme dans le Nouveau Testament," *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible* 8:1222-337; Theodore M. Crone, *Early Christian Prophecy: A Study of Its Origin and Function* (Baltimore, Md.: St. Mary's University Press, 1973); David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979); M. Eugene Boring, *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982); David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983; repr., 1991).

⁸ Adrian Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem, a Study of the Teaching of St. Luke* (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1958); Cecil M. Robeck Jr., "The Gift of Prophecy in Acts and Paul, Part I," *Studia Biblica et Theologica* 5 (1975): 15-38; Paul S. Minear, *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke* (New York: Seabury Press, 1976); Roger Stronstad, *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999).

prophets.⁹

Perhaps one of the reasons why Luke's understanding of prophets has not generated sustained attention is because the concept of prophecy appears self-evident. Is it not the case that discussions of prophecy "are concerned with one phenomenon, the person of which is προφήτης or προφήτις, the action of which is προφητεύω, the product of which is προφητεία"?¹⁰ This is a reasonable assumption, but the evidence from Luke-Acts does not correspond to what would be expected if Luke believed that all those who prophesy (προφητεύω) are prophets (προφῆται). While Acts 2:17-21 lists prophesying (προφητεύουσιν) as a consequence of the Spirit's coming "in the last days," Luke reserves the title "prophet" for a limited number of predominantly minor characters in the rest of Luke-Acts—even though it is assumed that all who repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus receive the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). This apparent conflict between the quotation from Joel in Acts 2:17-21 and the rest of Acts is widely acknowledged. It is also commonly recognized that Luke appears to portray such main characters as Peter, Stephen and Philip in the guise of prophets but withholds from them the title "prophet." I will consider proposed solutions to these problems in chapter three. At present the mere acknowledgement that Luke's usage poses a challenge to a straightforward understanding

⁹ Aune, *Prophecy*, 195-8, cf. 15, surveys the use of προφήτης in early Christian literature, but he does not evaluate Luke's usage independently of this wider body of literature. The same is true of Erich Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1927), 171-87, and Gerhard Friedrich, "προφήτης, κτλ.," *TDNT* 6:828-61. Robeck, "Prophecy," 15-38, examines Christian prophets in Acts in some detail, but he does not consider Luke's usage as a whole. Even the thorough survey of prophets in Luke-Acts by Cothenet, "Prophétisme," 1275-85, lacks an independent examination of Luke's terminology. Discussions of the Spirit (of prophecy) invariably fail to evaluate Luke's use of προφήτης and cognates.

¹⁰ M. Eugene Boring, "What Are We Looking for?: Toward a Definition of the Term 'Christian Prophet,'" *SBLSP* (1973): 142. Cf. Hill, *Prophecy*, 2.

of the terms is enough to commend a more detailed evaluation of the evidence.

A second reason why Luke's own understanding of prophets has received inadequate attention lies in the recognition that Luke—as well as Second Temple Jews—inherited a technical terminology and a set of authoritative traditions about past prophets from Jewish Scripture. Yet this shared inheritance raises questions about Luke's knowledge of and relation to Second Temple Judaism in its variegated forms.¹¹ For example, how close is Luke's interpretation of biblical traditions about prophets to the interpretations of Second Temple Jewish writers? To what extent was Luke's understanding and portrayal of contemporary prophetic activity similar to and perhaps influenced by beliefs common to his Jewish contemporaries?¹²

Too often these questions are not asked, with the result that Luke-Acts is simply read in light of an understanding of prophets derived from Scripture or—with more sophistication—in light of a reconstruction of Second Temple Jewish views about prophecy. In particular, Luke-Acts is frequently read with the assumption that most Jews in the late Second Temple period held that real prophecy belonged either to the distant past or to the distant future. According to this common scholarly reconstruction, Jews believed that God still communicated with his people and that prophet-like experiences continued, but most Jews thought this activity did not measure up to the activity of

¹¹ Technically, the period of the Second Temple extends from 515 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. I use the term more broadly to include the entire first century C.E. It is safe to say that at least the Torah, Prophets and Psalms had attained scriptural status (though not necessarily a fixed form) by the late Second Temple period. See John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel After the Exile* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1986, 55-82.

¹² The formulation of the question does not presuppose knowledge of Luke's ethnicity (see further on page 8 below), nor does it presume that the early Christian movement had broken with Judaism at the time of Luke's writing. Similar questions might be asked about Philo's or Josephus's relation to other Second Temple Jewish writers.

prophets of the past. On this view, many Jews expected the renewal of prophecy in connection with God's restoration of Israel, and anticipated the coming of one or more future prophets—perhaps a prophet like Moses or the return of Elijah. Hence, many if not most Jews during this period reserved the title "prophet" for the biblical prophets and for eschatological prophets; any prophets who did appear on the scene were necessarily identified by the people as eschatological prophets. This "standard view" about prophecy is contested in contemporary scholarship—it will be the task of the next chapter to survey the evidence and to summarize the state of the question in further detail—but it remains ubiquitous, especially among New Testament scholars.

When the "standard view" is assumed as the background against which Luke's Gospel is read, the prophetic activity in the infancy narrative in Luke 1-2 is naturally taken as a sign that the Spirit of prophecy has returned, ending a long barren era in which prophets were not active. The main weakness of this line of reasoning is that the restoration of prophecy must be read into the Gospel from outside it. While Luke may have assumed that his readers would grasp that prophecy had returned from his manner of narration, it is remarkable that Luke never signals this directly, but instead introduces us to Zechariah who "prophesied" (Luke 1:68), as well as to Anna the "prophetess" (2:36) without further ado. As one might expect, several different explanations have been proposed to account for the prophetic activity in the Lukan infancy narrative; these will be evaluated in chapter four. Still, the apparent dissonance between the standard view and the beginning of Luke's Gospel calls for analysis of Luke's portrayal in order to see how well statements about prophets in Luke and Acts comport with scholarly proposals

about Second Temple Jewish perceptions of prophecy.

In this thesis, therefore, I will respond to the need for a fresh analysis of Luke's conception of prophets. After a review of the evidence for Jewish views about prophets during the Second Temple period (chapter two), those individuals explicitly and implicitly identified as prophets in Luke's narrative will be studied in order to determine Luke's conception of what prophets were (chapter three). Taking a lead from the standard view outlined above, chapter four will consider whether Luke believed prophetic activity had ceased or experienced decline during the Second Temple period, as well as the extent to which Luke distinguished prophetic activity after Pentecost from prophetic activity that had gone before. Chapters five and six will examine the evidence for eschatological Elijah and Moses traditions in Luke-Acts.

A detailed comparison that takes seriously the complexity of the Second Temple evidence will not be possible within the confines of this thesis, but the results of this study will indicate either that the standard view should be abandoned or that Luke's conception of prophets differed significantly from those of his contemporaries—for Luke did not believe that prophecy had ceased before the coming of Jesus and (though he did regard John the Baptist as the one who filled the eschatological role of Elijah), he had no concept of a "prophet like Moses" understood as an independent figure of eschatological expectation. While this study is given shape by its interaction with common scholarly assumptions about prophets in Second Temple Judaism, its primary contribution will be to a better understanding of Luke's Christology, of the relationship between Jesus and his disciples in Acts, and of Luke's conception of the place of the church in relation to Israel's

past.¹³

In the following sections of this initial chapter I will outline the assumptions I hold about the Gospel of Luke and the book of Acts, as well as the methodology to be employed in the remainder of the thesis.

The Use of Second Temple Jewish "Background"

The importance of reading New Testament documents within their Jewish and Greco-Roman contexts is everywhere acknowledged. The dangers of abusing parallels are also well-known, but are still worth reiterating here.¹⁴ One potential hazard is that the New Testament evidence may form a subtle framework into which the bits and pieces of non-Christian Jewish evidence are made to fit, obscuring the possibility that the Jewish evidence could be construed in entirely different ways if it were not for the outline inscribed by a prior reading of the New Testament. A second danger is that of drawing premature conclusions about parallels when further study would reveal that the similarities between texts are more apparent than real. If it is possible to arrive at a distorted picture of Second Temple Judaism by reading it through New Testament eyes, it is also conceivable that a distorted interpretation of New Testament texts may ensue from too close an identification of early Christian and Jewish concepts.

The present study requires additional caution in the use of evidence from outside of Luke-Acts because one of its purposes is to prepare for a comparison of Luke's

¹³ A similar interest in the role of prophecy and the "discourse of the periodization of history" in the construction of religious identities guides Laura Salah Nasrallah's recent study of prophecy in 1 Corinthians, Tertullian and Epiphanius. Cf. Laura Salah Nasrallah, *'An Ecstasy of Folly': Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003), esp. 11-19.

¹⁴ Cf. Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962): 1-13; T. L. Donaldson, "Parallels: Use, Misuse and Limitations," *EvQ* 55 (1983): 193-210.

conception of prophecy with those of (other) Second Temple Jewish writers. The comparison will be compromised if one starts from the assumption that Luke took for granted—but did not necessarily express—ideas about prophets attested in Second Temple Jewish literature. While conclusions about Luke's ethnic identity might seem to impinge on the larger question of Luke's knowledge of Judaism,¹⁵ the reverse is actually the case. Since knowledge of Luke's ethnic identity must be inferred from internal evidence alone, it has no independent value for determining Luke's conception of prophets or, for that matter, of interpreting Luke-Acts in general.¹⁶

As a methodological safeguard I will therefore avoid moving from ideas attested in the writings of Luke's near contemporaries to the conclusion that Luke would have been aware of such ideas—unless positive evidence for them can be adduced from Luke-Acts itself. Evidence from Second Temple Judaism does perform an invaluable service, however, when it fosters greater openness towards what Luke might have intended to convey.¹⁷ Modern scholars necessarily remain unfamiliar with many of Luke's everyday assumptions; they do not, for example, read Scripture in the same way that seemed intuitive for Luke, nor do they know it as well. Because what we see is influenced to such a great extent by the background against which we consciously or unconsciously set the evidence, contextual parallels may illumine the text under discussion by enabling us

¹⁵ An overwhelming majority of scholars hold that Luke was a Gentile, but a few scholars have argued that he was a Jewish-Christian. According to François Bovon, *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (ed. Helmut Koester; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 8, "Luke was most likely a Greek by birth, who turned to Judaism early in life; he belongs to that circle of sympathizers whom one designates 'God-fearers.'" Cf. Denova, *Prophetic*, 230-1; Jacob Jervell, "The Mighty Minority," in *The Unknown Paul*, 42; Busse, *Wunder*, 463; and Tiede, *Prophecy*, 7, 10, who argues similarly that whether or not Luke was a Jew, he records "an *intra-family* struggle."

¹⁶ Cf. Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999), 353.

¹⁷ Cf. Donaldson, "Parallels," 204.

to take off our own blinders and perceive what possible readings that we would not otherwise notice.

It follows from my approach to the use of Second Temple Jewish evidence that conclusions about what Luke intended or believed must often remain more tentative than we would like. Since there may be no evidence for what Luke took for granted, and hence failed to make explicit, the absence of evidence for a particular viewpoint is not in itself decisive. Still adhering to this self-imposed limitation will render a valuable service, if only in delineating more clearly the shape and location of the evidence, and in facilitating a careful comparison between views about prophets attested in Luke-Acts and contemporary Second Temple Jewish texts.¹⁸

How to Tell a Prophet When You See One

In contrast to most recent examinations of ancient prophecy, I will adopt an emic as opposed to an etic approach to the study of perceptions of prophecy.¹⁹ Emic historical explanations are formulated in order "to provide an account of ancient beliefs and practices in terms that derive from the ancient authors themselves."²⁰ In an etic approach, on the other hand, definitions and interpretive categories are formulated by modern scholars; that those being studied may have understood their own experience differently or described it using varied terminology is largely irrelevant. Closely related to the emic-

¹⁸ The value of such a comparison remains regardless of conclusions about Luke's ethnicity. If Luke was a Jewish-Christian, his beliefs about prophets may well have been influenced by his Christian experience. Jew or Gentile, this analysis of Luke's beliefs about prophets will enable a comparison between one adherent of early Christianity and (other) forms of Judaism.

¹⁹ For helpful discussions of the terminology, see Mark G. Brett, "Four or Five Things to Do with Texts: A Taxonomy of Interpretative Interests," in *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield* (eds. David J.A. Clines, Stephen E. Fowl, and Stanley E. Porter; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 362-5, and Marvin Harris, "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction," *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5 (1976): 329-50.

²⁰ Brett, "Taxonomy," 360-1.

etic distinction is the difference between studies of perceptions and studies of phenomena. One can focus on the experience of ancient prophecy or on how a given group conceived of the experience of prophecy. Though studies of phenomena tend naturally to employ an etic approach, perceptions and attitudes, at least, may be studied from either an etic or an emic approach.

A useful way to highlight the distinctives of my own emic approach is to contrast it with the etic methodology presented in Eugene Boring's influential essay on the definition of the term Christian prophet.²¹ Common to Boring's essay as well as a series of books and articles on prophecy that appeared during the 1970s and 1980s was a concern to compare the phenomenon of Christian prophecy with similar experiences attested in the wider Greco-Roman cultural context.²² The comparative interest of these studies necessarily required an etic approach because the vocabulary employed by adherents of Greek religions diverges from the vocabulary employed by early Christians and, as a result, it is necessary for modern scholars to determine the nature of the phenomenon being compared.²³

²¹ Boring's basic methodology is adopted by Hill, *Prophecy*, and, with modifications, by Christopher Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995; repr., Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997), 188-92. Aune, *Prophecy* differs from Boring, et al., in his close attention to forms of prophetic speech, but his system of classification is still clearly based on an etic approach. For another more recent etic evaluation of prophecy in the first century, see Robert L. Webb, *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Survey* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991), 316 note 23.

²² Cf. Crone, *Prophecy*; Boring, *Sayings*; Hill, *Prophecy*; Aune, *Prophecy*; Forbes, *Prophecy*. Interest in the subject was no doubt stimulated by the Society of Biblical Literature's seminar on early Christian prophecy, which ran from 1972-1977.

²³ Boring, "Prophet," 149. It is possible, of course, to undertake cross-cultural emic comparisons. For example, one may compare attitudes about acceptable kinship practices in different cultures (Harris, "Emic/Etic Distinction," 341-2). An etic approach is required in comparisons between Greco-Roman and Christian experiences of prophecy not merely because of different terminology, but also because of an absence of agreement among ancient writers about the nature of the phenomenon being discussed.

Boring proposes that once a functional definition of prophecy is established, those who serve as prophets should be given the label of "prophet" "even though the word group *προφητ*- is not used by or of them." Similarly, "The definition excludes all those who do not perform the described function, even if the word group *προφητ*- is used by or of them."²⁴ To be sure, Boring and others interested in the phenomenon of prophecy do not eschew an emic approach altogether. It is recognized that research must begin from an analysis of ancient writers' own terminology, but the overall goal is still to define and characterize the ancient phenomenon of prophecy from a modern frame of reference.²⁵ Boring's suggestions for developing a functional definition of prophecy are as follows:

(1.) Since it is Christian prophets of the first few generations who are the subjects of primary interest, our definition should be formulated beginning with those who are specifically called prophets in the earliest Christian literature. . . . (2.) With the question of function in mind, the group labeled as prophets in this literature should be used as a kind of sample group for the purpose of formulating a working definition. No attempt should be made to embrace every instance of the word group *προφητ*-. A 'core' group should be sought, with peripheral and derivative usages of the word allowed to fall under the table. . . . (3.) This core group should be analyzed to determine which function(s) they have in common, which function(s) they have which differentiates them from other functionaries, i.e. which function(s) constitute [sic.] them as prophets. (4.) This prophetic function should then be described as our normative working definition, and whoever performs it should be considered a prophet for our purposes, whether or not he bears this label in the sources, especially if some reason can be shown why the term is absent.²⁶

When applied to the work of a *single* ancient author, there is much to commend in Boring's proposal. My own methodology is indebted to his appeal for a functional definition based on characteristics derived from a core group of those whom Luke labels "prophets." As we cannot presume on ancient writers' willingness to identify explicitly

²⁴ Boring, "Prophet," 148-9.

²⁵ Boring, "Prophet," 147.

²⁶ Boring, "Prophet," 145-6.

every prophet for the benefit of future readers, Boring rightly rejects a label-based approach that only accepts as prophets those who are given the title. Nevertheless, the procedure employed by Boring has serious weaknesses in its present form. (1) While an etic definition is required to facilitate a comparison of inspired speech across Greco-Roman and Christian traditions, the move from analyzing the terminological usage of individual writers to forming a provisional definition happens too rapidly. In practice, a "provisional" definition tends to become the basis for all further discussion, allowing modern scholars to exclude activities that do not fit their definition even though some ancient authors may have considered these activities typical of prophets.²⁷ (2) By attempting to derive a definition from a wide body of literature, Boring's methodology runs the risk of seriously obscuring the differences between distinctive understandings of prophecy held by writers operating within the same general world of thought. (3) A third weakness is the assumption that a working definition based on evidence from Christian texts can be used in a search for parallels in non-Christian literature without examining non-Christian literature on its own terms.²⁸

Instead of attempting to establish a definition that can be used for cross-cultural study of the same phenomenon, I wish to compare different conceptions of prophecy among those who shared both a common vocabulary and a normative set of traditions about prophets, but who would not necessarily agree to the same definition of what a

²⁷ Notice that the monographs of Boring, *Sayings*, 16, and Hill, *Prophecy*, 8-9, begin with provisional definitions. Cf. Aune, *Prophecy*, 23. Boring's "provisional" definition in his 1973 programmatic essay is virtually identical to the definition he uses in his 1982 monograph (cf. Boring, "Prophet," 147, and Boring, *Sayings*, 16).

²⁸ Cf. Forbes, *Prophecy*, 189; *contra* Boring, "Prophet," 142.

"prophet" was.²⁹ Comparing separate characterizations of prophets is more effective than bringing them together under a common definition when the focus of study is on conceptions rather than phenomena.

My methodology begins with an independent analysis of how words of the נביא/προφήτ- word groups are used by individual writers: (1) Those who are explicitly identified by an author as "prophets" should form a core group from which to derive the characteristics and activities attributed by that author to "prophets." One should not assume, however, that all activities of those identified as prophets were necessarily regarded as prophetic,³⁰ or that characteristically prophetic activities were thought to be performed only by prophets. (2) Attention should be directed both to an author's customary use of terminology as well as to unusual uses of terminology. Only when solid reasons can be adduced should a given usage be allowed "to fall under the table."³¹ (3) Due weight should be given to the formative role of Scripture. Jews as well as Gentile adherents of the early Jesus movement could not help but be influenced by the terminology of their shared Scripture, whether in Hebrew or in translation. The language and narrative of Scripture formed the basis for their understanding of any phenomenon they chose to label as "prophecy."³² An apparently obscure application of terminology

²⁹ Cf. Markus Öhler, "Jesus As Prophet: Remarks on Terminology," in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records* (eds. Michael Labahn, and Andreas Schmidt; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 127-9, who observes that there was no accepted definition of "prophet" shared by ancient Jews and Christians.

³⁰ Hill, *Prophecy*, 118.

³¹ *Contra* Boring, "Prophet," 145.

³² The word προφήτης and its cognates are not necessarily equivalent to נביא and its cognates (Lester L. Grabbe, "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period," *SBLSP* 37, no. 2 (1998): 525). Still, any writer who knew the LXX was bound to be heavily influenced by the fact that the LXX almost always translates נביא as προφήτης (cf. Rolf Rendtorff, "προφήτης, κτλ.,"

should therefore be allowed to carry more weight if it is paralleled in Scripture. For example, I will not assume that the verb "to prophesy" always signals the activity of "prophets" because Scripture itself provides illustrations of those who "prophesied" on occasion, but who were never given the title "prophet," and who appear not to have been regarded as "prophets."³³ Moreover, special attention should be directed to the manner in which biblical prophets are portrayed, as this will permit investigation into the ways that contemporary inspired experience was believed to parallel or to be distinguished from the experiences attributed to biblical prophets. (4) Particular consideration should be given to those instances in which characters who act like prophets are not given the title of "prophet." Since formal terminology will not necessarily be employed each time a prophet is introduced, analysis of an author's normal usage and characteristic portrayal of those explicitly given the title "prophet" will help determine whether or not someone who is not given the title is regarded as a prophet. (5) Only after each author's understanding of prophecy has been analyzed on its own terms should a comparison between different authors be attempted.

This methodology is only practicable among groups with a shared authoritative tradition and a shared terminology. It also requires the existence of discrete written sources large enough to support independent investigation, whose authors refer to the shared authoritative tradition as well as to later events. My methodology is poorly suited to the sort of cross-cultural comparison that Boring wished to perform, not only because

TDNT 6:812).

³³ See chapter 3, page 130 below. Cf. Forbes, *Prophecy*, 190: "Boring's definition assumes that in early Christianity prophecy is characteristically exercised by those called prophets, which may or may not have been the case."

it requires more careful attention to individual texts before parallels are drawn, but also because it does not require a formal definition that identifies the necessary and sufficient conditions of prophets and prophecy.³⁴ Yet cross-cultural comparison is not its aim. To draw a linguistic analogy, if Boring's etic approach is concerned with identifying synonyms, the method I have described is concerned with identifying different meanings of one word. Or taking a more vigorous example, upon being introduced first to American and then to Canadian football, Boring would want to derive a definition common to both, while I would be more interested to examine the differences between the two games in the hope that they might help explain the similarities as well as the very real distinctions between Canadian and American culture.³⁵ The methodology outlined in this section could be applied to a variety of different authors including Philo, Josephus, and the writings of the apostle Paul, as well as to discrete literary groups such as the sectarian Dead Sea Scrolls.

Evaluating the Formative Role of Scripture

While Luke's familiarity with Second Temple Judaism apart from his involvement in the early Jesus movement is open to question,³⁶ it is clear that Luke knew Jewish Scripture well.³⁶ An accurate assessment of traditions about the eschatological Elijah and

³⁴ For this aspect of definitions, see Eugene A. Nida and Johannes P. Louw, *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament* (Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992), 86; Boring, "Prophet," 146. This is not to admit that the emic methodology described in this section falls into the category of "ostensive definition" criticized by Boring, "Prophet," 143, for it is possible both to describe something well and to distinguish it from other things without being able to *define* it well. Moreover, it is still possible to derive an etic definition at the end of the process described in the last paragraph. Presumably more detailed analyses of independent authors would result in a superior etic definition.

³⁵ Both of us may be justly criticized for interfering with the pure enjoyment of the game.

³⁶ I assume that Luke's close familiarity with Scripture came from reading the Septuagint. Cf. James A. Sanders, "Isaiah in Luke," in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (eds. Craig A. Evans, and James A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 16; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The*

the prophet like Moses in particular, requires careful attention to Luke's use of Scripture. But how does one evaluate Scripture's influence? On the one hand, it is obvious that an ability to discern echoes requires a close familiarity with the Scriptures to which Luke referred. We should be wary of demanding from Luke a degree of explicitness that would have been unnecessary to first century readers who, like Luke, were steeped in Scripture.³⁷ On the other hand, it is important to recognize how great the threat of "parallelomania"³⁸ is in situations where Luke's literary dependence on the Septuagint is posited. The echoes one hears will be affected both by the texts with which one is most familiar and by what one is listening for. Those who are attuned to particular texts and themes will be tempted to hear them everywhere.³⁹

The problem of "parallelomania" is particularly acute in the case of proposed literary typologies between characters in Luke-Acts and major biblical characters such as Moses or David. These biblical figures were so prominent that it would be difficult for Luke (or others) not to draw on characteristics shared with them when portraying later heroes—whether or not a comparison was intended. One must therefore be cautious when evaluating the intention, the purpose and the significance of apparent allusions to great figures of the past.

It is also essential to bear in mind that Scripture can be used in a wide variety of ways, ranging from explicit citation to unintentional echo. A biblical phrase may be used

Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes (2 vols.; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981, 1985), 113-25; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994, 1998), xlv-xlviii.

³⁷ Cf. Dale C. Allison, *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 92-3.

³⁸ Cf. Sandmel, "Parallelomania," 1, for a discussion of the term.

³⁹ Cf. Wayne A. Meeks, *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967), 287 note 1, speaking of John's Gospel.

to evoke its larger context, it may form part of a literary typology, or it may be employed simply to affect a biblical style. In the absence of further evidence one cannot simply conclude that a verbal parallel—even a unique verbal parallel—was consciously intended to allude to a specific biblical passage, let alone to the wider context of that passage.

It is perhaps wise, therefore, to pose as one slightly hard of hearing—requiring Luke to enunciate clearly, or at least to repeat himself, before being satisfied of proposed allusions to Scripture. That is, I will only allow as intentional those echoes that contain a verbal parallel with a biblical passage.⁴⁰ Proposed comparisons with biblical figures will be accepted with greater confidence when several allusions appear together, and when the parallels consist of "unusual imagery and uncommon motifs."⁴¹ Allusions to Scripture should also mesh well with, and indeed help to explain, the passages in which they appear.⁴² The requirement of verbal parallels may exclude some legitimate scriptural allusions, but it will serve as a methodological control, while leaving plenty of room for discussion. After all, no literary typology rests on a single non-verbal allusion.

Of Authorship, Tradition and Redaction

It is customary for those writing on Luke-Acts to append a footnote explaining that "Luke" is a name adopted for the sake of convenience to refer to the otherwise anonymous author of the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles.⁴³ It must also be

⁴⁰ Additional non-verbal similarities may add force to an allusion or comparison suggested on other grounds.

⁴¹ Allison, *Moses*, 23.

⁴² Similar criteria are presented in Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale, 1989), 29-31, and William Freedman, "The Literary Motif: A Definition and Evaluation," *Novel* 4 (1971): 126-7.

⁴³ Although I am sensitive to the possibility of temporal and thematic differences between the two works, the term "Luke-Acts," coined by Henry J. Cadbury, remains the best available way of envisaging the

stressed that constructions of "Luke" are always dependent on the extant literary evidence; we do not have access to Luke as he actually was.

It is good and fitting to begin by giving an author the benefit of the doubt, presuming that the text forms a coherent narrative in the absence of clear signs to the contrary. Still, in a work as complicated and as dependent on sources as Luke-Acts,⁴⁴ it is important to consider the possibility that tradition and Luke's own understanding of that tradition *may* at times be at cross-purposes with each other, and further that Luke may not always have been in full control of his sources.⁴⁵ Where sources can be identified, Luke's aims and beliefs may be discerned in his redactional changes. When an argument is made on the basis of traditional material, I try to provide evidence demonstrating that Luke was aware of the direction of his sources. Careful study of Luke's style uncovers other characteristic literary techniques—including the use of programmatic stories and scriptural citations—that shed light on what our author intended to convey as well as what he took for granted.⁴⁶

Although I begin with an appreciation of Luke's literary prowess, I do not assume that every redactional change is significant, nor do I presume perfect assimilation of tradition into Luke's narrative aims. Moreover, I do not assume that Luke's beliefs about prophecy were of such importance to him that he consciously reflected on them or

relationship between Luke's two-volume *oeuvre* (cf. Cadbury, *Making*, 11).

⁴⁴ I assume that Luke relied heavily on Mark for the composition of his Gospel, and that he had access to other traditions, normally designated Q, whose existence is reflected also in Matthew. I do not assume that the double traditions shared by Matthew and Luke were always written; in some passages, however, the similarity in wording suggests that at least parts of it were written. No particular source theory is assumed for Acts, but I take for granted that much of Acts relies on earlier written sources. Further conclusions about Luke's use of sources are not essential for my purposes.

⁴⁵ Cf. Christopher M. Tuckett, "The Christology of Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 133-64.

⁴⁶ See especially Cadbury, *Making*, section III (213-96). For more on Luke's use of programmatic passages see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 227-8.

intended to convey all of them to his audience. Though prophets and prophecy play an important role in Luke's story, it would be a mistake to assume that prophecy was one of his driving interests; it is very likely that he took these views for granted.⁴⁷

Finally, the common suggestion that the Lukan infancy narrative was written last⁴⁸ sometimes has the effect of focusing attention on the development of Luke's thought rather than on what he intended by the text as published. Though I am interested in the beliefs and assumptions of Luke, I am not interested in tracing the development of his thought. While one may use a passage occurring later in Luke's work to interpret an earlier one, one must be careful about the way in which and the extent to which this is done. Unless there are good reasons for concluding otherwise, it is reasonable to suppose that Luke intended his work to be read and understood in order from beginning to end.

⁴⁷ A failure on Luke's part to think through and articulate his conception of prophets does not exclude an emic description of his conception of prophets, for "there is nothing antithetical . . . in attributing to emic structures both conscious and unconscious dimensions" (Harris, "Emic/Etic Distinction," 338). Using categories derived from Luke-Acts, my goal will be to arrive at a description of prophets with which Luke would agree.

⁴⁸ Cf. Raymond E. Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (2d ed.; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 240; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 199.

Chapter Two: Eschatological Prophets and Prophecy in Second Temple Judaism

In the previous chapter I discussed briefly the common view that prophecy was believed to have ceased in the Second Temple period, and how this view has influenced the interpretation of Luke-Acts. In the present chapter I will survey evidence for Second Temple beliefs about prophets from outside the New Testament, beginning with the question whether prophecy *was* believed to have ceased, and then turning to an examination of the role that eschatological prophets were thought to play in the future. Although the evidence from this period does not permit neat conclusions about the cessation of prophecy, the first part of this chapter will note commonalities and highlight questions that will give shape to our investigation of prophecy in Luke-Acts. The second part of this chapter takes its shape from traditions about eschatological prophets that some scholars have identified within Luke-Acts, and aims to determine whether and to what extent these traditions are attested in other texts from the Second Temple period.

In an attempt to keep the discussion manageable as well as to minimize the danger of anachronism, the following survey will be limited to literary evidence from the late Second Temple period. This means that rabbinic and targumic literature will be left to one side for the purposes of this study, as it was written well after the end of the Second Temple period and mixes later material of uncertain date together with earlier traditions.¹ My concern with *literary* evidence also requires that I refrain from forming conclusions about the beliefs of *most* Jews about future prophets, which may not be fairly represented

¹ It is not impossible to date and cautiously use rabbinic traditions for the elucidation of the New Testament, but there are many pitfalls. See Anthony J. Saldarini, "Rabbinic Literature and the NT," *ABD* 5:602-4, for a discussion of the difficulties involved.

by the surviving textual evidence.

The Existence of Prophets in the Second Temple Period

The question of the cessation of prophecy is disputed not simply because scholars read the primary sources in opposing ways, but also because there are different understandings of the question itself. Depending on how it is defined, the "standard view" can include those scholars who maintain that the phenomenon of prophecy actually continued even though most Jews believed it had ceased,² as well as those who hold that the phenomenon of prophecy in fact experienced significant decline even though there was no established belief that prophecy had ceased.³ In order to avoid confusion about the object of our inquiry, it will be helpful to recall the differences between emic and etic approaches and between studies of perception and studies of phenomena as they relate to the question of the cessation of prophecy.⁴

First, it is important to distinguish between the study of an ancient phenomenon, however it is described and labelled by modern scholars, and the study of the way in which a given phenomenon was perceived in antiquity. It is one thing to suggest that the *phenomenon* of prophecy ceased, quite another to claim that Jews in antiquity *perceived* that prophecy had ceased. Though the first view often implies the second (or the second the first), one does not necessarily entail the other. In the following discussion I will be concerned with ancient Jewish perceptions—their beliefs and assumptions about

² Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 115; S. Philip Alexander, "'A Sixtieth Part of Prophecy': The Problem of Continuing Revelation in Judaism," in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer* (eds. Jon Davies, Graham Harvey, and Wilfred G. E. Watson; Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995), 430.

³ Cf. Ragnar Leivestad, "Das Dogma von der prophetenlosen Zeit," *NTS* 19 (1972-1973): 291; John R. Levison, "Did the Spirit Withdraw From Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest Jewish Data," *NTS* 43 (1997): 56.

⁴ Cf. chapter one page 9 above.

prophecy—and not with the phenomena they experienced. Thus, for our purposes it does not matter what actually happened to the complex phenomenon of eighth century biblical prophecy, whether the essential experience of prophecy continued more or less unchanged,⁵ whether it died with the monarchy,⁶ whether it was supplanted by the written Law,⁷ whether it failed because of the loss of social support,⁸ or whether it was transformed into "apocalyptic."⁹ It matters only whether Jews believed prophecy had ceased.

Second, it is important to adopt consistently either an etic or an emic approach to the study of Second Temple Jewish perceptions of prophecy. While it is entirely appropriate to examine ancient perceptions of prophecy defined from a modern standpoint and categorized using modern definitions, interpreters are guilty of anachronism when they assume that the ancients would agree with their modern definitions of prophecy. In what follows, I will be concerned with an emic examination of Second Temple beliefs about prophecy, as defined from the perspective of Second Temple Jews.

With these distinctions in mind, the "standard view" will here be restricted to

⁵ Cf. Alexander, "Sixtieth Part," 433

⁶ Cf. Frank Moore Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973), 343; David L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 97.

⁷ Cf. Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel* (1883; trans. J. Sutherland Black, and Allan Enzies; Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1983), 488.

⁸ Cf. Robert R. Wilson, *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980), 30-1; Thomas W. Overholt, "The End of Prophecy: No Players Without a Program," in *The Place Is Too Small for Us: The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship* (ed. Robert P. Gordon; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995), 534, 538.

⁹ Cross, *Canaanite Myth*, 343; cf. Paul D. Hanson, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (Rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 10 note 8; Wilson, *Prophecy and Society*, 308.

those scholars who assert that most Jews believed that prophecy—understood from a Second Temple Jewish perspective—was a thing of the past. According to common presentations of this model, most Jews also hoped for a future renewal of prophecy and the coming of one or more eschatological prophets who were expected to serve as agents in connection with God's future restoration of Israel. They therefore reserved the title "prophet" for the biblical prophets and for eschatological prophets. Any prophets who did appear on the scene would be identified by the people either as impostors or as eschatological prophets, and, in the latter case, as a sign that the end was near.¹⁰

My presentation of the evidence in terms of the standard view and its challengers may leave the impression that there has been a linear development from a universally accepted scholarly view about prophecy which only began to be questioned during the second half of the twentieth century. In fact, challenges to the standard view began much earlier. At the turn of the twentieth century, Adolf von Harnack argued that "there were very wide circles of Judaism who cannot have felt any surprise when a prophet appeared."¹¹ Other early and influential challenges to the standard view were put forward by Rudolf Meyer (1940), who argued that prophecy finally died out during the rabbinic period,¹² and Ephraim Urbach (1946), who maintained that the rabbinic view that prophecy ceased shortly after the destruction of the first temple was a response to early

¹⁰ Note again that this definition of the standard view includes scholars who argue against the conclusion that the phenomenon of prophecy ceased, but who claim that a majority of ancient Jews *believed* that prophecy as defined by ancient Jews had ceased.

¹¹ Adolf Harnack, *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (trans. James Moffatt; 4 vols.; 1904; repr., 1972), 1:415. The German original appeared in 1902.

¹² Rudolf Meyer, *Der Prophet aus Galiläa, Studie zum Jesusbild der ersten Evangelien* (1940; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970), 41-60. Cf. Rudolf Meyer, "Prophecy and Prophets in the Judaism of the Hellenistic-Roman Period," *TDNT* 6:812-28.

Christians, who claimed that Jewish prophecy ceased when Jesus appeared.¹³ In spite of the protests of Harnack and others, however, the standard view was so widely accepted by biblical scholars during the first half of the twentieth century that it was often taken as a given about the Judaism of the late Second Temple period. Writing in 1949, Franklin Young could say:

It is a fact generally acknowledged by biblical scholars that long before Jesus' day the Jews believed prophecy had ceased in Israel and the prophetic spirit had withdrawn. We need not labor this point. There are biblical passages of post-exilic origin that definitely substantiate this fact.¹⁴

Growing recognition of the diversity within Second Temple Judaism has prompted more cautious presentations of the data as well as the affirmation that Jews during this period at least acknowledged the continued existence of many of the *experiences* that they attributed to the biblical prophets; contemporary scholars are understandably hesitant to make statements about what *most* Jews believed.¹⁵ But with

¹³ Ephraim Urbach, "מתי פסקה הנבואה?", *Tarbiz* (1945-1946): 8: "מהרגע שישו התעלה או הועלה" 10: "מתי," Cf. Urbach, "מתי," 10: "לפי זה טענו היהודים כי הנבואה כבר פסקה עם חורבן הבית הראשון בתשובותיהם לנוצרים."

¹⁴ Franklin W. Young, "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination," *JBL* 68 (1949): 286. Young cites Ps 74:9; Mal 4:5-6; Zech 13:4-6. Cf. Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ*, 161-4; H. A. Guy, *New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance* (London: Epworth Press, 1947), 25; Jean Gribet, "Prophétisme et attente d'un messie prophète dans l'ancien Judaïsme," in *L'Attente du Messie* (eds. L. Cerfaux, and et al; Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954), 90; Joachim Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ," *TDNT* 5:679; Oscar Cullmann, *The Christology of the New Testament* (trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1957; repr., London: SCM, 1959), 14-15; Howard M. Teeple, *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet* (Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957), 2-3; Peter Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung vom heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur* (München: Kösel-Verlag, 1972), 145-6; David George Clark, "Elijah As Eschatological High Priest: An Examination of the Elijah Tradition in Mal. 3:23-24" (Ph.D., University of Notre Dame, 1975), 19; and more recently, Gershon Brin, "תפיסת הנבואה," in *Sha'arei Talmon: Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East* (eds. Emanuel Tov and Michael Fishbane; Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1992), 101*; Benjamin D. Sommer, "Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation," *JBL* 115, no. 1 (1996): 31-47; Haim Milikowski, "סוף נדמה שאין בכלל מקום," *Sidra* (1994): 94: "הנבואה וסוף המקרא בעיני סדר עולם, ספרות חז"ל והספרות שמסביב לה לדעה הטוענת שהפסקת הנבואה היא נחלת חז"ל בלבד."

¹⁵ Cf. George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003), 96-7, on prophecy, and 185-193, on diversity in Second

caveats firmly in place, many scholars still operate within the framework of the traditional model, maintaining either that there existed a widespread belief among Second Temple Jews that prophecy, as Second Temple Jews understood it, belonged to the past,¹⁶ or claiming that those Second Temple Jews who acknowledged the continued existence of prophecy as "prophecy" belonged to groups that believed they lived in or very near the end times.¹⁷ Nevertheless, it is safe to say that the case put forward by Harnack and especially Meyer has finally gained a hearing and that the pendulum has now swung away from the cessation view.¹⁸

Despite differences of interpretation, there is widespread agreement about the scope of evidence requiring discussion. Thorough treatments of the subject inevitably refer to passages that speak about an absence of prophets, passages that speak about the prophets as a well-defined group from the past, passages that speak about inspired experiences, and texts that refer to divine-human communication which may be classified

Temple Judaism.

¹⁶ Cf. Israel Abrahams, "The Cessation of Prophecy," in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels* (New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1967), 120; Ferdinand Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (trans. H. Knight, and G. Ogg; Göttingen: 1963; repr., London: Lutterworth, 1969), 352-3; Leivestad, "Dogma," 291; Crone, *Prophecy*, 63-8; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 214; Hill, *Prophecy*, 21, 25; Aune, *Prophecy*, 83; Barton, *Oracles*, 116; Morna D. Hooker, *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus* (Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1997), 6-9.

¹⁷ Cf. Martin Hengel, *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period From Herod I until 70 A.D.* (trans. David Smith; Leiden: Brill, 1976; repr., Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1989), 235-6; Boring, *Sayings*, 111.

¹⁸ Otto Michel, "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann* (ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957), 60-6 cites Meyer; Paul Ewing Davies, "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet," *JBL* 64 (1945): 246 follows Harnack; R. J. Zwi Werblowsky, "Le prophétisme dans le judaïsme contemporain," *Lumière et Vie* 22 (1973): 43, follows Urbach. Cf. Leivestad, "Dogma," 288-99; Willem C. van Unnik, *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller* (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1978), 46-7, and more recently Frederick E. Greenspahn, "Why Prophecy Ceased," *JBL* 108 (1989): 37-49; Nebe, *Züge*, 38; Alexander, "Sixtieth Part," 414-33; Levison, "Withdraw?," 35-57; Grabbe, "Reality," 544; Günter Stemmerger, "Propheten und Prophetie in der Tradition des nachbiblischen Judentums," *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 14 (1999): 145-74. See further the discussion on pages 39 and following below.

as prophetic experience. Mention is also generally made of the appearance of pseudonymous texts that ascribe inspiration to great figures from the past, as well as to rabbinic statements to the effect that prophecy ceased with the death of the last biblical prophets.

An Absence of Prophets

We may safely exclude from consideration all *biblical* passages that mention an absence of prophets. Regardless of their date of composition, both the statement that Zion's "prophets obtain no vision from the LORD" in Lam 2:9 and the declaration that "there is no longer any prophet" in Ps 74:9 describe the loss of the first temple and would not have been interpreted by readers familiar with post-exilic prophets as statements about the cessation or permanent decline of prophecy.¹⁹ While Zech 13:2-6 has been interpreted as a polemic against prophecy by the anonymous author or redactor of Deutero-Zechariah,²⁰ it would be surprising if this oracle attributed to the prophet Zechariah was interpreted as a critique of prophecy itself. When understood as the words of a prophet, late Second Temple readers would surely see in Zech 13:2-6 a polemic against false prophecy rather than against all prophecy.²¹

The references to the absence of prophets in 1 Maccabees, however, are not so easily dismissed. According to 1 Macc 4:46, after the rededication of the temple (in 164 BCE) the priests decided to store the stones from the defiled altar "in a convenient place

¹⁹ Cf. Meyer, *TDNT* 6:814.

²⁰ So Petersen, *Late*, 97.

²¹ Meyer, *TDNT* 6:813, argues that the passage betrays a conflict between "two opposing prophetic groups."

on the temple hill until a prophet should come to tell what to do with them."²² Again in 9:27, the author comments about the events that occurred after the death of Judas: "So there was great distress in Israel, such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them." Finally, according to 14:41, the bronze record of Simon's acclamation as leader stated, "The Jews and their priests have resolved that Simon should be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise." Since 1 Maccabees makes no mention of a prophet who appeared later, it would seem that prophets were still regarded as absent when the book was written.²³ It may also be significant that the only other use of the *προφητ*- root in 1 Maccabees refers to the biblical prophets Haggai and Zechariah, who were associated with the rebuilding of the temple. The exclamation, "They tore down the work of the prophets!"²⁴ suggests that the prophets that come most readily to mind belong in the now distant past. These passages

²² The procedure adopted in 1 Macc 4:46 is reminiscent of Nehemiah's response to the priests who were unable to prove their ancestral descent: "the governor told them that they were not to partake of the most holy food, until a priest with Urim and Thummim should come" (Neh 7:65). Still, the absence of "a priest with Urim and Thummim" in Neh 7:65 does not exclude the presence of prophets. Prophets (whom Nehemiah regards as false prophets) are mentioned in Neh 6:7, 14; the prophets Haggai and Zechariah are mentioned in Ezra 5:1-2.

²³ Levison, "Withdraw?," 39-40 argues that 1 Macc 9:27 should be translated "from the day (*ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας*) a prophet did not appear to them"—meaning that on a specific day in the past a calamity occurred when a prophet did not appear as expected, not that prophets ceased appearing for all time on a specific day in the past. In support of his translation, Levison observes that when the preposition *ἀπό* is followed by a relative pronoun elsewhere in 1 Maccabees, the phrase consistently refers to a specific point in time that is specified in the words that follow (cf. 1 Macc 1:11; 9:27, 29; 12:10, 22; 16:24). But although the following words normally specify what time is meant when *ἀπό* is followed by a relative pronoun, it is by no means apparent why a specific point in time must be in view. In fact, in 1 Macc 1:11 (not cited by Levison), the same phrase refers generally to a time in the past when an event occurred that continued into the present: "since we separated from them (*ἀφ' ἧς ἐχωρίσθημεν*) [with the implication that we remain separated until this day] many disasters have come upon us." Against Levison, "Withdraw?," 40, it is more likely that the singular *προφήτης* in 9:27 refers collectively to prophets in general (cf. Smyth §996) rather than to a specific unnamed (but well-remembered) prophet. The clause *ἀφ' ἧς ἡμέρας οὐκ ὤφθη προφήτης* will thus refer to an event in the past with ongoing consequences—the time when prophets stopped appearing.

²⁴ 1 Macc 9:54. Cf. Ezra 5:1-2; Hag 1:12-15; Zech 7:9.

do not necessarily represent a widespread belief that prophecy had ceased with the biblical prophets, nor do they necessarily anticipate the appearance of one eschatological prophet; they do, however, suggest that prophets were perceived to be absent.

Turning to another corpus, Josephus's apologetic defence of the antiquity and authority of Jewish Scripture implies a distinction between the biblical prophets and those who came after them: "From Artaxerxes to our own time the complete history has been written, but has not been deemed worthy of equal credit with the earlier records, because of the failure of the exact succession of the prophets" (1.41). "The failure of the exact succession of the prophets" is ambiguous. Some scholars believe the phrase expresses a conviction that true prophets were limited to the biblical period,²⁵ in which case Josephus's view parallels the well known claim attested in rabbinic literature that the Holy Spirit (or prophecy) was withdrawn from Israel when Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi died or when the first temple was destroyed.²⁶ But perhaps the most that can be inferred from this passage is that "Josephus seems to have believed that there were no more prophets at all of the sort who could write absolutely authoritative history."²⁷

If Josephus agreed that prophecy belonged to the past, he evidently disagreed with the rabbis about when prophecy ceased, for Josephus presents John Hyrcanus (d. 104 BCE) as a prophet, stating that he had rule over the nation, the high priesthood, and

²⁵ Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus," *JJS* 25 (1974): 240; Louis H. Feldman, "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus," *JJS* 41 (1990): 398.

²⁶ Cf. *b. Sanh. 11a*; cf. *b. Sotah 48b*, *t. Sotah 13.3*; *b. Bava Basra 12a-b*; *b. Yoma 21b*. For a discussion of additional rabbinic evidence see Urbach, "מתי," 2-3; Milikowski, "סוף הנבואה," 83-94.

²⁷ Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence From Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 16. According to van Unnik, *Josephus*, 48. Josephus speaks only of the failure of the exact succession of prophets, not of the cessation of prophecy *per se*.

prophecy (προφητείαν), and that he prophesied (προεφήτευσεν).²⁸ Another allusion to the time of John Hyrcanus confirms that Josephus did believe that at least one form of prophecy ceased in the past. In describing the high priestly vestments, Josephus comments that the Urim and Thummim "alike ceased to shine two hundred years before I composed this work, because of God's displeasure at the transgression of the laws."²⁹ Although the use of the Urim and Thummim might fit more comfortably into the modern category of priestly divination, Josephus clearly regarded it as a form of prophecy that had ceased around the time of John Hyrcanus's death.³⁰

The absence of prophets is also mentioned by two pseudonymous texts attributed to characters living during the Babylonian exile. In *2 Baruch*, Jeremiah's faithful scribe claims that "the prophets are sleeping" (85:3); and in the Prayer of Azariah, Daniel's companion mourns, "In our day we have no ruler, or prophet, or leader, no burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, no place to make an offering before you and to find

²⁸ *J.W.* 1.68-69; cf. *Ant.* 13:299-300. Feldman, "Prophets," 402, argues that it is significant that Josephus never refers to Hyrcanus by the title προφήτης and suggests that Josephus may have attributed προφητεία to Hyrcanus because he "did not possess a word to indicate the state of possessing the ability to discern a *bat kol*." Cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, "'We Pay No Heed to Heavenly Voices': The 'End of Prophecy' and the Formation of the Canon," in *Biblical and Humane: A Festschrift for John F. Priest* (eds. Linda Bennett Elder, David L. Barr, and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 22 note 4; Young, "Prophet," 290 note 15. But it is most likely that Josephus did not label John Hyrcanus a προφήτης in *J.W.* 1.68 because of the requirements of syntax rather than because of qualms about the use of the title: Josephus lists three privileges enjoyed by Hyrcanus in the nominal form: τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην καὶ προφητείαν. He clearly believed that Hyrcanus was a high priest, even though he speaks here of the high priesthood. It would have interrupted the flow of the sentence for Josephus to switch from the nominal form, προφητεία, to the title, προφήτης. In the parallel to *J.W.* 1.69 in *Ant.* 13.282-3, Josephus narrates how God communicated to Hyrcanus through a voice in the Temple without explicitly claiming that Hyrcanus prophesied.

²⁹ *Ant.* 3.218. If Josephus wrote the *Antiquities* in the 90s CE, two hundred years would extend back approximately to the end of Hyrcanus's reign. Cf. Gray, *Figures*, 20.

³⁰ Josephus consistently portrays divination by means of the Urim and Thummim as prophetic activity. Cf. esp. *Ant.* 6.115 (1 Sam 14:16-23) as well as *Ant.* 5.120 (Judg 1:1); *Ant.* 3.192 (Aaron); *Ant.* 6.64, 3.214-218, 4.200, 5.159. Cf. Ernst Bammel, "APXIEPEYΣ ΠPOΦETEΨΩN," *TLZ* 79 (1954): 351-6; Feldman, "Prophets," 419-21.

mercy" (15). Though both texts were composed with the real authors' present situation in mind, it is not immediately apparent how closely an absence of prophetic revelation correlated with the authors' own experience. Unless the Prayer of Azariah was composed around the time that Antiochus IV defiled the temple, the claim that there is "no burnt offering" would not reflect the author's experience.³¹ It is thus possible that mentioning the absence of prophecy may have become a standardized way of referring to the loss of the first temple, perhaps under the influence of biblical statements that associate the destruction of the temple with a temporary absence of prophets (Ps 74:9; Lam 2:9). Yet in the case of *2 Baruch* the claim that "the prophets are sleeping" is so tightly integrated with the author's concern to impress upon his post-70 audience the fundamental importance of remaining faithful to the law of Moses,³² that it is most likely that the mention of the absence of prophets reflected the author's own experience. The fictional setting of the book during the Babylonian exile (regardless of whether or not it was understood as a transparent fiction), and the association of prophets with "former generations" suggest that the author relegated prophets to the more distant past.³³ One may argue that *2 Baruch*'s late date makes it an unreliable indicator of pre-70 beliefs about prophets,³⁴ but *2 Baruch* shares with 1 Maccabees and (to some extent) Josephus, a

³¹ It is commonly supposed that the prayer had had an independent life of its own before ca. 100 BCE when it was incorporated into the Greek translation of Daniel (cf. *HJP* 3.2, 723, 725). George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981), 29, suggests that the prayer may have been "composed during the persecution," adding "reference to the lack of a prophet could have been made at any time that the author believed there was no prophet" (Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 40 note 29).

³² Cf. *2 Bar.* 77:1-10; 84:5; John J. Collins, *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (2 ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 221. On the date of *2 Baruch* see *HJP* 3.2, 752-3.

³³ *Contra* Levison, "Withdraw?," 44-5.

³⁴ Cf. Leivestad, "Dogma," 295: "Diese Apokalypse ist ja aber erst in der rabbinischen Zeit

sense that prophets (at least of the biblical variety) were absent.

Prophets and the Past

More telling than direct statements about an absence of prophets in the present are passages in which the prophets under discussion clearly belong to the past. Already in Zechariah earlier prophets are referred to with apparent nostalgia as the "former prophets" (Zech 1:4; 7:7, 12). Ben Sira refers to the "bones of the twelve prophets" (49:10), and his comparison of law, wisdom and prophecy implies that "prophecies" are written records from past prophets (39:1). In fact, the technical terms used to designate prophets and prophecy in both the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint eventually came to be reserved almost exclusively for figures of the past. In the Greek Apocrypha, words of the same root as προφήτης refer almost entirely to biblical characters;³⁵ Josephus almost never applies words of the same root as προφήτης to any except the biblical prophets;³⁶ the same pattern appears in the non-biblical Dead Sea Scrolls in connection with the root נבא.³⁷

abgefaßt."

³⁵ Tob 2:6 (Amos); 14:4-5 (prophets of Israel); 14:8 texts A and B (Jonah); cf. 4:12; Jdt 6:2 (Achior); Wis 11:1 (Moses); Sir 1:1; 36:14-15; 39:1; 44:3; 46:1 (Joshua); 46:13, 15, 20 (Samuel); 47:1 (Nathan); 48:1 (Elijah); 48:8, 13 (Elisha); 48:22 (Isaiah); 49:7 (Jeremiah); 49:10 (the twelve prophets); Bar 1:16, 21; 2:20, 24; Bel 1, 33 Theod. (Habakkuk); 1 Macc 9:54; 2 Macc 2:1-2, 4 (Jeremiah); 2 Macc 2:13; 15:9 (written prophets); 15:14 (Jeremiah); 4 Macc 18:10 (written prophets). Exceptions include Wis 7:27, 14:28 (idolaters); Sir 24:33. See discussion below.

³⁶ Cf. David E. Aune, "The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus," *JBL* 101 (1982): 419-21. Apart from those whom Josephus regards as false prophets (see discussion below), the two main exceptions are John Hyrcanus and a quotation of Alexander Polyhistor in which Cleodemus is called προφήτης (*Ant.* 1.240).

³⁷ Cf. James E. Bowley, "Prophets and Prophecy At Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (2 vols; eds. Peter W. Flint, and James C. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999), 2.371: "There is no text which unequivocally identifies a current teacher or leader of the group with the title נביא." If וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשנו (1QS viii 16) is read in conjunction with ככול הנגלה עת (viii 15), then the "prophets" in question might refer to the present, but the combination of Moses (viii 15) and the "prophets" makes it more likely that the prophets refer to figures from the past (so Bowley, "Prophets," 361). 11Q5 xxii 14 ("Apostrophe to Zion") could refer to contemporary (or future) prophets,

It is often suggested that a widespread belief in the cessation of prophecy accounts for pseudonymous works in which claims to inspiration are attributed to great figures from the past,³⁸ but the descriptions of inspired experiences in apocalyptic literature most likely represent the kinds of revelatory experiences that individuals such as prophets were thought to experience;³⁹ they may also reflect the experiences of some of the writers of apocalypses themselves.⁴⁰ Whether a claim to inspiration amounted to a claim to be a prophet remains uncertain, however.

The Title "Prophet" Applied to Contemporary Figures

At least one passage employs the term *προφήτης* in a context that implies that prophecy continued: the author of the Wisdom of Solomon stated that "in every generation [wisdom] passes into holy souls and makes them friends of God, and prophets."⁴¹ Although the evidence is ambiguous, other passages may at least be construed in this way. For example, Philo of Alexandria wrote about his own experience of divine possession, how he instructed his soul to be inspired as the prophets are inspired, and how he claimed to be an initiate of Moses and a disciple of the prophet

but the mention of remembering the "pious deeds of your prophets" in xxii 5 suggests that they belong to the past. 4Q177 12-13 i 1 quotes from Jer 18:18 ("For instruction shall not perish from the priest . . . nor the word from the prophet") in an eschatological context, but the interpretation is not clear (cf. George J. Brooke, "Catena," *EDSS* 1:122). There are a few other occurrences of נביא in the Scrolls that do not clearly refer to past prophets, but the context is insufficient to decide one way or the other.

³⁸ Cf. Sommer, "Prophecy," 43; Werner Foerster, "Der heilige Geist im Spätjudentum," *NTS* 8 (1961-1962): 133.

³⁹ Cf. D. S. Russell, *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964), 158-9; Barton, *Oracles*, 125-6.

⁴⁰ Cf. Michael E. Stone, "Apocalyptic--Vision or Hallucination?," in *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition* (ed. Michael E. Stone: Leiden: Brill, 1991), 425; Russell, *Jewish Apocalyptic*, 132-4; Barton, *Oracles*, 212.

⁴¹ Wis 7:27. Ben Sira may lay claim to prophetic inspiration when he writes, "I will again pour out teaching like prophecy" (24:33), but the context draws attention to the enduring quality of his teaching rather than to its inspired nature.

Jeremiah.⁴² Philo was certainly aware that words of the *προφητ*- root were commonly used in Scripture of the biblical prophets, yet he used words of the *προφητ*- root in connection with inspired experiences,⁴³ and was willing to portray his own inspired experiences in a manner similar to those of Moses.⁴⁴ One might well conclude that he was describing what he regarded as contemporary prophetic experience, albeit of a decidedly mystical kind.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, it is not at all clear how literally one should take Philo's terminology.⁴⁶

While no positive figure is clearly labelled a *נביא* in the Dead Sea Scrolls, there are a few references to contemporary figures who are labelled false prophets.⁴⁷ A straightforward reading of the charge of false prophecy implies a claim to prophecy by

⁴² Cf. *Cher.* 49; *Migr.* 34-35; *Her.* 69-74; Philo's language in *Cher.* 49 may mean no more than "allegorical study of the Mosaic Law" and the book of Jeremiah (David M. Hay, "Philo's View of Himself As an Exegete: Inspired, But Not Authoritative," *Studia Philonica Annual* 3 [1991]: 45).

⁴³ Cf. *Gig.* 61: "But the men of God are priests and prophets (*προφήται*) who . . . have risen wholly above the sphere of sense-perception"; *Migr.* 38: "He that sees [Goodness] is the wise man. . . . That is why in former times they called the prophets (*προφήτας*) seers"; *Her.* 78, 259. Philo also speaks of prophets as those who are possessed by the divine spirit—with no suggestion that such experiences no longer exist (cf. *Spec.* 4.49-52).

⁴⁴ Cf. John R. Levison, "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus," *JSJ* 26 (1995): 295-7.

⁴⁵ Cf. Aune, *Prophecy*, 147-8.

⁴⁶ See the discussions in Hay, "Philo's View," 48; David Winston, "Two Types of Mosaic Prophecy According to Philo," *JSP* 4 (1989): 61; Levison, "Inspiration," 321.

⁴⁷ In 1QH^a XII 16, *נביאי כזב* are opponents of the speaker (cf. חזי רמיה [1QH^a xii 10]; חזי תעות [1QH^a xii 20]). CD vi 1 refers to the boundary shifters who "preached rebellion against the commandments of God given by the hand of Moses and of His holy anointed ones" and who "prophesied lies (וינבאו שקר)." The context suggests that the boundary shifters were in existence immediately prior to the formation of the sect; 4Q266 1 a-b 4 indicates that they were still in existence. Elisha Qimron, "רשימת נביאי לפשרה של רשימת נביאי," *Tarbiz* 63, no. 2 (1994): 273-5 and Alexander Rofé, "רשימת נביאי השקר מקומראן - שתי חידות," *Ha'aretz* (1994), B: B11 have argued that the last surviving line of the list of false prophets in 4Q339 refers to John Hyrcanus (son of Simon). However, Shaye J.D. Cohen, "False Prophets (4Q339), Netinim (4Q340), and Hellenism At Qumran," *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 1 (2000): 56-66, has demonstrated conclusively that antiquarian list-making could be an end in itself; a contemporary application was unnecessary. According to Magen Broshi and Ada Yardeni, "4Q339," in *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (eds. Magen Broshi, et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 79, Qimron eventually adopted the reconstruction, "נביאה די מן גב[עון]," but to my knowledge Qimron's revised view has not appeared in print.

the author's opponents, but given the common use of sobriquets at Qumran, the references to false prophets may simply form part of a polemic against outsiders addressed to insiders, in which case they cannot be used as evidence to show that individuals outside of Qumran were actually claiming to be prophets.⁴⁸ On the other hand, the development of legal texts that consider how false prophets are to be identified suggests that the adjudication of competing claims to prophetic inspiration was more than an antiquarian concern.⁴⁹ Still, the possibility cannot be excluded that the laws were preserved from the past or designed for use in the future.⁵⁰ In the end, there is still insufficient information about those labelled "false prophets" by the community at Qumran to be able to determine whether they actually claimed to be prophets or whether the polemical epithet was chosen simply because they appeared as false teachers.⁵¹

Josephus also presents various figures as false prophets and, fortunately for us, he sketches their behaviour. The so-called "sign prophets,"⁵² who were active in the years

⁴⁸ Cf. Leivestad, "Dogma," 297.

⁴⁹ 11QT liv 8-18; lxi 1-5; 4Q375 entertains the possibility that a false prophet's tribe will rise up to defend him as a trustworthy prophet (נביא [נ]אמן הואה; 4Q375 1 i). The simple transmission of Deut 13 would signal mere respect for tradition; it is the development and modification of the tradition, particularly in 4Q375 that suggests active interest.

⁵⁰ Cf. Bowley, "Prophets," 374-5; John Strugnell, "4Q375. 4QApocryphon of Moses^a," in *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (vol. XIX; eds. Magen Broshi, Esther Eshel, et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 119.

⁵¹ 4Q375 poses considerable difficulties on any reading of the text: If 4Q375 refers to the evaluation of contemporary prophets, then the true prophet mentioned in 4Q375 1 i 1 most likely refers to a contemporary prophet acting within the community because the words of Moses in Deut 13:1 (EVV 12:32) are echoed in the words attributed to God: אלהיכה אליכה מפי הנביא ושמרתה [את כול אשר]. This is surprising, considering that the title נביא is not regularly used of contemporary true prophets elsewhere. The biblical sounding language at the beginning of the column supports the conclusion that the passage simply reworks biblical laws regardless of their contemporary applicability (cf. Gershon Brin, *Studies in Biblical Law: From the Hebrew Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls* [trans. Jonathan Chipman; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994], 132, 134, who takes הנביא as a reference to the prophets of the biblical period). But then, as Brin, *Studies*, 135, recognizes, one must explain why the latter part of the column diverges so markedly from Deuteronomy 13.

⁵² The term was coined by P. W. Barnett, "The Jewish Sign Prophets--A.D. 40-70--Their

leading up to the Jewish revolt, include Theudas (*Ant.* 20.97-99), the Egyptian (*War* 2.261-63; *Ant.* 20.169-72), a certain impostor who appeared while Festus was procurator (*Ant.* 20.188), a false prophet whose followers congregated in the temple portico near the end of the revolt (*War* 6.283-7), and various other unnamed figures.⁵³ Josephus's attitude toward these figures is uniformly negative,⁵⁴ but the fact that he occasionally uses *προφήτης* when he presents their own claims removes any doubt that he knew they were regarded as genuine prophets by their supporters.⁵⁵ The sign prophets therefore provide strong evidence for the existence of prophets during the Second Temple period. Yet this is not a decisive argument against the standard view, for adherents of the standard view maintain that the sign prophets were *eschatological* prophets who claimed to be associated with the events of the end times.⁵⁶

Inspired Experiences

Regardless of the terminology employed, there are many examples of figures who are portrayed by Second Temple writers as experiencing inspiration, who behaved in a manner reminiscent of the biblical prophets, and who were able to predict the future, but who are not given the title "prophet." For example, the speaker of 1QH^a claims to be

Intentions and Origin," *NTS* 27 (1981): 679.

⁵³ *War* 2.258-60 par. *Ant.* 20.167-8; *War* 6.286.

⁵⁴ He prefers to refer to them as γόητες: Theudas (γόης; *Ant.* 20.97); the Egyptian (ψευδοπροφήτης and γόης; *War* 2.261); the impostor (γόης) under Festus (*Ant.* 20.188); the false prophet (ψευδοπροφήτης; *War* 6.285) in the temple portico; other unnamed figures: γόητες (*Ant.* 20.167); πλάνοι (*War* 2.259); ἀπατεῶνες (*War* 2.259; *Ant.* 20.167).

⁵⁵ Theudas (*Ant.* 20.97); the Egyptian (*War* 2.261; *Ant.* 20.169). On one occasion Josephus does refer to many προφήται who were "suborned by the tyrants to delude the people" during the revolt (*War* 6.286). Cf. Aune, "ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ," 419-20.

⁵⁶ Cf. Young, "Prophet," 297; Sommer, "Prophecy," 36.

inspired by the holy spirit⁵⁷ as well as a "mediator of secret wonders."⁵⁸ According to 1QpHab vii 4-5, God made known to the Teacher of Righteousness "all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets." Based on this evidence of inspired activity, James Bowley proposes that the Qumran group's failure to identify the Teacher of Righteousness as a "prophet" may have stemmed from their polemical context rather than from any sense that the Teacher was less than a prophet: "The claim of prophetic authority may have been seen as a weaker apologetic, and thus the idea of a divine exegete was preferred as a safer, but apparently equally authoritative, model."⁵⁹

The evidence from Josephus for prophet-like experience is often rehearsed by scholars. Remarking about those among the Essenes who foretell the future, Josephus claims, "Seldom, if ever, do they err in their predictions" (*War* 2.159); he comments that the predictions of Judas the Essene "never once proved erroneous or false",⁶⁰ he also refers to the predictive ability of the Pharisees (*Ant.* 17.41-45), noting that the predictions of the Pharisees Pollion (*Ant.* 15.3-4) and Samaias (*Ant.* 14.174) came true. It has been suggested that Josephus did not deem the predictive ability of the Essenes and Pharisees worthy to be called "prophecy."⁶¹ If so, it is surprising how regularly Josephus presents the prophetic activity of the biblical prophets as prediction.⁶²

⁵⁷ שמעתי לרוח קודשכה (1QH^a xx 12). Cf. 1QH^a iv 26, xvii 23). In 1QH^a vi 25, the psalmist claims to be favoured with the "spirit of knowledge."

⁵⁸ מליץ דעת ברזי פלא (1QH^a x 13). Cf. 1QH^a xii 27-28, xxiii 9-15; Bowley, "Prophets," 371.

⁵⁹ Bowley, "Prophets," 372-3. Bowley refers to Mic 3:5-8 as a biblical precedent for this polemical move. Cf. Stemberger, "Propheten," 146-7.

⁶⁰ *War* 1.78; *Ant.* 13.311-13. Cf. the ability of Simon the Essene to interpret dreams (*War* 2.112-113; *Ant.* 17.345-8), and the account of Manaemus the Essene's prediction about Herod (*Ant.* 15.373-9).

⁶¹ Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 180.

⁶² Cf. Gray, *Figures*, 31. Note especially Josephus's comment about Samuel in *Ant.* 5.351 (Thackeray, LCL): "But the renown of Samuel increased more and more, since all that he prophesied was seen to come true." Cf. *Ant.* 2.194 (Gen 49); 4.320 (Deut 33); 6.254-255 (1 Sam 22:9-10).

The claim that dreams and divination are less than full-fledged prophecy overlooks the fact that Josephus and Philo understood biblical prophecy in precisely these terms. For example, Josephus adds to the biblical account that God appeared to the prophet Nathan in a *dream*.⁶³ Josephus also refers to his own "nightly dreams, in which God had foretold to him the impending fate of the Jews," adds that "he was an interpreter of dreams and skilled in divining the meaning of ambiguous utterances of the Deity," and presents himself as one "inspired (ἐνθους)" (*War* 3.351-3). Although Josephus never explicitly labels himself a προφήτης, he certainly portrayed himself as a prophet-like figure,⁶⁴ and it is possible, as Lester Grabbe has argued, that Josephus assumed "the wise would understand" that he was a prophet.⁶⁵

Finally, although Josephus never identifies Jesus son of Ananias as a prophet, his description of this "rude peasant," who incessantly repeated "Woe to Jerusalem!" until he was silenced by a projectile from a Roman catapult, cannot fail to evoke the activity of the biblical prophets of judgement.⁶⁶ Unlike the sign prophets who fit rather well into the traditional conception of eschatological prophets, Jesus ben Ananias never promised eschatological deliverance nor, apparently, did he attract a following.

⁶³ *Ant.* 7.147 (2 Sam 12:1); cf. Feldman, "Prophets," 407. Philo explains similarly that interpreters of dreams are "prophets expounding divine oracles" (*Ios.* 95 [Colson, LCL]) and proves that Moses is the greatest of all prophets because he predicted his death in writing before he died (*Mos.* 2.288). *Contra* Sommer, "Prophecy," 40, 42.

⁶⁴ For Josephus' depiction of himself as a prophet-like figure, see *Jos. J.W.* 3.135-7; 4.622-629 as well as Blenkinsopp, "Josephus," 240; David Daube, "Typology in Josephus," *JJS* 31 (1980): 18-36; Steve Mason, "Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House," in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (eds. Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers; Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994), 176-7.

⁶⁵ Grabbe, "Reality," 536. Cf. Reinhold Mayer and Christa Möller, "Josephus—Politiker und Prophet," in *Josephus-Studien* (eds. O. Betz, K. Haacker, and M. Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974), 282-4; van Unnik, *Josephus*, 41-54; Gary Lance Johnson, "Josephus: Heir Apparent to the Prophetic Tradition?," *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 337-46.

⁶⁶ *War* 6.300-9. Cf. Michel, "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum," 61-2; Gray, *Figures*, 158-63.

Conclusion

In sum, we are left with scattered statements about the absence of prophets, a remarkable avoidance of biblical terminology in connection with contemporary figures, but strong evidence from Josephus, Philo, and the Dead Sea Scrolls that testifies to the perceived reality, in some circles, of the existence of inspired revelatory experiences.

It goes without saying that the same evidence is patient of several different interpretations. As indicated above, adherents of the standard view tend to underline the significance of terminology—a widespread belief that prophecy belonged to the past does not exclude divine-human communication or prediction of the future so long as these are not understood as "prophecy." The fact that Josephus never identifies the Essenes as "prophets" suggests to proponents of the standard view that he would have denied they were prophets. Although those responsible for the Qumran scrolls certainly believed in revelation, the fact that they avoided technical "prophet" terminology when referring to contemporary revelatory experiences might imply that they did not regard this activity as prophecy.⁶⁷ Opponents of the standard view obviously place more weight on the perceived experiences of Second Temple Jews. Though the terminological evidence at first seems to support the standard view, there are ways in which this evidence is taken into account by those who argue that most Jews during this period believed that "prophecy" was still possible in the present. We will consider these explanations in what follows.

At times only a fine line separates those who emphasize that *most* Jews believed

⁶⁷ Cf. Foerster, "Der heilige Geist," 132.

The paucity of references to contemporary figures who are explicitly labelled "prophets" is often attributed to a sense of nostalgia for the past—the titles *προφήτης* and *נביא* tended to be reserved for the great prophets of the biblical period even though most Jews would affirm that "prophecy" really did continue and that "prophets" still existed.⁷⁰ Others explain the fact that most of our sources do not employ the title "prophet" for contemporary figures by positing a sharp disjunction either between the views of the educated elites—whose beliefs are preserved in the surviving literature from this period—and the views of the common people; or between the views of the rabbis and their predecessors, and most other Jews. According to the former explanation, the majority of common people, for whom prophecy was a living reality, would not have

⁷⁰ Cf. Gray, *Figures*, 34, 142; Stemmerger, "Propheten," 154; Urbach, "מתי," 8: "הרגשת ההבדל . . . אולם, כפי שהדגשנו כבר קולה והמרחק היתה קיימת וראו בדברי הנביאים האלה רק הד של הנבואה הקדומה . . . עדיין לא נדם."

subscribed to an elitist dictum that prophets belonged in the past.⁷¹ Belief in the cessation of prophecy is sometimes described as a "historical fiction" that arose as a corollary to the rabbinic concept of a closed canon,⁷² or it is attributed to the rabbis and their predecessors, who wanted to delegitimize ongoing experiences of prophecy by authorizing a schematic history that left the prophets in the past as the forerunners of the scribes.⁷³

Given the diversity of our sources we may expect to discover a variety of answers to the question whether prophecy ceased and, if so, when. I will not attempt to assess how a majority of our extant sources—let alone most Jews—would answer. In my view, such an assessment at this stage is premature, particularly if one aims to take into account how contemporary inspired figures were viewed in relation to the biblical prophets. The question is complicated and requires decisions about vocabulary usage as well as an examination of how inspired figures were characterized in each individual corpus.⁷⁴ For example, although Philo did not hesitate to employ words of the *προφητ*- root in connection with both contemporary as well as biblical figures, and Josephus generally refrained from doing so, it does not follow that Philo believed prophecy continued while Josephus believed it ceased. One must also explore what Philo and Josephus meant when

⁷¹ This general view is espoused by Meyer, *TDNT* 6:828; Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973), 90-4; Alexander, "Sixtieth Part," 432; Greenspahn, "Prophecy," 48-9; Joan E. Taylor, *The Immerser: John the Baptist Within Second Temple Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 223-34; Richard A. Horsley and John S. Hanson, *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus* (Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985), 159-60.

⁷² Alexander, "Sixtieth Part," 430-1.

⁷³ Greenspahn, "Prophecy," 48: "By accepting prophetic leadership as one stage in Jewish history, the rabbis relegated it to the past. Canonizing prophecy protected them from its contemporary practitioners." Cf. Meyer, *TDNT* 6:818; Alexander, "Sixtieth Part," 431.

⁷⁴ Cf. Leivestad, "Dogma," 289; Barton, *Oracles*, 109.

they used words of this root, as well as the ways in which they compared the biblical prophets with and distinguished them from later figures. Different authors may have had different reasons for employing or avoiding the standard terminology for prophets. Unfortunately, such a detailed examination of Second Temple literature lies beyond the scope of this thesis.

Although much more work remains to be done with regard to Second Temple Jewish beliefs about the existence or absence of prophecy, this much is clear: the extant evidence tends to refrain from applying the characteristic biblical language for prophets to contemporary figures. Any attempt to show that prophecy was understood to continue must offer an explanation why the normal terminology used to designate prophets came to be reserved primarily for biblical figures. It will not do simply to demonstrate the existence of what modern scholars would identify as prophecy.

Eschatological Prophets

While scholarly views about the absence of prophecy during the late Second Temple period are often taken for granted when interpreting Luke-Acts, Jewish beliefs about eschatological prophets tend to figure more prominently—especially in discussions of Lukan Christology. The remainder of this chapter will assess the Second Temple literary evidence for Jewish beliefs about eschatological prophets such as the eschatological Elijah and the prophet like Moses. I will also discuss Second Temple evidence for the belief that the end times would be characterized by widespread prophesying, as well as evidence for the expectation of an independent eschatological figure patterned after the Isaianic servant, as it has been suggested that these expectations

form part of the background against which Luke-Acts was written.

The Eschatological Elijah

Malachi 3:23-24 (EV 4:5-6) forms the basis for the belief in Elijah's end-time return:

²³Behold, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the LORD comes. ²⁴He will turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents, so that I will not come and strike the land with a curse.

Within the final form of Malachi, this prediction of Elijah's return is linked to the announcement of the coming of an unnamed messenger mentioned in 3:1-2:

¹Behold, I will send my messenger to prepare the way before me, and the Lord whom you seek will suddenly come to his temple. The messenger of the covenant in whom you delight—indeed, he is coming, says the LORD of hosts. ²But who can endure the day of his coming, and who can stand when he appears? For he is like a refiner's fire and like fullers' soap.⁷⁵

The connection between the sending of the prophet Elijah and the sending of "my messenger" raises two questions of significance for the interpretation of eschatological Elijah traditions in Luke-Acts. The first question concerns the way in which the return of Elijah was understood with respect to the figures mentioned in Mal 3:1. In addition to the speaker (who is undoubtedly identified with God), Mal 3:1 refers to "my messenger," "the Lord (יְהוָה)," and "the messenger of the covenant (מַלְאֲכִי הַבְּרִית)." The fact that recent commentators have advanced at least four different interpretations of Mal 3:1

⁷⁵ The parallel structure of Mal 3:1 and 22 functions to identify the two figures:

Mal 3:22-23	Mal 3:1
הנה אנכי שלח לכם את אליה הנביא לפני בוא יום יהוה	הנני שלח מלאכי ופנה-הדרך לפני
καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω ὑμῖν Ἠλίαν τὸν Θεοσβίτην	ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου
πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου	καὶ ἐπιβλέψεται ὁδὸν πρὸ προσώπου μου

Cf. David L. Petersen, *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary* (Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1995), 230; Andrew E. Hill, *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 383.

underscores the complexity of the passage and warns against easy assumptions about how it was interpreted by Second Temple Jews. (1) It is possible that all three titles—"my messenger," "the messenger of the covenant," and "the Lord (יהוה)"—denote one messenger who precedes the coming of God, in which case it is this one messenger who comes and purifies the sons of Levi as a refiner's fire (3:2-4) before God comes in judgement.⁷⁶ Alternatively, (2) Malachi 3:1 could describe the coming of one messenger (3:1a) who precedes the coming of God, but with God referred to as "the Lord (יהוה)" and "the messenger of the covenant."⁷⁷ (3) Malachi 3:1 could describe the coming of one messenger who precedes the coming of God, but with God referred to as "the Lord (יהוה)" and the messenger referred to variously as "my messenger" and "the messenger of the covenant."⁷⁸ (4) Malachi 3:1 could refer to God as "the Lord (יהוה)," who is accompanied by two distinct messengers.⁷⁹

As I will argue in chapter five that Luke understood Jesus to be the "Lord" of Mal 3:1 before whom John the Baptist prepared the way, it will be useful to consider in this section whether similar exegetical moves are attested in Second Temple literature. Although ancient readers of Malachi would not have questioned the unity of the book, they may well have interpreted it atomistically. Thus, it will be necessary first to determine in each passage under discussion whether the prediction of Elijah's return was

⁷⁶ Petersen, *Zechariah and Malachi*, 211, 231.

⁷⁷ Beth Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi: The Divine Messenger* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 130-35; Pieter A. Verhoef, *The Books of Haggai and Malachi* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 288-9; John H. Hughes, "John the Baptist: The Forerunner of God Himself," *NovT* 14 (1972): 193; Steven M. Bryan, *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 91.

⁷⁸ Petersen, *Late*, 42-3; Bruce V. Malchow, "The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal 3:1," *JBL* 103 (1984): 253; Webb, *Baptizer*, 250-1; Öhler, *Elia*, 6.

⁷⁹ Hill, *Malachi*, 288-9.

understood in light of its wider context, and then to assess the specific activities with which the Elijah-Messenger was associated.

The second question concerns the time and nature of Elijah's activity with respect to the coming day of YHWH. According to Mal 3:23-24, Elijah will come *before* the day of YHWH with the aim of "turning the hearts of parents to their children" and thereby averting a curse on the land. A similar sentiment is expressed in Sir 48:10: "It is written, at the appointed time you [Elijah] are destined to appease wrath before (the time of God's) anger,"⁸⁰ to turn the heart of parents to their children and to make ready the tribes of Israel."⁸¹ On the basis of these two passages, it is sometimes asserted that Elijah's eschatological role was not one of judgement,⁸² or that the "judgement and restoration" associated with Elijah should be distinguished from the final judgement connected with the day of YHWH, since both Malachi and Ben Sira associate the eschatological Elijah with restoration that takes place *before* the day of YHWH.⁸³ If, on the other hand, the returning Elijah is identified with the figure of Mal 3:2 whose coming is to be feared and who is like a "refiner's fire," then Elijah may be associated much more closely with the day of YHWH itself. As we will see, one's understanding of the nature of Elijah's eschatological role has the potential to affect how one sees eschatological Elijah

⁸⁰ Cf. Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 531. The end of the clause is missing from the Hebrew text ([לפני] אף להשבית), and the Greek is expressed elliptically (LXX: κοπάσαι ὀργήν πρό θυμοῦ). The Hiphil of the verb שבח can mean "to put an end to," but it can also denote "to remove, put away" (see *HALOT* 2:1408). The latter meaning is more likely in the present context, especially if the "day of the LORD" is associated with wrath, as Mal 3:19-24 and the Greek of Sir 48:10 imply.

⁸¹ My translation follows the Hebrew (ל.. להשיב לב אבות על בנים ולהבין ש..). Cf. the LXX: ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ καταστῆσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ.

⁸² Cf. Charles H. H. Scobie, *John the Baptist* (London: SCM, 1964), 75; Öhler, *Elia*, 59.

⁸³ Cf. Webb, *Baptizer*, 254.

traditions developed in Luke-Acts.

There is still a third question about eschatological Elijah traditions which arises from a Qumran document rather than directly from Malachi 3. 4Q521 2 iii 2 refers to "fathers coming to the sons (נבון באים אבות על בנים)," which may well echo Mal 3:24 "He will turn the hearts of fathers to the sons (וְהָשִׁיב לִב־אֲבוֹת עַל־בָּנִים)."⁸⁴ It is frequently suggested that 4Q521 preserves a lengthy description of Elijah, the prophetic "anointed one," whose eschatological role is defined in terms of allusions to Psalm 146 and Isaiah 61. The mention of an "anointed one" in connection with allusions to Isaiah 61 and Malachi 3 has been taken as evidence that the Lukan Jesus, who applies Isaiah 61 to himself, understood his own task as that of the eschatological Elijah.⁸⁵

In addition to Sir 48:10 and 4Q521, the return of Elijah may also be cryptically referred to in *1 En.* 90:31;⁸⁶ the end times reappearance of Elijah is alluded to in *L.A.B.* 48:1,⁸⁷ and mentioned explicitly in *Sib. Or.* 2:187-9,⁸⁸ as well as in an additional very fragmentary text from Qumran.⁸⁹ Since other references to Elijah's return give few

⁸⁴ The phrase אבות על-בנים is fairly common (Exod 20:5; 34:7; Num 14:18; Deut 5:9; 24:16; 2 Kgs 14:6; 2 Chr 25:4; cf. Ps 103:13), but only in Mal 3:24 does it appear in an eschatological context. Cf. Émile Puech, "4QApocalypse messianique," in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579) (DJD XXV)*; ed. Émile Puech; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998), 35.

⁸⁵ Cf. James D. Tabor and Michael O. Wise, "4Q521 'on Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study," *JSP* 10 (1992): 149-62; John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 117-22. For the reference to an "anointed one," see למשיחו in 4Q521 2 ii 1.

⁸⁶ Cf. *1 En.* 89:53. *Contra* Aune, *Prophecy*, 125, there is no indication in *1 Enoch* 90 that Elijah's role is to prepare for or to go before the Messiah.

⁸⁷ God tells Phinehas that he will reappear on earth as Elijah (Elijah's name is not mentioned, but his actions correspond to those of Elijah); Phinehas will then be taken up again, only to return to earth when God "remember[s] the world." Cf. C. T. Robert Hayward, "Phinehas—the Same Is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition," *JJS* 29 (1978): 22-34; Öhler, *Elia*, 26-7.

⁸⁸ Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 14.

⁸⁹ 4Q558 1 ii 4: "[...] לכן אשלח לאליה קד[ם]" (text from Florentino García Martínez, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* [2d ed.; 2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000]). Cf.

details about Elijah's future role, I will concentrate in what follows on Ben Sira 48 and 4Q521.

Elijah in Ben Sira 48

As is well known, Ben Sira concludes his encomium of Elijah by explicitly referring to Elijah's second coming in language reminiscent of Malachi 3.⁹⁰ It is less often recognized that Ben Sira applies imagery from Malachi 3 to his description of Elijah in Sir 48:1, when Elijah is introduced as a prophet who arose "like fire (ὡς πῦρ/כֶּאֱשׁ)." While this statement is developed with reference to the Elijah narrative in 2 Kings 1-2,⁹¹ the language echoes Mal 3:2 in which either "the Lord (יְהוָה/κύριος)" or the "messenger of the covenant" is described as coming "like a refiner's fire (εἰσπορεύεται ὡς πῦρ χωνευτηρίου/מִצְרֵף כֶּאֱשׁ)." ⁹² Moreover, the second line of Sir 48:1 mentions that Elijah's words were "like a burning oven (כְּתִנּוֹר בּוֹעֵר)," a description which echoes the description of the day "burning like an oven (בֵּיעַר כְּתִנּוֹר)" that will burn up the evildoers

Johannes Zimmermann, *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftenfunden von Qumran* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1998), 413-5. It has also been suggested that the "Messiah of Aaron" mentioned at various places in the scrolls was the expected eschatological Elijah. Cf. Clark, "Elijah," 120, and most recently John C. Poirier, "The Endtime Return of Elijah and Moses At Qumran," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 221-42. It is true that other texts identify Elijah as a priest (cf. Joachim Jeremias, "'Ἡλ(ε)ίας," *TDNT* 2:932-3), and indeed with Phinehas (cf. *L.A.B.* 48:1)—an identification that has some basis in Malachi itself (cf. Mal 2:4-6; Clark, "Elijah," 35, 167). The main difficulty with this proposal is that the passage from Malachi that predicts the return of Elijah makes explicit that it was "the prophet Elijah" who was expected to return. It is therefore unlikely that the Qumran sectarians identified the eschatological Elijah with the priestly "messiah of Aaron." Cf. Raymond E. Brown, "The Messianism of Qumran," *CBQ* 19 (1957): 54 note 7.

⁹⁰ Compare ἐπιστρέψαι (Heb. לְהָשִׁיב) καρδῖαν κτλ. in Sir 48:10 with ἀποκαταστήσει (MT וְהָשִׁיב) καρδῖαν κτλ. in Mal 3:23.

⁹¹ Sir 48:3 mentions that Elijah brought down fire from heaven three times; 48:10 recalls that he was taken up in "a whirlwind of fire." Cf. Skehan & Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 533.

⁹² A comparison with fire (כֶּאֱשׁ/ὡς πῦρ) is not itself exceptional (cf. Ps 88:47; Isa 66:15; Jer 4:4, 20:9; Amos 5:6); it is the strong allusion to Malachi 3 in the second half of the verse that makes an allusion to Mal 3:2 likely also in the first half of Sir 48:1.

like stubble.⁹³

Though Ben Sira may simply have borrowed a felicitous expression from Mal 3:19 without intending to relate Elijah's words and the day of YHWH in any deeper way,⁹⁴ the common "*day of the LORD*" language in Mal 3:2 and 19 suggests that Ben Sira's decision to characterize Elijah using language from these two verses was prompted by his understanding of Elijah's eschatological mandate. After Mal 3:1 introduces "my messenger," "the Lord (יְהוָה)," and "the messenger of the covenant," verse 2 refers to a coming day: "But who can endure the *day* of his coming, and who can stand when he appears?" In language that recalls the "day of his coming" (Mal 3:2),⁹⁵ verse 19 affirms that this separation between the righteous and the wicked is made known on the coming "*day of the LORD*" that is "burning like an oven" which will burn up the evildoers like stubble (3:19); the righteous will also "tread down the wicked" on the day that God acts (3:21). Finally, according to 3:23 God will send Elijah before "the *day of the LORD*" comes. Just as the declaration of God's coming judgement in 3:1-5 responds to the challenge to God's justice in 2:17, so also 3:16-21 responds directly to the complaint that "it is vain to *serve* God" (3:14) by announcing the coming destruction of those who do not serve God.⁹⁶ The reference to the coming day in both 3:1-5 and 3:16-21 suggests that

⁹³ Mal 3:19. The parallel is obscured in the LXX, where the phrase in Mal 3:19 is rendered by καιομένη ὥς κλίβανος, and the phrase in Sir 48:1 is rendered by ὥς λαμπὰς ἐκαίετο.

⁹⁴ Cf. Skehan & Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 533.

⁹⁵ Mal 3:2 refers to "the day of his coming (יּוֹם בּוֹאוֹ)"; 3:19 states "the day is coming (הַיּוֹם בָּא)" and refers to "the coming day (הַיּוֹם הַבָּא)"; 3:23 declares " . . . before the day of the LORD comes (לפני בוא יום יהוה)." Only 3:23 identifies the coming day as the "day of the LORD." Mal 3:17, 21 mention the day on which God will act, but do not refer to the day as the "coming day." Note also the repetition of the interjection הִנֵּה in 3:1, 19 and 23.

⁹⁶ Cf. Hill, *Malachi*, 356-7.

the two passages may be superimposed and taken as descriptions of the same event.⁹⁷ It is thus a simple matter to move from the identification of the eschatological Elijah of 3:23 with the messenger of Mal 3:1-4, to the conclusion that Elijah must also have a part to play in connection with the events of the "coming day" that are described in 3:19.

Probably Ben Sira 48:1 coloured Elijah with both the language of the coming one in Mal 3:2 and the language of the coming day in Mal 3:19 because Ben Sira believed Elijah had a part to play on the day itself. To be sure, Elijah comes before that day (Mal 3:23); perhaps his restoring work was seen behind the selection of a remnant in 3:16-18 in the same way that Ben Sira appears to have identified the purifying activity of 3:2-4 as the task of Elijah.⁹⁸ But the allusion to Mal 3:19 in Sir 48:1 suggests that Ben Sira also associated Elijah with the judgement that is to take place on the day itself. Instead of limiting Elijah's activity to the period before the day of YHWH, Ben Sira associates the eschatological Elijah closely with the day itself.

Although it was once taken for granted in scholarship that Elijah was expected to come before the Messiah, Malachi itself makes no reference to a Messiah, and there is no clear pre-Christian literary evidence for the belief that the eschatological Elijah's role consisted of preparing the way for the Messiah.⁹⁹ The obvious allusions to Mal 3:23 in

⁹⁷ Cf. Verhoef, *Haggai & Malachi*, 324; Glazier-McDonald, *Malachi*, 253. This is not to say that the description of the refining fire in 3:2-4 was originally regarded as identical to the fire of 3:19 (cf. Petersen, *Zechariah and Malachi*, 224; Hill, *Malachi*, 362). Ben Sira presumably interpreted the day of 3:2 and the day of 3:19 as references to the same event, but it is not clear that even Ben Sira or readers like him blurred all the distinctions between the two passages.

⁹⁸ This process may already have begun in the LXX, for instead of *וְיָלֵךְ בְּנֵימָה עַל-אַבְוֹתָם* in Mal 3:24, the LXX has *καὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ*. The phrase *πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ* is reminiscent of the phrase *ἐκαστος πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ* that appears in 3:16 as a translation of *אִישׁ אֶת-רֵעֵהוּ*.

⁹⁹ So correctly John A. T. Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus : An Essay in Detection," *NTS* 4

Sir 48:10 suggest that Ben Sira envisaged the coming of Elijah in association with the coming day of YHWH; there is no reference to a third figure for whom Elijah prepares the way.

Elijah in 4Q521

4Q521 is most well-known for its mention of an "anointed one" (2 ii 1)¹⁰⁰ before a prediction that "the Lord (אֲדֹנִי)" will "make alive the dead and proclaim good news to the poor."¹⁰¹ The passage is remarkable not only because of the mention of raising the dead, but also because the order is very close to a dominical logion preserved in Matthew and Luke in which raising the dead (with no biblical parallel) is followed immediately by a mention of preaching good news to the poor (Isa 61:1).¹⁰²

Biblical allusions in 4Q521 are by no means limited to Isaiah 61, however. This predictive text echoes a variety of passages, most prominently Ps 146:7-8 (2 ii 1, 8).

There is also good reason to believe that the similarities between 4Q521 and Malachi 3 run deeper than the phrase "fathers to the sons" in 2 iii 2 which, as we noted above,

(1958): 268-9. The once dominant view that most Jews in the Second Temple period expected Elijah as a fore-runner of the Messiah has been decisively refuted by Morris M. Faierstein, "Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First," *JBL* 100 (1981): 77; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "More About Elijah Coming First," *JBL* 104 (1985); and more recently Öhler, *Elia*, 1-30. The older view is still quite widespread, in part due to the influence of Jeremias, *TDNT* 2:951-2 and *HJP* 2, 515. *Contra* A. W. Zwiép, *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 63, Mark 9:11-13 mentions a scribal view that Elijah would come before the resurrection, rather than before the Messiah (So J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 269; Fitzmyer, "Elijah"). Mark 9:11-13 is in any case New Testament literary evidence.

¹⁰⁰ The reading משיח seems certain, but it is still possible (but not probable) that we have to do with a plural noun spelled defectively (i.e. משיחיו instead of משיחיו). Cf. Elisha Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986), 59. See discussion in Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 385-6.

¹⁰¹ לְבָשֶׁר עֲנִיִּים יִבְשֶׁר (2 ii 12). Cf. Isa 61:1).

¹⁰² Cf. Luke 7:22 (par. Matt 11:5); Tabor and Wise, "4Q521," 158-62; Collins, *Scepter*, 121-2. It should be noted, however, that the three remaining items in the Synoptic list (viz. "the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, and the deaf hear") are not paralleled in 4Q521; the latter list also contains several additional items not present in the Synoptics. Cf. George J. Brooke, "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. Michael E. Stone, and Esther G. Chazon; Leiden: Brill, 1998), 46.

recalls Mal 3:24: (1) Since it appears in the immediately preceding line, Émile Puech suggests that חק in 2 iii 1 alludes to the "statutes and ordinances (חֻקִּים וּמִשְׁפָּטִים)" of Mal 3:22.¹⁰³ (2) If Puech's reconstruction of ע[די]ק לרשע in fragment 14 is correct, that phrase is a direct citation of Mal 3:18.¹⁰⁴ (3) In addition, the phrase "those who seek the Lord in his service (מבקשי אדני בעבדתו)" (2 ii 3) has a close parallel in the biblical collocation "you that seek the LORD (מְבַקְשֵׁי יְהוָה)" (cf. Isa 51:1; Ps 105:3), but the use of עבודה for "le service 'religieux' de la Torah" parallels the use of the verb עבד in Mal 3:14, 18 to denote the service of God that consists of obedience to God's commands.¹⁰⁵ This in turn suggests that מבקשי אדני alludes rather to the coming of the "Lord whom you are seeking (הָאֲדֹנָי אֲשֶׁר-אַתֶּם מְבַקְשִׁים)" (Mal 3:1), whose task it will be to distinguish between the righteous and the wicked.¹⁰⁶

4Q521 is more positive than Malachi 3; its statement that those who seek the Lord through obedience will find him, transforms Malachi's ominous pronouncement against those who claim to seek God, but who will instead face his judgement (Mal 3:1-4), into a promise of blessing for those who do not turn from the holy commandments (4Q521 2 ii 2-3). Still, 4Q521 does not neglect the punishment of the disobedient (cf. 4Q521 7 5, 13), and the focus on blessing for the righteous is consonant with Malachi 3 as a whole,

¹⁰³ Puech, "4Q521," 19.

¹⁰⁴ Puech, "4Q521," 34.

¹⁰⁵ Puech, "4Q521," 12. Cf. אֲמַרְתֶּם שׁוּא עֲבַד אֱלֹהִים (Mal 3:14); בֵּין עֲבַד אֱלֹהִים לֹא עָבְדוּ (Mal 3:18). The verb עָבַד is used frequently of cultic service, but it is not common for words of this root to be used in the Hebrew Bible in connection with obeying the law of Moses. Cf. Puech, "4Q521," 21.

¹⁰⁶ Puech, "4Q521," 12, does not associate מבקשי אדני with מְבַקְשֵׁי אֲשֶׁר-אַתֶּם מְבַקְשִׁים, but he does observe that the line is reminiscent of Malachi 3.

which concludes with a promise of eschatological healing¹⁰⁷ for the righteous God-fearers on the day when God acts.¹⁰⁸

If *מְבַקְשֵׁי אֲדֹנִי* in 4Q521 2 ii 3 alludes to the "Lord whom you are seeking (*הָאֲדֹנָי* (אֲשֶׁר-אַתֶּם מְבַקְשִׁים" (Mal 3:1), then we may be fairly confident that the author of 4Q521, like Ben Sira, did not focus only on the conclusion of Malachi 3. It also seems certain that he identified the "Lord" of Mal 3:1 with God.¹⁰⁹ Nevertheless, the Qumran text's understanding of the identity and role of the other figures mentioned in Malachi 3 remain unclear. Although one may presume that Elijah is expected to be involved,¹¹⁰ the agent responsible for the "fathers coming to the sons" (2 iii 2) is not made explicit; the author seems more concerned with eschatological renewal than with Elijah himself. Because Elijah only lurks in the background, it is difficult to know whether he should be identified with or distinguished from the "anointed one" mentioned at the beginning of column two. Since Isa 61:1 describes the activity of a human figure, it is possible that the proclamation of good news to the poor is performed by the "anointed one" acting as God's agent,¹¹¹ but it is noteworthy that the activities listed in 2 ii 5-13, including proclaiming good news to

¹⁰⁷ Although God is well-known as a healer (cf. Exod 15:26; Deut 32:39; Ps 103:3; Hos 6:1; *Jub.* 23:29; Puech, "4Q521," 16), there is no clear biblical precedent for *יִרְפָּא חַלְלִים* in 4Q521 2 ii 12 (cf. Tabor and Wise, "4Q521," 157), but it is at least possible that the phrase was influenced by *וּמִרְפָּא בְּכַנְפֵּיהָ* (Mal 3:20). Otherwise, Craig A. Evans, "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 2.586, who proposes that the phrase echoes Isa 53:5.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Mal 3:16-21. The fragmentary nature of the surviving manuscript makes it impossible to confirm additional echoes from Malachi, but we may note the following possibility: "Blessing" and God's favour are referred to in 2 iii 3 (*אֲשֶׁר בֵּרַכְתָּ אֲדֹנִי בְּרַצְוֹנוֹ*); the word *בֵּרַכָּה* occurs in Mal 3:10 (cf. 3:12), and *רָצוֹן* in 2:13. Neither word is distinctive, but the underlying ideas that they express go to the core of Malachi's message—namely, that the absence of divine blessing (2:2) and God's failure to look with favour on the Temple sacrifices (1:6-14; 2:13; 3:14) result from disobedience; repentance and obedience will result in blessing (3:6-12). In addition, Puech suggests that *רָעוּ וְעָם שָׂכְנוּ* (4Q521 6 5) reflects the LXX wording of Mal 3:23 (Puech, "4Q521," 22).

¹⁰⁹ The author consistently used *אֲדֹנִי* in place of the divine name. Cf. Puech, "4Q521," 36.

¹¹⁰ Pace Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 369.

¹¹¹ So Tabor and Wise, "4Q521," 157-8; Collins, *Scepter*, 118-9.

the poor (12), are attributed to the "Lord (אֲדֹנָי)" and not to the "anointed one."¹¹² The fact that raising the dead is mentioned before the proclamation of good news to the poor does not demonstrate that the eschatological Elijah is in view,¹¹³ because from the perspective of 4Q521 it is God who raises the dead.¹¹⁴

Since our author is manifestly concerned with the eschatological activity of God, human agency can neither be assumed nor excluded for the activities mentioned in column two. Rather than identifying the eschatological figure or figures mentioned in this text or focussing on their activity, it seems more likely that they are alluded to in passing as part of an acknowledged eschatological scenario; the focus throughout is on God's future activity and its significance for those who seek him. In any case, the fragmentary nature of the evidence renders uncertain any equation of the implied Elijah of column three with the "anointed one" of column two.¹¹⁵

Conclusion

The belief in Elijah's return, though not prominent, is quite well attested in Second Temple literature. Two of the most important texts that mention this expectation interpret the promise of Elijah's return in the context of Malachi 3 as a whole. As we have seen in connection with the discussion of Elijah's role as understood by Ben Sira

¹¹² The mention of listening to the anointed one in 4Q521 2 ii 1, may suggest that a prophet is in view, as Collins, *Scepter*, 118 and Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 388 conclude, but it is also possible that prophetic and royal elements are combined (cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 382-3).

¹¹³ *Contra* Collins, who argues on the basis of the allusion to Isa 61:1 in line 12 that a human agent is responsible for both the proclamation of good news to the poor and of resurrection from the dead. He then suggests that if human agents are in view, Elijah is the most likely candidate (Collins, *Scepter*, 118-9).

¹¹⁴ Cf. Michael Becker, "4Q521 und die Gesalbten," *RevQ* 18 (1997): 92; Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 386-7.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 382; Hans Kvalbein, "The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 par.," *JSP* 18 (1998): 107-8.

and the allusions to Malachi 3 in 4Q521, Malachi 3 is a complex and enigmatic passage; it is no easy task to determine the relationship between the figures mentioned in Mal 3:1 within Malachi itself, let alone to establish how the text was later understood. Ancient readers, like contemporary scholars, might have had recourse to several possible interpretations of Malachi 3. Still, there is no evidence that the eschatological Elijah was expected to precede anyone other than God himself.

The Prophet Like Moses

The concept of the prophet like Moses is more difficult to assess than the expectation of the eschatological Elijah because the passage from which the concept is derived does not predict the return of Moses himself, but the appearance of a prophet *like* Moses, whose function is not spelled out clearly.¹¹⁶ According to Deut 18:15, 18-19:

¹⁵The LORD your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people; you shall heed such a prophet. . . . ¹⁸I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people; I will put my words in the mouth of the prophet, who shall speak to them everything that I command. ¹⁹Anyone who does not heed the words that the prophet shall speak in my name, I myself will hold accountable.

It is commonly suggested that there developed a widespread expectation based on this passage of an eschatological Mosaic prophet who was to be associated with God's final deliverance of his people.¹¹⁷ Although few would deny the existence of an eschatological interpretation of Deut 18:15, some scholars dispute its popularity, claiming that there is

¹¹⁶ Even if a new Moses figure was envisaged, there is no reason apart from Deut 18:15-19 to expect the new Moses to be a *prophet*. The expectation of a Mosaic prophet therefore implies the influence of Deut 18:15-19 (*contra* Teeple, *Mosaic*, 49).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Joachim Jeremias, "Μωυσης," *TDNT* 4:862; Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten," *SE* 1 (1959): 636; Hahn, *Titles*, 364-5; Feiler, "Jesus," 251; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992), 70; Allison, *Moses*, 83; Wolfgang Kraus, "Die Bedeutung von Dtn 18,15-18 für das Verständnis Jesu als Prophet," *ZNW* 90 (1999): 164; Poirier, "Endtime Return," 237.

only meagre evidence for it in the surviving Second Temple literature.¹¹⁸

Disagreement about the popularity of the eschatological interpretation of Deut 18:15-19 has to do with the way in which the evidence is assessed, but it also results from ambiguity within the text itself, for there are many ways in which a later figure could be *like* Moses. Were the actions of the Mosaic prophet expected to mirror those of the biblical Moses? Was the main point of similarity between Moses and the prophet like Moses rooted in the deliverance the expected figure was to bring? If so, how *prophetic* was the Mosaic figure expected to be? What role did signs and wonders play in the identification and activity of the expected Mosaic prophet? Was the expectation so general that any eschatological figure could be identified as the prophet like Moses?

Philo classified Moses' primary roles as those of a law-giver, king and prophet (*Mos.* 2.2-3). Comparisons between Moses and a later figure might dwell on only one of these roles, or develop different ones. Alternatively, they might draw out a series of parallels which link the two figures closely together. A comparison with Moses could be employed to connect the later figure with a specific anticipated Mosaic prophet in fulfillment of Deut 18:15-19, but the purpose could also have been to honour someone by comparing him or her with Moses, or to evoke one of the many parts of Moses' career. As Dale Allison has shown, Moses typologies in early Jewish and early Christian texts were developed in a variety of ways and for a variety of reasons, not all of them

¹¹⁸ According to Barrett, *Acts*, 208, "The 'prophet like Moses' was a Jewish Christian theologumenon, except that the Samaritans also seem to have known it." Cf. F. J. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, "Christology" in *BEGS* 1.405; P. E. Davies, "Role," 243; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 173 note *; Richard A. Horsley, "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets At the Time of Jesus," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 441-3; Webb, *Baptizer*, 254 note 141.

eschatological.¹¹⁹ Any assessment of traditions about the eschatological prophet like Moses must consider the possibility that those who are compared with Moses are not presented as the fulfillment of Deut 18:15-19, or that individuals presented in terms of Deut 18:15-19 are regarded as successors of Moses rather than as eschatological prophets like Moses.

The degree to which Deut 18:15-19 formed the basis of a definite eschatological expectation must also be considered. If Deut 18:15-19 was regarded as a prediction of a particular figure, we might expect to find the prophet like Moses considered separately from the Davidic messiah or from the eschatological Elijah. If, on the other hand, Deut 18:15-19 was viewed as only one among many predictions still awaiting fulfillment, we might anticipate greater willingness to combine future expectations in different ways. Although it is more common to suppose that at least some Second Temple Jews expected the coming of Elijah and of a prophet like Moses,¹²⁰ some scholars conclude the prophet like Moses was expected to appear as Elijah.¹²¹ Similarly, some maintain that the expectation of a prophet like Moses was kept separate from the expectation of a Davidic Messiah,¹²² while others believe the two could be combined.¹²³ At issue is whether Deut 18:15-19 functioned as a rather amorphous text open to different configurations, or whether it led to a concrete anticipation of a specific individual.

¹¹⁹ Allison, *Moses*, 91-3.

¹²⁰ Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:856-8; Teeple, *Mosaic*, 100-1; Hahn, *Titles*, 354; Allison, *Moses*, 75.

¹²¹ Cf. Cullmann, *Christology*, 17; Clark, "Elijah," 41-2; as well as Strugnell, "4Q375," 118-9 and Collins, *Scepter*, 115-6, regarding Qumran.

¹²² Cf. Teeple, *Mosaic*, 119; Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung," 628, 638; Hahn, *Titles*, 358; Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 28-9; Ferdinand Dexinger, "Der 'Prophet wie Mose' in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M Mathias Delcor* (eds. A. Caquot, S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu; Kevelaer, Germany: Butzon & Bercker, 1985), 100.

¹²³ Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:859; Allison, *Moses*, 89; Lierman, "Moses," 58, 192.

In what follows, I will begin by examining the extant literature for evidence of a belief in the coming of an eschatological prophet like Moses, regardless of the specific form it took. I will then attempt to determine whether Deut 18:15-19 was understood as predicting a particular prophet to be distinguished from other expected eschatological figures or whether the prediction was combined with other eschatological expectations.

Deut 18:15-19 and Past Prophets

Both Josephus and Ben Sira affirm that Moses was the first in a line of prophets despite his unique qualities. Ben Sira refers to Moses' exalted status (45:2), and mentions Moses' faithfulness (45:4)—alluding to the famous statement in Num 12:6-8 that distinguishes Moses from all other prophets.¹²⁴ Josephus summarizes the statement about Moses' exalted status in Deut 34:11: "As general he had few to equal him, and as prophet none, insomuch that in all his utterances one seemed to hear the speech of God himself" (*Ant.* 4.329). Nevertheless, this high esteem for Moses did not stop either Ben Sira or Josephus from presenting Joshua as Moses' successor (διάδοχος) in prophecy (προφητεία).¹²⁵ It is not unlikely that Josephus and Ben Sira saw in the appointment of Joshua as prophet in place of Moses a fulfillment of Deut 18:15-19, but since neither

¹²⁴ Sir 45:4 refers to Moses' faithfulness (בְּאֵמֶן מֹשֶׁה/ἐν πίστει). The only passage in the Torah where Moses is described as faithful is Num 12:7 (וְאֵמֶן מֹשֶׁה/πιστός ἐστίν).

¹²⁵ Jos. *Ant.* 4.165: "Moses, already advanced in years, now appointed Joshua to succeed him (διάδοχον ἑαυτοῦ) both in his prophetic functions (ἐπὶ τε ταῖς προφητείαις) and as commander-in-chief" (cf. Jos. *Ant.* 4.311; Num 27:18, 23). The Greek translation of Sir 46:1 diverges somewhat from the Hebrew (compare מֹשֶׁה בְּנִבְיֹשׁה מִשְׁרָתָהּ with διάδοχος Μωϋσῆ ἐν προφητείαις). Cf. Sir 48:8 where διάδοχος is used in the context of Elijah anointing kings as well as "prophets to succeed you." Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 314, concludes from Sir 48:8 that Ben Sira held to a succession of prophecy that was analogous to kingship and the priesthood, and that was consecrated by anointing. But since the mention of prophetic anointing in Sir 48:8 is drawn from 1 Kgs 19:16, other illustrations of prophetic anointing are required in order to confirm that Ben Sira considered anointing a characteristic feature of installation into prophetic office.

writer mentions the passage directly in this regard, it is impossible to be certain.¹²⁶

Deut 18:15-19 and "The Prophet"

Deuteronomy 18:18 is explicitly discussed by Philo of Alexandria, who glosses the verse as follows: "A prophet possessed by God will suddenly appear and give prophetic oracles."¹²⁷ Philo seems less concerned with the sudden appearance of the prophet than with the nature of prophetic inspiration, which he proceeds to discuss in connection with prophets in general. While it is possible that Philo regarded this passage as implying a succession of prophets after Moses,¹²⁸ Philo's reference to suddenness indicates that he regarded Deuteronomy's "prophet like Moses" as a literal prediction about one future prophet rather than as a broad statement about prophets in general.¹²⁹ Still, Philo says nothing about the role of the future prophet beyond that he will give oracles.

The Dead Sea Scrolls provide unambiguous evidence for the eschatological interpretation of Deut 18:18-19. The passage is quoted in 4QTest 5-8, followed by quotations from Num 24:15-17 and Deut 33:8-11. The verses cited in 4QTestimonia are not interpreted, but since Num 24:15-17 is interpreted elsewhere with reference to the Davidic Messiah,¹³⁰ and the latter passage refers to Levi,¹³¹ most scholars have concluded

¹²⁶ Cf. the mention of the "spirit" on Joshua in Num 27:18. Joshua is also presented as Moses' successor in *T. Mos* 1:7, 10:15, but Deut 18:15 is not specifically invoked.

¹²⁷ *Spec. Laws* 1.65: ἀλλά τις ἐπιφανεῖς ἐξαπινάίως προφήτης θεοφόρητος θεσπιεῖ καὶ προφητεύσει.

¹²⁸ Cf. Gilet, "Prophétisme," 115; Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:857 note 114.

¹²⁹ Cf. Teeple, *Mosaic*, 66-7; Cullmann, *Christology*, 17; Aune, *Prophecy*, 124. For Philo's eschatology, cf. *Mos.* 2.288; *Praem.* 95; Peder Borgen, "'There Shall Come Forth a Man': Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo," in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 341-61.

¹³⁰ Cf. CD vii 19; Philo, *Praem.* 95; Collins, *Scepter*, 63-4. Cf. 1QM xi 6-7.

¹³¹ Cf. Collins, *Scepter*, 114.

that 4QTest offers proof texts for "the Prophet," the Messiah of Israel, and the Messiah of Aaron—three eschatological figures who are mentioned together in 1QS ix 11: "until the prophet comes and the anointed ones of Aaron and Israel."¹³² Even though there is nothing in the context of 1QS ix 11 that attributes Mosaic characteristics to the expected prophet, it seems likely that this figure was understood as the prophet like Moses predicted in Deut 18:15-19.¹³³ A related instance of the absolute use of "prophet" occurs in John 1:21-25. Here we may infer from the context that "the prophet" refers to the prophet like Moses of Deuteronomy 18 because the prophet is distinguished from both the Messiah and Elijah.¹³⁴

Since Deut 18:15-19 predicts only that a prophet like Moses will arise, some have concluded that the concept of the Mosaic prophet is implicit in other passages where future prophets are mentioned. For example, it is sometimes suggested that the Qumran sectarians identified the prophet like Moses with the historical Teacher of Righteousness¹³⁵ or with the future "Law interpreter (דורש התורה)" (CD vii 18) and "the

¹³² A link between the future prophet of 1QS ix 11 and Deut 18:18-19 seems most likely, but it is not necessarily the case that each of the proof texts cited in 4QTest refers exclusively to one of the three individuals. For example, Collins, *Scepter*, 115, argues that "the prophet and eschatological priest may not always have been clearly distinguished." Cf. the dual interpretation of Num 24:15-17 in CD vii 18-20: Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (ed. Joseph A. Fitzmyer; London: G. Chapman, 1971), 84.

¹³³ Deut 18:18-19 appears again in 4Q158 (4QReworked Pentateuch^a) 6 6-9, a text that conforms to the Samaritan Pentateuch of Exod 20:19-21 (cf. Bruce K. Waltke, "Samaritan Pentateuch," *ABD* 5:933). Since the Samaritan evidence linking the prophet like Moses to the *Taheb* dates from well after the end of the Second Temple period (cf. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 219), it falls outside the scope of the present inquiry. Nevertheless, 4Q158 shows that the text form on which such an identification was based is ancient (cf. Dexinger, "Prophet," 109-10).

¹³⁴ Cf. Brown, "Messianism," 60; Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 21-5.

¹³⁵ Cf. Naftali Wieder, "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses," *JJS* 4 (1953): 171-2, 167-8; Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:859; Teeple, *Mosaic*, 54; Gibley, "Prophétisme," 127-8; Dexinger, "Prophet," 101; Poirier, "Endtime Return," 240-1.

one who will teach righteousness (יורה הצדק) at the end of days" (CD vi 10).¹³⁶ But it is unlikely that the Teacher of Righteousness was identified with the prophet like Moses because the Scrolls elsewhere associate the Teacher with the founding of the sect and locate his activity in the past (CD i 11, vi-vii, xx 14-15), while 1QS ix 11 was written after the founding of the sect,¹³⁷ and 1QS ix 11 places the coming of the prophet in the future.¹³⁸ In addition, the future "Law interpreter" probably designate a future priest rather than a prophet.¹³⁹

Other scholars maintain that the "trustworthy" prophet whose future appearance is contemplated in 1 Macc 14:41 is really the eschatological prophet like Moses.¹⁴⁰ Although "raising up" is a common biblical locution for the introduction of a figure into history,¹⁴¹ the mention of the "arising of a prophet" in 1 Macc 14:41 does resemble Deut 18:18, and the reference to his trustworthiness recalls the description of Moses in Num 12:6.¹⁴² Together these correspondences suggest that 1 Macc 14:41 intentionally alludes to Deuteronomy 18. However, an allusion to Deut 18:18-19 does not necessarily evoke

¹³⁶ Cf. Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 170.

¹³⁷ Sarianna Metso, "Constitutional Rules At Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years*, 1.199-200.

¹³⁸ Cf. Brown, "Messianism," 73-4; Collins, *Scepter*, 113.

¹³⁹ Cf. Collins, *Scepter*, 113-4.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:857-8; Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung," 632; Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 169; and more recently, Marc Philonenko. "Jusqu'à ce que se lève un prophète digne de confiance (1 Machabées 14,41)," in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity* (eds. Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1992), 95-8.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Exod 1:8 (a king); Judg 5:7; 10:1, 3 (various judges); 1 Sam 2:35 (a priest; echoes Deut 18:15); 1 Kgs 14:14 (a king); Jer 23:4 (shepherds); Jer 30:9 (David).

¹⁴² Cf. ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν (1 Macc 14:41), προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ ἀναστήσει σοι (Deut 18:18), and "[Moses] is faithful (πιστός) in all my house" (Num 12:6; cf. note 124 above; Giblet, "Prophétisme," 106 note 3; Philonenko, "1. Machabées 14,41," 97-8). Alternatively, πιστός may simply act as a summary of Deut 18:18b. Cf. 4Q375 1 i 6-7: גבִּיִּא גַּאֲמֵן הוּאָהּ; Strugnell, "4Q375," 114, 118.

the concept of an *eschatological* prophet like Moses because we have seen that there is no reason why Deut 18:15-19 should always be interpreted eschatologically.¹⁴³

If one had only to mention the appearance of a future prophet for people to recognize a reference to the prophet like Moses, the concept must have been widespread indeed. But the evidence from Qumran and from the Gospel of John is not sufficient to demonstrate that isolated references to future prophets were understood in terms of Deuteronomy 18. Unless the context provides some sort of confirmation that a prophet is regarded as an eschatological prophet, and unless there are either verbal parallels with Deut 18:15-19 or literary patterning after Moses, it would be unwise to conclude from the use of the term "prophet" that the eschatological prophet like Moses is in view.¹⁴⁴

The "Sign Prophets"

We now turn from literary statements about anticipated eschatological figures to Josephus's description of historical individuals active in the years preceding the Jewish revolt. Although Josephus regarded these figures as impostors (γόητες), many scholars have concluded that they claimed to be, and were regarded by their followers as, the

¹⁴³ Herbert Donner, "Der verlässliche Prophet : Betrachtungen zu 1 Makk 14,41ff und zu Ps 110," in *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel: Festschrift für Siegfried Herrmann zum 65. Geburtstag* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991), 91, notes that προφήτην πιστόν (1 Macc 14:41), back-translated into Hebrew as נָבִיא נֶאֱמָר, is reminiscent of the description of Samuel in 1 Sam 3:20 (πιστός Σαμουηλ εἰς προφήτην/נָבִיא נֶאֱמָר). Within the context of 1 Samuel, the description of Samuel in 3:20 recalls God's promise of a faithful high priest in 2:35 (ἀναστήσω ἐμαυτῷ ἱερέα πιστόν/יִהְיֶה קֹהֵן לִי בָרָה). 1 Sam 2:35 in turn echoes Deut 18:15-19. Cf. Giblet, "Prophétisme," 106, speaking of 1 Macc 14:41: "Il ne s'agit sans doute pas d'un prophète messianique, mais du prophète qui surgit aux époques importantes de l'histoire."

¹⁴⁴ If it preserves ancient Jewish tradition, the mention "of the unique prophet" in *T. Benj.* 9:2 will attest to an expectation of an eschatological prophet, but not unequivocally to the prophet like Moses (cf. Allison, *Moses*, 77-8); *T. Benj.* 9:3, at least, is an obvious Christian creation. *Contra* Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:859, there is nothing intrinsic in *T. Levi* that links the prophet of 8:14 to Moses.

eschatological prophet like Moses.¹⁴⁵ If so, these "sign prophets" could provide valuable information about the expected characteristics of the prophet like Moses, as well as some indication about how widespread this expectation was.

The designation "sign prophets" aptly reflects the fact that Josephus characteristically associates these prophetic figures with miraculous signs that were supposed to play some role in connection with divine deliverance. According to Josephus, Theudas promised that the Jordan would be parted at his command (*Ant.* 20.97); and various impostors and deceivers persuaded the people to go into the wilderness, saying that God would there show "signs of freedom (σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας)" (*War* 2.259) or, as the account in *Ant.* 20.168 has it, "They said that they would show them unmistakable marvels and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα) that would be wrought in harmony with God's design." Perhaps as an example of these impostors and deceivers, Josephus then refers to the Egyptian, who had gained the reputation of being a "trustworthy prophet (προφήτου πίστιν)," and who led his followers from the wilderness to the Mount of Olives where he promised that the walls of Jerusalem would fall down at his command.¹⁴⁶ Near the end of the revolt a false prophet promised that those who went up to the temple court would receive "signs of deliverance (τὰ σημεῖα τῆς σωτηρίας)" (*War* 6.285). Finally, Josephus records that another "impostor" promised "salvation

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Meyer, *Prophet*, 85; Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:863; Teeple, *Mosaic*, 65, 109, who allows that those with some association to the desert were Mosaic prophets; Hahn, *Titles*, 358; Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 163-4; Marianus de Jonge, "Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes," in *Josephus-Studien* (eds. Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974), 218-9; Otto Betz, "Miracles in the Writings of Flavius Josephus," in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (eds. Louis H. Feldman, and Goher Hata; Detroit: Wayne State University, 1987), 226; Allison, *Moses*, 83; Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 165.

¹⁴⁶ *War* 2.261-3. The parallel account in *Ant.* 20.169-72 makes it sound as though the Egyptian planned to conquer Jerusalem by dint of force rather than through miraculous means.

(σωτηρία) and rest from troubles" to those who followed him into the wilderness (*Ant.* 20.188).¹⁴⁷

It is true that these "sign prophets" are introduced in various ways—the promised actions of Theudas and the Egyptian are not called "signs"; the impostors who pledge "wonders and signs" are not called "prophets"—but it seems appropriate to view them together as prophets who promised signs. Josephus consistently portrays the whole lot as impostors who claimed inspiration and gained a following among the populace; he does not distinguish between the "false prophet" who exhorted the people to go up to the Temple to receive "signs of salvation" and those who led their followers into the desert promising to show them "signs of freedom."¹⁴⁸

¹⁴⁷ In addition, Josephus refers to a Samaritan who promised to show his followers "the sacred vessels which were buried there, where Moses had deposited them" (*Ant.* 18.85), but the Samaritan is not referred to as a prophet or as an inspired figure; it is unclear whether the showing of the sacred vessels is regarded as a miraculous event, although it did prompt his followers to gather in arms. Josephus also mentions various prophets who were "suborned by the tyrants to delude the people, by bidding them await help from God" (*War* 6.286); no miraculous signs are mentioned, but "help" might be construed as the equivalent to the "salvation" promised by other "sign prophets." Finally, Josephus portrays Jonathan the weaver in similar fashion as "a most evil man (πονηρότατος ἄνθρωπος)" (*War* 7.438; cf. 4377-50; *Life* 424-5) who promised σημεία καὶ φάσματα in the desert (*War* 7.438), but Josephus never refers to him as a ψευδοπροφήτης or explicitly as one who claimed to be a προφήτης. The uprising prompted by Jonathan occurred in Cyrene after the Jewish revolt.

¹⁴⁸ *Contra* Richard A. Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements At the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 8, who rejects the term "sign prophets," claiming that "signs" are only mentioned in connection with the "deceivers and impostors" of *War* 2.259 par. *Ant.* 20.168. Horsley excludes the "false prophet" of *War* 6.285 because he thinks the false prophet might be an oracular prophet rather than a leader of a movement like Theudas and the Egyptian. However, the distinction between oracular and movement prophets is made by Horsley, not Josephus, and the false prophet's promise of "signs of deliverance (τὰ σημεία τῆς σωτηρίας)" is very close to the "signs of freedom (σημεία ἐλευθερίας)" promised by the impostors of *War* 2.259 (cf. Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 685; Betz, "Miracles," 227). Although the "deceivers and impostors" of *War* 2.258-260 are not explicitly called prophets, Josephus reports that they operated "under the pretence of divine inspiration" (2.259). Theudas, the Egyptian, the "deceivers and impostors" (*Ant.* 20.167; cf. *War* 2.259) and the impostor of *Ant.* 20.188, are all given the epithet γόης; the figure of *War* 6.285 is called a "false prophet." It seems likely that the Egyptian who promised the collapse of Jerusalem's walls is introduced in *War* 2.261 as a concrete illustration of the "deceivers and impostors" who promised "signs of freedom" (*War* 2.259). In any case, I shall argue that the promised deeds of Theudas and the Egyptian are best understood as examples of the "signs" mentioned elsewhere. No signs are mentioned in connection with the unnamed γόης of *Ant.*

Not surprisingly, the combination of prophets who are linked to the wilderness, deliverance, and miraculous signs suggests to many readers of Josephus that these "impostors" laid claim to the role of the prophet like Moses. Moses, after all, was the agent of God's prototypical deliverance of his people, and the exodus from Egypt involved the performance of miraculous signs as well as movement through a wilderness.

All of these sign prophets promised that God would soon deliver his people.¹⁴⁹ In this respect they are like Moses, who had promised the Israelites deliverance prior to the exodus. Theudas and the Egyptian also tied their predictions about the future to God's past deliverance during the exodus and conquest; frequent association with the wilderness may indicate that the other sign prophets did the same.¹⁵⁰ Still, the idealization of the past reflected in Josephus's account does not require that the sign prophets identified themselves with an expected prophet like Moses, for the promises of Theudas and the Egyptian resemble Joshua more than Moses.¹⁵¹

20.188, but his promise of salvation and rest is enough to include him with the other sign prophets.

¹⁴⁹ Josephus does not provide enough information to determine whether the prophets anticipated political deliverance from Rome, deliverance at the end of time, or both; it is clear that divine intervention was expected.

¹⁵⁰ Yet as Gray, *Figures*, 137, observes: "as a religious motif, the wilderness had wider associations than the exodus and conquest events alone." It may be significant that the false prophet of *War* 6.285 is not associated with the wilderness.

¹⁵¹ The anticipated collapse of Jerusalem's walls (*Ant.* 20.169-172) obviously echoes Joshua's conquest of Jericho. Gray observes that Josephus's account draws "no direct comparison" between the crossing of the Red Sea under Moses and the crossing of the Jordan under Joshua (Gray, *Figures*, 199 note 6), but she still concludes that the historical Theudas's promised crossing of the Jordan may have been patterned after *both* Moses and Joshua (Gray, *Figures*, 115). Regardless of Theudas's own intentions, it is unlikely that Josephus intended to compare him with Moses, for Josephus's report about Theudas's promise to provide an easy passage across the Jordan has more in common with his earlier account of Joshua's crossing the Jordan (*Ant.* 5.16-19) than it does with his version of the Red Sea miracle (*Ant.* 2.338-344). Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 689, appears to assume that the widespread expectation of the prophet like Moses would have naturally led to the identification of those who linked themselves to the "Exodus-Conquest" as Mosaic prophets (Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 696 note 81). It is also possible to regard Theudas and the Egyptian as prophets who modelled themselves after Joshua, while regarding the prophets to whom "signs" are explicitly attributed as Mosaic prophets (cf. Meyer, *Prophet*, 84-5).

It is true that the mention of the impostors' promised "signs of freedom (σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας)" (*War* 2.259) is similar to a passage in the *Antiquities*, where the Israelites at the Red Sea "turned to accusing Moses, forgetful of all those miracles (σημείων) wrought by God in token of their liberation (ἐλευθερίαν)."¹⁵² Based on this apparent similarity between the exodus signs and those of the sign prophets, as well as the fact that both sets of signs were expected to be "close in time to their fulfilment," Paul Barnett concludes that "these Prophets believed that if only a 'sign' of the Exodus-Conquest could be performed, then the wheels of God would be set in motion for a re-run of His Great Saving Act."¹⁵³

There are several problems with this conclusion. First, Josephus's account of the sign prophets who promised "signs of freedom" (*War* 2.259) was written before his account in the *Antiquities*, which associates signs, freedom and Moses.¹⁵⁴ Since it is unlikely that Josephus patterned Moses after the sign prophets, the account of the sign prophets in *War* 2.259—if it connects the sign prophets to Moses—must be dependent on a common association of signs, freedom and Moses. But ἐλευθερία and cognates are not used in connection with the exodus in the Greek Pentateuch. As a result, one must question whether Josephus's use of "signs of freedom (σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας)" in connection

¹⁵² *Ant.* 2.327: ἐπιλεησμένοι τῶν ἐκ θεοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν αὐτοῖς σημείων γεγονότων. Cf. Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 682-3; Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements," 4.

¹⁵³ Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 688. Barnett's image of setting the "wheels of God" in motion (itself borrowed from Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress From Reimarus to Wrede* [trans. W. Montgomery; 1906; repr., New York: Macmillan, 1961], 370-1), is rejected by Horsley, but Horsley's understanding of the signs is similar: "[Signs] can be understood as anticipatory participation in God's liberating actions" (Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements," 10).

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Louis H. Feldman, "Josephus," *ABD* 3:982, for the date. In *Ant.* 20.168 Josephus replaces σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας by τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα. As we will see below, the phrase τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα does not allude to the exodus any more than the phrase σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας does.

with the sign prophets really recalls the exodus.

Second, even if an intentional allusion to the exodus is granted, the "signs" of the sign prophets will have little to do with setting in motion God's new redemption. Josephus diverges sharply from his scriptural source by carefully avoiding the use of either σημεῖον or τέρας in reference to the miracles of deliverance from Egypt, such as the ten plagues and the crossing of the Red Sea. The three authenticating "signs" given to Moses at the burning bush, Josephus is wont to observe, were intended to confirm Moses as Israel's deliverer (*Ant.* 2.272-4); the ten plagues, on the other hand, are attributed solely to God.¹⁵⁵ Third, Josephus believed the performance of authenticating signs—in contrast to the miracles of deliverance from Egypt, which Josephus does not refer to as signs—was characteristic of prophets in general. Prophetic signs (σημεῖα) include the initial authenticating miracles given to Moses at the burning bush,¹⁵⁶ but they also include signs associated with the prophets Samuel and Elijah, the miraculous sign performed by the prophet Jadon before king Jeroboam at Bethel, as well as the sign given to Hezekiah by the prophet Isaiah.¹⁵⁷ According to Josephus, miracles function to authenticate the words of prophets in much the same way that other omens function as signs of divine approval or disapproval.¹⁵⁸ In fact, the signs promised by those whom Josephus

¹⁵⁵ The transition from the scene in which Moses performs his "signs" to the beginning of the plagues makes this very clear: "But, since the king disdained these words of Moses and paid no more heed to them, dire plagues descended upon the Egyptians" (*Ant.* 2.293; Gray, *Figures*, 126-7). Since it occurs immediately before the crossing of the Red Sea, the mention of "signs" in *Jos. Ant.* 2.327 could be regarded as an exceptional reference to the ten plagues (as assumed by Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 682-3 and Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements," 4). However, the context concerns accusations against Moses. As Moses had previously been accepted by the Israelites on the basis of his three authenticating signs (*Ant.* 2.280-1), it is most likely that the "signs" of *Ant.* 2.293 also denote the same authenticating miracles.

¹⁵⁶ *Jos. Ant.* 2.274, 276, 280, 283-4.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. *Jos. Ant.* 6.54, 57, 91; 8.232, 236; 3.347; 10.28-29. Cf. Gray, *Figures*, 125-30.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. *Ant.* 6.110; 18.211; 19.9, 94; *War* 3.405; 4.623; and especially *War* 1.377.

identifies as false prophets contrast with the heavenly signs portending Jerusalem's destruction, which Josephus claims were tragically misunderstood by the inhabitants of the city.¹⁵⁹ We may safely conclude that the signs promised by the sign prophets do not correspond to the ten plagues or the miracles of deliverance from Egypt, nor were they designed to set the wheels of fate in motion. If they do correspond to the signs of Moses, they would function as authenticating miracles; but since signs are characteristic of prophets in general, the mere performance of signs cannot be judged a particularly Mosaic quality.¹⁶⁰

If the performance of signs is characteristic of prophets in general, were the sign prophets different from all other prophets only by virtue of their perceived proximity to the end?¹⁶¹ Did they gain a following because they corresponded to a recognized eschatological figure or because they offered deliverance? Answers to these questions need not be mutually exclusive. On the one hand, Josephus's portrayals of the Egyptian and Theudas demonstrate either that the coming divine deliverance was expected to resemble the past, or that recollecting the past was regarded as a way of envisioning the

¹⁵⁹ *War* 1.28; 6.295-6, 315.

¹⁶⁰ The Egyptian's claim that at his command the walls of Jerusalem would collapse could be construed as an act of deliverance, but the similarities between the Egyptian's promised deed and that of Theudas suggest that it was also regarded as an authenticating sign. (Crossing the Jordan could be miraculous, but in the late first century would hardly be regarded as deliverance itself.) Moreover, the phrase "signs of freedom (σημεῖα ἐλευθερίας)" is not restricted to exodus-related passages. In Josephus's lengthy account of the murder of the emperor Gaius a password of freedom (σημεῖον ἐλευθερίας) ironically portends Gaius's murder (*Ant.* 19.54, 186, 188). Barnett, "Sign Prophets," 683, also observes that both Moses and the sign prophets perform signs by "God's providence" (cf. *Ant.* 2.286; 20.168). But the apparent parallel seems less striking when it is noted that Josephus is particularly fond of referring to "God's providence," using the phrase in many different contexts (cf. *War* 4.219; *Ant.* 5.277; 13.163; 14.463; 20.91; *Life* 15). It is true, however, that the phrase is only used in connection with the performance of miraculous signs in *Ant.* 2.286 and 20.168.

¹⁶¹ Cf. Gray, *Figures*, 141: "It is possible to think that the sign prophets were eschatological prophets in the general sense without thinking that they were acting out the role of a particular End-time prophet."

future—or both. In Josephus's account, the story of the Israelites crossing the Jordan is followed immediately by the capture of Jericho, after which Josephus comments that the name Gilgal "signified 'freedom'; for, having crossed the river, they felt themselves henceforth free (ἐλευθέρους) both from the Egyptians and from their miseries in the desert."¹⁶² It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the association of both Theudas and the Egyptian with the crossing of the Jordan and the conquest of Jericho is related to the promised "signs of freedom (ἐλευθερίας)" promised by other sign prophets. Yet the analogy between the sign prophets, Moses, and Joshua has more to do with promised deliverance than it does with miraculous signs, and the fact that Theudas and the Egyptian are connected with Joshua rather than Moses suggests that Deut 18:15 did not lie behind the behaviour of the sign prophets.

Excursus: The Prophet like Moses and "Signs and Wonders"

Regardless of Josephus's presentation of the "sign prophets," it is possible that the biblical connotations of miraculous "signs" were enough for Second Temple Jews to identify the "sign prophets" with the prophet like Moses. Deuteronomy 34:10-12 remarks that Moses remained unsurpassed as a prophet partly as a result of the "signs and wonders" he performed:

¹⁰Never since has there arisen a prophet in Israel like Moses, whom the LORD knew face to face. ¹¹He was unequaled for all the signs and wonders that the LORD sent him to perform in the land of Egypt, against Pharaoh and all his servants and his entire land, ¹²and for all the mighty deeds and all the terrifying displays of power that Moses performed in the sight of all Israel.

Deuteronomy's insistence on Moses' incomparable status recalls Moses' prediction in

¹⁶² *Ant.* 5.34. Cf. *Ant.* 2.252, 281, 290, 327, 327, for other occurrences of words of this root in connection with the events of the exodus.

Deut 18:15 that "the Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet *like me* from among your own people." Since the eulogy of Moses in Deuteronomy 34 emphasizes the "signs and wonders" Moses performed, it is no great leap to associate "signs and wonders" with the activity of the future prophet like Moses.¹⁶³ I will consider the biblical usage in some detail because the meaning of the biblical phrase has a significant impact on the interpretation of Luke-Acts.

The phrase "signs and wonders," which was evidently regarded as an established expression by the translators of the Septuagint,¹⁶⁴ is used most frequently of the miracles associated with the exodus from Egypt.¹⁶⁵ These exodus "signs and wonders" are attributed to God alone, with the exception of Deut 34:11, where "signs and wonders" are attributed to Moses alone,¹⁶⁶ and Exod 11:10 (LXX)¹⁶⁷ and Ps 105:27 (MT), where "signs and wonders" are attributed to Moses and Aaron. When the referent of the phrase can be established from the context, exodus "signs and wonders" usually denote the ten plagues.¹⁶⁸ But the phrase "signs and wonders" in the Septuagint sometimes ranges

¹⁶³ Cf. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 163; Clark, "Elijah," 40-1; Betz, "Miracles," 226. Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 155-6 note 13, notes that in its original context Deut 34:10f. does not exclude other prophets who were like Moses; it claims no other prophet could measure up to Moses—the signs and wonders he performed were beyond comparison. Cf. Num 12:6-8.

¹⁶⁴ In the four instances where the singular of *אֵימֹת* and *מוֹפְתִים* are joined by *וְ* (Deut 13:2-3; 28:46; Isa 20:3), the LXX either translates the phrase as "sign or wonder" (Deut 13:2-3) or as "signs and wonders" (Deut 28:46; Isa 20:3).

¹⁶⁵ Exod 7:3; 11:9-10; Deut 4:34; 6:22; 7:19; 11:3; 26:8; 29:2; 34:11; LXX Pss 77:43; 104:27; 134:9; LXX Jer 39:20-21 (but note *ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης*); Neh 9:10 (2 Esd 19:10 has *σημεῖα* alone). Cf. Wis 10:16; Bar 2:11. Exceptions include the following: Deut 28:46 (LXX); Isa 8:18; 20:3 (LXX); Dan 3:32-33 and 6:28 (Aram.); Dan 4:2 (Theod.); 4:37 (LXX); 6:28 (Theod.). Cf. Add Esth 10:3f.; Wis 8:8; Sir 48:12 (Heb.).

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Wis 10:16; Ezek. Trag. 224-6.

¹⁶⁷ The LXX adds *τὰ σημεῖα*, while the Hebrew text refers only to *הַמִּפְתִּים*. The context implies that the "signs and wonders" here refer to the nine plagues.

¹⁶⁸ The context often makes this clear by locating the "signs and wonders" in Egypt and by specifying that they were done against Pharaoh and Egypt: Exod 11:9-10 (LXX); Deut 6:22; 7:19; 29:2; Ps 77 (78):43; 104 (105):27; 134 (135):9; Jer 32:20-21; Neh 9:10 (MT); cf. Wis 10:16; Wolfgang Weiß.

beyond these events to include the authenticating miracles given to Moses at the burning bush¹⁶⁹ as well as the miraculous events that took place during the period of wilderness wandering.¹⁷⁰ The "signs and wonders" attributed to Moses in Deut 34:11, then, may have originally referred to Moses' involvement in the ten plagues,¹⁷¹ but later readers—especially those dependent on the Septuagint—may well have interpreted the stereotypical language more broadly.

In addition to referring to God's mighty acts of deliverance and the authenticating miracles given to Moses at the burning bush, the phrase "signs and wonders" can refer to symbolic actions that embody a prediction of the future (Isa 8:18; 20:3 LXX) or to predictions whose fulfillment legitimates the messenger as well as the message.¹⁷² Yet it

"*Zeichen und Wunder*": eine Studie zu der Sprachtradition und ihrer Verwendung im Neuen Testament (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995), 11. The context is not clear in Deut 4:34 and 26:8, but we can probably conclude from the normal Deuteronomic usage that the plagues are primarily in view; cf. Bar 2:11.

¹⁶⁹ After the reference to God's "signs and wonders" in Exod 7:3, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the "sign or wonder" (Exod 7:9 LXX: σημεῖον ἢ τέρας; Heb. מוֹפֶת) requested by Pharaoh and performed by Aaron, is one of God's "signs and wonders." The authenticating miracles given to Moses at the burning bush, and performed by Aaron before the Israelite community as well as before Pharaoh are normally referred to as "signs" or "wonders" rather than as "signs and wonders." Cf. Exod 4:8, 9, 17, 21, 28, 30.

¹⁷⁰ In the MT of Deut 11:3, וְהָיָה לְפָנֶיךָ should probably be limited to what God did in Egypt, while וְהָיָה לְפָנֶיךָ includes the events described in 11:3-7; but in the LXX, the translation of וְהָיָה לְפָנֶיךָ by καὶ τὰ σημεῖα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ τέρατα αὐτοῦ comprises the description of all that God did (ὅσα ἐποίησεν) in verses 3-7 as part of the "signs and wonders" including the events of the exodus, as well as crossing the Red Sea, what God did in the wilderness, and what God did to Dathan and Abiram.

¹⁷¹ Cf. A.D.H. Mayes, *Deuteronomy* (London: Oliphants, 1979), 158, 414.

¹⁷² Cf. especially Exod 7:3 as well as the singular σημεῖον ἢ τέρας in Deut 13:2. Deuteronomy 13:2-6 (EV 1-5) was at least *understood* by later readers as condemning those prophets who enjoined idolatry rather than as forbidding the performance of signs or wonders themselves. Cf. Stephen B. Chapman, *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2000), 125 note 71. Other passages make clear that the "giving" of a sign refers primarily to making a prediction of the future; the sign "comes" when the predicted event takes place, resulting in a confirmation of the prophet's words. Cf. 1 Sam 2:27-36, 10:7; 1 Kgs 13:3, 5. Cf. Isa 7:11-16; Isa 37:30-32; Jer 44 (51):29-30; Exod 3:12. Both אֵימָה and מוֹפֶת, can also refer to omens that are not directly connected to the activity of a prophet. Cf. Judg 6:17; 1 Sam 14:10; 2 Kgs 20:8-9; Jer 10:2; Joel 3:3; 2 Chr 32:24, 31. Note that the biblical usage is different from Josephus, who consistently regards signs as authenticating miracles.

is striking that the plural phrase "signs and wonders" is almost never used in connection with symbolic actions or predictions of the future.¹⁷³ Thus the biblical evidence does not provide strong support for the characteristic use of the plural phrase "signs and wonders" to denote the predictive signs of prophets or, for that matter, authenticating miracles such as those given to Moses at the burning bush.¹⁷⁴

God's mighty acts of deliverance during the time of the exodus are linked to the present in Jer 32:20, but only in Daniel is the phrase "signs and wonders" used more generally of God's mighty deeds with no connection to the exodus.¹⁷⁵ In sum, the phrase "signs and wonders" is used of predictive signs and authenticating miracles in a few places; the examples from Daniel suggest that the phrase could be used generally for God's mighty deeds; but in the overwhelming majority of cases the phrase refers to the miracles associated with God's deliverance of his people from Egypt.¹⁷⁶

With the exception of the Dead Sea Scrolls,¹⁷⁷ post-biblical usage tends to diverge

¹⁷³ Exceptions include Isa 8:18 and 20:3; Exod 7:3.

¹⁷⁴ *Contra* Chapman, *Law*, 125: "Thus, the prophets are characterized as doers of 'signs and wonders,' or as 'signs and wonders' themselves." Cf. S. Vernon McCasland, "Signs and Wonders," *JBL* 76 (1957): 150; Weiß, *Zeichen*, 117; Leo O'Reilly, *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lukan Theology* (Rome: Editrice Pontifica Università Gregoriana, 1987), 173.

¹⁷⁵ אֲתִיבָא וְתִמְהִיָּא (3:32; translated in Dan Theod. 4:2 by τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα); . . . אֲתִיבָא וְתִמְהִיָּא (3:33); אֲתִיבָא וְתִמְהִיָּא (6:28 translated in Theod. by σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα; cf. Dan 4:37 LXX: αὐτὸς ποιεῖ σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα). *Contra* Karl Heinrich Rengstorf, "σημεῖον, κτλ.," *TDNT* 7:221, who suggests that "the translators detected in both these verses the ancient historical expression [used of the exodus miracles]."

¹⁷⁶ The conclusion of Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:221, is therefore generally correct: "Thus in Greek-speaking Judaism in so far as this stands behind the literature comprised in the LXX the formula σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, based on the Deuteronomic model, seems to be reserved for God's wonders in the days of Moses."

¹⁷⁷ The few references to "signs and wonders" in the Dead Sea Scrolls correspond fully to biblical usage. The phrase appears in connection with the exodus plagues, but never in connection with authenticating miracles or predictive signs. מוֹפֶת and מוֹפְתִים (in the plural) clearly refer to the plagues in Egypt in 4Q392 2 and in 4Q422 10 iii, 5. In addition, מוֹפְתִים may well have occurred in the lacuna before מוֹפְתִים in 4Q378 26 5 on the analogy of Deut 6:22, 29:2; in 4Q185 1-2 i, 14-15 the exodus miracles of deliverance are referred to by מוֹפְתִים and מוֹפְתִים. 11QT liv, 8-9 repeats Deut 13:2-3, with מוֹפְתִים in the singular. Cf. Ezekiel the Tragedian, who reserves "signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τεράτ)" for the plagues

from the Septuagintal pattern. The Hebrew text of Sir 48:12 attributes "many signs and wonders" to Elisha,¹⁷⁸ and Add Esth 10:3f. parallels Jeremiah in extending God's "signs and wonders" beyond the exodus, by referring to the deliverance of Jews during the time of Esther as "signs and wonders."¹⁷⁹ Unlike the Septuagint, Philo of Alexandria distinguishes sharply between the ten plagues and the authenticating miracles given to Moses at the burning bush, but—reversing the biblical pattern—he refers to the three authenticating miracles of Moses as "signs and wonders" (*Mos.* 1.95).¹⁸⁰ Like Josephus, Philo maintains that it is the rejection of authenticating "signs and wonders" that results in the punishment of the ten plagues. Josephus employs the "signs and wonders" formula twice—both times in connection with the Jewish revolt: He refers to the portents that preceded the destruction of Jerusalem as "signs and wonders" (*War* 1.28), and he accuses those whom he clearly views as *false* prophets of promising to display "wonders and signs."¹⁸¹ Since "signs and wonders" is a recognized collocation for portents in non-

in Egypt (cf. 132, 224-6).

¹⁷⁸ פי ש. . . אחות הרבה ומופתים כל מוצא פיהו. Reference noted in Lierman, "Moses," 33.

¹⁷⁹ Cf. Sir 36:5, where God is asked to reprise the events of the exodus by giving "new signs (σημεῖα)." The mention of "signs and wonders" in Wis 8:8 is most likely not related to the exodus (*contra* Rengstorff, *TDNT* 7:221).

¹⁸⁰ The plagues themselves are not referred to in the context by either τέρας or σημεῖον. Moses' authenticating miracles are referred to as "signs" in *Mos.* 1.76-77, 210, and as "wonders" in 1.80, 90-91. Cf. Lierman, "Moses," 36. The only other occurrence of the plural phrase "signs and wonders" is an exception (*pace* Weiß, *Zeichen*, 22, Moses plays no role in the immediate context): In the course of summarizing the feast of first-fruits, Philo says that when the people bring their sacrifices they recite a canticle (cf. Deut 26:1-11), recounting God's dealings with Israel, including their time in Egypt: "He who is kindly to all the wronged accepted their supplication and confounded their assailants with signs and wonders and portents (σημείοις καὶ τέρασιν καὶ φάσμασι) and all the other marvels that were wrought at that time" (*Spec.* 2.218). To these two passages there should probably be added the probable reference to omens as σημείων ἢ τεράτων in *Aet.* 2 (Weiß, *Zeichen*, 23). Neither σημεῖον nor τέρας is used by Philo of the miracles of deliverance from Egypt in any other passage.

¹⁸¹ Jos. *Ant.* 20.168. Cf. Mark 13:22, where Jesus predicts the coming of "false prophets" who "will arise and show signs and wonders" (cf. Matt 24:24 [par.]; John 4:48 [Jesus]; 2 Thess 2:9 [the lawless one]).

Jewish Greek,¹⁸² it is most probable that Josephus employs "signs and wonders" in the sense of portents or authenticating signs, and not in connection with the exodus miracles of deliverance, which he never refers to as "signs and wonders." Thus, while the Septuagint prefers to use the phrase "signs and wonders" for the miracles of deliverance from Egypt and seldom applies it to authenticating miracles or to predictive signs, Philo and Josephus avoid using the "signs and wonders" formula of the exodus miracles and *do* apply it to the authenticating miracles of prophets.

The evidence we have examined should caution against facile conclusions about the connotations of references to "signs and wonders." The mere employment of the phrase by itself does not require an allusion to the exodus, nor does it necessarily evoke the authenticating miracles of Moses and Aaron, or the predictive signs performed by the biblical prophets.

Conclusion

A passage in 4Q Testamonia attests to the antiquity of the eschatological interpretation of Deut 18:15-19; Philo's paraphrase of the passage suggests that the eschatological interpretation was widespread enough to include Hellenistic Jews in the Diaspora.¹⁸³ However, the expectation of an eschatological prophet like Moses is not attested well enough to justify the conclusion that the default category for eschatological

¹⁸² According to McCasland, "Signs," 149, "It is well known that the Greek idiom σημεία καὶ τέρατα was widely used by Hellenistic writers." The phrase is attested in non-Jewish Greek literature, but it is *not* widely used—at least not in proportion to its use in the LXX and Acts. When it does appear the term is normally associated with omens or portents. Cf. Polybius, *Hist.* 3.112.8; Plutarch *Alex.* 75, *Sept. sap. conv.* 149c; Aelian *Var. hist.* 12.57; Appian *Bell. civ.* 2.5.36, 4.1.4; Theophrastus, *Caus. plant.* 5.4.3-4; *Rhetorica Anonyma*, *Περὶ τῶν τοῦ λόγου σχημάτων*. Cf. discussion of the phrase in Rengstorff, *TDNT* 7:206-7 and especially Weiß, *Zeichen*, 18-22.

¹⁸³ 4Q158 also indicates that the Samaritan use of Deut 18:15 is ancient.

prophets was the prophet like Moses.¹⁸⁴ Josephus suggests that visions of future salvation were cast in terms of past deliverance, but his narrative does not support the supposition that anticipation of the prophet like Moses formed part of contemporary eschatological hopes.

Scholarly conclusions about the expected characteristics of the prophet like Moses vary, depending on whether scholars give preference to Josephus's sign prophets or to the evidence from Qumran. Those who take the sign prophets as their model for contemporary expectations about the prophet like Moses naturally conclude that he was expected to perform miraculous signs,¹⁸⁵ while others conclude from descriptions of the past or future leaders in the Dead Sea Scrolls that the prophet like Moses was expected to proclaim God's authoritative will and to disclose eschatological secrets;¹⁸⁶ still others combine the two roles, concluding that he was expected to perform redemptive miracles redolent of the Exodus as well as to be an authoritative teacher.¹⁸⁷ The association of the prophet like Moses with the performance of miraculous signs is based on the questionable conclusion that Josephus's sign prophets posed as prophets like Moses. The identification of the prophet like Moses as an eschatological teacher finds some support in the text of Deut 18:15-19 itself as well as in its (most likely uneschatological) appropriation in 1 Macc 14:41, but it is often based on the doubtful identification of the Teacher of Righteousness or the future "Law interpreter" with the prophet like Moses. The variety of scholarly reconstructions indicates that modern readers no longer have

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Teeple, *Mosaic*, 65: "apparently not every eschatological Prophet claimed to be a New Moses."

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 163-4; Teeple, *Mosaic*, 102.

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Schnackenburg, "Die Erwartung," 633; Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 169-70.

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Hahn, *Titles*, 365; Nebe, *Züge*, 37.

sufficient evidence on which to base conclusions about the form that the fulfillment of Deut 18:15 was expected to take. Indeed, it seems unlikely that there was an established model to which the (or a) prophet like Moses was expected to conform.

The Isaianic Messenger

Unlike the Ethiopian eunuch in Acts 8:34, we are not here concerned with the question whether the prophet Isaiah was speaking "about himself or about someone else," but with the ancient debate about the interpretation of Isaiah implied by the eunuch's question. While the eunuch was puzzled by Isaiah 53, scholarly interest in the Isaianic Servant or herald as it relates to Luke-Acts centres on the reception history of Isa 61:1-2:

¹The spirit of the Lord GOD is upon me, because the LORD has anointed me; he has sent me to bring good news to the oppressed, to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and release for the prisoners; ²to proclaim the year of the LORD's favor, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all who mourn.

In its original context, the speaker is equated with the prophet who uttered the oracle.¹⁸⁸

but the passage is inevitably applied to someone other than the prophet Isaiah when the passage is regarded as a statement about the future, as it is in 11QMelchezedek and Luke

4. With whom did later readers identify this future anointed messenger? Was the passage applied to a future "Jesaja-Heilszeityp-Propheten"¹⁸⁹ or to another future figure such as the eschatological Elijah,¹⁹⁰ the Davidic Messiah,¹⁹¹ or the prophet like Moses?¹⁹²

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Gerhard Friedrich, "εὐαγγελίζομαι, κτλ.," *TDNT* 2:709.

¹⁸⁹ Nebe, *Züge*, 37-8, 68.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Collins, *Scepter*, 120-2, regarding the מְשִׁיחַ of 4Q521, and Clark, "Elijah," 57-64, who argues that Malachi applies the Isaianic servant to Elijah.

¹⁹¹ Cf. Robert B. Sloan, *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilarly Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin, Tex.: Schola Press, 1977), 51-68; Bock, *Proclamation*, 109-11; Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 242.

¹⁹² Cf. Hahn, *Titles*, 380, 356-7, who accepts the argument of Aage Bentzen, *King and Messiah* (London: Lutterworth, 1955), 70-1, that the Isaianic servant was originally depicted as a new Moses. Cf. I.

(Of course, we dare not assume that the text was read in only one way.)

Regardless of the particular solution chosen, it is often suggested that the speaker of Isa 61:1 was conflated with the servant of Deutero-Isaiah—either within the final form of Isaiah, or by later readers. In addition to the sound reasons for connecting the servant to the speaker of Isa 61:1,¹⁹³ this interpretive move has the advantage of allowing conclusions about the identity of the servant to colour one's interpretation of Isa 61:1.¹⁹⁴ For instance, if the servant of Deutero-Isaiah was portrayed as a new Moses, one could easily envisage Second Temple readers of Isaiah who expected the prophet like Moses to assume the form of the Isaianic servant.¹⁹⁵ If the Isaianic servant also bears royal characteristics, the stage is set for the identification of the prophet like Moses with the Messiah.¹⁹⁶

To be sure, the new exodus motif plays a prominent role in Isaiah, and it is possible that the servant was intended to be viewed as a new Moses.¹⁹⁷ But it is important to bear in mind that even though ancient readers of Isaiah would not have distinguished between first and second Isaiah or extracted the so-called servant songs from their contexts, we cannot presume that they would have read the text coherently as

Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (3rd ed.; Paternoster, 1970; repr., Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988), 119, 127-8; Sloan, *Jubiliary*, 71-3; Turner, *Power*, 240.

¹⁹³ For example, the spirit is connected to the speaker of Isa 61:1 as well as the servant in Isa 42:1; the "year of favour" in Isa 61:2 recalls the "time of favour" in Isa 49:8; and the one who proclaims good news to the poor (לְבַשֵּׁר עֲנִיִּים) in Isa 61:1 is reminiscent of the herald (מְבַשֵּׂר) of 52:7. For additional examples, cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 239-40; Hahn, *Titles*, 356-7.

¹⁹⁴ It would fall outside of the scope of this chapter to consider all the various ways in which the servant of Deutero-Isaiah was understood. Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 5:682-700.

¹⁹⁵ Cf. Marshall, *Historian*, 127; Turner, *Power*, 240.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Marshall, *Historian*, 127-8; Sloan, *Jubiliary*, 71-3; Allison, *Moses*, 90; Turner, *Power*, 243.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Nickelsburg, *Origins*, 18; Bentzen, *King and Messiah*, 65-7.

an interpretive unit.¹⁹⁸ The presence of a new Moses typology within the wider book of Isaiah does not mean that later readers would have understood Isaiah 61 within this framework, nor does a Moses typology attested elsewhere—let alone the presence of new exodus language more generally—mean that the speaker of Isa 61 would automatically be identified as a prophet like Moses. It is necessary to find evidence that this step was taken in the texts themselves.

The preceding review of options has necessarily included some preliminary discussion of the application of Isaiah 61 to Jesus in Luke 4 because, aside from the New Testament, Second Temple evidence for the eschatological interpretation of Isaiah 61 is restricted to the Dead Sea Scrolls. For my purposes, the most important treatment of Isaiah 61 in the Scrolls is found near the end of the surviving text of 11QMelchizedek as part of an interpretation of Isa 52:7: "How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of the messenger (מְבַשֵּׂר) who announces peace, who brings good news (מְבַשֵּׂר טוֹב), who announces salvation, who says to Zion, 'Your God reigns.'" According to 11QMelch ii 17-19:

¹⁷The mountains [are] the prophet[s]; they [] every [] ¹⁸And the messenger (המבשר) i[s] the anointed of the spir[it] (משיח הרוח), as Dan[iel] said about him: ['Until an anointed, a prince (עַד מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד), it is seven weeks.' And the messenger of] ¹⁹good (טוב) [ומבשר]; cf. Dan 9:25-6) who announ[ces salvation] is the one about whom it is written [²⁰To comfo[rt] the [afflicted] (Isa 61:1) its interpretation:].¹⁹⁹

If the lacunae are restored correctly in the above translation, both "the messenger

¹⁹⁸ Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 5:682. Pace Strauss, *Messiah*, 233-4.

¹⁹⁹ Fitzmyer's restoration of the lacuna after "concerning whom Dan[. . .]" with a quotation from Dan 9:25 has been widely accepted. Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "Further Light on Melchizedek From Qumran Cave 11," in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (ed. Joseph A. Fitzmyer; London: G. Chapman, 1971), 253, 265-6. The restoration is supported by other allusions to Dan 9:24-27 in 11QMelch (Fitzmyer, "Melchizedek," 259, 265). Within the book of Daniel the word מְשִׁיחַ only occurs in 9:25-26.

(המבשר)" and "[the messenger of] good (טוב [מבשר])" receive individual interpretations with proof texts drawn from Dan 9:25-26 and Isaiah 61 respectively. However, both "the messenger" and "the messenger of good" were apparently understood as labels for the same individual because the basis for the equation of "the messenger (המבשר)" with "the anointed one of the spirit ([משיח הרוח])" is to be found in Isa 61:1. Using the technique of keyword association, or *gezerah shawah*, 11QMelch links the messenger (מבשר) of Isa 52:7 with the speaker of Isa 61:1, who claims to be anointed with the spirit (מָשַׁח יְהוָה) in order to proclaim good news (לְבַשֵּׁר).²⁰⁰

The "anointed of the spirit," who is defined as the messenger of Isa 61:1, should be distinguished from the Melchizedek figure who plays a prominent role in most of the rest of the document.²⁰¹ More difficult is the decision whether the anointed messenger should be understood as an eschatological prophet²⁰² or as a royal Messiah.²⁰³ Apart from Isa 61:1, the verb בָּשַׁר is not closely linked to prophets (or to kings) in the Hebrew Bible.²⁰⁴ In 4Q377 2 ii 11 the verb מְבַשֵּׁר may be applied to Moses in a revelatory context: "out of His mouth he spoke like an angel. For who is a messenger like him

²⁰⁰ Cf. Marinus de Jonge and Adam S. van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament," *NTS* 12 (1965-1966): 306-7. An anointing of the spirit is not made explicit in Isa 61:1, but since the presence of the spirit results from the anointing, this may well be implied. In no other biblical passage are spirit and anointing associated so closely.

²⁰¹ "Die Interpretation Melchisedeks als höchste Engelgestalt bzw. אֱלֹהִים ist hinreichend, um ihn vom 'Gesalbten des Geistes' in Z. 18 zu unterscheiden" (Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 410). *Contra* James A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," in *Luke and Scripture*, 57.

²⁰² Cf. de Jonge and van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek," 306-7; Collins, *Scepter*, 118-9; Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 410-1; Hermann Lichtenberger, "Qumran-Messianism," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls, in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. Shalom M. Paul, et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 332; Poirier, "Endtime Return," 226.

²⁰³ *HJP* 3.1, 450; Fitzmyer, "Melchizedek," 266, tentatively. In Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 529-30, the prophetic alternative is preferred.

²⁰⁴ 1QH^a xxiii 14 (cf. x 6) clearly echoes Isa 52:7 and 61:1, and the verb is applied to the anonymous speaker, but the speaker's prophetic identity should not be taken for granted.

(וכמלאך ידבר מפיהו כיא מי מבשר)?"²⁰⁵ Since Moses is also given the title משיח in line 5 of the same column, 4Q377 could provide strong support for the conclusion that the anointed herald of 11QMelch ii 18 is a Mosaic figure.²⁰⁶ However, מבשר can also mean "from flesh (מבשר)," resulting in the translation, "who of fles[h] is like him,"²⁰⁷ which would exclude an allusion to Isa 61:1. This latter rendering better suits the context of 4Q377.²⁰⁸

The task of the anointed messenger of Isa 61:1-2 does resemble the role of a prophet or a priest more closely than that of a king, especially as that role is expounded in 11QMelch ii 20: "to [in]struct them in all the ages of the w[orld]."²⁰⁹ On the other hand, Scripture also associates spirit and anointing to the royal anointing of Saul, and especially David, who is introduced as "the anointed of the God of Jacob" immediately before he utters an oracle claiming, "The spirit of the LORD speaks through me."²¹⁰

In support of a prophetic anointing, "the anointed of the spirit (משיח הרוח)"

²⁰⁵ Trans. Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (5 ed.; New York: Penguin Books, 1997), 542. Cf. Exod 24:15; 19:9.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Géza G. Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 183.

²⁰⁷ Trans. James VanderKam and Monica Brady, "4Q377," in *Wadi Daliyeh II and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2. DJD XXVIII* (ed. Moshe Bernstein, et al.; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001), 214.

²⁰⁸ Although the reference to speech in the same line may favour מבשר (Jan Willem van Henten, "Moses As Heavenly Messenger in Assumptio Mosis 10:2 and Qumran Passages," *JJS* 54 [2003]: 226), a statement about how Moses was distinguished from all other humans (מבשר) suits the comparison of Moses to an angel at the beginning of the line. Furthermore, "from flesh (מבשר)" is used in a similar comparative way in 1QH^a vii 19-20 (ותרם מבשר כבודו). Thus rather than identifying Moses as a "herald," it is more likely that 4Q377 distinguishes him from all other humans (cf. VanderKam & Brady, "4Q377," 216; Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 339). Angels are also mentioned in connection with מבשר in 1QSb iii 6: ׀ם [מבשר ועם מלאכי קודש . . .]. The line is too fragmentary to be certain, but "from flesh" fits the sense of 1QSb iii 6 better than "herald" does.

²⁰⁹ Cf. Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 411.

²¹⁰ 2 Sam 23:1-2; cf. 1 Sam 10:1, 6 (Saul); 16:13 (David).

(11QMelch ii 18) closely resembles the plural form of this phrase (משיחי רוח), which appears elsewhere in the scrolls as a designation for the prophets.²¹¹ But although there is biblical precedent for a prophetic anointing,²¹² and although the Dead Sea Scrolls uses the plural משיחי to denote prophets, words of the משה root are most commonly applied to priests and kings.²¹³ Hence, in the absence of other evidence we would expect an individual "anointed one" to be a royal or priestly figure. Moreover, if the lacuna after "Dan[iel] said ([. . .]אמר דנ)" in line 18 is correctly filled by a quotation from Dan 9:25, then the mention of an "anointed prince" favours a royal or perhaps a priestly "anointed one" over a prophetic "anointed one"—particularly as the two other occurrences of "prince (נגיד)" in the Scrolls are associated with David.²¹⁴ Although the speaker of Isa 61:1 was probably a prophetic figure, this says nothing about the prophetic identity of the messenger since Isa 61:1 could easily have been regarded as a prediction about a non-

²¹¹ *Contra* Poirier, "Endtime Return," 230-1. In CD ii 12-13 the משיחי רוח קדשו are in parallelism with the חזי אמת, and in 1QM xi 7 "your anointed ones (משיחיכה)" are defined as the "seers of decrees (חזי (תעודות))." Cf. CD vi 1 (par. 4Q267 2 6; 6Q15 3 4). The juxtaposition of "those anointed with the holy spirit (משיחי רוח הקדש)" and sedition (סרה) evokes Deut 13:6 and most likely refers to prophets (4Q270 2 ii 14). Presumably 4Q287 10 13, and possibly 4Q521 8 9; 9 3 refer to prophets, but there is insufficient context to be certain. The only plural use of משיח that does not refer to prophets is 1QS ix 11.

²¹² In 1 Kgs 19:6 Elijah is commanded to anoint the prophet Elisha as his successor. In Ps 105:15 (par. 1 Chr 16:22), prophets are referred to as משיחי.

²¹³ For priestly anointings see Exod 40:13, 15; Lev 4:3f.; 16:22; Num 3:33; 35:25. For royal anointings see Judg 9:8; 1 Sam 2:10; 9:16; 24:7; 2 Sam 2:4; 12:7; 22:51; 1 Kgs 1:34; 19:15-16; 2 Kgs 11:12; 23:30; Ps 89:21; 132:10. Cf. the "messiah of Aaron and Israel" (CD xii 23; xiv 19; xix 10; xx 1; pl. 1QS ix 11); the "messiah of Israel" (1QS^a ii 12, 14, 20); David is designated "Messiah" (4Q252 v 3; 11QPs^a xxviii 8, 11, 13); 4Q458 2 ii 6 clearly refers to a royal Messiah; 4Q381 15 7 might also do so (Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 225-7), but the context (see line 8) allows for the possibility that משיחך should be translated "from your discourse" (from the noun משיח; cf. Eileen M. Schuller, *Non-Canonical Psalms From Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection* [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986], 101-2). For anointed priests see 4Q365 1 i 9, 12a-b ii 6; 4Q375 1 i 9; 4Q376 1 i 1.

²¹⁴ Cf. 4Q504 1-2 iv 7; 11Q5 xxviii 11; Fitzmyer, "Melchizedek," 265-6.

prophetic figure.²¹⁵ Finally, one may observe in passing that מִשַׁח יְהוָה in Isa 61:1

resembles the common royal designation מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה.²¹⁶

To conclude: If the proposed restoration from Dan 9:25 is left out of consideration, the context of 11QMelchizedek favours the interpretation of the anointed messenger as a prophet,²¹⁷ but if the restoration of מְשִׁיחַ נָגִיד is accepted, then perhaps we should envisage a royal figure whose role, like David's, overlaps with that of a prophet.²¹⁸ The probable citation of a passage from Daniel points to the conflation of different eschatological images and demonstrates that the anointed herald of 11QMelch 2 ii 18 could have been interpreted in light of other expected eschatological figures. There is nothing within 11QMelchizedek that requires the identification of the anointed messenger with the prophet like Moses.²¹⁹ Since we have seen that the expectation of the eschatological Elijah was attested at Qumran, the messenger of 11QMelchizedek may also refer to Elijah.

All God's People

According to David Aune, "there was an apparently widespread view in early

²¹⁵ *Contra* Collins, *Scepter*, 132 note 84: "The speaker of a prophetic oracle . . . must be presumed to be a prophet unless there is compelling evidence to the contrary."

²¹⁶ 1 Sam 24:7, 11; 26:9, 11, 16, 23; 2 Sam 1:14, 16; 19:22.

²¹⁷ Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 400, proposes that the passage in question is either Dan 12:4 or 12:9 rather than 9:25. Unfortunately, these verses comprise Michael's instructions to Daniel, not what "Daniel said." Although the same could be said of 9:25-26, Gabriel's long interpretation better suits a reference to what "(the book of) Daniel said."

²¹⁸ Cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, "David. 'Being Therefore a Prophet' (Acts 2:30)," *CBQ* 34 (1972): 338, who remarks: "it is not impossible that the anointing [of David] began to be understood in the Qumran community, not of his regal function, but of prophecy." Alternatively, David's regal and prophetic functions may not have been separated so carefully.

²¹⁹ *Contra* Xeravits, *King, Priest, Prophet*, 183. The frequent identification of the messenger of 11QMelch and the messenger of 4Q521 as the prophet like Moses results in part from the association of the prophet of 1QS with Deut 18:18. Cf. de Jonge and van der Woude, "11Q Melchizedek," 307; Poirier, "Endtime Return," 226; Zimmermann, p. 412]; re: 11QMelch, and Zimmermann, *Messianische*, 389; Lichtenberger, "Qumran-Messianism," 332. re: 4Q521.

Judaism that at the end of the present age or in the age to come the Spirit of God would be poured out on all Israel and all Israelites would have the gift of prophesying.²²⁰ The belief finds support in Joel 3:1-2 (EV 2:28-29):

Then afterward I will pour out my spirit on all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, and your young men shall see visions. Even on the male and female slaves, in those days, I will pour out my spirit.

Joel's prediction recalls Moses' statement in Num 11:29: "Would that all the LORD's people were prophets, and that the LORD would put his spirit on them!"²²¹ Various rabbinic texts reflect on these passages from Joel and Numbers,²²² but the evidence from earlier literature is very sparse.²²³ The community at Qumran believed that the holy spirit was present in their midst more generally, but this does not necessarily mean that they regarded their activity as including "prophesying."²²⁴ However, since it occurs in an eschatological context, the reference to the spirit hovering over the poor (ועל עניים רוחו) in 4Q521 2 ii 6 may evoke Joel 3:1, even though the language echoes Gen 1:2 more clearly.²²⁵ Since a belief in widespread prophesying in the end times is easily derived

²²⁰ Aune, *Prophecy*, 193; cf. Erik Sjöberg, "רוח in Palestinian Judaism," *TDNT* 6:384-6.

²²¹ In other texts, such as Ezek 36:26-27, God promises to put his spirit on his people without referring to prophecy. Cf. Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 11:19; 37:14.

²²² Cf. Schäfer, *Die Vorstellung*, 112-5.

²²³ Cf. *Jub.* 1:23 and *4 Ezra* 6:26, which recall Ezek 36:26. On the latter passage cf. Michael E. Stone, *Fourth Ezra* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 124. The mention of the spirit in *Sib. Or.* 4:46 probably refers to life rather than to an end-times renewal of the spirit (cf. the restatement in *Sib. Or.* 4:189). *T. Jud.* 24:1-3 alludes to Joel 3:1-2, but it expresses Christian sentiment (so Collins, *Scepter*, 92). The reference to the holy spirit in *T. Levi* 18:11 is probably also due to Christian composition, as the first part of the line echoes Rev 22:2.

²²⁴ See discussion above. Cf. 1QS iii 7-8; iv 3.

²²⁵ Cf. Puech, "4Q521," 13. In 1QS iv 20-26 and ix 3, the spirit is mentioned in an eschatological context. Cf. David Hill, "The Background and Biblical Usage of the Term *Pneuma*," in *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms* (ed. David Hill; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 238-40; Foerster, "Der heilige Geist," 126-32, who distinguish between the community's present experience of the spirit and its expectation of future experience. Otherwise Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 138-9, who claimed the community regarded the present work of the spirit as an eschatological event.

from an eschatological reading of Scripture, the absence of evidence does not mean that such a belief did not exist during the Second Temple period.

Conclusion

The extant literature tends to avoid the title "prophet" when speaking of contemporary inspired figures, but further study is needed to determine what this means in any particular case. Belief in the return of Elijah has stronger and more widespread support than belief in the appearance of an eschatological prophet like Moses; belief in widespread prophesying in the end-times has very little extrabiblical support. A comparison of the evidence for belief in the eschatological return of Elijah and the evidence for belief in the future appearance of a prophet like Moses suggests that the degree to which future hopes regarding eschatological prophets took on a concrete form sometimes depends on the presence or absence of a firm basis for such hopes in Scripture. Although an eschatological interpretation of Deut 18:15-19 is attested in some passages, Deut 18:15-19 says only that a prophet like Moses will arise who must be heeded. Some readers may have interpreted this passage with reference to an eschatological prophet, but there is very little biblical detail on which to determine what the prophet should look like, and there is scant evidence that these expectations ever took on a developed form. In the case of Elijah, however, the greater Scriptural detail appears to have led to a more specific eschatological expectation. An eschatological interpretation of Isaiah 61 is attested at Qumran, but is probably understood in 11QMelchizedek in relation to other eschatological figures. There is little evidence that the Isaianic servant was given an end-time role or that the "herald" was identified with

the prophet like Moses.

Given the fragmentary evidence for Jewish beliefs about prophecy, it would be dangerous to conclude too much from the absence of evidence for particular views—especially when (as in the case of widespread prophesying in the end time) there is a solid basis for such ideas in Scripture. A more detailed examination of the Second Temple evidence must await another study. In this thesis, however, I will take an initial step in this direction by carrying out a comprehensive analysis of the conception of prophets held by the author of Luke-Acts.

Chapter Three: Prophets in Luke-Acts

This chapter examines what Luke thought it meant to be a "prophet." Although Luke had a fairly clear range of established meanings in Scripture, it is not enough to remark that Luke's use of this word-group was given shape by the Septuagint, for Luke was influenced by other factors as well, and in any case it is still necessary to determine the biblical meanings to which he gave prominence. Any attempt to comprehend Luke's understanding of prophets must also grapple with the apparent conflict between Luke's portrayal of such major characters as Peter and Stephen in ways that resemble prophets and his restriction of the title "prophet" to relatively minor characters. The resolution of this terminological question will shed light on Luke's Christology, the significance of the parallels drawn in Acts between Jesus and his followers, as well as Luke's understanding of the role of prophets in the church. A detailed comparison of Luke's conception of prophets with beliefs about prophets held by (other) Second Temple Jews must await a further study, but this chapter's delineation of characteristics commonly attributed by Luke to prophets will prepare for such a comparison. It will also lay the groundwork for chapter four's comparison of Luke's portrayal of prophets in different periods of salvation history and for the study of Luke's treatment of eschatological prophets in chapters five and six.

For the sake of analysis, Luke's use of *προφήτης* will be divided into a discussion of traits and activities associated with individuals definitely regarded as prophets who play no active role in Luke's narrative, and traits and activities associated with characters labelled "prophet" who feature in the narrative of Luke and Acts. As one of the larger

purposes of this thesis is to consider Luke's conception of prophecy in relation to beliefs about prophets held by Second Temple Jews, I will also look for possible differences between Luke's own understanding of prophets and the beliefs about prophets he attributes to non-Christ-believing Jewish characters in his narrative. Once the analysis of "prophets" is complete, those characteristics that are central to Luke's conception of prophets may be distinguished from those that are peripheral as well as from those characteristics that are not related to the concept of prophet at all even though they are attributed to individuals bearing the title "prophet." Since there is no reason why Luke should formally identify everyone whom he regarded as a prophet, the second half of this chapter will assess other figures in Luke's narrative who are not explicitly given the title "prophet," but who may have been regarded by Luke as prophets.

In addition to isolating characteristics that Luke commonly attributed to prophets, I will argue that Luke's general concept of prophets was very similar to the view attributed to non-Christ-believing Jews in his narrative; his perspective only diverges from that of non-Christ-believing Jews when it comes to the relative importance of Jesus' identity as a prophet. Moreover, Luke in effect distinguished between those who might prophesy on a temporary basis and those whose prophetic activity was distinctive enough over a period of time to merit the title "prophet." Motivated by his desire to highlight the continuity between Scripture and its fulfillment in Jesus, Luke intentionally evoked biblical prophets in his portrayal of Jesus as a prophet. Luke's depiction of the main characters in Acts, however, was intended to relate the disciples to Jesus much more than it was intended to connect them to the line of past prophets. I will also propose that

Luke's presentation of Christ-believing prophets, and his limitation of the role of "prophet" in Acts to primarily minor characters, were shaped by the role that prophets played in the church.

Prophets from the Past

Of the 33 occurrences of words of the προφητ- root in Luke, and the 35 occurrences in Acts, 39 clearly refer to past prophets.¹ The following discussion of Luke's portrayal of past prophets will be guided by three basic interests. My first interest concerns the nature and scope of the prophets' task as message bearers. Second, who were the prophets? Did Luke use the term broadly for all great figures from Abel to Zechariah,² or did he have specific figures in mind when he referred to prophets from the past? This will require a discussion of specific individuals labelled prophets by Luke, who are not generally regarded as prophets by modern scholars. Finally, I will pay attention to the characteristic activities attributed by Luke to past prophets.

Past Prophets as Message Bearers

In most cases, past prophets are regarded as message bearers, with references to the prophets often denoting a written text of Scripture.³ The prophets earnestly anticipated the time when what they predicted would occur (Luke 10:24). They were understood primarily as those who predicted the "last days" (Acts 2:17) or "these days" (3:24). That is, they spoke concerning the coming of "the righteous one" (Acts 7:52), the

¹ Luke 1:70; 3:4; 4:17, 27; 6:23, 26; 9:8, 19; 10:24; 11:47, 50; 16:29, 31; 18:31; 24:25, 27, 44; Acts 2:16, 30; 3:18, 21, 25; 7:42, 48, 52; 8:28, 30, 34; 10:43; 13:15, 20, 27, 40; 15:15; 24:14; 26:22, 27; 28:23, 25.

² Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 96-7.

³ Cf. Luke 3:4; 4:17; 16:16, 29, 31; 24:27, 44; Acts 2:16; 7:42, 48; 13:15, 40; 15:15; 24:14, 44; 26:22; 28:23, 25.

suffering of the Messiah (Acts 3:18), his resurrection and the experiences of his followers (Acts 26:22-23; cf. Acts 2), the forgiveness of sins (Acts 10:43) and the future restoration expected generally by Jews.⁴

While all the prophets from Samuel onwards proclaimed "these days" (Acts 3:24);⁵ the past prophets did not *only* predict the events of the last days,⁵ for Acts 7:42 refers to a prediction of the exile written in the "book of the prophets." Nor were prophets, as Luke describes them, concerned only with predictions of the future. The mention of resurrection at the conclusion to the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus hints at the predictive role of the prophets who proclaimed the resurrection of the Messiah, but within the body of the parable the requirement to "listen" involves heeding the ethical demand to care for the poor as stipulated in the Law and the prophets.⁶ The fact that the prophets of the past—like Jesus and his followers—tended to be rejected and persecuted⁷ by those to

⁴ In the context of Paul's speech to Agrippa, the question, "Do you believe the prophets?" (Acts 26:27) includes within the prophets' predictions the suffering and resurrection of the Messiah (26:23) as well as God's promise about what "our twelve tribes hope to attain, as they earnestly worship day and night" (26:7). Presumably Luke also believed that the prophets predicted that Jesus would be the "judge of the living and the dead" (Acts 10:42), even though the prophets' testimony is linked particularly with the forgiveness of sins made available through his name (10:43). And in Acts 3:17-21, the message of the prophets should not be limited to the suffering of the Messiah (3:18), but also includes the prediction of his return from heaven (3:21). *Contra* Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; New York: Harper & Row, 1961), 161: "The Eschaton and the Judgement, however, do not seem to come within the range of Scriptural prophecy."

⁵ *Contra* Barton, *Oracles*, 194, who maintains that for "the Christians who wrote the New Testament. . . all ancient prophecy pointed to the *same* age as being the time when it would be fulfilled."

⁶ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1134; John Nolland, *Luke* (3 vols.; Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1989, 1993), 831. *Contra* Barton, *Oracles*, 164: "Neither in the gospels nor in Paul, then, do we find more than hints of the use of non-Pentateuchal material to support ethical decisions." Barton, *Oracles*, 161, allows that Luke 16:29-31 might be "a marginal exception," and grants that "Acts and John have enough material to show that what was to become the normal perception of prophecy in Tannaitic times was already current, but little more." The prophets can also be cited for other reasons. Acts 7:48, for example, quotes "the prophet" (Isa 66:1) to prove that God's dwelling is not the Jerusalem temple.

⁷ Cf. Luke 11:47, 50; 13:34; Acts 7:52. The standard treatment on the motif of persecuted prophets in the Hebrew Bible, early Judaism and Christianity is still that of Odil Hannes Steck, *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener

whom they were sent demonstrates that Luke believed the prophets were sent to call their contemporaries to repentance as well as to predict the more distant future.⁸ Moreover, according to Luke 11:32, Jonah functioned as a sign to the Ninevites rather than to Jesus' contemporaries alone—presumably through the judgement oracles Jonah proclaimed.⁹

The Identity of Past Prophets

Those past figures who are identified as prophets in Luke-Acts and mentioned by name are all characters who appear in Jewish Scripture.¹⁰ In most cases these biblical figures are also identified as prophets in Scripture. Further comment is required in the case of Zechariah, Abel, Moses and David, however, either because their designation as prophets is unexpected or because of the light they shed on Luke's conception of who the past prophets were—or both.

Abel and Zechariah as Prophets

In Luke 11:50-51, Jesus announces that his contemporaries will be "charged with

Verlag, 1967). Cf. Scott Cunningham, *'Through Many Tribulations': The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

⁸ Cf. Luke 6:23 (par. Matt 5:12), 26; 10:24 (par. Matt 13:17); 11:47 (par. Matt 23:29), 50 (par. Matt 23:35); 13:28, 34 (par. Matt 23:37); Acts 7:52.

⁹ In Matt 12:39-40, the sign of Jonah the prophet (Ἰωνᾶ τοῦ προφήτου) is directed at Jesus' contemporaries rather than being a sign to the Ninevites (ἐγένετο Ἰωνᾶς τοῖς Νινευίταις σημεῖον; Luke 11:30), and in Matthew's version the sign consists, at least in part, in Jonah's three-day experience in "the belly of the sea monster." See Acts 7:42-43 for another prophetic judgement oracle applied to events in the past. The sign of Jonah that is now given to Jesus' audience (Luke 11:29) consists of the analogy between Jonah and the Son of Man (11:30) and the latent threat that unless they too repent Jesus' contemporaries will experience the judgement once held in store for Ninevah. Cf. Luke 13:3; Nolland, *Luke*, 652-3.

¹⁰ Past figures mentioned by name and explicitly identified by the title προφήτης in Luke-Acts include Abel (Luke 11:51), Moses (Acts 3:22; 7:37), Samuel (Acts 3:24; 13:20), David (Acts 2:30), Elisha (Luke 4:27), Joel (Acts 2:16), Zechariah (Luke 11:51) and Isaiah (Luke 3:4 par. Matt 3:33; 4:17; Acts 8:28, 30-34; 28:25; cf. Acts 7:49-50). Amos and Habakkuk are quoted in Acts 7:42-43; 13:40; 15:15, but the quotations are attributed to the "prophets." A modified version of Mal 3:1 is quoted in Luke 7:27, but is introduced simply by γέγραπται (par. Matt 11:10; cf. Mark 1:2). Luke 23:30 quotes Hos 10:8, but lacks a citation formula. Elijah is unquestionably understood as a prophet since he is associated with Elisha in Luke 4:25-27, even though the title is never affixed to Elijah's name (cf. 1 Kgs 17; 2 Kgs 5:1-19; Luke 9:8, 19). Jonah, like Elijah, is never given the title προφήτης in Luke-Acts, though he is cited by name in Luke 11:29-32.

the blood of all the prophets shed since the foundation of the world, from the blood of Abel to the blood of Zechariah, who perished between the altar and the sanctuary."

Despite differences in detail, the Zechariah in question is evidently the Zechariah son of the priest Jehoiada who, according to 2 Chr 24:20-22, was murdered "in the courtyard of the house of the LORD" after he delivered an inspired oracle announcing that God had forsaken the people.¹¹ Although Zechariah is not explicitly given the title "prophet" in 2 Chronicles, the immediate context associates him with prophets (cf. 2 Chr 24:19), and it is easy to understand how later readers concluded Zechariah was a prophet. The Matthean parallel to Luke 11:50-51 conflates the story of Zechariah's murder with the writing prophet Zechariah the "son of Barachiah,"¹² but there is no positive evidence that Luke confused the two figures in the same way.¹³

Mentioning Abel and Zechariah is a way of encompassing all martyred prophets, for Abel's was the first biblical murder, and Zechariah was one of the last prophetic

¹¹ Both the Hebrew and Greek versions agree that Zechariah was killed by stoning in the courtyard of the house of the Lord (יהוה בֵּית יְחֶזְקִיָּה/ἐν αὐλῇ οἴκου κυρίου), but the saying in the double tradition differs markedly from the Septuagint: (1) The LXX has Αζαριαν son of Ιωδαε the priest, whereas Luke 11:51 and Matthew 23:35 give the name Ζαχαρίου, which corresponds to the Hebrew זְכַרְיָה. (2) The description of the murder and the location of the event do not correspond closely to the LXX or to the MT. Matt 23:35 has ἐφονεύσατε μεταξύ τοῦ ναοῦ καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου; Luke 11:51 has Ζαχαρίου τοῦ ἀπολομένου μεταξύ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ τοῦ οἴκου.

¹² Matt 23:35. This is much more probable than that Matthew's Zechariah refers to Zacharias son of Baris mentioned in Jos. *War* 4.335 (*contra* Steck, *Israel*, 39-40).

¹³ Cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 506; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 951; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium, zweiter Teil, erste Folge: Kommentar zu Kapitel 9, 51 - 11,54* (Freiburg: Herder, 1994), 325. It is unlikely that Luke regarded the writing prophet Zechariah as the last of the biblical prophets: (1) Although Acts 7:52 implies that all prophets were persecuted, it does not say that all prophets were martyred—and Luke 11:51 is concerned with all martyred prophets from Abel to Zechariah. (2) The quotation of Mal 3:1 in Luke 7:27 suggests that Luke was aware that Malachi was a prophet, and—if the order of the book of the Twelve was fixed at this time—Luke would have known that Malachi followed Zechariah (Acts 7:42 attests to the existence of a "book of the prophets" that includes Amos; cf. Sir 49:10). For Mal 3:22-24 as a colophon to the Book of the Twelve see Clark, "Elijah," 41.

figures whose murder is narrated in the Bible.¹⁴ But Abel is never identified as a "prophet" in Scripture, and it comes as a surprise to find him identified as a προφήτης here. The common observation that this verse represents an exceptional "broad use of the term" is true,¹⁵ yet fails to explain how Abel could be regarded as a prophet. Perhaps the best solution is that the identification of Abel as a prophet reflects a willingness to regard the great figures of the past as prophets even when they were not identified as such in Scripture.¹⁶

John Barton contends further that Abel is listed as the first prophet because "he was a righteous man," and argues that particularly in Luke-Acts, the term "'prophet' seems quite often to be not much more than an honorific, like 'saint' in later Christian usage." According to Barton, "all the prophets" who enter the kingdom of God along with the patriarchs (Luke 13:28) are "all the great figures of Israel's history," and the "many prophets and kings" of Luke 10:24 include "all the great men of the past."¹⁷

Luke does take for granted that God's prophets were holy.¹⁸ Jesus classes "all the prophets" with those who will enter the kingdom of God (Luke 13:28), and claims that

¹⁴ There are only two "true" prophetic figures whose murders are narrated in Scripture. In addition to Zechariah son of Jehoiada, Jer 26:20-23 describes the murder of Uriah son of Shemaiah who fled to Egypt before being killed by King Jehoiakim (the slaughter of false prophets is described in 1 Kings 18). The murder of true prophets during the time of Ahab is mentioned, but not narrated, in 1 Kgs 18:4; 19:10, 14; 2 Kgs 9:7. Nehemiah 9:26 also mentions the murder of the prophets before the exile. The persecution of prophets is mentioned in 1 Kgs 22:26-27; 2 Chr 16:10; 36:16; cf. Jer 20:1-6; 38:4-13; Ezek 2:6; 3:4-11. After the order of books in the Hebrew Bible was fixed, speaking of "Abel through Zechariah" would be tantamount to saying "all the prophets right through the Bible, from Genesis to Chronicles"—but it is far from clear that the boundary of the Writings or the order of the books in the third division of Scripture was fixed at this time (cf. James A. Sanders, "Canon," *ABD* 1:842-3). The identification of Zechariah as the son of Jehoiada does not require that Chronicles was already placed at the end of the canon by the time of Q (*contra* Steck, *Israel*, 37); the rhetorical effect of the statement is obviously more important than its precision.

¹⁵ Marshall, *Luke*, 506. Cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 668; Schürmann, *Lukas* 2, 325.

¹⁶ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 951; Barton, *Oracles*, 96-8.

¹⁷ Barton, *Oracles*, 96-7.

¹⁸ Cf. Luke 1:70 and Acts 3:21 (holy prophets); cf. Luke 11:47 (par. Matt 23:29).

association with the prophets by enduring persecution is cause for joy because it leads to assurance of great reward.¹⁹ However, it is doubtful that προφήτης can be reduced to a title of respect for great figures of the past, for as we have seen, when Luke identifies past prophets by name they normally correspond to the standard list of biblical prophets.

Moreover, Luke 11:51 mentions only Abel's murder as a possible reason for his inclusion among the prophets; the reference to Abel as a righteous person is in the text of Matthew rather than that of Luke.²⁰ In the other examples adduced by Barton, the context does not provide enough clarification to determine who is meant by the term.²¹ In such instances, it is prudent not to extend the meaning of "prophet" beyond the range of meaning that can be established when the context is clear.

Moreover, the identification of Abel as a prophet conflicts with other aspects of Luke's typical portrayal of past prophets. For example, if Abel was regarded as a prophet, it remains puzzling why Luke later has Peter say "that all the prophets from Samuel on have foretold these days" instead of beginning the sequence with Abel (Acts 3:23). And while Luke often refers to the "prophets" without specifying whom he has in

¹⁹ Luke 6:23; par. Matt 5:12. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 254.

²⁰ Compare πᾶν αἷμα δίκαιον (Matt 23:35) instead of τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν (Luke 11:50). Abel's piety is not mentioned in Luke 11:51, nor is it prominent in Genesis. Heb 11:4, however, may indicate that Abel's righteousness was proverbial.

²¹ In Luke 13:28, the prophets are revered figures of the past along with the patriarchs Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, but there is little reason to conclude that the patriarchs are included as prophets (Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1026; Nolland, *Luke*, 735). In Acts 3:25, the statement "you are sons of the prophets and of the covenant . . ." is primarily figurative and means that Peter's audience is heir to the blessings of the covenant as well as the promises made by the prophets (cf. Rom 9:5; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of the Acts* [Rev ed.: Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988], 87), though a literal reference to the fact that Peter's audience were "of the same Hebrew stock as the prophets" may also be intended (Barrett, *Acts*, 211; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [New York: Doubleday, 1998], 290; cf. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* [trans. Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971], 209 note 4). In any case, Acts 3:25 does not indicate that the Israelite ancestors were all regarded as prophets.

mind, there are no other examples of προφήτης being applied to anyone before Moses in those instances where a referent can be inferred.²² Since Abel was most likely already identified as a prophet in Luke's source material,²³ it is perhaps better to suppose that though Luke did not find the identification of Abel as a prophet objectionable enough to remove it, as Matthew seems to have done, he probably would not have expressed himself in this way if he were composing on his own.

Moses as a Prophet

Moses is generally distinguished from other prophets even when the writings attributed to Moses are regarded as prophetic texts.²⁴ This is not surprising since Moses is often mentioned in his capacity as lawgiver²⁵ and "Moses" or the "law of Moses" frequently designates the Torah as a division of Scripture. In Acts 3:21-26 Peter proclaims that Jesus must remain in heaven until the times of restoration that "God announced by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old" (3:21). Moses' prediction in Deut 18:15 is then cited as an example of what the "prophets from of old" had foretold. After this one specific example from Moses, Peter generalizes that all the other prophets "from Samuel and those who came after him"²⁶ also proclaimed "these days." Instead of

²² It is not the case that "Luke thinks of the prophets as going back to creation (1.70)" (Michael D. Goulder, *Luke: A New Paradigm* [2 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989], 2.524). The parallel wording in Luke 1:70 and Acts 3:21 suggests that "the holy prophets from of old" go back to Moses (cf. Acts 3:22) rather than to Abel or Adam (see discussion of Moses in the following section).

²³ Schürmann, *Lukas* 2, 327; Steck, *Israel*, 31 note 8; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 943; Marshall, *Luke*, 506.

²⁴ Cf. Luke 24:27, 44; Acts 26:22; 28:23; cf. Acts 24:14.

²⁵ The name "Moses" sometimes designates no more than the written law of Moses (cf. Luke 20:37; Acts 15:21; 21:21). Sometimes the agency of Moses as lawgiver is emphasized, but this is normally just another way of referring to the written law: cf. Luke 5:14 (par. Mark 1:44); Luke 20:28 (par. Mark 12:19).

²⁶ That Luke has a line of prophets in view seems required from ἀπὸ Σαμουὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς. The word καθεξῆς normally designates a set chronological or geographical order or sequence (cf. the other NT occurrences in Luke 1:3, 8:1; Acts 3:24, 11:4, 18:23). Scripture refers to only one other figure between

presenting Samuel as the first in a line of prophets, Acts 3:21-24 manifestly places Samuel and his successors after the great prophet Moses.²⁷⁾

Since Acts 3:22-24 lists Moses as the first in a sequence of prophets, it is tempting to conclude that Luke believed Moses' prediction of a "prophet like me" was partially fulfilled in the prophets who succeeded Moses, even though—on Luke's view—the prediction found its ultimate fulfillment in Jesus.²⁸ The quotation of Deut 18:15 in Acts 3:22 shows that Luke was aware of the affinity established in Deuteronomy between Moses, whose words must be listened to (ἀκούσεσθε),²⁹ and other prophets who, like Moses, demand a hearing.³⁰ Acts 7 shows that Moses and his successors were closely related: Stephen illustrates Israel's rejection of the prophets at some length using the example of Moses, before accusing his audience's ancestors of persecuting all the prophets (7:52).

Because the injunction to listen is a common biblical expression there is no necessary connection between Moses and the imperative to "hearken,"³¹ but the emphasis Luke places on "hearing" Moses and the prophets in other contexts suggests that Luke

Moses and Samuel as a נביא/προφήτης (Judg 6:8) and one as a נביא/προφήτης (Judg 4:4).

²⁷⁾ Cf. Lierman, "Moses," 32: "This passage seems not only to parallel Moses with a prophet to come, but actually to name him as one of 'the prophets' of old." Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 210; Bruce, *Acts*, 87; *contra* Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 290. The μέν . . . δέ construction begun by Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν in Acts 3:22 is completed by καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται in Acts 3:24 (so rightly Lierman, "Moses," 32; *pace* Barrett, *Acts*, 210; *BDF* § 447.9).

²⁸ Cf. John Calvin, *Commentary Upon the Acts of the Apostles* (4 vols.; Henry Beveridge, ed.; trans. Christopher Fetherstone; Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844), 1:155-6.

²⁹ Deut 4:1; 5:1, 27 (cf. Exod 24:7); Deut 6:3-4; 9:1; 12:28.

³⁰ Deut 18:15; cf. 13:4.

³¹ Exhortations to hear the word of God also appear frequently in relation to the prophets outside of Deuteronomy. Cf. 3 Kgdms 22:19; 4 Kgdms 7:1; 4 Kgdms 20:16; 2 Chr 28:11; Hos 4:1; Amos 3:1, 4:1, 5:1; Mic 1:2; 3:1; Joel 1:2; Zech 3:8; Isa 1:10; 7:13; 28:14; Jer 2:4; 7:2; 13:14; Ezek 21:3; 36:4. Cf. 2 Chr 20:15. An exhortation to "hear" is also a common biblical way of introducing direct address. See e.g. Prov 4:1, 10; 1 Chr 28:2.

believed Deut 18:15 was fulfilled in a preliminary way in Moses' successors. At the conclusion to the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus, Abraham links Moses and the prophets tightly together when he declares, "They have Moses and the prophets; let them hear (ἀκουσάτωσαν) them," and again, "If they do not hear (ἀκούουσιν) Moses and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if some one should rise from the dead " (Luke 16:29, 31). If, as I will argue below, the command to listen (ἀκούετε) to Jesus in Luke 9:35 evokes Deut 18:15, Luke may have expected that Abraham's statement about the need to listen to Moses and the prophets would recall the relationship between Moses and the prophets laid down in Deut 18:15.³² In any case, the story of the Rich Man and Lazarus illustrates in dramatic form the fate of those who do not listen to Moses and the prophets, and in so doing parallels Peter's warning that those who fail to listen to the prophet like Moses "will be utterly rooted out of the people" (Acts 3:23). Since Deut 18:15 is quoted as an illustration of what the prophets predicted about the times of restoration, it is certain that Luke's primary concern in Acts 3 is to show that Jesus is the final fulfillment of Deut 18:15, but there is some evidence that Luke also accepted a wider non-eschatological fulfillment of Moses' prediction in other past prophets.

David as a Prophet

Though David is naturally regarded as a royal figure and is only explicitly labelled a προφήτης in Acts 2:30, it is assumed elsewhere in Luke-Acts that the author of

³² Cf. Goulder, *Luke*, 639; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991), 253, 256. In view of Luke's usage elsewhere, the reference to "Moses and the prophets" should be attributed to Luke's redaction (so Nolland, *Luke*, 831). On the allusion to Deut 18:15 in Luke 9:35, see chapter six page 259 below.

the Psalms spoke by the Holy Spirit and predicted the future.³³ But rather than simply citing a psalm as an inspired text spoken by the Holy Spirit through David, the Lukan Peter delves into David's prophetic nature, assuming that David knew his words applied to the distant future. Peter explains that since David died and was buried, the words "you will not . . . let your Holy One experience corruption" (2:27) must apply to David's greater son, the Messiah: "Foreseeing (προϊδών), David spoke of the resurrection of the Messiah" (2:31). Peter's argument thus hangs on David's presumed foreknowledge of the future. Although David's prophetic status was widely recognized,³⁴ support for Peter's conclusion that David foresaw (προοράω) the resurrection might also have been found in the use of the verb προοράω at the beginning of the quotation from Psalm 16 in Acts 2:25.³⁵ Prophets, assumes the Lukan Peter, have supernatural insight into what is hidden from their contemporaries and are thus able to predict the future with great accuracy.³⁶ From Luke's perspective there was no conflict between David's identity as prophet and his identity as king.

³³ According to Acts 1:16 and 4:25, the Holy Spirit spoke through David. In Acts 13:33, the second Psalm is regarded as fulfilled in Jesus. Davidic authorship of (some of) the Psalms is assumed in Luke 20:42. Luke 24:44; Acts 1:20; 13:33 show that the Psalms were regarded as Scripture.

³⁴ Cf. Fitzmyer, "David," 332-9; James L. Kugel, "David the Prophet," in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition* (ed. James L. Kugel; Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 45-55; 11QPs^a xxvii 1, 11: כול אלה דבר בנבואה¹¹. . . ויהי דויד בן ישי חכם¹. Since Philo also identifies the author of the Psalms as a prophet (*Ag.* 50; *Her.* 290), the identification is not limited to "Palestinian" Judaism.

³⁵ To be sure προοράωμεν τὸν κύριον (Ps 16:8 in Acts 2:25), means that David saw God, not that David saw the future, but the repetition of the same verb in verse 31 suggests that Luke thought it denoted foresight into the future. At the very least, the choice of προϊδών in Acts 2:31 was probably suggested by προοράωμεν in 2:25. Cf. BEGS 4, 24; Barrett, *Acts*, 144: "Luke may well have taken [προ-] to be temporal, since he regards the Psalm as a prediction." Pace Haenchen, *Acts*, 181.

³⁶ Acts 2:31 permits a distinction between David's supernatural insight into the future (προϊδών) and his actual prediction of the future (ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως).

The Activities of Prophets

Since the prophets were sent, it is perhaps unnecessary to add that Luke assumed they were commissioned as prophets by God;³⁷ the examples of Elijah and Elisha (Luke 4:24-27) show that the prophets sometimes experienced divine direction to specific places. Luke did not restrict the prophets' activities to the reception of messages from God and proclamation to other people; he also knew that at least Elijah and Elisha performed miracles (Luke 4:25-27), the example of Jonah suggests that he was aware of a connection between prophets and "signs" (Luke 11:32), and Scriptural echoes in Acts 13:20-23 suggest that Luke thought Samuel played the role of a transitional figure precisely in his prophetic involvement in the anointing of both Saul and David as king.³⁸

Conclusion

Luke apparently thought of Moses as the first prophet, who was succeeded by Samuel and those who came after him. In one exceptional passage Luke refers to Abel as a persecuted "prophet," but this does not justify the conclusion that all the great figures of the past were normally regarded as "prophets." The belief that David was a prophet is well-attested; Luke assumed that the psalms predict the Messiah, and that as a prophet David knew and predicted the future. Luke believed that the prophets both spoke about the last days and addressed messages from God to their contemporaries through the Holy

³⁷ Cf. Luke 4:26; 13:34 (par. Matt 23:37).

³⁸ Paul's description of David as a man after God's own heart draws on the words of Samuel to Saul in 1 Sam 13:14 (Barrett, *Acts*, 636). The mention of the removal of Saul and the choice of David son of Jesse shows that Acts 13:22 recalls Samuel's anointing of David, since David is first designated as a son of Jesse in 1 Sam 16:1 when Samuel is sent by God to anoint David king. Cf. 1 Kgs 1:34-38 for additional evidence that "anointing" kings was considered an activity appropriate to prophets. Bruce, *Acts*, 255, observes that εὐρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαὶ in Acts 13:22 recalls εὐρον Δαυὶδ τὸν δοῦλόν μου in Ps 88:21 (EV 89:21). Perhaps significantly, in the second line of Ps 88:21, God claims, "with my holy oil I have anointed him."

Spirit. Often, it seems, these were messages of coming judgement, and just as frequently the messengers were rejected by those to whom they were sent. But the prophets also promised great things for the future, and it was in these predictions that Luke was most interested because he believed that much of what the prophets said in Scripture had come to fulfillment in Jesus and the early church; he also believed that the final fulfillment of all God's promises through the prophets would soon be realized. It goes without saying that the prophets of the past were "holy." We will see in what follows that Luke's portrayal of post-biblical prophets is in many respects similar to his portrayal of biblical prophets.

Prophets as Characters in Luke-Acts

In addition to the prophets who were active before Luke's narrative begins, the term προφήτης is applied to John the Baptist and Jesus in Luke's Gospel; in Acts it is applied to various disciples of Jesus, including "prophets from Jerusalem" (11:27), prophets at Antioch (13:1), Judas and Silas (15:32), and Agabus (21:10); the only occurrence of προφήτις refers to Anna (Luke 2:36); the only instance of ψευδοπροφήτης is applied to Elymas, "the Jewish false-prophet" (Acts 13:6). All occurrences of the verb προφητεύω are connected to characters who lived in the time period that falls within Luke's story, including Zechariah the father of John (Luke 1:67); Jesus (Luke 22:64); Jesus' disciples at Pentecost (Acts 2:17-18); the disciples of John the Baptist (Acts 19:6), and Philip's daughters (Acts 21:9). Our discussion will proceed sequentially rather than topically, beginning with an analysis of those characters in Luke's Gospel who are explicitly labelled "prophets," including Anna, John the Baptist, and Jesus. It will then

turn to an examination of disciples in Acts who are given the title προφήτης. This survey of characters explicitly given the title "prophet" will lay the groundwork for a subsequent evaluation of central and peripheral characteristics of prophets.

Anna the Prophetess

Luke informs us that after Simeon's blessing the prophetess Anna "began to praise God and to speak about the child to all who were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke 2:38). Coming as it does after Simeon's oracles, Anna's speech about Jesus most likely involved predictions about Jesus' future as it related to the "redemption of Jerusalem"—but this need not mean that she was called a prophetess only "because she had the gift of foreseeing and foretelling the future."³⁹ Luke's primary concern in this section is to accentuate the anticipation of God's redemption shared by pious Israelites, and his description of Anna as a *prophetess* who spent all her time in the temple "worshipping night and day with fasting and prayers" (2:37) adds to Luke's characterization of Anna as a devout woman.

Eugene Boring argues that Anna's association with worship was a distinguishing feature of early Christian prophetic activity, which Boring maintains was consistently practiced in a communal setting.⁴⁰ But Luke never states that Anna's religious service was conducted in a communal setting.⁴¹ What is more, worship, prayer and fasting, as they appear in Luke-Acts, are characteristic activities of pious Jews and God-fearing

³⁹ *Contra* Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:836.

⁴⁰ Cf. Boring, *Sayings*, 69-70.

⁴¹ To be sure, Anna worships in public in the Temple (Luke 2:37), but although public worship in the Temple could be communal (cf. Luke 1:10), it was not necessarily so (cf. Luke 18:11, 13). Brown, *Birth*, 442, surmises that the verb λατρεύω "may be meant to cover her participation in the hours of sacrifice and in the observance of the weekly fasts."

Gentiles, whether or not they are disciples of Jesus.⁴² Since words of the προφητ- root are only associated with worship and prayer in the case of Anna (Luke 2:36-38), the prophets at Antioch (Acts 13:1-2), and the initial coming of the Spirit at Pentecost (1:14; cf. 2:1-4), it would be too much to conclude that Luke depicts prophetic activity as normally taking place in the context of worship.⁴³ Nor may we conclude from Luke's usage that the title "prophet" was broad enough to be applied to individuals solely on the basis of their presumed closeness to God.⁴⁴ However, Luke's characterization of Anna does suggest that prophets were regarded as people who were particularly close to God, and that—as in Jewish Scripture—prophetic activity was related to other forms of communication with God such as prayer⁴⁵ and praise.⁴⁶

Luke's mention of the sexual purity of both Anna and Philip's seven daughters who "prophesied"⁴⁷ is tantalizing in light of Second Temple and rabbinic sources that link

⁴² *Fasting*: disciples of John (Luke 5:33; 18:12); followers of Jesus (Luke 5:35; Acts 13:2-3; 14:23). *Prayer*: non-Christ-believing Jews (Luke 1:10; 18:10-11; 19:46; 20:47; Acts 3:1; cf. Acts 16:13, 16); John's disciples (Luke 11:1); Cornelius, a God-fearing Gentile (Acts 10:2, 4, 30-31); Jesus (cf. Luke 3:21; 5:16; 6:12); Jesus' disciples (cf. Luke 11:2; Acts 1:14; 2:42; 6:4, 6; 12:5; 10:9). *Worship*: non-Christ-believing Jews (Luke 1:74; Acts 26:7); Paul (Acts 24:14; 27:23).

⁴³ *Contra* Boring, *Sayings*, 69-70. Boring cites other passages in Acts to support his claim that Christian prophetic activity was characteristically practiced in a worship setting (Acts 11:27-29; 15:1-32; 16:6-9; 19:1-7; 20:23; 21:4, 10-14), but the contexts of these passages do not mention communal worship.

⁴⁴ *Pace* Barton, *Oracles*, 96, as well as Vermes, *Jesus*, 92, who suggests that within Second Temple Judaism charismatic saints were popularly regarded as prophets: "The belief in saints, the bearers of the spirit of God, continued among the simple people, and in those milieux the Gospel tradition concerning the prophet Jesus was not seen as self-contradictory." See on page 88f. above for a discussion of the exceptional application of the title "prophet" to Abel.

⁴⁵ Although anyone could pray, prophets were known as people of prayer, who could intercede effectively on behalf of other people. Cf. Gen 20:7 (Abraham); Num 21:7; Deut 9:20 (Moses); 1 Sam 7:5-6; 12:19-25 (Samuel); 1 Kgs 18:36-46 (Elijah); Amos 7:1-9; 2 Kgs 19:2 (Isaiah); cf. 1 Kgs 13:6; Jer 27:18; Ezek 22:28-31.

⁴⁶ Prophetic figures are frequently associated with (musical) worship in Scripture. Cf. Exod 15:20-21 (Miriam); Judg 4:4; 5:1-31 (Deborah); 1 Sam 10:5 (band of prophets); Asaph is given the title προφήτης in 1 Chr 25:2 and 2 Chr 29:30 (MT has נָבִיא and חֹזֶה respectively); in 2 Kgs 3:11-15 Elisha asks for music before he gives an oracle.

⁴⁷ Acts 21:9. Cf. Luke 2:36-7.

prophecy and celibacy together,⁴⁸ but the evidence does not permit firm conclusions about whether or not Luke thought the two were connected. One might also note that Anna is introduced in similar fashion as the biblical prophetesses Miriam, Deborah and Huldah.⁴⁹ Moreover, like Miriam and Deborah (Exod 15:20-21; Judg 5), Anna praised God (Luke 2:38); like Deborah and Huldah (Judg 4:6-7; 2 Kgs 22:16-20), Anna predicted the future. The Holy Spirit is not mentioned in conjunction with Anna's activity, but Luke probably saw no reason to refer to the Spirit when he had already introduced Anna as a prophetess.⁵⁰ Finally, there is no indication that Anna's prophetic role was a recent development or of limited duration; the mention of her great age implies rather that she had been a prophetess for a considerable period of time.

John the Baptist

Statements by reliable characters in Luke's narrative confirm the people's opinion that John the Baptist was "a prophet" (20:6). The popular attestation of John should be understood together with Gabriel's proclamation that John would operate in "the spirit and power of Elijah" (1:17), and Zechariah's prediction that John would be called a "prophet of the Most High" (1:76). Luke introduces John with an introduction formula reminiscent of the biblical prophets,⁵¹ and like the biblical prophets, John predicted the

⁴⁸ The belief that celibacy and prophecy go together is attested in Philo *Mos.* 2.68-69; *b. Shab.* 87a. Cf. the discussion in Vermes, *Jesus*, 100-1.

⁴⁹ Each prophetess is introduced by listing her name, her role, and her relation to a near male relative. Cf. Exod 15:20; Judg 4:4; 2 Kgs 22:14; Luke 2:36.

⁵⁰ Cf. Shelton, *Mighty*, 24.

⁵¹ Luke 3:2: ἐγένετο ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην. The combination of γίνομαι + ῥῆμα occurs sometimes as an introduction formula (cf. Gen 15:1; 1 Kgdms 15:10; 2 Kgdms 7:4; 3 Kgdms 17:2, 8; 20:28; Isa 14:28), but γίνομαι + λόγος is much more frequent (cf. Mic 1:1, Jon 1:1, Jer 1:2). The preposition ἐπὶ is never used with this kind of introduction formula in the LXX, but Luke may have combined the form for the coming of the spirit on a person with the formula for the coming of the word of the Lord on someone: cf. ἐγενήθη πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, in reference to Balaam (Num 23:7); ἐγενήθη . . .

future, and exhorted (παρακαλῶν) his contemporaries to repent (Luke 3:7-18). John was sent to perform a task in fulfillment of Scripture that led to Jesus' identification of John as more than a prophet (7:26), but we may safely conclude that Jesus' statement was not intended to deny that John was a prophet; it was the specific nature of John's calling to prepare the way for the Lord that set him apart from other prophets.⁵² That the people appreciated something of the eschatological tenor of John's ministry is implied by their question whether he was the Messiah (3:15).

Descriptions of John's characteristic dress are omitted from Luke's account, yet—though it is not apparent whether Luke believed an ascetic lifestyle was common among prophets—it is clear that John practiced an ascetic lifestyle.⁵³ Although Luke does not refer to the Holy Spirit in connection with John's active ministry, Gabriel announces, "Even before his birth he will be filled with the Holy Spirit" (1:15). Luke records no miracles performed by John, but this did not hinder popular regard for him as a prophet.⁵⁴ John's baptism is presented as an activity distinctive to the prophet (Luke 20:4; Acts 19:3-4). Though the ritual falls broadly into the category of symbolic actions, it differs from prophetic symbolic actions, which are associated closely with predictions of the future.⁵⁵ Finally, John experienced a typical prophet's fate when he was put to death for

πνεῦμα . . . ἐπὶ Σαυλ, of the evil spirit on Saul (1 Kgdms 16:23; cf. 19:9).

⁵² Luke 1:15, 76; 7:26. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 671.

⁵³ Luke 7:33. Gabriel's statement about John not drinking wine or strong drink (1:15) may indicate that John was a Nazarite (Num 6:3); it probably also alludes to the prophet Samuel's birth narrative (1 Sam 1:11). Despite the similarity to Lev 10:9, it is less likely that the avoidance of wine is due to John's priestly status (*pace* Bovon, *Luke*, 36).

⁵⁴ For John's popularity see Luke 20:6 (cf. Mark 11:32; Matt 21:26); 3:15; 7:24-26 (par. Matt 11:7-9). Meyer, *Prophet*, 40, 115 and Cullmann, *Christology*, 33 note 2, however, conclude from Mark 6:14-16 that John performed miracles.

⁵⁵ Cf. Acts 21:11 and the excursus in chapter two, as well as note 108 below for biblical references.

condemning the evil deeds of King Herod (3:19). In Acts, John functions to mark off the beginning of Jesus' ministry; he is remembered as one who baptized, and as one who predicted the coming of Jesus.⁵⁶

Jesus as Prophet

Not surprisingly, the majority of popular statements about prophets in Luke's Gospel are centred around the person of Jesus. My examination of Jesus' prophetic role will thus provide an opportunity also to consider Luke's depiction of Jewish beliefs about prophets and the degree to which they correspond to Luke's own conception of prophets. Of course, a study of Jesus' prophetic role also necessitates a consideration of the disputed question of the place of prophethood in Luke's Christology. It is to this question that we turn first.

Jesus as Prophet and Messiah

To a greater extent than either Matthew or Mark,⁵⁷ Luke records that Jesus was widely regarded as a prophet. After Jesus raises the widow of Nain's son from the dead, the people exclaim, "A great prophet has risen among us!" (7:16). A few verses later Simon the Pharisee betrays how widespread this conception is when he says to himself, "If this man were a prophet, he would have known who and what kind of woman this is" (7:39). Luke includes various popular suggestions about Jesus' prophetic identity (9:7-9, 19), and after Jesus' arrest he recounts that the men who were guarding Jesus blindfolded him and told him to "prophesy" (22:64). Finally Jesus' disciples on the road to Emmaus

⁵⁶ Cf. Acts 1:22; 10:37; 11:16; 13:24-25; 18:25; 19:2-4. See the next section for a discussion of John's involvement in the anointing of Jesus.

⁵⁷ Luke includes the three reflections of popular opinion about Jesus present in Mark: Luke 9:8 (Mark 6:15); Luke 9:19 (par. Mark 8:28; Matt 16:14); Luke 22:64 (par. Mark 14:65; Matt 26:68). Cf. Matt 21:11, 46.

claim that Jesus had been "a prophet mighty in deed and word" (24:19).

Against the commonly accepted view that Luke agreed in principle with the popular identification of Jesus as a prophet, Jack Dean Kingsbury argues that the conceptions of the unreliable crowds should be distinguished from Luke's own view about Jesus, according to which Jesus was not "a prophet" or even "the prophet," but the Messiah.⁵⁸ Kingsbury agrees that Jesus applied to himself proverbial sayings about prophets, but maintains these statements show that Jesus regarded his own experience "as being typical of prophetic experience in general," and that he expected to experience the same fate as that of the prophets; they do not mean that Jesus identified himself as a prophet.⁵⁹ Kingsbury argues further that when the crowds identify Jesus as a "great prophet" (7:16), Luke presents them as mistakenly attributing to Jesus the role of Elijah.⁶⁰ Similarly, Cleopas's statement about Jesus as a prophet reports popular opinion (21:19), before going on to explain that the disciples had hoped that Jesus would be the one "to redeem Israel," that is, the Messiah.⁶¹

Although Luke believed that Moses' prediction of a "prophet like me" was fulfilled in Jesus, Kingsbury denies that Acts 3:22 and 7:37 identify Jesus as a prophet; instead, Jesus fulfills Moses' prediction as the Messiah rather than as a prophet.⁶² According to Kingsbury, Luke depicts Jesus as a prophetic figure in order to establish continuity with the past, but the discerning reader will realize that Jesus should not be

⁵⁸ Kingsbury, "Jesus," 37-8.

⁵⁹ Kingsbury, "Jesus," 39-40. Cf. Luke 4:24; 13:33; Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke* (4th ed.; 1901; repr., Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910), 127; Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:841; Crone, *Prophecy*, 183.

⁶⁰ Kingsbury, "Jesus," 38, 40.

⁶¹ Kingsbury, "Jesus," 40.

⁶² Acts 3:20. Cf. Kingsbury, "Jesus," 41.

understood as a prophet: "To Luke's way of thinking, to look upon Jesus as prophet is not to perceive who he is, for in being Messiah, he is infinitely more than prophet."⁶³

Kingsbury rightly emphasizes that the title Messiah is a much more important category for Luke than the title "prophet,"⁶⁴ but as we will see, there is no reason why the affirmation of Jesus as a royal Davidic Messiah requires a corresponding denial that Jesus was a prophet.

The debate about whether Luke envisaged Jesus as both Messiah and prophet does not rest on the interpretation of any single text; but if one were to sort the relevant texts, the passage that would surely rank first in importance is Jesus' claim in fulfillment of Isa 61, "The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he has anointed me to bring good news to the poor" (Luke 4:18). Scholars are almost equally divided between those who argue that Luke 4:18 refers to a prophetic anointing⁶⁵ and those (such as Kingsbury) who argue that it refers to a royal messianic anointing.⁶⁶ The following examination of the question will show how closely Luke conceives of the relationship between Jesus' status

⁶³ Kingsbury, "Jesus," 39, cf. 41.

⁶⁴ Cf. Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 370: "Jesus is the Messiah whose status encompasses but surpasses that of a prophet"; Bovon, *Luke*, 154; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Volume One: The Gospel According to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 63.

⁶⁵ Ignace de la Potterie, "L'onction du Christ," *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 80 (1958): 229; Hahn, *Titles*, 380; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 119-20; Augustin George, "L'Esprit Saint dans l'oeuvre de Luc," *RB* 85 (1978): 517; Marshall, *Luke*, 178; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 532; Nolland, *Luke*, 196; Moessner, *Lord*, 47, 50; C. F. Evans, *Saint Luke* (London: SCM, 1990), 266; Johnson, *Luke*, 81; Albert VanHoye, "L'intérêt de Luc pour la prophétie en Luc 1.76: 4,16-30 et 22,60-65," in *The Four Gospels 1992* (vol. 2; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992), 1537; David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995), 115.

⁶⁶ Plummer, *Luke*, 121; Cadbury, *Making*, 276-7; Walter Grundmann, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963), 120; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium, erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1, 1 - 9, 50* (Freiburg: Herder, 1969), 229; Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1969), 148; Schnider, *Jesus*, 165; Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 167-8; Jervell, "Sons," 99; Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 58; Kingsbury, "Jesus," 34; Tuckett, "Christology," 147.

as the royal Davidic Messiah and his role as a prophet.⁶⁷

Regardless of the significance of the Lukan Jesus' "anointing," there is widespread agreement that it took place at his baptism because the Spirit's involvement in Jesus' ministry is especially highlighted after the baptism.⁶⁸ Acts 10:38 confirms the impression one receives from Luke 4: Peter mentions Jesus' baptism and then explains that "God anointed (ἔχρισεν) [Jesus] with the Holy Spirit and with power," and that he used to "heal all who were oppressed by the devil." The references to Jesus' power and the healing miracles he performed recall the immediate context of Jesus' sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:14, 33-41), while the reference to anointing *with* the Holy Spirit unmistakably refers back to the mention of "anointing" at Jesus' inaugural address and interprets that anointing as the coming of the Holy Spirit at Jesus' baptism.⁶⁹

Although it is possible that Jesus' baptismal anointing as it is interpreted by Isa 61:1 was thought to be an anointing as a prophet, the emphasis on Jesus' messianic identity in the preceding context supports the conclusion that Luke understood the

⁶⁷ We have already seen that the term "anointed one (χριστός)" was not limited to royal figures in Scripture or in Second Temple Judaism, but that it could also denote priests and prophets. 1QS ix 11 refers to a future priestly "anointed one," and if משיח הרין in 11QMelch ii 18 and למשיחו in 4Q521 2 ii 1 denote prophets, then eschatological prophets could also be designated "anointed one" or "Messiah" (see chapter two page 78). However, it is normally assumed with good reason that the expectation of the Messiah, as Luke portrays it, takes a fairly definite form as the expectation of a royal Davidic figure. This is confirmed by statements by reliable characters in the infancy narrative that shape the implied reader's understanding of the term when it appears on its own (cf. Luke 2:11 in the context of 1:32-33, 69), as well as by explanatory comments made by other characters in Luke's narrative, such as Jesus (Luke 20:41-42, par. Mark 12:35-36), the elders of the people (Luke 23:2; cf. 23:3, 35, 37-38), and in Acts by Peter (2:25-36), the believers (4:25-26), and apparently by Paul (cf. 17:3 and the explanation in 17:7). A possible exception is found in Luke 3:15 when the people wonder whether John might be the Messiah (cf. Green, *Luke*, 180), but even here the context suggests that a royal Davidic figure is in view (cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 201). Although Luke took for granted that David and Jesus were prophets, and although Luke clearly believed that the Messiah could also be a prophet (cf. Luke 3:15; Acts 3:20, 22), the term χριστός is associated with royal Davidic expectations rather than with eschatological prophet expectations. Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 258-60.

⁶⁸ Luke 4:1, 14. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 529; Nolland, *Luke*, 196.

⁶⁹ Cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 369; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 482; Nolland, *Luke*, 196; Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 167.

coming of the Spirit as an anointing of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah. In Luke 1, Gabriel predicted that Jesus would be the "son of the Most High" (1:32) and the "Son of God" (1:35) who would rule on David's throne (cf. 1:68-69). At his birth the angel proclaimed, "Today, in the city of David, a saviour has been born who is Christ the Lord" (2:11). When the people wondered whether John the Baptist was the Messiah (3:15), John contrasted his ministry with the coming of a "stronger one"—later identified with Jesus (7:19)—who would baptize with the Holy Spirit and fire (3:16).⁷⁰ The christological statements in the infancy narrative are significant precisely because the expectations of Luke's audience would have been shaped first by them. Regardless of the order in which Luke-Acts was composed, Luke's readers would have approached the story from the beginning, using it to structure their understanding of the narrative to follow. Since the early chapters of Luke place such great emphasis on Jesus' identity as the Davidic Messiah, it is not surprising to find *χρίω* being understood in connection with *χριστός* even though the immediate context of Luke 4:18 lacks "reference to a Davidic dynasty or a royal function of Jesus."⁷¹

The prayer recorded in Acts 4:25-27 provides further evidence that Luke would have connected *χρίω* in Luke 4:18 with the title *χριστός*, linking Jesus' baptismal anointing with his royal messianic role. After a quotation from Ps 2:1-2, a peshier-like interpretation applies the psalm to the events of the crucifixion in which Herod, Pontius Pilate, the nations and "the peoples of Israel" gathered together against "your holy servant

⁷⁰ See chapter five for a more extended treatment of John's prediction.

⁷¹ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 529. Luke may have believed Jesus was enthroned at his resurrection and exaltation, but he certainly held that Jesus was Messiah, in some sense, before this event. Cf. François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-1983)* (trans. Ken McKinney; Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick, 1987), 183-4.

Jesus whom you anointed (ἔχρισας)" (Acts 4:27). The choice of the verb ἔχρισας instead of the nominal form χριστός simultaneously connects Jesus to "the anointed one (τοῦ χριστοῦ)" in Ps 2:2 and alludes back to the anointing mentioned in Isa 61:1, which Jesus had quoted with reference to himself in Luke 4:18.⁷² The appellation "your holy servant Jesus" (Acts 4:30) parallels the attribution of the psalm to "your servant David" (4:25), and suggests that in Acts 4:27 the anointed Jesus is regarded as the Davidic Messiah. The use of the verb χρίω to explain the referent of the cognate noun χριστός in Acts 4:27 confirms that Luke, at least, would have recognized the connection between the title ὁ χριστός and the verb χρίω the first time the verb appeared in Luke 4:18.

Additional support for the idea that Jesus' anointing with the Holy Spirit is connected to his identity as Messiah may be found in the similarities between the proclamation of Jesus as "my beloved Son" at his baptismal anointing (Luke 3:22) and the statement, "you are my son" in Ps 2:7.⁷³ Luke's wording of the statement is identical to that of his Markan source, but the quotation of Psalm 2 in Acts 13:33 (2:7) and Acts

⁷² Within Luke-Acts the verb χρίω only appears in Luke 4:18, Acts 4:27 and 10:38. Since both Acts 10:38 and Luke 4:18 refer to Isa 61:1, it is most likely that Acts 4:27 does too (cf. Rese, *Christologie*, 120, 148). Otherwise one must explain the use of the verbal instead of the more common, and expected, nominal form. The argument of de la Potterie, "L'onction," 225-52, that the verb χρίω is never related to the noun χριστός in the New Testament is a remarkable *tour de force*, but fails adequately to explain Acts 4:27. In this verse τοῦ χριστοῦ is most naturally interpreted by Ἰησοῦν ὃν ἔχρισας given the point by point application of elements from Ps 2:1-2 to corresponding groups and individuals involved in the events of the passion (i.e., ἔθνη in Ps 2:1 corresponds to ἔθνεσιν; the plural λαοί in Ps 2:1 is applied to the Jews, the λαοὶς Ἰσραὴλ; οἱ βασιλεῖς in Ps 2:2 corresponds to Ἡρώδης, with οἱ ἄρχοντες corresponding to Πόντιος Πιλάτος). Cf. Jacques Dupont, "L'interprétation des Psaumes dans les Actes des Apôtres," in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (ed. Jacques Dupont; Paris: Cerf, 1967), 297. Because of this pattern of key-word interpretation, de la Potterie's attempt to preserve a non-messianic meaning for ὃν ἔχρισας by claiming that the psalm's τοῦ χριστοῦ was interpreted by πᾶς under the influence of Isaiah 53 is unconvincing (de la Potterie, "L'onction," 243; cf. Ravens, *Luke*, 116). Cf. Schürmann, *Lukas 1*, 194-5: "Das Taufgeschehen muß doch auch als Geistsalbung des Messias verstanden werden, wie Luk Apg 10, 38 (vgl. Lk 4, 18) im Lichte von Is 61, 1 ausdrücklich kommentiert und Apg 4, 27 im Lichte von Ps 2, 2 erkennbar wird."

⁷³ Cf. σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου in Luke 3:22 and υἱός μου εἶ σύ in Ps 2:7. Aside from Gen 22:21, 24 (εἰ σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου Ἠσαὺ ἢ οὐ), Ps 2:7 is the closest verbal parallel to Luke 3:22 in the LXX.

4:25-26 (Ps 2:1-2) with reference to the Davidic Messiah suggests that Luke would have recognized an allusion to Ps 2:7 in the statement, "You are my beloved Son, in you I am well pleased."⁷⁴ Even if an allusion to Psalm 2 is excluded, the identification of Jesus as God's son in Luke 3:21-22 links Jesus' baptismal anointing to his messianic identity, for although the semantic range of "Son of God" is not limited to that of "Messiah" in Luke-Acts, Luke clearly believed Jesus' "sonship" encompassed his messianic role even as it went beyond it.⁷⁵ Luke's use of the phrase "Son of God" already in the infancy narrative would have prepared his readers to see in the baptismal acclamation of Jesus as God's son a reference to Jesus' messianic identity.

Finally, the transitional role of Samuel in anointing David as king (cf. Acts 13:20-22) parallels the preparatory role of John the Baptist before the coming of David's heir. In Acts, the prophet Samuel functions as a temporal marker dividing the period of the judges from the period of the kings (Acts 13:2), and, as we have seen, beginning a line of successors to the prophet Moses.⁷⁶ Although Samuel's role in anointing David as king is not explicitly mentioned in Acts 13, it is implied. Paul's summary of the removal of Saul and God's choice of David as king (Acts 13:22) echoes God's instructions for Samuel to

⁷⁴ Most commentators recognize that Isa 42:1 is also in view in Luke 3:22 (cf. Gustaf Dalman, *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language* [Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902], 279; Hahn, *Titles*, 339), but the similarity in wording between Luke 3:22 and Ps 2:7 makes it difficult to exclude an allusion to the Psalm (*contra* Jacques Dupont, "'Filius meus es tu': L'interprétation de Ps. II. 7 dans le Nouveau Testament," *RSR* 35 [1948]: 526; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 485). Others who recognize an allusion to Ps 2:7 in the present form of the acclamation include Dalman, *Words*, 277; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 174; Hahn, *Titles*, 339; Nolland, *Luke*, 164; Green, *Luke*, 186; Turner, *Power*, 197.

⁷⁵ Luke 1:35 and 3:38 link Jesus' divine sonship to his conception by the Holy Spirit (cf. Dalman, *Words*, 276, 288; Nolland, *Luke*, 164). Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 155-6: "It is, then, as the Son of God that Jesus is the Messiah, rather than vice versa." Cf. Walter Grundmann, "χρίω, κτλ.," *TDNT* 9:534; Augustin George, "Jésus fils de Dieu dans l'Évangile selon Saint Luc," *RB* 72 (1965): 206-9.

⁷⁶ See on page 92f. above. Cf. *BEGS* 4, 151.

anoint David king in 1 Sam 16:1, as well as God's claim in Ps 88:21 (EV 89:21) that *God* anointed David "with . . . holy oil."⁷⁷ John, too, is a transitional figure, bearing characteristics of the old age and the new—and frustrating commentators' attempts to locate him firmly in one epoch or the other.⁷⁸ Luke's portrayal of John's role in the baptismal anointing of Jesus is similar to Samuel's (implied) role in anointing David king: Like Samuel, John the Baptist is adroitly removed from the scene immediately prior to Jesus' baptismal anointing with the Holy Spirit.⁷⁹ In the case of both Samuel and John the human role of the prophet is displaced by an emphasis on divine action in selecting first David as king and then Jesus as David's heir. I conclude, then, that Luke regarded the anointing of Jesus as a messianic anointing with the Holy Spirit which took place at Jesus' baptism.⁸⁰

⁷⁷ See note 38 above.

⁷⁸ Cf. Luke 16:16 and the literature cited in Nolland, *Luke*, 811-2. Acts 13:24-25 also summarizes John's transitional role. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 637-8.

⁷⁹ Cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 56; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 21.

⁸⁰ It may be argued that Jesus' anointing with the Holy Spirit cannot refer to a messianic anointing precisely because it took place at the baptism, and Luke believed Jesus was born the Messiah (Luke 1:31-35; 2:11). Unlike the proclamation that Jesus is the son of God at his baptism (3:22), which may readily be understood as an acclamation of a status Jesus had by virtue of his birth (1:35; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 155), the anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit is manifestly a new event that takes place at the baptism. Perhaps Luke is not fully consistent here, but in light of Acts 4:27 we must conclude that the anointing in Luke 3:22 is nonetheless a messianic anointing. Jesus is anointed because he is Messiah; he is not Messiah because he is anointed. Cf. Grundmann, *TDNT* 9:534: "He is *χριστός* as the recipient of the Spirit of God by whom He is conceived and who is given to Him personally in baptism." Other objections to a messianic anointing include the following: (1) Marshall, *Luke*, 183 remarks, "In Is. 61 the anointing is clearly that of a prophet." This would be true if the passage was believed to be the first person speech of the prophet Isaiah (as maintained by Frederick W. Danker, *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel* [Rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988], 106; Evans, *Luke*, 269), but the Lukan Jesus, interestingly, interprets it as a prophecy about himself (cf. Ulrich Busse, *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu. Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4,16-30* [Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977], 75). It is therefore not clear that the passage was thought by Luke to refer to the anointing of the prophet Isaiah. Attempts to show how Luke would have read the passage based on evidence from the Isaiah Targum (de la Potterie, "L'onction," 230; Turner, *Power*, 200) beg the question of the extent of Luke's knowledge of Jewish traditions. (2) Ravens, *Luke*, 115, claims that a prophetic anointing is supported by the example of Elisha, who was the only biblical prophet who is clearly connected to anointing, but the citation of Elijah as a parallel illustration in Luke 4:25-26 precludes this argument, for Elijah is never said to have been anointed

But if Luke regarded Jesus' baptismal anointing as a messianic anointing, the rest of the sermon shows that it was an anointing to the task of a prophet. In fact, Luke's presentation does not allow for a sharp distinction between a messianic and a prophetic anointing in Jesus' case.⁸¹ Jesus announced that the acceptable day of the Lord had arrived, and that the Scripture he had just read was fulfilled in himself (4:21). He then referred to himself as one who was *already* known as a prophet who was unacceptable in his home town (4:24), and justified his refusal to perform miracles by referring to miracles performed by the great prophets Elijah and Elisha on behalf of foreigners instead of on behalf of Israelites (4:25-27). The context indicates that this was no facile comparison, for Jesus was known to be a miraculous healer as Elijah and Elisha had been (4:23, 33-41).⁸² Moreover, Jesus' mission to preach and to heal (4:18) was empowered by the Spirit with which he was anointed at his baptism. According to Luke 4:14, Jesus came to Galilee in the power of the Spirit, and his teaching was honoured by all (4:15). "His word was with authority" (4:32) not only in his teaching and preaching (4:31, 43-44), but also in the power by which he commanded unclean spirits to come out (4:36).⁸³

In view of the intertwining of messianic and prophetic elements in Jesus' baptism, we may conclude that Luke did not regard "prophet" and "Messiah" as mutually exclusive titles,⁸⁴ but that he believed Messiahship entailed prophethood. If Luke

as prophet.

⁸¹ Cf. Busse, *Jesu*, 74-5; Tiede, *Prophecy*, 46; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 30.

⁸² Cf. Hahn, *Titles*, 382; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 530, 537. *Contra* Plummer, *Luke*, 127; Schnider, *Jesus*, 166.

⁸³ Cf. Schürmann, *Lukas 1*, 234-5.

⁸⁴ While the roles of prophet and Messiah may be distinct phenomena when they are evaluated from an etic perspective (cf. Webb, *Baptizer*, 313; Hahn, *Titles*, 358), Luke apparently did not make this distinction. Cf. Meyer, *Prophet*, 109, on the interrelationship of prophetic and messianic titles in

believed the category of Messiah enveloped and was consonant with the category of prophet, there need be no opposition between a messianic anointing and a prophetic task.⁸⁵ Jesus not only refers to himself as a prophet (Luke 4:24; 13:33) and associates himself with the prophets Elijah and Elisha (4:25-27); his speech and actions correspond closely to what we have seen to be Luke's own understanding of what was characteristic of past prophets. For instance, Jesus performed miracles reminiscent of the miracles performed by Elijah and Elisha;⁸⁶ Jesus was sent prophet-like (4:43) to proclaim a Spirit-inspired message that was recognized as authoritative,⁸⁷ and which included inspired praise,⁸⁸ judgement oracles, as well as other predictions of the future.⁸⁹ Finally, Jesus also shared the same fate as the biblical prophets (13:33-34; cf. Acts 7:52).

It is not simply the case that Jesus is identified as a prophet by unreliable characters, nor are Jesus' references to himself as a prophet merely proverbial statements designed to accommodate himself to the limited viewpoint of the crowds. To some extent the popular response to Jesus as prophet corresponded to Luke's own understanding of Jesus' identity.⁹⁰ But in contrast to the people, who seem to have regarded both Jesus and John first of all as prophets, Luke does not depict Jesus either as a prophet who became the Messiah, or as one who first filled the role of a prophet and second that of the Messiah; instead, he portrays Jesus' prophetic role as a function of his

connection with Jesus.

⁸⁵ *Contra* Turner, *Power*, 233.

⁸⁶ Luke 4:25-27; 7:11-16. See further chapter five.

⁸⁷ Luke 4:14-15, 31-32, 36.

⁸⁸ Luke 10:21. Cf. Turner, *Power*, 264-5.

⁸⁹ Cf. Luke 14:41-44; 21:20-36; 22:29-34; 23:28-31.

⁹⁰ Certainly, the crowds do not get matters entirely right, but in Luke 4:36-37 and 7:16 the positive response of the crowds contributes to Luke's own narrative ends. Cf. Marshall, *Historian*, 125; Busse, *Wunder*, 404; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 537.

identity as the Messiah.⁹¹

The Popular Response to Jesus as a Prophet

The reaction of the villagers of Nain to Jesus' resuscitation of the widow's son (Luke 7:16) and the statement of Cleopas about Jesus' "powerful" deeds (24:19) suggest that at least "great" prophets were associated with miracle-working. In Luke 7:39-40, Simon the Pharisee assumes that prophets have access to information hidden from ordinary mortals, only to have Jesus respond by revealing his knowledge of Simon's thoughts. Similarly, the mocking, "Prophecy! Who hit you?" (22:64) takes for granted that prophets have supernatural insight into what could not otherwise be known.⁹² According to Geza Vermes, the association of prophets with miracles on the one hand and supernatural insight on the other corresponds to two distinct Jewish conceptions of prophecy. The first view was shared by Jesus' followers and the majority of "simple people" who still believed that old-style prophets like Elijah and Elisha could appear. It was assumed that the prophetic ministry of these charismatic figures included miracle-working. Educated Jews, on the other hand, tended to believe that "prophecy as such" had long since ceased. According to this "intellectual elite," contemporary prophetic activity was reduced to such gifts as supernatural insight and prediction of the future.⁹³

Luke's Gospel at first appears to support this distinction. According to Luke

⁹¹ Cf. Bovon, *Luke*, 154; Busse, *Wunder*, 388. *Contra* Johnson, *Luke*, 79, 81, who accepts the connection between *χρίω* and *χριστός* in Luke 4:18, but thinks Luke's "quite literal" understanding of Messiah is primarily that of a prophet, since Jesus is anointed with the "spirit of prophecy," which is subsequently poured out at Pentecost.

⁹² Cf. Matt 26:68; Mark 14:65. For biblical examples of "supernatural insight" cf. 1 Sam 9:5-29; 2 Sam 12:1-15; 2 Kgs 6:8-23; 1 Kgs 14:2; 2 Chr 19:1-3. Cf. also the discussion of David in Acts 2:31 on page 94 above.

⁹³ Vermes, *Jesus*, 89-94.

11:15-16, some of those among the crowds accused Jesus of casting out demons by Beelzebul, while others requested a "sign from heaven (σημεῖον ἐξ οὐρανοῦ)" as an unambiguous divine authentication of Jesus. Again in 11:29, Jesus castigated "this evil generation" for requesting a prophetic sign.⁹⁴ Although a heavenly portent may well be in view in both instances,⁹⁵ it is also possible that, in the second instance at least, Luke envisaged a divinely enabled miracle.⁹⁶ In any case, it seems unlikely that the crowd expected Jesus to make a prediction; they were expecting a legitimating event that went beyond miracles of exorcism. So far Luke has been careful to attribute the desire to see a sign to the crowds rather than to the Pharisees or Jewish leaders, but when Herod finally interviews Jesus at his trial, Luke alone tells us that Herod wanted to see Jesus perform a sign (23:8). We may be confident that Herod, as portrayed by Luke, was interested in a miraculous spectacle rather than in an evaluation of Jesus' prophetic status,⁹⁷ but Luke's emphasis on Herod's long-standing desire to see Jesus recalls the initial report of speculation about Jesus' prophetic identity (9:7-8) that was bracketed by a statement that Herod heard about Jesus (9:7a), and a statement that Herod sought to see Jesus (9:9).⁹⁸

⁹⁴ Though Jesus' identity as a prophet is not explicitly mentioned in Luke 11, the demand for a sign recalls the Deuteronomic instructions about evaluating prophets in Deut 13:2-3 (cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 638; Green, *Luke*, 453).

⁹⁵ According to Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 935, the request is for a "flamboyant portent." Cf. the similar statement about a σημεῖον ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ in Mark 8:11 immediately after the feeding of the 4,000 (cf. Matt 16:1, 12:38). The word σημεῖον denotes heavenly portents in Luke 21:7 (par. Mark 13:4; Matt 24:3); 21:11, 25.

⁹⁶ This will involve taking ἐξ οὐρανοῦ as an indication of the source of the miracle rather than as a statement about the place where it occurs; cf. Luke 11:13 (ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δώσει πνεῦμα; for the text-critical problems of 11:13 see Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [3d ed.; Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971], 157-8); Ps 56:4 LXX; 1 Macc 12:15; 3 Macc 4:21; 5:50. Cf. Luke 23:8.

⁹⁷ Nolland, *Luke*, 1123.

⁹⁸ Cf. καὶ ἐζήτει ἰδεῖν αὐτόν (9:9) and Ὁ δὲ Ἡρώδης ἰδὼν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐχάρη λίαν, ἣν γὰρ ἐξ ἱκανῶν χρόνων θέλων ἰδεῖν αὐτόν διὰ τὸ ἀκούειν περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἠλπίζεν τι σημεῖον ἰδεῖν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ

The allusion back to Luke 9:7-8 confirms that the signs Herod hoped to see Jesus perform were to be worked by a prophet; it also confirms that miraculous signs were associated with prophets by both the crowds as well as Herod.⁹⁹ Yet although Herod undoubtedly belonged to the upper strata of society, it is possible that he should be ranked with the common people rather than with the "intellectual elite"—at least as far as Jewish religious education goes.¹⁰⁰

Because Luke agreed with the crowds that prophets could be expected to perform miracles it seems unlikely that he was aware of a distinction between educated and uneducated views about prophets—even though the distinction that Vermes makes between them is not formally contradicted by Luke's narrative. Thus whether or not Vermes's model accurately reflects first century Jewish views about prophecy, it seems that Luke did not divide them along these lines.¹⁰¹ As Jesus' opponents would naturally wish to discount any signs performed by Jesus, it is not surprising that they do not refer to his miracles in connection with their analysis of his prophetic status;¹⁰² it is probably

γινόμενον (23:8). Cf. John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 193.

⁹⁹ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1481; Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 197.

¹⁰⁰ If so, Herod Antipas is characterized differently from his grand nephew Herod Agrippa II, who is portrayed in Acts 26 as one well acquainted with Jewish lore (cf. Acts 26:3, 27). The fact that Herod Antipas came to Jerusalem for the main Jewish feasts (Luke 23:7) shows that Luke does not portray him as being entirely ignorant of Jewish customs (cf. *HJP 1*, 343). The parallels between the trial of Jesus under Herod Antipas, the murder of James and arrest of Peter under Herod Agrippa I (Acts 12), and the trial of Paul under Herod Agrippa II (Acts 26) serve to link the various Herods together as opponents of Jesus and his followers (cf. Darr, *Herod*, 207-8). Herod Antipas's desire to see Jesus (Luke 9:9) also parallels Herod Agrippa's desire to hear the case of Paul (Acts 25:22). Since Luke gives no indication about Herod Antipas's knowledge of Judaism (apart from his desire to see Jesus perform a sign), it is possible—though by no means certain—that we should regard both Herods as equally cognizant of Jewish affairs. Luke is, of course, only concerned to show the interest of the Herods in the way of the Messiah and his followers; he is not otherwise interested in the religious education of Jewish leaders.

¹⁰¹ To be sure, Vermes's concern is with the historical events reported by the Gospels rather than with the particular opinions of the Evangelists themselves.

¹⁰² In Acts 4:16 the Jewish leaders are faced with a σήμερον they cannot deny—performed through

coincidental that only Simon the Pharisee and those associated with the high priest in Jerusalem connect prophecy with supernatural insight. Indeed, in its Lukan context, Simon's questions about Jesus' prophetic status reflect his awareness of the popular acclamation of Jesus as a prophet.¹⁰³

The crowds are unreliable characters, but it is probable that most of the views about prophecy attributed by Luke to the crowds reflect Luke's own beliefs about prophecy.¹⁰⁴ For example, the popular response to Jesus' miracles (Luke 7:16) and their desire to see the prophet Jesus perform a sign (11:16) is paralleled by the affirmation in Acts 2:22 that Jesus *was* attested by God through "miracles, wonders, and signs." Similarly, just as the crowds believed that prophets have supernatural knowledge about current events, so Luke attributes such knowledge to Jesus without explicitly connecting it to his role as prophet.¹⁰⁵ We may conclude that Luke agreed with the crowds that Jesus was a prophet. Luke also agreed with the crowds that prophets perform miracles and signs, and that they have supernatural insight. Finally, both Luke and the crowds in Luke's story were willing to accept that a prophet could be the Messiah. But in contrast to the crowds who regarded Jesus as primarily a prophet, Luke held that Jesus was first and foremost the Messiah.

Agabus and the Prophets from Jerusalem

In Acts 11:27 we are informed that "prophets came down from Jerusalem to

the name of Jesus (4:10).

¹⁰³ Cf. Evans, *Luke*, 341, 358. If, as is likely, Luke 4:24-25 shows that the crowds already identified Jesus as a prophet, then their statements about Jesus' authoritative word (4:31-32) will also reflect their assumptions about prophets.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Nebe, *Züge*, 84.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Luke 5:5-6; 8:45-46; 9:47; 22:21.

Antioch." We hear nothing more about these anonymous προφῆται because attention shifts to one of them named Agabus, who "predicted (ἐσήμανεν) by the Spirit that there would be a severe famine over all the world" (11:28). The story about the famine enables Luke to associate Barnabas and Saul as the emissaries through whom the Antioch church sent gifts to the "believers living in Judea" (11:30). The prophets, then, were somewhat incidental to Luke's main concerns, which were to prepare for the future ministry of Barnabas and Saul, and to show that Barnabas and Saul—as well as the church at Antioch as a whole—maintained connections with the church in Judea.¹⁰⁶ Luke does suggest that these prophets operated in a group reminiscent of the biblical "company of the prophets,"¹⁰⁷ and that they engaged in predicting the future.

In Acts 21:10-14 Agabus is described as a "certain prophet from Judea named Agabus"—as if Luke had not introduced him before. Once again, Agabus illustrates more widespread prophetic activity (21:4, 8-9) and predicts the future, this time by performing a symbolic action similar to the symbolic actions performed by the biblical prophets.¹⁰⁸ The citation formula "thus says the Holy Spirit" also recalls the common biblical form, "thus says YHWH."¹⁰⁹ In neither Acts 21:11 nor (apparently) in 11:28 does Agabus instruct those who hear what they should do with the information he

¹⁰⁶ Luke was clearly concerned to show that the Jerusalem church was connected to the Gentile mission. Cf. Acts 8:14-25; 11:1-2; 15:1-5, 13-14; 21:17-26. Whether he believed that the Jerusalem church legitimated the Gentile mission (cf. Andrew C. Clark, *Parallel Lives: The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lucan Perspective* [Carlisle, Cumbria, U.K.: Paternoster Press, 2001], 50) is another question. Cf. Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 182.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. 1 Sam 10:5-13; 19:18-24; 1 Kgs 20:35-43; 2 Kgs 2:3-5; 4:38; 6:1-7; 9:1-13; Amos 2:11, 7:14.

¹⁰⁸ Acts 21:11. Cf. 1 Kgs 22:11 (Zedekiah); 2 Kgs 13:14-19 (Elisha); Isa 20:2-3; Jer 16:1-9; 19:27:2; 28:10-11; Ezek 3:22-5:4; 12:1-16; Hosea 1.

¹⁰⁹ Aune, *Prophecy*, 263.

reveals.¹¹⁰

Paul, Barnabas, and the Prophets at Antioch

Acts 13:1 mentions "prophets and teachers (προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι)" among the church at Antioch. The only names in the list that reappear elsewhere in Acts are Barnabas, whose name heads the list, and Saul, whose name concludes the list. It is uncertain whether the list included some people who were prophets and others who were teachers,¹¹¹ or whether everyone on the list was regarded as both a prophet and a teacher,¹¹² but even if all members of the list were referred to as both prophets and teachers, it does not follow that the two terms were interchangeable.¹¹³ The context does imply that the prophets at Antioch were involved in mediating divine guidance through the Holy Spirit (13:2). As we will see, Saul's conflict with the "Jewish false prophet" in the following verses indicates that Saul and Barnabas were included among the prophets of Acts 13:1.

After Saul and Barnabas arrive in Cyprus, Luke introduces Elymas as "a certain magician (μάγος), a Jewish false prophet (ψευδοπροφήτης), named Bar-Jesus" (13:6), and again as "Elymas the magician" (13:8). Elymas's association with the proconsul (13:7) and his subsequent opposition to Barnabas and Saul (13:8) identify him as a

¹¹⁰ Aune, *Prophecy*, 264. Thus Paul is technically not guilty of failing to listen to the prophet's message. A prophetic injunction *not* to go up to Jerusalem could, however, be implied—especially in light of Acts 21:4 (cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 602 note 1; Jervell, "Sons," 114-5). But it is more likely that Luke envisaged the injunction not to go to Jerusalem as a human interpretation of the Spirit's message rather than that he thought Paul disregarded the Spirit (cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 990).

¹¹¹ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 496; James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996), 172.

¹¹² Bruce, "Holy Spirit," 182; Haenchen, *Acts*, 395-6; Ellis, "Prophet," 55; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Volume Two: The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990), 160; Johnson, *Acts*, 225.

¹¹³ Pace Ellis, "Prophet," 64.

political advisor who recalls the court prophets who functioned as political advisors in the book of Jeremiah.¹¹⁴ As with false prophets in Jeremiah, Elymas is unmasked as a *false* prophet because he said what was false—he "opposed the right way of the Lord."¹¹⁵ Elymas functions as a foil for Barnabas and Paul, who were listed among a group of Christ-believing "prophets and teachers," who were chosen by the Holy Spirit while they were "worshipping the Lord and fasting" (13:2), and who were sent out by the Holy Spirit (13:4). When Elymas "tried to turn the proconsul away from the faith,"¹¹⁶ "Saul, who was also called Paul," was filled with the Holy Spirit, pronounced a biblical-sounding curse on the false prophet,¹¹⁷ and struck him blind, declaring, "And now listen—the hand of the Lord is against you!" (13:11). The identification of Elymas as a false prophet is not coincidental. We have here a classic conflict between true and false prophets. The combination of *προφητ*-terminology *and* prophetic characterization leads to the conclusion that Luke expected his readers to regard Paul and Barnabas as prophets.¹¹⁸ The use of *προφητ*-terminology in Acts 13:1 thus prepares for the conflict between the

¹¹⁴ The LXX translates נִבִּי as ψευδοπροφήτης in Jer (MT 26) 33:7, 8, 11, 16; (27) 34:9; (28) 35:1; (29) 36:1, 8. Cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 398.

¹¹⁵ Acts 13:10. Luke certainly believed that Elymas was no true prophet of God, but although Luke depicted Elymas as one who claimed to be a medium of revelation, he was primarily concerned with Elymas's false counsel. Thus, Luke used the term in a primarily verbal rather than a nominal way. *Contra* Bruce, *Acts*, 249, who concluded the word implies that Elymas *falsely* claimed to be a medium of revelation. For the distinction between verbal and nominal denotations of the word see J. Reiling, "The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus," *NovT* 13 (1971): 148.

¹¹⁶ Acts 13:8. Susan R. Garrett, *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 81, observes that "making crooked the straight paths of the Lord" (13:10) contrasts Elymas with John the Baptist (cf. Luke 3:4).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 403.

¹¹⁸ *Contra* Forbes, *Prophecy*, 233. Clark, *Parallel*, 330, 143-5, points to Acts 13:1-4 as the call of Barnabas and Paul as apostles, but Barnabas and Paul are not identified as apostles until Acts 14:4, 14, while they *are* identified as prophets in the immediate context.

prophets Paul and Barnabas and the Jewish false prophet.¹¹⁹

Once it is recognized that Luke included Paul and Barnabas among the prophets of Acts 13:1,¹²⁰ it is possible to identify other characteristics attributed by Luke to Paul and Barnabas that are assigned to prophets elsewhere in Luke and Acts. Like the prophets of old, Paul was chosen by God¹²¹ and sent to proclaim a message (26:16-17); he experienced persecution (9:16); he had visions;¹²² he predicted the future (27:10); he exercised supernatural insight (14:9); and he performed miracles that are described as "signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα)."¹²³ Barnabas too is characterized as being "a good man, *full of the Holy Spirit* and of faith" (11:24). Luke, however, only explicitly refers to Paul and Barnabas as "prophets" along with the other church leaders at Antioch in Acts 13:1, which suggests that the term was not of such great significance for Luke that he needed to repeat the title after he had once formally identified Paul and Barnabas as προφῆται.¹²⁴

Judas and Silas

The remaining two characters who are explicitly referred to as "prophets" in Acts (15:32) are Judas and Silas, two "leading men" (15:22) who were chosen as emissaries to accompany Paul and Barnabas back to Antioch with the letter from the Jerusalem

¹¹⁹ Cf. Otto Bauernfeind, "Die Apostelgeschichte," in *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (ed. Volker Metelmann; Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980), 170-1; Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 162; Johnson, *Acts*, 226-7.

¹²⁰ It is most likely, then, that "prophets and teachers" in Acts 13:1 refers to one group, for if the first and last members of the list are prophets, those in the middle are most likely prophets too. Cf. Schnider, *Jesus*, 58; Crone, *Prophecy*, 199.

¹²¹ Acts 9:15; 22:14; 26:16.

¹²² Cf. Acts 16:9; 18:9; 22:17-21; 27:21-25.

¹²³ Acts 15:12. Cf. Acts 14:8-11; 16:16-18; 19:11-12; 20:7-12; 28:3-10.

¹²⁴ Cf. Hastings, *Prophet*, 139-40.

council. Since Judas and Silas are only depicted as exhorting (παρακαλέω) and strengthening the brothers "through many words" (15:32), E. Earle Ellis argues that Luke conceived of the act of exhorting or encouraging (παρακαλέω) as a "form of prophecy."¹²⁵ In support, one may note that Luke connects the activity of proclamation and exhortation with prophets elsewhere.¹²⁶ Barnabas, who is included among the prophets at Antioch (Acts 13:1), was also designated the "son of exhortation" (Acts 4:36),¹²⁷ and when Barnabas first came to Antioch, he too had exhorted (παρακαλέω) the people (11:23). It is probable that the appearance of παράκλησις (15:31) in connection with the Spirit-inspired (15:28) apostolic letter prompted the identification of Judas and Silas as prophets who exhorted (παρακαλέω) the people (15:32), in which case the title "prophet" demonstrates that Judas and Silas's exhortation, like that contained in the letter, was prompted by the Spirit.

No doubt Judas and Silas were introduced as prophets in order to underline their qualifications for the task of explaining the decision reached by the Jerusalem council,¹²⁸ but while exhortation was something that Judas and Silas did in their capacity as prophets, it would be too much to say that παράκλησις is a "distinctly prophetic function"

¹²⁵ Ellis, "Prophet," 58. Cf. Crone, *Prophecy*, 203-4; Hill, *Prophecy*, 102-3.

¹²⁶ The verb παρακαλέω is applied to John the Baptist in Luke 3:18.

¹²⁷ If the mention of παράκλησις in 15:31 reminded Luke to designate Judas and Silas prophets along with the prophets Barnabas and Paul, then it is possible that Luke already associated υἱὸς παρακλήσεως with prophecy in Acts 4:36 and that he believed (or had heard) that the name Βαρναβᾶς came from the Aramaic בר נביא or בר נביאות. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 259; otherwise Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 321. The word παράκλησις can mean "exhortation" (Barrett, *Acts*, 258), which corresponds to one characteristic function of prophets known to Luke. On the other hand, Augustin George, "L'oeuvre de Luc: Actes et Evangile," in *Le ministère et les ministères selon le Nouveau Testament* (ed. J. Delorme: Paris: , 1974), 217, observes, "mais, si Luc a trouvé cette donnée dans ses sources, il ne l'a pas reprise: il ne donne jamais ce titre à Barnabé quand il le présente à Jérusalem."

¹²⁸ Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 201.

signalling the presence of prophets even when prophets are not explicitly mentioned.¹²⁹

This is because both παρακαλέω and παράκλησις are used frequently in Luke-Acts with a range of meaning that extends well beyond prophetic activity.¹³⁰ Even though the task of explaining the contents of the letter (15:27) is later identified as exhortation (15:32), there is a subtle difference between Ellis's statement that "the fact that Judas and Silas are prophets is the basis of their ministry of παράκλησις,"¹³¹ and saying that the fact that Judas and Silas are prophets qualifies them to clarify the contents of the letter. Ellis's statement makes it sound as though Judas and Silas were identified as prophets because the type of παράκλησις performed by the emissaries was inherently prophetic; the second formulation assumes that the activity of παράκλησις was not inherently prophetic and, as a result, seeks other reasons why Luke chose to identify Judas and Silas emphatically as prophets.

Other more convincing reasons why Luke may have chosen to identify Judas and Silas as prophets are ready to hand. First, Luke uses the Jerusalem council and subsequent letter to tie various threads of the narrative together in a way that confirms that Paul's law-free mission to the Gentiles was divinely ordained and that the inclusion of the Gentiles among God's people apart from submission to Torah had the support of

¹²⁹ *Contra* Ellis, "Prophet," 56-7, who concludes with reference to the New Testament use of the term that "it probably has a special connexion with Christian prophecy, even when that connexion is not explicitly expressed."

¹³⁰ Cf. Forbes, *Prophecy*, 235. Ellis, of course, never claims παράκλησις is always prophetic; the cognate verb is used of requests (cf. Acts 8:31; 9:38; 13:42; 16:9, 15, 39; 19:31). But in contrast to Ellis, "Prophet," 56-7, the idea of request, as opposed to prophetic exhortation, is also most prominent in Acts 2:40; and the synagogue rulers who requested "a word of exhortation" from Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:15) did not do so because they thought Paul and Barnabas were prophets. In addition, the comfort experienced by the disciples at Troas (Acts 20:12) was due to the reviving of Eutychus, not to the lengthy discourse of Paul.

¹³¹ Ellis, "Prophet," 57.

the apostles and elders in Jerusalem. Passing over the debate in silence, Luke begins his narration of the meeting in Jerusalem with a series of illustrations demonstrating God's authorization of the Gentile mission. Though by this time Luke has already narrated the conversion of Cornelius twice (Acts 10-11), Peter recalls yet again how God testified that the Gentiles were accepted by giving the Holy Spirit to them (15:8); Barnabas and Paul recount "all the signs and wonders that God had done through them among the Gentiles" (15:12); James then declares that the "words of the prophets" confirm the evidence from experience (15:15). Not only do the conclusions reached by the Jerusalem church meet with the approval of the Holy Spirit (15:28); those assigned to explain the decision were prophets, who by implication received the Spirit's guidance in announcing the message (15:32). In this context, Judas and Silas are not identified as prophets because the form of παράκλησις that they were expected to deliver required prophets, but because Luke wants to show that all aspects of the apostles' decision had divine approval.

In addition, the emphatic identification of Judas and Silas as prophets may well have been prompted by Judas and Silas's association with the prophets Barnabas and Paul as representatives of the Jerusalem church.¹³² In any case, the identification of Judas and

¹³² The comparison with Barnabas and Paul is implied by the emphatic καὶ αὐτοί before προφηται ὄντες. It is true that the phraseology in 15:27 is similar to 15:32, but this does not support the argument that prophecy is closely related to the verb παρακαλέω:

15:27	ἀπεστάλκαμεν οὖν Ἰούδαν καὶ Σιλᾶν καὶ αὐτοὺς	διὰ λόγου	ἀπαγγέλλοντας
15:32	Ἰούδας τε καὶ Σιλᾶς καὶ αὐτοὶ	προφηται ὄντες	διὰ λόγου πολλοῦ παρεκάλεσαν

Lake and Cadbury conclude from the similar structure of these two verses that παρεκάλεσαν parallels ἀπαγγέλλοντας, that καὶ αὐτοὶ functions as the subject of the participle in the same non-emphatic way as καὶ αὐτοὺς does in 15:27, and that προφηται ὄντες is therefore a parenthesis that modifies παρεκάλεσαν (*BEGS* 4, 182; cf. Fascher, *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ*, 184; Haenchen, *Acts*, 454). But the structure of the two sentences is not as similar as it first appears. In 15:27 καὶ αὐτοὺς functions as the subject of the participle ἀπαγγέλλοντας which expresses the action performed by Judas and Silas. In 15:32, the action performed by Judas and Silas is expressed by the finite verb παρεκάλεσαν; in the absence of προφηται ὄντες, καὶ

Silas as prophets in this context heightens their status¹³³—not only were Judas and Silas "leaders among the brothers" (13:22), they were also prophets like Barnabas and Paul.¹³⁴ Perhaps a subsidiary reason for identifying Judas and Silas as prophets is to prepare for the ensuing narrative when Silas will be chosen as a replacement for the prophet Barnabas to accompany Paul on the rest of his missionary travels.

Towards a Definition of "Prophet"

Luke never defined προφήτης, no doubt because he took for granted that his readers would know what he meant when he used the term. I will argue that the evidence does not permit a strict definition which isolates what is unique about the entity being defined¹³⁵—partly because Luke did not provide as many details about prophets as we would like and partly because there are few (if any) characteristics attributed uniquely to prophets. Nevertheless, it is still possible to arrive at a descriptive definition of "prophet" which distinguishes between central and peripheral characteristics of prophets by analyzing the frequency in which characteristics appear and the degree to which they are tied to an individual's prophetic role.

We may begin by summing up the results of our investigation thus far in the form

αὐτοί would be entirely superfluous. The conclusion that καὶ αὐτοὺς functions as the introduction to a circumstantial clause is forced upon interpreters by the context of 15:27 even though this is a very unusual way to introduce a circumstantial clause in Greek (cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 743). There is no need to resort to the more difficult construction in 15:27 to explain 15:32 because in the latter passage καὶ αὐτοί functions much more naturally as an emphatic subject of προφητῶν ὄντες. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 749; Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 201.

¹³³ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 568; Johnson, *Acts*, 278.

¹³⁴ Haenchen, *Acts*, 454 note 3 objects, "but what reader would hit upon the allusion [to Acts 13:1]?" Against Haenchen, the prophetic status of Judas and Silas is highlighted not in comparison with the Antiochene prophets of Acts 13:1 (*pace* Bruce, *Acts*, 300 note 83; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 568), but in comparison with their fellow messengers, Barnabas and Saul, who were first identified as prophets in Acts 13:1, but who continued to play a role as prophets in the ongoing narrative.

¹³⁵ Cf. chapter one note 34.

of a table that presents traits and activities attributed by Luke to minor characters who are explicitly identified as prophets. The initial column combines the characteristics attributed by Luke to past prophets in order to facilitate comparison with other prophets in Luke-Acts; the final column lists views about prophets attributed by Luke to people in his Gospel:

Table 1: Minor Characters as Prophets in Luke-Acts

Characteristics Associated with Prophets	Past Prophets	Prophets as Minor Characters in Luke-Acts						View of the People
		Anna	John	Agabus	Antioch Prophets	Barnabas	Judas Silas	
Holy Spirit	•		•	•	•	•		
Prediction of the future	•	•	•	•				
Proclamation	•		•					
παράκλησις			•			•	•	
Writers of Scripture	•							
Worship		•			•			
Divine commission	•		•					
Divine direction	•				•			
Supernatural insight	•							•
Symbolic actions/Signs	•		•	•				
Miracles/Signs (& wonders)	•							•
Persecution	•		•					
Holiness/Piety	•	•				•		•
Celibacy/Asceticism		•	•		•			
Anointing kings	•		•					

Clearly, it is not enough to list all characteristics attributed to prophets at one time or another. Since a single individual may occupy several different roles, not all the activities performed by those labelled prophets are necessarily characteristic of their prophetic calling. Although the role played by John the Baptist is more central and developed more fully than any other character listed in the table, he is included in the

table because he is presented wholly as a prophet. The same cannot be said for Jesus and Paul, who are excluded from the chart in order to avoid prejudicing the results. Since Paul is presented as a witness (Acts 22:15; 26:16) and is called ἀπόστολος as well as προφήτης,¹³⁶ it is not necessarily the case that the divine direction experienced by Paul throughout his ministry should be related to his identity as a prophet. Nor is it necessarily the case that Jesus' proclamation, for example, was regarded as particularly characteristic of his prophetic role, for Jesus both referred to himself, and was commonly referred to by others, as a teacher.¹³⁷

One may also observe that some characteristics (such as piety) apply to everyone on the list even though the characteristics are only mentioned explicitly in connection with relatively few prophets. It is just as obvious that some activities (such as writing Scripture) do not apply to every prophet. It is also apparent that not all characteristics on the list are distinctively prophetic: piety, worship, fasting (included under asceticism) are presented as common to devout Jews regardless of their prophetic abilities. We will see in what follows that most of the traits and activities attributed to prophets in Luke-Acts are associated with others besides prophets, and that few of the traits and activities associated with prophets in some contexts are characteristic of all prophets.

¹³⁶ The attribution of ἀπόστολος to Paul and Barnabas in Acts 14:4, 14 is exceptional. Although questions remain concerning why the title is given to Paul and Barnabas only in Acts 14, the title probably functions to associate them with the Twelve (Clark, *Parallel*, 148). Still, the peculiar context in which the title appears warns against placing too much weight on Acts 14:4, 14.

¹³⁷ Luke 7:40; 8:49 (par. Mark 5:35); 9:38 (par. Mark 9:17); 10:25 (cf. Matt 22:36); 11:45; 12:13; 18:18 (par. Mark 10:17); 19:39; 20:21 (par. Mark 12:14); 20:28 (par. Mark 12:19); 20:39; 21:7 (diff. Mark 13:4); 22:11 (par. Mark 14:14). Even prediction of the future—the activity that would seem decisively to designate Jesus a prophet—is introduced with the question, "Teacher, when will this be?" (Luke 21:4). To be sure, the fact that Simon the Pharisee can address Jesus as "teacher" immediately after Luke reveals Simon's doubts about Jesus' reputation as a prophet (7:39-40) suggests that the role of a prophet could be closely related to that of a teacher. Even John the Baptist is addressed as "teacher" in Luke 3:12.

Prophets and Those who "Prophesy"

At Pentecost, Peter announced that the gift of the Holy Spirit, made available to all who repent and are baptized in the name of Jesus, is the fulfillment of God's promise to Israel.¹³⁸ The programmatic quotation from Joel 3:1-5 in Acts 2:17-21 emphatically links the gift of the Spirit to "prophesying":

¹⁷In the last days it will be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams. ¹⁸Even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.¹³⁹

It seems obvious from the cognate relationship between the noun προφήτης and the verb προφητεύω that "prophesying" was considered typical behaviour of "prophets," and that activities denoted by the verb overlap considerably with the characteristic activities of prophets. However, "prophesying" is not included in Table 1 because (with the exception of Jesus) it is not attributed to any individual in Luke-Acts who is labelled a "prophet." Still, the connection between "prophesying" and the Spirit in Acts 2, and the promise of the Spirit to all Jesus' followers, leads many readers to the conclusion that Luke believed all disciples were, or at least should be, prophets.¹⁴⁰ As a result of the semantic relation between the noun προφήτης and the verb προφητεύω and the association between prophecy and the Spirit, scholars sometimes also connect the coming of the Spirit at

¹³⁸ Acts 2:38-39. Cf. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 65; Jervell, "Sons," 99; Turner, *Power*, 349.

¹³⁹ Acts 2:17-18. Note the addition of καὶ προφητεύσουσιν (diff. LXX Joel 3:2) at the end of 2:18 as if to underscore the point.

¹⁴⁰ "Virtually all scholars are agreed that for Luke there was at least a theoretical sense in which all believers, having the Spirit, were prophets" (Forbes, *Prophecy*, 245). Cf. Eduard Schweizer, "πνεῦμα, πνευματικός, κτλ.," *TDNT* 6:412; W. B. Tatum, "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i-ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 13 (1966-1967): 191; Max-Alain Chevallier, "Luc et l'Esprit à la mémoire du P. Augustin George (1915-77)," *RSR* 56 (1982): 5; Mainville, *L'Esprit*, 286; Menzies, *Pneumatology*, 228-9; Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 15; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 28, cf. 156; Minear, *Reveal*, 87.

Pentecost in fulfillment of Joel 3:1-5 together with Moses' wish in Num 11:29: "Would that all the LORD's people were prophets, and that the LORD would put his spirit on them!"¹⁴¹

Yet Luke does not refer to Numbers 11 or apply the title *προφήτης* to all believers in Jesus, but instead restricts its application to a limited number of predominantly minor characters who are sometimes distinguished from other Christ-believers precisely by the title "prophet." If Luke held that all members of the Jesus movement were prophets, then the application of the title to individual disciples in Acts 11:27, 13:1 and 15:32 would be essentially meaningless. This apparent disjunction between Luke's use of *προφητεύω* and his use of *προφήτης* is widely recognized and has been explained in a variety of ways.

First, it is possible that Joel 3:1-5 was only partially suited to Luke's concerns, and that the use of this proof text introduced an inconsistency which Luke never noticed or bothered to resolve.¹⁴² On this interpretation, Luke was influenced by an already traditional application of Joel 3:1-5 to the early Jesus movement—both in Acts 2 as well as in the parallel account in Ephesus where Luke explains that at the laying on of Paul's hands, the Holy Spirit came on John the Baptist's disciples and they "spoke in tongues and prophesied" (Acts 19:6). Since Luke does not consistently present believers as "prophets" throughout Acts, one might conclude that he was concerned primarily with the

¹⁴¹ Cf. Hill, *Prophecy*, 96; Chevallier, "l'Esprit," 10; Bruce, *Acts*, 61; Turner, *Power*, 288. Within the context of Numbers 11, the connection between prophets (*נביאים*/*προφῆταις*) and the spirit recalls the seventy elders who prophesied (*נביאים/ἐπρόφητευσαν*) "when the spirit rested upon them" (11:25).

¹⁴² Cf. Guy, *Prophecy*, 92-4; Schnider, *Jesus*, 58; Geoffrey W. Lampe, *God As Spirit* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977), 66-9.

presence of the Spirit in the early church and not with Joel's connection of the Spirit to prophecy.¹⁴³

In support, we may note that Luke probably did not think the phenomena of tongues-speaking and "prophesying" normally accompanied the reception of the Spirit, for Acts does not always mention tongues and "prophesying" at baptism.¹⁴⁴ The prophetic experience of John the Baptist's disciples at Ephesus appears to be an exceptional event designed to recall the equally exceptional event of Pentecost.¹⁴⁵ On the other hand, Luke did not leave the "prophesying" mentioned in Joel's prediction undeveloped, nor did he restrict "prophesying" to Pentecost and other exceptional events designed to recall Pentecost. While the Pentecost-like experiences at Caesarea (Acts 10-11) and among the Samaritans (8:14-24) might be explained as "the initial effect of the infilling of the Holy Spirit experienced by a group which had not previously enjoyed the divine presence in their midst,"¹⁴⁶ and while the unusual instance of "prophesying" at Ephesus recalls Pentecost, it is difficult to construe the Ephesian disciples of John the Baptist as a "group" who required a Pentecost-like experience in the same way that Cornelius's Gentile household (Acts 10-11) and the Samaritans (Acts 8:4-25) could constitute separate groups. Moreover, the description of Philip's prophesying daughters (21:9) demonstrates that "prophesying" was not limited to initial experiences of the Spirit.¹⁴⁷ Although Luke seldom employs the verb προφητεύω, he occasionally reminds his readers that the Spirit's coming resulted in a greater degree of "prophesying" than was

¹⁴³ Lampe, *Spirit*, 69.

¹⁴⁴ Cf. Acts 8:39; 16:33-34; Turner, *Power*, 394-7; *contra* Schweizer, *TDNT* 6:410.

¹⁴⁵ Cf. Lampe, *Spirit*, 68; Turner, *Power*, 397.

¹⁴⁶ Aune, *Prophecy*, 199.

¹⁴⁷ See on page 143f. below.

common in contemporary Judaism.

A second solution removes the problematic disjunction between the noun προφήτης and the verb προφητεύω by adopting a functional definition of prophets, according to which προφήτης denotes the person who engages in the activity expressed by the verb προφητεύω.¹⁴⁸ On this view, anyone who prophesies is by definition a prophet; nothing in the title προφήτης itself indicates whether or not the individual in question prophesied on more than one occasion.¹⁴⁹ Luke's insistence on the presence of the Spirit in fulfillment of Joel's quotation could thus mean that all believers were regarded as potential prophets, while only those believers who did prophesy were considered "prophets."¹⁵⁰ However, if Luke believed Joel's prophecy was fulfilled in the creation of a community of potential prophets, one might well ask why it was impossible to be a *potential* prophet before Pentecost. This interpretation of Acts 2:17-21 represents a strained attempt to account for the fact that Luke reserves the title προφήτης for a few individuals, while on a functional definition Luke's use of Joel's prediction that "your sons and your daughters shall prophesy" should mean that everyone who prophesied was a prophet.

Others adopt a third explanation according to which Luke distinguished between an inspired community of believers, whose members might prophesy from time to time, and a select group of "prophets," who were so designated "not because the ability to

¹⁴⁸ Cf. Boring, "Prophet," 142; Hill, *Prophecy*, 2.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 994-5.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Forbes, *Prophecy*, 253; Menzies, *Pneumatology*, 227. It is also possible to hold to a functional definition and maintain that Luke inconsistently limits the activity of prophesying to a limited number of minor characters; see note 143 above.

prophecy was confined to them but because their inspiration and exercise of the gift was more regular and more frequent."¹⁵¹ It is not always noticed that this explanation requires the abandoning of a functional definition of prophets, for if only those who prophesy *consistently* are prophets, then we cannot say that a prophet is by definition one who "prophesies."¹⁵²

The main reason for distinguishing in some cases between "prophets" and those who "prophesied" is the fact that Luke reserves the title in Acts for predominantly minor characters. In addition, Jewish Scripture also supports a separation between the title "prophet" and the activity of prophesying. In 1 Samuel, the proverbial question, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" occurs twice, each time after Saul has been said to prophesy (1 Sam 10:11; 19:24). In each case, Saul's prophetic activity was unusual; the fact that the question keeps being asked, but not answered, suggests that the implied answer is negative. Certainly, Saul's other messengers did not become prophets through their experience of prophesying (1 Sam 19:20-21). Luke does not allude to these passages, but they do establish that the identification between the activity of prophesying and prophets was not made automatically in Scripture, though the occurrence of the one term normally implied the other. Although Luke never explains that those designated "prophets" "prophesied" more frequently or more consistently than others—perhaps because he was not concerned with how one became a prophet or how to distinguish prophets from non-

¹⁵¹ Hill, *Prophecy*, 99. Cf. P. E. Davies, "Role," 248; Ellis, "Prophet," 56; Robeck, "Prophecy," 35; Boring, *Sayings*, 38.

¹⁵² The claim of Boring, *Sayings*, 38, that prophets in Acts were those who "function[ed] consistently as prophets" conflicts with his earlier statement that prophets are those who perform the action denoted by προφητεύω (Boring, "Prophet," 142). Boring, *Sayings*, 38-9, seems to acknowledge that Luke's usage does not conform to a functional definition when he adds that Luke "does not draw a sharp line between prophets and non-prophets."

prophets—I believe this third explanation is essentially correct. Luke did not regard the mere activity of "prophesying" as a necessary and sufficient condition for the identification of "prophets."

An additional reason to distinguish between "prophets" and those who "prophesy" is found in the way the title προφήτης functions in Luke's narrative. Sometimes—as in the case of Anna, Judas and Silas—Luke seems more interested in the ambience created by the connotations of "prophet" language than he is with specific activities associated with the title: Anna's status as a prophetess contributed to Luke's characterization of her as a devout Jew; Judas and Silas are introduced as prophets in order to reinforce the Spirit's involvement in the decisions about the Gentiles reached by the church in Jerusalem. The introduction of the title also highlights the prophet's qualifications for a particular role. It is because Anna was a prophetess that she was qualified to speak about Jesus to those awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem (Luke 2:38); it was because Judas and Silas were prophets that they were qualified to deliver the conclusions reached by the Jerusalem council. The identification of Judas and Silas as prophets implies that not everyone was so qualified and suggests, on the analogy of the biblical prophets, that those designated προφῆται exercised their tenure as prophets over a period of time. The identification of specific individuals as "prophets" thus contrasts with the more limited experience of prophesying that Luke describes in Acts 2 and 19. Whether or not the disciples at Pentecost or John the Baptist's Ephesian disciples were later regarded as prophets, Luke does not characterize them as prophets in the passages in which they appear.

While it is correct to say that, on Luke's view, not all those who "prophesied" were prophets and that all prophets "prophesied," it is a mistake to define the verb προφητεύω as "to act as a prophet."¹⁵³ In fact, there are several specific ways in which the verb is used in the Lukan corpus, and it is not clear that Luke believed all the activities denoted by the verb were performed by all prophets. The verb occurs six times, twice in Luke's Gospel and in three different contexts in Acts.¹⁵⁴ Only in the case of Jesus is the verb associated with someone who is also labelled προφήτης. In a traditional passage shared with Mark and Matthew, the men who were holding Jesus asked him to "prophesy"—referring, as we have seen, to the revelation of information obtained through supernatural means.¹⁵⁵ Aside from this request for Jesus to display his supernatural insight, no mention is made here of any recognizable prophetic behaviour. Since other passages identify Jesus as a prophet and show that prophets were expected to possess supernatural insight, this passage confirms the close relationship between the noun προφήτης and the verb προφητεύω.

The other occurrence of the verb in Luke's Gospel appears in connection with John the Baptist's father Zechariah, whose Benedictus is attributed to Zechariah's "prophesying" activity (1:67). As the Benedictus itself involves "blessing (Εὐλογητός) God" (1:68), Zechariah's prophecy in 1:68-79 most likely fills in what it was that Zechariah said when his speech was restored and he spoke "blessing God (εὐλογῶν τὸν

¹⁵³ Cf. Boring, *Sayings*, 38-9; Hill, *Prophecy*, 99.

¹⁵⁴ Luke 1:67; 22:64; Acts 2:17-18; 19:6; 21:9.

¹⁵⁵ Luke 22:64. See page 112 above.

θεόν)" (1:64).¹⁵⁶ In addition to praise, Zechariah's prophecy included a declaration that the prophecies of the "holy prophets of old" had reached their fulfillment (1:70); it also involved a prediction about John the Baptist, identifying him as the prophet who would go before the Lord to prepare his way (1:76). Zechariah's initial words of praise were no doubt unexpected, but this single instance can hardly serve as evidence that "prophesying" characteristically involved unexpected speech, since Zechariah's prophecy was only made possible through an (unexpected) miracle of restored speech.

While the verb προφητεύω does refer to the characteristic activities of prophets in Luke 2, it is more difficult to correlate the occurrences of the verb in Acts with activities associated with prophets in other contexts—primarily because there are few clues to the nature of the activity denoted by the verb. Peter's claim that the immediate result of the Spirit's coming at Pentecost was a fulfillment of Joel 3:1-5 indicates that Luke included "speaking with tongues" (Acts 2:4) in the activity of "prophesying" (2:17-18).¹⁵⁷ The next occurrence of the verb in Acts 19:6 recalls the initial coming of the Spirit at Pentecost, as the mention of tongues-speaking, prophesying and the coming of the Spirit on John the Baptist's Ephesian disciples make clear. The verb is used a final time in a description of Philip's seven virgin daughters "who prophesied" (21:9). Here too the description of Philip's prophesying daughters demonstrates the fulfillment of Joel's prediction: "your sons and your *daughters* shall *prophesy*."¹⁵⁸

¹⁵⁶ So Plummer, *Luke*, 38; Green, *Luke*, 115.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:829; Haenchen, *Acts*, 186; Ellis, "Prophet," 55; Crone, *Prophecy*, 194-5; Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit*, 169; Forbes, *Prophecy*, 52, 219; Turner, *Power*, 270-1. Otherwise, Jacques Dupont, "La première Pentecôte chrétienne," in *Études*, 492, 496; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 253; and Barrett, *Acts*, 137, who argue that prophesying was related to but not combined with "tongues."

¹⁵⁸ Acts 2:17. Cf. *BEGS* 4, 267 (tentatively); Schnider, *Jesus*, 57; Kerrigan, Alexander, "The

Although the prophet Agabus's prediction in the immediate context might help to clarify what it meant for Philip's daughters to prophesy, Luke does not give further details about the nature of their "prophesying." Luke's repeated allusions back to Acts 2:17-21 elsewhere in Acts suggest that the visions Luke records were included in part to demonstrate that Joel's prediction was fulfilled in the community of Jesus' followers.¹⁵⁹ Depending on how Luke understood Joel 3:1-2, he may well have regarded "seeing visions" and "dreaming dreams" (Acts 2:17) as part of what it meant to "prophesy." Such an interpretation is supported not only by the structure of the quotation from Joel,¹⁶⁰ but also by other passages from Scripture that associate prophets with visions and dreams.¹⁶¹

The "prophesying" at Pentecost (Acts 2:4, 17-18) as well as at Ephesus (19:6) apparently included speech and, as we have seen, was closely related to speaking in tongues, but Luke's terse description leaves unanswered many questions about the nature of the speech. In addition, the appearance of προφητεύω in connection with descriptions of the coming of the Spirit in Acts 2:17-18 and 19:6 suggests that the verb could also refer to a recognizable inspired activity that could be mistaken for drunkenness (2:13, 15). According to Acts 11:15—a passage where the verb προφητεύω does not appear,

'Sensus Plenus' of Joel, III, 1-5 in Act., II, 14-36," in *Sacra Pagina* (vol. 2; eds. J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and É. Massaux: Gembloux: Duculot, 1959), 305; Tannehill, *Unity I*, 134.

¹⁵⁹ Cf. Ananias (9:10, 12); Cornelius (10:3); Peter (10:17, 19; 11:5); Paul (16:9-10; 18:9). Moses' experience at the burning bush is also described as a ὄραμα (7:31). Although Joel's distinctive terminology for dreams (ἐνυπνίοις ἐνυπνιασθήσονται) does not reappear, it is clear that Paul's visions occurred at night. Cf. Kerrigan, "Sensus Plenior," 305. Luke elsewhere substitutes ὄραμα, the more common word for visions, for Joel's ὄρασις. See further Bart J. Koet, "Divine Communication in Luke-Acts," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*, 747, 750. Cf. Zechariah's temple vision (ὄπτασία) in Luke 1:22; Jesus' claim to have seen Satan fall from heaven (Luke 10:18); and Peter's trance (ἔκστασις) in Acts 10:10.

¹⁶⁰ In Luke's version of the quotation, dreams and visions are bounded on both sides by a reference to the coming of the Spirit and "prophesying" (Acts 2:17-18).

¹⁶¹ Cf. Num 12:6; 1 Sam 3:1; Isa 1:1; Ezek 7:26; 12:27. Cf. 2 Chr 32:32 and Dan 11:14 where the LXX translates נִרְאָה by προφητεία.

but that undoubtedly describes a similar event—the disciples who witnessed the conversion of Cornelius's household recognized that the coming of the Spirit occurred "just as it had upon us at the beginning."¹⁶² The accusation that those who had received the Spirit were drunk (Acts 2:13) is reminiscent of the stereotypical image of the insane prophet (cf. 2 Kgs 9:11); prophecy is also likened to drunkenness in Scripture.¹⁶³ The verb προφητεύω is also used in the Septuagint to denote a recognizable activity that bears no clear relation to other typical prophetic activities such as predicting the future.¹⁶⁴

Given the cognate relationship between the noun and the verb, it seems clear that Luke believed prophets engaged in recognizable activity that was considered typical of prophets and that could be described as "prophesying." But although Luke may have assumed that prophets spoke in tongues and "prophesied" in a *specific* recognizable way on a regular basis, there is little evidence for this conclusion apart from the cognate relationship between the noun and the verb. Since there are several different possible meanings of the verb—including prediction of the future and supernatural insight—it would be wrong to assume that "prophesying" always took the form of a specific

¹⁶² Cf. Acts 10:46, where the verb ἐκχέω is used in connection with the coming of the "gift of the Holy Spirit" on Cornelius's household, recalling the Joel quotation (Acts 2:17) and the "pouring out" of the Spirit at Pentecost (2:33). Cf. Acts 8:18-19.

¹⁶³ Jeremiah says "I have become like a drunkard, like one overcome by wine, because of the LORD and because of his holy words" (Jer 29:26 MT; 36:26 LXX). Cf. Isa 28:7 and the word-play connecting prophecy with drunkenness in Isa 29:9-10. Cf. Philo, *Ebr.* 146-8 (noted by Barrett, *Acts*, 125).

¹⁶⁴ For example, two of the seventy elders were recognized "prophesying" in the camp (Num 11:25-27) and the people could tell that Saul was prophesying (1 Kgdms 10:1-13; 19:20-24). (Any distinctions between the Hithpael and Niphal forms of נָבֵא were lost in the standard Septuagintal translation of verbs of this root by the Greek verb προφητεύω.) If the behaviour of Saul is characteristic, this recognizable activity involved—at least in some cases—ecstatic behaviour. Cf. Zech 13:3-4; 1 Kgs 22:10. Cf. George, "L'Esprit Saint." 538: "Il semble donner alors à ce verbe un sens bien différent de Paul en *I Cor.* . . . et beaucoup plus proche de celui qu'il a dans les récits de l'A.T. sur l'enthousiasme collectif des groupes de prophètes des anciens âges (*II Rois*, II, 3)."

recognizable activity.¹⁶⁵ The evidence does not permit the conclusion that all prophets "prophesied" in the sense of the recognizable activity associated with Pentecost. While Luke may have presumed that his readers would know what sort of experiences prophets normally had, he was not usually concerned to describe them in detail.¹⁶⁶

In sum, the fact that someone "prophesies" is no guarantee that Luke regarded that individual as a prophet. The verb προφητεύω can be used for several characteristic activities of prophets including predicting the future, exercising supernatural insight, and probably the reception of revelation through visions and dreams; it is also used in association with one or more recognizable activities associated with prophets. Although it is not always clear to modern readers what activity is in view when the word is used, it is not apparent that all prophets engaged in all characteristic activities or that the verb simply meant "to act as a prophet."

Other Central Characteristics of Prophets

Even though the Holy Spirit is not mentioned in connection with the activity of all prophets, it is safe to conclude that the Holy Spirit was believed to be involved in the lives of all true prophets because of the frequency and centrality of the Spirit's involvement in prophetic activity. Past prophets are represented as speaking through the Holy Spirit; Acts 2:17 associates prophesying with the Spirit; and on two occasions the

¹⁶⁵ Pace Boring, *Sayings*, 16: "The early Christian prophet was an immediately-inspired spokesman for the risen Jesus who received intelligible oracles that he *felt impelled* to deliver to the Christian community"; Forbes, *Prophecy*, 236: "According to Luke and Paul, Christian prophecy was the reception and *immediately subsequent* public declaration of *spontaneous*, (usually) verbal revelation, conceived of as revealed truth and offered to the community on the authority of God/Christ/the Holy Spirit" (italics added).

¹⁶⁶ Luke does state that Jesus "rejoiced in the Holy Spirit" (Luke 10:21), that Stephen's face "was like the face of an angel" (Acts 6:15) and that he "gazed into heaven and saw the glory of God" (7:55), and that Peter "fell into a trance (ἐκστασις)" (Acts 10:10): Luke also describes the content of various visions, most notably that of Peter in Acts 10:9-16.

title "prophet" effectively parallels references to the Spirit: Anna's identification as a prophetess links her to Simeon who was guided by the Spirit (Luke 2:25-38); and the *Spirit*-inspired letter of "exhortation" (Acts 15:28, 31) is followed by the exhortation of the *prophets* Judas and Silas (15:32).¹⁶⁷ Although the Spirit is closely associated with prophets, it follows from the above analysis of "prophesying" and the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost that the presence of the Spirit—even the "Spirit of prophecy"—is not a sure sign that a prophet is in view.¹⁶⁸

Luke regarded prophets as those who communicated messages from God to people. The messages could assume different forms and express diverse content: they were delivered orally or (in the case of Scripture) in writing; they could comprise prediction, proclamation issuing in a call to repentance (in the case of Jonah and John the Baptist), or the exhortation given by the prophets Judas and Silas to the church at Antioch. But while certain kinds of messages were considered typical of prophets, non-prophets, for example, could also exhort and call people to repentance. Although the ability to predict the future is unquestionably a central characteristic of prophets in Luke-Acts,¹⁶⁹ some non-prophets in Luke-Acts predicted the future,¹⁷⁰ and other prophets such as Judas and Silas, Barnabas, and the prophets at Antioch are not presented as foretellers.

¹⁶⁷ Cf. Luke 1:15, 17, 76; 4:14; Acts 2:30; 11:24, 28; 21:11; 28:25.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Jervell, "Sons," 109-10. Scholars often argue that the spirit within Judaism was conceived of primarily as the "spirit of prophecy." Cf. Lampe, *Spirit*, 65; Hill, *Prophecy*, 96; Forbes, *Prophecy*, 252; and especially Turner, *Power*, 86-92, 104. However, John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism* (Brill: Leiden, 1997), 253, has demonstrated that within Second Temple Judaism the spirit was not related only to prophecy.

¹⁶⁹ The prophets of the past are most commonly cited for their predictions of the future; prophets who function as characters within Luke's narrative—including Anna, John the Baptist, Jesus, Agabus and Paul—also predict the future.

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Luke 1:13-17, 30-35 (Gabriel); Acts 16:16 (the Philippian diviner); see the discussion of Zechariah below.

Worship was an activity common to all pious individuals, but Jesus' words of praise to God "in the Spirit" suggest that the inspired speech of prophets could sometimes be directed towards God.¹⁷¹ The activity of "prophesying" (whether or not it is performed by prophets) could also take the form of inspired praise (cf. Luke 1:67-68). Anna's words of praise to God (Luke 2:37-38) and possibly the worship of the prophets at Antioch (Acts 13:2) should also be included in this category.

If prophets were known as those who delivered messages from God to people, it follows that they had access to information hidden from ordinary mortals. Simon the Pharisee's assumption that Jesus would surely know who was touching him if he were a prophet (Luke 7:39) shows how central "supernatural insight" was to popular conceptions of prophets.¹⁷² As we have seen, prophets also characteristically received divine direction about what they should do.

Piety was not restricted to prophets, and there is little to suggest that great saints of the past were identified as prophets solely on the basis of their piety. But prophets were also believed to be closely related to God: anyone through whom the Holy Spirit spoke and to whom God revealed information hidden from ordinary people must be close to God and therefore holy. The point may seem too obvious to require further elaboration, yet the high reputation of prophets helps to explain why the identification of Anna as a prophetess is listed along with other traits which together contribute to her characterization as a devout woman. Although it is never expressly stated, we may infer

¹⁷¹ Cf. Turner, *Power*, 100.

¹⁷² See the discussion of Jesus' gift of "übernatürlicher Einsicht" in Meyer, *Prophet*, 104. Turner, *Power*, 92-5, would include supernatural insight within his category of "charismatic revelation and guidance to an individual."

that the prophets' nearness to God (or God's nearness to the prophets) enabled them to serve as conduits of divine revelation and as purveyors of divine power.¹⁷³ To be sure, not all prophets performed miracles, and the miracles of Elijah and Elisha mentioned by Jesus in Luke 4:25-27 did not constitute them as prophets. Nevertheless, the demand for a supernatural sign from Jesus indicates that prophets were commonly expected to have access to divine power.

Luke emphasizes that prophets identified so closely with the divine message that they frequently experienced persecution at the hands of those who rejected their message. Although it is presented as a common occurrence, persecution is something that happened to prophets rather than something intrinsic to the nature of prophethood as such. Other traits associated with prophets are even more peripheral: Agabus, John the Baptist, and Jonah performed symbolic actions, but this characteristic is rarely mentioned in connection with prophets; Anna was celibate, John the Baptist appears to have practiced an ascetic lifestyle, and the prophets at Antioch engaged in fasting, but not all prophets followed this pattern.

Leaving aside these more peripheral characteristics, my definition attempts to capture the features that seem essential to Luke's portrayal of prophets even if they are not present in all prophets. "Prophets" may be defined as those who by virtue of their nearness to God are enabled by the Holy Spirit to have insight into matters hidden from other humans, and (sometimes) to perform deeds beyond the ability of ordinary mortals;

¹⁷³ Passages such as Isaiah 6 envisage God coming near the prophet who is then purified for the task at hand (cf. Luke 3:2: "the word of God came to John"). Cf. the prominent emphasis on Jesus at prayer in Luke's Gospel (e.g. 3:21; 4:42; 6:12). Cf. Minear, *Reveal*, 68, 74.

prophets are also empowered by the Holy Spirit to address divinely-commissioned messages to other humans or to proclaim words of praise to God.¹⁷⁴

Other Possible Prophets

If Luke seldom repeats the title προφήτης when he refers to those whom he has once designated prophets, we should not be surprised to encounter characters whom Luke regarded as prophets who are never given the title προφήτης. Since the characteristics of prophets in my descriptive definition are not present in connection with every prophet in Luke-Acts, and since few (if any) characteristics in the definition constitute necessary and sufficient conditions for being a prophet, it is not enough merely to identify individuals who fit the definition. Identifying those whom Luke regarded as prophets will therefore require careful attention to the function of characters in the narrative as well as to the ways in which they are connected to biblical prophets and other post-biblical prophets. One of the most helpful ways of identifying prophets is to consider whether Luke portrays potential candidates as functioning as prophets over an extended period of time.

Simeon

Simeon is introduced as a "righteous and devout" man who was waiting for the "consolation of Israel" (Luke 2:25). Although no word of the προφητ- root is used of Simeon, Luke seems to have regarded him as a prophet. This conclusion is suggested by

¹⁷⁴ My descriptive definition may be compared with other definitions of Christian prophets or prophecy. Cf. Minear, *Reveal*, 75: "We will not enter Luke's world without grasping the fact that healing and revealing were twin aspects of a single prophetic vocation"; Hill, *Prophecy*, 97: "All . . . could be inspired to prophesy, and that, for Luke, in this kind of context [Acts 2], means to proclaim among Jews and Gentiles the good news of God's grace and action in Christ." Cf. the definitions of Boring and Forbes in note 165 above.

the presence of terminology that is associated with prophets elsewhere, by the portrayal of Simeon as one who had ongoing experiences of revelation and guidance by the Holy Spirit, by the two predictive statements he made about the child and its destiny (Luke 2:29-35), and most decisively, by his close association with the prophetess Anna.

The Holy Spirit figures prominently in Luke's characterization of Simeon. In addition to describing Simeon as being righteous and devout, Luke states that "the Holy Spirit was upon him" (Luke 2:25); he had received a revelation by the Holy Spirit that he would see the Messiah before he died (2:26), and it was through the Spirit's direction that he encountered Mary, Joseph, and Jesus in the temple (2:27). It is not so much the Spirit's presence that identifies Simeon as a prophet, as it is the implication that the Spirit's association with Simeon was typical of his life as a whole. Luke's statement that "the Holy Spirit was upon him" is not qualified or limited in any way.¹⁷⁵ Simeon's experience of divine revelation was not limited to the two predictions made to Mary and Joseph about Jesus, for at some point previously "it had been revealed (κεχρηματισμένον) to him by the Holy Spirit" that he would see the Messiah. Elsewhere in the New Testament, the verb *χρηματίζω* is used to denote divine-human communication, a meaning the word also carried in the Septuagint as well as in non-biblical Greek.¹⁷⁶

Finally, Luke's decision to juxtapose the stories of Simeon and Anna corresponds

¹⁷⁵ The collocation *πνεῦμα + ἐπὶ + person* occurs with some frequency in the LXX, and does not itself imply that the person so indicated had an ongoing experience of the Holy Spirit. Cf. Num 11:25. In Luke 2:25, however, the verb *ἦν* indicates that *ἐπὶ αὐτόν* refers to the Spirit's remaining on Simeon, not to the inceptive coming of the Spirit (for this use of *ἐπὶ + accusative* see BDF §233). *Contra* Plummer, *Luke*, 66; Mainville, *L'Esprit*, 190-1.

¹⁷⁶ Cf. Matt 2:12, 22; Acts 10:22; Heb 8:5; 11:7; 12:25; LXX Jer 33:2; 36:23; 37:2; 43:2, 4; cf. Jer 32:30; Bo Reicke, "*χρηματίζω*." *TDNT* 9:481; *LSJ*.

to a conscious literary strategy apparent elsewhere in Luke-Acts in which stories about male and female characters are linked together.¹⁷⁷ The annunciation to Zechariah is followed by an annunciation to Mary (Luke 1:5-20, 26-38); Mary's Magnificat is followed by Zechariah's Benedictus (1:46-55; 67-79); Jesus' first recorded "healing" of a man with an unclean spirit is followed by Jesus' healing of Peter's mother-in-law;¹⁷⁸ the healing of the Centurion's slave parallels the resuscitation of the widow's son (7:1-17); the healing of a crippled woman on the Sabbath parallels the healing of a man with dropsy on the Sabbath;¹⁷⁹ the parable of the (male) shepherd and his lost sheep parallels the parable of the woman with a lost coin (15:3-10); two parables about prayer are juxtaposed, one involving a tax collector, the other a widow (18:1-14); and in Acts 9:32-43 Peter's healing of Aeneas parallels the healing of Tabitha.

The supposition that Simeon should be understood as a prophet is confirmed not simply by the juxtaposition of these two stories, but also by the parallels between the activities of Simeon and the prophetess Anna. Just as Anna was associated with those who were waiting for the "redemption of Jerusalem," so also Simeon awaited the "consolation of Israel"; Simeon spoke to Jesus' parents about the child's future, while Anna spoke about Jesus to all those who were awaiting the redemption of Jerusalem. Though we are not given the details of what Anna said, her function as a prophetess implies that her words paralleled those of Simeon's two oracles. From Luke's

¹⁷⁷ Cf. Cadbury, *Making*, 233-4; Tannehill, *Unity I*, 131-5.

¹⁷⁸ Luke 4:33-37, 38-39. The two stories and the order in which they appear is traditional (cf. Mark 1:23-31), but Luke heightens the connections between the two accounts by adding that Jesus rebuked the fever of Peter's mother-in-law (ἐπετίμησεν τῷ πυρετῷ; Luke 4:39; diff. Mark 1:31: ἀφῆκεν αὐτὴν ὁ πυρετός) as well as the (man with the) unclean spirit (ἐπιτίμησεν αὐτῷ; 4:35).

¹⁷⁹ Luke 13:10-17; 14:1-6. Both stories appear only in Luke; there are no intervening miracles between them.

perspective, Simeon was not simply an inspired figure who predicted the future, but a prophet who functioned along with the prophetess Anna to explain the significance of Jesus' birth.¹⁸⁰

Philip's Daughters

The same pattern of juxtaposing male and female characters suggests that Philip's seven virgin daughters who "prophesied (προφητεύουσαι)" were also regarded by Luke as prophetesses (Acts 21:9) even though the title προφήτις is not used. As with Anna, the sexual purity of Philip's daughters is stressed, and just as the account of Anna is juxtaposed with a longer description of Simeon, so the mention of Philip's daughters anticipates the longer account of Agabus's prediction of Paul's arrest in Jerusalem (21:11-14). The function of Philip's daughters within the narrative context also corresponds to the role played by the anonymous prophets from Jerusalem in Acts 11:27, for in both passages the prophet Agabus utters a predictive oracle in the company of other prophets. As in the case of Anna, we are told nothing about what Philip's daughters said. Perhaps Luke assumed his audience would know what their prophesying activity entailed. At any rate, Luke is not concerned here with precision, or with the details of their prophetic activity, but with the wider connotations of this type of characterization. Since it occurs as part of a description of Philip's residence in Caesarea, the mention of his prophesying daughters implies that they customarily prophesied.¹⁸¹ Apparently they engaged in prophesying often enough for them to be known for the activity, and the reference to the

¹⁸⁰ Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 452 note 22; Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 39; Bovon, *Luke*, 106.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 370; *BEGS* 4, 267.

activity conveyed enough about their father's character for Luke to be content.¹⁸² The on-going nature of their experience, along with the similarities between Philip's daughters, the prophets from Jerusalem, and Anna combine to suggest that Luke regarded Philip's daughters as prophetesses. The decision to describe the daughters using the participle προφητεύουσαι instead of the title προφήτις was most likely prompted by a desire to echo Acts 2:17-18.¹⁸³

Zechariah

If Philip's prophesying daughters were prophetesses, it stands to reason that Zechariah is presented as a prophet because he was the recipient of a vision (Luke 1:11-20), and—at least on one occasion—he "was filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesied (ἐπροφήτευσεν)" (1:67).¹⁸⁴ Nevertheless, the way in which Luke characterizes Zechariah contrasts with the way in which Simeon is portrayed. Even established seers characteristically respond to angelic visitations with fear,¹⁸⁵ but while Simeon is depicted as one whose experience of the Spirit was typical of his life as a whole, Zechariah's terrified and unbelieving response to Gabriel suggests that he was entirely unprepared for such an encounter (Luke 1:12, 20). Judging from the people's response to Zechariah's speech, his inspired words of praise were also unexpected (1:65). Zechariah's experience

¹⁸² Thus Philip's daughters both prepare for Agabus's prophecy *and* characterize their father. *Pace* Crone, *Prophecy*, 197, "In its present context the reference to the four prophetic daughters of Philip serves as an introduction to the Agabus story, but originally it was probably only a further description of Philip."

¹⁸³ Acts 2:17. See page 133 above. According to Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:829, "There was obvious hesitation to ascribe the title prophetess to women." But it is unlikely that Luke was that circumspect with his terminology.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 452; Warren Carter, "Zechariah and the Benedictus (Luke 1.68-79): Practicing What He Preaches," *Bib* 69 (1988): 243; Jervell, "Sons," 102; Paul Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann* (ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1954), 178.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. Ezek 1:28; Dan 10:8-9.

of "prophesying," like the birth of his son, came as a surprise.

Although the examples of Simeon and Philip's daughters show that Luke could still refer to individuals as "prophets" without using the titles προφήτης or προφήτις, both Simeon and Philip's daughters are paired with other figures who are labelled "prophet." In addition, the portrayal of both Simeon and Philip's daughters indicates that their prophetic experiences were on-going. To be sure, Zechariah's response to the angel and his initial prophetic utterances could be explained by the supposition that Luke recounted Zechariah's call to be a prophet in a manner that echoes biblical call narratives;¹⁸⁶ we might then imagine that Zechariah would not contrast so sharply with Simeon if Luke had also informed us about Simeon's initial prophetic experiences. Though he does not tell us anything about Zechariah's future life, it is possible that Luke believed Zechariah continued to function as a prophet after his son's birth. Nevertheless, the fact that Zechariah exits the story forever after his Benedictus suggests that his prophetic experiences were limited to this one occasion.

Of course, Luke was not interested in the question whether Zechariah was a prophet; he was concerned only to relate the miraculous events that surrounded the births of John and Jesus. But since we have seen that neither the use of the verb προφητεύω nor the presence of the Holy Spirit is sufficient evidence that a prophet is in view, and since Luke's account leaves the impression that Zechariah's experience was limited to the period associated with John's birth, it seems most likely that Luke would not have identified Zechariah as a prophet if he had paused to consider the question. Instead,

¹⁸⁶ Cf. Exod 3 (Moses); 1 Kings 19 (Elijah); Jeremiah 1; Jonah. Cf. the call of Gideon (Judges 6).

Zechariah—like Mary and Elizabeth—were the beneficiaries of limited revelatory experiences.¹⁸⁷

Are the Twelve and the Seven also Among the Prophets?

In addition to Simeon and Philip's daughters, it is also frequently suggested that main characters in Acts such as Philip himself,¹⁸⁸ as well as the twelve apostles, Peter in particular,¹⁸⁹ and Stephen¹⁹⁰ are presented as prophets by Luke even though προφητ-terminology is never used in connection with them. Luke Timothy Johnson's conclusion is characteristic:

We are justified in concluding in a preliminary fashion therefore that the major characters of Acts are portrayed deliberately as Prophets and that this dramatic description is applied consistently whether it refers to the Twelve, the Seven, or the great missionaries to the Gentiles, Barnabas and Paul.¹⁹¹

After surveying evidence that appears at first to favour this conclusion, I will argue instead that even though he evokes the biblical prophets in his portrayal of these figures, and even though they fit my definition of prophets, Luke did not regard members of the Twelve or the Seven as prophets.

Evidence of Prophetic Characterization

Luke's Gospel sometimes attributes prophetic characteristics to the disciples. The

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 118-9; Turner, *Power*, 147-8. Like Zechariah, Elizabeth is said to be filled with the Spirit (Luke 1:41); Mary's Magnificat parallels that of Zechariah even though she is not said to be filled with the Spirit or to prophesy. If Zechariah was not regarded as a prophet, it is unlikely that Elizabeth and Mary were regarded as prophetesses.

¹⁸⁸ Greene, "Portrayal," 204; Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 91.

¹⁸⁹ Ellis, "Prophet," 55.

¹⁹⁰ Hill, *Prophecy*, 99-100; Moessner, "Paul and the Pattern," 203; Denova, *Prophetic*, 166; Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 88; Clark, *Parallel*, 264.

¹⁹¹ Johnson, *Literary*, 59. Cf. Darr, *Herod*, 128-9: "It has become increasingly clear . . . that Jesus and the disciples/apostles are consistently depicted as Old Testament *prophets* in Luke's narrative." Cf. O'Reilly, *Sign*, 182-5; David P. Moessner, "The Christ Must': New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 28 (1986): 255; Minear, *Reveal*, 123; Tannehill, *Unity* 2: 33; Dillon, "Prophecy," 546.

sending of the Twelve with power and authority to carry on Jesus' own ministry of healing and preaching the kingdom of God is linked to the comment that Herod "heard about all that had taken place" and wondered who Jesus was—perhaps suggesting that the prophetic ministry of the disciples contributed to the reputation of Jesus as a prophet.¹⁹² In Luke 9:61-62, Jesus' response to a would-be disciple echoes Elijah's response to Elisha in 1 Kgs 19:20. In Luke 9:52-56, the disciples' request to call down fire from heaven as Elijah did, suggests that they associated themselves with the role of Elijah.¹⁹³ In Luke 10, the mission of the Twelve is extended to a mission of seventy others sent before Jesus to heal the sick and to proclaim, "The kingdom of God has come near to you" (10:9). The mission of the seventy is so closely related to Jesus' own work that those who reject the messengers reject Jesus (10:16). If Jesus was a prophet and the disciples shared in his mission, then a comparison of the apostles with the "company of prophets" from the Elijah-Elisha narratives is apt. On the other hand, the disciples are scarcely portrayed as those who have independent access to God or as those to whom God speaks. Jesus called the disciples blessed because they saw things that the prophets longed to see (10:21-24); they were also allowed to know the secrets of the kingdom (8:9-10); but in each case it was Jesus who mediated this information to them, and, characteristically, the disciples misunderstood what was revealed.¹⁹⁴ It is more accurate, then, to see the disciples in Luke as recipients of revelation mediated by a prophet than to regard them as prophets in

¹⁹² Luke 9:1-7. Moessner, *Lord*, 50; Nolland, *Luke*, 431. Mark 6:14 explains what it was that Herod "heard" by an awkward explanatory clause: καὶ ἤκουσεν ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης φανερόν γὰρ ἐγένετο τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. Luke 9:7 improves the style by replacing the explanatory clause with a more general statement about "all that had taken place": ἤκουσεν δὲ Ἡρώδης ὁ τετραάρχης τὰ γινόμενα πάντα.

¹⁹³ Cf. the discussion of Luke 9:52-56 in chapter five page 201 below.

¹⁹⁴ E.g., Luke 9:43-45; 18:31-34. Cf. Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 226-8, 253-74.

their own right.

After Pentecost, the twelve apostles are portrayed in ways that correspond to Luke's portrayal of prophets elsewhere. In addition to their central leadership responsibilities,¹⁹⁵ the apostles' primary function was to serve as witnesses of the life and especially of the resurrection of Jesus,¹⁹⁶ and to proclaim the word of God.¹⁹⁷ The apostles also performed miracles,¹⁹⁸ and were persecuted for their willingness to speak what God told them to say (Acts 5:29-32, 40-42). Jesus' promises of divine aid in speaking recall God's promises to provide similar speaking assistance to Moses and the biblical prophets.¹⁹⁹ In Acts 5:41 the apostles returned from the Sanhedrin rejoicing because "they were considered worthy to suffer dishonor for the sake of the name." Their joy illustrates the fulfillment of the fourth beatitude which instructed the mistreated to rejoice "for that is what their ancestors did to the *prophets*" (Luke 6:22-23). Peter, who often represents the apostles,²⁰⁰ spoke under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit (Acts 4:8);

¹⁹⁵ Acts 4:37; 6:1-6; 11:1; 15:6, 22-23; cf. 8:14.

¹⁹⁶ Acts 1:8; 1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39, 41; 13:31. Witness to Jesus' life is implied in 1:22; 10:39-41; 13:31.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. Acts 2:41; 4:4, 29, 31; 6:2, 4, 7; 8:25; 11:1. Acts 2:42 refers to the "teaching of the apostles."

¹⁹⁸ Acts 2:43; 5:12. Cf. Acts 4:33.

¹⁹⁹ "For the Holy Spirit will teach (διδάξει) you at that very hour what you ought to say" (Luke 12:12) is similar to Exod 4:12: "Now therefore go, and I will be with your mouth and teach you (LXX συμβιβάζω) what you shall speak." Cf. Isa 50:4. Luke 21:15 (ἐγὼ γὰρ δώσω ὑμῖν στόμα καὶ σοφίαν) is similar to statements in Exod 4:11 and Ezek 29:21: When Moses complained that he was slow of speech, God responded by asking, τίς ἔδωκεν στόμα ἀνθρώπῳ (Exod 4:11), and then promised that he would teach Moses what to say (cf. Danker, *Luke*, 332). When God promised to remove Ezekiel's muteness he declared, καὶ σοὶ δώσω στόμα ἀνεωγμένον ἐν μέσῳ αὐτῶν (Ezek 29:21; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 768). Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 192, claims, on the basis of Luke 21:15, that "the disciples as confessors will reproduce something of the character of Moses. The promise is fulfilled at Stephen's trial." For other passages where "mouth" and prophets are combined see 1 Kgs 17:24, Jer 1:9; Luke 1:70, Acts 1:16, 3:18, 21: 4:25. Jesus' assurance of physical protection (Luke 21:18) also echoes promises made by God to the biblical prophets. Cf. Exod 3:12; Jer 15:20; 1:8, 17, 19; 20:11; Dan 3:17-18. The idiom used in Luke 21:18 reappears in Acts 27:34; cf. 1 Sam 14:45, 2 Sam 14:11, 1 Kgs 1:52; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1341.

²⁰⁰ That Peter serves as a representative of the Twelve is obvious from Acts 2:14; 4:37-5:3; 5:12.

discerned the thoughts of Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:3, 9); had a vision (10:10-17), and was instructed what to do by the Spirit (10:19-20). Peter also performed healing miracles; he was the primary actor in the healing of the lame man (3:1-10), and his raising of Tabitha recalls Elisha's raising of the Shunammite woman's son from the dead.²⁰¹

Stephen and Philip, the two members of the Seven whose characters are developed, also share traits that Luke attributes to prophets. As members of the Seven, both Stephen and Philip are said to be "full of the Spirit and wisdom" (6:3). Both Stephen and the prophet Barnabas are described as being full of faith and the Holy Spirit (6:5; 11:24); "full of grace and power," Stephen "did great wonders and signs among the people" (6:8); like Moses who was raised "in all the wisdom of the Egyptians" and who was "mighty in his words and deeds" (Acts 7:22), Stephen spoke with such persuasiveness that his opponents "could not withstand the wisdom and the Spirit with which he spoke" (6:10). After talking about how his accusers always persecuted the prophets (7:52), Stephen himself was stoned to death.²⁰² Paul's comment about "the blood of your witness Stephen" in Acts 22:20 echoes Jesus' comment about "the blood of all the prophets."²⁰³ Moreover, when Philip "proclaimed the good news of the kingdom of God" in Samaria (8:12), he also performed "great signs and wonders" including exorcisms and healing the lame and paralyzed (8:7). He was later told by an "angel of

15, 29; 8:14. After Acts 9, Peter plays an independent role. Cf. Acts 15:7; Clark, *Parallel*, 128-9.

²⁰¹ Acts 9:36-43; 2 Kgs 4:32-37. See further note 223 below.

²⁰² Acts 7:58. Cf. Luke 13:34: "Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it!"

²⁰³ Cf. τὸ αἷμα πάντων τῶν προφητῶν τὸ ἐκκεχυμένον (Luke 11:50) and ὅτε ἐξεχύνητο τὸ αἷμα Στεφάνου τοῦ μάρτυρός σου (Acts 22:20). Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 391.

the Lord" to go down from Jerusalem to Gaza (8:26), and was instructed by the Spirit to approach the Ethiopian Eunuch's chariot (8:29). After the Ethiopian was baptized, "the Spirit of the Lord snatched (ἥρπασεν) Philip away."²⁰⁴

Perhaps, then, Luke expected his readers to recognize from his portrayal of Peter, Stephen, Philip, and the apostles that they were in fact prophets who proclaimed the word of God through the enabling of the Spirit. The members of the Twelve and the Seven certainly satisfy my definition of prophets as those who, by virtue of their nearness to God, are enabled by the Holy Spirit to have insight into matters hidden from other humans (cf. Acts 5:3), and (sometimes) to perform deeds beyond the ability of ordinary mortals (5:15-16); they were also empowered by the Holy Spirit to proclaim words of praise to God (4:23-31) and to address divinely-commissioned messages to other humans (cf. 5:29-32). In addition, these leaders share characteristics similar to those attributed by Luke to the biblical prophets; Luke has also drawn on imagery from biblical narratives about prophets in his more detailed portrayals of Peter and Philip. In fact, the apostles and the Seven appear more prophetic than other minor figures designated as prophets in Acts!²⁰⁵ However, the complete absence of προφήτης and its cognates in connection with the main characters in Acts (apart from Paul) should alert us to the possibility that Luke's interests lie elsewhere. I believe Luke's failure to identify members of the Twelve and the Seven as "prophets" reflects two fundamental transformations that take place

²⁰⁴ Acts 8:39. Although such an experience is never explicitly attributed to Elijah, both Obadiah (3 Kgdms 18:12) and the company of prophets (4 Kgdms 2:16) supposed that Elijah had similar experiences.

²⁰⁵ Cf. Hastings, *Prophet*, 139-40: "[T]he function of the prophet was replaced by that of the apostle-witness, a change of name which indicates a change in the structure of God's Church on earth. Prophets, named as such, remained in the Christian Church, and their function is not to be underestimated; but the name was acquiring a more specialized significance, and its bearer was subordinate to the apostle."

between Luke and Acts—the first is christological, the second has to do with Luke's assumptions about the role of prophets within the early Jesus movement.

Jesus as the Background to Acts

First, attempts to demonstrate that Luke presented the Apostles and the Seven—particularly Peter, Stephen and Philip—as prophets like Jesus miss the dramatic two-part christological reconfiguration that takes place between Luke and Acts. On the one hand, there is a shift in christological emphasis. While we have seen that Luke's Gospel gives considerable prominence to Jesus' prophetic role, Jesus is only identified as a prophet twice in Acts and, as I will argue in detail in chapter six, both Acts 3:22 and 7:37 refer to Jesus' *past* earthly role.²⁰⁶ Much like the inspired statements in the infancy narrative, Jesus' followers in Acts present their leader as the resurrected Lord and Messiah.²⁰⁷ While Jesus' followers in Acts are patterned after the Jesus of Luke's Gospel, the common argument that Jesus' disciples are presented as prophets like Jesus risks placing undue emphasis on a relatively minor feature of Luke's Christology. On the other hand, there is a shift in Luke's focus with respect to Jesus. Whereas the person of Jesus forms the centre of Luke's Gospel, and Scripture together with first century Judaism forms the background against which Luke's story is told, in Acts the scene has changed—not because Luke has extracted the early Jesus movement from Judaism, but because the figure of Jesus now fills the whole background.²⁰⁸ In other words, Luke's Gospel

²⁰⁶ See chapter six pages 243f. below.

²⁰⁷ Acts 2:36. Cf. Acts 5:42; 9:22; 10:36; 17:3; 18:5, 28; 26:23; 28:31. Cf. Bovon, *Theologian*, 179: "There is nothing surprising that when Jesus, the prophet, fulfills his mission in the Gospel, he yields up his place to the exalted Lord in the Acts." Cf. Henry J. Cadbury, "The Titles of Jesus in Acts," *BEGS* 5, 371; Busse, *Wunder*, 399.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (trans.

discusses the significance of Jesus primarily in light of Scripture and Jewish future expectations, while the book of Acts discusses the significance of the early Jesus movement primarily in light of Jesus.

Rather than identifying the apostles as prophets, many of the ostensible prophetic characteristics of church leaders in Acts arise from Luke's concern to highlight the similarity of Jesus' followers to Jesus.²⁰⁹ For example, just as it was necessary (δεῖ) for Jesus to preach the good news of the kingdom of God (Luke 4:43), so Peter and the other apostles refused to stop teaching in the name of Jesus because they were obligated (δεῖ) to obey God rather than people.²¹⁰ The fulfillment of Jesus' own promise—"I will give you a mouth and wisdom, which none of your adversaries will be able to withstand or contradict" (Luke 21:15)—was anticipated in the opposition Jesus faced after healing a crippled woman in a synagogue on the Sabbath (Luke 13:10-17), and narrated in the account of Stephen's conflict with the synagogue of the Freedmen.²¹¹ Although we have seen that the promise of divine assistance in trial echoes God's promises to the biblical prophets, the fulfillment of this prediction in Acts by disciples who speak in Jesus' name shows that Jesus himself continues his involvement in the ministry of his disciples as they

Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 59: "As the Christology of the gospel is constructed with the help of typological models (Elijah-Elisha and Moses), in Acts the destiny of the witnesses is woven into a Christological typology which aligns the life of the witnesses with the message they announce."

²⁰⁹ Many of these parallels between Jesus and his disciples in Acts are noted already in Cadbury, *Making*, 231-2.

²¹⁰ Acts 5:29. Cf. Luke 12:12; Acts 23:11.

²¹¹ In Luke-Acts ἀντίκειμαι occurs only in Luke 13:17, 21:15. Cf. ἀντιστῆναι in Luke 21:15, Acts 6:10. Elsewhere in Luke-Acts ἀνθίστημι only appears in Acts 13:8 where Elymas is unable to oppose Paul. Cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 997; Danker, *Luke*, 332.

bear witness to him.²¹²

The suffering of Jesus' followers in Acts also unites them with their resurrected Lord. In addition to announcing the necessity (δεῖ) of his own suffering²¹³ and predicting his own betrayal,²¹⁴ Jesus foretold the same fate for his disciples.²¹⁵ Just as Jesus predicted that his disciples would be brought before "synagogues, rulers, and authorities" and "kings and rulers,"²¹⁶ so Jesus himself stood on trial before Gentile rulers and authorities,²¹⁷ and was rejected in a synagogue (Luke 4:28). In Acts Jesus' prediction is fulfilled when his followers are rejected in synagogues and stand trial before Gentile rulers.²¹⁸ The links between Jesus and his followers are forcefully illustrated in the story of Peter's imprisonment during Passover, which contains numerous allusions back to the death of Jesus at Passover some years earlier.²¹⁹ Finally, the dying words of Stephen—"Lord Jesus, receive my Spirit"—recall Jesus' dying cry, "Father, into your hands I

²¹² References to speech in "the name of Jesus" in connection with Peter and John (Acts 4:17-18), the apostles (5:28, 40) and Saul (9:28), reinforce the close association between Jesus and the main characters of Acts that was established already by dominical sayings in Luke. See Luke 6:22; 9:24, 48; 10:16; 21:12, 17.

²¹³ Luke 13:33, 17:25, 22:37, 24:7, 26.

²¹⁴ Luke 9:44; 18:32; cf. 20:20; 22:4, 6, 21-22, 48; 24:7, 20; Acts 3:13.

²¹⁵ Luke 21:16. For the fulfillment see Acts 8:3. Cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 997.

²¹⁶ Luke 12:11-12 and 21:12-19.

²¹⁷ Cf. Luke 21:12 and Acts 4:27 as well as Luke 12:11 (prediction about Jesus' disciples) and 20:20 (statement about Jesus). Cf. Cadbury, *Making*, 231.

²¹⁸ Stephen was opposed in a synagogue (Acts 6:9), and Paul made his defence before the Gentiles, Felix and Festus, and before the Jewish king Agrippa. Cf. Acts 24:10, 25:8, 26:1-2, 24; 27:24; Tannehill, *Unity I*, 246; Evans, *Luke*, 195; Johnson, *Luke*, 195. Before recording Jesus' prediction that his disciples' opponents would "lay hands on" them (Luke 21:12), Luke had narrated the attempt by the scribes and chief priests to lay hands on Jesus (20:19); cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 995. For the fulfillment in Acts cf. 4:3; 5:18; 12:1; 21:27. Jesus' prediction of imprisonment (Luke 21:12) is fulfilled in Acts 5:18; 12:4; 16:23-40. Stephen (Acts 7:60) and James (Acts 12:2) are put to death in fulfillment of Luke 21:16.

²¹⁹ Acts 12:1-17. See Susan R. Garrett, "Exodus From Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24," *CBQ* 52 (1990): 672-7, for a convincing demonstration of the parallels between Jesus and Peter in Acts 12:1-17. Cf. Michael D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964), 43-5. Note also that before his denial of Jesus, Peter had insisted that he was ready to go to prison and death (Luke 22:33). In Acts, Peter is imprisoned during the time of Passover, only to escape death miraculously.

commit my spirit."²²⁰

The apostles, Stephen, and Philip are also linked to Jesus as workers of wonders and signs.²²¹ Like Jesus, Peter, Philip and Paul healed cripples; like Jesus, Peter and Paul healed the sick; and like Jesus, Peter, Philip and Paul performed exorcisms.²²² While Peter's raising of Tabitha is similar to the account of Elisha's raising of the Shunammite woman's son,²²³ Luke's reader's would remember that Jesus had also raised from the dead both the widow of Nain's son (Luke 7:11-17) and the daughter of Jairus (8:40-56). It must be admitted that there are few verbal parallels between Peter's raising of Tabitha and similar miracles performed by Jesus,²²⁴ and those that exist are less distinctive than the

²²⁰ Cf. Luke 23:46; Acts 7:59; Marguerat, *Historian*, 105: "Stephen's vision certifies the conformity of his martyrdom to the Passion of Jesus (Stephen not only dies *for* Jesus, he dies *like* him)." Cf. Acts 7:60 and Luke 23:34, though Luke 23:34 may well be a later insertion (for the text-critical issues see Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 180).

²²¹ Cf. Acts 2:22, 43; 5:12; 6:8; 8:6, 13. For a discussion of Moses' performance of "wonders and signs" (Acts 7:36) see chapter six below. At present it is sufficient to note that Jesus, the apostles, and Stephen are depicted as performing wonders and signs *before* Acts 7:36 links wonders and signs to Moses.

²²² Healing the lame: Peter (Acts 3:1-10; 9:32-35); Philip (8:7); Paul (14:8-18). Healing the sick: Peter (Acts 5:15-16); Paul (19:11-12). Exorcisms: Peter (Acts 5:16); Philip (8:7); Paul (16:16-18; 19:12).

²²³ The bodies of both Tabitha and the Shunammite's son are placed in the upper room (ὑπερῶν; 2 Kgdms 4:10; Acts 9:37); both Elisha and Peter are summoned (2 Kgdms 4:24-27; Acts 9:38); both Elisha and Peter go into the room alone and pray (2 Kgdms 4:33; Acts 9:40); and when Tabitha and the Shunammite's son are revived, both open their eyes 2 Kgdms 4:35: ἤνοιξεν τὸ παιδάριον τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ; Ac 9:40: ἤνοιξεν τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῆς.

²²⁴ The primary similarities are with Jesus' healing of Jairus's daughter: Both Jesus and Peter (as well as Elisha, see previous note) were asked to travel to the place where the miracle would be performed (Luke 8:41; Acts 9:38); mourners were present in both cases (Luke 8:52; Acts 9:39); Jesus prohibited all except the child's parents, Peter, James, and John from being present (Luke 8:51), while Peter prohibited everyone from entering (Acts 8:40); Jesus took the child by the hand (Luke 8:54), while Peter gave Tabitha his hand (Acts 9:41); Jesus said, "Child, get up! (ἡ παῖς, ἔγειρε)" (Luke 8:54), while Peter said, "Tabitha, get up" (Ταβιθά, ἀνάστηθι)" (Acts 9:40); both the widow's son in Luke 7:15 and Tabitha in Acts 9:40 sit up (ἀνεκάθισεν). In addition, ἐκβαλὼν δὲ ἔξω πάντας in Acts 8:40 has a close parallel in Mark's version of Jesus' raising of Jairus's daughter (ἐκβαλὼν πάντας; Mark 5:40), but is omitted in Luke's account. This may be coincidental (so Barrett, *Acts*, 485) or it may indicate that Luke (or his source) was more familiar with Mark's account than with Luke's own more smooth rendition of it, in which case it is clear that Luke (or his source) had Jesus' earlier miracle in mind. Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 127, remarks that Peter, like Jesus, raised the dead by verbal command while Elisha (and Paul) used "bodily contact" (cf. 4 Kgdms 4:34; Acts 20:10).

echoes of Elisha's raising of the Shunammite's son.²²⁵ Nevertheless, any resurrection miracle in Acts is bound to be more closely associated with Jesus than with Scripture—especially in a context in which Jesus' healing miracles have already been recalled. In this case, the similarities between Peter and Jesus in the story of Tabitha (Acts 9:36-43) are amplified by the clear similarities in the immediately preceding verses between Peter's healing of Aeneas the cripple (Acts 9:32-35) and Jesus' healing of a paralyzed man (Luke 5:17-26).²²⁶

Thus the apparent "prophetic" traits of the main characters in Acts seem more indebted to Luke's desire to connect Jesus' followers to Jesus than they are to a desire to present Jesus' followers as prophets in their own right. Of course, Luke could have considered his main characters in Acts as *prophets* who were like Jesus, since Luke also highlights similarities between Paul and Jesus,²²⁷ and I have argued that Luke depicts Paul as a prophet. Yet the failure to refer to the apostles and the Seven as προφήται suggests that Luke did not think of them as prophets.

²²⁵ It is difficult to determine the significance of the parallels between Peter and Elisha. Since the only resurrections narrated in Scripture are associated with Elijah and Elisha, Luke would necessarily echo these earlier accounts if he wished to tell resurrection miracles using a biblical style. Assuming that Luke is responsible for the biblical terminology, he may simply have found the biblical account amenable to a retelling of the tradition about Tabitha. Of course, Luke's decision to cast his story of Peter in a biblical style is significant, but in my view, Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 127, goes too far when he concludes that "Peter, like Elisha and Jesus, is a prophet 'powerful in work and word'" (cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 180). There may, however, be an attempt to show that "where miracles were concerned the Apostles could stand comparison with the great prophets of the Old Testament" (Haenchen, *Acts*, 341; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 478).

²²⁶ In both accounts the lame man is described as being paralyzed (ὁς ἦν παραλελυμένος; Acts 9:33; Luke 5:18; diff. Mark 2:3); Jesus tells the paralytic, "Stand up and take your bed (ἔγειρε καὶ ἄρας τὸ κλινίδιον σου) and go to your home" (Luke 5:24) while Peter tells the paralytic, "Get up and make your bed (ἀνάστηθι καὶ στρώσον σεαυτῷ)!" (Acts 9:34). In Luke 5:26 the people respond by glorifying God, while in Acts 9:35 all those who lived in Lydda and Sharon "turned to the Lord." Significantly, Peter tells Aeneas, "Jesus Christ heals you" (Acts 9:34).

²²⁷ Luke develops the Jesus-Paul typology to a greater extent than the parallels between Jesus and the other main characters in Acts. Both Jesus and Paul are required to make a long trip to Jerusalem which will result in suffering (Cadbury, *Making*, 232); Paul is called to suffer for Jesus' name (Acts 9:16); Isa 49:6 is applied to both Jesus and Paul and Barnabas (Luke 2:32; Acts 13:47).

Moreover, Luke's use of the title "prophet" in Acts contrasts with his portrayal of the prophets John and Jesus. In his Gospel, Luke does not question that John and Jesus were prophets, while in Acts Luke applies the term *προφήτης* only to minor characters (with the exception of Paul and Barnabas). Although it is apparent that Barnabas and Paul are also prophets, the title functions to associate them with other leaders in Antioch rather than to set them apart.²²⁸

To be sure, Luke was still deeply concerned to highlight the continuity between the early church, Scripture and traditional Jewish hopes, and he can still portray individual scenes, such as Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian and the circumstances surrounding Peter's raising of Tabitha, in a manner that recalls the biblical prophets. But the parallels between Jesus and the main characters in Acts are more prominent than the similarities between the main characters and the biblical prophets.²²⁹ Luke's christocentric method of characterization suggests that his main concern was to present the main characters in Acts as those who shared the mission and fate of Jesus, rather than to show that both Jesus and his disciples were prophets.²³⁰

The Role of Prophets in the Early Jesus Movement

There is almost complete overlap between the characteristics often associated by

²²⁸ It is the specific mission of Barnabas and Saul that distinguishes them (Acts 13:2, 4).

²²⁹ The portrayal of Stephen as a man characterized by wisdom (Acts 6:10) seems designed to point forward to the mention of Moses' (and Joseph's!) wisdom (Acts 7:10, 22) and thus forges a tighter connection between Stephen and the characters in his speech than is found in the minor echoes of the biblical prophets in connection with Philip and Peter. Cf. O'Reilly, *Sign*, 177. Still, the direct connections between Stephen's death and that of Jesus outweigh any resemblances between Stephen, Joseph and Moses.

²³⁰ This is not to say that Luke's method of characterization was motivated only by this one concern. As Clark, *Parallel*, 183-7, 274-7, 323-4, has shown, Luke was also concerned to highlight similarities between Paul and Peter, and Paul and Stephen. *Pace* Clark, *Parallel*, 269-72, however, my point is that the purpose of attributing "prophetic" characteristics to the main characters of Acts is to tie the disciples to Jesus—not to identify them all as *προφήται* who follow the Deuteronomistic pattern of the persecuted prophet. See further chapter six page 288f. below.

Luke with prophets, and the way in which the main characters in Acts are portrayed.

Indeed, we may go further and state that the prophetic tenor of the church in Acts after Pentecost makes it difficult to distinguish those designated "prophets" from other members of the early Jesus movement on the basis of their characteristics alone.²³¹

However, the reason why the Twelve and the Seven are not designated prophets may be explained, in my view, by the second shift in perspective reflected in Luke's use of προφητ- terminology, which arises from Luke's understanding of the role and relative status of prophets within the early church. Though such prophets as Agabus, Judas, and Silas performed leadership roles within the church, the status of these prophets was lower than that of members of the Twelve and the Seven, which may explain why Luke does not refer to members of the Twelve or the Seven by the more general and less prestigious designation "prophet." While Philip's behaviour is reminiscent of prophets, he is introduced as one of the Seven and "the evangelist" (Acts 21:8). Stephen is introduced as one of the Seven and as a "witness" (Acts 22:20) rather than as a prophet. Paul and Barnabas are the only main characters in Acts who are given the title προφήτης, but they belong neither to the Seven nor to the Twelve and they are given the title along with other disciples at Antioch.

Although there is continuity between the biblical prophets and the Christ-believing apostles, and although it would be possible, in theory, to be both an apostle and

²³¹ Cf. Boring, *Sayings*, 38: "Though Luke does recognize certain persons in the church who function consistently as prophets (whom he so designates), he does not draw a sharp line between prophets and non-prophets."

a prophet in the same way that Jesus was both prophet and Messiah,²³² and although the social role of apostle may have overlapped somewhat with the social role of prophet, Luke appears either not to have regarded members of the Twelve and the Seven as prophets at all or to have regarded the title as insignificant. Luke's use of προφητ-terminology thus reflects the more limited status of Christ-believing prophets as compared with the apostles and Luke's other main characters. It is not that the Twelve and the Seven do not bear prophetic characteristics; it is that their role in the early Jesus movement was much greater than the role played by most Christ-believing prophets.²³³

Conclusion

Luke does not use technical terminology with great precision,²³⁴ but with the exception of Abel in Luke 11:51, he does not employ the title "prophet" unpredictably. "Prophets" may be defined as those who, by virtue of their nearness to God, are enabled by the Holy Spirit to have insight into matters hidden from other humans and (sometimes) to perform deeds beyond the ability of ordinary mortals; prophets are also empowered by the Holy Spirit to proclaim words of praise to God or to address divinely-commissioned messages to other humans. The verb προφητεύω tends to appear in contexts in which a limited or unusual instance of "prophesying" occurs. The noun

²³² Paul, for instance, is identified as a prophet in Acts 13:1, an apostle in Acts 14:4, 14, and a witness in Acts 22:15; 26:16. See above note 136.

²³³ In Luke 11:49-51 Luke coordinates the roles and the fate of prophets and apostles, but he does not combine the two. The examples of Abel and Zechariah in Luke 11:50-51 suggests that "prophets" in Luke 11:49 refers to the biblical prophets (*contra* E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* [London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974], 173). Since there was no biblical category of ἀπόστολος, this second term will refer to the Twelve, although the word may originally have been used in its pre-Lukan context as "a comprehensive designation for messengers of God" (Nolland, *Luke*, 668; cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 950, Green, *Luke*, 75). Cf. Matt 23:34.

²³⁴ Cf. Ellis, "Prophet," 63.

προφήτης, conversely, designates an ongoing role. Luke's own view of prophets seems identical to the views about prophets attributed to Jewish characters in his narrative except that Luke believed both Jesus and John were more than mere prophets. Since Luke does not identify all disciples as prophets, the presence of characteristics or activities (including "prophesying") commonly associated with prophets does not in itself establish that a given figure is a prophet, though a combination of several of these characteristics may imply that a prophet is in view.

The complete absence of the title προφήτης from the Twelve and the Seven suggests that Luke did not think of members of these elite groups as prophets even though their activities were similar to those performed by other prophets. Luke does not refrain from using the title out of deference to the biblical prophets, because he does use the term; he applies it to relatively minor characters such as Agabus, and as we will see in the next chapter, he goes out of his way to highlight the similarities between Christ-believing prophets and their biblical counterparts.

Chapter Four: Prophets and the Three-fold Division of Salvation History

Hans Conzelmann's claim that Luke adjusted to the delay of the Parousia by envisioning three separate epochs of salvation history has been rightly criticized,¹ but both Conzelmann, and Heinrich von Baer before him, correctly observed that Luke distinguished in various ways between Israel's past, Jesus' earthly life, and the time after Jesus' ascension.² While Conzelmann emphasized the separateness of the three epochs, he also argued that "there is no break between them, for the elements in the former one persist into the next,"³ and that "it is prophecy in particular that creates the continuity" between the three periods.⁴ Still, Conzelmann maintained that the prophets themselves were distinguished from each other by the focus of their predictions: The prophets of the period of Israel predicted the coming of Christ, while "in the second period Jesus' prophecy extends to the Kingdom of God."⁵

Conzelmann's proposal is clearly inadequate, for we have already seen that the prophets of the past foretold "the time of universal restoration" associated with the Messiah's second coming rather than limiting their predictions to the first coming of Jesus.⁶ Nevertheless, Conzelmann is to be commended for compelling interpreters to ask what differences Luke saw among the prophets Samuel, Simeon and Silas besides the passage of time. Luke is the only Gospel writer whose story of Jesus includes the period

¹ For criticisms of Conzelmann's thesis, see Paul S. Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (eds. Leander E. Keck, and J. Louis Martyn; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1966, repr. 1999), 120-30; Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975), 9-12; Marshall, *Historian*, 84-8.

² Cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 76-79, 48-49, 208-9; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 150.

³ Conzelmann, *Theology*, 161.

⁴ Conzelmann, *Theology*, 150.

⁵ Conzelmann, *Theology*, 150, cf. 159 note 1.

⁶ Acts 3:21. Cf. chapter three page 87 above. *Contra* Conzelmann, *Theology*, 161.

immediately prior to Jesus' birth, and who also details the initial progress of the Jesus movement after its leader's departure. By comparing and contrasting Luke's presentation of prophets and prophetic activity in these three periods, we will be able to answer an additional question which Conzelmann did not address, namely, into which period does the prophetic activity of the infancy narrative belong? Do Simeon and Anna illustrate what Luke believed to be characteristic of prophets (including the biblical prophets) in the period of Israel,⁷ do they represent a new reawakening of prophecy that marks the beginning of the time of fulfillment for which the biblical prophets awaited,⁸ or do they represent what was considered normal prophetic activity in the post-biblical era before the coming of Christ?⁹ The answers to these questions have the potential also to uncover aspects of Luke's understanding of the relationship between the church's present and Israel's past.

While these questions have been touched on in a preliminary way during the

⁷ Cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 49; C. K. Barrett, *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1947), 124-5; Tatum, "Epoch of Israel," 189-90; G. Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit force de l'église: Sa nature et son activité d'après les Actes des Apôtres* (trans. J. Romero; Paris: Cerf, 1975), 167; George, "L'Esprit Saint," 514, 533-4; Chevallier, "l'Esprit," 15; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 319. Cf. Jervell, "Sons," 102. Note that the association of the infancy narrative with the period of Israel may coincide with the view that Luke believed prophecy had ceased. According to some adherents of this view, the prophetic activity of Luke 1-2 is depicted as a final irruption of the spirit of prophecy in the period of Israel (cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 48-9; Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit*, 167).

⁸ Minear, "Birth Stories," 120: "Surely the whole sequence of events from the conception of John to the arrival of Paul in Rome belongs within the orbit of Luke's testimony to the ways in which God is pouring out his Spirit 'on all flesh.'" The following writers mention the standard view in connection with Luke-Acts or claim that Luke presents the reawakening of prophecy—or both: Dabek, "Siehe," 180; Hastings, *Prophet*, 24 cf. 50, 83; Grundmann, *Lukas*, 160; Carruth, "Jesus-as-Prophet," 96; Franklin, *Christ*, 80; Minear, *Reveal*, 74; Lampe, *Spirit*, 65; Haya-Prats, *L'Esprit*, 167; Hill, *Prophecy*, 94; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 214; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 46; Evans, *Luke*, 248; Menzies, *Pneumatology*, 118; Bovon, *Luke*, 128 cf. 35; Shelton, *Mighty*, 171; Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 39, 69; Clark, *Parallel*, 270. Others who argue in various ways that the infancy narrative anticipates Pentecost include Lampe, *Spirit*, 65; Franklin, *Christ*, 80; Menzies, *Pneumatology*, 133; Shelton, *Mighty*, 25-6; Stronstad, *Prophethood*, 39; cf. Cadbury, *Making*, 269; Brown, *Birth*, 243, 466, 499; Ravens, *Luke*, 28.

⁹ Cf. Johannes Lindblom, *Gesichte und Offenbarungen: Vorstellungen von göttlichen Weisungen und übernatürlichen Erscheinungen im ältesten Christentum* (Lund: Gleerup, 1968), 171-3; Turner, *Power*, 164-5.

previous chapter's survey of the evidence, the purpose of this chapter is to draw the various threads together and to deal with possible objections. I will argue that the prophets of the infancy narrative belong in the period of expectation, even as they border on the time of fulfillment. Luke certainly believed that the past prophets mentioned in Scripture and responsible for its composition belonged to a distinct group, and he recognized the existence of greater and lesser prophets, but he did not think that prophecy ceased at the end of the biblical period only to be revived again around the time of Jesus' birth. The overwhelming similarities in the way Luke portrayed prophets across the sweep of salvation history suggests further that he would not have equated biblical prophets with great prophets and post-biblical prophets (before the time of fulfillment) with lesser prophets. There is little evidence that Luke thought the characteristic behaviours, abilities, and experiences of prophets differed by virtue of the period in which they lived.

Did Prophecy Cease?

The frequency of divine-human communication in the infancy narrative convinces many interpreters that Luke 1-2 depicts a reawakening of prophecy, or at least a preliminary revival of prophecy that anticipates Pentecost.¹⁰ Gabriel appears to Zechariah in a vision (Luke 1:22) predicting that Zechariah will have a son who will be like the great prophet Elijah (Luke 1:15, 17); Gabriel appears to Mary informing her that she will give birth to the Son of God (Luke 1:35); John the Baptist leaps prophetically in his mother's womb; Elizabeth is filled with the Holy Spirit (Luke 1:41-42); after John's

¹⁰ See note 8 above.

birth his father prophesies (1:67), predicting that John will become a "prophet of the Most High" (1:76). The whole narrative is pervaded by joy, excitement, wonder, and awe.

Those who are on the watch for the "consolation of Israel" (2:25) and the "redemption of Jerusalem" (2:38) announce that the time of waiting is over. Given Luke's keen interest in the Holy Spirit and prophecy, and the intensity of prophetic activity at the very time when Israel's hopes are finally beginning to be realized, one can readily understand how some readers conclude that Luke is also signalling the eschatological return of prophecy.

This interpretation is supported by the following considerations: First, when Luke refers to the "prophets" he normally has the biblical prophets in view, which might suggest that he believed the prophets as a group belonged to the distant past.¹¹ Second, the fact that the people respond to the prophetic activity of John the Baptist with the question, "Are you the Messiah?" might suggest that the very existence of a prophet was enough to arouse questions about his eschatological role. Third, while Mark's report that Jesus was regarded as a prophet "like one of the prophets" (6:15) may imply that the Markan Jesus was compared to prophets among his contemporaries,¹² Luke has it that Jesus was reputed to be "one of the ancient prophets" (Luke 9:8). This could be taken as evidence that the people, as Luke portrays them, believed true prophets belonged either in the past or the eschatological future.¹³

Nevertheless, we may be confident that Luke did not think prophecy had ceased only to be restored at the births of John and Jesus, and that he did not present belief in the

¹¹ See on page 168.

¹² Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 117-8.

¹³ Cf. Bovon, *Luke*, 350: "Everyone is surprised at the new efflorescence of the prophecy that they had believed extinguished, and everyone measures it against the standard of the past." Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, 200 on Luke 7:16.

cessation of prophecy as a common Jewish conviction. First, and most significantly, Luke portrayed Simeon and Anna as prophets who were active well *before* Jesus' birth rather than as prophets who began to be active after John and Jesus were born.¹⁴ Second, the existence of prophets did not automatically lead the Jews in Luke's story to the conclusion that the end was at hand. Questions were raised about the Messianic status of John the Baptist during his ministry (Luke 3:15), and Jesus confirmed that John had an eschatological role to play (7:26); but after John's death when any end-times expectations in connection with him would have faded among the crowds, Luke claimed that all the people still held John to be a prophet (20:6). Against the suggestion that Jesus was identified as an "ancient" prophet because contemporary prophets were believed absent (Luke 9:8), the popular identification of Jesus with one of the "ancient prophets" may well imply that other contemporary prophets were known to exist.¹⁵

Furthermore, Jewish characters in other passages betray no awareness of a belief that prophecy had ceased. Simon the Pharisee proceeds by evaluating Jesus' reputed prophetic ability rather than denying the possibility that prophets existed when he muses, "If this man were a prophet he would know what sort of woman it is who is touching him."¹⁶ If the mere existence of prophets was a sign of the end times, Simon could have questioned Jesus' reputation as a prophet in order to avoid admitting that Jesus was an eschatological figure, but although Jesus' perception of Simon's thoughts effectively puts

¹⁴ Cf. chapter three page 98f. and 140f. above.

¹⁵ Cf. Gerhard Dellling, "ἄρχω, κτλ.," *TDNT* 1:487: "In Lk. 9:8, 19 the reference is to 'one of the ancient prophets,' who evoke implicit trust in contrast to contemporaries who come with a prophetic claim."

¹⁶ Luke 7:39. Cf. Urbach, "מתי," 5, who observes that if most Jews believed that prophecy had ceased we would expect the cessation of prophecy to be employed in Pharisaic polemic against Jesus the prophet: "בויכוח החריף עם הפרושים בבשורות הנוצרות אין שום סימן לדעה הטוענת שהנבואה פסקה ומשום כך אין גם שום אפשרות לפעולתו של נביא חדש."

to rest any doubts about Jesus' prophetic ability (7:4), it is Jesus' power to forgive sins rather than the revelation of his supernatural insight that prompts a surprised response from Simon's guests (7:49). Similarly, it was not Jesus' self-identification as a prophet that provoked the anger of his hometown, but (among other things) his refusal to perform miracles.¹⁷ Although those who witnessed the resuscitation of the widow's son proclaimed that Jesus was a "great prophet" (7:16), and some came to identify Jesus with one of the "ancient prophets" (9:8), Luke presents these responses to Jesus as part of a process of discovery that begins with popular regard for Jesus as an ordinary prophet rather than as an eschatological prophet. Finally, the Jewish "false prophet" Bar-Jesus, who opposed the prophets Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:6), serves as additional evidence for Luke's belief that non-eschatological prophets (albeit of doubtful character) existed within Second Temple Judaism.¹⁸

In conclusion, the prophetic activity in the infancy narrative suits the aura of fulfillment surrounding the births of John and Jesus, but it is not itself a part of that fulfillment. The fact that Luke portrays the people as going out into the desert to see the prophet John (Luke 7:26) implies that prophets were uncommon, but Luke does not characterize the time before Jesus' birth as an era marked by a complete cessation of prophets or prophecy, nor does he suggest that Jewish future hopes included a belief in

¹⁷ The cause of Jesus' conflict with his Nazareth audience is debated (see discussion in Tannehill, *Unity I*, 68-73), but it was manifestly not Jesus' self-identification as a prophet in 4:24.

¹⁸ Cf. Lindblom, *Offenbarungen*, 171. See the discussion of Bar-Jesus in chapter three page 117f. above. Theudas and the Egyptian, two characters whom Josephus characterizes as false prophets, are mentioned in Acts 5:36 and 21:38 respectively, but since Luke betrays no awareness that they claimed to be prophets, it cannot be assumed that he regarded them as prophets (*contra* Denova, *Prophetic*, 208).

the return of prophecy.¹⁹

The Case for an Intertestamental Period

It does not necessarily follow from the continuation of prophecy that Luke classed the prophets of the infancy narrative together with the biblical prophets in the "period of Israel," for it is also possible—as Max Turner contends—that Simeon and Anna represent characters who lived in what Luke believed to be a period after the biblical prophets and before the coming of the Messiah:

I would not wish to dispute that Luke sees *some* sort of analogy between the Spirit's activity in the Old Testament, in Luke 1-2, and in the body of Luke-Acts, in the various gifts of inspired speech. But . . . it seems to be the general, phenomenological and inevitable analogy, produced by a common context; there is no evidence that he has deliberately sharpened or highlighted the analogy. The existence of this phenomenon does not serve to break down the differences in the way the Spirit was active in the successive phases of salvation; it merely permits a (somewhat uncontroversial!) common factor.²⁰

Turner compares the prophetic activity of Luke 1-2 to texts external to Luke—the Septuagint and other Jewish literature from the Second Temple period and beyond—demanding (but not finding) positive evidence that Luke consciously shaped his portrayal of Simeon, Mary, Elizabeth, and Zechariah in terms of the biblical prophets rather than in terms of expected Second Temple prophetic behaviour. Turner concludes that Luke's portrayal of prophets in the infancy narrative is closer to other depictions of inspired activity in the Second Temple period than it is to the prophetic activity attested in Jewish Scripture. With the exception of John the Baptist, who "breaks the mould and deserves the description 'eschatological prophet,'" Luke 1-2 reflects "the typical Jewish experience

¹⁹ The prediction of widespread prophesying in Joel 3:1-2 (cf. Acts 2:17-18) does not require that prophecy had ceased beforehand.

²⁰ Turner, *Power*, 165. Cf. Lindblom, *Offenbarungen*, 173.

of prophecy at a turning point or crisis in the nation's history."²¹

While it is helpful to inquire whether Luke depicts the prophets of the infancy narrative in terms of the biblical prophets as they are portrayed in the Septuagint, Turner fails to consider whether Luke's own conception of the biblical prophets differed from the way prophets are portrayed in the Septuagint. Because Luke's portrayal of both ancient and more recent prophets was undoubtedly affected by his contemporary environment, it is more important to compare Luke's portrayal of post-biblical prophetic figures with his *own* depiction of the biblical prophets than it is to compare his portrayal of post-biblical prophetic figures with the Septuagint and other Second Temple texts. The possibility that the birth narrative prophets resemble Second Temple prophetic activity more than prophetic activity described in the Septuagint is only significant to the extent that Luke's portrayal of the birth narrative prophets diverges from his portrayal of the biblical prophets. The comparative analysis to follow will critically examine Turner's contention that the prophets of the infancy narrative are portrayed as distinct from both the biblical prophets and prophetic activity after Pentecost.

Comparing Prophets in the Distant and More Recent Past

For heuristic reasons the following discussion will refer to four periods of salvation history: the period of the biblical prophets, the period of the infancy narrative, the period of Jesus, and the period of the church. After assessing the similarities and differences between prophets in these "periods" it will be possible to determine whether

²¹ Turner, *Power*, 164. Turner, *Power*, 149 concedes that Simeon's "relatively permanent endowment of the Spirit of prophecy . . . would be rare in Judaism," but claims, "there were examples of the claim even among the rabbis."

Luke actually differentiated between prophets in this way.

Distinguishing Features of the Biblical Prophets

Luke frequently refers to the "prophets" as a group whose boundaries are normally (though not always) clearly restricted to the past. Often listed along with the Law, the προφῆται may denote a collection of written texts that had attained scriptural status,²² and are normally associated with ancestors rather than contemporaries of characters in Luke's narrative.²³ Peter claims that "all the prophets . . . predicted these days" (Acts 3:24), and refers to his audience as "sons of the prophets" (Acts 3:25); Stephen asks, "Which of the prophets did your *ancestors* not persecute?" (7:52); and when Jesus lists the first and apparently the last of "the prophets" who were persecuted, he mentions Abel and Zechariah—two figures from the distant past (Luke 11:50-51).²⁴ In all likelihood the formation of the "prophets" as a collection of writings regarded as Scripture contributed to the use of the term "prophets" to denote a fairly well-defined group of past prophets. The belief that many of the prophets wrote parts of Scripture must also have contributed to a conviction that the "prophets" were distinct from later figures who played no role in the formation of Scripture.²⁵

It is because of these differences between the biblical prophets and those who

²² Cf. Luke 16:16, 29, 31; 18:31; 24:27, 44; Acts 7:42; 13:15, 27, 40; 15:15; 24:14; 26:22; 28:23. See further discussion in chapter three page 86 above.

²³ According to Luke 1:70 and Acts 3:21, the "holy prophets" were "from of old (ἀπ' αἰῶνος)." Cf. Luke 9:8 (προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων); diff. Mark 6:15. Cf. Luke 10:24, par. Matt 13:17; Acts 13:32-33: "What God promised to our ancestors he has fulfilled for us, their children, by raising Jesus."

²⁴ Cf. Luke 6:23 (diff. Matt 5:12); Luke 11:47 (diff. Mat 23:29). In both Luke 6:23 and 11:47, the mention of πατέρες in Luke's version accentuates the connection with Israel's ancestors. Cf. Acts 7:52; Marshall, *Luke*, 255.

²⁵ Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 116. Luke, however, clearly did not hold that only the "kind of prophets who wrote holy books" could be classified as prophets.

succeeded them that Turner and others think Luke presented the prophetic activity in the infancy narrative in terms of expected Second Temple experience rather than in terms of what the biblical prophets were thought to experience. If it were not for the evidence from the infancy narrative that prophets continued after the end of the biblical period, there would be little reason to conclude that references to the "prophets" include any figures other than the biblical prophets. But although we may presume that the "prophets" normally denote those individuals in Scripture who were widely regarded as prophets—and not merely all the righteous people of the past²⁶—there is some evidence that the outer boundary of the "prophets" may not have been clearly or consistently defined. While Abel and Zechariah appear to delimit the first and last of all the persecuted prophets whom God sent (Luke 11:49), Jesus later includes himself among the persecuted prophets, stating, "It is impossible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem."²⁷ No doubt the saying about "all the prophets" who will join the patriarchs in the kingdom of God (Luke 13:28) evokes the biblical prophets first of all, yet prophets in addition to the biblical prophets are not definitely excluded. Similarly, Peter's claim that "all the prophets, as many as have spoken . . . predicted these days" refers in the first place to the *biblical* prophets Samuel and those after him (Acts 3:24), but only the first of Moses' successors is mentioned; the precise identity of "all the prophets" after Samuel is not clearly specified.²⁸ In any case, even though the biblical prophets formed a distinct

²⁶ *Contra* Barton, *Oracles*, 96. See the discussion in chapter three page 90 above.

²⁷ Luke 13:33-34. In Acts 7:52, the persecuted prophets are in the past, and Stephen's audience is accused of killing the "righteous one" predicted by the prophets.

²⁸ According to Luke 16:16 (diff. Matt 11:13), "the law and the prophets were until John." If the verse stated only that the prophets were until John, we might well surmise that the prophets continued to exist until John, but the juxtaposition of law and prophets suggests that the saying concerns written

group, Luke could still have classed Simeon and Anna in the same general era as the biblical prophets.

On the other hand, John Barton has claimed that most Second Temple Jews believed the main difference between contemporary inspired figures and the great prophets of the past was precisely that "great" prophets belonged in the past:

In people with little historical sense it is the most natural thing in the world to assume that the past was in all essentials like the present, only longer ago. . . . The ancient prophets were holier, more profoundly inspired, in every way greater than anything we have today: but they were not of a radically different kind.²⁹

While it is true that the biblical prophets, as Luke portrays them, are not "of a radically different kind" than prophets in other eras, Luke's conception of the biblical prophets does not seem greatly influenced by a nostalgia for the past biblical era.³⁰ Far from representing a golden age of the past, the biblical prophets were rejected by their contemporaries, and joined with others in their longing for the future realization of God's promises to Israel.³¹ Simeon and Anna share with the biblical prophets their earnest hope that God will fulfill his promises to Israel; they are distinguished from the biblical prophets in that they live to see the initial fulfillment of this hope.

Barton's point is, of course, that the biblical prophets were deemed more inspired than their successors, not that their messages were universally accepted. One way in

Scripture (implicitly from the past). Conzelmann, *Theology*, 16, rested on Luke 16:16 much of his argument that the period of Israel extended until John, but though it does state that something radically new occurs beginning with John that contrasts with the law and the prophets, Luke's version of the saying does not make clear in what sense the law and the prophets continued until John. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1114-8, for further discussion.

²⁹ Barton, *Oracles*, 125, cf. 115.

³⁰ This is admitted as a possibility by Barton, *Oracles*, 116. For the importance of nostalgia for the past, see Barton, *Oracles*, 115.

³¹ Cf. Luke 10:24; par. Matt 13:17; Luke 1:69-71; Acts 3:24-25; 13:32; 26:27.

which prophets of the past were regarded as superior to inspired figures of the Second Temple period, according to Barton, is that the great ancient prophets predicted events to transpire in the distant future, while other inspired figures proclaimed messages for their contemporaries.³² But Luke does not seem aware of a distinction between past prophets who predicted only the distant future and more recent inspired figures who spoke to their contemporaries. Luke knows, for instance, that the Babylonian exile—an event that occurred during the time period in which the biblical prophets were active—was predicted by the "book of the prophets" (Acts 7:42), and it was simply as a prophet that David was able to foresee the resurrection of the Messiah.³³ Moreover, even though most biblical prophecies quoted in Luke-Acts are applied to the present circumstances of Jesus and the church, one need only consider the many statements about prophets who were rejected by their contemporaries to realize that Luke was fully aware of the past mission of the biblical prophets.³⁴

Obviously not all the prophets were considered equal, for the crowd responds to Jesus' resuscitation of the widow's son by exclaiming, "A *great* prophet has risen among us" (Luke 7:16), and in Luke 9:7-8 Jesus' miracles prompt speculation that he was "one of the ancient prophets" who had *arisen* from the dead.³⁵ Since both responses were

³² Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 199: "To put it as strikingly as possible, a 'prophet' for many people in our period meant what much modern scholarship would describe as an apocalypticist: someone who had a long-term view of world history, whose details had been revealed to him supernaturally by God."

³³ Acts 2:30 (προφήτης οὗν ὑπάρχων). See further chapter three page 94 above. That Luke was aware of debates about the correct time referent of predictions is shown by the Eunuch's question, "About whom, may I ask you, does the prophet say this, about himself or about someone else?" (Acts 8:34).

³⁴ See chapter three page 87 above.

³⁵ Luke 9:7-9 (προφήτης τις τῶν ἀρχαίων ἀνέστη). Since the reference is to "ancient prophets," presumably their only possible manner of appearing was through resurrection from the dead. Cf. Schürmann, *Lukas* 1, 507; Marshall, *Luke*, 356; Nolland, *Luke*, 432; Öhler, *Elia*, 185; *pace* Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 759; Green, *Luke*, 352 note 25.

provoked by Jesus' miracles, it is possible to connect "ancient prophets" and "great" prophets, concluding that ancient prophets—in contrast to contemporary inspired figures—were commonly regarded as those who were able to perform miracles.³⁶ In support, one might observe that while Luke attributes miracles to the biblical prophets, miracles are not connected to prophets in the infancy narrative and, with the exception of Paul, they are not attributed to prophets in Acts.³⁷

While the reference to the eschatological return of Elijah³⁸ in the immediate context (9:8) might imply that the resurrection of an "ancient prophet" was also regarded as an eschatological event,³⁹ this is not certain. The conclusion that Jesus was a resurrected prophet from the past might mean only that great miracle-working prophets were perceived to be absent in the present. In this case Luke 9:8 reflects nostalgia for the past, but the identification of Jesus with *one* of the "ancient prophets" who would be able to perform miracles such as those that Jesus did says nothing about popular regard for all ancient prophets. While the acclamation of Jesus as a "great" prophet (7:16) may imply that the common people, as Luke portrays them, believed "great" prophets no longer existed, Luke 7:16 confirms only that prophets who could raise the dead were considered "great" prophets. The verse does not mean that Luke—or the common people in Luke's Gospel—held that all the biblical prophets were "great."⁴⁰ The relative greatness of prophets was more likely tied to their abilities, than to the era in which they appeared. In

³⁶ Cf. Barton, *Oracles*, 99-100, who does not link Luke 7:16 and 9:8, but cites 9:7-9 as evidence for the view that ancient prophets were "idealized hero[es]."

³⁷ *Biblical prophets*: Elijah and Elisha (Luke 4:25-27). *Jesus' ministry* (Luke 4:23-24). *After Pentecost*: Paul in a prophetic context (Acts 13:9-12).

³⁸ Cf. chapter five.

³⁹ Cf. Cullmann, *Christology*, 34-5; Schürmann, *Lukas 1*, 507; Nolland, *Luke*, 432.

⁴⁰ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 658.

order to establish that Luke believed the biblical prophets were superior to their successors in the Second Temple period, one would need to show that Luke's portrayal of the prophetic activity in the infancy narrative was different from Luke's portrayal of the activities of the biblical prophets.

Distinguishing Features of Prophets During Jesus' Ministry and After Pentecost

The frequency of prophetic and angelic activity in the infancy narrative does contrast with the main body of Luke's Gospel in which divine-human communication is restricted almost exclusively to two prophets, John and Jesus.⁴¹ In contrast to Simeon and Anna, John and Jesus are presented as extraordinary prophets, with Jesus identified by the crowds as a "great prophet" (7:16), and John identified by Jesus as "more than a prophet" (7:26). A third and related distinguishing feature concerns the Holy Spirit's close association with Jesus to the exclusion of other figures. While the birth narrative mentions the Holy Spirit in connection with John, Mary, Elizabeth, Zechariah and Simeon,⁴² the Spirit is associated with Jesus alone in the body of Luke; his disciples receive the Holy Spirit only after Jesus' ascension.⁴³

The question whether other true prophets continued to exist during Jesus' life is not addressed, but—if Luke considered the question (which is perhaps doubtful)—it is unlikely that he would have envisaged a sudden cessation of all other prophecy apart from John and Jesus. The portrayal of Jesus as the (only) Spirit-bearer is rather a matter of perspective. In the same way that Luke removes John from the scene immediately

⁴¹ Exceptions include the voice from heaven in Luke 3:22 and 9:35; the appearance of Moses and Elijah at the transfiguration (9:28-35); and the two men at the tomb in Luke 24:1-8.

⁴² Luke 1:15, 35, 41, 67; 2:25-27.

⁴³ Cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 71-2. The Spirit is promised or mentioned in connection with the disciples in Luke 11:13 (diff. Matt 7:11); 12:10 (par. Mark 3:29), 12:12 (cf. Mark 13:11). Cf. Luke 24:49.

before Jesus' baptism by mentioning John's arrest and then narrating Jesus' baptism in the passive voice,⁴⁴ so throughout his Gospel Luke focuses all attention on Jesus as the Spirit-anointed Messiah and prophet.⁴⁵ The emphasis placed on the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost affords an additional reason why the Spirit is not associated with the disciples during Jesus' ministry.⁴⁶

As was noted in chapter three, the main difference between Luke's depiction of prophetic experience in the narrative of Acts and prophetic experience in earlier periods is that prophets and especially prophetic activity are portrayed as more prominent after Pentecost than in the immediate past. This widespread prophetic activity results from the pouring out of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, and is not limited to individuals characterized as prophets. The identification of Elymas as a "false prophet" suggests that from Luke's perspective, true prophets now belong only in the community of Jesus' disciples.

There are other distinctions between prophets in the different periods, but their significance is far from clear. For example, prophetic signs or symbolic actions⁴⁷ and (if we include the account of Paul in Acts 13:1-9) miracles⁴⁸ are associated with prophets in every period except for the infancy narrative. One could argue that characteristics common to all periods except the infancy narrative demonstrate that Simeon and Anna

⁴⁴ Luke 3:20-22. Cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 56; Conzelmann, *Theology*, 21.

⁴⁵ As Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 227-8 notes, "It is hard to explain why the Spirit never appears in the final part of the travel account . . . in the story of Jesus' Jerusalem ministry . . . in the passion narrative, or in the resurrection narrative."

⁴⁶ Cf. von Baer, *Geist*, 72; Turner, *Power*, 341.

⁴⁷ *Biblical prophets*: Jonah (Luke 11:32). *Jesus' ministry* (Acts 2:22). *After Pentecost*: Agabus (Acts 21:11).

⁴⁸ Cf. note 37 above.

were in some way less than prophets in other periods,⁴⁹ but the absence of these characteristics in Luke 1-2 is more likely a result of the topics with which Luke is there concerned, and to the disproportionately small space allotted to the prophets in the infancy narrative, than it is a sign of inferior prophetic experience.

A similar explanation accounts for other minor divergences in the way prophets are portrayed. If Paul and his companions are left out of consideration, persecution is only directly associated with the biblical prophets, as well as John and Jesus.⁵⁰ But this is because Anna, Simeon, and—with the exception of Paul and his companions—the Christ-believing prophets in Acts are all depicted as addressing receptive audiences. Prophetic proclamation that issues in a call to repentance is attested only in connection with the biblical prophets, John and Jesus (all of whom addressed Israel)—no doubt because of the common Lukan refrain that Israel always rejected the message of the prophets. In Acts, when the prophets address Christ-believing audiences, non-predictive prophetic speech is more commonly expressed as "exhortation (παράκλησις)."⁵¹ Although prediction of the future is typical of prophets in all four periods, it predominates at the beginning of Luke's story, offering the reader an enigmatic preview of what is yet to come.⁵² Similarly, when Paul's call on the road to Damascus is left out of consideration (Acts 9, 22, 26), a divine commission is only mentioned in connection

⁴⁹ Cf. Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:836; Plummer, *Luke*, 65, 72; Leivestad, "Dogma," 298-9.

⁵⁰ *Biblical prophets*: Luke 11:49-50; Acts 7:52. *Jesus' ministry*: John (Luke 3:19-20); Jesus (13:33). The necessity or expectation of persecution is extended to all Christ-believers in Acts, not all of whom are presented as prophets. For example, Paul tells the disciples at Lystra, Iconium and Antioch: "It is through many persecutions that we must enter the kingdom of God" (Acts 14:22). If Paul's call narrative is regarded as the call to be a prophet, then the prediction that Paul will undergo suffering in Acts 9:16 constitutes an example of persecution being linked to a prophet after Pentecost.

⁵¹ Cf. Acts 15:32; chapter three page 119f. Cf. John the Baptist (Luke 3:18).

⁵² For this function of prophecy in Luke-Acts see Bovon, "Effet," 355-7.

with the biblical prophets, John and Jesus,⁵³ for the simple reason that Luke is not concerned to narrate how Simeon and Anna or other minor prophets became prophets.

In sum, there is strong evidence that the biblical prophets were regarded as a distinctive group closely associated with the composition of Scripture. But gaps in the evidence severely weaken attempts to demonstrate, on the basis of characteristics attributed to prophets, that Luke believed the biblical prophets as a group were greater than their successors.

Similarities in the Portrayal of Prophets

Building on chapter three's examination of the evidence, Table 2 lists characteristics associated with prophets in each of the four "periods" of history. (Items in parentheses are mentioned only in connection with Jesus or Paul.)

Table 2: Characteristics of Prophets in Different Periods⁵⁴

Characteristics	Past Prophets	Infancy Narrative	Period of Jesus	After Pentecost
Holy Spirit	•	•	•	•
Prediction of the future	•	•	•	•
Proclamation	•		•	
παράκλησις			•	•
Writers of Scripture	•			
Worship		•	(•)	•
Divine commission	•		•	
Divine direction	•	•	•	•
Supernatural insight	•	•	(•)	(•)
Symbolic actions/Signs	•		•	•
Miracles/Signs & Wonders	•		(•)	(•)
Persecution	•		•	
Celibacy/Asceticism		•	•	•

⁵³ Cf. Luke 11:49 (biblical prophets); 1:15-17, 3:2 (John); 4:43 (Jesus).

⁵⁴ The category of past prophets comprises all prophets whose ministry is in the past at the time at which Luke's narrative begins; prophets in the infancy narrative include Simeon and Anna; prophets in the period of Jesus include John the Baptist and Jesus; prophets after Pentecost include Agabus, the prophets at Antioch, Paul and Barnabas (as they are portrayed in Acts 13:1-12), Judas and Silas, and Philip's daughters.

In addition to the distinguishing features mentioned in the previous section, Luke also attributes several characteristics to prophets in general that establish the basic similarity of prophets regardless of the period in which they appear. First, Luke's willingness to use the title "prophet" for individuals in all four periods sets him apart from the Second Temple writers surveyed in chapter two who tend to reserve words related to *προφήτης* and *נביא* for the biblical prophets.⁵⁵ Second, the Holy Spirit is intimately related to prophets and prophetic activity in all four periods.⁵⁶ This characteristic will be considered in more detail below. Third, prophets in all four periods predict the future.⁵⁷ Friedrich's claim that Anna merely predicted the future instead of coming "before the people with a message of grace and judgment" as the biblical prophets did⁵⁸ fails to recognize that for Luke, the ability to predict the future is closely tied to the role of prophets in general. According to Acts 2:30, for example, David's prophetic ability is highlighted in order to demonstrate that he foresaw the resurrection of the Messiah. Fourth, prophets in all four periods are described as being divinely sent or directed.⁵⁹ Finally, supernatural insight into what could not otherwise be known is

⁵⁵ Turner's focus on the Spirit leads him to overlook Anna, the only character other than John the Baptist who is explicitly referred to as a "prophet (*προφήτης*)" in Luke 1-2.

⁵⁶ *Biblical prophets*: Acts 1:16, 4:25 (David); Acts 7:51-52 (juxtaposition of opposing the Spirit and persecuting the prophets); Acts 28:25 (Isaiah). *The infancy narrative*: Simeon (Luke 2:25-27); cf. the prophetic activity of Zechariah (1:67). *Jesus' ministry*: John the Baptist (Luke 1:15 by implication); Jesus (Luke 3:22; 4:1, 14, 18; 10:21; Acts 1:2; 10:38). *After Pentecost*: Agabus (Acts 11:28; 21:10-11); Barnabas and Saul (13:4); Paul (13:9); cf. Acts 21:4. For prophetic activity cf. Acts 2:17; 19:6.

⁵⁷ *Biblical prophets*: e.g. Luke 1:70; 18:31. *The infancy narrative*: Simeon (Luke 2:34-35); cf. Anna (2:38). *Jesus' ministry*: John the Baptist (Luke 3:16-17); Jesus (e.g. Luke 9:21-22). *After Pentecost*: Agabus (Acts 11:28; 21:10-11); cf. Acts 20:23, 21:4 (prophets are not explicitly mentioned, but their mediation may be implied).

⁵⁸ Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:836.

⁵⁹ *Biblical prophets*: Luke 4:26; 13:34 (par. Matt 23:37). *The infancy narrative*: Simeon (Luke

attributed to David (Acts 2:30), as well as to the prophet Simeon in the infancy narrative (Luke 2:26-32), to Jesus (7:39-49) and to Paul in a context in which Paul and Barnabas are identified as prophets (Acts 13:10). It should be obvious that prophets in all four periods satisfy our descriptive definition of prophets as those who, by virtue of their nearness to God, are enabled by the Holy Spirit to have insight into matters hidden from other humans and (sometimes) to perform deeds beyond the ability of ordinary mortals; they are also empowered by the Holy Spirit to proclaim words of praise to God and to address divinely-commissioned messages to other humans.

Another feature of Luke's portrayal of prophets that spans all four periods is his "biblical" characterization of John and Jesus, Christ-believing prophets in Acts and, to a lesser extent, the prophetic activity in the infancy narrative. To review the evidence laid out more fully in the previous chapter, the statement "the word of God came to John son of Zechariah in the wilderness" (Luke 3:1-2) recalls the introductions to the prophetic books in Scripture. Jesus explicitly compares his healing activity to that of the prophets Elijah and Elisha (Luke 4:25-27), and the raising of the widow's son at Nain recalls Elijah's raising of the widow of Zarephath's son in 2 Kings 17. Paul's encounter with Bar-Jesus the false prophet recalls biblical conflicts between true and false prophets (Acts 13:6-12). The prophet Agabus is typically accompanied by other prophets who are reminiscent of the biblical "company of the prophets," and both the citation formula he uses as well as the symbolic action he performs recall characteristic activities of the

2:27). *Jesus' ministry*: Jesus (Luke 4:1, 43). *After Pentecost*: Barnabas and Saul (Acts 13:4); Paul (Acts 16:6-7; 20:22).

biblical prophets.⁶⁰ Very few details are provided in the case of Anna (Luke 2:36-38), but we may note that she is introduced in a manner reminiscent of the biblical prophetesses, and her characteristic behaviour of praising God and predicting the future is similar to that of the biblical prophetesses who went before her. Luke, to be sure, often echoes Scripture in his characterization of later figures. Since his depictions of Stephen and Peter also echo the biblical prophets Moses and Elisha, it is clear that mere allusion to Scripture does not prove that Luke regarded later prophets as being on a level with the biblical prophets—but it does underscore the similarities between prophets across the different periods.

In addition to shared characteristics and patterning after the biblical prophets, the specific collocations used to describe the Spirit's involvement in prophetic activity unify Luke's portrayal of prophets in all four periods. Luke mentions the Holy Spirit in a variety of different ways: it is possible to be filled with the Spirit, to speak through the Spirit, or to be directed by the Spirit; the Spirit can speak through people or to people; sometimes the Spirit is said to come to or be upon people. What proves decisive for our purposes is that the various ways of referring to the Spirit are not restricted to any one prophetic "period."

David Aune recognizes that the messenger formula, "Thus says the Holy Spirit," which Agabus used to introduce his prediction of Paul's coming imprisonment in Acts 21:11, is a variation on the biblical formula, "Thus says the LORD." But Aune argues that the form of Agabus's oracle "has little relationship to OT prophetic speech forms,"

⁶⁰ Acts 11:27-28; 21:9-11.

and concludes that the reference to the Spirit at the beginning of the oracle "is a fairly widely distributed feature of early Christian prophetic speech."⁶¹ Aune is correct. The spirit is not normally mentioned in the introduction to prophetic oracles in Scripture, and the spirit was certainly not part of a set formula such as "Thus says the LORD."⁶² But it is important to note that even though "Thus says the Holy Spirit" is not attested in Jewish Scripture, the expression is fully in line with Luke's tendency in other passages to associate the Spirit with the verbal activity of *biblical* prophets. In Acts 1:16, Peter explains that "the Holy Spirit spoke beforehand by the mouth of David" about Judas's defection from the Twelve, and in Acts 28:25, Paul declares, "The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your ancestors through the prophet Isaiah" It is to be expected that our author's late first century perspective on the biblical prophets diverges somewhat from the way the biblical prophets are presented in the Septuagint. However, the combination of close parallels to the biblical prophets in the description of Agabus, together with minor differences that are shared in common with Luke's portrayal of the biblical prophets, makes it unlikely that Luke meant to distinguish Agabus's oracle from typical oracles of the biblical prophets.

The language of being "filled" with the Spirit is Luke's most characteristic way of referring to the Spirit. The adjective πλήρης followed by πνεῦμα is used in reference to

⁶¹ Aune, *Prophecy*, 264. Cf. Rev 2:7, 11, 17-18, 29; 3:6, 13, 22. The context of Acts 13:1-3 indicates that the Holy Spirit's direct speech in Acts 13:2 was mediated through one of the prophets mentioned in 13:1.

⁶² But cf. 2 Sam 23:2: "The spirit of the LORD speaks through me (יְהוָה דִּבֶּר-בִּי) / πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐλάλησεν ἐν ἐμοί"; 1 Kgs 22:24: "Which way did the spirit of the LORD pass from me to speak to you?"; cf. Ezek 11:5; Zech 7:12; Friedrich Baumgärtel, "Spirit in the OT," *TDNT* 6:362-3.

the Seven, Stephen and Barnabas in Acts, and to Jesus in Luke.⁶³ The adjective is normally applied to individuals who are depicted as being characteristically filled with the Spirit, but in Acts 7:55 the statement that Stephen was "full of the Holy Spirit" seems related to a specific state in which Stephen saw heaven opened, rather than denoting an ongoing experience of the Spirit.⁶⁴ In Luke 4:1 the phrase looks back to Jesus' baptism as the beginning of an ongoing experience of fullness with the Spirit.⁶⁵

The passive of the verb *πίμπλημι* followed by *πνεῦμα* tends to be used of more temporary experiences. At Pentecost the assembled disciples are filled with the Holy Spirit, resulting in inspired speech that is later identified as the activity of prophesying (Acts 2:4, cf. 2:17). In Acts 4:8 Peter is filled with the Spirit prior to his testimony before the rulers and elders in Jerusalem; in Acts 4:31 the assembled believers are filled with the Spirit, resulting in bold declaration of the word of God; and in Acts 13:9, Luke mentions that Paul is "filled with the Holy Spirit" when he issues a prophetic rebuke against the false prophet Bar-Jesus.⁶⁶ But "filling" with the Spirit is not limited to Christ-believing individuals after Pentecost. The same collocation also occurs in the infancy narrative when Elizabeth is filled with the Holy Spirit and cries out a blessing on Mary (Luke 1:41) and when Zechariah is filled with the Holy Spirit and prophesies (1:67). Luke may well have assumed that biblical prophets were also "filled with the Spirit" even though the

⁶³ Luke 4:1 (Jesus); Acts 6:3 (the Seven); Acts 6:5, 7:55 (Stephen); Acts 11:24 (Barnabas).

⁶⁴ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 382. *Contra* Turner, *Power*, 150, who lists all occurrences of *πλήρης* + *πνεῦμα* as examples of "notable *continuing* prophetic experience of the Spirit."

⁶⁵ Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 168: "From the baptism onwards Jesus is continually filled with the Spirit."

⁶⁶ The verb can also be used to introduce an on-going state (Luke 1:15). As I argued above, not all those who are filled with the Spirit are prophets, nor is the Spirit's filling always connected to prophetic activity or to speaking. In Acts 13:52, the disciples in Antioch are said to be "filled with (*ἐπληροῦντο*) joy and with the Holy Spirit." Cf. Acts 9:17.

term itself was, perhaps, derived from Christian experience. Yet since Luke is not concerned to narrate the experiences of the biblical prophets, it is not surprising that he never says that the prophets mentioned in Scripture were filled with the Spirit.

Despite the verbal parallels between the experiences of Elizabeth and Zechariah in Luke 1-2 on the one hand, and the experiences of disciples in Acts on the other, Turner argues that within Luke 1-2 "the language and ideas are simply those of intertestamental Jewish pneumatology in general."⁶⁷ According to Turner, the fact that Elizabeth and Zechariah are said to be filled with the Spirit does not link them to prophetic activity narrated in Scripture because Luke's language of "filling with the Spirit" lacks true parallels in the Septuagint.⁶⁸ Elizabeth and Zechariah and disciples in Acts are described in similar ways, but Turner maintains that the language of filling with the Holy Spirit merely signifies "charismatically inspired speech" in a variety of forms, and thus does not link the prophetic activity of the infancy narrative together with the kind of prophetic activity that occurs in Acts.⁶⁹ Turner contends that the inspired speech of Elizabeth and Zechariah is distinctive because the Spirit-filled speakers of Luke 1-2 utter "invasive prophetic speech"—a type of prophetic speech unique to the infancy narrative in Luke-Acts—while inspired speech in other contexts in Luke and Acts takes the form of "charismatic praise" and "inspired preaching."⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Turner, *Power*, 148. Turner claims that "the motif of charismatic revelation and/or prophetic speech afforded by the Spirit of prophecy through a relative at or approaching a rite of passage is regular in Judaism," but although he cites examples from post-biblical texts, all refer to experiences that allegedly took place in the lives of biblical figures rather than during the Second Temple period.

⁶⁸ When someone is said to be filled with the divine spirit, the verb ἐμπίμπλημι is used instead of πίμπλημι. Cf. Turner, *Power*, 148; Exod 28:3; 31:3; 35:31; Deut 34:9; Isa 11:3; Sir 39:6; 48:12.

⁶⁹ Turner, *Power*, 148.

⁷⁰ Turner, *Power*, 148.

Against Turner, the verbal parallels between the prophetic activity in the infancy narrative and in Acts demonstrate that Luke was not concerned to distinguish sharply between forms of Spirit-inspired speech. The same phrases involving the Spirit are employed with reference to divine revelation, prompting human speech, and directing human action—without regard for distinctions in the "periods" of salvation history. Jesus is presented as one who, like Agabus, spoke "through the Holy Spirit (διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου)"⁷¹ just as God spoke through David "by the Holy Spirit."⁷² Similarly, both Jesus and Simeon are led "by the Spirit (ἐν τῷ πνεύματι)."⁷³ According to Luke 2:26, information was revealed to Simeon "by the Holy Spirit (ὕπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου)," while in Acts, Paul and Barnabas are sent off "by the Holy Spirit (ὕπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος)" (13:4), and Paul and his companions are "forbidden by the Holy Spirit (ὕπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος) to speak the word in Asia" (16:6).⁷⁴

In addition, there is no clear correlation between ways in which the Spirit's guidance is expressed and different forms of direction, for the Spirit speaks *privately* to Philip (Acts 8:29) and to Peter (10:19; 11:12), as well as *publicly* to the assembled church leaders at Antioch (13:2). And while Paul and Barnabas are sent off *publicly* "by the

⁷¹ Acts 1:2. Cf. Acts 11:28: "Agabus . . . predicted by the Spirit (ἐσήμανεν διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος)." Cf. Luke 10:21.

⁷² Acts 4:25 (ὁ . . . διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ . . . εἰπών) appears to suggest that God spoke through the Holy Spirit as well as through the mouth of David. See discussion in Barrett, *Acts*, 244-5.

⁷³ Luke 2:27; 4:1. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 119.

⁷⁴ At the Jerusalem council, the apostles and elders write that their decision "seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us" (Acts 15:32); Paul claims "that the Holy Spirit testifies to me in every city that imprisonment and persecutions are waiting for me" (20:23); and the disciples in Tyre warn Paul "through the Spirit (διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος)" not to go up to Jerusalem. It is possible, of course, that prophets in every city warned Paul of coming persecutions (so Aune, *Prophecy*, 200-1), but Luke does not make the agent of divine revelation explicit.

Holy Spirit" (Acts 13:4), information is revealed to Simeon *privately* "by the Holy Spirit" (Luke 2:26).

According to Luke 2:25, "the Holy Spirit was upon [Simeon] (πνεῦμα ἦν ἅγιον ἐπ' αὐτόν)." In most other Lukan occurrences of πνεῦμα followed by the preposition ἐπί, an initial coming of the Holy Spirit on an individual or group is in view. This is particularly evident at the successive coming, falling or pouring out of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, Caesarea and Ephesus;⁷⁵ the Holy Spirit also comes upon Mary at Jesus' conception (Luke 1:35) and on Jesus at his baptism (Luke 3:22); and in his Nazareth sermon, Jesus declares in the words of Isaiah 61, "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ' ἐμέ)" (Luke 4:18). To be sure, the wording of Luke 4:18 is constrained by Scripture, and the subsequent verses go on to show that Isaiah 61 was fulfilled uniquely in Jesus,⁷⁶ but the fact remains that Luke portrays both Simeon and Jesus as prophets upon whom the Spirit rested. A similar effect is produced in Luke 1:15 when Gabriel announces that John "will be filled with the Holy Spirit, even from his mother's womb." The enduring presence of the Spirit seems characteristic of prophets in general, regardless of the "period" in which they belong.⁷⁷

Turner notes that apart from the description of Simeon in Luke 2:26, neither Luke nor Jewish Scripture ever uses the verb χρηματίζω in conjunction with the Spirit to

⁷⁵ Acts 1:8; 2:17; 10:44; 11:15; 19:6.

⁷⁶ Turner, *Power*, 150.

⁷⁷ Turner, *Power*, 150, entertains the possibility that the description of Simeon as one upon whom the Spirit rested instead of one who was "full of" the Spirit "deliberately contrasts Simeon's experience of the Spirit as a lesser one compared with Christian experience." This is unlikely. It is not unusual for Luke to express the same concept in different ways (cf. Henry J. Cadbury, "Four Features of Lukan Style," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 92).

denote divine revelation.⁷⁸ But the verb *χρηματίζω* is used in connection with divine revelation elsewhere in Acts as well as in Jewish Scripture,⁷⁹ and, as we have seen, the Spirit is closely associated by Luke with the revelatory activity of the biblical prophets.

Even though Zechariah, like the disciples at Pentecost, "was filled with the Holy Spirit, and prophesied,"⁸⁰ Turner maintains that the verb *προφητεύω* in Luke 1:67 designates oracular speech while the verb in Acts 2:17 and 19:6 "designates invasive charismatic praise."⁸¹ This explanation is problematic on two counts. First, although Zechariah's "prophesying" (1:67) includes predictions about the future, it also fits nicely into the category of "invasive charismatic praise" if, as is most probable, it includes his initial words of praise to God after he regained his ability to speak.⁸² Second, Luke's statement that the Spirit-filled speakers at Pentecost proclaimed "God's deeds of power" (Acts 2:11) is a summary admirably suited to Zechariah's prophecy that what God promised Israel's ancestors had begun to be fulfilled (Luke 1:68-75). The fact that Luke records the content of Zechariah's prophecy but does not record the speech of those who prophesied at Pentecost (Acts 2:4, 17) and in Ephesus (19:6) proves nothing about whether or not Luke thought "prophesying" in Acts involved oracular speech.

⁷⁸ Turner, *Power*, 150. Cf. Luke 2:26: καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου.

⁷⁹ Cf. chapter three page 141 above.

⁸⁰ Luke 1:67. Cf. Acts 2:4, 17.

⁸¹ Turner, *Power*, 148 note 31, cf. 271-2.

⁸² Cf. chapter three page 132 above. The Spirit is not expressly mentioned as the motivating factor behind Agabus's symbolic action and speech in Acts 21:11, which may explain why Turner does not treat it as a possible example of invasive prophetic speech (Turner, *Power*, 350, classifies Acts 21:11 as an example of the Spirit giving "revelatory words or instruction or guidance"). The lack of clarity in Luke's description indicates that he was not concerned about the difference between invasive and non-invasive revelatory speech.

Allowing for Luke's stylistic preference for variety in expression,⁸³ we must acknowledge that the presentation of the Spirit's involvement in prophetic activity is remarkably similar in all four "periods" of salvation history. While the speeches of Zechariah and Elizabeth may correspond to what was expected in the Second Temple period, the verbal parallels between descriptions of the temporary experiences of Zechariah and Elizabeth and descriptions of the temporary experiences of inspired disciples in Acts point to the essential likeness of prophetic activity before and after Pentecost. Although Luke may not have consciously attempted to underscore the similarities between the involvement of the Spirit in the activity of the biblical prophets and Simeon,⁸⁴ nothing in our review of Luke's characterization of Simeon indicates that he intended to *distinguish* Simeon from the biblical prophets. There is, in sum, no convincing evidence that the Spirit-inspired prophetic activity in the infancy narrative was regarded as essentially different from the experiences of biblical figures on the one hand, or inspired disciples in Acts on the other.

Conclusion

Attempting to determine what Luke believed to be the basic similarities and essential differences between prophets throughout history is complicated by our author's reasonable decision to devote most of his attention to the prophets John, Jesus, and Paul, spending relatively little time on other prophets in the infancy narrative and in Acts. As a result, it is difficult to establish whether Luke would have regarded as significant the fact

⁸³ Cf. Cadbury, "Style," 92: "Variety, then, almost studied variation of phrase and exchange of synonyms, is a distinct feature of the style of this author and exists alongside of a striking identity of style and diction."

⁸⁴ Turner, *Power*, 148.

that prophets in the infancy narrative and, for the most part, in Acts are not depicted as performing miracles; the difference in portrayal may result from the source material at Luke's disposal and the narrative function that he intended for prophets who are minor characters. It would be wrong to conclude from the small amount of space allotted to them that Luke restricted the activities of Anna and prophets in Acts to prediction of the future and to the mediation of divine direction.⁸⁵ To take another example, Jesus and John are clearly portrayed in ways that evoke the biblical prophets, but this does not mean Luke assumed that eschatological prophets resembled the great biblical prophets of the past, while contemporary prophets were distinguished from the biblical prophets,⁸⁶ for Simeon and Anna also evoke the biblical prophets. If Luke had granted a larger role to these infancy narrative prophets, the parallels with the biblical prophets might well have been much more prominent. One must therefore be cautious about making too much of the differences in the way prophets are portrayed.

There are still clear distinctions between the periods of salvation history with respect to prophecy. During Jesus' earthly ministry prophets are limited to the two eschatological figures John and Jesus. After Pentecost there is a marked increase in prophetic activity. Though prophets continue to function in the early Jesus movement, prophetic activity is not restricted there to prophets, but is made available to others in the community of the Spirit. In spite of the existence of prophets who are active within the time frame of Luke's story, the "prophets" are normally located in the more distant past

⁸⁵ Pace Forbes, *Prophecy*, 314: "in Luke an important narrowing of the range has occurred. While visions, healings and miracles continue to occur, the προφήτης does not perform them. His role . . . has been limited to inspired speech. Visions and wonders are no longer characteristic of the prophet."

⁸⁶ As suggested by Frein, "Jesus-as-Prophet," 36.

and associated with a fairly well-defined group of people mentioned in Scripture. In this light, the widespread prophetic activity in Luke 1-2 contrasts with the two prophets in Luke's Gospel and the general sense of antiquity associated with the "prophets." It is no wonder, then, that many interpreters conclude that the infancy narrative was written last and that it reflects the perspective of Acts. The prophetic activity of Zechariah, Elizabeth and Mary as well as the angelic appearances to Zechariah, Mary and the shepherds are indeed extraordinary events designed to convey something of the significance of Jesus' and John's births.⁸⁷ But regardless of the order in which the Gospel was written, Luke presents the prophets Simeon and Anna as prophets who were already active *prior to* Jesus' birth. The responses to Jesus and John in the body of Luke's Gospel confirm further that the mere existence of prophets was not understood as a sign of the end-times. Luke did not believe that prophecy had ceased.

Instead of looking back to the past, Simeon and Anna are closely related to the biblical prophets as they anticipate together the time when God's promises will be fulfilled. While Luke "has not gone out of his way to reproduce [biblical] expressions" in his account of prophetic activity in the infancy narrative,⁸⁸ the more important question is this: Did Luke go out of his way to *distinguish* the experiences of Simeon and Anna from those of the biblical prophets? Apart from the obvious restriction of the biblical prophets to the time of Scripture, our answer must be "no." The combination of characteristic expressions used in connection with prophets in all four periods together with biblical sounding language is what one would expect from an author immersed in Scripture who

⁸⁷ Cf. Johnson, *Luke*, 35.

⁸⁸ Turner, *Power*, 164.

is describing post-biblical people and events. The extensive similarities between prophets and prophetic activity across the four periods suggest that Luke did not believe qualitative differences between prophets ran along salvation historical fault lines. There were great prophets in the past and the people betray some nostalgia for the past, but Luke does not present all past prophets as great without exception.

Moreover, the fact that Luke distinguishes the periods before and after Jesus' earthly life from the time of the ministry itself should not be allowed to obscure a more basic two-fold division: The infancy narrative invites us to think of a time of anticipation, which included the biblical prophets as well as Simeon and Anna, and a time of progressive fulfillment of God's promises, inaugurated with Jesus' birth and ministry, and carried forward after his ascension. The prophets who lived at the turn of the ages were distinguished from those who had gone before because they lived to see what all the other prophets had anticipated. John the Baptist was an eschatological prophet by virtue of his eschatological role, not because of any characteristic difference between his *modus operandi* and that of the biblical prophets and Simeon and Anna.⁸⁹ Though prophetic activity is much more widespread after Pentecost, the prophets among Jesus' followers in Acts, similarly, are depicted in ways that link them to the biblical prophets.⁹⁰ It is a fundamental mistake to distinguish the characteristics of prophets on the basis of a division of salvation history into three (or four) distinct periods.

⁸⁹ *Contra* Turner, *Power*, 153, who concludes that John's "[charismatic expository discourse] . . . aligns him more with the description of Jesus . . . and of the church than with that of the other prophetic figures of Luke 1-2."

⁹⁰ Cf. Shelton, *Mighty*, 26: "If one insists that a difference must be maintained between the experience of the infancy narrative witnesses with the Holy Spirit and that of the disciples at Pentecost, it must be seen not as a qualitative difference but as a *quantitative* one."

I conclude therefore that Luke did not conceive of an "intertestamental" period marked off at one end by the biblical prophets and by the birth of Jesus at the other. Luke classed Simeon and Anna along with the biblical prophets in the "period of Israel" or—to choose a term better suited to Luke—the "period of anticipation." Beyond this, Luke does not address the relationship between Simeon, Anna and the biblical prophets. Were we to hazard a guess about how Luke might have envisaged the relationship, we could do no better than to quote from a passage with which Luke was undoubtedly familiar, a passage that points to an ebb and flow of prophetic experience rather than to a consistent idealization of the past. Speaking of the time of the prophet Samuel's youth, the biblical narrator states: "The word of the LORD was rare in those days; visions were not widespread."⁹¹ Since Jewish Scripture does not lend itself to the conclusion that there was a suffusion of prophets until they passed from the scene, we may speculate that Luke regarded the period before Jesus' birth as a time within the "period of Israel" when prophets such as Simeon and Anna were active, but when prophets were not as prominent as they would be within the early Jesus movement after Pentecost.

⁹¹ Luke's familiarity with the context in which this verse appears is confirmed by echoes of the account of Samuel's birth in Luke 1-2. Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 268-9, 281; Green, *Luke*, 81.

Chapter Five: The Eschatological Elijah in Luke-Acts

Of all the eschatological expectations surveyed in chapter two, belief in the return of Elijah was found to be most widely attested in the surviving Second Temple literature.¹ Luke also witnesses to eschatological expectations involving Elijah. The standard scholarly designation for this type of expectation is belief in Elijah *redivivus*. Unfortunately, a term that means "renewed Elijah" is sufficiently ambiguous to permit interpreters to overlook the question of how Elijah was expected to return: some use the term to refer to the expectation of the reappearance of the Elijah who was taken up into heaven,² while others define the term inclusively as the expectation of "the return of Elijah or the coming of an Elijah-like figure."³ For the sake of clarity, I will use "eschatological Elijah" to refer broadly to all expectations of the fulfillment of Mal 3:23 including the expectation that a coming prophet might only be like Elijah; I will use "Elijah *redivivus*" more narrowly to denote a belief in the return of the actual person of Elijah.

As the study of Luke's use of eschatological Elijah traditions is entangled in the modern scholarly debate about the relationship between John the Baptist and Jesus, this chapter will contribute not only to a better understanding of Luke's beliefs about eschatological prophets but also to his Christology. While Mark and Matthew identify John the Baptist with the eschatological Elijah, many scholars have argued that Luke tried to enhance his depiction of Jesus by characterising him as an Elijah-like prophet and

¹ See chapter two page 52.

² Cf. Walter Wink, *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968), 43.

³ Webb, *Baptizer*, 50 note 11. Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 2:931-2, 937.

by eliminating unnecessary parallels between Elijah and other figures such as John.⁴

Some maintain further that Luke believed it was Jesus rather than John the Baptist who filled the role of the eschatological Elijah,⁵ while others argue that Luke used Elijah traditions in relation to both John and Jesus typologically rather than eschatologically.⁶

Finally, other scholars minimize or at least regard as insignificant any connections between Elijah and Jesus, asserting that despite any surface parallels between Jesus and Elijah, Jesus is fundamentally the prophet like Moses.⁷

The attempt to determine which figure, if any, was regarded as the eschatological Elijah requires an examination of the extent and significance of Luke's references and

⁴ Félix Gils, *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques* (Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957), 26-7, 164; de la Potterie, "L'onction," 227, 231; Wink, *John*, 42-3; Schnider, *Jesus*, 46; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 177-179; Michael Tilly, *Johannes der Täufer und die Biographie der Propheten: Die synoptische Täuferüberlieferung und das jüdische Prophetenbild zur Zeit des Täufers* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1994), 124; Peter Böhle, *Jesus und der Täufer: Schlüssel zur Theologie und Ethik des Lukas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 261. Cf. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 176; Danker, *Luke*, 199. Conzelmann, *Theology*, 24-5, 153 note 2, emphasizes that John is not the eschatological Elijah, but does not develop the connections between Jesus and Elijah except to note that in Acts 3:20-21 "we see the adaptation of the Elijah typology to Christ" (Conzelmann, *Theology*, 101 note 1).

⁵ Dabek, "Siehe," 180, 189; Hastings, *Prophet*, 75; Dubois, "Elie," 175-6; Crone, *Prophecy*, 158, 181; Greene, "Portrayal," 180, 195-6; Kelly, "Christology," 692; Ravens, *Luke*, 132; Bovon, *Luke*, 37, 274. Cf. Ulrich Kellermann, "Zu den Elia-Motiven in den Himmelfahrtsgeschichten des Lukas," in *Altes Testament - Forschung und Wirkung* (Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994), 123-37, who believes Acts 1:6 and 3:19-21 identify Jesus with the eschatological Elijah of Jewish expectation, but who does not discuss Luke's treatment of John, and Shelton, *Mighty*, 18, who distinguishes between a "Messianic Elijah" and a "Forerunner Elijah."

⁶ Wink, *John*, 42: "There is thus no Elijah typology; neither John nor Jesus fulfil anything as 'new Elijahs'. Luke uses Elijah purely as a basis for comparison." Cf. Stephen G. Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," *NTS* 16 (1969-1970): 333. Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 276, and Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 213-15, who do not deny to John an eschatological role, but who suggest that Luke portrays both John and Jesus as prophets like Elijah.

⁷ Jindrich Mánek, "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke," *NovT* 2 (1958): 22; Hahn, *Titles*, 379; Marshall, *Historian*, 127; Minear, *Reveal*, 67; Johnson, *Literary*, 95-6; Green, *Luke*, 846. The supposition that Luke believed John was the eschatological Elijah is frequently used to relegate Elijah-Jesus parallels to pre-Lukan source material with which Luke was not particularly concerned (cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 276; Turner, *Power*, 235-40), or to play down prophet Christology in general (cf. Kingsbury, "Jesus," 37; Martin Karrer, *Jesus Christus im Neuen Testament* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998], 218-19). Even when parallels between Jesus and Elijah are admitted, the identification of John as the eschatological Elijah is sometimes used to minimize Elijah-Jesus parallels in favour of a Moses-Jesus typology. Cf. Reese, *Christologie*, 206; Nebe, *Züge*, 62 cf. 50; Feiler, "Jesus," 276-7; Strauss, *Messiah*, 283; Ohler, *Elia*, 191.

allusions to Elijah. Accordingly, the following investigation begins by evaluating Lukan references to Elijah stories in 1 and 2 Kings, then examines Lukan references to the prediction of Elijah's return in Malachi 3, and finally analyses the way in which Elijah was expected to return according to Luke-Acts. It will be important to avoid the assumption that each allusion to Elijah is motivated by eschatological concerns. I will argue that while Luke freely alludes to stories from Elijah's life in his portrayal of Jesus as a prophet, he does not associate Jesus with the predictions of Elijah's return recorded in Malachi 3. Jesus is a prophet like Elijah, but the role of the *eschatological* prophet like Elijah was reserved by Luke for John the Baptist. Luke thus preserves two distinct eschatological Elijah conceptions: while the crowds expected the return of the biblical figure of Elijah, Luke himself was opposed to any Elijah *redivivus* conception, understanding Malachi's statement about Elijah's return as a prediction of the coming of one *like* Elijah. Neither John nor Jesus is directly identified by Luke as the person of Elijah.

The Elijah of 1 and 2 Kings

Elijah and the Sermon at Nazareth (Luke 4:25-26)

In his inaugural sermon at Nazareth, Jesus illustrates his statement that "no prophet is acceptable in his own town" (Luke 4:24) by citing the example of Elijah, who was sent to help a widow at Zarephath in Sidon instead of to an Israelite widow, and the example of Elisha, who healed the Syrian leper Naaman.⁸ That comparison prompts the following question: In what ways is Jesus *like* Elijah and Elisha according to Luke? Was

⁸ Luke 4:25-27; cf. 1 Kings 17; 2 Kings 5.

Jesus proclaiming himself a prophet who was the equal of the biblical prophets, Elijah and Elisha? Was he making an eschatological claim to be the end-times prophet who was patterned after Elijah and Elisha? Or did Luke intend the comparison merely to foreshadow the eventual Gentile mission?⁹

One might naturally conclude that the comparison with Elijah and Elisha in the eschatological context of Jesus' claim to be the fulfillment of Isa 61:1 serves also to identify Jesus as the eschatological Elijah.¹⁰ However, it is not clear that the Nazareth sermon presents Jesus as an eschatological prophet at all, let alone as the eschatological Elijah. Certainly Jesus is an eschatological figure by virtue of the time in which he lives, and—Luke's readers know—he is an eschatological figure because he is the royal Messiah who is destined to rule on David's throne. As Messiah, Jesus was sent on a prophetic mission based on Isaiah 61 to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, but Luke's narrative thus far has not prepared his readers to identify Jesus as the eschatological Elijah or as an eschatological Isaianic prophet¹¹ in the same way that it has prepared them to identify John the Baptist with Elijah (Luke 1:17, 76), and Jesus with the royal scion of David.

We have seen that Luke presents Jesus' anointing as having both royal Davidic

⁹ An allusion to the Gentile mission is generally acknowledged. See Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 529; Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 71; Öhler, *Elia*, 176. The passage most likely also foreshadows the widespread rejection of the message of Jesus by members of Israel. It is not apparent, however, that the Elijah-Elisha illustrations portend God's rejection of Israel. See the discussion in Tiede, *Prophecy*, 127-32; Green, *Luke*, 208.

¹⁰ See chapter two page 51, for a rebuttal of the common claim that 4Q521 interpreted Isaiah 61 with reference to the eschatological Elijah.

¹¹ For a discussion of the Isaianic Servant within Luke-Acts see chapter six pages 304f. below.

and prophetic elements,¹² and—though it may be splitting hairs to distinguish between Jesus' prophetic and his messianic identity in this passage—it is at least worth questioning whether Jesus should be identified as an (or the) eschatological prophet simply because he is an eschatological figure as well as a prophet. When the prophetic elements in Luke 4 are examined closely, the combination of eschatological figure and prophet into eschatological prophet seems less tenable. Jesus does not signal that his own status is unique when he speaks generally about prophets without honour.¹³ Moreover, the reference to Elisha as well as Elijah rules out any particular eschatological nuance, since Elisha was not associated with eschatological expectations either by Luke or by Second Temple Jewish writers.¹⁴ While Jesus may be regarded as an eschatological prophet, there is insufficient evidence in Jesus' Nazareth sermon on which to base such a conclusion.

The Widows of Zarephath and Nain (Luke 7:11-17)

Elijah's encounter with the widow of Zarephath was mentioned in Luke 4:25-26 and appears again in 7:11-17, this time allusively as the literary backdrop for Jesus' raising of the widow's son at Nain. The similarities and verbal parallels between the two accounts are extensive.¹⁵ In both cases the woman concerned is a widow with a son who dies and is raised from the dead;¹⁶ Elijah and Jesus first meet the widows at the gate of

¹² See chapter three page 102f.

¹³ Cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 405; Öhler, *Elia*, 183: "Festzuhalten ist für unseren Zusammenhang aber auch, daß Jesus nicht mit Elia und Elisa identifiziert wird. Es geht nicht um die Person der beiden Propheten, sondern um ihr Schicksal."

¹⁴ Raymond Edward Brown, "Jesus and Elisha," *Perspective (Pittsburgh)* 12, no. 1-2 (1971): 88.

¹⁵ Cf. Dabek, "Siehe," 181; Gils, *Jésus*, 26; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 176; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 659.

¹⁶ Cf. 3 Kgdms 17:12-13, 15, 17; Luke 7:12.

the city;¹⁷ according to the Septuagint, the raised child cries out, while in Luke, the child begins to speak;¹⁸ both Elijah and Jesus give the child to its mother;¹⁹ and in both instances there is a response of acclamation: to Elijah the widow says, "Behold, I know that you are a man of God and the word of the Lord in your mouth is true" (3 Kgdms 17:24); of Jesus the crowd says: "a great prophet is raised among us and God has visited his people."²⁰

The verbal similarities between Luke 7:11-16 and 3 Kingdoms 17 are undeniable. Nevertheless, it is sometimes suggested that the acclamation of Jesus as a "great prophet (μέγας προφήτης)" evokes the prophet like Moses more than it does Elijah.²¹ For example, Max Turner argues that within the larger context of Luke-Acts it is Moses rather than Elijah who is regarded as "the great miracle-working prophet."²² But

¹⁷ 3 Kgdms 17:10 (τὸν πυλῶνα τῆς πόλεως); Luke 7:11 (τῇ πόλῃ τῆς πόλεως). This verbal parallel may be coincidental (so Turner, *Power*, 238), but a conscious allusion is probable in light of the other allusions to 3 Kingdoms 17.

¹⁸ 3 Kgdms 17:22 (καὶ ἀνεβόησεν τὸ παιδάριον); Luke 7:15 (καὶ ἤρξατο λαλεῖν). The phrase is absent from the MT of 1 Kgs 17:22.

¹⁹ The wording ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ is identical in 3 Kgdms 17:23 and Luke 7:15. Turner, *Power*, 238, claims this motif is not particularly Elijanic, citing Luke 8:42 (ἀπέδωκεν αὐτὸν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ) as another example of a characteristically Lukan phrase, but the wording of the latter passage may echo the earlier account in Luke 7:10-17 (note the repetition of μονογενής in Luke 7:12, 8:42; cf. 9:38). Öhler, *Elia*, 203, admits that the phrase in Luke 7:15 echoes 3 Kgdms 17:23, but he concludes from the reappearance of the phrase in Luke 8:42 that the phrase was included because it is a biblical expression. However, the precise verbal parallel with 3 Kgdms 17:23 in Luke 7:15 amidst several other echoes of the story from 1 Kings 17 makes a deliberate echo of 3 Kgdms 17:23 more likely.

²⁰ Luke 7:16. The acclamation of both figures as *prophets* establishes a firm connection between the two accounts. Turner, *Power*, 238, points to Luke 9:43 as evidence that the acclamation is another typical Lukan commonplace, but Luke 9:43 does not include reference to Jesus as a *prophet*. Another possible parallel to this event is found in Elisha's raising of the Shunammite's son, but aside from the proximity of Nain to Shunem, there are few similarities between the two accounts (cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 656).

²¹ Cf. Hahn, *Titles*, 379; Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:846; Rese, *Christologie*, 168, 206; Bovon, *Luke*, 273-4.

²² Turner, *Power*, 239. Turner points to Acts 7:22, 36 as evidence that Moses was regarded by Luke as a worker of miraculous "wonders and signs." The passages which Turner refers to from Wis 10:15-16, Artap. 9.27.27-37, and Ezek. Trag. 224-29, do no more than demonstrate that the biblical passages that attribute signs and wonders to Moses were known to Hellenistic Jewish writers. See further

although there are scattered allusions to Moses in Luke, and Luke's audience may well have known that "signs and wonders" were attributed to Moses, Jesus and Moses are not clearly linked together at this point in Luke's narrative. By having Jesus begin his public ministry with a programmatic sermon in which he explicitly compares himself to Elijah and Elisha, alluding to miracles they performed, Luke prepares his readers to associate miracles with Elijah and Elisha rather than with Moses.²³

In spite of the connections between Jesus and Elijah in this passage, the reference to the "raising up (ἡγέρθη)" of a great prophet suggests to some interpreters that the verse alludes to Moses' prediction that God "will raise up (ἀναστήσει) for you a prophet like me from among your own people."²⁴ But although the semantic ranges of ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι overlap considerably, it is significant in this context that references to the "raising up" of prophets in Deuteronomy employ ἀνίστημι instead of ἐγείρω,²⁵ and that the verb ἐγείρω is never used of prophets in the Septuagint. Moreover, as was noted in chapter two, "raising up" is a fairly common biblical locution for the introduction of a figure into history.²⁶ A mere reference to the raising up of a prophet is no sure sign that Deut 18:15 is in view—especially when divine agency is not made explicit.²⁷

On the other hand, the declaration that "God has visited (ἐπεσκέψατο) his people" may recall the exodus from Egypt. If this is the case, one could argue that in spite of

chapter six below.

²³ Cf. Gils, *Jésus*, 41; Schürmann, *Lukas I*, 402 note 104; Nolland, *Luke*, 323.

²⁴ Deut 18:15. Cf. Miller, "Elijah," 615 note 3; Bovon, *Luke*, 273-4.

²⁵ Deut 13:3; 18:15, 18; 34:10. Cf. 1 Macc 14:41; Sir 48:1.

²⁶ Cf. chapter two page 59 above.

²⁷ If the crowds in Luke 7:16 had stated, "God has raised up a great prophet among us" instead of "a great prophet has arisen among us," then the similarities between this verse and Deut 18:15 would have been stronger.

similarities between Jesus and Elijah, Luke used the story of the resuscitation at Nain in order to connect Jesus with Moses.²⁸ Within the Septuagint, the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι sometimes denotes God's provision for, or deliverance of his people,²⁹ but God's prototypical "visitation" occurs at the exodus from Egypt.³⁰ In later passages, ἐπισκέπτομαι refers to God's anticipated deliverance of his people from exile, yet God's coming "visitation" tends still to be associated with the memory of God's first deliverance of Israel out of Egypt.³¹

That the exodus connotations of ἐπισκέπτομαι were not lost on Luke seems clear from the use of the verb elsewhere in Luke-Acts. The crowd's statement that "God has visited his people" recalls the beginning of Zechariah's Benedictus: "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited (ἐπεσκέψατο) and redeemed his people, and has raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David."³² The popular association of God's visitation with Jesus' ministry is reinforced in Luke 19:44 when Jesus himself predicts the destruction of Jerusalem because "you did not recognize the time of your visitation (ἐπισκοπῆς)." Finally, the use of "visitation" language in reference to God's deliverance of his people in Luke suggests that the verb carries the same connotation when Stephen states that Moses decided "to visit his brothers, the Israelites" (Acts 7:23). Even though Moses' commission to deliver his people is not

²⁸ Turner, *Power*, 239.

²⁹ Cf. Gen 21:1; 1 Sam 2:21; Ruth 1:6; Jer 15:15; Zeph 2:7; Zech 10:3; Sir 46:14; Jdt 4:15; 8:33; 13:20; *Pss. Sol.* 3:11.

³⁰ Cf. Gen 50:24-25; Exod 3:16; 4:31; 13:19.

³¹ Cf. Ps 105:4 LXX; Jer 39 (MT 32):21, 41; 36:16; compare Jer 29:13 with Deut 4:29.

³² Luke 1:68-69; cf. 1:78; Strauss, *Messiah*, 299. Though Luke 1:68 may be a traditional passage, Luke's use of "visitation" and "redemption" language elsewhere in eschatological contexts indicates that he was aware of the connotations of the words. Cf. chapter six page 293f. below.

narrated until 7:34, Stephen implies that Moses "visited" his people as an agent of God's deliverance, adding that Moses "supposed that his kinsfolk would understand that God through him was rescuing them."³³ In Luke 7:16, then, a miracle that clearly resembles Elijah's raising of the widow of Zarephath's son leads to the acclamation of Jesus as a great prophet; the audience also declares that God "visited" his people, using language that recalls the exodus from Egypt under Moses.

However, although the exodus resonates in the background when "visitation" language is used, the mention of "visitation" does not require the development of a new exodus typology. God's "visitation" simply implies that God will deliver his people in a manner that corresponds to some extent with God's past deliverance of his people. If the conception of the prophet like Moses was already well-established among Luke's readers, then we might expect them to discern in Luke 7:16 a reference to Jesus as the eschatological prophet like Moses. But in contrast to Jesus' own explicit comparison of himself with Elijah (Luke 4:25), Luke has not highlighted similarities between Jesus and Moses prior to this passage in Luke. Although Acts 7:23 associates "visitation" language with Moses, Luke 1:68-69 connects God's visitation with the "horn of salvation" he raised up "in the house of his servant David." In Acts 15:14, ἐπισκέπτομαι is used in connection with the inclusion of Gentiles in the church, and is followed by a proof text from Amos 9:11 about the restoration of David's fallen tent. In both passages visitation language is joined to references to David rather than to Moses. Luke's readers have no

³³ Acts 7:25. Although it summarizes Exod 2:11, Acts 7:23 probably borrows the reference to visitation from Exod 3:16. (Exodus 3:16 is never directly cited in Acts 7, but verses 30-34 summarize Exod 3:2-10.) So also Alfred Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920), 329; Haenchen, *Acts*, 281; Barrett, *Acts*, 357.

reason to conclude from the crowd's statement about divine visitation at this point in the Gospel that Jesus should be regarded as the prophet like Moses rather than as a prophet who performed miracles like Elijah had done, and through whom God delivered his people.

Luke probably expected his readers to conclude from the allusions to 3 Kgdms 17 that the people associated Jesus' resuscitation of the widow's son with the great prophet Elijah's raising of the widow of Zarephath's son.³⁴ Since this is the only passage where the crowd speaks of divine "visitation," the statement may refer only to an individual case of divine favour shown to God's people. Indeed, Turner regards the acclamation as "a subtle piece of irony" because the onlookers see the connections between Jesus and Elijah, but they do not perceive the redemptive significance of Jesus' work.³⁵ Nevertheless, since the word ἐπισκέπτομαι and its cognate noun ἐπισκοπή commonly carry eschatological connotations in Luke-Acts, it is more likely that Luke expected his readers to conclude that the onlookers had in mind God's eschatological "visitation."³⁶ The response of the onlookers to Jesus suggests further that they went beyond accepting Jesus as simply *a* prophet to the recognition of him as a prophet who would be involved as an eschatological agent of God's redemption.³⁷

³⁴ Cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 382: "Die Erzählung ist so redigiert, daß das Volk assoziativ wegen der überraschenden Ähnlichkeit mit der biblischen Sareptageschichte 3 Kön 17 schließ muß, Jesus sei ein großer Prophet."

³⁵ Turner, *Power*, 239. Cf. Nebe, *Züge*, 79; Bovon, *Luke*, 273-74.

³⁶ It is the combination of ἐπισκέπτομαι with God as the subject in response to a miracle performed by Jesus that connects Luke 7:16 to other eschatological uses of this word-group.

³⁷ So Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:846; Schürmann, *Lukas* 1, 402-3; Grundmann, *Lukas*, 160; Rese, *Christologie*, 168; Danker, *Luke*, 162; Johnson, *Luke*, 120. Otherwise Marshall, *Luke*, 286-7; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 660; Tannehill, *Unity* 1, 148; Nolland, *Luke*, 323; Bovon, *Luke*, 273-4; Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 1996), 653-54; Green, *Luke*, 293. Part of the disagreement concerns the nature of eschatological prophet conceptions. Those who believe *the* eschatological Prophet was the

Additional support for the idea that the onlookers at Nain regarded this miracle of resurrection as the acting out of events associated with the age of fulfillment may be found in the immediate context. Requested by a delegation from John the Baptist to confirm whether or not he was the "one to come," Jesus replies by alluding to passages from Isaiah, including the passage from Isaiah 61 that he claimed was fulfilled when he began his ministry: "The blind receive sight, the lame walk, lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, *the dead are raised*, and good news is proclaimed to the poor" (Luke 7:22).³⁸ Jesus' answer is all the more significant because John's question was fashioned in response to a report by his disciples about "all these things" which they saw Jesus doing (Luke 7:18)—including the miracle at Nain in the previous pericope. In its Lukan context, then, Jesus' response to John the Baptist interprets the resurrection at Nain as an eschatological event. While the viewpoint of the crowds should not be expected to coincide with that of Jesus, it is likely that Luke intended for his readers also to recognize that the crowds identified the miracle at Nain as an eschatological event. However, we must wait until Luke 9:8 for Jesus to be identified directly with the eschatological Elijah.

Fire from Heaven (Luke 9:51-56)

In Luke 9:54, James and John ask Jesus if he would like them to call down fire from heaven to destroy a Samaritan village for rejecting Jesus. Their request

prophet like Moses will be less prone to identify a reference to an eschatological prophet in this pericope that associates Jesus and Elijah. The difference between Luke 7:16 and Jesus' self-presentation in his sermon at Nazareth is that here Jesus is referred to explicitly and primarily as a prophet rather than as Messiah.

³⁸ This verse is from the double tradition (cf. Matt 11:4-5), but the miracle at Nain is not, and was probably placed in its present location in order to prepare for Luke 7:22 (Schnider, *Jesus*, 112-3).

unmistakably refers back to Elijah's behaviour towards Ahaziah's envoys in 2 Kings 1.³⁹ Jesus' critical response to the disciples' request may have been intended to disclose that the crowds were wrong to identify Jesus with Elijah,⁴⁰ or at least to dissociate Jesus from an erroneous understanding of the eschatological Elijah's role.⁴¹ Yet the form of their request is ambiguous. "Lord, do you wish that we should say 'let fire come down from heaven' (θέλεις εἰπόμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι)" could be a polite way of requesting Jesus to call down fire from heaven as Elijah did, with the disciples associating themselves with Jesus' action.⁴² But the wording of their request implies that the disciples thought their own role corresponded to that of Elijah, in which case it is not Jesus but the disciples who are characterized here as Elijah-like figures.⁴³

Calling Disciples (Luke 9:57-62)

In Luke 9:61-62, Jesus forbids a would-be disciple from saying farewell to those at his house, saying, "No one who puts his hand to the plow and looks back is fit for the kingdom of God."⁴⁴ The proverb about the plow echoes the encounter between Elijah and Elisha described in 1 Kings 19, in which Elisha, after Elijah threw his mantle over him, abandoned the twelve yoke of oxen with which he had been plowing.⁴⁵ Jesus' reply

³⁹ Note the similarities between Elijah's statement in 4 Kgdms 1:10, 12 (καταβήσεται πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ καταφάγεται σε) and Luke 9:54 (εἰπόμεν πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι αὐτούς).

⁴⁰ Green, *Luke*, 406. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 176, and Tannehill, *Unity I*, 230, think the critical use of this Elijah motif functions to demonstrate Jesus' superiority to Elijah.

⁴¹ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 830.

⁴² Marshall, *Luke*, 407; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 830; Craig A. Evans, "He Set His Face': On the Meaning of Luke 9:51," in *Luke and Scripture*, 103 note 37; Green, *Luke*, 405-6.

⁴³ Cf. Dabek, "Siehe," 182; Miller, "Elijah," 616 note 3; Nolland, *Luke*, 536.

⁴⁴ Luke 9:62. The third episode in Luke 9:61-62 may derive from the double tradition even though it appears only in Luke. So Marshall, *Luke*, 408; Öhler, *Elia*, 155.

⁴⁵ Regardless of its original referent, the language of the proverb echoes 3 Kgdms 19:19-21 in its present context. Cf. Danker, *Luke*, 211; *contra* Öhler, *Elia*, 158 note 245.

to the would-be disciple contrasts with that of Elijah, who permitted Elisha to say farewell to his parents,⁴⁶ but the overall effect of the allusion to Elijah is to relate the two figures rather than to distinguish them.⁴⁷

Perverting the Nation (Luke 23:2)

At Jesus' trial before Pilate Luke alone records the charge, "We found this man perverting our nation (διαστρέφοντα τὸ ἔθνος ἡμῶν)" (23:2). The accusation may echo Pharaoh's claim that Moses and Aaron were turning (διαστρέφετε) the people away from the work (Exod 5:4),⁴⁸ but the language is closer to 3 Kgdms 18:17, where Ahab calls Elijah "the perverter of Israel (ὁ διαστρέφων τὸν Ἰσραηλ)."⁴⁹ As with any literary allusion, it is difficult to recover why the verbal parallel was employed—perhaps it was an unconscious adoption of biblical language. If Luke was aware of the echo of 1 Kgs 18:17, his decision to employ language from the Elijah cycle strengthens the connections between Jesus and Elijah.

The Ascension and the Giving of the Spirit

There are several ways in which Luke's account of the ascension in Acts 1 echoes

⁴⁶ An allusion to 1 Kgs 19:19-21 is widely recognized. Cf. de la Potterie, "L'onction," 229; Schürmann, *Lukas* 2, 43; Marshall, *Luke*, 412.

⁴⁷ Cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 545; *contra* Öhler, *Elia*, 158. Considering the conceptual allusion to Elijah's calling of Elisha in 1 Kings 19, Luke 5:28 likely contains a second allusion to the same biblical story. Compare καταλιπὼν πάντα, a Lukan redactional insertion in Luke 5:28 (Nolland, *Luke*, 245), with κατέλιπεν . . . τὰς βόας in 3 Kgdms 19:20. Cf. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 176.

⁴⁸ So Robert F. O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," *BTB* 20 (1990): 24; Allison, *Moses*, 100.

⁴⁹ Elsewhere in Luke-Acts the verb only occurs in Luke 9:41, Acts 13:8, 10 which echo Isa 59:8, and Acts 20:30. Cf. Danker, *Luke*, 363, and Nolland, *Luke*, 1117, who cite the parallel in 1 Kgs 18:17. Evans, *Luke*, 845, objects that there is no true parallel because the verb is used in a religious sense in 3 Kgdms 18:17 and in a political sense in Luke 23:2. But although Elijah responds to the charge by applying it in a religious sense, Ahab's original use of the epithet was in relation to the famine brought by Elijah, not in relation to Elijah's religious activity.

the account of Elijah's assumption into heaven recorded in 2 Kings 2.⁵⁰ First, the aorist passive of the cognate verb ἀναλαμβάνω was used by the translators of the Septuagint for the "taking up" of Elijah into heaven (4 Kgdms 2:9, 11). Under the influence of the Septuagint, the idea of ascension into heaven within Jewish tradition became closely associated with this form of ἀναλαμβάνω.⁵¹ Luke was clearly influenced by biblical usage, for in Acts 1 ἀναλαμβάνω denotes Jesus' assumption into heaven.⁵² Since the semantic range of the verb corresponds so closely to its cognate noun ἀνάλημψις,⁵³ and since death is not a common meaning of ἀνάλημψις,⁵⁴ it is most likely that the mention of Jesus' ἀνάλημψις in Luke 9:51 points forward to the ascension of Jesus described in Acts 1.⁵⁵ Luke's readers may have associated, but would not necessarily have identified,

⁵⁰ Technically, both 2 Kings 2 and Acts 1 describe an assumption, a "being taken up into heaven," rather than an active ascent into heaven (see Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 828). But because it is more common to speak of the ascension of Jesus than it is to speak of the assumption of Jesus, I use the two terms interchangeably.

⁵¹ The aorist passive form is used of Elijah's ascension in 1 Macc 2:58; Sir 48:9. In Sir 49:14 this verb form is used of Enoch's disappearance. The only places where the aorist passive form is not used of an ascension-like experience are Ezek 12:7 (going into exile) and Tob 1:20 & (Tobit's possessions were taken into the royal treasury). Cf. Gerhard Dellling, "λαμβάνω, κτλ.," *TDNT* 4:8.

⁵² In the NT this form of the verb is used of Jesus' ascension in Mark 16:19, Acts 1:2, 11, 22; and 1 Tim 3:11. The only exception is Acts 10:16, where the word is used of the sheet that was taken up to heaven in Peter's vision.

⁵³ Cf. *MM*, 35: "The substantive follows the verb's wide range of meaning."

⁵⁴ It is true that ἀνάλημψις means death in *Pss. Sol.* 4:18, but we can hardly generalize from this one instance that the word means death in the Septuagint (*contra* Öhler, *Elia*, 207), especially as it is unlikely that Luke knew or was influenced by this passage from *Psalms of Solomon*. The word occurs nowhere else in the LXX. Although on rare occasions, the "taking up" denoted by ἀνάλη(μ)ψις or ἀναλαμβάνω may refer to "death," such a meaning can only be established when the context confirms that the "taking up" refers to a person's passing away from life. *LSJ*, 110-111, lists only 4 Kgdms 2:9 and Acts 1:11 as instances of ἀναλαμβάνω with the meaning "take up into heaven," only *Pss. Sol.* 4:18 as an instance of ἀνάλη(μ)ψις with the meaning "being taken up or away," and only Luke 9:51 as an instance of ἀνάλη(μ)ψις with the meaning "ascension." *MM*, 35 give no instances of the meaning "death" or "assumption" (beyond *Pss. Sol.* 4:18). *LSJ* and *MM* do cite many more examples of other denotations of the word. It is therefore entirely misleading to suggest that "death" is the normal meaning of the word group. *Contra* P. A. van Stempvoort, "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts," *NTS* 6 (1958): 32; Dellling, *TDNT* 4:8-9.

⁵⁵ Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, 262; Schürmann, *Lukas* 2, 24-5; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 823, 828; Zwiep, *Ascension*, 80-6.

the "taking up" of Jesus with the somber events about to transpire in Jerusalem; when they reached the beginning of Acts, they would come to see that Luke identified the "taking up" of Jesus with his assumption into heaven.⁵⁶

Since Elijah is the only biblical figure whose ascension into heaven is described in Jewish scripture, the use of similar terminology in Luke 9:51 and Acts 1 to describe Jesus' ascension may result from Luke's desire to emulate biblical style more than from any concern to highlight the similarities between Jesus and Elijah—especially considering that within the ascension narrative of Acts 1 Luke is recording traditional beliefs rather than creating out of whole cloth.⁵⁷ On the other hand, it should be emphasized that Luke had other options at his disposal. Since "rapture" stories were common in the ancient Mediterranean world, Luke must have been familiar with the normal vocabulary used to describe "raptures," and he could have used this more common vocabulary to depict Jesus' ascension if he had wished to dissociate Jesus from Elijah,⁵⁸ but he chose instead to employ the distinctively biblical terminology that was tied very closely to the story of Elijah.⁵⁹ Even though the ἀναλαμβάνω word group may have been on its way to becoming technical language for ascension in Jewish circles,⁶⁰ it is unlikely that the verb ἀναλαμβάνω would have been used for an assumption into

⁵⁶ Cf. Marguerat, *Historian*, 49-51. Those who, like Theophilus, had received some instruction in the faith, might already have identified Jesus "taking up" with the cessation of his appearances to the disciples.

⁵⁷ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 63; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 209; Haenchen, *Acts*, 151.

⁵⁸ Cf. Gerhard Friedrich, "Lukas 9,51 und die Entrückungschristologie des Lukas," in *Auf das Wort kommt es an* (ed. Johannes H. Friedrich: Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978), 32, for a list of common terminology including ἀρπάζω, ἀποπέμπω, ἀναφέρω, μετατίθημι, ἀφαιρέω.

⁵⁹ Friedrich, "Lk 9,51," 41: "Das Verbum ἀναλαμβάνω (Apg 1.2.11) kommt in der außerbiblischen Literatur für Entrückung kaum vor." Cf. Zwiep, *Ascension*, 82. *Contra* Öhler, *Elia*, 215, if Luke had wished to compare the ascension of Jesus with those of Heracles, Romulus and the Caesars, he would have used different terminology.

⁶⁰ Dellling, *TDNT* 4:8, refers to ἀναλαμβάνω as a technical term.

heaven without recalling the story of Elijah. Moreover, Luke's redactional anticipation of the ascension in Luke 9:51 immediately before a series of allusions to Elijah (9:54, 61-62) highlights the importance of this event and increases the likelihood that Luke intended for Jesus' ascension to recall the biblical narrative about the assumption of Elijah.

It may also be the case that the language of Luke 9:51 echoes the narrator's statement about Elijah's imminent departure in 4 Kgdms 2:1. According to 4 Kgdms 2:1, Elijah and Elisha were on their way out of Gilgal when "the Lord was about to take up Elijah with a whirlwind (συσσεισμῶ)." This statement anticipates the actual ascension of Elijah in a whirlwind described in 4 Kgdms 2:11. Similarly, the mention of Jesus' "taking up (ἀναλήμψεως)" in Luke 9:51 anticipates the narration of Jesus' ascension in Acts 1:1-11.⁶¹ It is true that the time between 4 Kgdms 2:1 and 2:11 apparently only spanned the length of one day (2:3, 5), while Jesus' journey to Jerusalem occupies a much longer period of time; it is also true that the mention of Jesus' ascension in Luke 9:51 is separated from Luke's account of the ascension by fifteen chapters instead of eleven verses. Still, 4 Kgdms 2:1 and Luke 9:51 share in common the following characteristics: both statements are narrative asides with a remarkably similar sentence structure;⁶² both

⁶¹ The intimation of Jesus' ascension in Luke 9:51 is recalled in Acts 2:1. Cf. ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ (Luke 9:51) and ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῆς πεντηκοστῆς (Acts 2:1). Cf. Zwier, *Ascension*, 183. For discussion of the singular subject of συμπλήρω in Acts 2:1, cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 110-1; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 237.

⁶² Note the parallel sentence structure between 4 Kgdms 2:1 (καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀνάγειν κύριον τὸν Ἡλίου ἐν συσσεισμῷ . . .) and Luke 9:51 (ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήμψεως αὐτοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ). Cf. Zwier, *Ascension*, 80. As Öhler, *Elia*, 208 observes, the combination of ἐγένετο + articular infinitive is common in Luke-Acts. Yet the parallel structure extends beyond this grammatical pattern to include a reference to an anticipated departure prior to a journey.

statements foreshadow an ascension; both statements are followed by a reference to a *journey* which culminates in an assumption up to heaven.⁶³ While the ascension of Jesus is not emphasized in Luke 9:51 in the same way as the assumption of Elijah is emphasized in 4 Kgdms 2, the fact that Luke includes a reference to the ascension already in Luke 9:51 lends a corresponding prominence to this anticipation of the ascension.

Although verbal parallels are limited, additional links between the ascension narratives of Luke-Acts and 4 Kgdms 2 are frequently proposed—including the following: (1) Elijah repeatedly instructed Elisha, "Wait (κάθου) here,"⁶⁴ but Elisha resolved to remain with Elijah. Jesus instructed his disciples to wait (καθίσατε) in Jerusalem "until you have been clothed with power from on high."⁶⁵ (2) As Elijah and Elisha were "walking and talking," Elijah was taken up into heaven in a whirlwind (ἀνελήμφθη Ἐλίου . . . ὡς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; 4 Kgdms 2:11). Like Elijah, Jesus ascended *into heaven* (ὁ ἀναλημφθεὶς . . . εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; Acts 1:11)⁶⁶ while he was speaking to his disciples.⁶⁷ (3) After Elisha requests a double-portion of Elijah's spirit, Elijah replies, "If you see me as I am being taken from you, it will be granted you; if not, it will not" (4 Kgdms 2:10). Elisha did see Elijah's ascension (2:11), and the company of prophets recognized that his wish was granted: "The spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha" (2:15). Luke

⁶³ Cf. de la Potterie, "L'onction," 228; Dabek, "Siehe," 182; Marshall, *Luke*, 405; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 214.

⁶⁴ 4 Kgdms 2:2, 4, 6. So Dabek, "Siehe," 182-3; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 177.

⁶⁵ Luke 24:49. The verbs καθίζω (Luke 24:49) and κάθημαι (4 Kgdms 2:2, 4, 6) are near synonyms. Cf. Acts 1:5.

⁶⁶ Cf. Mikeal C. Parsons, *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 139.

⁶⁷ Friedrich, "Lk 9.51," 42. The parallel is inexact, for 4 Kgdms 2:11 depicts a conversation, while in Luke 24:51 Jesus was blessing his disciples as he ascended.

emphasizes that the disciples witnessed Jesus' ascension,⁶⁸ and in due course they received the Holy Spirit, which Peter claimed was poured out as a result of Jesus' exaltation.⁶⁹

The echoes of Elijah in the Lukan ascension narratives ring more faintly than they do in the account of the miracle at Nain, for example. Though both Elijah and Jesus told their disciples to wait, Elijah tried to prohibit Elisha from accompanying him beyond the Jordan, which would have kept Elisha from receiving a double-portion of Elijah's spirit (2 Kgs 2:9). In contrast, Jesus instructed his disciples to remain in Jerusalem precisely so that they would receive the power of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49). Though both accounts affirm that the disciples saw the ascensions, only Elijah requires witnessing the ascension as a precondition for receiving a double-portion of his spirit.⁷⁰ In addition, a longer period of time elapses between the disciples' reception of the Spirit in Acts (cf. 1:14, 2:1), and Elisha's empowerment by the spirit that was on Elijah (2 Kgs 2:13-15).⁷¹ More importantly, passages related to Elijah are not mentioned when the gift of the Spirit is explained at Pentecost. Yet although it is impossible to determine how many of these proposed allusions to 2 Kings 2 Luke intended, there are enough similarities to conclude that Luke intentionally alluded to the biblical account of Elijah's ascension in his depiction of the ascension of Jesus.

Nevertheless, while Luke has portrayed Jesus' ascension in a manner reminiscent of Elijah's ascension, there is little evidence that he exploited these similarities for

⁶⁸ Acts 1:9-11. Cf. Zwiep, *Ascension*, 106.

⁶⁹ Acts 2:33. The same connection between the ascension of Elijah and the passing on of his spirit is made in Sir 48:12. Cf. Dabek, "Siehe," 183; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 177.

⁷⁰ Öhler, *Elia*, 215.

⁷¹ Öhler, *Elia*, 213.

theological purposes. If Luke had wished to employ Elijah-Jesus parallels in order to justify the connection between the ascension and the giving of the Spirit, we would have expected him to underline the similarities to a greater degree than he has done. Because Luke draws on Joel and the Psalms rather than on Elijah traditions when he explains the significance of the outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost in Acts 2, it is better to conclude that the allusions to Elijah's ascension were chosen in order to aid Luke's portrayal of Jesus' ascension rather than to form the basis for the relationship between the ascension and the coming of the Spirit.⁷² While there were traditions about the assumption of Moses, Luke does not betray awareness of them;⁷³ those allusions that do exist are to the biblical account of the ascension of Elijah rather than to the assumption of Moses.

We have seen that Luke alludes to Elijah traditions from 1 and 2 Kings in his portrayal of Jesus' miracles as well as in his depiction of Jesus' relationships with his followers, in the charge brought against Jesus by his opponents, and in his description of Jesus' ascension into heaven. But with the possible exception of Jesus' miracle at Nain (Luke 7:11-17), there is little evidence that Luke intends for us to conclude from these allusions that Jesus is the eschatological Elijah. Since the biblical basis for belief in the return of Elijah is found in Malachi 3, attempts to demonstrate that Luke regarded Jesus as the eschatological Elijah will be on firmer ground if it can be shown that Luke associated Jesus with Elijah traditions rooted in Malachi.

⁷² *Contra* Zwiep, *Ascension*, 193, who claims, "The Elijah tradition enabled him to connect the ascension with the parousia and the outpouring of the Spirit." Cf. Goulder, *Type*, 148.

⁷³ *Pace* Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 177; C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955), 40, 42; Johnson, *Luke*, 164. Luke's mention of the conversation about Jesus' ἔξοδος does not require that both Moses and Elijah experienced either an assumption or an exodus of their own.

The Elijah of Malachi

Luke 1:17 and 7:27 constitute the two clearest references to eschatological Elijah traditions from Malachi 3. First, Gabriel's annunciation to Zechariah includes the following prediction concerning John the Baptist:

With the spirit and power of Elijah he will go before him, to turn the hearts of parents to their children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous, to make ready a people prepared for the Lord.

The mention of Elijah and turning "the hearts of parents to their children" recalls the description of Elijah in Mal 3:23-24⁷⁴:

²³Behold, I will send you the prophet Elijah before the great and terrible day of the LORD comes. ²⁴He will turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents, so that I will not come and strike the land with a curse.

Gabriel's prediction that John "will go before him" also recalls Mal 3:1, a verse Jesus later quotes in modified form and applies to John the Baptist: "This is the one about whom it is written, 'Behold I am sending my messenger before your face who will prepare your way before you'" (Luke 7:27).

If Luke's use of Elijah traditions was limited to these two passages there would be no doubt that Luke regarded John the Baptist as the eschatological Elijah. The controversy to which I alluded in the introduction to this chapter exists because, as we have seen, Luke sometimes portrays Jesus in a manner reminiscent of Elijah, and because Luke never directly equates John with the returning Elijah. While Luke 1:17 and 7:27 can be taken as evidence that Luke did identify John as the eschatological Elijah,⁷⁵ the

⁷⁴ Cf. Wink, *John*, 75; Brown, *Birth*, 261; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 326.

⁷⁵ Cf. Scobie, *John*, 126; Webb, *Baptizer*, 70; Öhler, *Elia*, 82.

quotation from Mal 3:1, which Luke 7:27 takes over from his source material,⁷⁶ does not *explicitly* connect the messenger of Mal 3:1 and the returning Elijah of Mal 3:23.⁷⁷ It is also possible that Gabriel's prediction (1:17) either formed an integral part of a pre-Lukan written source with which Luke did not agree,⁷⁸ or that the statement about John working "with the spirit and power of Elijah" is distinguished from an explicit identification of John with Elijah.⁷⁹ Moreover, in contrast to Mark and Matthew, Luke omits the discussion from his Markan source where Jesus most clearly identifies the eschatological Elijah with John:

¹¹Then they asked him, "Why do the scribes say that Elijah must come first?" ¹²He said to them, "Elijah is indeed coming first to restore all things. . . . ¹³But I tell you that Elijah has come, and they did to him whatever they pleased, as it is written about him."⁸⁰

For these reasons some scholars maintain that Luke identified Jesus rather than John with the eschatological Elijah.⁸¹ Building on an earlier proposal by J. A. T. Robinson, Joseph Fitzmyer has attempted to account for the connections between Jesus and Elijah as well as John and Elijah by arguing that Luke developed a "double Elijah theme." Robinson argued that John's prediction of "one stronger than I (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου)" (Luke 3:16) and his question, "Are you the one who is to come (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), or are we to wait for another?" (Luke 7:19; cf. Matt 11:3) show that John the Baptist

⁷⁶ Cf. Matt 11:10; Mark 1:2. Luke 7:18-28 is paralleled by Matt 11:2-15.

⁷⁷ Cf. Wink, *John*, 43; Crone, *Prophecy*, 158; Kelly, "Christology," 699; Tilly, *Johannes*, 124. Cf. Matt 11:14.

⁷⁸ Cf. Gils, *Jésus*, 27 note 2; Crone, *Prophecy*, 163-4. Brown, *Birth*, 276 reverses the argument, suggesting that the infancy narrative was written last, and that it contradicts Luke's earlier view that Jesus was the "Elijah-like eschatological prophet of the last times."

⁷⁹ Dubois, "Elie," 165; Wink, *John*, 43; Tilly, *Johannes*, 124.

⁸⁰ Mark 9:11-13. Matthew makes explicit the implicit connection between Elijah and John the Baptist by adding, "Then the disciples understood that he was speaking to them about John the Baptist" (17:13).

⁸¹ See note 5 above.

expected Jesus to be the eschatological Elijah of Malachi 3 whose role was to prepare for the coming of God.⁸² According to Robinson, Jesus rejected the fiery role of Elijah assigned to him by John when he refused to call down fire from heaven (Luke 9:54) and declared that he came to bring division instead of peace (12:51).⁸³ Jesus was thus the first to identify John with the eschatological Elijah,⁸⁴ but his view eventually won the day, and the earlier connections between Jesus and Elijah faded from Christian memory.⁸⁵ While Robinson assumed that Luke simply believed John was Elijah, and claimed that Luke did not notice that some of the traditions he so faithfully transmitted point in the opposite direction,⁸⁶ Fitzmyer argues that Luke consciously retained and developed this "double Elijah theme,"⁸⁷ allowing for the joint portrayal of both John and Jesus as "*Elias redivivus*" during Jesus' earthly ministry.⁸⁸

Robinson and Fitzmyer correctly identified an allusion to Malachi 3 in John's prediction of a "coming one." However, I will argue that instead of preserving a "double-Elijah" tradition in which both Jesus and John are associated with the eschatological Elijah, Luke believed John's prediction of a "coming one" referred to Jesus as the Lord whose way was prepared by John who came as the eschatological Elijah.⁸⁹ Luke's

⁸² J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 270. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 213; Taylor, *John*, 289; David Ravens, "Luke 9:7-62 and the Prophetic Role of Jesus," *NTS* 36 (1990): 134.

⁸³ Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 273-5; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 664.

⁸⁴ J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 276. Cf. Luke 7:27, Mark 9:11-13. Schweitzer, *Quest*, 373, appears to have been the first modern scholar to suggest that it was Jesus who identified John as Elijah. Cf. Scobie, *John*, 129; Bryan, *Jesus*, 107-11.

⁸⁵ J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 278.

⁸⁶ J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 276.

⁸⁷ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 213. Cf. Ravens, *Luke*, 134.

⁸⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 215.

⁸⁹ I am not claiming that the prediction of John the Baptist was originally indebted to the imagery of Malachi 3, but that Luke's configuration of traditional material together with the scriptural allusions he introduces elsewhere suggest that Luke understood John's prediction in this way.

application of the title Lord to Jesus suggests that Luke believed the κύριος of Mal 3:1 referred to Jesus rather than to God. In order to make my case, it will be necessary first to establish that Luke was familiar with the context of Malachi and that he understood the "coming one" with reference to Malachi 3. I will then seek to determine the figure in Malachi 3 with which Jesus as the "coming one" is identified.

The "Coming One" and Malachi 3

Perhaps an attempt to determine whether John's prediction of a "coming one" was understood by Luke in terms of Malachi 3 requires too much consistency from Luke. After all, Luke acquired several of his references to Malachi from traditional material, and it is possible they were transmitted faithfully by Luke without his comprehending his sources: Luke 3:9, 16-17 is paralleled in Matt 3:10-12; Luke 7:18-28 is paralleled in Matt 11:2-11; the Elijah material in Luke 9:51-56 is normally attributed to Luke's special source;⁹⁰ and Luke 12:49 is unique to Luke, but is commonly attributed to Q along with the surrounding context.⁹¹ If Luke's allusions to Malachi 3 occur only in traditional material, it is hardly feasible to discuss Luke's own understanding of Malachi's prophecy. He may not have heard the echoes of Malachi to which I have given prominence, and he may not have noticed that the traditions he transmitted conflict with each other.

Evidence that Luke did hold to a coherent, though not necessarily original, interpretation of Malachi 3 may be found in the brief comments about John the Baptist in Acts 13:24-25. Before recalling John's prediction of the "coming one (ἔρχεται μετ' ἐμέ)" in Acts 13:25, Paul mentions John, who preached a baptism of repentance "before his

⁹⁰ Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 404; Nolland, *Luke*, 533.

⁹¹ Cf. Luke 11:51-53 par. Matt 10:34-36; Marshall, *Luke*, 546; Nolland, *Luke*, 707.

[Jesus'] coming (πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ)" (13:24). The combination of the prepositional phrase πρὸ προσώπου with the only Lukan occurrence of εἴσοδος resonates powerfully with the language of Mal 3:1-2, in which the sending of a messenger before God (πρὸ προσώπου μου) is followed by the question, "And who will endure the day of his coming (εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ)?"⁹² The repetition of John's prediction of a "coming one" in Acts 13:25 reinforces the allusions to Mal 3:1-2 in Acts 13:24.⁹³ The presence of an additional reference to Malachi 3 in Acts that is consistent with the traditional material that Luke presented in his Gospel confirms that Luke was not simply acting as the unreflecting conduit of traditional references to Malachi. Against the claim that Acts 13:24-25 is itself drawn from Luke's source material, I note that the mention of John's activity prior to Jesus' εἴσοδος in Acts 13:24 corresponds to Luke's redactional statement about Jesus' ἔξοδος in Luke 9:31.⁹⁴ The allusions to Mal 3:1-2 in Acts 13 therefore invites consideration of how Luke may have construed the rest of Malachi 3.

John's initial prediction of a "coming one" appears in Luke 3:16-17:

¹⁶John answered all of them by saying, "I baptize you with water; but one who is more powerful than I is coming (ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου); I am not worthy to untie the thong of his sandals. He will baptize you with the Holy Spirit and fire.

¹⁷His winnowing fork is in his hand, to clear his threshing floor and to gather the wheat into his granary; but the chaff he will burn with unquenchable fire."

⁹² Compare προκηρύξαντος Ἰωάννου πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ in Acts 13:24 with πρὸ προσώπου μου in Mal 3:1 and καὶ τίς ὑπομενεῖ ἡμέραν εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ; in Mal 3:2a. Elsewhere in the NT, εἴσοδος occurs only in 1 Thess 1:9, 2:1; Heb 10:19; 2 Pet 1:11. Those who note the allusion to Mal 3:1 in Acts 13:24 include BEGS 4, 152; André Feuillet, "«L'exode» de Jésus et le déroulement du mystère rédempteur d'après S. Luc et S. Jean," *Revue Thomiste* 77 (1977): 188; Barrett, *Acts*, 637; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 513; Schnider, *Jesus*, 46.

⁹³ Compare ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται in Acts 13:25 with ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται in Mal 3:1. Taylor, *John*, 145, cf. 234, notes the verbal parallel, but she assumes the echo implies that John predicted the coming of Elijah.

⁹⁴ One could insist that the repetition of John's prediction in Acts 13:25 is still based on undigested traditional material, but at some point one must account for Luke's decision to include the material he did.

In its Lukan context, John's question, "Are you the one who is to come (ὁ ἐρχόμενος), or are we to wait for another?" (Luke 7:19; cf. Matt 11:3) is an attempt to verify whether Jesus is really the "one stronger than I (ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου)" whose coming John predicted in Luke 3:16.⁹⁵ To Luke 3:16-17 and Luke 7:19 should be added the related passage in Luke 12:49-50 in which Jesus reflects on his coming: "I *came* to bring fire to the earth (πῦρ ἤλθον βαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν), and how I wish it were already kindled! I have a baptism with which to be baptized, and what stress I am under until it is completed!"⁹⁶ In Luke 3, John had predicted that the one *coming* after him would "*baptize* with the Holy Spirit and *fire*"; in Luke 12:49-50, Jesus claims "I have *come* to bring *fire* to the earth" (12:49) and "I have a baptism with which to be *baptized*" (12:50). The immediate context of Luke 12:49-50 suggests that the metaphor of casting fire on the earth refers to a divine judgement which will result in division (12:51-53).⁹⁷ In Luke 3:9-17 fire is also connected to divine judgement which results in division.⁹⁸ It seems probable, therefore, that Luke 12:49-50 alludes back to the prediction made by John in Luke 3:16.

In Luke 12:51-53, Jesus claims as his mission precisely the opposite of what was

⁹⁵ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 666; Webb, *Baptizer*, 286.

⁹⁶ Those who note a connection between Luke 12:49 and 3:16 include Marshall, *Luke*, 547, and Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 996.

⁹⁷ Note the references to judgement in Luke 12:47-48, 54-56, 57-59. Fire is often associated with judgement in Scripture: cf. Deut 32:22-3; Isa 5:24; 9:18-19; 10:17; 60:15-16; Jer 15:14; Lam 4:11; Ezek 15:6-8; 19:14; 20:47-8; 21:31-2; 28:18. The image of refining is present in Jer 6:28-29; Zech 13:9; Mal 3:2. Cf. Isa 4:4. Cf. Luke 17:29. Öhler, *Elia*, 228 claims that the fire of Luke 12:49 is not connected to judgement, but to suffering and separation, but the association of verse 51 with what precedes implies that division results from the fire brought by Jesus. So Marshall, *Luke*, 545; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 995.

⁹⁸ Luke 3:9, 17 establish the judgement connotations of fire in the context of Luke 3:16; John's winnowing metaphor conveys the idea of division. Beyond noting that Luke connected John's prediction to judgement as well as to the Pentecost event, Luke's understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and fire in Luke 3:16 need not detain us here.

expected of the eschatological Elijah when he promises to create division between family members instead of restoring the hearts of fathers to their sons and people to their neighbours (Mal 3:23).⁹⁹ But the idea expressed in Luke 12:49-53—that restoration goes hand in hand with a fiery judgement that brings division—corresponds well to the overall tenor of Malachi 3. The refining of Mal 3:2b-4 does not avert the threat of judgement, for in 3:5 God declares, "I will draw near to *you* in judgement."¹⁰⁰ In verses 17-21 (EV 3:17-4:3), judgement is extended beyond the Levites, who were the focus of criticism at the beginning of Malachi 3, to include a total separation of the righteous from the evildoers. The latter will be burned like stubble on the coming day which is "burning like an oven" (3:19). Even if the refining fire of Mal 3:2 is regarded as a gracious preliminary to judgement, the rest of the chapter refers to a separation between the righteous and the wicked that is tightly connected to the day when God acts (3:18-19).¹⁰¹

John's message in Luke 3 is also reminiscent of Malachi 3. The prediction of one who will come to baptize with fire (Luke 3:15-17) recalls the fiery judgement language of

⁹⁹ Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "Elijah," 275. Instead of Matthew's διχάσαι ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ (Matt 10:35; cf. Mic 7:6), Luke's version has διαμερισθήσονται πατὴρ ἐπὶ υἱῷ καὶ υἱὸς ἐπὶ πατρί, which echoes Mal 3:23 (LXX): πατὴρ πρὸς υἱὸν. Since Luke's phrasing more clearly echoes the Hebrew text of Mal 3:24 (= 3:23 LXX) לִבְ-אָבוֹת עַל בָּנִים וְלִבְ בָּנִים עַל-אָבוֹתָם, the allusion to Malachi may already have been present in Luke's source. Cf. καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα (Luke 1:17).

¹⁰⁰ The temporal sequence of Mal 3:1-5 is difficult to determine. The divine judgement of 3:5 responds to the question about the "God of justice" in 2:17 (Hill, *Malachi*, 217), but the *waw*-relative + suffix conjugation construction at the beginning of 3:5 implies a continuation of the temporal sequence of verbs begun in 3:3: "he will sit as a refiner . . . the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasing . . . I will draw near . . ." (cf. *W-O* 32.2b). This is not in itself problematic, except that the imagery of refining in 3:2b-4 connotes an interior transformation over a period of time, which contrasts with the aura of finality in the language of sudden coming in 3:1-2a: and the judgement of 3:5, with its negative connotations, seems more appropriate after 3:2a than after 3:4 (Petersen, *Zechariah and Malachi*, 211). Still, the attempts of Verhoef, *Haggai & Malachi*, 293 and Hill, *Malachi*, 279 to coordinate 3:5 with 3:1-2 are not convincing. In its present form 3:5 follows after 3:2b-4.

¹⁰¹ Recall that Sir 48:1-10 associates Elijah both with judgement and "turning" (see chapter two pages 46f.). Cf. Bryan, *Jesus*, 114.

Mal 3:18-19; the imagery of burning stubble in Mal 3:19 is strikingly similar to John's language of clearing the threshing floor and burning chaff in Luke 3:17;¹⁰² finally, both Malachi 3 and Luke 3:16-17 are concerned about a coming one.¹⁰³ I conclude therefore that Luke 3:16-17 refers to one of the figures of Mal 3:1.¹⁰⁴

The Identity of the "Coming One"

If John's anticipation of the "coming one" is dependent on the imagery of Malachi 3, which figure did the Lukan John have in mind when he made his prediction? Did he identify Jesus with the eschatological Elijah? Did Luke consciously or unconsciously portray a disagreement between Jesus and John the Baptist about the true identity of the eschatological Elijah? If Luke believed that John filled the role of the Elijah-messenger of Malachi 3, and that the coming of Jesus after John *also* fulfilled Malachi 3, with which figure did Luke identify Jesus?

There are several reasons why Luke most likely regarded John's prediction of the "coming one" as a reference to someone other than Elijah. First, it is improbable that Luke thought John's understanding of his prediction about the "coming one" was mistaken, or that Luke consciously portrayed Jesus as rejecting a role assigned to him by

¹⁰² Cf. Jeffrey A. Trumbower, "The Role of Malachi in the Career of John the Baptist," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (eds. Craig A. Evans, and W. Richard Stegner; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 36: "Fire in these passages [Mal 3:2b-3, 19-20] serves two purposes: purification *and* judgment; the same is true of the fire imagery in John's Q sermon." Cf. Markus Öhler, "The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God." *JBL* 118 (1999): 471-2.

¹⁰³ Compare ἰδοὺ ἔρχεται in Mal 3:1 with ἔρχεται δὲ ὁ ἰσχυρότερός μου in Luke 3:16. Luke omits ὁπίσω μου (cf. Mark 1:7).

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 213; Ravens, *Luke*, 134; Cullmann, *Christology*, 17, 26, 36; Green, *Luke*, 180; Öhler, *Elia*, 64. Otherwise Hahn, *Titles*, 380; Marshall, *Luke*, 290; Bovon, *Luke*, 382; Nolland, *Luke*, 328-9. Webb, *Baptizer*, 221, rightly excludes a reference to the Elijah of Malachi 3 in John's prediction of a "coming one," but fails to consider seriously the possibility that the language of John's prediction points specifically toward one of the other figures mentioned in Malachi 3. The fact that only some of the elements in John's prediction are found in Malachi does not exclude an allusion to Malachi 3, for John could have alluded to Malachi 3 and contributed original elements in his description of the coming figure.

John. Not only did Luke believe John was a true prophet, he also repeated John's prediction of a "coming one" with approval in Acts 13:25. Second, the insistence in Acts 13:24-25 that John preached *before Jesus' coming*, and the recollection of John's prediction of a "coming one" suggests that John is to be identified with the first messenger of Mal 3:1a and that Jesus is to be identified with one of the figures who comes after him. Third, the version of Mal 3:1 quoted in Luke 7:27 distinguishes between God as speaker, John the Baptist as Elijanic messenger, and Jesus; but instead of quoting God as saying, "Behold I am sending my messenger . . . before me (πρὸ προσώπου μου)" as we would expect from Mal 3:1, Jesus quotes God as saying, "Behold I am sending my messenger before *you* (πρὸ προσώπου σου) who will prepare *your* way before *you*."¹⁰⁵ As in Acts 13:24-25, the modification of the quotation from Mal 3:1 serves to reapply it to the coming of John before Jesus. Since I have argued that Luke was quite familiar with the context of Malachi 3 and since Luke 1:17 and 7:27 connect John to the first messenger of Mal 3:1, while Luke 1:17 also associates John with Mal 3:23, it is most likely that Luke identified John as Elijah and Jesus as one whose way was prepared by John the Baptist.

As we saw in chapter two, Mal 3:1-2 is susceptible to a variety of interpretations, but because the pronominal change in Luke 7:27 effectively distinguishes between God as speaker and the one whose way is prepared, we may safely conclude that Luke identified Jesus with neither the messenger who prepares the way nor with the "LORD

¹⁰⁵ Luke 7:27. Luke 7:18-28 is paralleled by Matt 11:2-15. The form of the quotation from Mal 3:1 in Luke 7:27 (par. Matt 11:10; cf. Mark 1:2) has been influenced by Exod 23:20. Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 68-9; Bryan, *Jesus*, 99.

almighty" who is the speaker of Mal 3:1. Since Jesus is never termed a "messenger" in Luke-Acts, it is unlikely that Luke distinguished between "my messenger," the "messenger of the covenant," and the "Lord" in Mal 3:1, assigning the first role to John, the second to Jesus, and the third to God.¹⁰⁶ I propose, then, that Luke identified Jesus with the κύριος of Mal 3:1, whose way is prepared by the messenger of Mal 3:1a.¹⁰⁷

Jesus as the Messianic Lord

If Luke believed Mal 3:1 predicted the coming of the Elijahic Messenger before the coming of another *human* figure identified as the "Lord," his interpretation of Malachi 3 conflicts with the other Second Temple literary evidence discussed in chapter two, which uniformly expected the eschatological Elijah to precede the coming of God rather than the coming of the Messiah.¹⁰⁸ According to Steven Bryan, however, it is unnecessary to suggest that the Evangelists understood Jesus as the "Lord" of Mal 3:1. According to Bryan, the Gospel writers shared with Jesus and early Jewish expectations the belief that the eschatological Elijah would prepare the way for the coming of God.¹⁰⁹ The difference was that members of the early Jesus movement believed God had come decisively through Jesus.¹¹⁰

Against Bryan, there are two reasons why it is more likely that Luke identified "the Lord" of Mal 3:1 with Jesus the Messiah.¹¹¹ First, although we should not presume

¹⁰⁶ This interpretation is mentioned as a possibility by Trumbower, "Role of Malachi," 36.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Schnider, *Jesus*, 40.

¹⁰⁸ See chapter two page 52.

¹⁰⁹ Bryan, *Jesus*, 128-9.

¹¹⁰ Bryan, *Jesus*, 101. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 58-9, with reference to Luke 1:17.

¹¹¹ Just as John was sent as a messenger "before you to prepare your way before your face" (7:27), so in Luke 9:52-53 Jesus sent messengers before him, who went into a Samaritan village to prepare for him (cf. Luke 10:1). In this passage it is Jesus rather than God who sends messengers, and the messengers who

that the "coming one" was an accepted title for the Messiah in Second Temple Judaism, as if the Messiah was the only figure who was expected to come,¹¹² for Luke "the one who comes" is a way of expressing the hoped for arrival of the royal Messiah.¹¹³ John's initial prediction about the "stronger one" was in response to speculation that John might be ὁ χριστός (Luke 3:15), and after echoing Mal 3:2 in Acts 13:24, the Lukan Paul cites John's prediction that "one is coming after me" as the positive counterpart to John's prior denial, "I am not he" (13:25). In the context of Acts 13, the expected one can only refer to the descendant of David whom God had promised to bring as saviour (13:22-23).

The "coming one" also bears a messianic connotation by virtue of its association with Ps 118:26. The blessing on "the one who comes in the name of the Lord (εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος)," which is mentioned already by Jesus in Luke 13:35,¹¹⁴ is repeated by the crowds as a royal acclamation at Jesus' entry into Jerusalem.¹¹⁵ Since Luke consistently associated John's prediction with royal messianic expectations and also identified the "coming one" with the "Lord" of Mal 3:1a, it seems most likely that he regarded the eschatological Elijah as the one who was to prepare the way for the Messiah.

Additional confirmation that Luke interpreted Mal 3:1 in the way I have suggested is found in Luke's use of the title "Lord" for Jesus. While the other Evangelists

prepare the way are Jesus' disciples rather than John the Baptist. However, although they fill the role that John once occupied (Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 230, 234; Nolland, *Luke*, 535, 537), the disciples do not thereby become the eschatological Elijah. Nor does the fact that Jesus sends messengers imply that Jesus fills the role played by the LORD almighty in Mal 3:1. There is merely an analogous relationship between Luke 7:27 and 9:52-53.

¹¹² So correctly Webb, *Baptizer*, 270; *contra* Johannes Schneider, "ἐρχομαι, κτλ.." *TDNT* 2:670.

¹¹³ Cf. Kingsbury, "Jesus," 32; Strauss, *Messiah*, 246; Green, *Luke*, 295 note 42.

¹¹⁴ In Luke this saying anticipates Jesus' entry into Jerusalem, whereas in the Matthean parallel it occurs after the entry into the city (Matt 23:39).

¹¹⁵ Luke 19:38 par. Mark 11:9, Matt 21:9. Luke's addition of ὁ βασιλεύς makes the royal acclamation explicit. Cf. John 12:13.

seem reluctant to refer to Jesus as κύριος during his earthly life, Luke does not hesitate to do so.¹¹⁶ Acts 2:34-36 suggests that Jesus was granted full status as Lord at his ascension to God's right hand,¹¹⁷ but Luke insists that Jesus was already Lord at his birth. In Luke 1:43, Elizabeth greets Mary as "the mother of my Lord," and in 2:11 the angel announces to the shepherds that Jesus was "the Messiah, the Lord (χριστὸς κύριος)." Luke's application of κύριος to Jesus during his earthly ministry confirms that he already regarded Jesus as Lord in some sense prior to the resurrection.¹¹⁸

The exaltation of Jesus to the right hand of the throne of God as Lord (Acts 2:34-36), and the statement that Jesus is "Lord of all" (Acts 10:36) indicates that as Lord, Jesus shares in the exercise of God's divine rule.¹¹⁹ One may thus affirm that according to Luke, "In Him God acts as is said of the κύριος in the OT."¹²⁰ Nevertheless, it remains necessary to specify the manner in which this is true. Since Luke follows Septuagintal

¹¹⁶ The vocative κύριε is commonly applied to Jesus in all three Gospels, and in exceptional cases Jesus is referred to as κύριος in dialogue (Mark 11:3 par. Matt 21:3; cf. Mark 2:28 par. Matt 12:8 of the Son of Man), but Luke alone refers to Jesus as κύριος in narrative descriptions (Luke 7:13, 19; 10:1, 39, 41; 11:39; 12:42; 13:15; 17:5-6; 18:6; 19:8; 22:61).

¹¹⁷ Cf. Ignace de la Potterie, "Le titre κύριος appliqué à Jésus dans l'évangile de Luc," in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Béda Rigaux* (eds. Albert Descamps and R. P. André de Halleux; Gembloux: Duculot, 1970), 145; Franklin, *Christ*, 53; and the discussion of Acts 2:36 in chapter three page 151 above.

¹¹⁸ Cf. Franklin, *Christ*, 52; Marshall, *Historian*, 167. The suggestion of de la Potterie, "Le Titre," 129-41, that many of the Lukan occurrences of κύριος for Jesus anticipate the life of the church is unconvincing at least from the perspective of Luke's readers, who cannot be expected to have discerned this level of nuance in Luke's narrative. So correctly Gerhard Schneider, "Gott und Christus als κύριος nach der Apostelgeschichte," in *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk* (ed. Gerhard Schneider; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1985), 223. Against the argument of C. F. D. Moule, "The Christology of Acts," in *Studies in Luke-Acts*, 160, that Luke's narration should be distinguished from statements made by characters within Luke's story, cf. Franklin, *Christ*, 50-2, who rightly notes that vocative appeals to Jesus as κύριε sometimes bear the same sense as Luke's statements about Jesus as κύριος (Franklin, *Christ*, 52; cf. Luke 19:8).

¹¹⁹ Jacques Dupont, "Jésus, Messie et Seigneur dans la foi des premiers Chrétiens," in *Études*, 389; de la Potterie, "Le Titre," 146; Augustin George, "Jésus « Seigneur »" in *Études sur l'oeuvre de Luc* (ed. Augustin George; Paris: Gabalda, 1986), 255; Marshall, *Historian*, 166.

¹²⁰ Werner Foerster, "κύριος," *TDNT* 3:1094. Cf. Schürmann, *Lukas 1*, 173: "Im Kommen Jesu kommt Gott an"; George, "Seigneur," 255; Marshall, *Historian*, 101.

practice in referring to God as κύριος, it is frequently difficult to establish when κύριος refers to God and when it refers to Jesus,¹²¹ especially as Luke occasionally applies biblical passages about God as κύριος to Jesus.¹²² But although Luke does not always make the referent of κύριος clear, it is unlikely that he intentionally conflated God and Jesus through his use of the term. In Peter's quotation of Ps 110:1 (Acts 2:34), for example, God as "Lord" is clearly distinguished from Jesus as "Lord."¹²³ Since Luke normally distinguishes between God and Jesus when the two are set side by side, it seems unlikely that Luke did intend to conflate God and Jesus in the limited number of passages where the referent of κύριος is not clear.¹²⁴

Moreover, Luke also applies κύριος to Jesus in contexts that suggest that κύριος was understood as a royal messianic title. For example, in the context of the annunciation to Mary, Elizabeth's reference to Mary as "the mother of my Lord" cannot avoid bearing messianic connotations,¹²⁵ and Luke takes for granted that the second "Lord" of Ps 110:1 refers to the Davidic Messiah.¹²⁶ The juxtaposition of the two titles in Luke 2:11 and Acts 2:36 indicates that "Lord" and "Messiah" were not entirely synonymous, but it is impossible to exclude the messianic connotations of κύριος when it

¹²¹ This problem is particularly acute in Acts. Cf. the passages listed by Schneider, "Gott und Christus," 219-23 and George, "Seigneur," 242.

¹²² For example, the prediction of Joel 3:5 in Acts 2:21 that "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved" is applied to Jesus when Peter instructs his audience to be baptized in "the name of Jesus" whom God has made "Lord and Christ" (Acts 2:38, 36). Cf. Acts 4:12; George, "Seigneur," 252-3.

¹²³ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, lxxxvi.

¹²⁴ Cf. Acts 2:36, 39; 4:26; 20:21, 24; 28:31; J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts and Its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 131; Schneider, "Gott und Christus," 223: "Da eine absichtliche 'Vermischung' beim Gebrauch von κύριος dem Acta-Verfasser nicht unterstellt werden kann, ist auch die Frage nach eventuellen 'Motiven' in dieser Hinsicht unangebracht."

¹²⁵ Luke 1:43. Cf. de la Potterie, "Le Titre," 119-20; George, "Seigneur," 246.

¹²⁶ Luke 20:41-44; Acts 2:34-36. Cf. George, "Seigneur," 247. For another example, see the discussion about Jesus as Lord in the context of his entry into Jerusalem (Luke 19:31-34; Dupont, "Messie et Seigneur," 375).

is applied to Jesus.¹²⁷

Luke does not explicitly identify Jesus as κύριος when Mal 3:1 is quoted in Luke 7:27 or when it is alluded to in Acts 13:24-25, but Luke's application of the title to Jesus elsewhere makes it probable that he regarded Jesus as the κύριος of Mal 3:1 whose way was prepared by John the Baptist. In keeping with his use of the title in reference to Jesus, Luke will have interpreted κύριος as a reference to Jesus as the messianic agent through whom God worked rather than as the coming of God as κύριος through Jesus. Robert Webb has shown that God was consistently understood to be the main actor behind expected eschatological human agents,¹²⁸ and it is in this sense that God was expected to act through Jesus—even though the extent of Jesus' participation in God's divine rule presumably went beyond what was conventionally expected of the Messiah. Still there is a fine line between the two conceptions, and the early allusions to Malachi 3 in the infancy narrative remain ambiguous. Zechariah's prediction that John "will go before the Lord to prepare his ways" (Luke 1:76) may already refer to John as the forerunner of Jesus, since Jesus was identified as Lord in 1:43,¹²⁹ but Gabriel's announcement that John "will go before him" (1:17) most naturally depicts John as the forerunner of "the Lord their God" (1:16) rather than of the Lord Jesus.¹³⁰

To conclude: Far from distinguishing between the two, Luke identifies the coming "Lord" of Mal 3:1 with the coming Messiah anticipated, at least by believers, in such

¹²⁷ Cf. Dubois, "Elie," 176; Wink, *John*, 76. *Contra* Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 203-4.

¹²⁸ Cf. Webb, *Baptizer*, 257: "While different figures of judgment and restoration were expected, *Yahweh is the prime figure behind all of them.*"

¹²⁹ So Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 385-6; Öhler, *Elia*, 85.

¹³⁰ So Plummer, *Luke*, 15; Marshall, *Luke*, 58; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 327; Nolland, *Luke*, 31. *Contra* Dubois, "Elie," 176; Schürmann, *Lukas 1*, 36; Tilly, *Johannes*, 123; Öhler, *Elia*, 84.

passages as Ps 118:26.¹³¹ Since "Lord" was not a common messianic title,¹³² and since neither Malachi nor Ben Sira refer to a messianic figure in connection with the eschatological Elijah, it is most probable that Luke here conveys a distinctive reading of Mal 3:1 adopted by Jesus' followers in which the coming of the messianic "Lord" through whom God acts is preceded by the eschatological Elijah. At the same time, Jesus' status as "Lord" does not keep Luke from portraying him as a prophet who is still in many ways like Elijah.

Restoring Israel

Malachi 3:23 predicts that Elijah will come and "restore (ἀποκαταστήσει) the heart of father to son and the heart of people to their neighbours." Mark 9:12 indicates that Elijah's "restoration" was understood to extend beyond the healing of broken family relations to include the "restoration of all things (ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα)."¹³³ Luke omits this passage from Mark, but Acts 3:21 also refers to the "restoration of all things (ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων)" announced by God through the prophets—which in context must refer to the disciples' earlier question, "Are you at this time going to restore

¹³¹ Could it be that the belief that Elijah was to be the forerunner of the Messiah arose in part through a conflation of Mal 3:1 and Ps 118:26? This possibility appears to have been overlooked as a result of the assumption that "the one who comes" in Mal 3:1 can refer only to Elijah or to God.

¹³² Dalman, *Words*, 326 cites only *b. Sanh.* 98^a. Cf. Gerhard P. Voss, *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen* (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965), 57 note 8: "Als Messias-titel gibt es κύριος im Judentum nicht."

¹³³ Note that the verb ἀποκαταστάνω is a by-form of ἀποκαθίστημι; cf. BDAG. The LXX translation of Mal 3:22-23 may already offer Elijah an expanded role, for instead of predicting that Elijah will "turn the hearts of parents to their children and the hearts of children to their parents," the LXX says that Elijah will "restore (ἀποκαταστήσει) the heart of father to son, and the heart of a man to his neighbour (καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου πρὸς τὸν πλησίον αὐτοῦ)." The Greek translation of Ben Sira 48:10 extends Elijah's role further by replacing the statement about restoring neighbourly relationships with a clause that echoes LXX Isa 49:6:

Sir 48:10: ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν
καὶ καταστήσαι φυλὰς Ἰακωβ

Isa 49:6: τοῦ στηῆσαι τὰς φυλὰς Ἰακωβ καὶ τὴν
διασπορὰν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψαι.

Cf. Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 71; Meyer, *Prophet*, 94; Öhler, *Elia*, 8.

(ἀποκαθιστάνεις) the kingdom to Israel?"¹³⁴

According to Otto Bauernfeind, traces of an original source remain in the reference to restoration (ἀποκαταστάσεως; Acts 3:21; cf. Mal 3:23), as well as in the promised sending (ἀποστείλῃ; Acts 3:20; cf. Mal 3:22 ἀποστέλλω) of the agent of restoration.¹³⁵ The tradition was originally adapted by disciples who equated Jesus with the eschatological Elijah, but "die messianische Jesusgemeinde" eventually replaced the name Elijah with that of Jesus. Much later when Luke encountered the tradition, he recognized its antiquity, believed that it dated from the apostolic age, and attributed it to Peter, but he remained oblivious to the connections to Malachi 3 embedded in his source.¹³⁶ Thus, according to Bauernfeind, Acts 3:19-21 stands very close to early Jewish beliefs about eschatological prophets, but the passage says nothing about Luke's own awareness of such beliefs, nor does it contribute to an understanding of Luke's portrayal of Jesus and Elijah.¹³⁷

The unusual vocabulary, concentration of diverse christological titles, and

¹³⁴ Acts 1:6. *Contra* Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 289, there is no severe disjunction between Acts 1:6 and 3:21. Even if the promise in Acts 3:21 is more universalistic than the disciples' question in Acts 1:6 (Barrett, *Acts*, 76), both references to restoration occur in the context of God's promises to Israel. Certainly Luke's conception of the promises extends beyond Israel's national hopes, but Luke still regarded the "restoration of all things" as the fulfillment of the promises to Israel. The similar language in Acts 3:21 (ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων) suggests that the concern in Acts 3 is at least related to the disciples' question in Acts 1:6 about the "restoration of the kingdom to Israel." In addition, διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν (Acts 3:21) recalls the national promises made to Israel about a Davidic king that were spoken διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος προφητῶν αὐτοῦ (Luke 1:70). Cf. Ferdinand Hahn, "Das Problem alter christologischer Überlieferungen in der Apostelgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Act 3,19-21," in *Les Actes Des Apôtres: Tradition, Rédaction, Théologie* (ed. J. Kremer; Gembloux/Leuven: J. Duculot/Leuven, 1979), 142-3; Öhler, *Elia*, 223-4, 227. *Contra* Haenchen, *Acts*, 211.

¹³⁵ Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 67. Cf. Otto Bauernfeind, "Tradition und Komposition in dem Apokatastasispruch Apostelgeschichte 3, 20 f.," in *Abraham unser Vater . . . Festschrift für Otto Michel* (eds. O. Betz, M. Hengel, and P. Schmidt; Leiden: Brill, 1963), 17.

¹³⁶ Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 67-8.

¹³⁷ Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 71.

difficult sentence structure in Acts 3:11-26 are best explained by positing Luke's reliance on traditional source material,¹³⁸ but there is also strong evidence that Luke reworked the sources at his disposal in Acts 3.¹³⁹ In any case, it is still necessary to inquire into what Luke *meant* by the text as it stands: Would Luke have intended or recognized an allusion to Mal 3:23 in the word ἀποκατάστασις (Acts 3:21)?

The reference to the "restoration of all things" in both Mark 9:12 and Acts 3:21 convinces some interpreters that both Acts 3:21 and Mark 9:12 develop the same eschatological Elijah traditions based on Malachi 3, and thus that Luke agreed with Mark 9:12 that Elijah's task included restoring all things, and that he omitted Mark 9:12 because he believed that Jesus rather than John was the eschatological Elijah.¹⁴⁰ However, this interpretation is based on a passage that Luke omits from his Gospel, and fails to consider Luke's own references to Malachi 3. Luke never uses words of the ἀποκαθίστημι root in connection with the eschatological Elijah or John the Baptist,¹⁴¹ but instead assigns the task of ethical transformation to the one who will come "in the spirit and power of Elijah." In Luke 1:16-17,¹⁴² John is presented as one who will "turn

¹³⁸ Cf. John A. T. Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?," in *Twelve New Testament Studies* (ed. John A. T. Robinson; London: SCM, 1962), 151; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 283; Barrett, *Acts*, 189.

¹³⁹ Hahn, "Act 3, 19-21," 141, observes that the call to repentance in Acts 3:19 is a typically Lukan motif; the statement about what "God spoke through the mouth of the holy prophets of old" (3:21) is reminiscent of Luke 1:70 and should be attributed to Luke (*contra* Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 67, who takes the verbal parallel as a sign that both Luke 1:70 and Acts 3:21 stem from the same hymn). Although the unique elements within Acts 3:19-21 remain, Luke has integrated the passage into his own theology (Hahn, "Act 3, 19-21," 148). Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 220.

¹⁴⁰ Cf. Kellermann, "Elia-Motiven," 129, 136, who claims that Luke uses Elijah *redivivus* expectations to place the fulfillment of Israel's national hopes for restoration into the future at Jesus' anticipated return. See the similar conclusions of Zwiep, *Ascension*, 116, 180-1, as well as Dubois, "Elie," 173, and Goulder, *Type*, 148.

¹⁴¹ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 206.

¹⁴² Luke 1:13-17 or parts thereof is often attributed to a pre-Lukan source (Öhler, *Elia*, 89 note 323), but Ulrich Busse, "Die Engelrede Lk 1, 13-17 und ihre Vorgeschichte," in *Nach den Anfängen*

(ἐπιστρέψει) many of the people of Israel to the Lord their God" (1:16), and who "will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah, to turn (ἐπιστρέψει) the hearts of parents to their children" (1:17). While Luke 1:16-17 echoes Malachi's earlier prophecy that the Elijah-messenger would "restore (ἀποκαταστήσει) the heart of parents to their children and people to their neighbours," the verb ἐπιστρέφω is used in place of the Septuagint's ἀποκαθίστημι.¹⁴³

There is no suggestion in Luke 1:15-17 that John will restore "all things," let alone that he will restore the kingdom to Israel. Rather than speaking of the turning of "hearts of children to their parents" (Mal 3:23 MT) or of the restoring of the heart of "people to their neighbors" (Mal 3:23 LXX), Luke 1:17 refers to the turning of "the disobedient to the wisdom of the righteous," anticipating the ethical instruction proclaimed by John the Baptist in Luke 3.¹⁴⁴ Instead of speaking of the restoration "of the tribes of Jacob" (Sir 48:10d), Luke 1:17 echoes the language of Isa 40:3 and proclaims that John's task will be "to make ready a people prepared for the Lord."¹⁴⁵ In

Fragen. FS. Gerhard Dautzenberg (eds. Cornelius Mayer, Karlheinz Müller, and Gerhard Schmalenberg; Gießen: Selbstverlag des Fachbereichs Evangelische Theologie und Katholische Theologie, 1994), 163-177, and Brown, *Birth*, 272-9, show that if Luke does not compose this material without the aid of sources, he at least turns the source material at his disposal to his own ends.

¹⁴³ Luke's preference for the verb ἐπιστρέφω over the verb ἀποκαθίστημι appears to have been influenced by the language of LXX Sir 48:10:

Luke 1:17: ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίας πατέρων ἐπὶ τέκνα	Mal 3:23: ὃς ἀποκαταστήσει καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν	Sir 48:10: ἐπιστρέψαι καρδίαν πατρὸς πρὸς υἱὸν
--	--	---

Cf. Brown, *Birth*, 279.

¹⁴⁴ Luke 3:3. Cf. Acts 13:24; Busse, "Engelrede," 174; Tannehill, *Unity* 1, 24.

¹⁴⁵ Brown, *Birth*, 278, claims that Luke 1:16 (πολλοὺς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψει ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτῶν) echoes καταστήσει φυλὰς Ἰακωβ in Sir 48:10, but the last line of Sir 48:10 itself echoes Isa 49:6 (see note 133 above) and portends the national restoration of Israel, while the context of Luke 1:16 suggests that this "turning" is to be understood in ethical terms. Both LXX Sir 48:10 and Luke 1:17 conclude with an infinitive clause, but instead of echoing Isa 49:6 as Sir 48:10 does, the infinitive clause ἐτοιμάσαι κυρίῳ λαὸν κατεσκευασμένον in Luke 1:17 echoes the version of Isa 40:3 that is quoted in Luke 3:4 (ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου) as well as the spliced version of Mal 3:1 and Exod 23:20 quoted in Luke

Luke 1:76, John's task of going "before the Lord to prepare his ways" is defined further as giving "knowledge of salvation to his people by the forgiveness of their sins." Instead of serving as the agent of national restoration, the one who comes in the "spirit and power of Elijah" prepares the people for God to act by serving as an agent of ethical renewal.¹⁴⁶

In contrast to the preparatory role assigned to John, Jesus in Acts 1:6 and 3:21 is charged with the restoration of "Israel." Luke was no doubt aware that some people assigned to Elijah a more prominent role; he may also have been aware of the restoration language used in connection with Elijah in Mal 3:23. But Luke would have denied that the eschatological Elijah had ever rightly been assigned the task of restoring *all* things—that task belonged to the Messiah.¹⁴⁷ Acts 3:21, then, does not connect Jesus to the eschatological Elijah of Malachi 3.

The Nature of Elijah's Return

Thus far I have referred to expectations about Elijah derived from Malachi 3 as "eschatological Elijah" expectations, without specifying the nature of the identification between Elijah and the eschatological Elijah. By itself the original prediction in Mal 3:23 suggests that a return of the actual figure of Elijah was expected. This Elijah *redivivus* expectation¹⁴⁸ is supported further by the Septuagint, which replaces "Elijah the prophet"

7:27: ὃς κατασκευάσει τὴν ὁδὸν σου. Cf. Mark 1:2-3; Busse, "Engelrede," 172-3.

¹⁴⁶ There are several reasons why Luke might have omitted the saying in Mark 9:11-13. Perhaps he thought another statement about John was out of place in the context of the transfiguration especially after having identified John as the eschatological Elijah in Luke 1:17 (Nolland, *Luke*, 322; Johnson, *Luke*, 159; cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 186). Or perhaps Luke omitted the saying because he thought it could be (mis)interpreted in reference to national restoration (cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 224).

¹⁴⁷ This contrasts with Öhler, *Elia*, 226, who concludes that Luke transferred to Jesus a role that he knew belonged to Elijah.

¹⁴⁸ For the terminology see on page 191 above.

with "Elijah the Tishbite,"¹⁴⁹ and by Sir 48:10, which speaks of the return of Elijah after describing Elijah's ascension into heaven. Although Jesus' identification of John with Elijah in Mark 9:13 may be taken as evidence that belief in the return of Elijah was understood as a belief in the coming of a prophet *like* Elijah rather than the return of Elijah himself, there is still a third possibility that would incorporate Jesus' statement that "Elijah has come" into the category of Elijah *redivivus* expectation. According to this explanation, Jesus' identification of John as the eschatological Elijah is not reduced to a metaphorical relationship,¹⁵⁰ but reflects a belief that "one person can return in another person, the former person constituting the essence of the latter person."¹⁵¹ On this view, the popular suggestions that Jesus was John the Baptist, Elijah or one of the prophets (Mark 8:28) are essentially congruent with Jesus' own identification of John with Elijah. Both Jesus and his audiences assumed that the return of Elijah could occur through the reappearance of Elijah in a different person in a different historical context:

In all these texts we are dealing with the idea that a well-known and biographically distinct individual (Jesus of Nazareth, John the Baptist) is in reality someone else—someone who constitutes the theologically significant identity of that individual. This is apparently how the notion of a "return" was conceptualized.¹⁵²

According to Markus Öhler, this same conception lies behind the statement in the pre-Lukan tradition recorded in Luke 1:17 that John will come "in the spirit and power of Elijah." John will not simply be like Elijah, he will be possessed with the actual person

¹⁴⁹ Cf. Zwiep, *Ascension*, 61 note 2.

¹⁵⁰ Öhler, *Elia*, 108: "es muß wohl davon ausgegangen werden, daß es sich nicht um eine Person wie Elia, sondern um den Thesbiten selbst handelt."

¹⁵¹ Klaus Berger, *Identity and Experience in the New Testament* (trans. Charles Muenchow; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003), 30. Evidence for this interpretation of Malachi's prophecy—or at least evidence that Elijah's prophecy could be interpreted in this way—may be found in *L.A.B.* 48:1. Cf. chapter two note 87 as well as Öhler, *Elia*, 108.

¹⁵² Berger, *Identity and Experience*, 30.

of Elijah.¹⁵³ According to Öhler, Luke did not attempt to modify the text because, in contrast to the tradition before him, Luke believed that John was like Elijah rather than really being Elijah.¹⁵⁴ The simple equation "he is Elijah (Ἡλίας ἐστίν)" in Mark 6:15 was understood literally as the return of Elijah in Jesus,¹⁵⁵ but in reworking Mark's account, Luke characteristically obscured the tradition by removing any hint that Elijah was thought to have reappeared in the distinct person of Jesus.¹⁵⁶

However, if the reference to the "spirit and power of Elijah" referred to the incarnation, as it were, of Elijah into John, then we might expect the phrase to appear in connection with his birth instead of in connection with his going before the Lord.¹⁵⁷ The mention of the spirit of Elijah is more likely a reminiscence of the observation in 2 Kgs 2:15 that "the spirit of Elijah rests on Elisha."¹⁵⁸ In 2 Kings, Elisha's request for a double portion of Elijah's spirit appears to have been connected to his ability to work miracles rather than to any desire to be doubly endowed with the essence of Elijah himself. In Luke 1:17, the "spirit and power of Elijah" is similarly connected to John's performance of his prophetic task. Even considered on its own, Luke 1:17 probably functions to

¹⁵³ Öhler, *Elia*, 109: "Gemeint ist damit, daß die Person Elias von Johannes Besitz ergriffen hat, denn πνεῦμα bedeutet hier nichts anderes als auch bei den Dämonenaustreibungen, nur hier im positiven Sinn." Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 82.

¹⁵⁴ Öhler, *Elia*, 89, cf. 82; Busse, "Engelrede," 168.

¹⁵⁵ Öhler, *Elia*, 117.

¹⁵⁶ Öhler, *Elia*, 185.

¹⁵⁷ Öhler, *Elia*, 109, makes the comparison with the incarnation himself. Against Öhler, the involvement of the spirit in connection with John's birth is compared with the spirit's involvement in Jesus' birth (1:35), but the comparison is made in Luke 1:15 not 1:17, and the spirit is there identified as the Holy Spirit rather than the spirit of Elijah.

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Richard Bauckham, "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. James M. Scott; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 448: "The one outstanding difference between Luke and the Jewish traditions is that the latter often make clear and never deny that the eschatological figure of Elijah is the same human person as the historical Elijah who ascended to heaven. Luke's innovation—entailed by the very fact that he is narrating the *birth* of his Elijah-like figure—is to avoid such identity, substituting the phrase: 'in the Spirit and power of Elijah' (1:17), for which he has some precedent in Elisha's relation to Elijah (2 Kgs 2:15)."

identify John as the eschatological Elijah, which is to say, the prophet *like* Elijah who serves as the messenger described in Mal 3:1.

By making explicit the manner of appearance of those with whom Jesus was associated, the interpretation of Mark 6:14-15 in Luke 9:7-8 excludes the possibility that Elijah himself was expected to act in the distinct person of Jesus. Instead of stating "he is Elijah (Ἡλίας ἐστίν)," the crowds in Luke's version say, "Elijah has appeared (Ἡλίας ἐφάνη)" (9:8); and instead of identifying Jesus as "a prophet, like one of the prophets" (Mark 6:14), the crowds in Luke's version considered the possibility that Jesus was one of the *ancient* prophets who had arisen from the dead (Luke 9:8). Luke may be doing nothing more than smoothing out Mark's text,¹⁵⁹ but by stating that the people wondered whether Jesus was a reappearance of Elijah, Luke reveals that he believed the crowds were aware that Elijah had ascended into heaven; he also suggests that the people expected, or at least were willing to consider the possibility of, a return of the biblical prophet Elijah from heaven.¹⁶⁰

The differences between Luke and Mark should not be overstated, however. While Mark's terse account of popular views about Jesus allows for the type of identification between Elijah and Jesus that Berger and Öhler have proposed, there is simply not enough information to elicit the nature of the identity supposed by the crowds. The suggestion that Jesus was John the Baptist raised from the dead is at least as difficult to comprehend as the belief that Jesus was a physical reappearance of Elijah. Moreover,

¹⁵⁹ Bovon, *Luke*, 348.

¹⁶⁰ The fact that Elijah has already been connected to Israel's eschatological hopes in Luke 1:17 suggests that this is no trivial comparison.

the appearance of Elijah at the transfiguration implies that the essence of Elijah's identity was connected to the figure from the past who appeared at the transfiguration. The disciples would know him when they saw him. Though the disciples' question about the coming of Elijah was prompted by Jesus' comments about the resurrection,¹⁶¹ its narrative placement immediately after the transfiguration functions to shape the readers' expectations about the nature of the coming Elijah. In this context, Jesus' answer that "Elijah has come" (Mark 9:13) is more a riddle than a statement about a well-recognized form of expectation. Obviously, it came as a surprise to the disciples who had still been expecting the coming of Elijah.¹⁶² The answer to the riddle could involve the explanation that Elijah had really come in the person of John. But Mark does not supply enough information for us to form this conclusion with confidence, and the answer to the riddle could just as easily have involved a metaphorical interpretation of Malachi's prophecy, with Jesus explaining that the return of Elijah really meant the return of a prophet like Elijah rather than the return of Elijah himself.

Although Luke omits the question about Elijah in Mark 9:11-13, he too maintains that the eschatological Elijah of Malachi 3 referred to another prophet like Elijah rather than to Elijah *redivivus*. Luke attributes the latter belief to the Jewish crowds, but he is careful to avoid a literal identification of either Jesus or John the Baptist as Elijah.¹⁶³ John the Baptist was to act in the spirit and power of Elijah (1:17); he was the Elijanic messenger of Mal 3:1 (Luke 7:27), but he was not Elijah himself. In Luke as well as

¹⁶¹ Mark 9:9-10. So correctly Fitzmyer, "Elijah," 295; Öhler, *Elia*, 41.

¹⁶² Matthew 17:13 implies that the logion was also puzzling to later interpreters.

¹⁶³ Marshall, *Historian*, 147. Cf. Miller, "Elijah," 619 note 3; Feiler, "Jesus," 263-4.

Mark and Matthew, the transfiguration makes clear the difference between the past and the present, the difference between Elijah himself and prophets like Elijah.¹⁶⁴

Conclusion

We have seen that Luke frequently associates Jesus with stories from the life of Elijah. In addition to Jesus' explicit comparison of himself with Elijah, the narrator compares the miracle at Nain with Elijah's raising of the widow of Zarephath's son, Jesus' interactions with would-be disciples echo Elijah's calling of Elisha, the multitude accuses Jesus of "perverting" the Jewish nation just as Ahab had accused Elijah of "perverting" Israel, and the portrayal of the ascension of Jesus into heaven echoes Elijah's ascension into heaven. These parallels are more positive and more pervasive than is often allowed. Together they suggest that Luke intentionally depicted Jesus as a prophet *like* Elijah.

In their attempt to account for Luke's redactional changes to Mark, those who deny that Luke regarded John as the eschatological Elijah do not notice that Luke's employment of Elijah traditions follows a consistent pattern. Luke draws freely from the biblical account of Elijah's life to aid his portrayal of Jesus, but while the crowds speculate that Jesus is a reappearance of Elijah (Luke 9:8, 19), the narrator and reliable characters within Luke-Acts connect passages related to the prediction of Elijah's *return* to John, but not to Jesus. Thus, Gabriel (1:17), Zechariah (1:76), Jesus (7:22), and John himself (3:16) identify *John* as the one who fills the role of the Elijahian messenger of Malachi 3. This dissociation of Jesus from the role of the Elijahian messenger

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Green, *Luke*, 381. This difference is illustrated immediately after the transfiguration when the disciples James and John apparently adopted this more figurative interpretation of Mal 3:23, requesting permission to call down fire from heaven just as Elijah had done in 2 Kings 1 (Luke 9:54-56).

demonstrates that Luke conceived of John rather than Jesus as the *eschatological* prophet like Elijah.

Those who use the parallels between Jesus and Elijah to identify Jesus rather than John with the eschatological Elijah also fail adequately to consider why Luke retained the link between John the Baptist and Elijah in Luke 1:17 when he could have eliminated it altogether if he had regarded it as problematic. Appearing as it does at the beginning of Luke's Gospel, this characterisation of John the Baptist as a prophet like Elijah prepares the reader for what follows in the ensuing narrative. Indeed, readers of Luke's Gospel familiar with Scripture could not fail to conclude from the infancy narrative that John was to be understood in terms of the Elijah predicted in Malachi 3. When Jesus later applies Mal 3:1 directly to John the Baptist (7:27), Luke may have seen no reason to make the intended allusion to the Elijanic messenger more obvious than it already was.¹⁶⁵ Luke may have omitted the discussion about John's identity as Elijah in Mark 9:11-13 because he did not want his readers to confuse John's more limited task of restoration with the final restorative role attributed to Jesus; but also because in the immediate context of the transfiguration he was concerned only with Jesus' identity. If the Elijanic role of John is downplayed in Luke, it is not because he wants to correct his sources and claim that John was not a prophet like Elijah, but because he consistently removes John from centre stage to focus all attention on Jesus.

Finally, Luke's association of both John and Jesus with Elijah need not be

¹⁶⁵ Since Matthew elsewhere makes the connections between Elijah and John the Baptist explicit, the statement in Matt 11:14 explaining that John the Baptist "is the Elijah that was to come," can be safely attributed to Matthew's own redaction.

explained by excluding an eschatological use of the tradition altogether, for we have seen that Luke distinguishes between stories from Elijah's life which are echoed in Luke's portrayal of Jesus, and passages from Malachi 3 which are applied to John. Nor does Luke's presentation of John as the forerunner of the Lord Jesus instead of as the forerunner of God imply any diminution of John's eschatological role.¹⁶⁶ In contrast to the crowds who speculate that Jesus is Elijah *redivivus*, Luke claims that neither John nor Jesus *is* Elijah. John is a prophet who fulfills the eschatological role of Malachi's Elijahian messenger to prepare the way for the Lord Jesus. Yet this does not prevent Luke from applying characteristics of Elijah—as well as other prophets—to Jesus, the central character in his story. Although Jesus is the Lord of Malachi 3, Luke also portrays him as a prophet whose actions correspond to those of Elijah.

¹⁶⁶ As suggested by Miller, "Elijah," 621.

Chapter 6: From "Prophet like Moses" to Exalted "Lord"

When Peter names Moses as an example of the holy prophets from long ago who predicted the coming of the Messiah, he quotes from Deut 18:15: "Moses said, 'The Lord your God will raise up (ἀναστήσει) for you from your own people a prophet like me. You must listen to whatever he tells you'" (Acts 3:22). The identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses is sometimes regarded as an isolated statement left undeveloped by Luke,¹ but there is a strong tendency in recent Lukan scholarship to argue at the very least that Acts 3:22 provides the key to Jesus' prophetic identity, if not also to major aspects of Luke's theology and to the structure of Luke-Acts as a whole.²

For example, scholars have often remarked how Luke emphasizes the necessity of the Messiah's suffering in fulfillment of Scripture, but does not dwell on the "soteriological significance" of Jesus' death³ or explain where in Scripture he found the Messiah's suffering foretold.⁴ According to David Moessner, however, the perception that Luke was uninterested in the salvific effects of Jesus' death and that he failed to demonstrate the necessity of that death from Scripture results from a failure to perceive the way in which Jesus the Messiah is portrayed by Luke in terms of the *Deuteronomistic*

¹ Conzelmann, *Theology*, 167 note 3: "If we relate Deut. xviii, 15, 18 to Christ (Acts iii, 22 f.; vii, 37), then there is admittedly a suggestion of typology; but Luke has simply taken it over from the tradition without reflecting on it." Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:868-9; Teeple, *Mosaic*, 87-8, 120; Cullmann, *Christology*, 37-8; Richard F. Zehnle, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971), 89; Aune, *Prophecy*, 155; Barrett, *Acts*, 208; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 793.

² Cf. Hastings, *Prophet*; Marshall, *Historian*, 127-8; Minear, *Reveal*; Johnson, *Luke*, 18-9; Dillon, "Prophecy," 544-56; Moessner, *Lord*; Feiler, "Jesus"; O'Toole, "Parallels," 22-9; Allison, *Moses*, 98-100; Turner, *Power*, 238-40; Schubert, "Image."

³ Conzelmann, *Theology*, 201; cf. Franklin, *Christ*, 65.

⁴ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 200.

prophet like Moses whose coming all the prophets predicted.⁵ Building on the work of other scholars who argue that the mention of Jesus' ἔξοδος in Luke 9:31 links Jesus' death to the redemptive events of the exodus from Egypt under Moses,⁶ Moessner contends that as the prophet like Moses, Jesus was sent at the transfiguration on a "suffering journey" which culminated in an atoning death outside Jerusalem that brought deliverance to the children of Israel just as Moses' earlier death outside the land effected deliverance for Israel.⁷ What is more, Luke's exodus typology "becomes *the organizing principle* for the form and content of the whole of the Central Section" of Luke's Gospel (9:51-19:44).⁸

Moessner is not alone in concluding that the concept of the prophet like Moses contributes to the structure of Luke-Acts. In an influential monograph and two commentaries, Luke Timothy Johnson has argued that the explanatory power of the prophet like Moses concept extends well beyond the central section of Luke's Gospel. According to Johnson, "Luke uses the prophetic pattern established by his reading of the Moses story to structure his entire two-volume work."⁹ Other scholars maintain that Luke interpreted Deuteronomy's prediction of a prophet like Moses through the lens of "new exodus" and servant passages from Isaiah, which enabled him to achieve in Jesus a synthesis of the expectations of the Davidic Messiah and the prophet like Moses.¹⁰

⁵ Moessner, *Lord*, 264. Busse, *Wunder*, 376, 400-1 and Nebe, *Züge*, 105, also claim that Luke portrayed Jesus as a *Deuteronomistic* eschatological prophet like Moses. Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 284.

⁶ Cf. Evans, "Central Section," 37-53; Manek, "New Exodus," 8-23; Sharon H. Ringe, "Luke 9:28-36: The Beginning of an Exodus," *Semeia* 28 (1983): 83-99; Garrett, "Exodus," 656-80.

⁷ Moessner, *Lord*, 57, 60, 68, 82, 76 note 67.

⁸ Moessner, *Lord*, 60.

⁹ Johnson, *Acts*, 13. Johnson's argument was originally set forward in Johnson, *Literary*, 60f. Clark, *Parallel*, 272, writing in 2001, shows how influential Johnson's explanation has been when he states, "For it is in this section [Acts 7] that Luke is concerned to emphasise *the prophetic pattern which structures his whole work*."

¹⁰ Cf. Sloan, *Jubiliary*, 71-3; Bock, *Proclamation*, 110-1; Allison, *Moses*, 90; Turner, *Power*, 243;

Although there are still differences "of contextual appropriateness,"¹¹ Max Turner concludes that the Isaianic new exodus motif "best explains Luke's remarkable fusion of Davidic, servant and Mosaic Christologies, which otherwise might seem merely 'promiscuous', if not bizarre."¹²

One of the major goals of this chapter, then, is to determine the meaning as well as the significance of Luke's application of Deut 18:15 to Jesus. Luke might have assumed that his readers knew Jesus was the prophet like Moses and that they knew what this designation entailed, but contemporary scholars dare not make this assumption absent supporting evidence in the text of Luke-Acts, for we have seen already that there is little to suggest the expectation of an eschatological prophet like Moses assumed a widely accepted form in Second Temple Jewish writings. Since the presence of analogies between Moses and Jesus is undeniable in Acts 3 and 7, it is tempting to conclude that when Jesus is presented as a prophet in other passages the concept of the prophet like Moses lies in the background; it is also tempting to regard as Mosaic those characteristics that are attributed to Moses in Acts 7 and to Jesus elsewhere in Luke-Acts. Nevertheless, adopting passages from Luke's second volume as the interpretive key to Luke's conception of Jesus as a prophet (if not the structure of his whole work) may fail to consider the message Luke wished to convey to his readers, as well as the effect the story would have had on his audience when read in sequence. The explicit identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses in Acts 3:22 does not *necessarily* mean that Jesus is

David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2000; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002), 77. Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 304.

¹¹ Turner, *Power*, 241.

¹² Turner, *Power*, 248-9.

demonstrates that Luke conceived of John rather than Jesus as the *eschatological* prophet like Elijah.

Those who use the parallels between Jesus and Elijah to identify Jesus rather than John with the eschatological Elijah also fail adequately to consider why Luke retained the link between John the Baptist and Elijah in Luke 1:17 when he could have eliminated it altogether if he had regarded it as problematic. Appearing as it does at the beginning of Luke's Gospel, this characterisation of John the Baptist as a prophet like Elijah prepares the reader for what follows in the ensuing narrative. Indeed, readers of Luke's Gospel familiar with Scripture could not fail to conclude from the infancy narrative that John was to be understood in terms of the Elijah predicted in Malachi 3. When Jesus later applies Mal 3:1 directly to John the Baptist (7:27), Luke may have seen no reason to make the intended allusion to the Elijahan messenger more obvious than it already was.¹⁶⁵ Luke may have omitted the discussion about John's identity as Elijah in Mark 9:11-13 because he did not want his readers to confuse John's more limited task of restoration with the final restorative role attributed to Jesus, but also because in the immediate context of the transfiguration he was concerned only with Jesus' identity. If the Elijahan role of John is downplayed in Luke, it is not because Luke wants to correct his sources and claim that John was not a prophet like Elijah, but because he consistently removes John from centre stage to focus all attention on Jesus.

Finally, Luke's association of both John and Jesus with Elijah need not be

¹⁶⁵ Since Matthew elsewhere makes the connections between Elijah and John the Baptist explicit, the statement in Matt 11:14 explaining that John the Baptist "is the Elijah that was to come," can be safely attributed to Matthew's own redaction.

portrayed as *the* eschatological Mosaic prophet whenever he is identified as a prophet. Indeed, I will argue that Luke most likely had no conception of "the prophet like Moses," understood as an independent eschatological figure. Luke did believe that Deut 18:15 was fulfilled in Jesus as the Messiah, but he thought the primary significance of Moses' prediction was in the requirement to "listen" to Jesus.

Evidence for a Moses-Jesus Typology

Stephen's Speech

Stephen's speech in Acts 7 is the clearest development of a Moses-Jesus typology in Luke and Acts. Sensitive readers of Luke's narrative—especially those equipped with a concordance—will observe that many of the statements about Moses in Acts 7 echo descriptions of Jesus made elsewhere. The following direct verbal parallels are commonly noted¹³: (1) Moses is depicted as "powerful in his words and deeds (δυνατὸς ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ)" (Acts 7:22). Cleopas and his companion describe Jesus in almost identical terms, referring to Jesus as a "prophet powerful in deed and word (προφήτης δυνατὸς ἐν ἔργῳ καὶ λόγῳ)" (Luke 24:19). (2) Stephen says, "Moses was raised in all the wisdom (ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ) of the Egyptians" (Acts 7:22). Luke mentions the wisdom (σοφία) of Jesus in Luke 2:40, 52. (3) Stephen explains that Moses "thought his brothers would understand that God was providing salvation (σωτηρία) through his hand" (7:25). The word σωτηρία is never applied to Moses in the Septuagint, but elsewhere in Luke-Acts it is frequently connected to Jesus, whose task it was to "seek and

¹³ Most of the parallels mentioned in this paragraph are discussed in O'Toole, "Parallels," 22-9. Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:868 note 226; John J. Kilgallen, *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7.2-53* (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 64-80; Allison, *Moses*, 99-100.

to save the lost."¹⁴ (4) The exodus connotations of the verb ἐπισκέπτομαι associate Moses' visitation of his people (Acts 7:23) to God's visitation of his people in Jesus.¹⁵ (5) Citing Exod 2:14, Stephen identifies Moses as a ruler and judge (ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν; 7:27, 35); according to Acts 7:35b, Moses was a "ruler and deliverer (ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν). Jesus is identified in similar terms as "prince and saviour (ἀρχηγὸν καὶ σωτήρα)" (Acts 5:31), and in Luke 12:14, Jesus echoes the language though not the titles of Exod 2:14 when he asks, "Who appointed me judge or arbiter between you?"¹⁶ (6) Both Moses (Acts 7:34) and Jesus (Luke 4:43; 10:16) were sent (ἀποστέλλω) by God. (7) The verb ἀρνέομαι is never applied to Moses in the Septuagint, but according to Acts both Moses (7:35) and Jesus (3:13-14; 4:16) were denied (ἀρνέομαι) by the people of Israel. (8) Moses is never identified as a redeemer in the Septuagint, but Stephen explains that the Moses denied by the Israelites was sent by God as a "ruler and redeemer (ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν)" (Acts 7:35). The Emmaus disciples also admit, "We had hoped he was the one to redeem (λυτροῦσθαι) Israel" (Luke 24:21). (9) According to Stephen, Moses performed "signs and wonders (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα)" (Acts 7:36); according to Peter, Jesus performed "miracles, wonders and signs (δυνάμεσι καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις)" (2:22). (10) In the middle of his survey of Moses' career, Stephen pauses to remind his hearers of the Mosaic promise that God would raise up a prophet like

¹⁴ Luke 19:9. The word σωτηρία is explicitly connected to Jesus in Luke 1:69, 71; 19:9; Acts 4:12; 13:26.

¹⁵ Luke 1:68; 7:16. See chapter five page 197f.

¹⁶ Compare τίς σε κατέστησεν ἄρχοντα καὶ δικαστήν ἐφ' ἡμῶν; (Exod 2:14) with τίς με κατέστησεν κριτὴν ἢ μεριστὴν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς; (Luke 12:14). According to Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 176, this reminiscence "seems to point to a contrast rather than to a resemblance between them." On the other hand, Nolland, *Luke*, 685, thinks the allusion is ironic, signalling that the questioner did not recognize Jesus' authority as a "new 'Mosaic' figure."

Moses (Acts 7:37). Although the identity of the Mosaic prophet is not made explicit at this point in his defence, readers of Acts know from 3:22-23 that the prophet like Moses is Jesus. (11) Finally, it goes without saying that both Moses (Acts 7:37-8) and Jesus (Luke 13:33) are portrayed as prophets.

Taken as a whole these parallels are convincing. The charges against Stephen centre around questions about the relative authority of Moses and Jesus (Acts 6:14), and there is an unmistakable connection at the end of the sermon between the rejection of Moses and all the prophets on the one hand, and the rejection of the "Righteous One" on the other. In this context it can hardly be doubted that Luke intended to set up an extended typology between Moses and Jesus in Acts 7.¹⁷ The sheer length of Stephen's speech suggests that this Moses-Jesus typology was important to Luke.

No doubt Luke's conviction that Jesus fulfilled Deut 18:15 contributed to the development of this series of parallels, but it is not clear that the typology developed here explains what Luke believed it *meant* for Jesus to be the prophet like Moses. After all, the focus of Stephen's speech was not on Jesus' identity, but on the consistent failure of Israel to respond positively to God and his messengers (Acts 7:51-53). Moreover, the presence of a typology in Acts 7 fails to demonstrate that the Mosaic prophet motif is widespread throughout Luke-Acts, much less that Jesus' prophetic identity should be understood primarily as that of *the* prophet (like Moses). As Paul Feiler admits,

The fact that in the 'parallelism,' the references to Jesus are scattered but the ones to Moses are, for the most part, concentrated in Acts 7 could lead to the conclusion that

¹⁷ Regardless of conclusions about a pre-Lukan source behind Acts 7, the parallels between Moses in Acts 7 and Jesus throughout Luke-Acts cannot all be attributed to pre-Lukan sources. So also Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 159. *Contra* Barrett, Acts, 337-9.

Luke is here paralleling Moses to Jesus (the 'Jesufication' of Moses) rather than paralleling Jesus to Moses (the 'Mosification' of Jesus).¹⁸

Hence, it would be unwise to move from the existence of similarities between Moses and Jesus to the conclusion that these shared characteristics are essentially Mosaic in quality. Both Moses and Jesus were sent by God, but since a divine commission was commonly associated with prophets, the sending of Jesus need not be conceived of in Mosaic terms.¹⁹ Similarly, even though both Moses and Jesus provide "salvation," we should not conclude without further ado that Jesus' saving mission was regarded as a Mosaic activity. Some of the parallels between Jesus and Moses are only convincing because they occur among a dense cluster of other links between Moses and Jesus. Other parallels are also connected by Luke to a Joseph-Jesus typology that precedes the admittedly more extensive Moses-Jesus typology:²⁰ like Jesus, Joseph was betrayed;²¹ like Jesus, Joseph is given grace and wisdom;²² like Jesus, Joseph was appointed as ruler;²³ and just as God saved Israel through Joseph, so he provided salvation through Jesus.²⁴

I will examine other possible parallels between Jesus and Moses in the course of the discussion below—excluding some and accepting others. Rather than building a case

¹⁸ Feiler, "Jesus," 111-2 note 3. Cf. Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 160.

¹⁹ See chapter three page 96 above.

²⁰ Cf. Jacques Dupont, "L'utilisation apologétique de l'Ancien Testament dans les discours des Actes," in *Études*, 252; Kilgallen, *Stephen*, 41-63 (esp. 48-49, 62).

²¹ The word παραδίδωμι is frequently used of Jesus' betrayal and handing over to the Gentiles (cf. Luke 9:44, 18:32, 20:20; 22:4; 23:25; 24:7). In Acts 7:9 the verb is used with reference to Joseph. Cf. also προδότης, which is applied to those who rejected Jesus in Acts 7:53.

²² Luke 2:40, 52; 4:22; Acts 7:9.

²³ Joseph was appointed ruler (ἡγούμενος) over Egypt (Acts 7:10); Jesus is implicitly identified as ὁ ἡγούμενος in Luke 22:26.

²⁴ There are no verbal parallels between these two characteristics, as words of the σωτηρ- root are not used of Joseph. God's deliverance of Israel by means of Joseph is patent, however, in the biblical account (cf. Gen 50:20-21).

from scattered allusions to Moses, those who emphasize the importance of Luke's Moses Christology tend to rest more weight on characteristics that figure prominently in Luke's depiction of Moses and that are alleged to be basic to Luke's portrayal of Jesus. In what follows I will examine three characteristics of Jesus that are judged to be Mosaic partially—but not only—because they are associated with Moses in Acts 7: Both Jesus and Moses experience persecution, both perform "wonders and signs," and both bring deliverance to Israel. In addition, I will consider the claim that the mention of Jesus' "exodus" in Luke 9:31 is an important clue to Jesus' Mosaic identity as well as the assertion that Luke combined Jesus' Mosaic and Davidic roles in light of "new exodus" passages in Isaiah. First, however, we turn to Luke Timothy Johnson's contention that the key to the structure of Luke-Acts is found in Peter's initial identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses.

The "Raising Up" of the Prophet Like Moses

According to Johnson, Acts 3:22-26 presents Jesus as a prophet who, like Moses, was sent twice to his people, the first time during his earthly ministry, the second time through his disciples after his "raising up" from the dead²⁵:

²²Moses said, "The Lord your God will raise up (ἀναστήσει) for you from your own people a prophet like me. You must listen to whatever he tells you. ²³And it will be that everyone who does not listen to that prophet will be utterly rooted out of the people." ²⁴And all the prophets, as many as have spoken, from Samuel and those after him, also predicted these days. ²⁵You are the descendants of the prophets and of the covenant that God gave to your ancestors, saying to Abraham, "And in your descendants all the families of the earth shall be blessed." ²⁶When God raised up (ἀναστήσας) his servant, he sent him first to you, to bless you by turning each of you from your wicked ways. (Acts 3:22-26)

²⁵ Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 13; Johnson, *Literary*, 60-76.

If, as is frequently suggested, the "raising up (ἀνίστημι)" of Jesus refers at least in part to his *resurrection* from the dead,²⁶ Luke must have envisaged the *resurrected* prophet like Moses now summoning Israel to repentance through his disciples.²⁷

In addition to its impressive pedigree, this interpretation of ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:22, 26 is supported by the following arguments: (1) The verb ἀνίστημι, as well as its synonym ἐγείρω, often denotes the resurrection of the dead and could be used in the same way here.²⁸ (2) It is typical for speeches in Acts to include a scriptural citation that

²⁶ Cf. Dupont, "L'utilisation," 249; Gils, *Jésus*, 34; Goulder, *Type*, 159; Moule, "Christology," 169; Schnider, *Jesus*, 93; William Stephen Kurz, "Acts 3:19-26 As a Test of the Role of Eschatology in Lukan Christology," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1977 Seminar Papers* (ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977), 312; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 136-7; Robert F. O'Toole, "Some Observations on *Anistemi*, 'I Raise,' in Acts 3:22-26," *ScEs* 31 (1979): 85-92; Johnson, *Literary*, 67; Dennis Hamm, "Acts 3:12-26 : Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lamé," *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11 (1984): 213; Jacques Schlosser, "Moïse, serviteur du kerygme apostolique d'après Ac 3,22-26," *RSR* 61 (1987): 29; Bovon, *Theologian*, 197, 341; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 114; Feiler, "Jesus," 50-1; Moessner, *Lord*, 68-9, 324; Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 56 note 19; Schubert, "Image," 100, 210; Kraus, "Dtn 18,15-18," 158-9. Cf. Richard Belward Rackham, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Exposition* (9th ed.; 1901; London: Methuen, repr. 1922), 55; Calvin, *Acts* 1, 162: "But Peter meaneth rather, that Christ was raised up, when he was declared to be the author of the blessing; which thing, since it was done of late and suddenly, it ought to move their minds the more."

An allusion in Acts 3:26 to the quotation from Deut 18:15 (cited in Acts 3:22) is widely accepted regardless of one's interpretation of ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:26. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 290-91, however, interprets ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:22 as a reference to the coming on the scene of Jesus in fulfillment of Deut 18:15, but takes ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:26 as a reference to Jesus' resurrection, citing Acts 2:24 rather than 3:22 as a parallel. Against Fitzmyer, the following points demonstrate that both Acts 3:22 and 3:26 allude to Deut 18:15: (1) As the word ἀνίστημι in 3:22 is repeated in 3:26, it is likely that the referents of the verb are related if not identical in both verses. (2) The mission of the servant in 3:26 is the positive counterpart to the mission of the prophet like Moses in 3:22-23: the statement about the prophet like Moses highlights the potential negative consequences for those who do not listen and repent, while the servant is sent "to bless you by turning each of you from your evil ways." Johnson, *Literary*, 67 accepts the connection between Acts 3:22 and 3:26, and agrees that 3:26 refers to the resurrection, but maintains that Acts 3:22 also refers to the appointing of Jesus as prophet during his earthly ministry. The claim of Vermes, *Jesus*, 97, that Acts 3 presents Deut 18:15 as a prediction of the return of the prophet like Moses at the parousia, overlooks the connection between 3:22 and 3:26.

²⁷ Cf. Robert F. O'Toole, *Acts 26. The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense (Ac 22:1-26:32)* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978), 119; Johnson, *Literary*, 66-7; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 137; Hamm, "Healing," 213; Schlosser, "Moïse," 30; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 114; Moessner, *Lord*, 69, 324; Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 56; Schubert, "Image," 75.

²⁸ Sometimes the meaning resurrection is made explicit by adding "from the dead," as in Luke 7:22; 9:7; 20:37; Acts 3:15; 4:10; 13:30; 26:8 for ἐγείρω; and Luke 16:31; Acts 10:41; 13:34; 17:3; 17:31 (ἀνίστημι). At other times the reader must judge from the context which denotation is intended. Other

proves the resurrection; the quotation from Deut 18:15 is the only conceivable example of such a proof-text in this context. (3) References to Jesus' resurrection rather than to Jesus' earthly life are expected at the conclusion of speeches in Acts. (4) The belief that the resurrected prophet like Moses continued working through his disciples accounts for the strong parallels between Jesus and his disciples in Acts. (5) The connection between the resurrection and the identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses explains why Luke waited until Acts 3 to unveil Jesus as the fulfillment of Deut 18:15—Luke could not explicitly identify Jesus as the Mosaic prophet before the resurrection because, on this reading, Deut 18:15 is a prediction of the resurrection. (6) Both the summons to repentance and the warning about the consequences of rejection are tied to the prophet like Moses, and also correspond to the pattern of Jewish rejection of the message about Jesus that is played out in Acts. More importantly, (7) the warning in Acts 3:23 about the need for repentance would only be effective if Peter's audience could now hear Jesus speaking through Peter.

The arguments presented so far do not all carry the same weight. Some are not persuasive when considered on their own; others are nearly compelling. To my knowledge, no convincing response has yet been given to the final argument: (8) The description of the "raised up" servant's mission to *bless* the people corresponds best to what Jesus' followers were able to do in Acts as a result of the resurrection. That is, the blessings offered by the "raised up" servant in Acts 3:26 constitute the promises to

contextual indicators make it clear that ἐγείρω refers to resurrection in Luke 8:54; 9:22; 24:6, 34; Acts 5:30, 10:40; 13:37; cf. Luke 11:31. Other contextual indicators confirm that ἀνίστημι refers to resurrection in Luke 7:14; 8:55; 18:33 and 24:7, 46; Acts 2:24, 32; 9:34, 40; cf. Luke 11:32.

Abraham (3:25), which in this context most naturally include the promised Holy Spirit—a gift that was only made available *after* the resurrection. If these arguments are accepted and the "raising up" of the prophet like Moses is taken as a reference to the resurrection of Jesus, then the concept of the prophet like Moses does indeed play an integral role not only in Acts 3 but also in Luke-Acts as a whole.

Nevertheless, although it promises to resolve difficulties present in other readings of Peter's sermon, this interpretation creates an additional problem of its own. If the "raising up" of God's servant refers to the resurrection of Jesus, who was *sent* a second time after his resurrection "to bless you by turning each of you from your wicked ways" (3:26), then *Peter* must be envisaged as the agent through whom Jesus is now *sent* to bless Peter's audience. But is it really likely that Luke's implied readers (let alone Peter's audience within Luke's story world) would judge from the evidence in Peter's sermon that Peter was referring to *himself* as the agent of blessing when he said that God "raised up his servant" and "sent him to bless [the people] by turning [them] from their evil ways" (3:26)?²⁹ I will argue that the correct answer to this question is "no." Although ἀνίστημι can denote resurrection and although Luke can speak of Jesus working through his disciples, a reference to the sending of Jesus through his disciples is surely not the most obvious interpretation of Acts 3:26 when the verse is considered on its own. It is therefore necessary to bring forward evidence from the immediate context demonstrating how Luke prepared his readers for this surprising presentation of Jesus as the one through whom Jesus was sent—or at least to show how such an interpretative move is plausible in

²⁹ Cf. the criterion of "historical plausibility" in Hays, *Echoes*, 30-1.

light of statements Luke makes in other contexts. But most of the arguments adduced in support of this interpretation are circumstantial. Though they add force to this interpretation of "raising up," these arguments will only contribute to a cumulative case if there are other more compelling reasons to secure this interpretation of the passage.

I will argue that the more substantial arguments for this interpretation either misconstrue the structure of Luke's narrative or are not sufficient to account for the unexpected reference to the sending of Jesus in Peter which this reading requires. Finally, I will propose an alternative explanation according to which Peter refers back to the "blessing" brought by Jesus during his earthly life in order to demonstrate the necessity of repenting and "heeding" the message of the prophet like Moses so that his audience can receive the full blessing now offered to them. In my view, this explanation accounts for the difficulties raised by Acts 3:22-26 more simply and effectively than the interpretation that requires a reference to Jesus' resurrection in the "raising up" of the prophet like Moses. In order to support my answer, it will be necessary first to explain more fully the arguments summarized above and then to respond to them.

Circumstantial Arguments

Though they add force to the interpretation of "raising up" as a reference to resurrection, several arguments are easily accounted for under other configurations of the data.

The Meaning of ἀνίστημι: Given Luke's assumption that all Scripture points to Jesus,³⁰ and his frequent use of ἀνίστημι to refer to the resurrection, he certainly could

³⁰ Luke 24:27, 44-47. Cf. Dupont, "L'utilisation," 246.

have seen a reference to the resurrection in Deut 18:15. Yet the mere possibility of interpreting Deut 18:15 as a prediction of the resurrection is not enough to prove that Luke interpreted the text this way. Both ἀνίστημι and its synonym ἐγείρω are used in Luke-Acts with the meanings "to stand up," "to rise up," "to appoint," and "to come on the scene."³¹ As a result, those who argue that the "raising up" of Jesus in Acts 3:22, 26 refers to his resurrection generally combine the argument from the common meaning of ἀνίστημι with the claim that this interpretation is required by the immediate context of Acts 3.

The Normal Function of Quotations from Scripture: Luke normally applies the message of the prophets "who proclaimed these days" (3:24) to Jesus, or more specifically, to his death and resurrection.³² Since Deut 18:15 has no relation to the suffering of the Messiah, and does not appear to be related to the establishment of the eschatological kingdom, Jacques Dupont concluded that the reason for its introduction must have been to provide scriptural evidence for the resurrection.³³ But Luke's normal usage allows for exceptions (cf. Acts 1:6; 7:42-43). Indeed, the "days" proclaimed by the prophets most likely includes the period of the early church—at least according to Acts

³¹ The word ἐγείρω means "to appoint" or "to bring into being" in Luke 1:69; 3:8; Acts 13:22. The word ἀνίστημι clearly denotes "arising" in the sense of "appearing on the scene" in Acts 5:36-37; 6:9; 7:18; 20:30. It is frequently suggested that ἀνίστημι refers to the resurrection in Acts 13:33 (Dupont, "Filius meus es tu," 531-32; Haenchen, *Acts*, 411; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 516-7). If this is the case, it at least seems clear that Luke did not *unreflectingly* apply the verb to the resurrection because he uses the synonymous verb ἐγείρω in two different senses in the immediate context: in Acts 13:22 he speaks of "raising up" David as king, while in Acts 13:30 he refers to the raising (ῥῆγειρεν) of Jesus from the dead. For other examples of the meaning "resurrection" see note 28 above.

³² Cf. Acts 3:18; Luke 24:27; 24:45-47. The promises to Israel are associated with hope in the resurrection again in Acts 26:6-8. Cf. Acts 2:25-28 (Ps 16:8-11); Acts 13:35 (Ps 16:10). The "hope of the resurrection" is referred to again in Acts 23:6 and 24:15. Cf. Dupont, "Filius meus es tu," 529; O'Toole, "I Raise," 89-90.

³³ Cf. Dupont, "L'utilisation," 249.

3:24.³⁴ Nor is the resurrection always supported by Scripture; particularly in Acts 3-4 the resurrection is supported by an appeal to the healing of the lame man (3:15-16; 4:10).

Normal Subject Matter at the End of Speeches in Acts: It is true that statements about Jesus' earthly life are rare in Acts, and do not appear elsewhere at the end of a speech.³⁵ On the other hand, Luke is not bound by any requirement to end his speeches with a reference to the resurrection. Rather than saying that speeches in Acts tend to conclude with a reference to the resurrection, it is more accurate to say that they normally conclude with a real or implied call to repentance, a challenge, or at least an accusation of guilt.³⁶ In Acts 3, the warning attached to the prediction of a prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22-23),³⁷ together with the mention of the promises to Abraham (3:25), underline the necessity of responding to the call to repentance. Acts 3:26 thus echoes the language of Deut 18:15 quoted in 3:22 and, reiterating the exhortation of 3:19, brings the sermon to a close with the expected reminder of the need for repentance: God sent "his servant to bless you by turning each of you from your *wicked* ways." It is not surprising that the resurrection, as the culmination of the story of Jesus, tends to appear towards the end of sermons in Acts, but it is misleading to use this as evidence for a reference to resurrection

³⁴ Cf. chapter three page 86 above as well as Barrett, *Acts*, 210-1.

³⁵ O'Toole, "I Raise," 86. But see the summaries within speeches in Acts 2:22, 10:36-39. Since Luke had already written a narrative about Jesus' life on earth, lengthy summaries were unnecessary.

³⁶ In Acts 2, the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus whom "you crucified" (2:36) results in instruction about repentance. In Acts 4:8-12 and 5:29-32 the uniqueness of the exalted Jesus is stressed, with a call to repentance—or at least an accusation of guilt—implied at the end. In the other sermons in Acts, the opportunity of forgiveness (10:43; 26:29) and warning for those who do not repent (13:40-41; 17:31) are consistently stressed at the end. The claim that Jesus was resurrected is presumed in the surrounding context (Acts 6:14, 55), but Stephen never explicitly mentions the resurrection in his defence. This is especially surprising if the quotation of Deut 18:15 refers to the resurrection in Acts 3 because we would expect the same to be true when Deut 18:15 is cited in Acts 7:37.

³⁷ The second part of the quotation has been influenced by the language of Lev 23:29, but the warning was already present in Deut 18:19. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 209-10.

in Acts 3:26. In this passage, the statement about the "raising up" of God's servant appears at the end of Peter's speech because it is tied to the summons to repentance which makes up the second half of the sermon.

The Delayed Identification of Jesus as the Prophet like Moses: According to Richard Dillon, Luke could not explicitly reveal Jesus as the Mosaic prophet before Easter because to do so would require disclosing the Messianic secret that Jesus was the *suffering* Mosaic prophet of Luke's particular conception.³⁸ More significantly, Jesus could not be fully identified as the Mosaic prophet until he had been "raised up" at his resurrection in fulfillment of Deut 18:15.³⁹ While this line of reasoning might support a conclusion about the meaning of "raised up" established on other grounds, it is not in itself decisive, for there are many reasons why Luke could have waited until Acts 3 to identify Jesus as the prophet like Moses.

Parallels between Jesus and his Disciples

✕ One of the strongest arguments in favour of understanding the "sending" of Jesus as a reference to his continued activity through his disciples is that Luke presents Jesus as acting through his disciples in other contexts. Jesus' disciples carry on his mission in Acts, performing miracles and proclaiming that salvation and the forgiveness of sins are available in the name of Jesus. Indeed, the immediate context of Acts 3:22-26 makes clear that the healing of the lame man occurred through "the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth . . . whom God raised from the dead."⁴⁰ Before healing the paralytic in Lydda

³⁸ Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 132-3.

³⁹ Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 134-6. So also Schubert, "Image," 269.

⁴⁰ Acts 4:10; cf. 3:16. Salvation is directly connected to the name of Jesus in Acts 4:12 (and by implication in the quotation from Joel in Acts 2:21); it is connected to the "grace of Jesus" in Acts 15:11

Peter declares even more directly, "Aeneas, Jesus Christ heals you" (9:34). Jesus and his followers are bound so closely together that the exalted Jesus can ask Paul, who was persecuting Jesus' disciples, "Why are you persecuting *me*?" (Acts 9:4). When Paul insists "that as the first of the resurrection of the dead [Jesus] would proclaim light to his own people and to the Gentiles" (26:23) he echoes a passage from Isaiah 49:6 which Paul and Barnabas had earlier applied to their own ministry (Acts 13:47). It is possible to see in this joint quotation of Isa 49:6 evidence that Jesus proclaimed light first to his own people and then to the Gentiles through his witnesses in Acts.⁴¹ But although the parallels between Jesus and his disciples go a long way towards explaining how Luke could have envisaged Jesus being sent through his representatives, the parallels themselves do not show that Jesus and his disciples were linked by the motif of the prophet like Moses or that in Acts 3:26 Luke envisaged Jesus being sent through Peter.

The Call to Repentance and the Pattern of Rejection

Peter begins his address to the Temple crowd by claiming that God vindicated Jesus whom "you denied (ἡρνήσασθε)" and killed, but whom God raised from the dead (3:14-15). Peter then calls for repentance, intimating that there is a causal relationship between repentance and the final sending of the Messiah (3:20), and warning that anyone "who will not listen" to the prophet like Moses will be cut off from the people (Acts 3:22-23). It is sometimes argued that if the raising up of Jesus as the prophet like Moses

and to belief in Jesus in Acts 16:31. In Acts 5:31, 13:23, Jesus is called the "saviour." Forgiveness is connected to the name of Jesus in Acts 2:38; 10:43; 22:16. For healings and miracles in Jesus' name see Acts 3:6, 16; 4:7, 10, 30; 16:18; 19:13.

⁴¹ Cf. O'Toole, *Climax*, 119; Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 56, 324; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 761-2. Another alternative is that the proclamation of light occurs "by means of" the resurrection (so Barrett, *Acts*, 1166; cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 687-8), taking the preposition ἐξ instrumentally. Cf. Acts 13:38.

referred to his initial appearance on the scene of history, Peter's call for repentance would be rendered futile because his audience had already rejected Jesus and put him to death (3:15).⁴² On this view, the "raising up (ἀνίστημι)" of Jesus means the audience's initial rejection of Jesus was not final.⁴³

Moreover, according to Johnson, Acts 3 forms the central connecting link between the story of Moses' life in Acts 7 and the prophetic pattern as it is applied to Jesus and his disciples.⁴⁴ Just as Moses was sent⁴⁵ once to bring salvation, was rejected (7:35, cf. 7:27-28), was sent a second time as a wonder-working redeemer (7:34-36), and rejected again with devastating consequences when the people turned to idolatry (7:39-40), resulting in their exile beyond Babylon (7:43);⁴⁶ so in Luke's narrative the people who had initially rejected Jesus out of ignorance are now offered a final opportunity to accept or reject the prophet whom God "raised up" and sent a second time through Jesus' witnesses "to bless you by turning each of you from your evil ways" (3:26).⁽⁴⁷⁾ In Acts 3 Peter excuses the Jewish people as well as their leaders on the basis of their ignorance.⁴⁸ The warning in 3:23, however, makes clear that there will be no more excuses. "Those who reject the Prophet now . . . reject him definitively, and are as radically rejected themselves."⁴⁹ Johnson believes the implementation of this warning is incorporated into

⁴² Cf. Johnson, *Literary*, 66; O'Toole, "I Raise," 87-8.

⁴³ "The possibility of acceptance and rejection is still alive for the people, because Jesus is alive" (Johnson, *Literary*, 66). Cf. O'Toole, "I Raise," 88.

⁴⁴ Johnson, *Literary*, 121.

⁴⁵ The word ἀποστέλλω is not used, but Johnson apparently regards the use of ἐπισκέπτομαι in 7:23 and Moses' hope that they would understand that God would bring salvation through him (7:25) as a sign that God had sent him. Cf. Johnson, *Literary*, 72.

⁴⁶ Johnson, *Literary*, 72-5.

⁴⁷ Johnson, *Literary*, 67.

⁴⁸ Johnson, *Literary*, 66-7.

⁴⁹ Johnson, *Literary*, 67; cf. Schnider, *Jesus*, 97-8.

Luke's literary scheme. After Acts 3, no subsequent offer of repentance is held out to the Jewish leaders because they demonstrated their rejection of Peter's message by arresting him (Acts 4:1), and were themselves rejected as a result.⁵⁰

However, Acts does not suggest that Jesus and his disciples follow the pattern of Moses' life: Peter's offer of a second chance was not a final offer extended as a result of the "raising up" of the prophet like Moses to those who had rejected him the first time around, but a consistent practice of Jesus' disciples, who serve the God who "commands *all* people everywhere to repent" (17:31). The excuse because of ignorance was offered both to Jews in Jerusalem (3:17) and to Gentiles in Athens (17:30). According to Acts 8:1, Paul was among the Jewish leaders who heard Stephen's accusatory speech, but in Paul's case, at least, his rejection of the risen Jesus was not final. Acts 3:22-23, then, is only one of several passages in Acts that stress that the time to repent is now. There are no more full-fledged offers of repentance in Jerusalem because Luke provided a limited number of full-fledged speeches in Acts which serve as examples of what was typically said.⁵¹

Moreover, within the context of Acts 3 the exhortation to "hear" the prophet like Moses is presented by Peter rather than by the prophet like Moses himself, but this does

⁵⁰ Johnson, *Literary*, 68-9.

⁵¹ Pace Johnson, *Literary*, 64, the conclusion to Paul's speech at Antioch functions as a call for repentance even though it is in the form of a warning (Acts 13:41), as the response makes clear. Cf. Jacques Dupont, "La conversion dans les Actes des Apôtres," in *Études*, 464 on Acts 4:10-12. Zehnle, *Discourse*, 35-6, observes that the plural imperative form of the verb μετανοέω only occurs in Acts 2:38 and 3:19. The singular form occurs again in Acts 8:22, but elsewhere calls for repentance are not expressed in this direct way. The need for repentance is still insisted upon, however. The call for repentance in Acts 17:31 (τὰ νῦν παραγγέλλει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πάντα πανταχοῦ μετανοεῖν) is similar to the apostles' statement to the Sanhedrin about the need for repentance in Acts 5:31: τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς . . . ὑψώσεν . . . δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραὴλ καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.

not mean that the prophet like Moses must be conceived of as speaking through the agency of Peter. Just as the biblical prophets still speak even though they are no longer present,⁵² and must be listened to (Luke 16:29, 31), so Peter offers his audience a chance to give heed to the prophet like Moses by responding to the message about Jesus.

Heeding the prophet involves joining the community of his followers. The main point of the warning in Acts 3:23, therefore, is not that those who once rejected Jesus were granted a reprieve or that there is only one more chance to accept or reject the resurrected prophet like Moses, but that the manner in which one responds to Jesus has decisive consequences. It is the negative counterpart to the hope of the "restoration of all things" expressed in 3:19-21.⁵³

Paul Feiler affirms the centrality of Jesus' Mosaic role because, within the context of Luke-Acts, the quotation of Deut 18:15 and Lev 23:29 "serves as a bridge between the warnings of Jesus concerning Jewish unbelief found in the Gospel and the realization of these warnings in Acts."⁵⁴ According to Feiler, the pivotal role of Acts 3:22-23 depends on its being the first statement about the exclusion of those who reject Jesus.⁵⁵ But this is not, in fact, the case, for already in Acts 2:40 Peter had said, "Save yourselves from this corrupt generation," implying that most of his contemporaries were already condemned.⁵⁶

⁵² While the prophets wrote, and their written remains are read, Luke can also write about the "voice of the prophets" (Acts 13:27). The prophets both spoke in the past (Acts 2:16) and speak in the present when read or quoted (Acts 2:25, 34).

⁵³ Cf. Acts 17:31; Franklin, *Christ*, 25-9.

⁵⁴ Feiler, "Jesus," 65. The warnings are connected by the demand for proper hearing (Feiler, "Jesus," 73-4). Cf. Luke 6:46-9; 8:4-18; 9:26; 10:16; 11:27-32; see discussion below on page 303f. below.

⁵⁵ Feiler, "Jesus," 75.

⁵⁶ Both Acts 2:40 and Luke 9:41 use language reminiscent of the condemning statement about Israel in Deut 32:5. Compare σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιάς ταύτης (Acts 2:40) and ὁ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη (Luke 9:41) with Deut 32:5: ἡμάρτοσαν οὐκ αὐτῷ τέκνα μωμητά, γενεὰ σκολιά καὶ διεστραμμένη. The phrase γενεὰ σκολιά appears elsewhere in the LXX only in Ps 77:8, a verse which also

The quotation about the prophet like Moses certainly proved congenial to Luke's purposes in Acts 3, but rather than being a pivot on which the narrative turns, the warning of judgement forms part of a larger theme introduced already in Luke's Gospel that is rooted in Jesus' instructions to the seventy-two (Luke 10:8-12) and in his pronouncements of doom on those villages who did not repent at his message (10:13-16).⁵⁷ Paul and Barnabas's response to rejection in Acts 13:51 is identical to Jesus' instructions about the appropriate response to rejection in Luke 10:11; Acts 13:46-7 and Acts 28:26-27 express the same point as the quotation from Deut 18:15 in Acts 3:22-23 without recourse to Moses at all. The way in which the "raising up" of the prophet like Moses leads to an offer of blessing for Peter's audience remains to be explained, but we may conclude that Acts 3:22-26 does *not* form the basis of a structural pattern according to which there is only one final chance to accept or reject Jesus when he is sent a second time through his disciples.

The Promise of Abrahamic Blessing

The book of Acts repeatedly affirms that the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus resulted in an outpouring of blessing in fulfillment of God's promises. Foremost among these was the gift of the Holy Spirit, which Peter identified simply as "the promise" (Acts 2:33, 38-39), and which was made available only after the exaltation of Jesus (2:33). Luke also states that the name of the *resurrected* Lord Jesus brings healing (3:15-16), salvation (4:12), and the forgiveness of sins (10:43); and according to Acts 5:31, God

alludes to the wilderness generation. See page 263 below.

⁵⁷ It is also prefigured in the programmatic episode at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30). Cf. Johnson, *Literary*, 95.

raised and exalted Jesus in order "to give repentance and forgiveness of sins to Israel."⁵⁸

Similar ideas are expressed in Acts 3, when Peter claims that repentance will result in "times of refreshing" here and now, as well as in the return of the Messiah at the final time of restoration of all that the prophets foretold.⁵⁹ After quoting Deut 18:15, Peter states that the prophets foretold "these days" (3:24), and claims that the blessings promised to Abraham were intended to be applied to Peter's audience through the servant whom God raised up and sent to them (3:26).⁶⁰ Within Peter's exhortation, the blessings offered to his audience thus include the gift of the Holy Spirit, which was only made available after Jesus' resurrection.⁶¹ The fact that God's blessing is tied tightly to the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus remains the strongest reason for concluding that the "raising up" of Jesus refers to his resurrection.⁶²

As it stands, neither interpretation is free from difficulties. The reader must decide whether or not it is easier to see in Acts 3:26 a reference to Jesus' resurrection and the sending of Jesus through Peter than it is to see how a reference to blessings offered by Jesus when he was "raised up" as a prophet during his earthly life can be broadened to include the blessings of the Holy Spirit offered by Peter to his audience. I will now attempt to show how the balance of probability is tipped in favour of the latter alternative.

⁵⁸ The reference to crucifixion in 5:30 confirms that ἤγειρεν denotes the resurrection. So Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 94; Barrett, *Acts*, 289; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 337. In Acts 13:38, forgiveness of sins and justification are associated with the resurrection.

⁵⁹ The "times of refreshment (καιροὶ ἀναψύξεως)" in 3:20 are to be distinguished from the final "times of restoration of all things (χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων)" in 3:21 (so Barrett, *Acts*, 205, Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 288; *contra* Haenchen, *Acts*, 208).

⁶⁰ The participle εὐλογοῦντα in Acts 3:26 echoes ἐνευλογηθήσονται in Gen 22:18 as quoted in Acts 3:25.

⁶¹ Cf. Acts 4:4; 5:32; Gils, *Jésus*, 33-4.

⁶² Cf. Gils, *Jésus*, 33-4; Schlosser, "Moïse," 29-30; Hamm, "Healing," 213-14.

My understanding of the function of Jesus' resurrection within the argument of Peter's sermon is virtually identical to that of those who see in Jesus' "raising up" a reference to his resurrection. I agree that from Luke's perspective it is because of the resurrection—mentioned in 3:15 and featuring throughout the sermon at the level of argument—that Peter can offer to his audience a second chance to accept the blessing brought by Jesus. The crucial difference is that I regard the "raising up" of Jesus in Acts 3:22 and 26 as a reference to Jesus' earthly appointment as a prophet rather than to his resurrection. The reference to Jesus' *earthly* commission to bless the people by turning them from their "wicked ways" functions to highlight the continuity between the ministry of Jesus and the ministry of his disciples, who now offer the blessing Jesus was sent to bring to those who repent. Though the extent of the promised blessing is developed in Acts as a result of Jesus' resurrection (3:15), the ministry of the apostles is in fundamental continuity with the message brought by Jesus during his earthly life (3:26).

The problem of correlating an offer of blessings only made available *after* the resurrection with a sending of Jesus *before* his death may be resolved by distinguishing between the referent of "blessing (εὐλογοῦντα)" in the *illustration* from Jesus' earthly life and the extended referent given to "blessing" in Peter's application of the illustration to his audience at the temple. Luke can affirm that Jesus was sent in order to bless Israel because Luke believed that the "today" of God's fulfillment extended back to the earthly ministry of Jesus when, for example, Jesus announced the fulfillment of Isa 61:1 to the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:18-21). Like his disciples after him, Jesus proclaimed the

good news of the kingdom of God,⁶³ showing by his miracles of healing that he was the one expected by John the Baptist (Luke 7:21-22). Peter's call to repentance was thus a continuation and intensification of Jesus' own mission to "call sinners to repentance,"⁶⁴ which included providing the forgiveness of sins.⁶⁵

The sermon thus concludes with a reminder of what his audience already knew: Jesus was "attested to you by God with deeds of power, wonders, and signs" (Acts 2:22); Jesus went around "doing good and healing all who were oppressed by the devil" (Acts 10:38); Jesus, Peter says, was sent "first to you" during his earthly life "to bless you by turning each of you from your wicked ways" (3:26). Within the sermon, this summary of the blessings which Jesus came to bring *prior* to his death functions to call Peter's audience to repentance so that they too can experience the additional blessings now made possible after Jesus' exaltation. Even though the promised Holy Spirit doubtless formed part of the blessings offered by Peter to his audience, the activity of "blessing" for which the servant was sent can very well apply to the activity of Jesus begun during his time on earth.⁶⁶ In my view, it is easier to regard Acts 3:26 as a reminder of Jesus' earthly ministry than it is to envisage the sending of Jesus a second time in the person of Peter.

Conclusion

Luke interpreted Deut 18:15 as a specific prediction of the "raising up" of Jesus as

⁶³ Cf. Luke 4:43 and Acts 8:12, as well as Acts 14:22; 19:8; 20:25; 28:23, 31.

⁶⁴ Luke 5:32 (Luke has added εἰς μετάνοιαν to the traditional saying from Mark 2:17). Cf. Luke 10:13 par. Matt 11:21; Luke 11:32; 13:3, 5; 15:7, 10; 16:30.

⁶⁵ For the forgiveness of sins, see Luke 5:17-26 par. Mark 2:1-12 par. Matt 9:1-8; Luke 7:47. Although forgiveness of sins may well be eschatological (Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 136-7, 284), this does not mean it refers only to the period after Easter.

⁶⁶ Cf. Turner, *Power*, 353: "Luke does not portray Pentecost as the *beginning* of the New Age or Salvation for the disciples because this would conflict with his view that these were initiated decisively within Jesus' ministry."

a prophet during his time on earth.⁶⁷ Luke knew the verbs ἀνίστημι and ἐγείρω could refer both to appointment to a position and to resurrection from the dead, and he employed both senses in the same context (Acts 13:22, 30), but he did not combine the two meanings of the word in Acts 3.⁶⁸ The attempt to make a play on words⁶⁹ form the basis of an elaborate literary pattern is supported neither by the immediate context of Peter's sermon, nor by the larger narrative structure of Acts.⁷⁰ The function of the quotation from Deut 18:15 was not to prove the resurrection from Scripture, for the resurrection had already been validated by the powerful witness of the apostles (3:15). Instead, the reference to the "blessing" offered during Jesus' earthly life is used as the basis for Peter's extended offer of blessing to his audience. There is no second sending of Jesus after the resurrection before the parousia; there is one sending during Jesus' earthly ministry that is carried forward by Jesus' spirit-empowered disciples in Acts.

The Exodus

The closest parallels between Moses and Jesus apart from Acts 3 and 7 appear at

⁶⁷ So Loisy, *Les Actes*, 235-8; BEGS 4, 39, 154; Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 71; Haenchen, *Acts*, 210; Robinson, "Christology," 150; Busse, *Wunder*, 403; Bruce, *Acts*, 88; Barrett, *Acts*, 213; BDAG; Albrecht Oepke, "ἀνίστημι," *TDNT* 1:369; Hahn, "Act 3, 19-21," 145 note 79; Turner, *Power*, 236 note 65.

⁶⁸ Did Luke choose ἐγείρω to express the resurrection in 3:15 so that the reference to "raising up" (ἀνίστημι) in 3:22 would not be confused with the resurrection?

⁶⁹ The play on words is unavoidable because the reference to Jesus' "wonders and signs" in Luke 2:22, which Johnson regards as a Mosaic characteristic, clearly includes reference to Jesus' earthly life (Johnson, *Acts*, 50).

⁷⁰ Johnson's pattern breaks down in other ways too: (1) According to Acts 2:22 Jesus performs signs and wonders on his first sending, but Moses does not until his "second" sending (Acts 7:36). (2) Stephen's speech does not clearly mention two sendings of Moses, and the idea that Jesus was sent again through his disciples after the resurrection requires three missions of Jesus rather than two: Luke 4:43 and Acts 10:36 clearly refer to an initial past "sending" of Jesus during his earthly ministry. Acts 3:20 speaks of a future sending of the one appointed as the Messiah at the parousia (so Johnson, *Acts*, 74; Barrett, *Acts*, 204-5). If Acts 3:26 mentions Jesus' resurrection from the dead, then the verse refers to a third "sending" of Jesus after his earthly mission and before the parousia. Rather than multiplying missions, it seems more likely that the word ἀπέστειλεν in Acts 3:26 recalls Luke 4:47 and refers to Jesus' earthly ministry. Cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 210; Barrett, *Acts*, 213.

Jesus' transfiguration (Luke 9:28-36). (1) Moses and Elijah, both of whom had theophany experiences on a mountain, appear with Jesus on a mountain.⁷¹ (2) The cloud that overshadowed Jesus and those with him alludes to the cloud on the mountain of God at Sinai.⁷² (3) In this context the voice (φωνή) from the cloud echoes the voice of God at Sinai.⁷³ (4) The divine command, "This is my Son...listen to him (ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ)" (Mark 9:7) echoes God's instruction for the people to listen (αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε) to the prophet like Moses whom God will raise up (Deut 18:15).

All four of the above parallels appear already in Luke's Markan source, but Luke has intensified the Mosaic quality of this pericope by reversing the order of Mark's ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ to αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε, which aligns the phrase more closely with Deut 18:15.⁷⁴ Luke also reiterates the importance of hearkening to Jesus' words elsewhere in his Gospel,⁷⁵ and as we have seen, applies the command of Deut 18:15 to "hear" the prophet like Moses explicitly to Jesus in Acts 3:22. Finally, Luke's version of the transfiguration explains that Moses and Elijah spoke with Jesus about his impending ἔξοδος "which he was about to accomplish (ἤμελλεν πληροῦν) in Jerusalem" (Luke

⁷¹ Exod 24:9-18; 1 Kings 19. Cf. Mark 9:2-10; Luke 9:28-36; Matt 17:1-9. Whether Moses and Elijah are foils for Jesus (Marshall, *Luke*, 388) or models for Jesus (Bovon, *Luke*, 359-60; Green, *Luke*, 381), their presence together with him invites comparison.

⁷² The reference to fear may also echo the response of the people at Sinai (Exod 20:18; Moessner, *Lord*, 61). The use of the rare verb ἐπισκιάζω may recall the dedication of the Tent of Meeting when Moses was not able to enter the tent "because the cloud enveloped (ἐπεσκίαζεν) it" (Exod 40:35). Elsewhere in the LXX, the verb ἐπισκιάζω only occurs at Ps 90:4; Ps 139:8; Prov 18:11.

⁷³ According to Exod 19:19, "Μωυσῆς ἐλάλει, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ φωνῇ." Cf. Mark 9:7 par. Luke 9:35.

⁷⁴ On the Mosaic echo cf. Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 174; Bovon, *Luke*, 379-80; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 213.

⁷⁵ Morna D. Hooker, "Beginning From Moses and From All the Prophets," in *From Jesus to John. Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus De Jonge* (ed. M.C. de Boer: Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993), 228-9. Cf. Luke 10:16 (diff. Matt 10:40); 11:31 (par. Matt 12:42), and Luke 11:28, 14:35 which are unique to Luke. Cf. Luke 8:8 (par. Mark 4:9). See discussion on page 303f. below.

9:31). We will return to this redactional insertion below, after assessing several additional parallels between Jesus and Moses in the immediate context of the transfiguration which contribute little to a Moses-Jesus typology.⁷⁶

Minor Allusions in the Context of the Transfiguration

The Feeding of the Five Thousand (Luke 9:12-17): Jesus provision of bread and fish for five thousand people may evoke Moses' earlier provision of manna and quail in the wilderness (Exodus 16; Numbers 11). Aside from the provision of food,⁷⁷ the only parallel between this account and that of Moses is the reference to the wilderness (ἔρημος; 9:12; diff. Mark 6:35). While the word ἔρημος is sometimes associated by Luke with the exodus, this is not always the case.⁷⁸ Luke's account of the feeding of the five

⁷⁶ Other proposed parallels between Moses and Jesus at the transfiguration are less convincing: (1) Although there are no verbal parallels between Luke 9:28-36 and Exod 34:29-35 beyond τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, the description of Jesus' transfiguration may also have in view the change in Moses' face after speaking with God (so Marshall, *Luke*, 383; Allison, *Moses*, 99; Öhler, *Elia*, 191); but "if Luke intended an allusion to Moses' face, one wonders why he would have made it so abstruse" (Stephen B. Reid, "The End of Prophecy in the Light of Contemporary Social Theory: A Draft," *SBLSP* 24 [1985]: 105). (2) Ravens, "Luke 9," 125, notes the similarity between Jesus' lightning-like (ἐξαστράπτων) garments in Luke 9:29 (diff. Mark) and the lightnings (ἀστραπαὶ) on Sinai. If present, this echo is most likely mediated through Ezekiel's vision in Ezek 1:4, 7, 13. (3) *Contra* Moessner, *Lord*, 61, Luke's account does not contain verbal parallels with Exod 24:10, 17 because εἶδος in Exod 24:10, 17 forms part of a description of God and the place of his feet rather than of Moses, and *contra* Moessner, *Lord*, 61, Luke's addition of τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ in Luke 9:32 does not refer back to the vision of God's glory in Deut 5:24. Instead, the phrase anticipates the glory Jesus obtained subsequent to his suffering, as the repetition of the phrase in Luke 24:26 demonstrates (So Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 143). (4) According to Moessner, *Lord*, 57, 61, 66, the discussion of Jesus' exodus and the command to "hear" Jesus functions as the mountaintop call of Jesus that corresponds to the call of Moses on the mountain to mediate God's word to all Israel (cf. Deut 5:4-5, 23-31; Luke 9:35), but the closest thing to a "call" of Jesus occurs at his baptism (cf. Luke 3:21-22; 4:18; and chapter three page 105 above). (5) Finally, on the possibility that ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος combines the Davidic Messiah and Mosaic prophet in the Isaianic servant of Isa 42:1, see the discussion on page 304f. below.

⁷⁷ Augustin George, "Note sur quelques traits lucaniens de l'expression «Par le doigt de Dieu» (Luc XI, 20)," *ScEcccl* 18 (1966): 463, notes that the word ἐπισιτισμός (a NT *hapax*, occurring only in Luke 9:12) is connected to God's provision of manna and quail in Ps 78: 19, 25. This is possible, but the word is common in the LXX and is by no means always associated with the exodus.

⁷⁸ The word ἔρημος is used in the context of the exodus in Luke 3:4 (Isa 40:3; par. Matt 3:3); Acts 7:30, 36, 38, 42, 44; 13:18; cf. Green, *Luke*, 363. The traditional mention of the location of Jesus' temptation probably alludes to the exodus (Luke 4:1; par. Mark 1:12). No clear reference to the exodus is present in Luke 3:2 (par. Mark 1:4); 7:24 (par. Matt 11:7); 15:4; Acts 21:38.

thousand actually has more in common with Elisha's feeding of the one hundred than it does with the Israelites at Sinai⁷⁹: While the proportions are different, the feeding of the five thousand shares with Elisha's feeding of the one hundred the request to provide food,⁸⁰ the incredulity of those assigned to give out the food,⁸¹ as well as the left-over food at the end.⁸² Nevertheless, though it is not prominent, a reference to the provision of food during the exodus cannot be excluded.

The Mission of the Seventy (Luke 10:1-17): According to Numbers 11:16-30, God took some of the spirit that was on Moses and put it on the *seventy* elders whom Moses had selected to assist him, and they "prophesied." In Luke 10:1-12 according to the text of codex Sinaiticus, Alexandrinus and the majority of other manuscripts, Jesus selected *seventy* people and sent them ahead of him with instructions to heal the sick and proclaim the nearness of the kingdom. Although Luke 10 does not state that Jesus' messengers shared his prophetic spirit, the fact that their activity mirrored Jesus' own prophetic ministry together with the correspondence in number between the two groups may suggest that an allusion to Numbers 11 was intended.⁸³ However, the earliest manuscripts support the reading seventy-two.⁸⁴ Any connection between this passage

⁷⁹ *Contra* Marshall, *Luke*, 357; O'Toole, "Parallels," 23; Turner, *Power*, 239, who believe the feeding of the five thousand connects Jesus with Moses more than it does with Elisha. Although the story is traditional, it is not fair to say that Luke makes nothing of the connections between Jesus and Elisha (Nolland, *Luke*, 446), for Jesus earlier associated himself with Elisha in Luke 4:27. Cf. Green, *Luke*, 363.

⁸⁰ Compare δότε τῷ λαῷ καὶ ἐσθιέτωσαν in 4 Kgdms 4:42 with δότε αὐτοῖς ὑμεῖς φαγεῖν in Luke 9:13 (par. Mark 6:37).

⁸¹ The incredulity of Jesus' disciples is presented in different ways in Mark and Luke (cf. Luke 9:13; Mark 6:37-38; 4 Kgdms 4:43).

⁸² 4 Kgdms 4:43-44; Luke 9:17. Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 766 and Nolland, *Luke*, 446.

⁸³ So Manek, "New Exodus," 21; Garrett, *Demise*, 47-8.

⁸⁴ The reading εβδομηκοντα δυο is supported by P⁷⁵, B, and D the first time it appears in Luke 10:1. The second occurrence of εβδομηκοντα δυο in verse 1 is supported by B, K, Θ, f⁴³, while the Western text of D supports the reading εβδομηκοντα. In Luke 10:17, D again supports εβδομηκοντα δυο. along

and Moses, then, must be judged doubtful.⁸⁵

The "finger of God": In Luke 11:20, Jesus declares, "But if it is by the finger of God (ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ) that I cast out the demons, then the kingdom of God has come to you." Although it is uncertain whether Luke reproduced a traditional source or whether he is responsible for changing ἐν πνεύματι θεοῦ to ἐν δακτύλῳ θεοῦ, Luke probably recognized the similarity between Jesus' words and the response of Pharaoh's magicians to the third plague who declared: "This is the finger of God (δάκτυλος θεοῦ ἐστίν)!"⁸⁶

A "perverse generation" (Luke 9:41): When faced with unbelieving disciples after his descent from the mountain, Jesus exclaims, "You faithless and perverse generation (ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος καὶ διεστραμμένη), how much longer must I be with you and bear with you?" Luke's addition of διεστραμμένη in Luke 9:41 to ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος in his Markan source creates an echo of the "crooked and perverse generation (γενεὰ σκολιὰ καὶ διεστραμμένη)" mentioned in the Song of Moses (Deut 32:5).⁸⁷

with P⁷⁵, most likely P⁴⁵, and B. As the rarer number, the reading εβδομηκοντα δυο is also the more difficult one. Cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 151. Plummer, *Luke*, 272, suggested that δυο may have been inserted because the number of elders in Num 11 comes to seventy-two when Eldad and Medad are included, but that a reader of Numbers 11 would compute the math in this way is far from certain. Cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 415. Moessner, *Lord*, 273, proposes that Luke 10 alludes to the recapitulation of Num 11:16-25 and Exod 18:13-26 in Deut 1:9-18 instead of to Num 11 itself. This alleviates the textual problem because Deut 1:9-18 does not mention the number 70, but it also removes one of the textual bases for an allusion. Evans, "Central Section," 38, claimed that the sending of messengers in Luke 9:51-53 and 10:1 echoes Moses' sending of spies in Deut 1:21-25 in combination with the appointing of 70 elders in Num 11:16. But the language of Luke 9:51-53 and 10:1 is much close to that of Mal 3:1, which is quoted in Luke 7:27 (cf. Exod 23:20).

⁸⁵ If Luke heard an echo of Num 11:24-30 in John's report, "Master, we saw someone casting out demons in your name, and we tried to stop him" (Luke 9:49-50, par. Mark 9:38-39), then an allusion to Numbers 11 in Luke 10:1 would be more likely (O'Toole, "Parallels," 23; Johnson, *Luke*, 164). Luke, however, has done nothing to intensify the similarities present already in his Markan source between this story and Numbers 11.

⁸⁶ Exodus 8:15; EV 8:19. Those who argue in favour of Lukan redaction include Nolland, *Luke*, 639-40; George, "Par le doigt de Dieu," 462; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 172.

⁸⁷ Moessner, *Lord*, 63; Allison, *Moses*, 99. Although other options are possible, both Luke and Matthew probably added διεστραμμένη in their redaction of ὦ γενεὰ ἄπιστος in Mark 9:19 (par. Luke 9:41;

For Moessner, this echo of Deuteronomy extends beyond an observation that Jesus, like Moses, lived among a perverse generation, and confirms that the events following the transfiguration link Jesus' journey to Jerusalem to Moses' wilderness journey as described in Deuteronomy, for the people at the base of the mountain in both Luke and Deuteronomy are presented as stubborn and rebellious.⁸⁸ But although Jesus rebukes his generation in the language of Deut 32:5 immediately following the transfiguration, it is not apparent that the events following Jesus' descent from the mount of transfiguration are intended by Luke to recall the golden calf incident as described in Deut 9:15-16. Aside from the language of descending a mountain, there are no verbal parallels between Luke 9:37-43 and Deuteronomy 9.⁸⁹

Similarly unconvincing are Moessner's arguments that Jesus' instructions about children are intended to allude to the "children" addressed in Deuteronomy who entered the promised land, and that the crowds who follow Jesus are intended to represent all Israel who followed Moses toward the promised land. Though large crowds follow Jesus (Luke 14:25), this hardly means that Luke's readers will gain "the impression that *all Israel* is following Jesus into Jerusalem."⁹⁰ Nor does the traditional saying "whoever does not receive the kingdom of God as a little child will never enter it" (Luke 18:17 par. Mark 10:16)—together with the fact that one must heed the prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22-23)—mean that Luke compares Jesus' followers to the *children* of the wilderness

Matt 17:17), in order to make the reference to Deut 32:5 clearer.

⁸⁸ Moessner, *Lord*, 57-8, 63. According to Moessner, Deut 32:5 sums up the rebellious nature of Israel, an example of which is the rebellion at the base of Mount Sinai narrated in Deut 9:8-21.

⁸⁹ Although there are conceptual similarities within Deuteronomy between the description of Israel in Deut 32:5 and God's description of the people immediately prior to Moses' descent from the mountain (Deut 9:12-13), *verbal* parallels are absent there too.

⁹⁰ *Contra* Moessner, *Lord*, 217.

generation mentioned in Deut 1:39.⁹¹ Finally, Moessner's argument that Jesus' death outside Jerusalem parallels Moses' death outside the land *rests* on an extended comparison between the central section of Luke and Deuteronomy which Moessner attempts to establish elsewhere, rather than providing independent support of the Moses-Jesus typology.⁹² The central piece of evidence in support of Moessner's argument is the mention of Jesus' ἔξοδος in Luke 9:31, but we will see in the next section that it does *not* link Jesus' journey to Jerusalem to the wilderness wandering after the exodus from Egypt.

Jesus' Exodus

The word ἔξοδος literally denotes a "going out" or a "way out," but the word may also be used as a euphemism for death.⁹³ Considering the frequency of allusions to the Sinai theophany in the immediate context, most scholars agree that the word ἔξοδος also evokes the exodus from Egypt. Despite this remarkable agreement, the primary referent of the word as well as the significance of the allusion to the exodus are disputed: Does the literal sense of the word still convey meaning in this context? If so, what departure is in view? If the allusive meaning of the word is dominant, what is the referent and what part or parts of the exodus from Egypt are in view?

It is sometimes suggested that Jesus' ἔξοδος, understood as a journey

⁹¹ *Contra* Moessner, *Lord*, 262.

⁹² Moessner's proposal that Jesus' death outside Jerusalem was regarded as paralleling Moses' atoning death outside the land has commanded little agreement. See Strauss, *Messiah*, 276-85 for an extended critique. The references to Moses' "tragic" death in Deut 1:37; 3:26; 32:48-52; 34:1-5 can hardly be compared with the frequency or intensity of Jesus' predictions of his death in Luke.

⁹³ BDAG lists "movement from one geographical area to another, *departure, path, course*" and "departure from among the living" as the two basic meanings of ἔξοδος. Aside from Herm. *Vis.* 3.4.3 in which the word has the sense of "destination," all references for the former meaning refer to the departure from Egypt. For the latter meaning, see Wis 3:2, 7:6; Philo, *Virt.* 77; Jos. *Ant.* 4:189 (ἐπ' ἐξόδῳ τοῦ ζῆν); 2 Pet 1:15; Arr. *Epict.* 4.4.38. Especially in non-classical references, the idea of a journey must be inferred from the context. LSJ, however, cites evidence where the word is used to refer to a military expedition or a procession.

corresponding to the exodus of the Israelites from Egypt, most naturally includes Jesus' long journey to Jerusalem.⁹⁴ On this view, the fulfillment of Jesus' ἔξοδος in Jerusalem means not that it will begin in Jerusalem, but that it will be completed there.⁹⁵ An alternate suggestion is that Jesus' ἔξοδος began at the beginning of his public ministry rather than at the start of the travel narrative, for "if Jesus was 'soon to complete' (ἤμελλον πληροῦν) his exodus when he spoke with Moses and Elijah on the mountain, then that journey must have begun already."⁹⁶

The main difficulty in regarding Jesus' ἔξοδος as something that occurs during his earthly ministry is that it requires an unlikely meaning for the fulfillment (πληροῦν) of Jesus' ἔξοδος that takes place in Jerusalem. The word πληρώω can denote the completion of an activity already in progress, or it can be applied to the fulfillment of a prediction or to the execution of a command.⁹⁷ In the first case, the temporal modifier "in Jerusalem" would mean that Jesus' exodus was to end or be completed in Jerusalem. In the latter two cases, the fulfillment "in Jerusalem" would mean that Jesus' exodus was itself to take

⁹⁴ Cf. Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 132, 141-3; Ringe, "Exodus," 83-99; Moessner, *Lord*, 57-63; Evans, "Central Section," 37-53.

⁹⁵ Ringe, "Exodus," 93; Moessner, *Lord*, 46, 66.

⁹⁶ Strauss, *Messiah*, 304; cf. Turner, *Power*, 248-9.

⁹⁷ Within Luke-Acts πληρώω refers to fulfilled prophecy in the sense that the one to whom the prophecy pointed has appeared (Luke 4:21) or in the sense that what it predicted has come to pass (Luke 24:44; Acts 1:16; Acts 13:27; cf. ἐκπλήρωω in Acts 13:33). The word may also denote the end or completion of something: In Luke 7:1, the explanation "when he fulfilled (ἐπλήρωσεν) all these words" refers to the time at which Jesus stopped talking. When the verb is used with this sense it is normally connected to a period of time (Luke 21:24, Acts 7:23, 30; Acts 9:23; 19:21; 24:27; note the similar use of the noun ἐκπλήρωσις in Acts 21:26), but it is also used to denote the completion of Paul's missionary journeys (Acts 12:25; 14:26). (The "fulfilling" of Paul's missionary journeys may also suggest that the journeys completed what was intended for them.) In Acts 13:25 the verb is used of John the Baptist finishing his "course" (Acts 13:25), a metaphor which should perhaps be included in the category of time. In each of the above examples—unlike Luke 9:31—the viewpoint is retrospective, looking back on a period of time that has passed, or on events that have happened. In Luke 1:1, πληροφορέω probably refers both to what has taken place as well as to the fulfillment of things that had been predicted.

place in Jerusalem. The forward-looking context of the transfiguration suggests that the discussion about Jesus' exodus concerned an activity to be begun in the future.⁹⁸

Moreover, when the word ἔξοδος is used of the exodus in the Septuagint, the actual departure from Egypt rather than the wilderness wandering is in view.⁹⁹ If Luke's choice of words was influenced by the Septuagint, it is likely that Jesus' ἔξοδος also denotes a departure rather than a wilderness wandering, in which case the temporal modifier "in Jerusalem" makes it clear that Jesus' departure will take place in Jerusalem, not on the way to Jerusalem.¹⁰⁰ Instead of forming part of the exodus, Jesus' journey to Jerusalem leads up to the place where that exodus will occur.¹⁰¹

Rather than deriving the meaning of Jesus' ἔξοδος from the probable allusion to the exodus from Egypt, Luke's own usage indicates that the word should be understood literally as a departure. In Acts 13:24, Paul explains that John preached a baptism of

⁹⁸ Admittedly the examples are few, but when πλήρω refers to an event within forward-looking contexts in Luke-Acts the verb always designates the fulfillment of something which has not yet begun to take place (cf. Luke 1:20; 21:24; 22:16). There are exceptions outside of Luke-Acts (2 Cor 10:6; 2 Thess 1:11; cf. Col 4:12), but the meaning "complete" apart from a reference to time or the fulfillment of a prediction or a promise is extremely rare in the LXX (Gerhard Delling, "πλήρω," *TDNT* 6:288 lists 4 Macc 12:14 as the only possible example). For our purposes it is insignificant whether the event to be fulfilled in Luke 9:31 is the fulfillment of a prediction (BDAG; Tannehill, *Unity* 1, 223-4) or of a task (Marshall, *Luke*, 385; cf. Delling, *TDNT* 6:297).

⁹⁹ Exod 19:1; Num 33:38; Ps 104:38; 113:1. Cf. Ringe, "Exodus," 93. Feuillet, "L'exode," 187, points to Heb 11:22 as a passage where the word ἔξοδος denotes entry into the land as well as the departure from Egypt because Heb 11:22 alludes to Joseph's prediction in Gen 50:23-24, where departure from Egypt and entry into the promised land are closely associated. But though the two events are closely related, it is not clear that ἔξοδος in Heb 11:22 encompasses the entry into the land as well as the departure from Egypt.

¹⁰⁰ Marshall, *Luke*, 385; Reinhard von Bendemann, *Zwischen ΔΟΞΑ und ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001), 102.

¹⁰¹ In light of the Septuagintal usage of ἔξοδος, Ringe, "Exodus," 93 thinks that the occurrence of this loaded term in the context of the beginning of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem is a significant argument in favour of taking the start of Jesus' exodus as the beginning of his journey to Jerusalem. But it is also possible to journey to a place of departure as Elijah (2 Kgs 2:1) and Moses (Deut 32:48) did. Cf. J. H. Davies, "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," *Studia Evangelica* 2 (1964): 165; Dubois, "Elie," 169; Lampe, "Holy Spirit," 176-7.

repentance to all Israel "before [Jesus'] coming (πρὸ προσώπου τῆς εἰσόδου αὐτοῦ)."

Jesus' εἴσοδος thus refers to the beginning of his public ministry after his baptism by John.¹⁰² Since εἴσοδος (Acts 13:24) and ἔξοδος (Luke 9:31) occur only once in Luke-Acts, both times with reference to Jesus, they should be understood together as terms for the beginning and end of Jesus' career respectively.¹⁰³ Jesus' ἔξοδος must therefore refer to Jesus' departure *from* public ministry.¹⁰⁴

That Jesus' departure includes his death is normally taken for granted because the word ἔξοδος can mean death, and the conversation about Jesus' ἔξοδος is flanked on both sides by predictions of his death (9:22, 44). But although the normal human means of departure from earthly existence is through death, Luke believed that Jesus finally departed from earth at the ascension. As a result, most scholars conclude that Jesus' exodus included his death, resurrection, and ascension.¹⁰⁵ It is better, however, to conclude that the meaning of Jesus' ἔξοδος in Luke 9:31 is left undetermined.¹⁰⁶ Moses and Elijah talk with Jesus about his exodus, but neither the disciples nor Luke's readers are made privy to what the exodus will entail.¹⁰⁷ Though they can surmise from Jesus' predictions that his departure will involve great suffering, Luke 9:31 does not specify the

¹⁰² So Feuillet, "L'exode," 188. See further the discussion of εἴσοδος in chapter five page 214f. above.

¹⁰³ Schürmann, *Lukas 1*, 558 note 36; William C. Jr. Robinson, "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative," *JBL* 79 (1960): 23; Strauss, *Messiah*, 303.

¹⁰⁴ So Nolland, *Luke*, 500; von Bendemann, *Zwischen*, 104. Cf. Öhler, *Elia*, 193.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Plummer, *Luke*, 251-2; Feuillet, "L'exode," 181-92; Augustin George, "Le sens de la mort de Jésus pour Luc," *RB* 80 (1973): 215; Nolland, *Luke*, 499-500; Bovon, *Luke*, 376; Garrett, "Exodus": Barbara E. Reid, *The Transfiguration: A Source- and Redaction-Critical Study of Luke 9:28-36* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993), 126; Green, *Luke*, 404.

¹⁰⁶ Bovon, *Luke*, 376: "In Luke clarity is appropriate to historical narrative, while a cryptic phrase characterizes the form of an oracle." Cf. Bovon, "Effet," 356.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. Tannehill, *Unity 1*, 56.

precise point or mode of departure. The fact that the departure is to take place "in Jerusalem" suggests that Jesus' ἔξοδος begins with his death,¹⁰⁸ but it is only at the end of Luke and the beginning of Acts that it is made clear that Jesus' final leave-taking is completed at the ascension. Thus, Peter insists that a replacement for Judas must be chosen from those who accompanied Jesus from the baptism to the ascension—that is, from his entrance into public ministry until his final departure from it.¹⁰⁹

If the literal sense of ἔξοδος receives primary emphasis, it is still hard to avoid the conclusion that the allusive resonance of the word ἔξοδος extends beyond the literal reference to Jesus' own departure to evoke the redemptive events of the first exodus, especially in the context of other parallels between Jesus and Moses highlighted at the transfiguration.¹¹⁰ However, it is important to recognize that the analogy is not developed in the manner we would expect if Luke envisaged Jesus as a new Moses who led others on a new exodus, for Luke speaks of Jesus' own ἔξοδος,¹¹¹ and never connects that ἔξοδος to a later exodus experienced by Jesus' followers.¹¹² In sum, the word ἔξοδος should not be pressed in service of a new Moses typology. Though the word *may* provide

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Luke 13:33. It is tempting to propose that Luke regarded the Mount of Olives as part of Jerusalem and that the ἔξοδος refers solely to the ascension, but although Luke emphasizes the nearness of the ascension site to Jerusalem ("about a sabbath day's journey"; Acts 1:12), and although the ascension takes place after Jesus has ordered his disciples to remain in Jerusalem (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4), the first decisive event that takes place in Jerusalem is Jesus' death.

¹⁰⁹ Acts 1:22. Cf. Feuillet, "L'exode," 191.

¹¹⁰ Cf. Green, *Luke*, 378: "Because of the overwhelming presence of exodus motifs, the meaning of the terms and phrases used in this scene overflows the boundaries of a strictly denotative interpretation."

¹¹¹ Nolland, *Luke*, 499; Öhler, *Elia*, 193.

¹¹² *Contra* Garrett, "Exodus," 659, who argues: "Luke regarded the death, resurrection, and ascension as an 'exodus' because in these events Jesus, 'the one who is stronger,' led the people out of bondage to Satan." Cf. Manek, "New Exodus," 17. It is surprising—if Luke "assumed that his readers already shared his knowledge of the more mysterious aspects of Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension" (Garrett, "Exodus," 678)—that the theme of the overthrow of Satan is relegated to the margins and is scarcely evident in the very passages that do discuss the significance of Jesus' death, resurrection and ascension.

a rare glimpse into Luke's understanding of the deeper significance of Jesus' death, Moses and Elijah were no doubt thought to be concerned primarily with Jesus' own departure (τὴν ἔξοδον αὐτοῦ; 9:31) from this life.

Signs and Wonders

According to Leo O'Reilly, "signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα)" function in Luke-Acts as "the credentials of the prophet-like-Moses who is attested by God but rejected by the people."¹¹³ His claim is supported not only by the fact that Luke expressly attributes the performance of "wonders and signs" to Jesus (Acts 2:22), as well as to Moses in a context that explicitly mentions Deut 18:15 (Acts 7:36-37), but also in the fact that the phrase—in reverse order—occurs frequently in the Septuagint in connection with God's deliverance of his people from Egypt.¹¹⁴ Nevertheless, I will argue that Luke's preference for "signs and wonders" has more to do with Joel than it does with Moses, and that the phrase does not support a widespread Moses-Jesus typology.

Those who argue that a Moses-Jesus typology lies behind Luke's attribution of "wonders and signs" to Jesus also tend to maintain that the attribution of "wonders and signs" to Moses in Acts 7 only confirms what Luke intended to convey by employing the phrase in the first place.¹¹⁵ On this view, "signs and wonders" is a phrase with such unmistakable associations with Moses that Luke did not need to make the connections explicit: When Luke wrote "wonders and signs" or "signs and wonders," he was not

¹¹³ O'Reilly, *Sign*, 177. Cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 50; Hahn, *Titles*, 374, 379; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 126; Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 32; Feiler, "Jesus," 187; Schubert, "Image," 75.

¹¹⁴ See chapter two page 68 above.

¹¹⁵ Cf. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:241-2; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 126 note 169; Johnson, *Acts*, 49-50.

merely describing the legitimating signs of prophets;¹¹⁶ he intended to prompt his audience to consider the similarities between Moses on the one hand, and Jesus and his disciples on the other.

However, to reprise our survey of the biblical and Second Temple evidence from chapter two, the phrase "signs and wonders" was current in Greek literature and, judging from its use in such Jewish writers as Philo and Josephus, there is no necessary connection between the phrase itself and the exodus from Egypt. If Luke's usage was primarily influenced by the Septuagint, he would have been aware of the exodus connotations of the phrase, but he would presumably also have been aware of its quite specific use in connection with the ten plagues, which were usually ascribed to God alone. Though Luke knew from the Septuagint that prophets performed miracles and predictive signs sometimes designated "signs" or "wonders," and although the healing miracles denoted by "signs and wonders" in Acts do play an authenticating role,¹¹⁷ the phrase "signs *and* wonders" is almost never used of such miracles in the Septuagint¹¹⁸ and healing miracles are not attested as authenticating signs in Jewish Scripture.¹¹⁹ In other words, if Luke's use of "signs and wonders" is understood against the background of Septuagintal usage, then one must bear in mind that the phrase by itself need not necessarily evoke Moses or the activities of prophets.

It is also important to distinguish between the authenticating role played by the

¹¹⁶ But cf. Weiß, *Zeichen*, 80 and Lierman, "Moses," 39, who argue that the "wonders and signs" attributed to Moses in Acts 7:36 confirm that Moses is regarded as a prophet.

¹¹⁷ Cf. Acts 2:22; 14:3; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 191-200.

¹¹⁸ The only exceptions are Exod 7:3 (cf. 7:9); Isa 8:18; 20:3. Cf. chapter two note 173 above.

¹¹⁹ Luke consistently uses "signs and wonders" or "wonders and signs" as a catch-phrase for the miracles narrated in Acts. Cf. Acts 2:22; 4:30; 5:12; 14:3; McCasland, "Signs," 151; Weiß, *Zeichen*, 13.

miracles themselves, and the significance of the terminology that Luke uses to describe the miracles. When this distinction is not made, "signs and wonders" tend to get lumped together with other terms into a general discussion of Luke's authenticating miracles,¹²⁰ and the reason why Luke selected the phrase in the first place is overlooked. While Luke may have chosen "signs and wonders" because he thought it was the term to use for authenticating miracles, it must be emphasized that there were other terms available, some of which Luke uses in other contexts.¹²¹ In contrast to δύναμις, a common Lukan word for miracle that is used of Jesus and his followers in both Luke and Acts,¹²² the word σημεῖον is never applied to Jesus' exorcisms or healing miracles in Luke's Gospel.¹²³ While the Lukan Jesus refused to perform "signs" on demand (Luke 11:16, 29), after Pentecost his apostle Peter surprisingly insisted that Jesus was "attested . . . by God with miracles, wonders, and signs" (Acts 2:22). Luke's sudden predilection for "signs and wonders" in Acts calls for explanation. The most reliable way to determine what Luke intended by the phrase is to examine his own usage in greater detail.

The Relation of "Wonders and Signs" to the Joel Quotation

Thus far we have concentrated our attention on Luke's attribution of "wonders and signs" to Jesus and Moses, but the phrase first appears in Acts 2:19 as part of a quotation

¹²⁰ Cf. Lierman, "Moses," 39; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 161, 190; McCasland, "Signs," 149-52; Molly Whittaker, "'Signs and Wonders': The Pagan Background," *SE* 5 (1968): 155-8.

¹²¹ Cf. Acts 8:6 (σημεῖα); 8:13 (σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας); 19:11 (δυνάμεις τε οὐ τὰς τυχοῦσας).

¹²² Jesus' miraculous deeds are denoted by the plural of δύναμις in Luke 10:13 (par. Matt 11:21), 19:37, Acts 2:22; cf. Acts 8:13 (Philip); 19:11 (Paul). Jesus' power to perform miracles is referred to by δύναμις in Luke 4:36 (cf. Mark 6:2, 5; Matt 13:54, 58); 5:17; 6:19; 8:46 (par. Mark 5:30); Acts 10:38. In Luke 9:1, the Twelve are given "power and authority" to heal and exorcise demons (cf. Luke 10:19). Cf. Acts 3:12; 4:7, 10. The context of Acts 4:33 implies that the great power (δυνάμει μεγάλῃ) with which the apostles bore witness to the resurrection of Jesus involved miracles (cf. 4:30; *BEGS* 4, 48; Haenchen, *Acts*, 231) as well as speech.

¹²³ In Acts, however, σημεῖον on its own is used. Cf. Acts 4:16, 22; 8:6, 13.

from Joel 3:3. Moreover, as the table below shows, Luke's "signs and wonders" formula sometimes appears as σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα and sometimes reverses the standard biblical order, appearing as τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα:

Table 3: Signs and Wonders

<u>Acts</u>	σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα	τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα
2:19		wonders (in heaven) and signs (on earth)
2:22		Jesus
2:43		Apostles
4:30	Prayer that God will do signs and wonders through the name of Jesus	
5:12	Apostles	
6:8		Stephen
7:36		Moses
14:3	Paul and Barnabas	
15:12	Paul and Barnabas	

Joel 3:3 refers only to "wonders (τέρατα) in heaven and on earth," but in Acts 2:19 a redactional insertion of ἄνω . . . σημεῖα . . . κάτω results in the following divine prediction: "In the last days . . . I will show wonders (τέρατα) in the heaven above and signs (σημεῖα) on the earth below." Immediately after this quotation from Joel 3:1-5, Peter introduces Jesus as "a man attested to you by God with miracles, wonders and signs (δυνάμει καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις) that God did through him among you." In the summary passage at the end of Peter's sermon Luke claims that "wonders and signs" were performed by the apostles (2:43). It seems clear that Acts 2:22 combines δύναμις, the normal word for Jesus' miracles in Luke's Gospel,¹²⁴ with the "wonders and signs" formula that will reappear elsewhere in Acts,¹²⁵ and that the "wonders and signs" formula

¹²⁴ See note 122 above.

¹²⁵ This solution remains most probable because of Luke's preference for δύναμις in his Gospel.

in Acts 2:22 was suggested by—or is at least related to—the mention of "wonders . . . and signs" in the Joel quotation.¹²⁶ But it is not clear why "signs . . . beneath" was added to the Joel quotation in the first place, nor is it easy to determine the referents of "wonders . . . and signs" in Acts 2:19, or the relationship between Acts 2:19 and the descriptions of Jesus and the apostles in 2:22 and 2:43. It is also difficult to know what significance, if any, there is in the order in which the formula appears. In this case, the best way forward is through a *via negativa*: In order to avoid simplistic conclusions about what Luke *must* have meant—converting "real obscurity into apparent lucidity"¹²⁷—one should lay out the various possibilities and admit how much we simply do not know. The end result will be a clearer perception of the function of the Lukan "signs and wonders" formula, and a clarification of the relationship of the phrase to Moses.

As the word τέρας never appears apart from σημεῖον in the New Testament, the addition of "signs . . . beneath" to the Joel quotation in Acts 2:19 may have been motivated entirely by stylistic considerations,¹²⁸ but this does not resolve the question how Luke understood the prediction as it appears in Acts. One stream of interpreters concludes that Luke believed the "wonders . . . and signs" referred at least in part to heavenly portents—either to future portents that will take place at the parousia,¹²⁹ or to

and σημεῖον + τέρας in Acts. The three terms also appear together in Rom 15:19; 2 Cor 12:12; 2 Thess 2:9; and Heb 2:4. Cf. Rengstorff, *TDNT* 7:242; Weiß, *Zeichen*, 80; Barrett, *Acts*, 141.

¹²⁶ Cf. BEGS 4, 23; Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 46; Rese, *Christologie*, 49-50; Ulrich Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (3rd ed.; 1961; repr., Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 33; Zehnle, *Discourse*, 34; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 164; Johnson, *Acts*, 50; Weiß, *Zeichen*, 85. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 141.

¹²⁷ BEGS 4, 22, regarding the text critical questions of the Joel quotation.

¹²⁸ Cf. BEGS 4, 23; Bock, *Proclamation*, 163.

¹²⁹ Haenchen, *Acts*, 179; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 253; Bock, *Proclamation*, 167. But if verses 19-20 are still in the future, it remains puzzling why Peter applies verse 21—"everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved"—to the present.

the eclipse of the sun and the rending of the temple veil associated with the crucifixion of Jesus;¹³⁰ or perhaps in the sound from heaven (ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) and the tongues of fire (πῦρ) that preceded the Spirit-inspired speech of Acts 2:4.¹³¹ Alternatively, Luke might have added "signs . . . beneath" to "wonders in heaven" in order to add to Joel's statement about the heavenly portents described in 2:19b-20 a reference to the miracles performed by Jesus in Luke¹³² or to the miracles that the apostles will perform in the remainder of Acts.¹³³

All the views discussed so far take seriously the heavenly portents mentioned in the Joel quotation, but they tend also to see a disjunction between the "wonders . . . and signs" in Acts 2:19 and the mention of Jesus' "miracles, wonders and signs" in 2:22. According to adherents of this approach the language of 2:22 may have been suggested by 2:19, but the "wonders . . . and signs" of Acts 2:19 refer at least in part to heavenly portents, while Jesus' "wonders and signs" in Acts 2:22 denote only the miracles performed during his earthly life.¹³⁴

A second approach to the interpretation of "wonders . . . and signs" in Acts 2:19

¹³⁰ Cf. Luke 21:25; 23:45; Bruce, *Acts*, 62; Rese, *Christologie*, 54. However, the σημεῖα mentioned in Acts 2:19 are to occur "on earth beneath," which conflicts with the "signs in the sun, the moon, and the stars" mentioned in Luke 21:25.

¹³¹ Cf. Bauernfeind, *Apostelgeschichte*, 45; Zehnle, *Discourse*, 123; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 126.

¹³² Cf. Turner, *Power*, 273-4. My conclusions about Luke's interpretation of this passage do not depend on the supposition that it was Luke who added "signs" to the passage from Joel. Those who conclude in favour of Lukan redaction include BEGS 4, 23; Zehnle, *Discourse*, 34; Rese, *Christologie*, 48; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 164-5; Barrett, *Acts*, 137; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 253.

¹³³ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 137. Weiß, *Zeichen*, 84, cf. 77-8, argues that Luke expected his readers to identify the *content* of the "wonders and signs" as the fulfillment of the prediction of "signs on the earth beneath" (Acts 2:19b), and to identify the *function* of "wonders and signs" with the function of "wonders in the heaven above and signs on the earth beneath." But the catch-word exegetical method employed by Luke is seldom this complicated.

¹³⁴ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961), 36, excludes entirely a connection between 2:19 and 2:22: "In Acts 2.22 there is a new start. . . in fact it bears no relation to the preceding quotation from Joel."

takes as its starting point the meaning that "wonders and signs" bears in Acts 2:22. Since Jesus' "miracles, wonders and signs" refer most naturally to the miracles he performed, the addition of "signs" to the Joel quotation must have created the common "wonders . . . and signs" phrase which Luke regarded as a reference to miracles.¹³⁵ The main problem with this interpretation is that instead of appearing together as τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα, intervening words specify where the wonders and signs mentioned in Joel's prophecy take place. If Luke understood τέρατα in connection with Jesus' miracles, how does one explain that these wonders are located "in the heaven above" in contrast to the σημεῖα that take place on the earth below? Various answers have been proposed,¹³⁶ but in the end there is simply not enough information to explain how Luke interpreted all the details in the passage—including the reference to heaven and earth in Acts 2:19.¹³⁷

Nevertheless, there are at least two reasons why the mention of "wonders . . . and signs" in the Joel quotation was most likely regarded as a prediction fulfilled in the miracles performed by Jesus and his disciples.¹³⁸ First, the use of catch-phrase

¹³⁵ Cf. Loisy, *Les Actes*, 200-1; Geoffrey W. Lampe, "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History* (ed. C.F.D. Moule; London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965), 173; Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden*, 33; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 166; Robert Sloan, "'Signs and Wonders': A Rhetorical Clue to the Pentecost Discourse," *EvQ* 63, no. 3 (1991): 235.

¹³⁶ Sloan, "Signs and Wonders," 236, argues that Luke recognized that the apocalyptic imagery of heavenly portents and the spatial distinctions between heaven and earth should not be taken literally, but it is far from clear that Luke shared this figurative understanding of apocalyptic imagery. According to Tannehill, *Unity* 2, 32, Acts 2:22 means that the "wonders and signs" on earth have begun, even though their heavenly counterparts have yet to occur. But if this is what Luke meant by adding ἄνω . . . σημεῖα . . . κάτω to Joel 3:3, he could have conveyed his point more clearly by adding καὶ σημεῖα immediately after τέρατα. Finally, it may be that Luke regarded the details as unimportant (cf. Wilckens, *Die Missionsreden*, 33; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 166).

¹³⁷ But see Dan 6:28 (Theod.), where Darius responds to the deliverance of Daniel from the lions' den by referring to God's "signs and wonders in heaven and on earth."

¹³⁸ On this view, Luke did not understand the mention of "blood, and fire, and smoky mist" (2:19b) and the turning of the sun to darkness and the moon to blood (2:20) as examples of what the "wonders . . . and signs" entailed.

interpretation elsewhere in Peter's speech suggests that the meaning of "wonders . . . and signs" in Acts 2:19 is at least similar to the meaning of "wonders and signs" in 2:22, and hence to the meaning of the "wonders and signs" attributed to the apostles in Acts 2:43. In addition to the explicit interpretation of the quotation from Ps 16:8-11 in Acts 2:31, Peter also implicitly refers to the scriptural passages cited in the sermon: ἐκχεῶ in Acts 2:17 is picked up again in 2:33 (ἐξέχεεν); the promise that "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved" (2:21) is developed in 2:38-39;¹³⁹ the verb προορώμην quoted from Psalm 15:8 LXX in Acts 2:25 appears to be echoed in 2:31 (προϊδών);¹⁴⁰ and the citation of Ps 110:1 in Acts 2:34-35 is anticipated in 2:30, 33.

^ A second reason to conclude that Luke understood the "wonders . . . and signs" of Acts 2:19 as a prediction of miracles performed by Jesus and his disciples is that the Joel quotation functions programmatically in Acts in the same way that the quotation of Isa 61:1-2 in Luke 4:18-19 functions programmatically in our author's first volume. Within Peter's sermon the Joel quotation points backward to interpret the inspired speech at Pentecost as prophetic activity resulting from the outpouring of the Spirit (2:4, 15-16). But the Joel quotation also points forward, for Luke alludes to this authoritative interpretation of the Pentecost event later in Acts 19:6 when he recounts that John the Baptist's disciples "spoke in tongues and prophesied" when the Holy Spirit came on them.¹⁴¹ The prediction that the outpouring of the Spirit will result in visions and dreams

¹³⁹ Peter's exhortation to be baptized into the name of Jesus (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ; 2:38) reflects ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (2:21), and ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσεται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν (2:39) is reminiscent of Joel 3:5d (not quoted in Acts): οὗς κύριος προσκέκληται. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 156.

¹⁴⁰ See chapter three page 94 above.

¹⁴¹ See chapter three page 133, as well as Earl Richard, "Pentecost As a Recurrent Theme in Luke-

is also fulfilled in the visions experienced by Ananias, Cornelius, Peter and Paul.¹⁴² I conclude, then, that Luke believed the statement about "wonders . . . and signs" in the Joel quotation was at least partially fulfilled in miraculous "wonders and signs."¹⁴³

"Signs and Wonders" or "Wonders and Signs"

Attempting to account for the variable order of the "signs and wonders" phrase and the connection of the saying to the Joel quotation, Karl Rengstorf proposed an interpretation of Luke's signs and wonders terminology that includes the phrase as part of a larger Moses-Jesus typology. Because Acts 7:36 speaks of Moses' "wonders and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα)," Rengstorf concluded that the Moses typology is in view whenever the phrase appears in this order; while passages in which reference is made to "signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα)" are concerned with the authentication of apostolic authority without reference to Moses.¹⁴⁴ According to Rengstorf, Luke avoided using "signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα)" language in his first volume because of his typological understanding that "the new Mosaic age of eschatological redemption" had only been inaugurated with Jesus' death and resurrection.¹⁴⁵ The "wonders (τέρατα) in

Acts," in *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed. Earl Richard; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1990), 140.

¹⁴² Cf. chapter three page 134 above.

¹⁴³ Against this interpretation, Bock, *Proclamation*, 167, objects that the "wonders . . . and signs" in the Joel quotation are not developed in Peter's sermon in the same way that the pouring out of the Spirit is (Acts 2:17, 33). But this "absence of exposition" is only the case if Acts 2:22 does not pick up the language of 2:19. Although "the exposition as a whole does not connect these signs done by Jesus [mentioned in Acts 2:22] with the Spirit as the Joel quote does" (Bock, *Proclamation*, 346 note 43), the miracles wrought by Jesus are elsewhere closely associated with the Spirit (cf. Luke 4:14; Acts 10:38). It is true that the wonders and signs in the Joel quotation follow the outpouring of the Spirit, and the "miracles, wonders and signs" of Acts 2:22 refer to miracles performed by Jesus before the outpouring of the Spirit (Bock, *Proclamation*, 346 note 43), but as I will show below, there remains a connection between Jesus' "wonders and signs" and the "wonders . . . and signs" in the Joel quotation that functions to link the miracles performed by Jesus with the miracles performed by his disciples after Pentecost.

¹⁴⁴ Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:242.

¹⁴⁵ Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:241.

heaven above and signs (σημεῖα) on the earth beneath" (2:19) denote the darkening of the sky at the death of Jesus in Luke 23:44 as well as "the outpouring of the Spirit and its effects" at Pentecost; the exodus connotations of "wonders and signs" signal further that in these events a new redemption has begun.¹⁴⁶ The mention of the "miracles, wonders and signs (τέρασι καὶ σημείοις)" performed by Jesus in Acts 2:22 immediately after the quotation from Joel 3:3 integrates the miracles Jesus performed before his death into this Mosaic typology. The use of the phrase "wonders and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα)" in connection with the apostles (Acts 2:43) and Stephen (Acts 6:8) also includes these figures commissioned by Jesus in the Mosaic typology, demonstrating that both the apostles and Stephen as well as Jesus were (like Moses) attested by God through the miracles they performed.¹⁴⁷

Rengstorf rightly observed that the order in which the phrase occurs in Acts follows a pattern, but his explanation of the pattern is not convincing. /Since the Lukan "signs and wonders" formula normally refers to miracles performed by human agents, it is unlikely that Luke believed Acts 2:19 referred to the events of the crucifixion and Pentecost. / And if the "wonders and signs" formula is first introduced after the beginning of the "new Mosaic age of eschatological redemption" inaugurated by Jesus' death, it is surprising that Acts 2:22 incorporates the miracles performed by Jesus *before* his death into this Moses typology. Finally, Rengstorf never explained why the order that—according to Rengstorf—forms part of Luke's Moses typology is the reverse of the standard biblical order.

¹⁴⁶ Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:242.

¹⁴⁷ Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:242; cf. Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 126.

In my view, Luke's choice of τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα in Acts 2:22 and 2:43 instead of the more Mosaic sounding σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα demonstrates that Luke was more concerned to connect the miracles of Jesus and his followers to the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy than he was interested in a Moses typology. It is no accident that the first occurrence of "wonders . . . and signs" in Acts 2:19 is followed by a reference to the "wonders and signs" performed by Jesus during his earthly life (2:22), and by a statement about the "wonders and signs" performed by the apostles after Pentecost (2:43), for according to Luke's interpretation of the Joel quotation, "wonders and signs" result from the coming of the Holy Spirit.¹⁴⁸ In Acts, Luke begins to show that the presence of the Holy Spirit results in "wonders and signs," but first Peter reminds his audience—and Luke, his readers—that the "wonders and signs" now taking place in the community of Jesus' disciples as a consequence of the outpouring of the Spirit are related to Jesus, the Spirit-bearer *par excellence*. Luke's primary concern in connecting the "wonders and signs" of Jesus to the "wonders . . . and signs" of the Joel quotation is therefore to highlight the continuity between the experiences of the disciples in Acts and their exalted Lord;¹⁴⁹ and the main reason for introducing the phrase is to show how Joel's prediction of the coming of the Spirit in the last days has been fulfilled.

It is true that the connection between the "signs and wonders" formula and the last days is only made explicit in Acts 2:19, while other passages in Acts seem to represent

¹⁴⁸ Dillon, "Prophecy," 553 note 12: "The persistence of the reverse order in 2. 22 and 2.43 shows the intent of punctually applying the edited prophecy." Cf. O'Reilly, *Sign*, 164.

¹⁴⁹ Cf. O'Reilly, *Sign*, 187 note 89; *contra* Weiß, *Zeichen*, 85.

the "signs and wonders" as miracles that confirm the message of Jesus' followers.¹⁵⁰

Nevertheless, there is a close relationship between the "wonders and signs" that demonstrate the presence of the Spirit and the arrival of the last days on the one hand, and the "signs and wonders" that authenticate the believers' message on the other. The two functions of "signs and wonders" blend together in the first miracle narrative of Acts: The healing of the crippled beggar (3:1-10)—designated a "sign" by the Sanhedrin in Acts 4:16, and a "sign of healing" by the narrator in 4:22—illustrates the summary statement that many "wonders and signs were being done by the apostles" (2:43), and prepares the way for the believers' prayer for God to perform more "signs and wonders" (4:30). The joint confirmation of Joel's prediction and the message about Jesus works well because the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost provides the impetus for the message of salvation, which includes the forgiveness of sins as well as the reception of the promised Holy Spirit (2:38).

In the end Luke's reasons for switching from "wonders and signs" to "signs and wonders" in Acts 4:30 and then back to "wonders and signs" in 6:8 and 7:36 are beyond recovery.¹⁵¹ One could argue that if Luke knew his Bible well enough to echo Elijah's ascension in the use of ἀνάληψις in Luke 9:51 and to heighten the Mosaic quality of the transfiguration by correcting Mark's ἀκούετε αὐτοῦ to the more biblical sounding αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε (Luke 9:35), then he would have been familiar enough with biblical terminology

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Acts 4:29-30; 5:12-17; 14:3.

¹⁵¹ Weiß, *Zeichen*, 116-7, argues that the order "wonders and signs" is always concerned with prophetic legitimation of the messenger, whereas the order "signs and wonders" is used to legitimate the proclaimed message. But Weiß does not observe the way that the miracle of Acts 3:1-10 links the "wonders and signs" of the apostles in Acts 2:43 to the request for "signs and wonders" in Acts 4:30. Against Weiß, Luke does not distinguish clearly between the legitimation of the message and the legitimation of the messenger (cf. O'Reilly, *Sign*, 178).

to know that he sometimes wrote "signs and wonders" backwards. But Luke's employment of the "wrong" order when he mentions the "wonders and signs" worked by Stephen (Acts 6:8) and Moses (7:36) might suggest that Luke was unconcerned to follow the biblical order exactly.¹⁵² We simply do not know. Nevertheless, the order of the phrase is not without significance, for two clear patterns emerge. The importance of the patterns lies not in the possibility of uncovering the reasons Luke may have had for changing the order of the phrase, but in what the changed order tells us about Luke's interest in referring to signs and wonders in the first place. The first pattern, beginning with Acts 2:19, and extending through 2:22, 2:43, 6:8 and 7:36, emphasizes that the "wonders and signs" performed by Jesus' followers in Acts occurred in fulfillment of Joel's prophecy, and that they were analogous to the miracles that Jesus performed in Luke (Acts 2:19, 22).

The second pattern, beginning in Acts 4:30 and extending through 5:12, 14:3, and 15:12 links the "signs and wonders" performed by Paul and Barnabas to the "signs and wonders" performed by the apostles in Acts 5:12, and emphasizes that both were in response to the believers' prayer for God to heal and to work "signs and wonders" through the name of Jesus (4:30).¹⁵³ The disciples in Acts 4:30 pray for boldness "while

¹⁵² O'Reilly, *Sign*, 177, claims that the mention of Stephen's "wonders and signs" in Acts 6:8 is "a deliberate imitation of 7,36 designed to reinforce . . . the intended typological link between the two figures" Stephen and Moses. If O'Reilly is correct, we must conclude that Luke had Acts 7 before him when he penned Acts 6:8 (which is possible if Acts 7 was adapted from a source), and that Luke expected his readers to recognize the similarity between Stephen and Moses retrospectively upon reading Acts 7:36. Though the phrase "wonders and signs" is one of several links between Stephen and Moses, the order of the expression in Acts 6:8 would more likely recall the programmatic quotation from Joel in Acts 2:19 than it would evoke the "signs and wonders" attributed to Moses in Deut 34:11—especially as Acts 2:19 and 6:8 reverse the standard biblical order.

¹⁵³ It may well be that the phrase drops out after 15:12 because it has served its function to legitimate the Gentile mission (so Weiß, *Zeichen*, 116).

you [God] stretch out your hand to heal, and signs and wonders are performed through the name of your holy servant Jesus." In Acts 5:12 Luke describes the fulfillment of the prayer, stating that "many signs and wonders were done among the people through *the hands of the apostles*." Paul and Barnabas are later described in similar terms in a passage that recalls the prayer of Acts 4:30 and its fulfillment in the wondrous deeds of the apostles: They spoke "boldly for the Lord, who testified to the word of his grace by granting signs and wonders to be done *through their hands*."¹⁵⁴ Finally, in Acts 15:12 Paul and Barnabas recount the "signs and wonders that God had done through them (δι' αὐτῶν) among the Gentiles." The net effect of Acts 14:3 and 15:12 is to legitimate Paul and Barnabas by associating them with the "signs and wonders" performed by the apostles earlier on in Acts in fulfillment of the believers' prayer.¹⁵⁵

"Signs and Wonders," "Wonders and Signs," and Moses

In the introduction to this chapter I argued that we should not assume the developed Jesus-Moses typology in Acts 7 forms the hermeneutical key to Luke's understanding of Jesus' prophetic identity. There is no guarantee that the parallels developed there undergird Luke's prophetic depiction of Jesus elsewhere, and in any case Luke's readers would initially form their understanding of Jesus' prophetic role from Luke and Acts 1-6 rather than from Acts 7. Since Luke's "signs and wonders" language is developed only after the quotation from Joel 3:3, it seems clear that Luke's predilection

¹⁵⁴ Acts 14:3. Note the similarities between the request for boldness in Acts 4:29 (μετὰ παρρησίας) and the bold speech of Paul and Barnabas (παρρησιαζόμενοι) in 14:3, as well as the mention of σημεία καὶ τέρατα performed διὰ τῶν χειρῶν in both 5:12 and 14:3. Speaking with boldness (παρρησιάζομαι) is, of course, one of Luke's favourite descriptions of Paul (cf. Acts 9:27-28; 13:46; 19:8; 26:26).

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Weiß, *Zeichen*, 91.

for "signs and wonders" was prompted first of all by his conviction that the miracles performed by the apostles confirmed the dawning of the last days in fulfillment of Joel's prediction. Our examination of the varying order of the "signs and wonders" formula indicated that Luke referred to Jesus' miracles as "wonders and signs" primarily in order to link Jesus and his followers together rather than to link Jesus to Moses.

Still, the direct attribution of "wonders and signs" to Moses in Acts 7 makes it possible that Luke expected his readers to pick up a secondary Mosaic echo in the phrase itself, apart from its explicit application to Moses in Acts 7. We have seen that within the Septuagint the phrase "signs and wonders (σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα)" normally refers to the ten plagues that led to Israel's deliverance from Egypt.¹⁵⁶ On their own, "signs (σημεῖα)" or "wonders (τέρατα)" could refer to deeds performed by prophets in order to confirm themselves or their message—or both. These prophetic deeds could take the form of predictive signs, such as those given to Saul by the prophet Samuel, or authenticating miracles, such as Moses' ability to turn his rod into a snake. In Acts, however, "signs and wonders" are more closely associated with salvation than they are with either authenticating miracles or the predictive signs of prophets even though they typically function to authenticate both messengers and their message. But although Luke's use of the "signs and wonders" formula may highlight the similarities between God's deliverance of Israel at the exodus and the salvation brought by Jesus in Luke and by his followers in Jesus' name in Acts, I will argue that (with the exception of Acts 7:36) Luke's "signs and wonders" formula does not link Moses to Jesus.

¹⁵⁶ See chapter two page 68 above.

In Acts 7:36, the "wonders and signs" attributed to Moses correspond quite closely to the "signs and wonders" that Deut 34:11 attributes to Moses—except that they are expanded to include the miraculous events during the period of wilderness wandering.¹⁵⁷ These "wonders and signs" are thus primarily miracles of deliverance rather than authenticating miracles. But in Stephen's sermon, at least, the "wonders and signs" also play an authenticating role as they give prominence to Moses' prediction of a prophet like himself (7:37) and heighten Stephen's condemnation of the Israelites for failing to listen to this Moses "who received living words to give to us" (7:38-39).

In response to the demand for a sign (Luke 11:29), the Lukan Jesus refuses, insisting that his exorcisms are sufficient proof that the kingdom of God has come,¹⁵⁸ and presenting himself (the Son of Man) as a sign of judgement against his Jewish contemporaries.¹⁵⁹ Jesus' refusal to perform the type of sign requested by the crowds indicates that the miracles he performed were not simply authenticating miracles.¹⁶⁰

Although the "wonders and signs" that God did through Jesus served as his divine

¹⁵⁷ The language of Acts 7:36a is reminiscent of Exod 7:3-4 (cf. Rengstorf, *TDNT* 7:242), but the latter part of Acts 7:36 echoes Deut 11:1-7 LXX, which, as we saw in chapter two note 170 above, extends the referent of "signs and wonders" to include crossing the Red Sea as well as the events in the wilderness.

¹⁵⁸ Schürmann, *Lukas* 2, 238.

¹⁵⁹ Luke 11:30. So Nolland, *Luke*, 653-4.

¹⁶⁰ Wayne Meeks claims that the interpretation of Deut 18:15-18 as a prediction of the future appearance of the prophet like Moses led to an eschatological interpretation of the instructions about false prophets in Deut 18:20-22 and 13:1-6 (Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 47). These false prophets were expected to deceive the people and to perform "signs and wonders" (Meeks, *Prophet-King*, 55). Jesus' prophetic status was repeatedly questioned (Luke 7:39; 22:64; cf. 20:6 re: John); it has been suggested further that Luke portrays the citizens of Nazareth already responding to Jesus as a false prophet by attempting to put him to death as Deut 13:1-6 requires (cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 190; Danker, *Luke*, 110; Schnider, *Jesus*, 166). The request for a sign in Luke 11:16 most likely reflects the same evaluation of Jesus' prophetic status (cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 637). Still, there is no hint that this questioning of Jesus' prophetic status in Luke is connected to the idea of a prophet like Moses. An insistence on true prophecy in Luke need not signify that the prophet like Moses is in view; it is much more likely that Luke's account is concerned only with the evaluation of Jesus' prophetic status in the same way that any other prophetic claimant would be evaluated. Jesus' refusal to perform a sign does not involve a denial that he is a prophet; nor does the demand for a sign imply that the crowds believed Jesus was an eschatological prophet.

attestation (Acts 2:22), the miracles Jesus performed also effected salvation.¹⁶¹ For example, Luke links Jesus' healing miracles and exorcisms to salvation,¹⁶² and in Acts 4:9-10 the "saving" (σέσωται) of the crippled beggar in the name of Jesus is followed by a pronouncement that "there is salvation (σωτηρία) in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among mortals by which we must be saved" (4:12).

Nevertheless, although the mention of the "finger of God" in Luke 11:20 connects Jesus' miracles to the exodus, and although Jesus' miracles, like the "wonders and signs" of Moses, effect deliverance, the most that can be said is that Jesus' actions recall God's deliverance of his people at the exodus.¹⁶³ Luke's "signs and wonders" formula by itself does *not* contribute to a depiction of Jesus as the prophet like Moses because the "signs and wonders" formula is used more often in relation to Jesus' followers than it is in connection with Jesus himself. While "wonders and signs" are only attributed to Jesus and Moses once (Acts 2:22; 7:36), the formula is used much more frequently in connection with Jesus' followers—including the Apostles (2:43; 5:12), Stephen (6:8), as well as Paul and Barnabas (14:3; 15:12). Luke's usage thus poses a challenge to those who would argue that the attribution of "wonders and signs" to Jesus and Moses confirms Jesus as *the* prophet like Moses.¹⁶⁴

As we have seen, the "signs and wonders" of Jesus' followers both authenticate

¹⁶¹ Cf. Busse, *Wunder*, 371.

¹⁶² Cf. Luke 8:36, 48, 50; 17:19; 18:42; 23:35. We may well suspect that more is involved here than mere physical healing. Cf. Luke 3:6; 8:12; 9:24; 13:23; 19:9-10. Cf. O'Reilly, *Sign*, 146; Weiß, *Zeichen*, 89.

¹⁶³ We might add that the exodus "signs and wonders" did not deliver the Egyptians upon whom they were performed in the same way that the healing miracles of Jesus and his followers delivered those who required healing.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 279 note 2.

their message and signal the fulfillment of Joel's prediction; like the miracles of Jesus, the miracles of his followers also bring salvation in Jesus' name (Acts 4:9-10). In addition, the reference to the "great wonders and signs (τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα μεγάλα)" Stephen performed (Acts 6:8) appears to have been influenced by the Septuagintal phrase (τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα τὰ μεγάλα that was used in connection with the exodus miracles.¹⁶⁵ But although we must be careful about presuming knowledge of what Luke would have done had his motives been different, we might have expected more accounts of Jesus' miracles to allude to Moses if Luke had regarded Jesus' wonder-working ministry as analogous to the "wonders and signs" performed through Moses. Luke could easily have added references to "signs and wonders" in his Gospel in the same way that he added references to δύνάμεις,¹⁶⁶ but he chose instead to omit the one occurrence of the phrase that was present in his Markan source.¹⁶⁷ Moreover, the Lukan miracle stories share more in common with Elijah than they do with Moses.¹⁶⁸

While it is sometimes suggested that the performance of "signs and wonders" in Acts forms part of Luke's Moses-Jesus typology because Jesus is seen as the actor whose power enables the working of the miracles performed through his disciples,¹⁶⁹ "signs and

¹⁶⁵ Deut 6:22; 7:19; 29:2; Bar 2:11; cf. Add Esth 10:3f. Cf. Acts 8:13 (σημεῖα καὶ δυνάμεις μεγάλας). On the other hand, Luke 21:11 employs a similar phrase (καὶ ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σημεῖα μεγάλα ἔσται) as a description of heavenly portents, which might suggest that Luke is simply borrowing the language of Scripture rather than signalling a correspondence between the exodus and the events of the end times.

¹⁶⁶ Luke adds references to Jesus' δύνάμεις in Luke 4:36 (diff. Mark 1:27, but cf. Mark 6:2); Luke 5:17 (diff. Mark 2:2; Matt 9:1); Luke 6:19 (diff. Mark 3:10), and to δυνάμεις in Luke 19:37 (diff. Mark 11:9; Matt 21:9).

¹⁶⁷ Mark 13:22; par. Matt 24:24. The phrase alludes to Deut 13:2-4 and warns against signs performed by "false Christs and false prophets." Luke may well have had additional reasons for omitting the logion. Cf. Weiß, *Zeichen*, 118.

¹⁶⁸ Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 279-80.

¹⁶⁹ Cf. Fritz Stolz, "Zeichen und Wunder: Die prophetische legitimation und ihre Geschichte," *ZTK* 69 (1972): 143. The "signs and wonders" attributed to the disciples could support the interpretation of

wonders" are normally attributed to God working through believers rather than to Jesus, as Acts 4:30 demonstrates. In fact, Jesus himself was "attested . . . *by God* with miracles, wonders, and signs that God did through him among you" (Acts 2:22), and according to Acts 15:12, "Barnabas and Paul told of all the signs and wonders that God had done through them."¹⁷⁰ Luke's interest in "signs and wonders" is consistently theocentric rather than Moses-centered, and if the narrative order of Acts is a reliable indicator, the phrase was introduced because of the Joel quotation, not because of any associations with Moses. The phrase functions to highlight the fulfillment of Joel's prophecy and to demonstrate the presence of the Spirit in the early Jesus movement. It may well be that Luke also believed the end times' "signs and wonders" performed in Acts reprise the time of the exodus,¹⁷¹ but—with the exception of Acts 7:36—they do not contribute to Luke's portrayal of Jesus as the prophet like Moses.

Persecution

In Acts 7, Stephen goes out of his way to remind his audience that the Moses who received the law, who delivered Israel from Egypt, and who predicted that a prophet like him would arise, was rejected by his people (7:27-8, 35, 39). The speech ends with Stephen tying the disobedience of the Israelites in the wilderness to a pattern of "always" resisting the Holy Spirit and persecuting the prophets (7:51-52). Just as the Israelites once rejected Moses, so also their descendants in Stephen's audience killed the "Righteous One" predicted by Moses (7:52). Richard Dillon believes this understanding

Acts 3:22-26 as a reference to the risen activity of the prophet like Moses through his disciples.

¹⁷⁰ Acts 14:3 is a possible exception, as *κupiō* could refer to Jesus, but it most likely refers to God as well on the analogy of Acts 2:22; 4:30; and 15:12. Cf. Schneider, "Gott und Christus," 222; Weiß, *Zeichen*, 93.

¹⁷¹ Cf. Lampe, "Miracles," 170; O'Reilly, *Sign*, 166.

of Moses as a rejected prophet explains the otherwise puzzling statements about the necessity of Messianic suffering. When Jesus opens the Scriptures (Luke 24:27) he begins from Moses, "for Moses, as *prototype of the rejected prophet*, is the key to the passion mystery that is about to be broken."¹⁷²

In a similar vein, David Moessner argues that Luke understood the promise of a prophet like Moses in light of the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history that Odil H. Steck claimed was prevalent within Palestinian Judaism, according to which the prophets whom God sent to warn Israel and summon her to repentance were consistently rejected, eventually resulting in God's judgement on Israel.¹⁷³ Although Steck denied that the Deuteronomistic view of Israel's history figured in Luke¹⁷⁴ and rejected the possibility that the portrayal of Moses' suffering in Deuteronomy was related to the Deuteronomic portrayal of the violent fate of the prophets,¹⁷⁵ Moessner argues that "as decisive a figure as Jesus could well invite a typological correspondence to Moses conceived fully within the Deuteronomistic framework."¹⁷⁶ According to Moessner, then, Jesus appears in

¹⁷² Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 132 cf. 137-8. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:865, 873 had earlier proposed that Luke's global citations of scripture beginning with Moses (Luke 24:27, 44; Acts 26:22) were based on the idea of the prophet like Moses as a prototype for Jesus. Instead of focusing on rejection (which is the emphasis in Acts), Jeremias referred to the conception of Moses as a *suffering* figure, suggesting that this understanding of Moses arose primarily because "the prototype was seen in the light of the fulfillment" (873). Cf. Teeple, *Mosaic*, 92.

¹⁷³ Cf. Steck, *Israel*, 67-8.

¹⁷⁴ Steck, *Israel*, 320: "Schon Lk aber ist die ganze Vorstellungstradition fremd geworden." Steck, *Israel*, 266, claimed that the Deuteronomic elements in Acts 7 were present already in Luke's source material.

¹⁷⁵ Steck, *Israel*, 201 note 4: "Auffallend ist, daß sich zwischen den Leidenszügen des dt Mosebildes . . . und der dtr Vorstellung vom gewaltsamen Geschick der Propheten keinerlei vorstellungsgeschichtliche Verbindung aufweisen läßt." With Steck, ancient Jews would no doubt be familiar with the motif of the rejected prophet, but there is no reason why they should associate it particularly with Moses even if Moses was also rejected, especially considering that summary statements about the persecution of the prophets within Jewish Scripture never include Moses. Cf. 1 Kgs 19:10; 22:26-27; 2 Kgs 9:7; Neh 9:26; 2 Chr 36:16; cf. 16:10; 24:20-21.

¹⁷⁶ Moessner, *Lord*, 85.

Luke-Acts as the *Deuteronomistic* prophet like Moses whose call to suffer in Jerusalem forms the pattern for main characters in Acts, such as Stephen and Paul, who are themselves persecuted as they carry forward to the Gentiles the salvation wrought by the suffering Messiah.¹⁷⁷

That the theme of the rejected prophet plays an important role in Luke-Acts is apparent from the fact that Jesus refers to the necessity of rejection every time he associates himself with the prophets.¹⁷⁸ Luke's belief that Jesus was the *prophet* like Moses could have led to a conviction that as a prophet Jesus must suffer, but an association with Moses is hardly necessary, as the other examples from Luke's Gospel illustrate well. In Luke 4:24 Jesus claims, "No prophet is acceptable in his hometown" and then refers to *Elijah* and *Elisha*. The fourth Lukan beatitude blesses Jesus' disciples when they are mistreated "on account of the Son of Man" because the ancestors of those who mistreat them did the same things to the prophets (Luke 6:22-23). Nothing in this beatitude would link the persecuted prophets to Moses. If anything, the contrast with false prophets in 6:26 evokes conflicts between true and false prophets during the monarchy. Setting aside for the moment questions about the identification of Abel as a prophet, it is significant for our purposes that Abel—not Moses—is identified by Jesus as the first persecuted prophet in Luke 11:50-51.¹⁷⁹ Finally, Jesus' accusation of Jerusalem for killing the prophets (13:34; par. Matt 23:37) and his claim that he too must share the

¹⁷⁷ Moessner, "Paul and the Pattern," 211.

¹⁷⁸ Luke 4:24; 13:33. For other statements about persecuted prophets see Luke 6:23; 11:47, 49-50; 13:34; Acts 7:52. Cf. chapter three page 87 above; Anton Büchele, *Der Tod Jesu im Lukasevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23* (Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1978), 91-2.

¹⁷⁹ If Luke was concerned to identify Jesus as an eschatological prophet who suffered like *Moses* did, there would be even more reason to avoid identifying Abel as a prophet (cf. chapter three page 88f.).

fate of prophets destined to be killed in Jerusalem (13:33) bear no relation to Moses.

We have seen already that Luke presents Moses as the first in a line of prophets.¹⁸⁰ Just as Peter cites Moses as an example of all the prophets who proclaimed these days (Acts 3:22-24), Stephen dwells at length on the rejection of Moses by the Israelites, before turning to accuse his audience of exceeding the sins of their prophet-persecuting ancestors by murdering the one whom the prophets predicted (7:52). As Moses was the first in a series of prophets, Stephen appropriately singles him out as an example of the experience of all the prophets, but in this case Stephen's choice of Moses as an example is especially fitting because his speech responds to charges that Stephen had blasphemed Moses (Acts 6:11) by claiming that Jesus would change the customs Moses had handed down (Acts 6:14). Not surprisingly, Stephen's defence develops the relationship between Moses and Jesus in particular. Nevertheless, Stephen's speech concludes by emphasizing that persecution was characteristic of prophets in general, rather than being an experience that distinguishes Moses and Jesus from other figures. Though Luke highlights that both Moses and Jesus were rejected, Luke did not have to appeal to Moses to show why Jesus the prophet had to suffer.

It is possible, however, that Jesus' identity as the suffering prophet like Moses resolves the puzzling statement in Luke 24 that Scripture foretold *Messiah's* suffering (24:27, 44-46). If Luke believed the prophet like Moses was the Messiah, then Moses' rejection by his people could serve as Scriptural proof that the *Messiah* had to suffer.¹⁸¹ In Acts 7, Jesus is presented explicitly as the "Righteous One" whose coming was

¹⁸⁰ Cf. chapter three page 92f.

¹⁸¹ Cf. Jeremias, *TDNT* 4:868-9. 873; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 144; Moessner, *Lord*, 56.

predicted by the prophets (7:52), and implicitly as the fulfillment of Deut 18:15 (7:37).

In Acts 3:22, Luke applies Deut 18:15 to Jesus immediately after referring to Jesus as the Messiah predicted by the prophets (3:20-21). Moreover, Acts 7 presents the murder of the "Righteous One" as part of a tragic progression of Israel's history in which leaders such as Joseph (Acts 7:9) and Moses, as well as prophets such as Moses and all the other prophets, were rejected by the people they were sent to assist.

No doubt Acts 7 helps to explain how Luke read Scripture with reference to the suffering of the Messiah, but the reader of the Emmaus account need not wait until Acts 7 to find an explanation for the necessity of Jesus' death; Jesus' association with all the prophets was developed already in Luke's Gospel. Since the royal Davidic Messiah, as Luke has portrayed him, is also a prophet, he must face a prophet's death in Jerusalem. When Jesus' messianic status is decisively affirmed at his exaltation (Acts 2:36), Jesus' predictions about his imminent suffering as a prophet and as the "son of man" are seen to be fulfilled in the Messiah.¹⁸²

While Acts 7 helps to explain the necessity of the Messiah's death by drawing connections between Moses and Jesus, other similar explanations of Jesus' death make no reference to Moses. Acts 13:29, for example, presents Jesus as the heir to David's throne, whose murder by the Jerusalem authorities fulfilled what was written about him in Scripture. One must not forget that the main point of Stephen's sermon is not to clarify how Jesus was like Moses, nor to explain why Jesus had to suffer, but to demonstrate that Israel consistently rejected all the prophets, and that their rejection of Jesus "the righteous

¹⁸² On the suffering of the "son of man" see Luke 9:21-22 (par. Mark 8:31); 9:44-45 (par. Mark 9:31); 17:25; 18:31-34 (par. Mark 10:33-34); on Jesus' suffering as a prophet, see Luke 4:24; 13:33.

one" was of a piece with Israel's persecution of the prophets who proceeded him.¹⁸³

Finally, as we will see below, the citation of Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37 and the allusion to Isa 52:13 in Acts 3:13 suggest on the one hand that when Luke mentioned Scripture's prediction of the Messiah's suffering, he thought primarily of Isaiah,¹⁸⁴ and on the other hand, that Luke believed the necessity of the suffering of the Messiah received a satisfying explanation in the statement that all Scripture *must* be fulfilled in the Messiah, for as Jesus said: "what is written must be fulfilled in me" (Luke 22:37).

Although the identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses may have confirmed for Luke that Jesus' prophetic identity was central to his eschatological role, the association of Jesus with Moses does not in itself explain the rejection of Jesus the Messiah in a way that Jesus' association with the suffering of other prophets fails to do. Acts 7 helps to explain how Luke might have read Scripture as a prediction of the Messiah's suffering, but it is not the only Lukan Scriptural explanation of Jesus' death, nor is it particularly concerned to explain why Jesus died.

Redemption

While persecution is the most prominent aspect of Stephen's sermon, and is shared in common between Joseph, Moses, all the prophets, and the "Righteous One," another characteristic attributed to Moses in Acts 7 marks him as a distinct figure uniquely associated with Jesus. Moses, explains Stephen, was sent by God as a "ruler and redeemer (ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν)" (Acts 7:35).¹⁸⁵ As we have already noted, this

¹⁸³ Cf. Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 2; Strauss, *Messiah*, 281. *Contra* Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 122.

¹⁸⁴ Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 258 note 1.

¹⁸⁵ God's deliverance of his people from famine by means of Joseph is alluded to in Stephen's

description of Moses recalls the Emmaus disciples' admission, "We had hoped [Jesus] was the one to redeem (λυτρωθῆναι) Israel" (Luke 24:21).¹⁸⁶ Since the Emmaus disciples also identify Jesus as a *prophet*, who, like Moses, was "powerful in deed and word" (24:19; cf. Acts 7:22), it is easy to understand why many interpreters conclude that the disciples hoped Jesus was the prophet like Moses whose calling was to redeem Israel.¹⁸⁷ Even though Moses is never identified as a redeemer in Scripture,¹⁸⁸ the concept of redemption has strong ties to the exodus from Egypt. When the word group is not used literally for the buying back of property or the ransoming of people,¹⁸⁹ "redemption" is associated primarily with the freeing of the Israelite slaves at the exodus from Egypt.¹⁹⁰ Because of the exodus connotations of this word group, it is understandable how Moses, as the agent of God's redemption, can be termed a redeemer (λυτρωτής) in Acts 7:35.¹⁹¹

sermon (Acts 7:9-15), but it is not explicitly mentioned—perhaps because going down to Egypt runs counter to the deliverance from Egypt that the author has in mind.

¹⁸⁶ Johnson, *Luke*, 394 and Green, *Luke*, 846, claim that the mention of Jesus' miracles followed by the phrase "before God and all the people (ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παντός τοῦ λαοῦ)" (Luke 24:19) recalls the description of the miracles "which Moses did before all Israel (ἐναντι παντός Ισραηλ)" (Deut 34:12). But although ἐναντι/ἐναντίον only occurs in Luke-Acts in the NT, the preposition is common in the LXX (cf. especially 2 Kgs 12:12; 1 Macc 5:63; Ps 115:19). A stronger echo may be found in Luke 2:52 (Ἰησοῦς προέκοπτεν . . . χάριτι παρὰ θεῶ καὶ ἀνθρώποις; cf. Danker, *Luke*, 392); the resemblance between Luke 24:19 and Deut 34:12 is probably coincidental. For other similar occurrences of ἐναντίον, see Luke 1:6 (δίκαιοι . . . ἐναντίον τοῦ θεοῦ); 20:26 (ἐναντίον τοῦ λαοῦ).

¹⁸⁷ Cf. Meyer, *Prophet*, 22; Friedrich, *TDNT* 6:846; Hahn, *Titles*, 377; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 132; Schubert, "Image," 218; Green, *Luke*, 846; Turner, *Power*, 240.

¹⁸⁸ Lierman, "Moses," 73 note 113, cites Exod 32:7 as an instance in which "Moses is a redeemer," but neither λυτρωτής nor λυτρώω is used in the context of Exod 32. While Moses may have been regarded as "the archetypal deliverer" (Lierman, "Moses," 73), the LXX consistently presents God rather than Moses as Israel's λυτρωτής. The closest parallel is Sir 48:20 (Israel is redeemed by the hand of Isaiah). Cf. Sir 49:10 (the Twelve prophets delivered [ἐλυτρώσαντο] them).

¹⁸⁹ Cf. Lev 25, 27; Num 18:15-17.

¹⁹⁰ Cf. Exod 6:6; 15:13; Deut 7:8; 9:26; 13:6; 15:15; 21:8; 24:18; 2 Kgs 7:23; 1 Chr 17:21; Esth 4:17g.

¹⁹¹ Though redemption is not mentioned, the idea is clearly present in the longer form of the institution of the Lord's supper in Luke 22:14-23 (cf. Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 173-7; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1387-8, for discussion of the textual question). Jesus' words about a "new covenant in my blood (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου)" (22:20) recall the reference to a "new covenant" in Jer 38:31 LXX (MT

Nevertheless, it is not immediately clear that an expression of hope in future redemption through Jesus links Jesus to Moses in any substantive way, much less that Jesus is portrayed in Luke 24:19-21 as the prophet like Moses. The verb λυτρόω and its cognates were also used in the Septuagint to convey hope that God would deliver individuals from distress, with no reference to the exodus.¹⁹² Other passages articulate hope that God will redeem his people yet again, in most cases by bringing them back from exile.¹⁹³ It is true that passages that mention return from exile frequently invoke the first redemption from Egypt,¹⁹⁴ but although any human agents mentioned in connection with God's redemption of his people necessarily corresponded in some way to Moses, God's earlier agent of deliverance, the degree of resemblance varied. There is no reason why the agent of God's redemption from exile *had* to be understood in terms of Deuteronomy's prediction of a *prophet* like Moses.

Instead of anticipating the identification with Moses that is still to come in Acts, Luke's readers would have been prepared by inspired figures in the infancy narrative to associate redemption with the Davidic Messiah rather than with Moses. In Luke 1:68-69, Zechariah prophesies:

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people

31:31) and echo the institution of the Mosaic covenant in Exod 24: 8 (Ἰδοὺ τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης) (Nolland, *Luke*, 1054). One could point to a resemblance between Moses as the one who instituted the first covenant (Exod 24:8) and Jesus who institutes the new covenant (cf. Hooker, "Moses," 229), but the focus of this traditional passage (cf. 1 Cor 11:25) is on the sacrificial significance of Jesus' blood, not on any parallels between Jesus and Moses. It is unlikely, therefore, that Deut 18:15 or the prophet like Moses is in view in this passage.

¹⁹² Cf. 2 Kgdms 4:9; 3 Kgdms 1:29; Ps 7:3; 25:11; 30:6; 31:7; 33:23; 54:19; 68:19; Jer 15:21; Dan 3:88; 6:28.

¹⁹³ A general desire for corporate redemption is expressed in Ps 43:27. Cf. Sir 50:24. For redemption from exile see Isa 43:1f; 51:11; 53:3; 62:12; 63:7f; Jer 27:34; 38:11; Mic 4:10; Zech 10:8-11.

¹⁹⁴ Passages which express hope for future redemption in contexts which look back to the first exodus include Isa 43:1f; 52:3; 63:7f; Mic 4:10 (cf. Mic 6:4).

(ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ), and has raised up a horn of salvation (σωτηρίας) for us in the house of his servant David.¹⁹⁵

A few verses later the "angel of the Lord" removes any lingering doubt about the identity of the "horn of salvation" when he announces to the shepherds, "To you is born this day in the city of David a Savior (σωτήρ), who is the Messiah, the Lord" (2:11). In light of the infancy narrative's firm association of Jesus, the Davidic Messiah, with salvation and redemption, the statement of Cleopas and his companion that "we had hoped that he was the one to redeem Israel" (24:21) harks back to the pious Israelites at the Temple "who were looking for the redemption (λύτρωσιν) of Jerusalem" (2:38). The statement in Luke 24:19-21 is best understood as an expression of (now dashed) hope that Jesus would be the Davidic Messiah chosen by God to deliver his people.¹⁹⁶

To be sure, the two disciples on the way to Emmaus identify Jesus first as a "prophet, mighty in word and deed" (24:19). But this should come as no surprise to Luke's readers, who might recall that the prophet John was suspected of being the Messiah (3:15),¹⁹⁷ and who know very well that Jesus, the Davidic Messiah, was also a prophet.¹⁹⁸ It is of course possible that Luke is anticipating ideas that will be developed more fully in Acts.¹⁹⁹ Indeed, we will see that the concept of the prophet like Moses adds an additional layer to Luke's Christology. But in order to appreciate Luke's

¹⁹⁵ Luke 1:68-69 does contain several verbal links with the description of Moses in Acts 7: Εὐλογητὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, ὅτι ἐπεσκέψατο (cf. Acts 7:23) καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν (cf. Acts 7:35) τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἤγειρεν κέρασ σωτηρίας (cf. Acts 7:25) ἡμῖν ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυίδ παιδὸς αὐτοῦ. However, the immediate context of Luke 1:68 is undeniably Davidic. We saw in chapter five page 197f., that though Luke was aware of the exodus connotations of ἐπισκέπτομαι (and λύτρωσις), he reused them to describe what God did by raising up a Davidic Messiah.

¹⁹⁶ Cf. Strauss, *Messiah*, 255-6.

¹⁹⁷ See chapter three page 101.

¹⁹⁸ See chapter three page 102f.

¹⁹⁹ Cf. Bovon, "Effet," 355-7.

understanding of the concept of a prophet like Moses and the role that it plays in his narrative, it is important to recognize that—in contrast to cryptic references to Jesus' ἔξοδος (9:31) and his ἀνάληψις (9:51), which await fuller development in Acts²⁰⁰—Luke 24:19-21 is readily comprehensible in light of all that has been said in the first twenty-three chapters of Luke; no reference to Moses is required.

Jesus as Messiah, Prophet like Moses and Isaianic Servant

Though no reference to Moses is required in Luke 24:19-21, it is possible Luke's implied readers would know from what is said already in Luke that Jesus' prophetic identity was fundamentally that of the prophet like Moses. In order to assess this possibility, we turn now to an examination of the significance of Moses-Jesus parallels in Luke.

The Significance of Moses-Jesus Parallels in Luke

There are (as we have seen) undeniable allusions to Moses in Luke's portrayal of Jesus. The description of Jesus' transfiguration (9:28-36) recalls Moses' experiences on Mt. Sinai, and the heavenly voice proclaims "hear him" in the language of Deut 18:15. In this context, the mention of Jesus' departure (ἔξοδος) recalls the Israelites' exodus from Egypt. Jesus' exclamation about this "faithless and perverse generation" (9:41) alludes to Deut 32:5, and the mention of the "finger of God" (11:20) echoes Exod 8:15. Although Mosaic parallels are not prominent in Luke 9:10-17, the feeding of the five thousand may also recall the provision of manna under Moses.²⁰¹ On the other hand, there are also links

²⁰⁰ See pages 205 and 269 above.

²⁰¹ Other Moses-Jesus parallels are not convincing: Authoritative teaching is seldom listed as one of the central characteristics attributed by Luke to Moses and Jesus—and rightly so. Feiler, "Jesus," 153-4 can only cite one passage where Jesus supplements "the law with additional demands," and this passage is

between Jesus and Elijah scattered throughout Luke, and the dominant impression one receives from Luke's Gospel is that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah. Placing these references to Moses in the context of other statements about Jesus' identity will help to determine their significance.

In the infancy narrative Jesus is explicitly and forcefully identified as the royal Davidic Messiah (Luke 2:11). Before Jesus begins his ministry, John the Baptist identifies the expected Messiah with a mysterious "coming one" (3:15-17). Though

not unique to Luke (Luke 18:18-30, par. Mark 10:17-31, par. Matt 19:16-30). The repeated instruction to listen to Jesus (Luke 9:35; Acts 3:22) does associate Jesus' teaching with that of Moses, but it is too much to say that Acts 3:22 "implies that Jesus proclaims a teaching which replaces that of Moses" (O'Toole, "Parallels," 24). Luke is concerned to show that Jesus (and Paul) were obedient to the law (cf. Acts 21:24; Barrett, *Acts*, xcix). *Contra* Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 136, the point of Acts 7:38 is not so much to portray Jesus indirectly as an authoritative lawgiver as it is to show that Israel resisted the prophets who spoke by the Holy Spirit just as they had earlier resisted Moses who received the law from God, and just as they eventually rejected the one towards whom Moses and the prophets pointed.

It is frequently suggested that Peter's Pentecost sermon develops a Moses-Jesus typology, according to which Jesus' reception of the gift of the Spirit parallels Moses' reception of the gift of the Law at Sinai. Cf. Lindars, *Apologetic*, 42-4, 51-9; Jacques Dupont, "Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2.33," in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament* (eds. Barnabas Lindars, and Stephen S. Smalley; 219-228 ed.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 219-28; and more recently Turner, *Power*, 279-89. The suggestion rests on two key arguments: First, the feast of Pentecost was associated with the giving of the law at Sinai (cf. James C. VanderKam, "Festival of Weeks," *ABD* 6:896-7, for evidence that this connection was made already during the Second Temple period). Second, it is argued that an allusion to Ps 67:19 LXX in Acts 2:33-4 also alludes to the Jewish interpretation of this psalm with reference to Moses' ascension to receive the law. The allusion to Ps 67:19 LXX is probable (cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 149-50): Compare τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς, τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου λαβὼν...ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ...οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς (Acts 2:33-34) and ἀνέβη εἰς ὕψος...ἔλαβες δόματα ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ (Ps 67:19 LXX). In the nature of the case, an allusion to a Second Temple interpretive tradition is more difficult to establish than an allusion to Scripture. Though there is evidence for ascent traditions in connection with Moses' reception of the law (cf. Turner, *Power*, 286), the evidence that Ps 67:19 LXX was interpreted in connection with this tradition rests on an admittedly late Targum (cf. Lindars, *Apologetic*, 52). Turner, *Power*, 286 (cf. 288), acknowledges that the Pentecost speech associates Jesus primarily with Davidic motifs, but he argues that positing a Mosaic background fills in parts of Peter's argument that are not convincing on a Davidic basis alone. However, although the antiquity of the tradition in the Targum *may* be confirmed by a similar interpretive move in Eph 4:8 (cf. Turner, *Power*, 287), this crucial interpretive move is missing from Acts 2:33: While both Eph 4:8 and the Targum state that the actor *gave* gifts instead of receiving gifts as stated in the psalm, Acts 2:33 retains the concept of *receiving* (cf. Lindars, *Apologetic*, 54, who argues that Acts 2:33 represents an "intermediate stage" of interpreting the psalm). A subtle allusion such as this one is a slender basis on which to posit a connection between Jesus and the prophet like Moses, especially in a context which contains direct quotations of other passages and in which Jesus is directly linked to David. If Luke had wanted to draw attention to traditions about Moses and Pentecost in Peter's sermon, one would expect him to do it more clearly. Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 149-50.

Jesus' temptation recalls the exodus from Egypt (4:1-13),²⁰² Luke's decision to place Jesus' genealogy between the baptism and the temptation conveys that it as the "son of David" and, more importantly, the "son of God," that Jesus undergoes temptation (3:31, 38). Jesus' claim to be *anointed* with the Spirit in fulfillment of Isa 61:1-2 confirms further that Luke understood him to be the royal "*anointed* one" who, nevertheless, adopts the mode of a prophet, and compares himself with the prophets Elijah and Elisha (Luke 4:16-30).²⁰³ Following Jesus' sermon at Nazareth, Luke sums up Jesus' healing ministry, saying, "Demons came out of many, shouting, 'You are the *Son of God*!' But he rebuked them . . . because they knew that he was the *Messiah*."²⁰⁴

Various aspects of Jesus' identity are developed in the teaching and miracle stories that lead up to Peter's confession of Jesus as Messiah (9:20). In response to a resuscitation with unmistakable parallels to Elijah's raising of the widow of Zarephath's son (7:11-16), the crowd acclaims Jesus as a "great prophet" and associates him with God's eschatological "visitation" of his people (7:16).²⁰⁵ The following pericope confirms that Jesus was the coming Messiah expected by John the Baptist (7:18-23).²⁰⁶ In Luke 7:39 Simon the Pharisee muses about the popular identification of Jesus as a prophet, but no further details are provided. A series of instructions about the importance of "hearing and doing (ἀκούοντες καὶ ποιοῦντες) the word of God" (8:21)²⁰⁷ perhaps points forward to the exhortation to "hear" Jesus on the mount of transfiguration.

²⁰² Cf. Johnson, *Luke*, 76.

²⁰³ Cf. discussion in chapter three page 102f. above.

²⁰⁴ Luke 4:41 (diff. Mark 1:34); cf. Luke 8:28.

²⁰⁵ Cf. discussion in chapter five page 197f. above.

²⁰⁶ Cf. Luke 3:15-17; see discussion in chapter five page 217f. above.

²⁰⁷ Diff. Mark 3:35; cf. Luke 8:4-20.

Amazement follows the calming of the storm and the raising of Jairus's daughter from the dead, but only the Gerasene demoniac identifies Jesus as "son of the most high God" (8:28).

Speculation about Jesus' identity comes to the fore in Luke 9:7-9, with suggestions ranging from a newly resurrected John the Baptist to the return of Elijah or the resurrection of one of the ancient prophets; no mention is made of a prophet like Moses. After the feeding of the five thousand, the same list of possibilities is repeated, followed by Peter's declaration that Jesus is "the Messiah of God" (9:20). The links between Jesus and Moses at the transfiguration (9:28-36) and at the following rebuke of the "faithless and perverse generation" (9:41) are bracketed by predictions of the Son of Man's betrayal (9:23-27; 43-45). There follow several echoes of Elijah, including an intimation of Jesus' coming ascension (9:51), the request of his disciples to call down fire from heaven (9:54), and an allusion to Elijah's first encounter with Elisha (9:61-62).²⁰⁸

Building on passages from the double tradition, chapter 10 and 11 emphasize the centrality of Jesus (cf. 10:13-16, 22-24; 11:29-32), drawing particular attention to the necessity of "hearing" him. Instead of Matthew's "whoever receives you receives me" (10:40), Luke's version has "whoever hears you hears me" (10:16). "Hearing" is mentioned again in Luke 10:24 (par. Matt 13:17), and in 10:38-42 the account of Martha and Mary dramatizes what it means to hear the word of the Lord: Mary "sat at the Lord's feet and listened to his teaching (ἤκουεν τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ)" (10:39). Luke alone includes the macarism, "Blessed rather are those who *hear* the word of God and obey it"

²⁰⁸ Cf. chapter five page 201.

(11:28), and in 11:31 the queen of Sheba is eulogized for coming to *hear* Solomon—in sharp contrast to Jesus' audience who fail to listen to him (par. Matt 12:42). Finally, the parable of the rich man and Lazarus concludes with the ominous statement, "If they do not listen (ἀκούουσιν) to *Moses* and the prophets, neither will they be convinced if someone *rises from the dead*" (16:31).²⁰⁹

Asked to perform a sign to demonstrate his divine authority to perform exorcisms (11:16), Jesus claims that he casts out demons "by the finger of God" (11:20)—alluding to Moses and Aaron's conflict with Pharaoh's magicians (Exod 8:19). But when the subject of signs comes up again, Jesus compares the Son of Man positively to Jonah and Solomon, without mentioning Moses or Aaron (11:29-32; cf. Matt 12:38-42). When he is warned that Herod Antipas plots his death, Jesus includes himself among the persecuted prophets (13:33-34; cf. Matt 23:37). After yet another prediction of the Son of Man's impending death (18:31-34) and before a statement of the Son of Man's mission to "seek out and to save the lost" (19:10), Jesus is addressed by a blind beggar in Jericho as "Son of David" (18:38-39; par. Mark 10:47-48).

From here on, royal Davidic elements grow more frequent. The "multitude of disciples" acclaim Jesus king on his entry to Jerusalem (19:38), and in 20:41-44, Jesus connects the Messiah and Davidic descent—while emphasizing at the same time that the Messiah is also David's lord.²¹⁰ At the last supper, Jesus both inaugurates a new covenant

²⁰⁹ Cf. Luke 14:35 as well as chapter three page 92f. on Luke 16:29, 31. The other Evangelists include exhortations to "hear" that are absent from Luke: Cf. Mark 4:3 (diff. Luke 8:5, Matt 13:3); Mark 4:23 (diff. Luke 8:17, cf. Matt 10:26); Mark 7:14 (par. Matt 15:10); Mark 12:29 (quoting Deut 6:4; diff. Luke 10:27; Matt 22:37); Matt 11:15; Matt 13:18 (diff. Mark 4:13; Luke 8:11); Matt 13:43; Matt 21:33 (diff. Mark 12:1; Luke 20:9). Nevertheless, Luke's development of the motif remains noteworthy.

²¹⁰ Par. Mark 12:35-37a. Cf. Brendan Byrne, "Jesus As Messiah in the Gospel of Luke:

(22:20) and confers a kingdom on his disciples (22:29). After his arrest, Jesus is mockingly told to "prophesy" (22:64), and is then accused of claiming to be the Messiah, which is defined in terms of the Son of God.²¹¹ The title Messiah is then interpreted for the benefit of the Roman procurator as a term meaning "king" (23:2). Finally, the titles king and Messiah are again juxtaposed at the crucifixion when the leaders and soldiers challenge Jesus to prove his claim to be Messiah and king by *saving* himself (23:35, 37; cf. 23:39).

Several observations follow from this survey. First, it can hardly be doubted that the Emmaus disciples' disappointed hope that Jesus would be "the one to redeem Israel" reflects royal messianic expectations. Second, Jesus is not associated with Moses by anyone except the narrator and Jesus himself. Unless it is held as a foregone conclusion that the only way to explain the juxtaposition of προφήτης and χριστός is through recourse to the expectation of the prophet like Moses, there is no hint that non-Christ-believing characters in Luke's narrative expected the coming of an eschatological figure in fulfillment of Deut 18:15-19. This contrasts with popular expectation of a Messiah (Luke 3:15), or of the return of Elijah, or of the return by resurrection of an "ancient prophet" (9:7-8).

Third, it follows that prophets were not excluded from candidacy for the office of Messiah. This is illustrated in the case of John the Baptist (3:15), but also after Jesus' arrest (22:64, 66-70); the same pattern occurs on the way to Emmaus as the disciples first

Discerning a Pattern of Correction," *CBQ* 65 (2003): 89.

²¹¹ Luke 22:67, 70. See chapter three page 108 on the relationship between Messiah and Son of God.

identify Jesus as a prophet, and only then mention their hope that he would be the one to redeem Israel (24:19-21). In each instance, the individual's status as a prophet appears to be presupposed (or widely known) before a connection is made with the Messiah. The pattern seems to hold also in Luke 4, where Jesus alludes to his already established reputation as a prophet (4:23-24) in the course of making even grander claims about his own mission (4:18-21). In Luke's presentation, however, the order is reversed: Jesus is presented first as Messiah and only later comes to assume a prophetic role.

Fourth, apart from the transfiguration, there are surprisingly few parallels between Jesus and Moses in Luke's Gospel. Those allusions to Moses that do occur are minor, and are not more prominent than the connections between Jesus and Elijah. I have found no confirmation for any of the alleged structural patterns between Moses and Jesus. Jesus' "raising up" as prophet in fulfillment of Deut 18:15 does not refer to his resurrection. Jesus' ἔξοδος refers primarily to his departure from this life; the broader connotations of the word are uncertain.²¹² Neither the performance of "signs and wonders," nor the experience of persecution, nor yet the bringing of redemption is associated with Moses outside of Acts 7.

Finally, the only characteristic that is clearly tied to Moses and that receives sustained development in both Luke and Acts is the exhortation to "hear him (αὐτοῦ ἀκούετε)." Though the obligation to listen to prophets is general,²¹³ the exhortation to listen to Jesus occurs at the climax of the transfiguration in the context of other parallels between Jesus and Moses, giving it great prominence. While Luke's Gospel reiterates the

²¹² See discussion of the Isaianic Servant below.

²¹³ Cf. Luke 16:29, 31; chapter three page 92f. above.

necessity of "hearing" Jesus, the Mosaic connotations of the phrase receive unambiguous confirmation in Acts when the demand to hearken becomes the focal point of Peter's quotation from Deut 18:15.²¹⁴ Those who do not listen, says Peter, "will be utterly rooted out of the people" (Acts 3:23). Though the demand to listen to the prophet like Moses is not mentioned, Stephen's much longer speech revolves around the same idea: the Moses who predicted that God would raise up "a prophet like me" (7:37) "received living oracles to give to us" (7:38), but "our ancestors were unwilling to obey him" (7:39). Stephen insists that the failure to obey Moses was no isolated incident, but typified Israel's response to all the prophets, culminating in the murder of the one whom Moses and the prophets predicted (7:51-52).

Several questions remain about the relationship between the fulfillment of Deut 18:15 in Jesus and Luke's portrayal of Jesus as a prophet. Evidently Luke had Deut 18:15 in mind at the transfiguration (Luke 9:35), but to what extent is the idea of the prophet like Moses integrated into other aspects of Luke's portrayal of Jesus? Did Luke depict Jesus as a prophet because he thought of Jesus as the prophet like Moses? Or did Luke begin his portrayal of Jesus as a prophet because that is how Jesus functioned in the tradition Luke received? Could Luke conceive of Jesus as a prophet without recourse to the idea of the prophet like Moses?

The Isaianic Servant and the Prophet like Moses

Thus far I have not seriously considered the possibility that Luke understood the prophet like Moses through the lens of Deutero-Isaiah, particularly passages that concern

²¹⁴ Cf. Feiler, "Jesus," 73-4.

the Isaianic servant.²¹⁵ If Luke merged the concept of the prophet like Moses with the servant and herald of Isaiah, then we must conclude that Jesus is portrayed as the prophet like Moses from the moment Jesus read Isa 61:1-2 in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:18-19).

Needless to say, quotations from Isaiah—not to mention allusions—play an important role in Luke and Acts.²¹⁶ Jesus uses Isa 61:1-2 to define his mission, as is clear from his allusion back to Isa 61:1 when he defends his mission to John's disciples (Luke 7:22), and from the summary of Jesus' ministry through the use of allusions to Isa 61:1 in Acts 10:36-38.²¹⁷ Some of Luke's Isaiah quotations are from "servant songs."²¹⁸ Luke 22:37 and Acts 8:32-33, in particular, present Jesus as the fulfillment of parts of Isaiah 53. Since Luke did not know about the modern scholarly designation "servant songs," it is possible that he identified the Servant of Isa 49:6, for example, with the herald of Isa 61:1.²¹⁹

Other statements clearly identify Jesus with the Servant of Isaiah. In Acts 3:13, Peter's claim that "[God] glorified his servant Jesus (ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν)," recalls the description of the Servant in Isa 52:13: "my servant . . . will be glorified exceedingly (ὁ παῖς μου . . . δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα)."²²⁰ In the immediate context

²¹⁵ See note 10 above.

²¹⁶ Luke 3:4-6 (par. Matt 3:3; cf. Mark 1:3) quotes Isa 40:3-5; Luke 4:18-19 mixes a quotation of Isa 61:1-2 with one line from Isa 58:6; Luke 19:46 (par. Mark 11:17) cites one line from Isa 56:7; Luke 22:37 cites Isa 53:12; Acts 7:49-50 quotes Isa 66:1-2; Acts 8:32-33 quotes Isa 53:7-8; Acts 13:34 cites Isa 55:3; Acts 13:47 quotes Isa 49:6; and Acts 28:26-7 quotes Isa 6:9-10 (cf. Luke 8:10).

²¹⁷ Cf. Franklin, *Christ*, 64; *contra* Tuckett, "Christology," 143.

²¹⁸ Luke 22:37 (Isa 53:12); Acts 8:32-33 (Isa 53:7-8); Acts 13:47 (Isa 49:6).

²¹⁹ Cf. Franklin, *Christ*, 64; Strauss, *Messiah*, 242-3.

²²⁰ Cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 194: "There can be no question that the figure is to be seen here, and the context makes it clear that he is thought of not only as exalted but also as suffering."

of a reference to the Servant of Isaiah 53, the description of Jesus as the "the Holy and Righteous One (τὸν ἅγιον καὶ δίκαιον)" in Acts 3:14 probably also echoes the description of the Servant as δίκαιος in Isa 53:11,²²¹ in which case the use of "the Righteous One (ὁ δίκαιος)" as a title for Jesus in Acts 7:52 will most likely echo the same passage from Isaiah 53.²²² The Servant is also identified as "my chosen one (ὁ ἐκλεκτός μου)" in Isa 42:1, while in Luke 23:35, the leaders scoff at Jesus saying, "He saved others; let him save himself if he is the Messiah of God, his chosen one (ὁ ἐκλεκτός)." ²²³ Finally, at the transfiguration, Luke replaces Mark's ὁ ἀγαπητός—which in Mark recalls the heavenly voice at Jesus' baptism (cf. Luke 3:22)—with ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος (9:35). Although the concept of God's election is by no means limited to Deutero-Isaiah, it is especially prominent there,²²⁴ and it is possible that the mention of election in Luke 9:35 and 23:35 recalls the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.²²⁵

Looking back over these examples, one may observe that probable references to Isaiah's Servant tend to occur in contexts where Jesus is identified as the prophet like Moses. After linking Jesus to the Servant of Isa 52:13 in Acts 3:13, and identifying Jesus as the fulfillment of Deut 18:15 in Acts 3:22-23, Peter alludes a second time to Deut 18:15 at the end of his speech, but instead of identifying Jesus as the *prophet* whom God raised up, Peter says that "God raised up his *servant*" (3:26). In Acts 7:52, after Stephen

²²¹ Barrett, *Acts*, 196.

²²² Cf. David Seccombe, "Luke and Isaiah," *NTS* 27 (1981): 257; Barrett, *Acts*, 377; *contra* Donald L. Jones, "The Title 'Servant' in Luke-Acts," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. Charles H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984), 154.

²²³ Instead of ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός (Luke 23:35), Mark 15:32 has ὁ χριστὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἰσραὴλ (par. Matt 27:42).

²²⁴ Cf. Isa 41:8-9; 43:10; 44:1-2; 49:7.

²²⁵ Cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 803; Bovon, *Luke*, 379. Otherwise, Schürmann, *Lukas* 1, 562.

has developed an extensive list of implicit parallels between Jesus and Moses, he concludes his speech abruptly by accusing his audience of betraying and murdering the "Righteous One." If there is an allusion to Isa 42:1 in the call to listen to Jesus as "my Son, my Chosen (ὁ ἐκλελεγμένος)" (Luke 9:35), then Servant and Mosaic qualities are juxtaposed also at Jesus' transfiguration.

In addition, the title *παῖς* is used frequently in the Septuagint of both Moses and the Isaianic Servant.²²⁶ Strauss also points to "new exodus" passages from Isaiah that are given prominence by Luke, including Isa 61:1-2 (quoted in Luke 4:18) and Isa 40:3-5. The latter passage functions within Isaiah to inaugurate a new exodus that is concerned primarily with Jerusalem.²²⁷ Strauss claims that Luke's own interest in Jerusalem corresponds to the concern for Zion expressed in new exodus passages in Isaiah.²²⁸ Since the liberation promised in Isaiah 61 and the salvation heralded in Isaiah 40 is already present in Jesus' ministry,²²⁹ Strauss concludes that Jesus' "exodus" that is mentioned explicitly in Luke 9:31 "becomes a metaphor for the eschatological time of salvation inaugurated with the coming of Jesus."²³⁰ Although Strauss thinks that the Lukan Jesus fulfilled the Isaianic "new exodus" primarily as the Davidic Messiah,²³¹ Turner argues

²²⁶ According to Jeremias, the title *παῖς θεοῦ* "is solidly established only for Moses" in Jewish usage after the LXX, but he notes that the title is also applied to David (Jeremias, *TDNT* 5:681). The only exceptions are Dan 3:93 in the plural; the superscription to Ps 17:1 where the servant is David; cf. 1 Esd 6:12; Wis 2:13. The term *παῖς* is used by itself in Isa 42:1, 19; 43:10; 49:6; 50:10; 52:13.

²²⁷ Strauss, *Messiah*, 298. See Isa 40:9-10; 35:10.

²²⁸ E.g. Isa 40:9, 61:3. At the beginning of Luke we meet a group of people waiting for the "redemption of Jerusalem" (Luke 2:38). Whether Jesus' *ἐξοδος* begins or ends in Jerusalem, it is at least connected to the city (Luke 9:31, 51); Luke's Gospel begins and ends in Jerusalem; and according to Luke 24:47 and Acts 1:8 the Christian message is to be preached beginning in Jerusalem.

²²⁹ See Luke 7:22 for Jesus' reiteration of his Isaiah 61 mandate, and Luke 7:50; 8:36, 48, 50; 17:19; 19:9-10 for examples of Jesus' provision of salvation.

²³⁰ Strauss, *Messiah*, 304, cf. 303.

²³¹ Strauss, *Messiah*, 297.

that "Luke's awareness of the New Exodus motif in his traditions facilitated his identification of the prophet-liberator of Isaiah 61 as the prophet-like-Moses."²³²

In contrast, I will maintain in what follows that Luke did not connect passages from Isaiah to Jesus' role as a prophet or as the fulfillment of Deut 18:15. Although Luke was most likely aware that the title Servant in Acts 3:26 was related to the Servant of Isaiah,²³³ Luke regarded Isaiah as something of a blueprint for the activities of the royal Davidic Messiah, and the title Servant as another way of referring to the Messiah.²³⁴

The above section on the exodus²³⁵ demonstrated that Jesus' ἔξοδος referred literally to a departure that began in Jerusalem with his death and that culminated in his ascension. Luke certainly believed that a decisive change took place at the death-resurrection-ascension of Jesus, as a result of which salvation was made available to all who call on his name.²³⁶ But Luke portrays the "new exodus" salvation brought by Jesus in fulfillment of Isa 40:3-5 as something that began *before* his death.²³⁷ After Jesus' entry (εἰσοδος; Acts 13:24) into his public ministry, he brought salvation and release from sin and disease through his ministry of preaching and healing—a ministry interpreted by Luke through the lens of "new exodus" passages from Isaiah, especially Isa 61:1 and

²³² Turner, *Power*, 243.

²³³ *Contra* Jones, "Servant," 155.

²³⁴ Cf. Jones, "Servant," 155; Bovon, *Theologian*, 183; Strauss, *Messiah*, 245.

²³⁵ See on page 265f.

²³⁶ Acts 2:21; 4:12. For discussions of the significance of Jesus' death and resurrection as it relates to salvation in Luke-Acts see especially George, "Le sens de la mort," 212-5, as well as Joel B. Green, "Salvation to the End of the Earth: God As the Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (eds. I. Howard Marshall, and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 95-101; Marshall, *Historian*, 170-5.

²³⁷ Although Luke's concept of salvation should not be restricted to the idea as it appears in Isaiah, Jesus' saving ministry should be understood in light of the prominent quotation of Isa 40:5 in Luke 3:36 (καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ) and the allusion to Isa 49:6 (εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς) in Luke 2:32 (note σωτήριον in Luke 2:30). Cf. Luke 6:9 par. Mark 3:4; Luke 7:50; 8:12, 36; Luke 8:48 par. Mark 5:34 par. Matt 9:22; Luke 17:19; 19:9.

58:6, both of which are cited by Jesus in his programmatic sermon at Nazareth.²³⁸

According to Luke, Jesus' actions were not mere prolepses of salvation, anticipating the ministry of the disciples in Acts;²³⁹ they effected salvation in the present. "New exodus" passages from Isaiah are thus connected to Jesus' ministry and to the ministry of his disciples; they are not limited to or focused particularly on Jesus' death, resurrection, and ascension.

Still, though there is no one-to-one correlation between Jesus' own departure (ἐξοδος) and "new exodus" passages from Isaiah, it is possible that the associative meaning of the term was intended to resonate with the central passages from Isaiah quoted by Luke. According to the quotation of Isaiah 40:3-5 in Luke 3:4-6, John is "a voice of one crying in the desert, 'Prepare the way of the Lord.'"²⁴⁰ Jesus, who sets out on a literal journey (ὁδός),²⁴¹ is known as one who teaches "the way of God."²⁴² After Jesus' departure (ἐξοδος; Luke 9:31), his disciples carry on his ministry, claiming that healings are performed, forgiveness is obtained, and salvation is made possible through the name of Jesus. In Acts, the message can be summed up as the "way of salvation" (Acts 16:17) or the "way of the Lord" (Acts 18:25-26); "the Way," in fact, comes to serve as a

²³⁸ Jesus' commission to proclaim "release for the captives (κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν)" (Luke 4:18; Isa 61:1) is applied to the forgiveness of sins in Luke 5:20-4 (par. Mark 2:5-10); Luke 7:47-9. For his commission applied to healing, cf. Luke 4:39; 7:22.

²³⁹ *Contra* Lampe, "Miracles," 169-70; Garrett, *Demise*, 51.

²⁴⁰ Isa 40:3 is also alluded to in Luke 1:76, a statement which is applied to John in its Lukan context. In the latter part of the conflated quotation of Exod 23:20 and Mal 3:1 from the double tradition (Luke 7:27 par. Matt 11:10), John is again identified as the messenger who will prepare the way.

²⁴¹ See Luke 9:57; 18:35; 19:36. Jesus' disciples are also sent on the way (Luke 9:3; 10:4)

²⁴² Luke 20:21. If Luke 1:79 refers to Jesus, he is depicted as one who will "guide our feet into the way of peace." See Strauss, *Messiah*, 303, 334-5, on Jesus' ministry as an Isaianic "way."

designation for the early Jesus movement as a whole.²⁴³ Paul, like Jesus before him, is called to be a "light for revelation of the Gentiles" in fulfillment of Isa 49:6.²⁴⁴ Though the ὁδός of Jesus comes to an end with his ἔξοδος, the "Way" of Jesus' followers continues on into Acts. Nevertheless, the term "new exodus" is potentially misleading because neither Luke nor Isaiah use ἔξοδος in reference to this deliverance.²⁴⁵

Moreover, a number of factors combine to demonstrate convincingly that Deutero-Isaiah and the Isaianic Servant were understood by Luke with reference to the royal Davidic Messiah and *not* the prophet like Moses. (1) Within Acts 3 Jesus is referred to as the Servant (3:13) in the context of several references to Jesus as Messiah (3:6, 18, 20). (2) While παῖς θεοῦ is frequently applied to Moses in the Septuagint,²⁴⁶ Moses is never referred to by the term παῖς in Luke or Acts. The term is, however, applied to Israel in Luke 1:54 and to David in Luke 1:69 and Acts 4:25. The identification of Jesus as God's holy servant in Acts 4:27 clearly links him to God's servant David in 4:25. (3) We have already concluded that the anointing of the Spirit in Isa 61:1 was regarded by Luke as a prediction of Jesus' royal Davidic anointing—in part because the rare use of ἔχρισας in a passage where Jesus is portrayed as a royal Davidic figure (Acts 4:27) suggests that ἔχρισεν in Luke 4:18 (Isa 61:1) was understood as a reference to the Davidic Messiah.²⁴⁷ The Davidic connotations of παῖς in this context suggest further that if Luke regarded the speaker of Isa 61:1-2 as the Isaianic Servant, he

²⁴³ Acts 9:2; 13:10; 16:17; 18:25-26; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22. For more on the "way" in Luke-Acts see W. C. Robinson, "Theological Context," 20-31; Pao, *New Exodus*, 59-69.

²⁴⁴ See Luke 2:32; Acts 13:47.

²⁴⁵ The word ἔξοδος does appear in Isa 37:28; 51:20.

²⁴⁶ Cf. Josh 14:7; 1 Chr 6:34; 2 Chr 24:9; Dan 9:11; as well as footnote 226 above.

²⁴⁷ See chapter three page 105f. above.

identified that Servant with David's heir. (4) I argued above that within the wider context of Luke-Acts the "Righteous One" whom all the prophets predicted (Acts 7:52) is the Davidic Messiah.²⁴⁸ If the "Righteous One" is a title drawn from Isaiah, it also denotes the Davidic Messiah. (5) If ὁ ἐκλεκτός (Luke 9:35) alludes to the chosen (ὁ ἐκλεκτός) Servant of Isa 42:1, then ὁ χριστὸς τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ ἐκλεκτός (Luke 23:35) probably does too, and in the latter context the "Chosen One" is clearly associated with the title Messiah.²⁴⁹

I conclude therefore that when Peter mentions the "raising up" of his Servant (Acts 3:26), he is not identifying the prophet like Moses with the Isaianic Servant; he is rather interpreting Deut 18:15 as a reference to the Davidic Messiah. The "Righteous One" of Acts 7:52 also denotes the Messiah, and the "Chosen One" of Luke 9:35 was already regarded as a reference to the Messiah when Luke associated it with God's command to "listen" to Jesus (Luke 9:35). Although Luke believed Jesus was the Davidic Messiah who fulfilled both Deut 18:15 and Isaiah's predictions about the Servant, he did not interpret Deut 18:15 in light of Deutero-Isaiah.

Conclusion

Luke interpreted Deut 18:15-19 as a specific prediction about Jesus that was fulfilled in his earthly life. The central characteristic of the prophet like Moses—and the only one that receives development outside of Acts 7—is the necessity of listening to him. While this characteristic arises directly from Deut 18:15, Stephen's speech in Acts 7 mines the potential of what it might mean to be *like* Moses. Yet since Stephen's lengthy

²⁴⁸ See page 291 above.

²⁴⁹ Cf. Bock, *Luke*, 874 note 20.

description of Moses recalls characteristics associated with Jesus as *Messiah* in a wide variety of earlier passages, it is much more likely that Luke's portrayal of Moses was based on his understanding of Jesus' messianic role, rather than that his portrayal of the Messiah was decisively informed by his understanding of Moses. It is because Luke depicts Moses in light of Christ that he attributes to Moses the role of redeemer (7:35) and associates him with God's salvation (7:25)—even though neither of these roles is attributed to Moses in Scripture. The extensive Jesus-Moses typology in Acts 7 confirms that Luke believed Deut 18:15 predicted the royal Davidic Messiah in the same way that Isaiah predicted the Messiah. In each case the concept of Messiah is central; Luke does not interpret the Isaianic Servant in light of Deut 18:15 or vice versa.

Since Luke does not seem embarrassed to depict Jesus as a prophet, it is possible that this presentation results from his belief that Jesus fulfilled Deut 18:15, but this possibility can hardly be confirmed or denied. I suspect that the concept of the prophet like Moses played a relatively minor role in Luke's conception of Jesus as a prophet. In any case, Luke's understanding of Moses' prediction did not prompt him to eliminate connections between Jesus and other biblical prophets. Since "hearing him" is the only characteristic consistently and extensively associated with Jesus as the prophet like Moses, and since this characteristic forms part of Deut 18:15, it seems probable that Luke was unaware of any other characteristics associated with an expected prophet like Moses. Indeed, there is no reason to think that Luke had a concept of "the prophet like Moses," understood as an independent eschatological figure. Based on the evidence from Luke-Acts it would be more accurate to say that Luke believed Deut 18:15 was fulfilled in

Jesus, rather than speaking of Jesus as "the prophet like Moses."

Conclusion

Although prophets and prophecy play a vital role in his story, Luke does not seem to have reflected on his own conception of what prophets were. Still, Luke attributes a fairly consistent range of characteristic activities to those labelled "prophets," and it is normally possible to explain why the title is used. Based on an examination of the occurrences of προφήτης in Luke-Acts, we may conclude that Luke conceived of prophets as individuals who, by virtue of their nearness to God, are enabled by the Holy Spirit to have insight into matters hidden from other humans and (sometimes) to perform deeds beyond the ability of ordinary mortals; prophets are also empowered by the Holy Spirit to proclaim words of praise to God or to address divinely-commissioned messages to other humans.

Perhaps Luke's failure to think consciously about the nature of prophecy explains why it is so difficult to isolate features that serve as the *sine quibus non* for the identification of prophets. While I have argued that Luke regarded some characters as prophets even though they are never referred to by the title προφήτης, we have also seen that the various traits and activities characteristically attributed to prophets—including "prophesying" and the experience of the Holy Spirit—could be performed and experienced by others whom Luke did *not* regard as prophets. There is, however, an (admittedly imprecise) distinguishing feature implied by the title προφήτης. While individuals might prophesy on occasion, the use of the verb to denote temporary experiences and the use of the noun as a means of characterizing individuals suggests that prophets served in that capacity over a period of time.

The difference between prophets and apostles in Acts, however, cannot be reduced to the distinction between temporary and on-going performance of characteristic prophetic activities, for we have seen that members of the Twelve and the Seven are portrayed in ways that fit my descriptive definition of prophets—and there is no suggestion that the roles of the Twelve and the Seven within the earliest Jesus movement were temporary or limited. In my view, the complete absence of words of the *προφητ*-root in connection with the Twelve and the Seven may be explained as the result of Luke's assumptions about the role and relative status of prophets within the early church. While prophets evidently functioned as leaders within the early church, their status was lower than that of the Twelve and the Seven. The fact that Luke did not refer to members of these elite groups as *προφῆται* indicates either that he did not believe the title was a helpful way to describe them or that he did not regard them as prophets at all.

Prophecy and Luke's Theology

Although Luke shows little interest in defining prophets, in distinguishing prophets from other individuals or in talking about the process of becoming a prophet, this study of Luke's conception of prophets has implications for other subjects that were of great importance to him. Foremost among these are Luke's understanding of the person of Jesus and the relationship between Jesus and his disciples in Acts.

First, the results of this study challenge recent scholarship that gives prominence to the identification of Jesus as the prophet like Moses. Luke believed Jesus was a prophet who could be compared with such biblical prophets as Elijah, Elisha, Jonah and

Moses. Luke also believed that Jesus was the final fulfillment of Moses' prediction of a "prophet like me" to whom all must give heed. In Acts, Peter announces that it is still possible to listen to the prophet Jesus by responding to the message of his followers. However, the concept of the prophet like Moses does not provide the key to the structure of all or even part of Luke's two volume work. It does not account for Luke's insistence that the Messiah must suffer, nor does it explain the redemptive significance of Jesus' death. The "raising up" of Jesus in fulfillment of Deut 18:15 refers to his appearance as a prophet during his life on earth rather than to his resurrection. Luke does not, therefore, link Jesus to his followers by presenting Jesus as the "raised up" prophet like Moses who now works through his disciples. Luke believed Jesus fulfilled Deut 18:15, but there is no reason to conclude that this passage (or Moses) is in view whenever Jesus is presented as a prophet. It is unlikely that Luke had a concept of "the prophet like Moses" understood as an independent figure of eschatological expectation. Finally, Luke did not synthesize prophetic and royal messianic Christologies by interpreting Deut 18:15 in light of "new exodus" and servant passages from Isaiah. Such a synthesis would have seemed unnecessary to a writer who had no difficulty combining royal and prophetic roles—whether in David the king-prophet or in Jesus, who received a messianic anointing and adopted a prophetic role. Luke regarded titles such as Servant and Son of God, and passages like Deut 18:15 as separate designations for and statements about Jesus the Davidic Messiah. According to Luke, the title best suited to Jesus, in addition to Messiah, was undoubtedly that of Lord. As Lord, Jesus fulfilled Malachi's prediction of the coming one whose way was prepared by John the Baptist as the eschatological Elijah.

The realization that Jesus' prophetic identity was confined to his time on earth points to a shift between Luke's first and second volumes that affects Luke's portrayal of Jesus as well as the background against which the story is told. During the majority of his earthly ministry Jesus is portrayed against the background of Scripture and first century Jewish life as one who functioned self-consciously both as a prophet and as the Messiah. As the exalted Messiah and Lord in Acts, Jesus then becomes the primary background against which the story of his followers is narrated. This, rather than his identification as the prophet like Moses, best explains the links between Jesus and his followers in Acts.

Prophecy in Luke and Second Temple Literature: A Preliminary Comparison

Overall, Luke's portrayal of eschatological expectations involving prophets corresponds closely to the evidence surveyed in chapter two. Both Luke and some Second Temple texts attest to an eschatological interpretation of Deut 18:15, but there is little to suggest that the expectation of a prophet like Moses took on concrete form. Neither the texts surveyed in chapter two nor Luke-Acts support the application of Isaiah 61 to an eschatological prophet like Moses. While we found no real evidence for the development of Joel 3:1-5 in Second Temple literature, Luke obviously gave great prominence to this passage.

Eschatological Elijah traditions are developed in Ben Sira 48, 4Q521 and in Luke-Acts; all three texts reflect upon the wider context of Malachi 3. While the nature of Elijah's return is not clearly discussed in Second Temple literature, Luke distinguished between the view of people in Luke's Gospel, who expected the physical return of Elijah,

and the views of Jesus and Luke himself, who believed that Malachi's prediction was fulfilled in the coming of one like Elijah. In contrast to the texts examined in chapter two, Luke regarded the coming "Lord" of Malachi 3 as a reference to the coming of Jesus rather than to the coming of God.

Clearly, Luke's conviction that "prophesying" was more common among Jesus' followers than it had been in Judaism before Pentecost stands in contrast to the evidence surveyed in chapter two. To my knowledge, no Second Temple text outside of the New Testament asserts that Joel's prediction was fulfilled. In Acts, the claim to possess the Spirit functions as an identity marker that distinguishes Jesus' followers from other Jews (5:32). Since Acts 2:17-21 effectively defines prophetic activity in Acts as a result of the eschatological coming of the Spirit, it can be accounted for under the standard view, which maintains that most Jews believed that prophecy had ceased but that it would return again in the end time. However, Luke's presentation of Simeon and Anna as prophets before Pentecost conflicts with the standard view, particularly as there is no sign that Luke was intentionally setting his own view about the existence of prophets over against the views of others who denied their existence. More importantly, Luke's explicit identification of Anna as a "prophetess" contrasts with the practices of most Second Temple Jewish writers who—for whatever reason—tended to reserve the title "prophet" for characters in the more distant past.

More research is required in order to ascertain why other writers avoided the title "prophet," but we may reflect here on what Luke's depiction of prophets in different periods of history implies about his understanding of the relationship between the present

and the past. Instead of dividing history into three or four prophetic periods such as the biblical period, the intertestamental period, the period of Jesus and the period of the church, the infancy narrative invites us to think of a time of anticipation, which included the biblical prophets as well as Simeon and Anna, and a time of progressive fulfillment of God's promises, inaugurated with Jesus' birth and ministry, and carried forward after his ascension. Although the biblical prophets formed a more or less discrete group, there is no reason to believe that Luke thought all biblical prophets were greater than the prophets who followed them. Luke suggests that prophetic activity was more common after Pentecost, but he does not indicate that there were major changes in the way that prophets operated. The prophets who lived at the turn of the ages were distinguished from those who had gone before because they lived to see what all the other prophets had anticipated—the coming of God's redemption through Jesus, Israel's Messiah and Lord.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abrahams, Israel. "The Cessation of Prophecy." Pages 120-8 in *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*. New York: Ktav Publishing House, 1967. (Repr. from *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels, Second Series* 2 [1924]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.)
- Alexander, S. Philip. "'A Sixtieth Part of Prophecy': The Problem of Continuing Revelation in Judaism." Pages 414-33 in *Words Remembered, Texts Renewed: Essays in Honour of John F.A. Sawyer*. Edited by Jon Davies, Graham Harvey, and Wilfred G. E. Watson. Sheffield: Sheffield, 1995.
- Allison, Dale C. *The New Moses: A Matthean Typology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Aune, David E. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983. Repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- _____. "The Use of ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in Josephus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 101 (1982): 419-21.
- Bammel, Ernst. "ΑΡΧΙΕΡΕΥΣ ΠΡΟΦΕΤΕΨΩΝ." *Theologische Literaturzeitung* 79 (1954): 237-62.
- Barnett, P. W. "The Jewish Sign Prophets--A.D. 40-70--Their Intentions and Origin." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 679-97.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1994, 1998.
- _____. *The Holy Spirit and the Gospel Tradition*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1947.
- Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel After the Exile*. 1986. Repr. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." Pages 435-87 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Bauernfeind, Otto. "Die Apostelgeschichte." 1939. Repr. pages 1-282 in *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Edited by Volker Metelmann. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1980.
- _____. "Tradition und Komposition in dem Apokatastasispruch Apostelgeschichte 3,

20 f." Pages 13-23 in *Abraham unser Vater ... Festschrift für Otto Michel*. Edited by O. Betz, M. Hengel, and P. Schmidt. Leiden: Brill, 1963.

Becker, Michael. "4Q521 und die Gesalbten." *Revue De Qumran* 18, no. 1 (1997): 73-96.

Bentzen, Aage. *King and Messiah*. London: Lutterworth, 1955.

Berger, Klaus. *Identity and Experience in the New Testament*. Translated by Charles Muenchow. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2003. Translation of *Historische Psychologie des Neuen Testaments*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991.

Betz, Otto. "Miracles in the Writings of Flavius Josephus." Pages 212-35 in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman, and Goher Hata. Detroit: Wayne State University, 1987.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. "'We Pay No Heed to Heavenly Voices': The 'End of Prophecy' and the Formation of the Canon." Pages 19-31 in *Biblical and Humane: A Festschrift for John F. Priest*. Edited by Linda Bennett Elder, David L. Barr, and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.

_____. "Prophecy and Priesthood in Josephus." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974): 239-62.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994, 1996.

_____. *Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.

Böhlemann, Peter. *Jesus und der Täufer: Schlüssel zur Theologie und Ethik des Lukas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Borgen, Peder. "'There Shall Come Forth a Man': Reflections on Messianic Ideas in Philo." Pages 341-61 in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by James H. Charlesworth. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Boring, M. Eugene. *Sayings of the Risen Jesus: Christian Prophecy in the Synoptic Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

_____. "What Are We Looking for?: Toward a Definition of the Term 'Christian Prophet'." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* (1973): 142-54.

Bovon, François. "Effet de reel et flou prophetique dans l'oeuvre de Luc." Pages 349-59 in *A cause de l'Evangile*. Paris: Cerf, 1985.

- _____. "La figure de Moïse dans l'oeuvre de Luc." Pages 47-65 in *La figure de Moïse*. Edited by R. Martin-Achard. Geneva: Éditions labor et fides, 1978.
- _____. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.
- _____. *Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-1983)*. Translated by Ken McKinney. Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick, 1987.
- Bowley, James E. "Prophets and Prophecy At Qumran." Pages 354-78 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Brett, Mark G. "Four or Five Things to Do with Texts: A Taxonomy of Interpretative Interests." Pages 357-77 in *The Bible in Three Dimensions: Essays in Celebration of Forty Years of Biblical Studies in the University of Sheffield*. Edited by David J.A. Clines, Stephen E. Fowl, and Stanley E. Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990.
- Brin, Gershon. "תפיסת הנבואה המקראית בכתבי קומראן," Pages 101*-112* in *Sha'arei Talmon : Studies in the Bible, Qumran, and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Emanuel Tov and Michael Fishbane. Winona Lake, Ind: Eisenbrauns, 1992.
- _____. *Studies in Biblical Law: From the Hebrew Bible to the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Translated by Jonathan Chipman. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Brodie, Thomas L. "Luke the Literary Interpreter: Luke-Acts As a Systematic Rewriting and Updating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative." S.T.D., Pontifical University of St Thomas Aquinas, 1987.
- Brooke, George J. "Shared Intertextual Interpretations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament." Pages 35-57 in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Edited by Michael E. Stone, and Esther G. Chazon. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Broshi, Magen, and Ada Yardeni. "4Q339." In *Qumran Cave 4.XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. Edited by Magen Broshi, and et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Brown, Raymond E. *The Birth of the Messiah*. 2d ed. New York: Doubleday, 1993.
- _____. "The Messianism of Qumran." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 19 (1957): 53-82.
- Brown, Raymond Edward. "Jesus and Elisha." *Perspective (Pittsburgh)* 12 (1971): 85-

104.

Bruce, F. F. *The Book of the Acts*. Rev ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

_____. "The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles." *Interpretation* 27 (1973): 166-83.

Bryan, Steven M. *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Büchele, Anton. *Der Tod Jesu im Lukasevangelium: Eine redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lk 23*. Frankfurt: Josef Knecht, 1978.

Busse, Ulrich. "Die Engelrede Lk 1, 13-17 und ihre Vorgeschichte." Pages 163-77 in *Nach den Anfängen Fragen. FS. Gerhard Dautzenberg*. Edited by Cornelius Mayer, Karlheinz Müller, and Gerhard Schmalenberg. Gießen: Selbstverlag des Fachbereichs Evangelische Theologie und Katholische Theologie, 1994.

_____. *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu. Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4,16-30*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1977.

_____. *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus. Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*. 1977. Repr. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979.

Byrne, Brendan. "Jesus As Messiah in the Gospel of Luke: Discerning a Pattern of Correction." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 65 (2003): 80-95.

Cadbury, Henry J. "Four Features of Lukan Style." Pages 87-102 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck, and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1966.

_____. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1927. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.

Calvin, John. *Commentary Upon the Acts of the Apostles*. 4 vols. Edited by Henry Beveridge. Translated by Christopher Fetherstone. Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, 1844.

Carruth, Theodore R. "The Jesus-As-Prophet Motif in Luke-Acts." Ph.D., Baylor University, 1973.

Carter, Warren. "Zechariah and the Benedictus (Luke 1,68-79): Practicing What He Preaches." *Biblica* 69 (1988): 239-47.

- Chapman, Stephen B. *The Law and the Prophets: A Study in Old Testament Canon Formation*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.
- Chevallier, Max-Alain. "Luc et l'Esprit à la mémoire du P. Augustin George (1915-77)." *Recherches De Science Religieuse* 56 (1982): 1-16.
- Clark, Andrew C. *Parallel Lives: The Relation of Paul to the Apostles in the Lucan Perspective*. Carlisle, Cumbria, U.K.: Paternoster Press, 2001.
- Clark, David George. "Elijah As Eschatological High Priest: An Examination of the Elijah Tradition in Mal. 3:23-24." Ph.D., University of Notre Dame, 1975.
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. "False Prophets (4Q339), Netinim (4Q340), and Hellenism At Qumran." *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism* 1 (2000): 55-66.
- Collins, John J. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- _____. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper & Row, 1961.
- Crone, Theodore M. *Early Christian Prophecy: A Study of Its Origin and Function*. Baltimore, Md.: St. Mary's University Press, 1973.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic: Essays in the History of the Religion of Israel*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973.
- Cullmann, Oscar. *The Christology of the New Testament*. Translated by Shirley C. Guthrie, and Charles A. M. Hall. London: SCM, 1959. Translation of *Die Christologie des Neuen Testaments*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1957.
- Cunningham, Scott. *'Through Many Tribulations': The Theology of Persecution in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Dabek, P. "Siehe es erschienen Moses und Elias." *Biblica* 23 (1942): 175-89.
- Dalman, Gustaf. *The Words of Jesus Considered in the Light of Post-Biblical Jewish Writings and the Aramaic Language*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1902.

Danker, Frederick W. *Jesus and the New Age: A Commentary on St. Luke's Gospel*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1988.

Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

Daube, David. "Typology in Josephus." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 31 (1980): 18-36.

Davies, J. H. "The Purpose of the Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." *Studia Evangelica* 2 (1964): 164-9.

Davies, Paul Ewing. "Jesus and the Role of the Prophet." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 64 (1945): 241-54.

Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Dexinger, Ferdinand. "Der 'Prophet wie Mose' in Qumran und bei den Samaritanern." Pages 97-111 in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M Mathias Delcor*. Edited by A. Caquot, S. Légasse, and M. Tardieu. Kevelaer, Germany: Butzon & Bercker, 1985.

Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.

_____. "The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses According to the Discourses of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 544-56.

Donaldson, T. L. "Parallels: Use, Misuse and Limitations." *Evangelical Quarterly* 55 (1983): 193-210.

Donner, Herbert. "Der verlässliche Prophet : Betrachtungen zu 1 Makk 14,41ff und zu Ps 110." Pages 89-98 in *Prophetie und geschichtliche Wirklichkeit im alten Israel: Festschrift für Siegfried Herrmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1991.

Dubois, Jean Daniel. "La figure d'Elie dans la perspective lucanienne." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 53, no. 2 (1973): 155-76.

Dunn, James D. G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996.

Dupont, Jacques. "'Filius meus es tu': L'interprétation de Ps. II, 7 dans le Nouveau Testament." *Recherches de science religieuse* 35 (1948): 522-43.

- _____. "Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2.33." *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*. Edited by Barnabas Lindars, and Stephen S. Smalley. 219-228. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- _____. *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- _____. "La conversion dans les Actes des Apôtres." Pages 459-76 in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*. Edited by Jacques Dupont. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- _____. "L'interpretation des Psaumes dans les Actes des Apôtres." Pages 283-307 in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*. Edited by Jacques Dupont. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- _____. "Jésus, Messie et Seigneur dans la foi des premiers Chétiens." Pages 367-90 in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*. Edited by Jacques Dupont. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- _____. "La première Pentecôte chrétienne." Pages 481-502 in *Etudes Sur Les Actes Des Apôtres*. Paris: Editions du Cerf, 1967.
- _____. "L'utilisation apologétique de l'Ancien Testament dans les discours des Actes." Pages 245-82 in *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*. Edited by Jacques Dupont. Paris: Cerf, 1967.
- Ellis, E. Earle. *The Gospel of Luke*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1974.
- _____. "The Role of the Christian Prophet in Acts." Pages 55-67 in *Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday*. Edited by W. Ward Gasque, and Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970.
- Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." Pages 37-53 in *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- _____. *Saint Luke*. London: SCM, 1990.
- Evans, Craig A. "'He Set His Face': On the Meaning of Luke 9:51." Pages 93-105 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans, and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- _____. "Jesus and the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 573-98 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, and James C. VanderKam. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

Evans, Craig A., and James A. Sanders. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Faierstein, Morris M. "Why Do the Scribes Say That Elijah Must Come First." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100 (1981): 75-86.

Fascher, Erich. *ΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ: Eine sprach- und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*. Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann, 1927.

Feiler, Paul Frederick. "Jesus the Prophet: The Lucan Portrayal of Jesus As the Prophet Like Moses." Ph.D., Princeton Theological Seminary, 1986.

Feldman, Louis H. "Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 41 (1990): 386-422.

Feuillet, André. "«L'exode» de Jésus et le déroulement du mystère rédempteur d'après S. Luc et S. Jean." *Revue Thomiste* 77 (1977): 181-206.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "'4QTestimonia' and the New Testament." Pages 59-89 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Edited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. London: G. Chapman, 1971.

_____. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.

_____. "David, 'Being Therefore a Prophet' (Acts 2:30)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 34 (1972): 332-9.

_____. "Further Light on Melchizedek From Qumran Cave 11." Pages 245-67 in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Edited by Joseph A. Fitzmyer. London: G. Chapman, 1971.

_____. *The Gospel According to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes*. 2 vols. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981, 1985.

_____. "More About Elijah Coming First." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 104 (1985): 295-6.

_____. "The Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts." Pages 165-83 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.

Flint, Peter W. and James C. VanderKam, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls after Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1998-1999.

Foakes Jackson, F. J., and Kirsopp Lake, Editors. *The Beginnings of Christianity Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. London: Macmillan, 1920-1933. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.

Foerster, Werner. "Der heilige Geist im Spätjudentum." *New Testament Studies* 8 (1961-1962): 117-34.

Forbes, Christopher. *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1995. Repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997.

Franklin, Eric. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1975.

Freedman, William. "The Literary Motif: A Definition and Evaluation." *Novel* 4 (1971): 123-31.

Frein, Brigid Curtin. "The Literary Significance of the Jesus-As-Prophet Motif in the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles." Ph.D., St. Louis University, 1989.

_____. "Narrative Predictions, Old Testament Prophecies and Luke's Sense of Fulfilment." *New Testament Studies* 40, no. 1 (1994): 22-37.

Friedrich, Gerhard. "Lukas 9,51 und die Entrückungschristologie des Lukas." Pages 26-55 in *Auf das Wort kommt es an*. Edited by Johannes H. Friedrich. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1978.

García Martínez, Florentino and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2d ed. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Garrett, Susan R. *The Demise of the Devil: Magic and the Demonic in Luke's Writings*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.

_____. "Exodus From Bondage: Luke 9:31 and Acts 12:1-24." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 52 (1990): 656-80.

George, Augustin. "L'Esprit Saint dans l'oeuvre de Luc." *Revue Biblique* 85 (1978): 500-42.

_____. "Jésus « Seigneur »." Pages 237-55 in *Études sur L'oeuvre De Luc*. Edited by Augustin George. Paris: Gabalda, 1986.

_____. "Jésus fils de Dieu dans l'Évangile selon Saint Luc." *Revue Biblique* 72 (1965): 185-209.

- _____. "Note sur quelques traits lucaniens de l'expression «Par le doigt de Dieu» (Luc XI, 20)." *Sciences Ecclésiastiques* 18 (1966): 461-6.
- _____. "L'oeuvre de Luc: Actes et Evangile." Pages 207-40 in *Le ministère et les ministères selon le Nouveau Testament*. Edited by J. Delorme. Paris: , 1974.
- _____. "Le sens de la mort de Jésus pour Luc." *Revue Biblique* 80 (1973): 186-217.
- Giblet, Jean. "Prophétisme et attente d'un messie prophète dans l'ancien Judaïsme." Pages 85-130 in *L'Attente du Messie*. Edited by L. Cerfaux, *et al.* Bruges: Desclée de Brouwer, 1954.
- Gils, Félix. *Jésus prophète d'après les évangiles synoptiques*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires, 1957.
- Glazier-McDonald, Beth. *Malachi: The Divine Messenger*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Goulder, Michael D. *Luke: A New Paradigm*. 2 vols. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- _____. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK, 1964.
- Grabbe, Lester L. "Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 37, no. 2 (1998): 524-45.
- Gray, Rebecca. *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence From Josephus*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- _____. "Salvation to the End of the Earth: God As the Saviour in the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 83-106 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall, and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Greene, Glenn Roger. "The Portrayal of Jesus As Prophet in Luke-Acts." Ph.D., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1975.
- Greenspahn, Frederick E. "Why Prophecy Ceased." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 108 (1989): 37-49.
- Grundmann, Walter. *Das Evangelium nach Lukas*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1963.

Guy, H. A. *New Testament Prophecy: Its Origin and Significance*. London: Epworth Press, 1947.

Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, and R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Hahn, Ferdinand. "Das Problem alter christologischer Überlieferungen in der Apostelgeschichte unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Act 3,19-21." Pages 129-54 in *Les Actes Des Apôtres: Tradition, Rédaction, Théologie*. Edited by J. Kremer. Gembloux/Leuven: J. Duculot/Leuven, 1979.

_____. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. Translated by H. Knight, and G. Ogg. London: Lutterworth, 1969.

Hamm, Dennis. "Acts 3:12-26 : Peter's Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11 (1984): 199-217.

Hanson, Paul D. *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology*. Rev. ed. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.

Harnack, Adolf. *The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. Translated by James Moffatt. 4 vols. 1904. Repr., Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1972.

Harris, Marvin. "History and Significance of the Emic/Etic Distinction." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 5 (1976): 329-50.

Hastings, Adrian. *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem, a Study of the Teaching of St. Luke*. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1958.

Hay, David M. "Philo's View of Himself As an Exegete: Inspired, But Not Authoritative." *Studia Philonica Annual* 3 (1991): 40-52.

Haya-Prats, G. *L'Esprit force de l'église: Sa nature et son activité d'après les Actes des Apôtres*. Translated by J. Romero. Paris: Cerf, 1975.

Haya-Prats, Gonzalo. *L'Esprit force de l'église*. Translated by José J. Romero, and Hubert Faes. Paris: Cerf, 1975.

Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale, 1989.

Hayward, C. T. Robert. "Phinehas—the Same Is Elijah: The Origins of a Rabbinic Tradition." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 29 (1978): 22-34.

- Hengel, Martin. *The Zealots: Investigations into the Jewish Freedom Movement in the Period From Herod I until 70 A.D.* Translated by David Smith. Leiden: Brill, 1976. Repr. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1989.
- Hill, Andrew E. *Malachi: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Hill, David. "The Background and Biblical Usage of the Term *Pneuma*." Pages 202-65 in *Greek Words and Hebrew Meanings: Studies in the Semantics of Soteriological Terms*. Edited by David Hill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- _____. *New Testament Prophecy*. Atlanta: John Knox Press, 1979.
- Hooker, Morna D. "Beginning From Moses and From All the Prophets." Pages 216-30 in *From Jesus to John, Essays on Jesus and New Testament Christology in Honour of Marinus De Jonge*. Edited by M.C. de Boer. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1993.
- _____. *The Signs of a Prophet: The Prophetic Actions of Jesus*. Harrisburg, Pa.: Trinity, 1997.
- Horsley, Richard A. "'Like One of the Prophets of Old' : Two Types of Popular Prophets At the Time of Jesus." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 435-63.
- _____. "Popular Prophetic Movements At the Time of Jesus. Their Principal Features and Social Origins." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (1986): 3-27.
- Horsley, Richard A., and John S. Hanson. *Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus*. Minneapolis: Winston Press, 1985.
- Hughes, John H. "John the Baptist: The Forerunner of God Himself." *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 191-218.
- Hur, Ju. *A Dynamic Reading of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Jervell, Jacob. "The Mighty Minority." Pages 26-51 in *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- _____. "Sons of the Prophets: The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 96-121, 172-9 in *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Edited by Jacob Jervell. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.

- _____. *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- Johnson, Gary Lance. "Josephus: Heir Apparent to the Prophetic Tradition?" *SBLSP* 22 (1983): 337-46.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1992.
- _____. *The Gospel of Luke*. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- _____. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Jones, Donald L. "The Title 'Servant' in Luke-Acts." Pages 148-65 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives From the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984.
- de Jonge, Marianus. "Josephus und die Zukunftserwartungen seines Volkes." Pages 23-44 in *Josephus-Studien*. Edited by Otto Betz, Klaus Haacker, and Martin Hengel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1974.
- de Jonge, Marinus, and Adam S. van der Woude. "11Q Melchizedek and the New Testament." *New Testament Studies* 12 (1965-1966): 301-26.
- Karrer, Martin. *Jesus Christus im Neuen Testament*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Keck, Leander E., and J. Louis Martyn. *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1966. Repr. Mifflintown, Penn.: Sigler, 1999.
- Kellermann, Ulrich. "Zu den Elia-Motiven in den Himmelfahrtsgeschichten des Lukas." Pages 123-37 in *Altes Testament - Forschung und Wirkung*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1994.
- Kelly, Joseph G. "Lucan Christology and the Jewish-Christian Dialogue." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 21, no. 4 (1984): 688-708.
- Kerrigan, Alexander. "The 'Sensus Plenus' of Joel, III, 1-5 in Act., II, 14-36." Pages 295-313 in *Sacra Pagina*, vol. 2. Edited by J. Coppens, A. Descamps, and É. Massaux. 2 vols. Gembloux: Duculot, 1959.
- Kilgallen, John J. *The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7.2-53*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.

- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. "Jesus As the 'Prophetic Messiah' in Luke's Gospel." Pages 29-42 in *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*. Edited by A. J. Malherbe, and W. A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993.
- Koet, Bart J. "Divine Communication in Luke-Acts." Pages 745-57 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Kraus, Wolfgang. "Die Bedeutung von Dtn 18,15-18 für das Verstandnis Jesu als Prophet." *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 90 (1999): 153-76.
- Kugel, James L. "David the Prophet." Pages 45-55 in *Poetry and Prophecy: The Beginnings of a Literary Tradition*. Edited by James L. Kugel. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kurz, William Stephen. "Acts 3:19-26 As a Test of the Role of Eschatology in Lukan Christology." Pages 309-23 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- Kvalbein, Hans. "The Wonders of the End-Time: Metaphoric Language in 4Q521 and the Interpretation of Matthew 11.5 par." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 18 (1998): 87-110.
- Lake, Kirsopp, and Henry J. Cadbury. *Volume IV: English Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 4 of *The Beginnings of Christianity Part I: The Acts of the Apostles*. Edited by F. J. Foakes Jackson, and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1932. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979.
- Lampe, Geoffrey W. *God As Spirit*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1977.
- _____. "The Holy Spirit in the Writings of St. Luke." Pages 159-200 in *Studies in the Gospels*. Edited by D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955.
- _____. "Miracles in the Acts of the Apostles." Pages 163-78 in *Miracles: Cambridge Studies in Their Philosophy and History*. Edited by C.F.D. Moule. London: A. R. Mowbray, 1965.
- Leivestad, Ragnar. "Das Dogma von der prophetenlosen Zeit." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972-1973): 288-99.
- Levison, John R. "Did the Spirit Withdraw From Israel? An Evaluation of the Earliest

Jewish Data." *New Testament Studies* 43 (1997): 35-57.

_____. "Inspiration and the Divine Spirit in the Writings of Philo Judaeus." *Journal for the Study of Judaism in the Persian, Hellenistic and Roman Period* 26 (1995): 271-323.

_____. *The Spirit in First-Century Judaism*. Brill: Leiden, 1997.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. "Qumran-Messianism." Pages 323-33 in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls, in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Edited by Shalom M. Paul, Robert A. Kraft, Lawrence H. Schiffman, and Weston W. Fields. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Lierman, John D. "The New Testament Moses in the Context of Ancient Judaism." Ph.D., Cambridge University, 2002.

Lindars, Barnabas. *New Testament Apologetic*. London: SCM, 1961.

Lindblom, Johannes. *Gesichte und Offenbarungen: Vorstellungen von göttlichen Weisungen und übernatürlichen Erscheinungen im ältesten Christentum*. Lund: Gleerup, 1968.

Loisy, Alfred. *Les Actes des Apôtres*. Paris: Émile Nourry, 1920.

Mainville, O. *L'Esprit dans l'oeuvre de Luc*. Montreal: Fides, 1991.

Malchow, Bruce V. "The Messenger of the Covenant in Mal 3:1." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 252-5.

Mánek, Jindrich. "The New Exodus in the Books of Luke." *Novum Testamentum* 2 (1958): 8-23.

Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'*. Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery, and Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Marshall, I. Howard. *The Gospel of Luke*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978.

_____. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. 3rd ed. Paternoster, 1970. Repr. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1988.

Mason, Steve. "Josephus, Daniel, and the Flavian House." Pages 161-91 in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith*. Edited by Fausto Parente, and Joseph Sievers. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1994.

- Mayer, Reinhold, and Christa Möller. "Josephus--Politiker und Prophet." Pages 271-84 in *Josephus-Studien*. Edited by O. Betz, K. Haacker, and M. Hengel. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
- Mayes, A.D.H. *Deuteronomy*. London: Oliphants, 1979.
- McCasland, S. Vernon. "Signs and Wonders." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 76 (1957): 149-52.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The Prophet-King: Moses Traditions and the Johannine Christology*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1967.
- Menzies, Robert P. *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology with Special Reference to Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.
- Metso, Sarianna. "Constitutional Rules At Qumran." Pages 186-210 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment*. Edited by Peter W. Flint, and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 3d ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Meyer, Rudolf. *Der Prophet aus Galiläa, Studie zum Jesusbild der ersten Evangelien*. 1940. Repr. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1970.
- Michel, Otto. "Spätjüdisches Prophetentum." Pages 60-6 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolph Bultmann*. Edited by W. Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1957.
- Milikowski, Haim. "סוף הנבואה וסוף המקרא בעיני סדר עולם, ספרות חז"ל והספרות שמסביב לה." *Sidra* (1994): 83-94.
- Miller, Robert J. "Elijah, John, and Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 611-22.
- Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." Pages 111-30 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck, and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville, Tenn.: Abingdon, 1966, 1980.
- _____. *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke*. New York: Seabury Press, 1976.
- Moessner, David P. "'The Christ Must': New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 220-56.

- _____. *Lord of the Banquet*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- _____. "Paul and the Pattern of the Prophet Like Moses in Acts." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 22 (1983): 203-12.
- Moule, C. F. D. "The Christology of Acts." Pages 159-85 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck, and J. Louis Martyn. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1966.
- Nasrallah, Laura Salah. *'An Ecstasy of Folly': Prophecy and Authority in Early Christianity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Nebe, Gottfried. *Prophetische Züge im bilde Jesus bei Lukas*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1989.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. *Ancient Judaism and Christian Origins: Diversity, Continuity, and Transformation*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.
- _____. *Jewish Literature Between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Nida, Eugene A., and Johannes P. Louw. *Lexical Semantics of the Greek New Testament*. Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Nolland, John. *Luke*. 3 vols. Dallas, Tex.: Word, 1989, 1993.
- O'Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts and Its Historical Setting*. London: SPCK, 1961.
- O'Reilly, Leo. *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lukan Theology*. Rome: Editrice Pontifica Università Gregoriana, 1987.
- O'Toole, Robert F. *Acts 26. The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense (Ac 22:1-26:32)*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978.
- _____. "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 20 (1990): 22-9.
- _____. "Some Observations on Anistemi, 'I Raise,' in Acts 3:22-26." *Science et esprit* 31, no. 1 (1979): 85-92.
- Öhler, Markus. *Elia im Neuen Testament: Untersuchungen zur Bedeutung des alttestamentlichen Propheten im Neuen Testament*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 1997.

- _____. "The Expectation of Elijah and the Presence of the Kingdom of God." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 118 (1999): 461-76.
- _____. "Jesus As Prophet: Remarks on Terminology." Pages 125-42 in *Jesus, Mark and Q: The Teaching of Jesus and Its Earliest Records*. Edited by Michael Labahn and Andreas Schmidt. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Overholt, Thomas W. "The End of Prophecy: No Players Without a Program." Pages 527-38 in *The Place Is Too Small for Us': The Israelite Prophets in Recent Scholarship*. Edited by Robert P. Gordon. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000. Repr. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *The Departure of Jesus in Luke-Acts: The Ascension Narratives in Context*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Petersen, David L. *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles*. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1977.
- _____. *Zechariah 9-14 and Malachi: A Commentary*. Louisville, Kent.: Westminster John Knox, 1995.
- Philonenko, Marc. "Jusqu'à ce que se lève un prophète digne de confiance (1.Machabées 14.41)." Pages 95-8 in *Messiah and Christos: Studies in the Jewish Origins of Christianity*. Edited by Ithamar Gruenwald, Shaul Shaked, and Gedaliahu G. Stroumsa. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1992.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. 4th ed. 1901. Repr. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1910.
- Poirier, John C. "The Endtime Return of Elijah and Moses At Qumran." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 221-42.
- Potterie, Ignace de la. "L'onction du Christ." *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* 80 (1958): 225-52.
- _____. "Le titre κύριος appliqué à Jésus dans l'évangile de Luc." Pages 117-46 in *Mélanges bibliques en hommage au R. P. Bédé Rigaux*. Edited by Albert Descamps, and R. P. André de Halleux. Gembloux: Duculot, 1970.
- Puech, Émile. "4QApocalypse messianique." Pages 1-38 in *Qumrân Grotte 4 XVIII: Textes Hébreux (4Q521-4Q528, 4Q576-4Q579)*. DJD XXV. Edited by Émile Puech. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998.

- Qimron, Elisha. *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.
- _____. "לפשרה של רשימת נביאי השקר." *Tarbiz* 63 (1994): 273-5.
- Rackham, Richard Belward. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Exposition*. 9th ed. 1901. Repr. London: Methuen, 1922.
- Ravens, David. "Luke 9.7-62 and the Prophetic Role of Jesus." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 119-29.
- _____. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Reid, Barbara E. *The Transfiguration: A Source- and Redaction-Critical Study of Luke 9:28-36*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1993.
- Reid, Stephen B. "The End of Prophecy in the Light of Contemporary Social Theory: A Draft." *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers* 24 (1985): 515-23.
- Reiling, J. "The Use of ΨΕΥΔΟΠΡΟΦΗΤΗΣ in the Septuagint, Philo and Josephus." *Novum Testamentum* 13 (1971): 147-56.
- Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Gütersloher: Gerd Mohn, 1969.
- Richard, Earl. "Pentecost As a Recurrent Theme in Luke-Acts." Pages 133-49 in *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Edited by Earl Richard. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Ringe, Sharon H. "Luke 9:28-36: The Beginning of an Exodus." *Semeia* 28 (1983): 83-99.
- Robeck Jr., Cecil. M. "The Gift of Prophecy in Acts and Paul, Part I." *Studia Biblical et Theologica* 5 (1975): 15-38.
- Robinson, John A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus : An Essay in Detection." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1958): 263-81.
- _____. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" Pages 139-53 in *Twelve New Testament Studies*. Edited by John A. T. Robinson. London: SCM, 1962.
- Robinson, William C. Jr. "The Theological Context for Interpreting Luke's Travel Narrative." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 79 (1960): 20-31.

Rofé, Alexander. "רשימת נביאי השקר מקומראן - שתי חידות ופתרונן." *Ha'aretz* (April 13, 1994): B11.

Russell, D. S. *The Method and Message of Jewish Apocalyptic*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.

Sanders, James A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." Pages 46-69 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans, and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

_____. "Isaiah in Luke." Pages 14-25 in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Craig A. Evans, and James A. Sanders. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 81 (1962): 1-13.

Schäfer, Peter. *Die Vorstellung vom heiligen Geist in der rabbinischen Literatur*. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1972.

Schiffman, Lawrence and James C. VanderKam, eds. *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Schlosser, Jacques. "Moïse, serviteur du kerygme apostolique d'apres Ac 3,22-26." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 61 (1987): 17-31.

Schnackenburg, Rudolf. "Die Erwartung des 'Propheten' nach dem Neuen Testament und den Qumran-Texten." *Studia Evangelica* 1 (1959): 622-39.

Schneider, Gerhard. "Gott und Christus als κύριος nach der Apostelgeschichte." Pages 213-25 in *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Edited by Gerhard Schneider. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1985.

Schnider, Franz. *Jesus der Prophet*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

Schubert, Judith M. "The Image of Jesus As the Prophet Like Moses in Luke-Acts As Advanced by Luke's Reinterpretation of Deuteronomy 18:15, 18 in Acts 3:22 and 7:37." Ph.D., Fordham University, 1992.

Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." Pages 165-86 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann*. Edited by W. Eltester. Berlin: A. Töpelmann, 1954.

Schuller, Eileen M. *Non-Canonical Psalms From Qumran: A Pseudepigraphic Collection*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

Schürmann, Heinz. *Das Lukasevangelium, erster Teil: Kommentar zu Kap. 1, 1 - 9, 50*. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.

_____. *Das Lukasevangelium, zweiter Teil, erste Folge: Kommentar zu Kapitel 9, 51 - 11,54*. Freiburg: Herder, 1994.

Schweitzer, Albert. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus: A Critical Study of Its Progress From Reimarus to Wrede*. Translated by W. Montgomery. 1906. Repr. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Scobie, Charles H. H. *John the Baptist*. London: SCM, 1964.

Seccombe, David. "Luke and Isaiah." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 252-9.

Shelton, James B. *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1991.

Shepherd, William H. , Jr . *The Narrative Function of the Holy Spirit As a Character in Luke-Acts*. Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1994.

Skehan, Patrick W., and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. New York: Doubleday, 1987.

Sloan, Robert. "'Signs and Wonders': A Rhetorical Clue to the Pentecost Discourse." *Evangelical Quarterly* 63 (1991): 225-40.

Sloan, Robert B. *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Austin, Tex.: Schola Press, 1977.

Sommer, Benjamin D. "Did Prophecy Cease? Evaluating a Reevaluation." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 31-47.

Squires, John T. *The Plan of God in Luke-Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Stemberger, Günter. "Propheten und Prophetie in der Tradition des nachbiblischen Judentums." *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 14 (1999): 145-74.

- Stolz, Fritz. "Zeichen und Wunder: Die prophetische legitimation und ihre Geschichte." *Zeitschrift Für Theologie Und Kirche* 69 (1972): 125-44.
- Stone, Michael E. "Apocalyptic--Vision or Hallucination?" Pages 419-28 in *Selected Studies in Pseudepigrapha and Apocrypha with Special Reference to the Armenian Tradition*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Leiden: Brill, 1991.
- _____. *Fourth Ezra*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Stronstad, Roger. *The Prophethood of All Believers: A Study in Luke's Charismatic Theology*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Strugnell, John. "4Q375. 4QApocryphon of Moses^a." Pages 111-9 in *Qumran Cave 4 XIV: Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*. DJD XIX. Edited by Magen Broshi, Esther Eshel, et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995.
- Tabor, James D., and Michael O. Wise. "4Q521 'on Resurrection' and the Synoptic Gospel Tradition: A Preliminary Study." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 10 (1992): 149-62.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Volume One: The Gospel According to Luke*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- _____. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Volume Two: The Acts of the Apostles*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1990.
- Tatum, W. B. "The Epoch of Israel: Luke i-ii and the Theological Plan of Luke-Acts." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1966-1967): 184-95.
- Taylor, Joan E. *The Immerser: John the Baptist Within Second Temple Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Teeple, Howard M. *The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet*. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature, 1957.
- Tiede, David L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Tilly, Michael. *Johannes der Täufer und die Biographie der Propheten: Die synoptische Täuferüberlieferung und das jüdische Prophetenbild zur Zeit des Täufers*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1994.

- Trumbower, Jeffrey A. "The Role of Malachi in the Career of John the Baptist." Pages 28-41 in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel*. Edited by Craig A. Evans, and W. Richard Stegner. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "The Christology of Luke-Acts." Pages 133-64 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Turner, Max B. *Power From on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Urbach, Ephraim. "מתי פסקה הנבואה?" *Tarbiz* (1945-1946): 1-11.
- van Henten, Jan Willem. "Moses As Heavenly Messenger in Assumptio Mosis 10:2 and Qumran Passages." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 54 (2003): 216-27.
- van Stempvoort, P. A. "The Interpretation of the Ascension in Luke and Acts." *New Testament Studies* 6 (1958): 30-42.
- van Unnik, Willem C. *Flavius Josephus als historischer Schriftsteller*. Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1978.
- VanderKam, James, and Monica Brady. "4Q377." Pages 205-17 in *Wadi Daliyeh II and Qumran Cave 4.XXVIII: Miscellanea, Part 2. DJD XXVIII*. Edited by Moshe Bernstein, et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2001.
- VanHoye, Albert. "L'intérêt de Luc pour la prophétie en Luc 1,76; 4,16-30 et 22,60-65." Pages 1529-48 in *The Four Gospels 1992*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1992.
- Verheyden, Jozef, ed. *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1999.
- Verhoef, Pieter A. *The Books of Haggai and Malachi*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. 5th ed. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
- _____. *Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1973.
- Vermes, Geza, Fergus Millar, Matthew Black, and Martin Goodman, eds. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* by Emil Schürer. Rev. ed. 4 vols. Edinburgh: T.&T. Clark, 1973, 1979, 1986, 1987.
- von Baer, Heinrich. *Der Heilige Geist in den Lukasschriften*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer,

1926.

von Bendemann, Reinhard. *Zwischen ΔΟΞΑ und ΣΤΑΥΡΟΣ: Eine exegetische Untersuchung der Texte des sogenannten Reiseberichts im Lukasevangelium*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2001.

Voss, Gerhard P. *Die Christologie der lukanischen Schriften in Grundzügen*. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1965.

Webb, Robert L. *John the Baptizer and Prophet: A Socio-Historical Survey*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Weiß, Wolfgang. *"Zeichen und Wunder": eine Studie zu der Sprachtradition und ihrer Verwendung im Neuen Testament*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995.

Wellhausen, Julius. *Prolegomena to the History of Ancient Israel*. Gloucester, Mass.: Peter Smith, 1983. Repr. Translated by J. Sutherland Black, and Allan Enzies.

Werblowsky, R. J. Zwi. "Le prophétisme dans le judaïsme contemporain." *Lumière et Vie* 22 (1973): 40-7.

Whittaker, Molly. "'Signs and Wonders': The Pagan Background." *Studia Evangelica* 5 (1968): 155-8.

Wieder, Naftali. "The 'Law-Interpreter' of the Sect of the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Second Moses." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 4 (1953): 158-75.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. 3d ed. 1961. Repr. Netherlands: Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.

Wilson, Robert R. *Prophecy and Society in Ancient Israel*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

Wilson, Stephen G. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

_____. "Lukan Eschatology." *New Testament Studies* 16 (1969-1970): 330-47.

_____. *Luke and the Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Wink, Walter. *John the Baptist in the Gospel Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

- Winston, David. "Two Types of Mosaic Prophecy According to Philo." *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 4 (1989): 49-67.
- Woods, Edward J. *The 'Finger of God' and Pneumatology in Luke-Acts*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Xeravits, Géza G. *King, Priest, Prophet: Positive Eschatological Protagonists of the Qumran Library*. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Young, Franklin W. "Jesus the Prophet: A Re-Examination." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 68 (1949): 285-99.
- Zehnle, Richard F. *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1971.
- Zimmermann, Johannes. *Messianische Texte aus Qumran: Königliche, priesterliche und prophetische Messiasvorstellungen in den Schriftenfunden von Qumran*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1998.
- Zwiep, A. W. *The Ascension of the Messiah in Lukan Christology*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.