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Throughout the Second Temple period (516 BCE-70 CE), the reading and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures shaped the national consciousness of the Jewish people. Within this setting, the Jesus movement emerged as a Jewish group which also laid claim to the Jewish scriptures as a means of articulating its identity even though, over time, the group came to be comprised primarily of non-Jews. How was it possible for a group of non-Jews to lay claim to the sacred texts of Jews and use these scriptures to define their own community? With the aim of exploring the answer to this question, my study compares and contrasts the way that the writings of the New Testament attributed to Luke, hereafter Luke-Acts, and the writings of the early Christian apologist Justin Martyr define the Christ-believing community by describing its privileged status in relation to the Jewish scriptures. This entails an examination of their respective representations of the Jewish scriptures and the exegesis of Christ-believers from two main vantage points: their portrayal of Christ-believers as authoritative interpreters of the Jewish scriptures (Part One) and their depiction of Christ-believers as heirs to the promises of scripture (Part Two). Although both authors similarly divide between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community by arguing that Christ-believers alone possess an inspired capacity to interpret the Jewish scriptures, they do not describe insiders to their community in precisely the same way. Whereas Justin argues that Christ-believers have become the rightful recipients of the scriptural promises that God originally made to Jews, Luke envisages an ongoing role for the Jewish people as the recipients of the promises that God pledged to Israel.
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Introduction

In the ancient world, certain written records held a privileged status as authoritative sources of truth. Because of their important link with the past, texts from antiquity were deemed worthy of ongoing study and appropriation. For example, works written in the ancient Greek period, such as Homer and Plato, came to represent a distinct source of wisdom, or canonical truth, which subsequent philosophers and educators propagated through interpretation and emulation.\(^1\) Although the influence of Hellenism led to a widespread adoption of variegated forms of this Greek \textit{paideia} from the fifth century BCE onward,\(^2\) some indigenous authors of the Near East also contested the cultural priority of such ancient Greek writings by appealing to and presenting their own ancient records as a superior source of truth.\(^3\) Moreover, competing interpretations of classical texts and the emergence of rival forms of philosophy led to "the multiplicity of

---


\(^2\) As Tim Whitmarsh, \textit{Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation} (Oxford: OUP, 2001), 5-11, explains, the Greek \textit{paideia} was not a single system but involved a series of "debates concerning the proper way in which life should be lived" (5). He notes that from the fifth century BCE onward this type of education played a constitutive role in determining what it meant to be Greek. Subsequently, some groups, such as Hellenistic Alexandrians and Romans, adopted this form of education as part of a complex process of imitation of, and resistance to, Greek culture.

\(^3\) In reaction to Greek ethnographical accounts of their peoples, these authors drew upon their own ancient records to provide a corrective to the Greek accounts (e.g., Manetho [Egyptian], Berosus [Chaldean], and Philo of Byblos [Phoenician]). See the discussion of the works of these authors by R. A. Oden, "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography," \textit{PEQ} 110 (1978): 115-126; Gregory E. Sterling, \textit{Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography} (NovTSupp LXIV; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 103-136; cf. Samuel K. Eddy, \textit{The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C.} (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961). As we shall see below, moreover, certain early Jewish and Christian apologists appropriated the Jewish scriptures for a similar purpose.
forms and modes of Roman Greek education” within the Roman empire. 4 Differing groups interpreted and appropriated their own ancient written sources in order to compete for cultural primacy and recognition. 5

From as early as the Persian period, the scriptures of Israel 6 functioned as a significant source of authoritative truth for the Jewish people. The public reading of Torah fostered a sense of national identity and formed the ideological basis for community life (e.g., Ezra 7; cf. Nehemiah 8). 7 Throughout subsequent generations, the ongoing cultural significance of the Jewish scriptures led to the emergence of interpreters who specialized in the reading and instruction of these sacred texts. Yet the diversity of this period also gave rise to differing interpretations of the Jewish scriptures. Accordingly, exegesis itself came to play a prominent role in articulating the identity of certain early Jewish groups. Various interpreters asserted that they had access to a special knowledge of the scriptures and used this claim to define the boundaries of their

---


5 As Mary Beard, “Writing and Religion: Ancient Literacy and the Function of the Written Word in Roman Religion” in *Literacy in the Roman World* (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series III; ed. M. Beard et al. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991), 35-58, has pointed out, the sacred texts of Roman civic cults could also play an important role for religious groups because they represented a form of communication with the divine and served as a symbolic representation of the relationship between a community and their gods.

6 Although the final, tripartite Jewish canon was not established in the Second Temple period, the concept of scripture did emerge during this era, and different Jewish groups recognized the distinct status of a core group of texts, many of which would later become canonized. I will sometimes use the designations “Mosaic law,” “written revelation,” “Jewish scriptures” or “biblical history” to refer to texts that were often regarded as authoritative during the Second Temple period (the five books of Moses, the former and latter prophets, Psalms, and some other books). At times, I will also refer to the term that a particular text uses when referring to an authoritative text, such as “Torah” or “the Law and Prophets.” For further discussion regarding the complex process of the development of canon, see J. J. Collins, “Before the Canon: Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism,” in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present and Future* (ed. J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, and K. H. Richards; Nashville: Abingdon, 1995), 225-241; cf. James C. VanderKam, *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

communities. In the words of Michael Fishbane, such “exegetical illumination” became a “new mode of access to God for a new type of community – formed around teachers and the texts that they authoritatively interpret.”

Within this world of diverse competing claims, the Jesus movement emerged in the first century CE as a Jewish group which, in its own way, laid claim to the Jewish scriptures as a means of competing for recognition and articulating community identity. Like some other early Jewish groups, Christ-believers insisted that their community alone possessed a privileged understanding of the Jewish scriptures. Unlike these other communities, however, the Christ-believing group eventually came to be comprised primarily of non-Jews. Notwithstanding this difference, Christ-believers continued to characterize the Jewish scriptures as their rightful possession and to appropriate these texts as their own. How was it possible for a group of non-Jews to lay claim to the sacred texts of Jews and use these scriptures to define their own community?

In order to contribute to an answer to this question, my study will evaluate the representations of scriptural interpretation in the New Testament texts traditionally attributed to Luke (hereafter Luke-Acts) and the writings of Justin Martyr. The works of these two figures serve as particularly important examples of how the scriptural interpretation of the Christ-believing community took shape in the first and second centuries. Luke presents the story of Jesus, the birth of the Jesus movement, and the inclusion of non-Jews as the realization of scriptural prophecy. Justin Martyr, who wrote

---

only a few decades later, similarly attempts to depict the rise of the non-Jewish church as the fulfillment of scriptural promises. Moreover, in their common attempt to appropriate the Jewish scriptures for the Christ-believing community, Luke and Justin each take pains to indicate why Christ-believers possess a privileged relationship to these texts by highlighting their authoritative exegesis of the scriptures and their status as heirs to the promises stated therein.

As an introduction to my comparison of the representations of scriptural interpretation in the writings of Luke and Justin, this initial segment of my study will unfold in two parts. In the first part, I will survey the findings of previous studies that relate to and inform my comparison of these two authors. This will entail a review of scholarly positions that address the following aspects of their writings: the possible dependence of the writings of Justin upon the synoptic gospels and Acts; the date of composition for their works; the parallels between their theological ideas; and their respective treatments of the Jewish scriptures. In the second part, I will outline the aims, rationale, and proposed plan of my study. Here I will explain my reasons for choosing to compare Luke and Justin, and describe the contribution of such a comparison to scholarship on this topic.

1. History of Scholarship

The Literary Relationship between Luke and Justin

Scholars have long speculated about the extent to which Justin might have relied upon the synoptic gospels as a source for his writings. He frequently cites or alludes to
traditions about Jesus that resemble material from the synoptic gospels,\(^9\) and identifies his written sources of Jesus sayings as “memoirs of the apostles,”\(^{10}\) “gospels,”\(^{11}\) or “memoirs of the apostles and their successors.”\(^{12}\) Although these descriptions of Jesus traditions suggest that Justin knew and used written texts that stand in close relationship to the synoptic gospels, some of the material that he cites differs from canonical traditions.\(^{13}\) Furthermore, in many cases, Justin uses what appears to be a harmonized form of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.\(^{14}\) These differences between the synoptic gospels and the sources of Justin have spawned a number of divergent theories about his possible dependence upon canonical traditions.

Arthur Bellinzoni provides a survey of the varying nineteenth-century positions regarding Justin’s unusual use of material from the synoptic gospels. He notes that earlier scholars attribute Justin’s citation of variant gospel traditions to factors such as failure of memory, reliance upon extra-canonical gospels, use of pre-synoptic traditions,
or dependence upon a post-synoptic gospel harmony. Within this debate, still others maintain that it is impossible to prove that Justin used sources other than the canonical gospels. Bellinzoni himself argues that Justin depended upon harmonized material from Matthew, Mark, and Luke, but concludes that he drew upon more than one written source that combined the synoptic gospels. Helmut Koester maintains that Justin read the synoptic gospels as reliable records of the life of Jesus but did not regard them as


17 Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 3-4, 140, also notes that his conclusion both concurs with and modifies the earlier view that Justin used a post-synoptic gospel harmony. See also the summary and critique of this conclusion provided by Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 213-217. Gregory argues that Bellinzoni’s hypothesis is consistent with the evidence that he cites but points out that these findings do not necessarily demand this conclusion. In Gregory’s view, Bellinzoni does not give adequate consideration to other explanations. In particular, Gregory notes the possibility that Justin could have drawn upon more than one “Gospel-like” source, rather than harmonized versions of the canonical gospels.
scripture. Along with a number of other scholars, he argues that Justin used the synoptic gospels as but one of many different historical sources. 18

Although Justin frequently combines material from the synoptic gospels and, in some cases, relies more heavily upon what appears to be a Matthean source, 19 scholars have often observed a close affinity between the thought of Luke and Justin. In particular, the similarities between their record of the post-resurrection appearances of Christ have led some to conclude that Justin knew and relied on both Luke and Acts (Luke 24:25-27, 36-49; Acts 1:1-11; J Apol. 39.2-4; 49.5; 50.12; Dial. 53.5; 76.6; 106.1). 20 Others recognize resemblances between the writings of Luke and Justin but argue that these only demonstrate their use of a parallel tradition, or common source, rather than Justin's direct dependence upon the writings of Luke. 21

---


In his work on the reception history of Luke and Acts, Andrew Gregory seeks to determine the extent of literary dependence of Justin upon Luke and Acts by subscribing to a method posited by Koester: "Literary dependence on the finished form of a text is to be identified only where the later text makes use of an element from the earlier text that can be identified as the redactional work of an earlier author/editor." Using this rigorous criterion, Gregory concludes that Justin drew upon Luke, either directly or indirectly, but he remains unable to verify his literary dependence upon Acts. His study illustrates both the strong resemblances between the writings of Luke and Justin and the difficulties associated with determining the precise literary relationship between them.

Gregory's study contributes to our knowledge of Justin's possible use of Luke and his seeming neglect of Acts, but he does not attempt to develop a comparison of their theology or use of the Jewish scriptures. His interest lies in determining if the writings of Justin provide evidence for his dependence upon Luke-Acts. Likewise, Helmet Koester and Arthur Bellinzoni seek to determine whether Justin depended upon Luke or Lukan


In his analysis of the relationship between Luke and Justin, Gregory, Reception of Luke, 253, 263, sees only limited material that he can attribute to Lukan redaction in Justin's writings (e.g., dependence of 1 Apol. 19.6 on Luke 18:27). He notes, however, that his criterion is limiting since it is difficult to determine if the use of a "Lukan single tradition is more likely to reflect Luke or any sources that may have been common to both Luke and Justin" (291). He concludes that it is impossible to determine the extent to which Justin relied on Luke, since a good deal of material common to Luke and Justin comes from the double and triple traditions.
traditions, but do not attempt to develop a comparison of the similarities or differences between these two authors.

**Date of Writing**

The ambiguities surrounding the date of Luke-Acts also pose a further problem for determining the literary relationship between the writings of Luke and Justin. Although the majority of scholars maintain that Luke wrote his gospel and the Acts of the Apostles in the latter part of the first century, the paucity of evidence for dating these texts makes it difficult to ascertain the exact time of their composition. The absence of firm evidence with which to date Luke, and especially Acts, led Henry Cadbury to set "extreme limits" for dating the two-volume work (60 CE-150 CE). He determined the terminus a quo for this range by noting the arrival of Paul in Rome (60 CE) and the

---


25 Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 51-55, surveys various scholarly positions regarding the date of Luke-Acts and outlines three basic views: early date – mid-60s; intermediate date – 80s; and late date – 100-130s. The absence of clear references to Paul's death or letters, to Nero's persecution, or to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus leads some to conclude that both Luke and Acts were written at a very early date (Harnack, Rackham, Blass, Bruce, Cambier, Cerf, Ellis, Filson, Guthrie, Hemer, Kistemaker, Mattill, McNeile, Mehat, Meinertz, Munck, Reicke, Robinson, and Torrey). Others suggest a second-century date for Luke and Acts, based upon the argument that Luke was influenced by the writings of Josephus, or upon arguments regarding possible links between Luke-Acts and the writings of Marcion or Justin Martyr (Burkitt, Klein, Koester, Knox, O'Neill, Overbeck, Schmiedel, Townsend; Tyson). See also Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006), 1-23, who provides a thorough discussion of dating theories.
terminus ad quem from evidence of Marcion’s use of Luke’s gospel (150 CE). More recently, John T. Townsend has posited an even higher upper limit for the date of Acts by arguing that there is no firm evidence of allusions or direct references to Acts prior to 170 CE. Furthermore, Joseph B. Tyson has recently argued for a late date for both Acts and the canonical form of Luke on the basis that “the challenge of Marcion and Marcionite Christianity forms a remarkably meaningful and probable context for Acts.”

Less uncertainty surrounds the date of the writings of Justin. Scholars generally agree that Justin wrote the Apologies around 150-155 CE and produced the final form of the Dialogue with Trypho at a slightly later date (~ 155-160 CE). Although some point out the various textual difficulties in his extant writings, discuss the complex relationship between the first and second Apologies, and note the disparity between the date and setting that Justin ascribes to the Dialogue (Ephesus, 135 CE) and the probable

---


28 Tyson, Marcion, 78, 79-131, at 78. Tyson also argues the following regarding canonical Luke: that it was composed ~120-125 CE; that it was based on a pre-Marcionite gospel but with a number of additions such as Luke 1:1-4; Luke 1:5-2:52; Luke 24:13-53; and that it was composed in order to respond to the claims of the Marcionites.

29 See, e.g., Rudolph, Denn wir sind jenes Volk, 19-20; Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 9; L. W. Barnard, Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought (Cambridge, 1967) 23f; Eric Francis Osborn, Justin Martyr (BHT 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 8; Chadwick, “Defense,” 278.

30 For summaries of the relevant evidence and scholarly discussion, see Miraslov Marcovich, ed., Justini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis (PTS 38; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1994), 1-11; idem, Dialogus cum Tryphone (PTS 47; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1997), 1-7.

31 For a recent summary and discussion of this issue, see Paul Parvis, “Justin, Philosopher and Martyr: The Posthumous Creation of the Second Apology,” Justin Martyr and His Worlds (Augsburg: Fortress, 2007), 22-37.
date of its composition.\textsuperscript{32} These issues do not have a significant impact on the range of date for his writings (~135-160 CE).\textsuperscript{33}

If we accept a late date for the canonical form of Luke and Acts, these writings would probably not have served as a source for Justin as much as they represent the thought of an author who was contemporaneous with him. Alternatively, if Luke-Acts


\textsuperscript{33} P. Lorraine Buck, “Justin Martyr’s Apologies: Their Number, Destination, and Form,” JTS 54 (2003): 55, notes four internal features of the Apologies that suggest a date of 150-154 CE. \textit{1 Apol.} 26.5-6 refers to Marcion as a contemporary opponent, which would suggest a date after 144 CE; in \textit{1 Apol.} 39.3-4, Justin makes reference to the prefecture of Felix, who held his office from 148-154 CE; Justin indicates in \textit{1 Apol.} 46.1 that the current date was 150 years after Christ; and \textit{2 Apol.} 1.1 makes mention of Urbicus, the prefecture who was in office between 144-160 CE. Buck makes the further observation that \textit{1 Apology} could have been written as early as 139 CE since, in his opening address, Justin refers to Marcus Aurelius as Verissimus and does not give him the title Caesar. Because he did not use the name Verissimus after being adopted by Antonius Pius and since he assumed the title of Caesar in 139 CE, it is possible that Justin’s address indicates that he wrote \textit{I Apology} prior to 139 CE. Even if this is the case, however, the variation in possible date of writing would not be substantial (~ 15 years). Likewise, although there is some debate as to whether a core segment of the Dialogue goes back as far as 135 CE, since Trypho indicates that he is a refugee of the war in Palestine (\textit{Dial.} 1.3), a date shortly after the composition of the Apologies (~ 155-160 CE) seems probable since the Dialogue (120.5) contains a reference to \textit{1 Apology} and Justin died around 165 CE. For his date of death, see Barnard, Justin Martyr, 13; cf. Philip Carrington, The Early Christian Church (Cambridge: CUP, 1957), 173. This range of date (135-160 CE) also does not represent a substantial time span.
was written prior to the close of the first century, Justin may have had access to this text as a source of information about Jesus and the early church.

**Previous Comparisons of Luke and Justin**

Whereas some scholars attempt to address questions surrounding the genealogical, or literary, relationship between Luke and Justin, the work of others, such as F. Overbeck, J. C. O'Neill, N. Hyl Dahl, Oskar Skarsaune, and William Kurz focus upon the commonalities between their theological viewpoints. In a lengthy article that compares the writings of Justin with Acts, Overbeck concludes that both Luke and Justin wrote from the same second-century perspective of "Heidenchristentum" which had abandoned its Jewish roots. Furthermore, he argues that Acts was the immediate forerunner to second-century Christian apologetic literature because it expresses political concerns that parallel those of Justin. Following Overbeck, O'Neill calls attention to a

---

39 Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss Justins," 316-342. In his expanded version of W. M. L. de Wette's commentary, *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte* (Leipzig, 1870), Overbeck reiterates this view: "Nicht kann vielmehr evidenter sein, als dass die A.G. das jüdische Christentum als solches preisgibt und auf einem Standpunkt geschrieben ist, welchem das Heidenchristentum als das in der Gemeinde durchaus vorherrschende Element gilt" (xxxi). He also notes that Luke and Justin both neglect "paulinischen Antinomismus," and fail to articulate the same contrast between faith and works of the law that Paul espouses: “Auch fällt es Justin niemals ein, das Neue des Christenthums dem Judenthum gegenüber wie Paulus in das Princip der Glaubensgerechtigkeit im Gegensatz zu dem der Werkgerechtigkeit zu legen, er that es namentlich auch nicht, wo er das ATliche Gesetz für abrogirt erklärt durch das Christentum" ("Ueber das Verhältniss Justins," 326). Furthermore, against the conclusions of the Tübingen school, Overbeck argues that the presentation of Paul in Acts does not serve to reconcile Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers. Instead, he maintains that Acts attributes the rise of non-Jewish Christianity to the unbelief of Jews and concludes that this sentiment exemplifies the dominant view of non-Jewish Christ-believers.
number of the same similarities between the theology and motives of Acts and those of Justin. He argues that both authors attempt to gain recognition for Christ-believers within the Roman empire by presenting them as the legitimate interpreters of the Jewish scriptures and their community as "the true organized representative of Jewish monotheism." Nevertheless, because his primary aim in pointing out these similarities lies in positing a late date for the book of Acts, O'Neill does not develop his comparison of the writings of Luke and Justin to the same extent that Overbeck does.

Like Overbeck and O'Neill, Hyldahl maintains that Luke and Justin share common apologetic aims. He argues that both authors attempt to defend Christ-believers against false accusations of crimes against the state, in part, by arguing that Christ-believers possess the proper understanding of the Jewish scriptures. For Hyldahl, this argument lies at the heart of the apologetic purposes of both authors; by describing their close connection to the Jewish scriptures, Luke and Justin assert the legitimacy and ancient origins of the Christ-believing community and in this way plead for its acceptance within the Roman Empire. Since the goal of Hydahl’s study lies in providing a detailed discussion of Dialogue 1-8, however, he limits his comparison of

41 O’Neill, Theology of Acts, 10-12, 168-175.
43 Although O’Neill, Theology of Acts, 10-28, asserts that Justin did not rely upon Luke-Acts, he points out correspondences between the writings of Luke and Justin in order to argue that they wrote in the same generation. Within this argument, O’Neill claims that Luke wrote during the same time period as Justin (~115-170 CE) but, contrary to the conclusions of earlier scholars (e.g., Albrecht Ritschl, Franz Overbeck, Ernst Haenchen), he maintains that Justin did not know or use Acts.
44 Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, 264-265.
45 Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, 268: "Der Schrift ist der richtige Messias-Begriff zu entnehmen, indem das Leiden als konstitutives Element mit zu diesem Begriff nachgewiesen wird; es wird dann die übereinstimmung des schriftmässigen Messias-Begriffes mit dem historischen Jesus nachgewiesen, so dass Jesus eben kraft seines Leidens sich als Messias und das christliche Schriftverständnis sich als wahr erweist."
46 Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, 266-269.
Luke and Justin to only a brief exploration of the similarities between their political defenses of Christ-believers.

In his doctoral dissertation, Kurz examines the “form and function of Christological proof from prophecy” in the writings of Luke and Justin.47 Throughout this study, he discusses numerous points of agreement and disagreement between the two authors, some of which relate closely to my findings. Nevertheless, his comparison of the Christology of Luke and Justin, and his focus upon a “rhetorical-formal” and “lexicographical-grammatical” analysis of their writings, allow for only limited discussion of their respective representations of the exegesis of the Christ-believing community.48 Furthermore, rather than developing a comprehensive comparison of the writings of Luke and Justin, Kurz provides a detailed analysis of Luke-Acts, and explains that he uses Justin’s Dialogue primarily as a “foil” for illuminating “the form and function of the Christological argument within Luke-Acts.”49

More recently, Skarsaune has provided insightful commentary on the similarities and differences between Luke-Acts and the writings of Justin, including helpful summaries that outline their use of specific passages from the Jewish scriptures.50 Of particular significance to my study is Skarsaune’s discussion of the close parallels between their conceptions of Christ’s post-resurrection instruction of the apostles.

47 Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 155-244, 250-255.
48 In the first half of his study, Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 16-149, focuses specifically upon Acts 2, 3, and 13 (chapters one and three) and the use of the term “Christ” in Luke-Acts (chapter two). In the remainder of his study, he compares the scriptural interpretation of Luke and Justin (155-244) and observes some of the similarities and differences between their use of the Jewish scriptures. On the whole, however, his focus upon their use of Christological proof from prophecy leads Kurz to develop his comparison and contrast of Luke and Justin in a different direction than my study.
50 Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 100-105, 256-259, 361-362, 431-432.
Although Skarsaune attributes these similarities to Justin’s reliance upon Luke-Acts or, more probably, an intermediary Lukan tradition, he recognizes that they develop such traditions in distinct ways, as “independent theologians who had ideas of their own.”

Since Skarsaune provides a detailed investigation of Justin’s use of a wide variety of other Jewish and Christian sources, however, his comparison of the thought of Luke and Justin remains relatively brief.

The Use of Scripture in the Writings Luke and Justin

Most of the studies that examine the scriptural interpretation of Luke or Justin focus upon only one of these two authors. Treatments of the use of scripture in the writings of Justin Martyr can be grouped into three basic categories: citations of the LXX and use of early Christian collections of proof-texts (i.e., ‘testimonia’); exegetical methods, Christological interpretation, and use of the Mosaic law; and reliance upon

52 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 431-432.
Greco-Roman and Jewish interpretive methods. Likewise, studies of the use of the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts tend to fall into similar basic groupings: use of Christian collections of scriptural readings or of scripture in the infancy narrative; dependence upon the LXX and Semitic influences, and application of particular exegetical methods or narrative strategies that influence the approach to the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts.


Although scholars frequently note Justin’s elaborate presentation of Christ-believers as the true people of God, few studies explore the role that the Jewish scriptures play in this description. Likewise, studies of Luke-Acts often recognize that the self-definition of the Christ-believing community represents a central concern for Luke but rarely point out the connection between this theme and his scriptural interpretation. In recent years, however, scholars of Luke-Acts have attempted to address this neglect by evaluating the “ecclesiological function” of scriptural themes within the writings of Luke. For example, Rebecca Denova maintains that Luke derives the “structural...
pattern” of his story from the Jewish scriptures and argues that he uses this interpretive approach “to bind the [Christ-believing] community to Israel.” 63 From a slightly different perspective, David Pao discusses the use of an “Isaianic New Exodus program” to provide “the structural framework for the narrative of Acts.” He argues that Luke appeals to this “foundational story” from the Jewish scriptures to “construct” the identity of the Christ-believing community. 64 Similarly, Kenneth Litwak suggests that Luke uses a particular intertextual method of scriptural interpretation – “framing in discourse” – to show the legitimacy of Christ-believers over against other early Jewish groups. 65 Notably, each of these recent studies evaluates the “ecclesiological” use of scripture in Luke-Acts by attempting to identify the influence of the Jewish scriptures upon the framework of Luke’s narrative.

2. Aims, Rationale and Proposed Plan of Study

Aims and Rationale

With the aim of making a fresh contribution to the study of Luke-Acts and the writings of Justin Martyr, I will attempt to evaluate their use of the Jewish scriptures to articulate the identity of the Christ-believing community by comparing and contrasting their respective depictions of the relationship between Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures. Rather than focusing primarily upon how the Jewish scriptures function as a

Litwak, *Echoes*, 30, argues that no studies other than those of Brawley, Evans, Green, Pao, and Steyn have “entertained the possibility that some theme other than Christology was the central focus of Luke’s use of the Scriptures of Israel, even if occasionally other themes were mentioned.” By contrast, Bock, *Proclamation*, 274-278, sees a close relationship between Christological and ecclesiological interpretation of scripture in Luke-Acts, and argues that Luke’s Christological scriptural interpretation validates the composition of the Christ-believing community.

64 Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 250.
65 Litwak, *Echoes*, 32.
framework for the writings of these authors, this avenue of inquiry considers the way that Luke and Justin each depict Christ-believers as authoritative interpreters of the Jewish scriptures and as recipients of the promises within these sacred texts. In what follows, I will provide my rationale and aims for comparing Luke and Justin in this way and, in conclusion, outline the overall plan of my study.

**Why Compare Luke and Justin?**

Of course, the repeated descriptions of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures in the writings of Luke and Justin do not, in and of themselves, represent a remarkable parallel between them since this theme runs throughout early Christian literature. For example, Matthew frequently cites the Jewish scriptures (55 scriptural quotations in Matthew as compared with a combined total of 65 quotations in the other three gospels), presents Torah interpretation as a central part of the message of Jesus (e.g., Matt 5:17-48), and emphasizes how Christ fulfilled the scriptures through his repeated use of the formulaic introduction: “All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had spoken by the prophet who said” (Matt 1:22; 2:5, 15, 17, 23; 4:14; 8:17; 12:17; 13:35; 21:4; 26:54, 56; 27:9). Similarly, the author of the Fourth Gospel refers to Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (John 2:13-24; 12:16; 20:9) and emphasizes the importance of interpreting and obeying them faithfully (John 5:39-46; 7:19, 49). Likewise, Paul

---

66 Notably, this differs from the way that Denova, Pao, and Litwak have evaluated scriptural themes to guide the structure of Luke-Acts. Where relevant, my study will include a consideration of the way that Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to frame his narrative. Nevertheless, it will focus more closely upon the way that Luke depicts the activity of scriptural interpretation within his narrative and identifies Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. This approach corresponds more closely to the recent work of scholars of early Judaism who attempt to evaluate the way that early Jewish interpreters present their exegesis as authoritative and use such a claim to define the privileged knowledge and status of their communities. See chapter one, pages 28-33 below.
frequently refers to how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures and stresses their relevance to the Christ-believing community (e.g., 1 Cor 10:11; Rom 3:21-22; 15:4; cf. 2 Tim 3:15-16). He also presents this fulfillment as a central part of the message of the gospel (e.g., 1 Cor 15:3-4; Rom 1:1-12; 16:25-26) and depicts the proper understanding of the scriptures as a special revelatory gift of Christ-believers (1 Cor 2:6-16; 2 Cor 3:12-18). Furthermore, a number of these themes find ongoing expression in the writings of the Apostolic Fathers (e.g., 1 Clem. 36.1-2; 45.2; 53.1; Barn. 1.5-8; 6.8-15; 9.3-9; Diogn. 11.5; 12.1-3) and second-century Christian apologists. Luke and Justin thus represent but two among many early Christ-believing authors who attempt to demonstrate the continuity between the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures and the emergence of the Christ-believing community.

Despite the ubiquity of this theme in first- and early second-century Christian literature, the parallels between the representations of scriptural interpretation in the writings of Luke and Justin stand apart from these other writings in at least two significant ways. First, only Luke and Justin explicitly indicate that the risen Christ commissioned the first disciples to proclaim how he had fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, and depict their subsequent preaching activities as the extension of this message and the further realization of scriptural promises. Second, as John O’Neill has observed, both

---

67 For a brief survey of this theme in the writings of the Christian apologists of the second-century, see chapter three, pages 140-144 below.
68 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, identifies the similarities between Luke and Justin as more prominent than those between Justin and other NT writings; cf. Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 50-58. Similarly, Hyl Dahl, *Philosophie und Christendum*, 260-261, has argued that the theology of Luke provides a closer point of comparison with Justin than the thought of the apostolic fathers.
69 Although the other synoptic gospels affirm that Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, as Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 15,
authors attempt to explain the world-wide significance of this exegetical proclamation and to present it as a continuation of the work of Jesus.\textsuperscript{70} Whereas a number of early Christian authors emphasize that Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, and even present this fulfillment as a central part of the message of Christ-believers, Luke and Justin are the first authors to link the scriptural interpretation of Jesus and the apostles with a world-wide mission to non-Jews. This overarching theme in the writings of both authors leads them to include extensive explanations of how and why the Christ-believing community – comprised of Jews and non-Jews – could lay claim to the sacred texts of Jews. Their writings thus serve as particularly important sources for understanding how Christ-believers came to appropriate the Jewish scriptures as their own.

"Judaism" and "Christianity"

Although Luke and Justin describe the origins of the exegetical tradition of the Christ-believing community in notably similar ways, it is no longer tenable to conclude with Overbeck that they were part of a monolithic "Heidenchristenthum" that stood over against Torah-observant "Jewish Christianity."\textsuperscript{71} As scholars have more recently pointed out, textual and material evidence suggests that many divergent forms of "Jewish Christianity" and "Gentile Christianity" developed throughout the first and second

\textsuperscript{70} O’Neill, \textit{Theology of Acts}: "The first writer, apart from Luke, to assume that the world mission of the Apostles should be told in the same breath as the history of Jesus’ death, resurrection, and ascension is Justin Martyr” (10).

\textsuperscript{71} Hyldahl, \textit{Philosophie und Christentum}, 271-272, appears to hold a similar position when he indicates that Justin belonged to the same form of Christianity as Luke: "Diese ist so eng, dass man trotz des zeitlichen Abstandes zwischen ihnen feststellen kann, dass Justin - man darf den Ausdruck benutzen: geistesgeschichtlich - zu einer ganz bestimmten Form des Christentums gehörte, nämlich zu derjenigen, die sich durch die Tradition, die auch bei Lukas zu Worte kommt, auszeichnet."(272). Hyldahl confines his discussion of the similarities between Luke and Justin, however, to their common political aims.
centuries. These observations suggest that an early and clearly defined separation between “Jewish” and “Gentile” Christians can no longer be assumed. Accordingly, I will attempt to provide close evaluation of both the similarities and differences between the writings of Luke and Justin in order to bring the thought of each into sharper focus and to shed fresh light on points of continuity and discontinuity between them. Such an approach will help to clarify both what is similar and what is distinctive about each, and will serve as a corrective to studies which assume that Luke and Justin wrote from an identical “Gentile Christian” perspective.

Furthermore, since the Christ-believing movement emerged as a type of Judaism which only gradually became distinguished as a non-Jewish entity, the scriptural interpretation of this community undoubtedly began to develop within the context of the exegetical practices of other early Jewish groups. In recognition of the close interaction and overlap between the beliefs and practices of various forms of “Judaism” and “Christianity” in this early period, I will evaluate the way that Luke and Justin each portray scriptural interpretation, in part, by considering how their exegetical strategies correspond to those of early Jewish exegetes. Moreover, because of the uncertainties

---


73 Brown, “Types,” 74.


75 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 245-424, frequently notes correspondences between the writings of Justin and early Jewish sources, as well as Jewish-Christian sources, but rarely integrates these discussions with his comparison of Luke and Justin (see also 315-322, 326-327). Similarly, Kurz,
surrounding the precise genealogical relationship between the writings of Luke and Justin, I will not attempt to draw firm conclusions regarding the possible dependence of Justin upon Luke and Acts. Although at times I will note their use of near parallel Jesus traditions, I will primarily seek to evaluate their respective representations of scriptural interpretation as if they were "independent theologians"; both authors appear to have been influenced by Jewish exegetical claims but each seeks to draw lines of continuity between the Christ-believing movement and the scriptures of Jews in their own way.

**Marcion**

To be sure, the above-described approach is not the only perspective from which to compare the scriptural interpretation of Luke and Justin. Tyson has argued, for example, that the works of Luke and Justin address a similar concern—"the challenge of Marcion and Marcionite Christianity"—and aim to refute Marcion's exclusion of the Jewish scriptures from the Christian canon. Despite the possibility that Luke and Justin appeal to the Jewish scriptures as part a proto-orthodox struggle against Marcionite

---

"Christological Proof," 178-184, 231-244, provides only limited discussion of the similarities and differences between the way that Luke and Justin express ideas that are both continuous and discontinuous with Judaism.

76 Tyson, *Marcion*, 24. See also footnote 28 on page 10 above.

Christianity, Luke never once identifies Marcion as an opponent nor does he explicitly refer to any of the central aspects of his thought. Likewise, although Justin clearly identifies Marcion as an opponent, his extant works rarely focus explicitly on refuting Marcion or so-called Gnostic opponents. Instead, Justin situates his representations of scriptural interpretation within contexts that address the relationship between Christ-believers and Jews, or that defend the status of Christ-believers within the Greco-Roman world. For these reasons, I will compare the scriptural interpretation of Luke and Justin primarily as it relates to their interest in differentiating Christ-believers from Jews and, where relevant, from competing Greco-Roman traditions.

Plan of Study

Within a world of intense competition for cultural recognition and priority, early Jewish and Hellenistic authors claimed to possess a privileged relationship to the sacred texts of the past. Although the Jesus movement originated as a Jewish group which also laid claim to the Jewish scriptures as a means of articulating its identity, over time, this group came to be comprised primarily of non-Jews. How was it possible for a non-Jewish group to continue to appropriate the scriptures of Jews and use these sacred texts to define themselves? With the aim of exploring the answer to this question, my study will compare and contrast the way that Luke and Justin describe the relationship between the Christ-believing community and the Jewish scriptures from two main vantage points: their portrayal of Christ-believers as authoritative interpreters of the Jewish scriptures

78 As Stylianopoulos, Mosaic Law, 20-44, rightly argues, Justin explicitly appeals to the Jewish scriptures within the context of debate between Christ-believers and Jews, or as part of a defense of Christ-believers against political charges. By contrast, Prigent, l'Ancien Testament, 9-12, 319-336, maintains that the Dialogue is a reworked version of the treatise he describes in 1 Apol. 26.8 (Syntagma Against all Heresies); cf. Osborn, Justin Martyr, 12-13; Campenhausen, Formation, 165-182.
(Part One) and their depiction of Christ-believers as heirs to the promises of scripture (Part Two).

In Part One, I will examine how early Jewish interpreters, Luke, and Justin similarly assert that they possess a divinely-inspired knowledge of the Jewish scriptures and use such a claim to define, or defend, the status of their communities in relation to outsiders. This includes a discussion of the way that scriptural exegesis came to be regarded as a mode of revelation in the Second Temple period and a means of defining group identity among early Jewish groups (chapter one), a consideration of how Luke and Justin likewise depict the exegesis of Christ-believers as a revelatory activity that defines their special status (chapter two), and an evaluation of the extent to which this type of claim also corresponds to the attempts of early Jewish and Christian apologists to use the Jewish scriptures to defend themselves over against competing non-Jewish traditions (chapter three).

Subsequently, in Part Two, I will compare how Luke and Justin each identify Christ-believers as recipients of the promises of scripture. This section of my study discusses their common portrayal of the exegesis of Christ-believers as the realization of prophetic predictions of illumination and salvation at the end of the age (chapter four) and evaluates their respective presentations of Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises that were originally made to Jews (chapter five). In conclusion, I summarize my findings and consider their broader implications for understanding how early Christ-believers represent the relationship between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community.
1.1 Introduction

Throughout the Second Temple period, the Jewish scriptures functioned as a powerful cultural symbol that fostered a sense of national identity for the Jewish people. The centrality of sacred text to community life contributed to the emergence of interpreters who specialized in the study and interpretation of the scriptures. Yet the diversity of this era also gave rise to the development of competing views of what constituted their true meaning. Various Jewish groups offered differing “hermeneutical ideologies,” or ways of reading the texts, which set them apart from other Jews as those who had special access to the proper knowledge of the will of God. Claims to possess an authoritative ability to interpret the Jewish scriptures thus served as a means of articulating group identity for certain early Jewish communities.

In this chapter, I will examine the way that scriptural interpretation functioned as a mode of revelation in the Second Temple period and explore how different Jewish groups defined themselves with reference to this activity. To this end, I will survey select early Jewish texts that exemplify this approach to reading the Jewish scriptures. After providing a brief overview of recent secondary literature, I will discuss primary texts that show evidence of the shift from classical prophecy to “charismatic” or “revelatory”
exegesis during the Second Temple period. Subsequently, I will provide a more extended discussion of early Jewish texts that demonstrate how such claims to an inspired knowledge of the Jewish scriptures could serve as a means of describing the identity and boundaries of certain early Jewish communities.

1.2 Recent Studies of Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation

Scholars of early Judaism have long noted the transition from classical prophecy as the primary mode of receiving revelation from God in ancient Israel to the divinely inspired reading and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures in the Second Temple period. This type of activity purports to extend the revelatory experience of prophecy to the exegesis of prophetic texts, as well as to the interpretation of other parts of the Jewish scriptures. Recently, scholars have explored this phenomenon further by evaluating the manner in which early Jewish interpreters attempt to present their own scriptural interpretation as authoritative and use this type of claim to define the privileged status of their communities. The following provides a brief overview of recent studies that use this type of approach for evaluating early Jewish scriptural interpretation.

---

3 Alex P. Jassen, Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism (STDJ 68; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 197-211, refers to this phenomenon as “revelatory exegesis” while Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis,” 126-150, uses the phrase “charismatic exegesis.”

In his monograph, *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*, Alex Jassen argues that the self-understanding of the Qumran community was founded upon the belief that it represented “the embodiment of biblical Israel,” and therefore possessed the true understanding of the writings of Moses and the prophets. Since the community lived in a time much later than Moses and the prophets, however, it was “forced to renew the world of the ancient prophets and revelation for its own time.” Jassen maintains that the Qumran community did this, in part, by “rewriting the ancient prophetic experience” and reconfiguring it in order to present the Qumran community as “the heir of the ancient prophetic tradition.”

According to Jassen, scriptural interpretation formed an integral part of this process because the Qumran community portrayed their exegesis of ancient prophecy as the proper extension and completion of the earlier form of divine communication (e.g., 1QpHab 7:1-8). Moreover, as Jassen notes, the Qumran community drew a further link between the ancient prophets and themselves by presenting the former as lawgivers and heirs of Moses, and their own legislative activities as the proper continuation of ancient

---

5 “Qumran community” refers to a sectarian group(s) that shared distinctive ideological, theological and halakhic ideas that were preserved in a portion of the texts that were discovered in caves on the western shore of the Dead Sea, hence the name Qumran, although not all, probably not even the majority, of the members of this group actually lived at this desert site.


9 Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 346. Since they, along with other early Jewish groups, regarded the writings of the ancient prophets as “divine communiqués” and predictions of the future, the Qumran community took on the task of uncovering the true meaning of these ancient repositories of divine truth. For a full discussion of this characteristic of Pesher Habbakuk, see Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 343-353. Jassen also discusses these characteristics in other early Jewish texts (see, e.g., 213-220, 310-314, 335-337, 353-362). For further discussion of 1QpHab, see pages 57-62 below.
prophetic revelation. By repeatedly demonstrating a direct line between the ancient prophets and themselves, the Qumran community attempted to confer upon their interpretation of the Law and Prophets an authority equivalent to the classical prophets.

In her chapter on early Jewish scriptural interpretation in the book *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*, Carol A. Newsom also discusses the attempts of various interpreters or groups to present their scriptural interpretation as authoritative. Newsom argues that, during the Second Temple period, knowledge of the scriptures was “represented as the special provenance of priests, Levitical interpreters, or others who possess special expertise.” In this sense, the sacred texts of Israel were the “common possession” of all Israel, on the one hand, but the “special possession” of privileged interpreters, on the other. According to Newsom, this contradiction led to the development of “rival claims to expertise” in scriptural interpretation, and differing movements used various forms of discourse about the scriptures as a means of self-definition:

As torah and written scripture to which it was closely connected become cultural objects of increasing importance, so the incentive increased for different segments of the community to find in talk about torah a means to define themselves and to compete for influence.

---

10 Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 331-342. See, in particular, his discussion of 1QS 5:8-12; 8:15-16.

11 Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 21-34. Although I refer to the “Jewish scriptures,” it should be noted that Newsom differentiates between “torah” and “scripture” in her discussion. She recognizes that torah as written text becomes prominent in the Second Temple period, but argues that torah and scripture should not be regarded as identical: “Not all that was regarded as scripture was torah or formed the basis for specific norms of conduct, and not everything that was believed to be required by God had a textual basis in scripture” (24).

12 Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 34.

Newsom argues that various groups within Second-Temple Judaism attempted to gain cultural influence by rendering some aspect of the scriptural interpretation problematic.\(^\text{14}\) By creating the perception that the scriptures were in some way difficult to understand, different interpreters, and the groups they represented, could carve out a privileged status for themselves as those who possessed exclusive knowledge or practices that enabled them to disclose their true meaning.\(^\text{15}\) Thus, “talk about the torah” helped individuals and groups to confer authority upon their interpretations of the Jewish scriptures, and use such claims to assert the special status of their group over against other Jews.\(^\text{16}\)

Similarly, Hindy Najman discusses the different ways that the authors of the book of *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll present their accounts as “part of the original and authoritative Sinaitic revelation,” and the proper accompaniment of Mosaic Law.\(^\text{17}\) Although these texts do not present themselves as interpretations of scripture, they implicitly suggest that the material revealed on Sinai amounts to far more than what the books of Moses contain. Accordingly, *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll supply additional and more ancient knowledge that enables the proper understanding of the Sinaitic covenant and laws.\(^\text{18}\) Najman maintains that *Jubilees* underscores the legitimacy of its claim to a special knowledge of the Pentateuch by indicating that the revelation in this

\(^{14}\) Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 70-71.

\(^{15}\) Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 23-75 (especially 65-75).

\(^{16}\) Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 43-59, discusses Daniel and other texts that demonstrate the use of knowledge claims to show the authority of particular scriptural interpretations. For Newsom, the book of *Jubilees*, Daniel, and Sirach serve as examples of how Second Temple Jewish interpreters promoted “expertise in torah and even esoteric claims to knowledge about torah, scripture, and the will of God” as strategies for defining themselves and their communities.


\(^{18}\) As Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 53-60, explains, “both *Jubilees* and the Temple Scroll establish their origin and foundation long before Sinai, in the time of the patriarchs,” and contain the idea of a “pre-patriarchal covenant” (60).
book was mediated by an angel, recorded on heavenly tablets, and written by Moses.¹⁹

Likewise, she notes that the Temple Scroll validates its revelation by representing the text in the first person voice of God.²⁰ According to Najman, these and other self-defining strategies in both Jubilees and the Temple Scroll have the effect of presenting the knowledge that they contain as essential information that provides the proper perspective with which to interpret the Mosaic Torah.²¹

Other studies frequently note how claims to possess the correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures contribute to the articulation of community identity. For example, a number of scholars have observed that some early Jewish texts portray the wisdom or biblical interpretation of a particular group as an eschatological gift that confirms the elect status of its members;²² they are the chosen community of the last days who

---

²⁰ Najman, Seconding Sinai, 63, 67-68.
²¹ Najman, Seconding Sinai, 74-98, also explores how Philo attempts to defend Judaism within the Roman Empire by “identifying various Greek philosophical ideas in the Torah of Moses” (74). Najman argues that Philo portrays his own interpretation of the Torah of Moses as a copy and continuation of the inspired activity of Moses and in this way demonstrates both the value of the Torah of Moses and his privileged status as an interpreter of Torah. For further discussion, see chapter three below, pages 138-139.
²² See John J. Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls,” in Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism (JSJSup 54; ed. John J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 311, who discusses the “prophetic sanction” of the chosen righteous in 1 Enoch and of the maskilim in Daniel provides “prophetic sanction for these groups.” Similarly, Steven D. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran,” JJS 44 (1993): 51-63, argues that the scriptural interpretation of the Qumran community served to define its elect identity as those who possessed an end-time revelation of the scriptures (see, especially 1 QS 8:12-16). Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, “Hidden Things and their Revelation,” RevQ 18 (1998): 420-421, also argue that the community’s special understanding of the “hidden things” and their scriptural interpretation fulfill the end-time injunction to “prepare the way of the Lord” (Isa 40:3; 1QS 8:11-16). George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity,” in To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and “Others” in Late Antiquity (ed. Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs; Chico, Scholars, 1985), 76-79, also observes that wisdom described in the Enochic collection has an “eschatological dimension” insofar as “it is God’s gift in preparation for the end” (77); cf. idem, “The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumranic Documents,” in Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (STDJ 31; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 92-101; idem, “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture,” in Texts...
understands what the rest of Israel does not. Many of the same scholars have also
highlighted the way that descriptions of the inspired exegesis of select leaders can serve
to define the collective identity of a community; the group as a whole gains access to
and benefits from the special revelation and skill of its leaders. Furthermore, these
scholars have noted that claims to a privileged knowledge of the scriptures can serve to
distinguish particular interpreters or groups from other Jews, and even support the view
that their group alone represents “true Israel.” Such observations suggest that scriptural

and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual Situational Contexts (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995), 333-354. See also George J. Brooke’s discussion of “pre-destined membership” in “Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding,” in Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations (ed. Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange with the assistance of Katie M. Goetz and Susan Bond; SBL Symposium Series 30: Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 81-83.

23 Although James C. VanderKam, “To What End? Functions of Scriptural Interpretation in Qumran Texts,” in Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich (VTSup 101; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 305, and others (e.g., Michael Fishbane, “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran,” in Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity [CRINT 2, 1; ed. Martin Jan Mulder; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988, 360-367]) suggest that the Qumran community claimed to receive inspired interpretation through the Teacher of Righteousness and subsequently through appointed leaders. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 51-62, has emphasized the way that the self-understanding of the Qumran community was linked with “the collective activity of scriptural interpretation” (51) and the possession of “an esoteric knowledge of God’s will” (53); cf. Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 411-421. See also Maxine L. Grossman, “Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and ‘Insider’ Status,” in Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS (STDJ 70; ed. Florentino Garcia Martinez and Mladen Popović; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1-11; Newsom, Self as Symbolic Space, 70-75; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 74-75; Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 81.


interpretation played a significant role in the articulation of community identity in the Second Temple period.

1.3 Exegesis as a Mode of Revelatory Experience

1-2 Chronicles

The book of Chronicles, which itself represents an interpretive retelling of earlier biblical traditions, provides evidence of a shift from classical prophecy to inspired interpretation of written traditions.\(^{26}\) This development in Chronicles occurs through the portrayal of certain individuals who receive divine inspiration even though they are not identified as prophets.\(^{27}\) The text points up the divine origin of their messages by including introductory formulas that describe their spirit-inspired state: “the spirit came upon Amasai” (1 Chron 12:19); “the spirit of God came upon Azariah” (2 Chron 15:1-8); “the spirit of YHWH came upon Jahaziel” (2 Chron 20:14-17); and “the spirit of God took possession of Zechariah” (2 Chron 24:17-22).\(^ {28}\) As Sara Japhet notes, these descriptions of direct inspiration are especially significant since the Chronicler does not even use such elaborate introductions when recounting the speeches of more familiar


prophets like Nathan, Gad, and Jehu. Moreover, in each of these cases, such figures do not mediate new prophetic revelation but instead rework and reapply earlier prophetic texts.

The speech of Azariah from 2 Chron 15:1-8 provides a particularly cogent example of how the Chronicler characterizes this new form of divine revelation. In the passage, he places an anthology of citations of earlier prophetic texts on the lips of Azariah, but presents this material as a prophetic message:

1. The spirit of God came upon Azariah son of Oded. 
2. He went out to meet Asa and said to him, “Hear me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: The LORD is with you, while you are with him. If you seek him, he will be found by you, but if you abandon him, he will abandon you. 
3. For a long time Israel was without the true God, and without a teaching priest, and without law; 
4. but when in their distress they turned to the LORD, the God of Israel, and sought him, he was found by them. 
5. In those times it was not safe for anyone to go or come, for great disturbances afflicted all the inhabitants of the lands. 
6. They were broken in pieces, nation against nation and city against city, for God troubled them with every sort of distress. 
7. But you, take courage! Do not let your hands be weak, for your work shall be rewarded.” 
8. When Asa heard these words, the prophecy of Azariah son of Oded, he took courage, and put away the abominable idols from all the land of Judah and Benjamin and from the towns that he had taken in the hill country of Ephraim. He repaired the altar of the LORD that was in front of the vestibule of the house of the LORD.

Michael Fishbane suggests that verses 2 and 7 echo Deut 31:7-8 (“he will be with you” and “be strong and bold”) and Josh 1:7-8 (“be strong and very courageous”). The Chronicler thus alludes to earlier exhortations to military service and applies them to a...
circumstance requiring cultic reform. A number of commentators also note that the phrase “Israel was without the true God, without a teaching priest, and without law” (verse 3) alters and reappropriates a passage from Hos 3:4: “For the Israelites shall remain many days without king or prince, without sacrifice or pillar, without ephod or teraphim.” If so, the citation and adaptation underscores the necessity of cultic rather than military leadership. Furthermore, the parallel words and phrases in 2 Chron 15:4-7 and Zech 8:9-11 suggest that the Chronicler was strongly influenced by language and motifs from Zechariah. The Chronicler thus portrays the speech of Azariah as a prophetic oracle, but the message itself contains a set of scriptural citations that apply to his contemporary context and concerns.

The “resignification” of the phrase “word of YHWH” (דבר יוהו) in Chronicles represents another indicator of this implicit emphasis upon the interpretation of written revelation. This phrase occurs 241 times in the Hebrew Bible and almost always refers...
to a prophetic oracle (221 times). In 1-2 Chronicles, however, the phrase “word of YHWH” also depicts Mosaic legislation. Of the fifteen times that the phrase occurs in 1-2 Chronicles, three come from direct dependence upon 1-2 Kings, six refer to the prophetic word without dependence upon 1-2 Kings, and six refer to the Mosaic law. A comparison of 2 Kgs 22:13 and 2 Chron 34:21 highlights this transition in the use of “word of YHWH”:

Go, inquire of the LORD for me, for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this book that has been found; for great is the wrath of the LORD that is kindled against us, because our ancestors did not obey the words of this book, to do according to all that is written concerning us.
(2 Kgs 22:13)

Go, inquire of the LORD for me and for those who are left in Israel and in Judah, concerning the words of the book that has been found; for the wrath of the LORD that is poured out on us is great, because our ancestors did not keep the word of the LORD, to act in accordance with all that is written in this book.
(2 Chron 34:21)

By identifying the Torah scroll that Hilkiah finds as the “word of YHWH,” the Chronicler implicitly equates this written text with the oracular revelation that prophets receive. According to Schniedwind, the use of the phrase to refer to both oracular prophecy and the written Torah represents a step in the process of change that ultimately led to the primacy of Torah: “Once the ‘word of YHWH’ becomes the Torah, then the

---


38 1 Chron 10:13 (Mosaic command); 11:3, 10 (prophetic word); 15:15 (Mosaic command); 22:8 (prophetic word); 2 Chron 11:2 (cf. 1 Kgs 12:22; prophetic word); 12:7 (prophetic word); 18:4, 18 (cf. 1 Kgs 22:5, 19; prophetic word); 19:11 (probably Mosaic command); 30:12 (Mosaic command); 34:21 (Mosaic command); 35:6 (Mosaic command); 36:21, 22 (prophetic word).

39 According to Schniedwind, *Word of God*, 137, the Deuteronomistic presentation of Moses as the paradigmatic prophet influenced this shift which eventually led to the replacement of prophecy with the transmission of correct Torah interpretation.
prophet naturally becomes the bearer of the law."40 Although this conclusion might be overstated, the use of “word of YHWH” to refer to Mosaic legislation in Chronicles suggests at least a widening in the understanding of the prophetic revelatory experience to encompass the reading and re-application of earlier, written traditions.41

Ezra

Like Chronicles, the book of Ezra provides evidence of a shift in understanding how divine revelation was mediated. The text clearly portrays Ezra as a “skilled scribe” who reads and interprets Torah for the people (Ezra 7:6).42 Indeed, as Alex Jassen notes, the role of Ezra as a scribal expert “characterizes his entire mission.”43 Ezra 7:6-10 also presents his skill in and communication of Torah as a divinely inspired activity. Reminiscent of the revelatory experience of the classical prophets, this passage indicates that “the hand of YHWH” was upon Ezra:

(6) this Ezra went up from Babylonia. He was a scribe skilled in the law of Moses that the LORD the God of Israel had given; and the king granted him all that he asked,


41 This transition in revelatory experience may also be related to the link that the Chronicler draws between prophets and Levites. As Harry V. Van Rooy has noted in his essay, “Prophet and Society in the Persian Period According to Chronicles,” in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period* (JSOTSup 175; ed. Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards; Sheffield: JSOT, 1994), 176-179, “the Chronicler identifies prophets of his day with the prophets of the nation’s history” (177). In a number of ways, the Chronicler presents Levites as recipients and mediators of divine revelation and, in some cases, replaces prophets with Levites. Compare, for example, the reference to “priests and prophets” in 2 Kgs 23:22 with the reference to “priests and Levites” in 2 Chron 34:30. For further discussion of this transition and the role of “Levitical prophets” in Chronicles, see Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy*, 55-87; cf. Jacob Martin Myers, *Chronicles* (AB 12; Garden City: Doubleday, 1963), 2:208; Aubrey Rodway Johnson, *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962), 72-73.


for the hand of the LORD his God was upon him. (7) Some of the people of Israel, and some of the priests and Levites, the singers and gatekeepers, and the temple servants also went up to Jerusalem, in the seventh year of King Artaxerxes.

(8) They came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king. (9) On the first day of the first month the journey up from Babylon was begun, and on the first day of the fifth month he came to Jerusalem, for the gracious hand of his God was upon him. (10) For Ezra had set his heart to study the law of the LORD, and to do it, and to teach the statutes and ordinances in Israel.

(Ezra 7:6-10)

As a number of scholars have noted, the expression “hand of YHWH . . . upon him” (Ezra 7:9, 28) denotes the force with which divine inspiration takes hold of a prophet.44 In this instance, however, the phrase refers to the divine favor that Ezra received to carry out his mission as a student and interpreter of the Torah. As Jassen observes, “Ezra’s status as a ‘skilled scribe’ is grounded in his receipt of the divine hand.”45 Moreover, Ezra 7:10 uses the infinitive construct, a verb more often used to describe inquiry of God through the mediation of a prophet, to describe Ezra’s study of the Mosaic law.46 The textual study of Ezra therefore becomes analogous to classical oracular prophecy.47

Such a description of the exegetical activities of Ezra demonstrates a shift in the understanding of how one received divine revelation during the post-exilic period. Once guided by and founded upon direct revelation to the prophets, the people of Yehud

---


46 Of the 16 times that מַעֵשֶׂה יְהוָה occurs in the Hebrew Bible, in 11 instances it refers to seeking for divine revelation from God or a deity through a prophet or a medium (Gen 25:22; Ex 18:15; 1 Kgs 14:5; 22:8; 2 Kgs 1:3; 6, 16 [2x]; 22:18; 1 Chron 21:30; Ezek 20:1). Other forms of מַעֵשֶׂה can also express inquiry of God or other deities through prophetic mediation (e.g., Deut 12:30; 18:11; 1 Sam 28:7; 1 Kgs 22:5, 7, 8; 2 Kgs 1:2; 3:11; 8:8; 22:13; 1 Chron 10:13, 14; 15:13; 21:30; 2 Chron 18:4, 6, 7; 34:21, 26; Isa 8:19; 19:3; Jer 21:2; 37:7; Ezek 14:3 (2x), 7, 10; 20:1, 3 (2x), 31 (2x); 36:27; Zeph 1:6) but rarely to textual inquiry (Isa 34:16; possibly Eccl 1:13; 1 Chron 28:8; Ps 119:45, 94, 155).

47 Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129.
became a community guided by the inspired study and reinterpretation of ancient written revelation.\textsuperscript{48}

**Ben Sira**

A similar understanding of inspired study and exegesis of the scriptures pervades the writings of Ben Sira. It is a commonplace for scholars to note that a primary theme of this text lies in its identification of wisdom with Mosaic Law.\textsuperscript{49} In Sirach 24, Ben Sira praises wisdom as a universal entity (Sir 24:1-22) but also depicts wisdom as Mosaic law:

(23) All this [i.e., universal wisdom] is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob.
(25) It overflows, like the Pishon, with wisdom, and like the Tigris at the time of the first fruits. (26) It runs over, like the Euphrates, with understanding, and like the Jordan at harvest time. It pours forth instruction like the Nile, like the Gihon at the time of vintage.
. . . (30) As for me, I was like a canal from a river, like a water channel into a garden.
(31) I said, “I will water my garden and drench my flower-beds.” And lo, my canal became a river, and my river a sea. (32) I will again make instruction shine forth like the dawn, and I will make it clear from far away. (33) I will again pour out teaching like prophecy, and leave it to all future generations. (34) Observe that I have not labored for myself alone but for all who seek wisdom.
(Sir 24:23-34)

Since Ben Sira equates universal wisdom with the “covenant of the Most High” and the “law of Moses” in Sirach 24, his description of his own wisdom teaching should be

\textsuperscript{48} Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 211. Fishbane, “Scribalism,” 440-443, also suggests that the reference to the loss of the Urim and Thummim in Neh 7:65 and the subsequent account of the public reading and interpretation of Torah (Neh 8:1-8) marks a shift in “modes of access to divine revelation” (441). For further discussion of Nehemiah 8 and Ezra 7, including the role of Ezra as a “mantic hermeneut of the Torah of YHWH,” see Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 107-113, 245, 539.

understood as interpretation of the Mosaic law; just as the Mosaic law pours forth wisdom like a river, so his scriptural interpretation represents a canal from this torrent. By also likening his teaching to prophecy (Sir 24:33), Ben Sira characterizes his interpretation of the Mosaic law as a form of divine revelation that stands in continuity with the ancient prophetic tradition.

In his portrait of the ideal scribe (Sir 38:34b-39:8), Ben Sira again highlights the centrality of scriptural interpretation and depicts it as a divinely inspired activity. By preceding his discourse with a description of the responsibilities of artisans and laborers, he suggests that their work stands in contrast to that of the wise scribe:

(38:34b) How different [from artisans and laborers] the one who devotes himself to the study of the law of the Most High! (39:1) He seeks out the wisdom of all the ancients, and is concerned with prophecies; (2) he preserves the sayings of the famous and penetrates the subtleties of parables; (3) he seeks out the hidden meanings of proverbs and is at home with the obscurities of parables. (4) He serves among the great and appears before

---


51 As Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 312, notes, the phrase “like prophecy” could indicate that the content of the instruction of the scribe was like prophecy or it could mean that the process of “pouring out” instruction was similar to prophecy. In either case, Ben Sira sees the teaching of the wise scribe as analogous to prophecy but the former meaning would more closely link scribal wisdom to divine revelation. The Syriac translation has “in prophecy” as compared to the Greek version which has “as prophecy” (ὡς προφητείαν). This suggests that the translator may have regarded the content of the instruction as a type of prophecy.

rulers; he travels in foreign lands and learns what is good and evil in the human lot.

(5) He sets his heart to rise early to seek the Lord who made him, and to petition the Most High; he opens his mouth in prayer and asks pardon for his sins. (6) If the Lord is willing, he will be filled with the spirit of understanding; he will pour forth words of wisdom of his own and give thanks to the Lord in prayer. (7) The Lord will direct his counsel and knowledge, as he meditates on his mysteries. (8) He will show the wisdom of what he has learned, and will glory in the law of the Lord's covenant.

(Sir 38:34b-39:8)

The poem can be summarized in the following way: the first strophe depicts the scribe's study of the sacred scriptures and other ancient traditions (Sir 38:34c-39:3); the second strophe describes his other activities (Sir 39:4-5); the third strophe portrays his reception of divine revelation (Sir 39:6-8), and the final strophe describes the fame that he receives as result of his understanding and wisdom (Sir 39:9-11). As in Sir 24:33, the third strophe portrays the revelation that the scribe receives as prophetic inspiration. Even as the spirit and word of God provided the prophets with revelation, so the "spirit of understanding" enables the scribe to "pour forth words of wisdom." Through the process of studying the scriptures and seeking wisdom, then, the ideal scribe receives divine revelation. Accordingly, his exegetical activities become equivalent to prophetic inspiration.

53 Perdue, "Ben Sira," 140-141, argues that this divine revelation is given to a "select group of sages," since Sir 39:6 indicates that the scribe only receives wisdom if God is willing to give it to him. Similarly, Stadelmann, Ben Sira, 233, suggests that the gift of revelation applies only to a special group of scribes: "ein Sonderfall des Schriftgelehrtenseins."

54 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 311; Bockmuehl, Revelation, 59; Beentjes, "Prophets in Ben Sira," 146-147.


56 In his discussion of this passage, Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 311, describes the first stage - study of the scriptures - as preparatory for the reception of divine revelation which he identifies as "sapiential revelation." This suggests that the divine gift of wisdom that the scribe receives is separate from his study and interpretation of the scriptures. Others, however, envision a more fluid relationship between these two stages; through careful study and the divine endowment of "the spirit of understanding," the scribe discovers the wisdom that lies hidden within the scriptures themselves. According to Mack,
Although this survey represents but a few examples of how Second Temple Jewish texts portray exegesis as a mode of divine revelation, it shows evidence of a trend that emerged during this period. The Chronicler describes inspired individuals who rework ancient scriptural traditions, the book of Ezra presents the scriptural interpretation of Ezra as analogous to the revelation that ancient prophets receive, and Ben Sira depicts the exegesis of the wise scribe as a revelatory experience. As such, they demonstrate the belief that scriptural exegesis was a divinely inspired activity that stood in continuity with classical prophetic traditions.57

1.4 Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition

The shift from classical prophecy to scriptural interpretation during the Second Temple period heightened the emphasis upon exegesis as a means of attaining revelatory knowledge, but the diversity of perspectives within the Judaism(s) of this era also gave rise to competing views of how to interpret and apply the sacred writ.58 In differing
ways, certain early Jewish interpreters portray themselves, and the groups they represent, as the exclusive heirs of the Jewish scriptures. Broadly speaking, such attempts at self-definition involve at least one of the following characteristics: 1) descriptions of the select status and privileged knowledge of the interpreter(s) and 2) assertions of a direct line of continuity between the revelatory experience of the interpreter(s) and the ancient prophets. These strategies, in turn, play a significant role in defining community identity since interpreters use such claims to describe themselves and the privileged status of the groups they represent.

59 These “authority conferring strategies” have overlapping and interdependent elements, especially since the select status and knowledge of the interpreter(s) often depends upon descriptions of their close relationship to the ancient prophets.

60 For example, Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 346, argues that early Jewish texts highlight the prophetic abilities of particular interpreters. Newsom, Self as Symbolic Space, 23-75, suggests that certain early Jewish groups and interpreters presented their elite status and access to knowledge as the means by which they understood the Jewish scriptures correctly (see further discussion below in section 1.3 of this chapter). Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 311, notes that the Enochic literature predicts the emergence of a “chosen righteous” group that possesses special insight and the book of Daniel similarly describes the maskilim. Nickelsburg, “Scripture in 1 Enoch,” 341-346, suggests that the Enochic collection reinterprets scriptural traditions according to its own authoritative perspective. Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing,” 380, outlines the following “authority conferring strategies” in the book of Jubilees: 1) the claim to reproduce ancient material; 2) the claim to be the product of angelic mediation of revelation; 3) the claim of Mosaic authorship; 4) the claim that its teachings are “true interpretation of the Torah”; cf. Najman, Seconding Sinai, 41-69. See also Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 47-50; Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis,” 126-137; James L. Kugel, The Bible As It Was (Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997), 1-51; VanderKam, “To What End,” 303-308.

61 Blenkinsopp, Prophecy and Canon, 129-131, argues that certain Second Temple scribal compositions (e.g., Ezra, Ben Sira) closely identify their inspired exegesis with that of the ancient prophets; cf. Beentjes, “Prophets in Ben Sira,” 148-149, who argues that Ben Sira presents himself as an inspired interpreter of prophecy and links his own activities with the prophets. Brooke, “Prophecy,” 154-158, similarly argues that the “parabiblical prophetic rewritings” and Pesher Habakkuk “can be viewed as continuous with the prophetic texts they interpret, and, as such, as a further form of prophecy in their own right” (157). Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 50-52, notes the special status of the Teacher of Righteousness as an authoritative interpreter of the scriptures but argues that other Qumran texts place the “collective activity” of Torah-interpretation “on par with God’s other means of revelation, through His inspired prophets” (52). As Shemesh and Werman, “Halakah,” 108-109, and many others have noted, “pesharim are grounded in the assumption that the prophecies contain information of which the prophets themselves were unaware and whose current and future context only the Teacher of Righteousness can elicit” (108). See also Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 20, 240, 333-362.
Although descriptions of the authoritative exegesis of a particular interpreter, or early Jewish group, occur in a wide variety of early Jewish texts, my discussion throughout the remainder of this chapter will focus upon documents that also express the expectation of an imminent end of the age, especially the literature attributed to the Qumran community. Such texts prove particularly relevant for my study because they often link scriptural interpretation with the end-time emergence of an elect group. As such, they provide a rich source of data for studying the relationship between early Jewish scriptural interpretation and group self-definition.

1.4.1 Early Jewish Apocalypses

Daniel 9

The book of Daniel, especially Daniel 9, demonstrates the view that correct understanding of the scriptures requires supernatural revelation. At the opening of Daniel 9, Daniel perceives from his study of the scriptures that the seventy years of exile prophesied by Jeremiah were coming to a close (Dan 9:1-2; cf. Jer 25:11-12; 29:10). This realization leads him to offer a penitential prayer in which he confesses the sin of Israel (Dan 9:4-10), accepts the disasters that have befallen them as the rightful consequence of their sin (Dan 9:11-14), and petitions God to restore the nation (Dan...
Although the prayer has a decidedly Deuteronomistic perspective, the answer that Daniel receives reorients this theological viewpoint, and provides a different understanding of how and when the prophecy of Jeremiah would be fulfilled. While Daniel is still in prayer, the angel Gabriel arrives and explains that the prophecy will be realized at a pre-determined time in the eschatological future (Dan 9:20-27).
message of Gabriel thus provides the additional information needed to interpret the prophecy of Jeremiah correctly: the seventy years of exile refer to seventy weeks of years. As such, his message represents a form of revelatory exegesis that explains how Jeremiah’s words apply to the defeat of Antiochus Epiphanes and the end of the present age.  

The author of the book of Daniel also attempts to demonstrate the divine origins of this scriptural interpretation. For example, by having an angelic emissary communicate the exegetical explanation of the prophecy, the author sets the interpretation apart as one that originates from God himself. Moreover, as Jassen observes, by using the term “word” to refer both to the message of Gabriel (דָבָר; Dan 9:23) and the message that came to Jeremiah (דָבָר יְהוָה; Dan 9:2, 25), the author draws an implicit connection between the revelatory exegesis of Gabriel and the original prophetic message.  

---

65 A primary difference between the initial interpretation of Daniel and the exegesis provided by Gabriel lies in Gabriel’s isolation of and focus upon the interpretation of the 70 years as 70 weeks of years. This exegetical method, which is often called ‘atomization’, is a common characteristic of pesharim. See Shani L. Berrin, The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169 (STDJ 53; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 12-23; Armin Lange, “Reading the Decline of Prophecy” in Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations (SBLSymS 30; ed. K. de Troyer and A. Lange; Atlanta: SBL, 2005), 186-189; Collins, Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 302; Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 220. For further discussion of the 70 weeks of years in Daniel, see Goldingay, Daniel, 257; Porteous, Daniel, 141; Hartman and Di Lella, Daniel, 250-251; Antti Laato, “The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel,” ZAW 102 (1990): 212-223. For a discussion of the influence of the sabbatical theology of Leviticus 25-26 on the formulation of an extended period that would include seventy sabbatical years, see Collins, Daniel, 352; Montgomery, Daniel, 373; Grelot, “Soixante-dix semaines,” 178-181; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 482-484. Collins, Daniel, 353-354, also suggests that the division of history into ten weeks or seventy periods in Enochic literature may have influenced the author of Daniel. In his view, this apocalyptic orientation is significant because it shows that both the Levitical understanding of covenant and apocalyptic determinism influenced this passage. For the latter perspective, see, especially, the use of “are determined” (רואים) in vs. 24. Collins also argues that the phrase “to finish the transgression” and the string of six infinitives that follow it in vs. 24, have God as the implied subject and emphasize the idea “that evil must run its course until the appointed time” (354).  

66 Although most commentators suggest that דָבָר in Dan 9:23 refers to Jeremiah’s prophecy (e.g., Montgomery, Daniel, 371; Porteous, Daniel, 139; Hartman and Di Lella, Daniel, 242; Collins, Daniel, 352), Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 218, rightly argues that the term דָבָר refers to the message of Gabriel.
conceptualizing the interpretation that Gabriel provides as a prophetic word, the author of Daniel shows his scriptural interpretation to be continuous with and the proper realization of the message of Jeremiah. Essentially, it infuses the new exegetical revelation with a status commensurate with the earlier prophetic oracle.

Yet the “wisdom and understanding” that the message of Gabriel provides corresponds to gifts of divine insight that Daniel already possessed. Compare, for example, Gabriel’s declaration that he had come forth to cause Daniel “to know and understand” in Dan 9:22 with the description of Daniel and his friends: “To these four young men God gave knowledge and skill in every aspect of literature and wisdom; Daniel also had insight into all visions and dreams” (Dan 1:17; cf. 2:30; 7:15-16; 8:15-17; 9:13, 22, 25). Furthermore, in Dan 9:23-25, Gabriel commands Daniel to “discern,” “understand,” “know” and “consider” the explanation of the prophecy. Gabriel gives wisdom and understanding that enables Daniel to understand the prophecy but Daniel also possesses gifts of wisdom and insight that assist him in comprehending such messages from God. In this sense, Daniel’s special capacity to discern other mysteries, together with the mediating message rather than to the original word of Jeremiah. In Dan 9:23, Gabriel clearly represents דָּבְרָיו (dabar) as the message that “went forth” from God through Gabriel when Daniel first began to pray.

67 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 218-220; Fishbane, Biblical Interpretation, 484.
68 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 272, also argues that Daniel is a paradigmatic example of the “newly emerging Second Temple period prophetic figure. His revelation is experienced through the reading and rewriting of earlier prophetic traditions as well as the receipt of revealed wisdom. These newer revelatory models are integrated into dreams and visions that Daniel experiences.”
69 Daniel’s dreams, visions, and interpretation of the prophetic writings are conceptualized as similar types of revelatory experiences. Note that the same verb “to understand” (בין) is used in each of these contexts (Dan 1:17; 8:5; 9:23; 10:11; cf. 8:27). For further discussion, see Hammer, Daniel, 94; Goldingay, Daniel, 231; Collins, “Jewish Apocalypticism,” 70; idem, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 305; Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 217.
of Gabriel, serve to demonstrate the authority of his divinely-inspired interpretation of Jeremiah.

These claims to authoritative exegesis and insight also appear to define a wider group. In his *ex eventu* predictions, the author links the wisdom and insight of Daniel with a later generation of “enlightened ones” (משִֽלְשָׁלָּהֲם; 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10), and portrays this group as heirs to his revelatory knowledge. In Dan 12:4 and 9, Daniel is instructed to “seal the book” of his revelations until the “end of time.” In this final era, the angel explains, “Many shall be purified, cleansed, and refined, but the wicked shall continue to act wickedly. None of the wicked shall understand, but those who are wise shall understand (וָנֵכָלֶֽהוּ)" (Dan 12:10). The author thus identifies a group of “enlightened ones” who gain access to the revelation that Daniel had received and reportedly “hidden and sealed.”

Through their eschatological gift of insight, the *maskilim* “know their God” and “give understanding to many (וָנֵכָלֶֽהוּ נָבְּנָה לְרַבַּם)” (Dan 11:32-33; cf. 12:3, 10). This knowledge and wisdom of the *maskilim* also sets them apart from those who forsake and act wickedly toward the covenant (Dan 11:30, 32-33).

In this sense, Daniel’s privileged wisdom and understanding of the Jewish scriptures serves to characterize the identity of a certain group of Jews. This group, in turn,

70 As Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 306, notes, the author of Daniel provides an *ex eventu* overview of history so that his interpretation of Jeremiah’s prophecy and Daniel’s visions fit the pattern of historical apocalypses: “An overview of history is provided in the guise of prophecy, but written after the fact, concluding with a real prediction about the eschatological future” (306).

71 For further discussion of the *maskilim* in Daniel, see Collins, *Daniel*, 66-67, 341-342, 384-385, 403; André Lacocque, *Daniel in His Time* (Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament; Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988), 189-195. Goldingay, *Daniel*, 303, suggests that the use of the *hiphil* form of נָבְּנָה to describe the teaching of the *maskilim* refers to their scriptural interpretation. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 489-493, also suggests that the *maskilim* were a community of interpreters with a special ability to understand ancient prophecy. See his discussion of Dan 11:10, 22, 26-27, 30-31, 33, 35-36, 40, 45; 12:1-4, 7, 9-10, 12.
provides wise teachers who disclose the proper perspective of God’s will and plan during this end-time era.\footnote{Collins, \textit{Daniel}, 392-394, 402-403; cf., Lacocque, \textit{Daniel}, 189-195. Although this scribal group falls victim to persecution (Dan 11:33-35), the author predicts that, at the appointed time, they will experience resurrection and “lead many to righteousness” (Dan 12:3).}

1 Enoch

Since 1 Enoch never explicitly quotes or paraphrases biblical passages,\footnote{George W. E. Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch} (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 57.} detecting and evaluating the use of scripture in this collection presents a challenge. Because the author allegedly lived long before the composition of any authoritative texts, it is perhaps not surprising that the Enochic collection does not explicitly refer to the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, the authors of 1 Enoch implicitly depend upon scriptural traditions, and expand them to address concerns of their own time.\footnote{Argall, \textit{1 Enoch and Sirach}, 7. Nickelsburg, \textit{1 Enoch}, 57-58, notes the numerous points at which 1 Enoch depends upon scripture but argues that the nature of this dependence is not always clear. He suggests that the text may draw upon material from memory or oral traditions related to scriptural narratives. He further argues that the Enochic collection does not cite scriptural passages explicitly because it claims to be authoritative scripture that depends not upon inspired texts but upon direct revelations that the primordial Enoch received; cf. idem, “Scripture in 1 Enoch,” 342-346. Gabriele Boccaccini, \textit{Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Partings of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 167, instead maintains that the “Mosaic torah is conspicuously absent from the earlier Enochic literature, up to and including the Dream Visions” but that this situation changed after the Maccabean revolt. By contrast, Annette Yoshiko Reed, “‘Revealed Literature’ in the Second Century BCE,” in \textit{Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection} (ed. Gabriele Boccaccini; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 94-98, argues that scholars wrongly interpret the revelatory claims of texts such as 1 Enoch 1-36 as an attempt “to supplant” older revelatory literature. In \textit{Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature} (Cambridge: CUP, 2005), 145, Reed further points out that works like 1 Enoch 1-36 draw “their legitimacy” from the Jewish scriptures. For example, 1 Enoch 1-36 appeals to biblical figures, mimics the biblical language and style of the scriptures, and relies upon the biblical record of history. In other words, 1 Enoch 1-36 reasserts the authority of the Jewish scriptures, rather than seeking to supplant it. Andreas Bedenbender, “The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature,” in \textit{The Early Enoch Literature} (JSJ 121; ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 65-94, argues that the authors of the Book of Watchers did not dispute the main body of Mosaic commands but objected to the symbolic universe the “Zadokites had created by reshaping the Torah”\footnote{Bedenbender notes, however, that the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks follow the biblical narrative and offer a Deuteronomistic pattern of sin, punishment, and return. He attributes this later more favorable attitude toward the Torah to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and argues that this historical circumstance would have placed Enochic Judaism on...}. Bedenbender notes, however, that the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks follow the biblical narrative and offer a Deuteronomistic pattern of sin, punishment, and return. He attributes this later more favorable attitude toward the Torah to the persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and argues that this historical circumstance would have placed Enochic Judaism on...}

For example, the
Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks contain reviews of biblical history that undoubtedly depend upon the Jewish scriptures. Within the context of 1 Enoch, it is possible to understand these historical reviews as interpretive readings of biblical history; they attempt to demonstrate the authoritative status of their exegesis through the claim that they represent the revelation originally given to Enoch.\(^75\)

Not only do the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks present their particular perspectives on biblical history; both also provide evidence of the belief that an elect and righteous group would arise to become the recipients of special revelation at the end of the age.\(^76\) The Apocalypse of Weeks divides human history into ten periods of time, designated as “ten weeks,” beginning with the time of Enoch. It opens by having Enoch state that his discourse concerns a select group: “the children of righteousness,” “the elect of the world,” and “the plant of uprightness” (1 En. 93:2). The seventh week represents the climax of biblical history at which time the elect righteous ones appear:

(8) After this there will arise a sixth week
and all who live in it will become blind,
and the hearts of all will stray from wisdom;
and in it a man will ascend.
And at its conclusion, the temple of the kingdom will be
burned with fire,
and in it the whole race of the chosen root will be dispersed.
(9) After this, in the seventh week, there will arise a perverse generation,
and many will be its deeds,
and all its deeds will be perverse.
(10) And at its conclusion, the chosen will be chosen,
as witnesses of righteousness from the everlasting plant of righteousness,
to whom will be given sevenfold wisdom and knowledge.77
(1 En. 93:8-10)78

The sixth week and the beginning of the seventh week represent the period leading up to
and following the Babylonian exile (1 En. 93:8-9). The author emphasizes the apostasy
of Israel during this stage and characterizes it as a season of blindness and lack of
wisdom. From this wicked generation, however, a particular group of righteous ones
emerges to receive “sevenfold wisdom and knowledge.”

The description of the election of the righteous group, in the seventh week,
parallels the description of the election of Abraham in the third week. Following a
postdiluvian period of evil, Abraham was “elected as the plant of righteous judgment,”
and his offspring became “the plant of righteousness” (1 En. 93:5). Accordingly, in the
same way that Abraham was selected from an evil group of humans to become a
righteous plant, so a certain group of righteous Jews are later selected from apostate
Israel to become the end-time continuation of the “plant of righteousness” that originally

77 Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 436, provides the English translation “sevenfold wisdom and knowledge”
but notes that the Ethiopic has the phrase “sevenfold wisdom concerning all his creation.” J. T. Milik, ed.
and trans., The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 265,
presents the Aramaic text as

78 Citations of 1 Enoch are from the translation provided by George W. E. Nickelsburg and James
C. VanderKam, 1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary (Minneapolis: Fortress,
2004).
began with Abraham. From the perspective of the author, then, this newly constituted group represents true Israel. Furthermore, the author indicates that this community emerged with the express purpose of receiving divine gifts of wisdom and knowledge.

Like the Apocalypse of Weeks, the Animal Apocalypse provides a review of history that climaxes with the election of a particular group of Jews who receive divine revelation. Throughout the account, the authors allegorically portray Israel as sheep, and their alternating states of apostasy and fidelity as blindness and eyesight, respectively.

According to James C. VanderKam, the first description of Israel’s eye-opening recounts the revelation given at Sinai after the deliverance from Egypt: “But the sheep escaped from that water and went forth into a wilderness, where there was no water and no grass; and they began to open their eyes and to see” (1 En. 89:28). Shortly thereafter,

---

79 Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 445-448, notes that the Apocalypse of Weeks refers to the plant four times (93:2, 5, 8, 10). Although the original plant represents historical Israel, “the eternal plant of righteousness” that is chosen in the seventh week represents only a select group of Jews.

80 For a discussion of the possibility that the description of an elect righteous group in 1 Enoch refers to a particular community, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 64-67. See also Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 109-115.

81 Undoubtedly, the wisdom and knowledge that the elect receive relates to the divine revelations that were given to Enoch (see, e.g., 1 En. 93:2). Elsewhere in the Enochic collection, the authors indicate that this heavenly wisdom has life-giving power (e.g., 1 En. 82:1-4) and produces joy and uprightness (e.g., 1 En. 104:12-13). For further discussion of the role of wisdom in 1 Enoch, see Nickelsburg, “Scripture in 1 Enoch,” 333-367; cf. Jassen, *Meditating the Divine*, 264-265. Nickelsburg, “Nature and Function of Revelation,” 95, also argues that the sevenfold wisdom and knowledge described in 1 En. 93:10 included revealed instruction about “the right life, i.e., Torah and ethics.” Since this wisdom functions as the antidote to the blindness and apostasy of Israel, moreover, in all probability it includes a revelation of how to obey Torah.

however, the majority of the sheep become blind as a result of the golden calf episode (1 En. 89:32-34), and experience alternating periods of vision and blindness during the period of the Judges (1 En. 89:41, 44). Further blindness occurs through subsequent apostasy (89:54), and the authors even depict the return from Babylon and the rebuilding of the Temple as a period of ongoing blindness (89:59, 74; 90:2). Finally, in what appears to be an account of the authors’ own time period, they refer to sheep who begin to open their eyes:

(6) And look, lambs were born of those white sheep, and they [an elect group of Jews] began to open their eyes and to see, and to cry out to the sheep. (7) But they did not listen to them nor attend to their words, but they were extremely deaf, and their eyes were extremely and excessively blinded. (8) And I saw in the vision that the ravens [non-Jewish opponents] flew upon those lambs and seized one of those lambs, and dashed the sheep in pieces and devoured them. (9) And I saw until horns came out on those lambs, and the ravens were casting down their horns. And I saw until a great horn sprouted on one of those sheep [probably Judas Maccabeus]. (10) And it looked on them, and their eyes were opened. 

This passage represents a significant turning point in the allegory since the eye-opening of an elect group marks a new beginning for Israel that culminates in the end of the age (1 En. 90:20-38). Furthermore, the description of eye-opening parallels the revelation

---

Najman and Judith H. Newman; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 286-292, suggests that the eye-opening described in 1 En. 89:28 refers to the Sinai event itself, specifically to the point at which Israel sees God (e.g., Exod 19:11; 24:9-10a). This latter argument, in addition to VanderKam’s discussion of the etymology of the word Israel (“one who sees God”), provides the best explanation of the referent of 1 En. 89:28. Accordingly, the first eye-opening of Israel occurs when they receive Torah at Sinai.

Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 384, links 1 En. 89:54-58 with the reign of Manasseh, but VanderKam, “Open and Closed Eyes,” 283, links 1 En. 89:54 more closely to the apostasy of the Northern Kingdom. As Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 316, notes, the period described in 1 En. 89:51-58 appears to include “the whole period from Rehoboam to Jehoiakim” and “is summarized as a period of apostasy and destruction.” For further discussion, see Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 282-283, 340. He suggests that the authors of the Animal Apocalypse portray the circumstances after the exile as worse than before it began. Apparently, this represents the time of Seleucid domination and the rise of the Maccabees. So Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 350-356; VanderKam, “Open and Closed Eyes,” 284; Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 400-401.

Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 356, maintains that the eye-opening of certain Jews in 1 En. 90:9-10 depicts a religious reformation involving more Jews than the ones described in 90:6.
given at Sinai\textsuperscript{87} which strongly suggests that the authors wish to depict Jews who receive this illumination as those who gain a renewed understanding of Mosaic law.\textsuperscript{88} The event thus binds the election of a select group of Jews to their reception of an end-time revelation of the true meaning of Mosaic law. By contrast, other Jews become exceedingly deaf and blind and therefore distinct from the elect.\textsuperscript{89}

Presented as predictions of the future, the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks aim to provide their readers with historical reviews that assert a particular perspective on biblical history. Implicitly, this privileged viewpoint is shown to be authoritative through the claim that these texts record the angelic revelations that Enoch received and passed down to subsequent generations (e.g., 85:1-2; 93:1-2). Yet the two accounts also portray wisdom and correct Torah-interpretation as eschatological gifts that only elect Jews possess.\textsuperscript{90} From this perspective, the accounts present the knowledge of a particular group as a manifestation of the final intervention of God. Their divinely-

\textsuperscript{87} Nickelsburg, \textit{I Enoch}, 398, notes that the Ethiopic wording in 1 En. 90:6 parallels the wording of 89:28, thereby drawing a close connection between these two events.

\textsuperscript{88} Nickelsburg, \textit{I Enoch}, 381; VanderKam, “Open and Closed Eyes,” 292. Similarly, Tiller, \textit{Animal Apocalypse}, 292, argues that the accounts of eye-opening in the \textit{Animal Apocalypse} depict “possession of God’s law and obedience to it.”

\textsuperscript{89} The author goes on to describe a final battle in which angels help the elect. After the battle, blind Jews and wicked non-Jews are judged. Subsequently, the eschatological Temple descends and the remaining sheep (Jews) and beasts of the field (non-Jews) are gathered into the Temple. This remaining group, which apparently includes non-Jews, then has a similar revelatory experience: “And the eyes of them all were opened, and they saw the good, and there was not one among them that did not see” (1 En. 90:35-36). Tiller, \textit{Animal Apocalypse}, 382, posits that this imagery also suggests a return to “the way shown by Moses” (382).

\textsuperscript{90} Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 76-79, observes that the wisdom described in the Enochic collection has an “eschatological dimension” insofar as “it is God’s gift in preparation for the end” (77). He argues that the books of Enoch often present insiders as the righteous, pious, and chosen, whose “status is related to their possession of revealed, eschatological wisdom about God’s Law and imminent judgment”; cf. idem, “The Nature and Function of Revelation,” 92-101; “Scripture in 1 Enoch” 333-354. See also Argall, \textit{I Enoch and Sirach}, 46-47.
bestowed gifts of revelation confirm their elect status as the chosen remnant and renewed
Israel.91

The Epistle of Enoch develops this perspective further through a series of
contrasts. It describes a conflict between the wicked and the righteous, and distinguishes
between these two groups on the basis of their acceptance or rejection of the knowledge
offered by “the wise.” Fools do not heed the wise and therefore do not receive salvation
(1 En. 98:9-10) whereas those who listen to the wise “learn to do the commandments of
the Most High” and so are saved (1 En. 99:10). Wise sages also stand in contrast to false
teachers who “alter the true words and pervert the everlasting covenant” (99:2; cf. 98:14-
16).92 These contrasts further define group identity with reference to wisdom and Torah

---

91 Although the precise historical identity of the elect righteous described in these apocalypses
remains difficult to determine, a number of scholars recognize that some parts of the Enochic collection
appear to attest to the existence of a historical group or community. As Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 64, states:
“The existence of a community or communities associated with the Enochic literature seems a reasonable
inference from the existence of the texts and the development of the corpus.” John J. Collins, The
Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature (2nd ed.; Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 1998), 70-74, remains cautious about identifying the community with a particular historical
group but still recognizes that the emergence of a movement in the Apocalypse of Weeks and the Animal
Apocalypse is “clearly attested” (74) and should be correlated with developments in the book of Jubilees
is the modern name for the mainstream body of the Essene party, from which the Qumran community
parted as a radical, dissident, and marginal offspring” (16). For a discussion of possible provenance of the
books of Enoch, see Nickelsburg, 1 Enoch, 64-67. Shemesh and Werman, “Halakhah,” 105-106, argue that
the Animal Apocalypse may symbolically depict the rise of the Teacher of Righteousness “whose eyes
were opened to the correct interpretation of Torah”; cf. M. Kister, “Concerning the History of the Essenes,”
Tarbiz 56 (1986): 1-15; Devorah Dimant, “Qumran Sectarian Literature,” in Jewish Writings of the Second
Temple Period (CRINT 2.2; ed. Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 544-545. Matthew Black,
The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch (SVTP 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 275, associates this group with the Hasidim
described in 1 Macc. 2:42, 7:12-14, and 2 Macc. 14:1, or the Maskilim of Daniel 11-12; cf. R. H. Charles,
The Book of Enoch (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1947), 207. As Tiller, Animal
Apocalypse, 109-116, cautions, however, the evidence used to support these theories of provenance is not
conclusive. Tiller further argues that a reform movement arose early in the second century BCE and
“spawned several smaller communities” (116). In his view, these smaller groups shared the same
background but separated and produced texts which were distinct to their own groups.

334-340.
interpretation: those who receive, or adopt, the privileged knowledge provided by the
Enochic collection become part of the elect whereas those who reject it are excluded.

1.4.2 Qumran Literature

Pesher Habbakuk (1QpHab)

As we have seen, a number of Second Temple Jewish texts present ancient
biblical prophecy as a written repository of revelation about the future (e.g., Daniel 9).93
From this perspective, the task of the interpreter involves gaining an understanding of the
relevance of the prophecy to contemporary circumstances.94 The pesharim texts from
Qumran exemplify this exegetical process since they attempt to correlate ancient
prophecy with present and eschatological events.95 Pesher Habakkuk, in particular,
applies the prophecies of Habakkuk to the experiences and expectations of the Qumran
sect. Since this text also contains a number of self-conscious reflections of the

---

93 On the similarities between pesher and the interpretation of Jeremiah in Daniel 9, see O. Betz,
Offerbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte (Tübingen: Mohr, 1960), 80-81; William Hugh
Brownlee, The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk (Missoula: Scholars, 1979), 29; Maurya P. Horgan, Pesharim:
Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books (Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979),
94 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 346; cf. Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis,” 133-134; Barton, Oracles,
180-181; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 81; Betz, Offerbarung, 36-59; Collins, “Prophecy and
Fulfillment,” 303.
95 K. Elliger, Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer (BHT 15; Tübingen: J. C. B.
Mohr, 1953), 150, stresses that the primary hermeneutical principle underlying the pesharim is that
prophecies refer to the end time and that time is now. Some NT scholars contrast the Qumran community’s
expectation of a future salvation with the emphasis upon the present salvation described in early Christian
texts. See, e.g., O. Betz, “Past Events and Last Events in Qumran Interpretation of History,” WCJS 6
demonstrated, the “end of days” at Qumran can include past, present, and future events; eschatological time
does not always refer only to the future. See also Shani Berrin, “Qumran Pesharim,” in Biblical
Interpretation at Qumran (ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 118-126.
interpretive activity of the Teacher of Righteousness, it provides significant information about the defining role that his exegesis played in the community.\textsuperscript{96}

Two key passages in 1QpHab disclose important details about the authoritative status of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness. The first, 1QpHab 1:16-2:10, outlines what appears to be three sets of opponents and explains the contrast between their error and his privileged insight:\textsuperscript{97}

1:16 [Look, O traitors ( Heb. ותימא),\textsuperscript{98} and] [see:]
1:17 [and wonder (and) be amazed, for I am doing a deed in your days you would not believe if]
2:1 it were told. (VACAT) [...] the traitors ( Heb. ותימא) together with the Man of

\textsuperscript{96} Early scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as J. T. Milik, \textit{Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea} (trans. J. Strugnell; Naperville: Alec Allenson, 1959), 11, regarded Pesher Habakkuk as an autograph, but this assumption has since been refuted. See, e.g., Horgan, \textit{Pesharim}, 3-4. Lawrence H. Schiffman, \textit{Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran} (Philadelphia: JPS, 1994), 226, suggests that Pesher Habakkuk was composed around 84-63 BCE but attempts to depict the earlier history of the sect. Similarly, Hartmut Stegemann, \textit{On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus} (The Library of Qumran; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 131-132, maintains that Pesher Habakkuk provides key information about the Teacher of Righteousness and the founding of the community in response to the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty (150 BCE), but argues that it was actually written much later (54 BCE). See also the discussion of the perfect and imperfect forms in Pesher Habakkuk by Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the Habakkuk Pesher (1QpHab),” in \textit{Qumran Studies: New Approaches New Questions} (ed. Michael Thomas Davis and Brent A. Strawn; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 124-149. Stuckenbruck suggests that the time and concerns of the pesherist are distinct from those of the Teacher of Righteousness. The precise historical time frame of the text, however, remains difficult to determine since Pesher Habakkuk contains no real historical names. Moshe J. Bernstein, “Pesher Habakkuk,” in the \textit{Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls} (ed. Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam; New York: OUP, 2000), 649-650, discusses the complexities associated with dating the text but notes that the vast majority of scholars identify the Kittim as Romans and conclude that Pesher Habakkuk was written around the time that Pompey took Jerusalem (63 CE). Nevertheless, the inner-Jewish conflict that Pesher Habakkuk describes could refer to the early part of the Hasmonean era, rather than to the time of Alexander Jannaeus. Brownlee, \textit{Midrash Pesher}, 23, argues that the text could have been written earlier and predicted the Roman invasion of Palestine. In Brownlee’s view, the references to the Romans are sufficiently ambiguous to make an earlier date in the second century BCE possible.

\textsuperscript{97} The English citations of 1 QpHab follow Brownlee, \textit{Midrash Pesher}.

\textsuperscript{98} This reconstruction of the lemma – Hab 1:5 – presents the phrase “upon the nations” ( Heb. נביה) in the MT as “traitors” ( Heb. ותימא). A number of commentators suggest that “traitors” is then repeated in 1QpHab 2:3 and 2:5 in order to apply the lemma to three groups that oppose the Teacher of Righteousness. Jassen, \textit{Mediating the Divine}, 31, suggests that the lemma occurred in the \textit{Vorlage} that the pesherist used; cf. Brownlee, \textit{Midrash Pesher}, 54. For further discussion, see William H. Brownlee, \textit{The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran} (JBLMS 11; Philadelphia: SBL, 1959); Silberman, “Riddle,” 335-336.
2:2 the Lie, for (they did) not [. . .] the Righteous Teacher from the mouth of
2:3 God. And it concerns the trait[ors to] the new [covenant.]
2:4 faithful to the covenant of God [. . .]99 his holy name.
2:5 And thus (VACAT) the interpretation of the passage [concerns the trait]ors
2:6 at the latter
days. They are the ruthless [ones of the cove]nant100 who will not believe
2:7 when they hear all that is going to co[me up]on the last generation from the mouth of
2:8 the priest101 to whom God gave into [his heart discernme]nt to interpret102 all
2:9 the words of his servants the prophets, [whom] by their hand God enumerated
2:10 all that is going to come up[on . . .]103

The pesherist emphatically affirms the authority of the Teacher’s exegesis by describing
its divine origin. He indicates that the words of the Teacher came “from the mouth of
God” (1QpHab 2:2-3) and explains that he arrived at a correct understanding of the
scriptures through a divine revelatory process: God put understanding into his heart to
interpret (ךפוש), all the words of the prophets (1QpHab 2:8).104 Although the passage
does not define the exegetical method of the Teacher, it clearly portrays his interpretation
as one that originated from God.105

99 Possibly “and they profaned.”
100 This restoration (ןירא יפל בבל) was first proposed by Erik Sjöberg, “The Restoration of
Midrash Pesher, 56, prefers Sjöberg’s reconstruction to “the ruth[less of the nati]ons”
proposed by Isaac Rabinowitz, “The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll,”
JBL 69 (1950): 41, since there is nothing in the context of this passage to suggest that the third group is not
Jewish.
101 In this context, the “priest” refers to the Teacher. So Brownlee, Midrash Pesher, 57; Jassen,
Meditating the Divine, 32; Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis,” 134; Schiffman, Reclaiming, 225.
102 Although the infinitive construct תָּרִיע הַפּוּשָׁה can be translated simply as “to interpret,” Brownlee,
Midrash Pesher, 57, renders it more elaborately as “to give prophetic meaning.” He does so because this
verb is a cognate of the noun הפושׁה which, in his view, here refers to the “secret prophetic meaning which
only an inspired interpreter may expound” (57).
103 Possibly restore as “and up[on his congregation.]”
104 Here I am following the reconstruction of a number of scholars who present 1QpHab 2:8a as
דִּבְרֵי הַמֶּרֶץ. See, e.g., Brownlee, Midrash Pesher, 53; Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 30.
Rabinowitz, “Columns,” 33, supplies דִּבְרֵי rather than דִּבְרֵי, but the sense of the phrase remains the same.
For a discussion of this and other possible reconstructions, see Bilha Nitzan, Megillat Pesher Habakkuk
(Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1986), 152. Shemesh and Werman, “Halakah,” 108, similarly argue that
1QpHab 2:8-10 indicates that God gave the Teacher of Righteousness the “requisite tools to interpret the
words of the prophets”; cf. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 50.
105 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 351-352.
The description of the Teacher in 1QpHab 2:1-10 corresponds closely to the one in 1QpHab 7:1-5. In this latter passage, the pesherist again takes extra care in outlining the divine origin of his exclusive understanding of Habakkuk:

7:1 and God told Habakkuk to write the things that are going to come upon
7:2 upon (sic.)\textsuperscript{106} the last generation, but the fulfillment of the period (.bp'c) he did not make known to him (הרותי)
7:3 (VACAT) And when it says, “so that he can run who reads it”
7:4 its interpretation concerns the Righteous Teacher, to whom God made known (הרותי)
7:5a all the mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets.

Here the pesherist emphasizes the authority of the Teacher by juxtaposing his knowledge with that of the prophet Habakkuk. Whereas God spoke through Habakkuk, he did not cause him to know\textsuperscript{107} how the prophecy would be fulfilled at the end of time (דמצם הימים).\textsuperscript{108} By contrast, God \textit{did} make known (הרותי) the mysteries of such prophecies to the Teacher. What the prophet merely recorded as a mystery, then, God enabled the Teacher to decode and apply to the final generation.\textsuperscript{109} This description

\textsuperscript{106} The doubling of the preposition \(ל	ext{ל}\) at the end of line 1 and the beginning of line 2 appears to be a result of dittography.

\textsuperscript{107} 1QpHab 7:2 has the \textit{hiphil} form of רמות יד with the third masculine singular pronoun written defectively: \(רמות יד\). Compare this with the full orthography in 1QpHab 7:4 (רומת ההדיע).

\textsuperscript{108} A number of scholars interpret the phrase \(דמצם הימים\) as a reference to the final end of time. See, e.g., the translations in Geza Vermes, \textit{The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English} (England: Clays Ltd., 2004), 512, “when time would come to an end”; Florentino Garcia Martinez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition} (Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998), 1:17, “the consummation of the era”; Horgan, \textit{Pesharim}, 37, “the fulfillment of the end-time.” This meaning may suggest that 7:1-2 indicates that God did not reveal the timing of the end to the prophet Habakkuk. Brownlee, \textit{Midrash Pesher}, 110, argues that the phrase \(דמצם הימים\) in 1QpHab 7:2 should be translated “fullness of that time” because it indicates that Habakkuk only received a partial revelation of “the entire content to which the enigmatic words relate” (110). Accordingly, the mysteries of the prophecy and its true meaning were left for the Teacher to uncover; cf. Jassen, \textit{Mediating the Divine}, 348-349, who argues that the description of the knowledge of the Teacher must be understood “in opposition to the ... seemingly unintelligible nature of the prophetic pronouncements” (348).

\textsuperscript{109} The phrase “mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets” (רומת יד אחיו הנביאים) suggests that the message of the prophets in some way needed to be deciphered. Compare the use of the Aramaic \(רומת יד\) in Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 29, 30, 47; 4:6 to refer to mysteries that need interpretation or decoding (רומת יד: Dan 2:4-5; 4:9). The passage thus indicates that the inspired exegesis of the Teacher was essential to the proper understanding of the prophets. See Horgan, \textit{Pesharim}, 37-38, 237; Brownlee, \textit{Midrash Pesher}, 112-113; Jassen, \textit{Mediating the Divine}, 353. A number of scholars suggest that Near Eastern dream
demonstrates that the divinely inspired interpretation of the Teacher stands in direct continuity with ancient prophecy and is essential to understanding the earlier revelation correctly. Moreover, by portraying the exegesis of the Teacher as the fulfillment of Hab 2:2, the pesherist asserts that his scriptural interpretation itself represents the realization of the purposes of God. The description of the exegesis of the Teacher in 1QpHab 7:1-5 thus serves to highlight the legitimacy of his scriptural interpretation from a number of different vantage points.111

Besides validating the exegesis of the Teacher of Righteousness, the descriptions of his interpretive activities also serve to define the boundaries of the community he represents. 1QpHab indicates that acceptance to or exclusion from the community occurs on the basis of one’s response to the message of the Teacher and his predictions about the final age. For example, 1QpHab 2:1-10 identifies three groups of “traitors” (בנויים) who

interpretation provided the foundation of pesher exegesis; a pesherist could regard the biblical text as a mysterious source of information that required decoding even as mysterious dreams also required interpretation. See, e.g., Betz, Offenbarung, 77-78; Silberman, “Riddle,” 332-335; Finkel, “Pesher,” 357-370; Collins, “Prophecy and Fulfillment,” 303; Berrin, “Pesharim,” 123-126.

110 The verb “may run” (רוח) in 1QpHab 7:3 was the work of a different hand, even though this verb occurs in the citation of Hab 2:2 in 1QpHab 6:15. As Brownlee, Midrash Pesher, 111, notes, the addition changes the sense of צלצל from “for the sake of” to “in order that.” The meaning of צלצל in 1QpHab 7:3 also presents an interpretive challenge. Brownlee, Midrash Pesher, 108, notes that צלצל has often been read in the lemma (1QpHab 6:16; cf. Hab 2:2) as a reference to reading or interpreting quickly, but argues that the term refers to the running of a prophetic emissary who carries God’s message to others (e.g., 2 Sam 18:21-26; Jer 23:21). He suggests that 1 QpHab 7:3 indicates that the Teacher of Righteousness performs an interpretive task that resembles that of a prophetic messenger; he reads the message of God and, through his interpretation, carries it to others. Silberman, “Riddle,” 344-345, suggests the meaning “to shatter,” (figuratively “to interpret”) since b. Sandedrin 34a likens the shattering of a rock in Jer 23:29 to biblical interpretation. In Jer 23:29, the verb used is רכש but Silberman maintains that the same meaning has been applied to צלצל. Brownlee, Midrash Pesher, 111, suggests that the term צלצל may be intended as a wordplay on the term “mystery” (ר), the Teacher of Righteousness provides interpretations that divulge the mysterious meanings of the words of the prophets.

111 The use of the definite article with the participle צלצל in 1QpHab 6:16 and 7:3 may further underscore the privileged status of the Teacher by presenting him as the one and only interpreter of prophecy. Compare צלצל in the MT of Hab 2:2.
reject or become unfaithful to the message of the Teacher (1QpHab 2:1-2, 3-4, 6). If so, the pesher defines three stages of community formation in which people were delineated as outsiders to the community on the basis of their rejection of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness. By contrast, the pesherist characterizes the in-group by describing their fidelity to the scriptural interpretations of the Teacher: these “men of truth” observe the Law and “will not desert the service of truth” even when the final age seems to delay in coming (1QpHab 7:10-12).

George Brooke suggests that Pesher Habakkuk may have had a further role in defining the Qumran community. Since the Jewish scriptures were a common basis of authority for many Jews, Brooke suggests that “the pesharim . . . could have been used to encourage identification with the community and its supposed scripturally ordained history and circumstances.” He argues that “divinely inspired exegesis” could have had a role in “convincing the potential convert of the heavenly origin of the religious view of the world” that the community espoused. The scriptural interpretation of the Teacher provided a foundation for community members who could identify with the Jewish

---


113 Silberman, “Riddle,” 336: “The first group belongs to the days of the Moreh ha-Zedek; the second, to the period after the new covenant was entered into; the third, to the future traitors” (336); cf. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesharim*, 54-56; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 24.

114 Note also the description of the “men of truth” who observe the Law and do not “desert the service of truth” (1QpHab 7:10-12). Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 226, also notes that the wider context of Pesher Habakkuk outlines two main opponents of the Teacher: the Man of Lies (e.g., 1QpHab 2:1-2; 5:8-12) and the Wicked Priest (e.g., 1QpHab 11:6-8; 4QPs 1-10.iv.8). The Wicked Priest pursued and persecuted the Teacher whereas the Man of Lies seems to have disputed with him over religious interpretation and law.

115 Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 80-84, at 84.
scriptures as a source of authority and understand their participation in the community as part of their final fulfillment. In addition to demonstrating the divine origin of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher of Righteousness, then, the author of Pesher Habakkuk uses his exegesis to define the boundaries of the community and to provide scriptural warrant for its existence.

The Hodayot (1QHª)

Although the Hodayot contain what appear to be two independent literary units — the hymns of the Teacher (1QHª 10-17) and the hymns of the community (1QHª 4-9; 11:3-18; 15:29-36; 15:37-16:4; 18-26) — both parts of this composition frequently refer to the divine revelation that God bestowed upon the community. The hymns of the Teacher portray him as a conduit of divine revelation. As such, he receives knowledge (דעת), understanding (مشاركة), truth (אמת), and “wondrous mysteries” (רבי פלא), and mediates this knowledge and revelation to the elect. Similarly, the community hymns

116 Some earlier scholars attributed the entire composition of the Hodayot to the Teacher of Righteousness. See, especially, E. L. Sukenik, The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955), 39. By contrast, Svend Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran (ATDan 2; Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960), 316, argued that the hymns were not a literary unity. G. Jeremias, Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit (SUNT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963) and J. Becker, Das Heil Gottes: Heils- und Sündenbegriﬀe in den Qumrantexten und in Neuen Testament (SUNT 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964) identified a select group of hymns that they attributed to the Teacher of Righteousness because of their use of an individual and authoritative “I” and the author’s claim to mediate divine revelation. According to Jeremias, these claims to authority were similar to those found in the Pesharim and the Damascus Document. J. Licht, Megillat ha-Hodayot: Me-megillot midbar Yehudah (Jerusalem: Bialik, 1956), 24-26, however, maintained that the author of the “Teacher hymns” was a later leader of the sect who occupied the office of the Maskil or Mevaqqer.

117 See, e.g., “You have set me . . . as a foundation of truth and knowledge . . . like a knowledgeable mediator of secret wonders . . . to open the source of knowledge for all who understand” (1QHª 10:10-18); “You have lightened my face for your covenant . . . like perfect dawn you have revealed yourself to me with perfect light” (1QHª 12:6); “Through me you have enlightened the face of the Many . . . for you have shown me your wondrous mysteries” (1QHª 12:27); “You have established me for your covenant and I will cling to your truth . . . because you have taught me your truth, you have made me know your wonderful mysteries” (1QHª 15:19-26); and “from my youth you have shown yourself to me in intelligence of your judgment, and with certain truth you have supported me (1QHª 17:31-32).
contain frequent expressions of thanksgiving for the revelation that God gives to the community.\textsuperscript{118} Indeed, this theme permeates the \textit{Hodayot} to such an extent that it represents one of the most central concepts within the collection.\textsuperscript{119} Moreover, the descriptions of divine revelation in the \textit{Hodayot} relate closely to the presentation of scriptural interpretation in these hymns.

\textit{1QH}^a 12:5-29, the first unit in a hymn of the Teacher (\textit{1QH}^a 12:5-13:4), links the gift of divine revelation with the ability to interpret the Torah:\textsuperscript{120}

12:5 I give thanks, Lord, because you have enlightened my face for your covenant (בריתך) and
12:6 [...] I have looked for you. Like perfect dawn you have revealed yourself to me (מעילך) with perfect light. But they, your people [...]  
12:7 [...] they lure them, and mediators of deceit (מ意味ך רוחם) [mis]direct them, so that they come to ruin without perceiving it. For [they carry out]  
12:8 their deeds in folly. For I have been rejected by them, and they do not esteem me when you made yourself great through me; for they drive me from my land  
12:9 like a bird from its nest; all my friends and my acquaintances have been driven away from me, and rank me like a broken jug. But they are mediators of  
12:10 fraud (מרותך) and seers of deceit (מיאבך חס), they have plotted a devilish thing against me {...} to change your Law, which you engraved in my heart, for flattering teachings (בכתרך)  
12:11 for your people; they have denied the drink of knowledge to the thirsty, but for their thirst they have given them vinegar to drink, to consider  
12:12 their mistake, so they may act like fools in their feasts so they will be caught in their nets. But you, O God, abhor every plan of  
12:13 Belial and your counsel remains, and the plan of your heart persists endlessly. But they, hypocrites, plot intrigues of Belial,  
12:14 they search you with a double heart and are not firmly based in your truth. A root which produces poison and bitterness is in their thoughts,  
12:15 with stubbornness of heart they inquire, they search for you among the idols, place in front of themselves the stumbling-block of their iniquities, they go  
12:16 to search for you in the mouth of the prophets of fraud attracted by delusion. They speak to your people [with] stuttering lip and weird tongue  
12:17 to convert to folly all their deeds with deceit. For they have not chosen the path of your [heart] nor have they listened to your word. For they said  
12:18 of the vision of knowledge: It is not certain! And of the path of your heart: It is not

\textsuperscript{118} See also pages 68-69 below.  
\textsuperscript{119} Licht, \textit{Doctrine}, 89.  
\textsuperscript{120} English citations from \textit{1QH}^a, \textit{1QS}, and \textit{CD} follow the translation of Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, eds., \textit{The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition} (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998).
that! But you, O God, will answer them, judging them
with your power [according to] their idols and the abundance of their offences, so
that in their plans are caught those who deviate from your covenant.
At the judg[ment you will annihilate all the men of deception, seers of delusion will
no longer be found. For there is no folly in any of your acts,
and there is no deceit [in] the intentions of your heart. Those who are in harmony
with you, will stand in your presence always; those who walk on the path of
of your heart,
will be established permanently. [And I,] when I lean on you, I remain resolute
and rise above those who scorn me, and my hands succeed against all those who
mock me; for
they do not esteem me, even though you exhibit your power in me and reveal
yourself in me with your strength as perfect light.
You have not covered in disgrace the face of
all those sought by me, those who unite / together / for your covenant (ךִּבָּרָהְבָּה).
Those who walk on the path of your heart have listened to me, they have
aligned themselves before you
in the council of the holy ones. You will make their right triumph, and truth leading
to justice. You will not let them be misled by the hand of scoundrels
as they have schemed against them; instead you will put their fear into your people
and the scattering of all the peoples of the lands, to destroy, at the judgment, all
who violate your word. Through me you have enlightened the face of the Many,
you have increased them,
so that they are uncountable, for you have shown me your wondrous mysteries

The passage presents the privileged knowledge of the Teacher as the key to
understanding the scriptures and the will of God. 121 1QH 12:5-10 announces that God
has enlightened the Teacher by his covenant (1QH 12:5; cf. 12:24). 122 He
portrays himself as a privileged recipient of divine knowledge: God has enlightened his

121 Commenting on this hymn, Newsom, Self as Symbolic Space, 311-312, refers to “rival claims
to knowledge of the torah” (312), and suggests that the Qumran community created an “ideology of truth”
in which they privileged a certain “knowledge of God’s will as the key to reality” (311).
122 Vermes, Dead Sea Scrolls, 268, translates this phrase “by your covenant” but Mansoor,
Thanksgiving Hymns, suggests that the בִּבְרַתֹּהְבָּה in the phrase בִּבְרַתֹּהְבָּה could have the meaning “for the purpose of” so that the phrase means “so that he enters your covenant.” Julie A. Hughes, Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot (STDJ 59; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 106-107, suggests that 1QH 12:5 draws a parallel
between the experience of the speaker and the illumination of the face of Moses when he received the Law
on Sinai and therefore argues that “the theme of the poem is declared to be interpretation of Torah” (106-
107).
face (IQHa 12:5), appeared to him (IQHa 12:6 הפתעהה; cf. 12:23 ת"ע), and caused him to know wondrous mysteries (IQHa 12:27 פלאה). These descriptions of the divine knowledge of the Teacher correspond to and legitimate his status as an inspired interpreter of Mosaic law. Through his access to divine revelation, he becomes illuminated by the covenant (IQHa 12:5), and God engraves the Torah in his heart (IQHa 12:10).

The revelation that the Teacher possesses also serves to define his community over against other Jews. Through his access to divine revelation, he enables those who listen to him to align themselves with God (IQHa 12:24), gain access to eschatological salvation (IQHa 12:25), and receive illumination (IQHa 12:27).

---

123 The Hodayot use the verbal roots לְדָעָה and פֵּסָּה to describe revelatory experiences (לְדָעָה in IQHa 5:8-9; 9:21; 19:17; 20:32-34; פֵּסָּה in IQHa 12:6, 23; 17:31; 23:5-7). This parallels language of revelation found in the Hebrew Bible. See Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 368.


125 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 285, 368. For references to knowledge of and obedience to the Law elsewhere in the Hodayot, see, e.g., IQHa 6:10-15; 8:1-10; 10:28; 18:30. See also Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 69-70; Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 287.

126 Newsom, Self as Symbolic Space, 321-322, argues that the Hodayot present the teaching and revelation of the Teacher as eschatological salvation, and describe this salvation as fellowship with the “holy ones.” Mansoor, Thanksgiving Hymns, 127, suggests that the phrase לְדָעָה ולְפֵסָּה in IQHa 12:25 may refer to angels. Compare צאצא והדיש in IQHa 11:22. See also the description of the community in IQHa 14:13-14 and 19:12-14. Holm-Nielsen, Hodayot, 297, similarly argues that the hymns present the elect as recipients of eschatological salvation because of their acceptance of the revelation of God. According to Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran (SUNT 4; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966), 44-64, 78-88, the community saw its existence as a beginning stage of the end of time. In the intermediary time period, the faithful enjoyed the privilege of communion with the angels. See also G. W. E. Nickelsburg, Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism (HTS 56; Cambridge: HUP, 2006), 188-193. Emile Puech, “Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament,” in The Community of the Renewed Covenant (CJAS 10; The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls; ed. Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press), 1994, 250-251, concurs but emphasizes that the Qumran community regards itself as but a first step to a final end that will include a complete destruction and renewal.
The identity of the community thus rests upon their reception of the revelation of the Teacher. By contrast, other Jews fail to receive this knowledge because they look for it in the wrong place. They listen to mediators of deceit and fraud (1QHa 12:7; מְלַאכְתּוֹ בְּכָל; מְלַאכְתּוֹ רָמָה; cf. 10:31) who search for divine revelation through illegitimate means (1QHa 12:14-16), reject the "vision of knowledge" of the Teacher (1QHa 12:18), and deny people the "drink of knowledge" (1QHa 12:11). The passage further describes the deluded condition of the opponents of the Teacher by indicating that they produce illegitimate interpretations of the scriptures that pervert his divinely inspired exegesis (1QHa 12:10). These contrasting descriptions both show the superiority of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher over that of rival leaders and

127 The term מְלַאכְתּ derives from the root מָלַך in the Hebrew Bible and means "to interpret" or "to intercede" in the hiphil form. The hiphil participle מָלַךְ is used four times in the Hebrew Bible (Gen 42:23; Isa 43:27; 2 Chron 32:31; Job 33:23) and means "interpreter," or "mediator." Holm-Nielsen, Hodoyot, 35, suggests that מָלַךְ in the Hodoyot refers to an intermediary of either truth or error. Hughes, Scriptural Allusions, 107, uses the more neutral term "spokesmen" to translate מָלַך. Michael C. Douglas, "Power and Praise in the Hodoyot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1-18:4," (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1998), 264, takes the term to mean "mediator" and argues that it refers to someone with an official role as teacher of the Torah.

128 As Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 287, notes, the repetition of term רָמָה describes the attempts of the opponents to gain access to divine revelation (1QHa 12:14, 15, 16). They seek God with a double heart (1QHa 12:14), among idols (1QHa 12:15), and through false prophets (1QHa 12:16).

129 They exchange the Torah which God has engraven on his heart for "flattering teachings" (רָמָה). In 1QHa 10:15, 31, the expression "flattering teachings" or "smooth things" (רָמָה) occurs within the phrase "seekers of smooth things" (רָמָה רָפָאִים) and is used as a label that depicts those who propagate deceit (cf. CD 1:18; 4Q169 23 iii 10; 4Q169 3-4 i 2, 7; 3-4 ii 2, 4; 2-4 iii 3, 7). A number of scholars suggest that the expression "smooth things" (רָמָה) represents a pun on גָּלוֹת הרָמָה, a term that refers to the legal enactment of the Pharisees. See Joseph M. Baumgarten, Studies in Qumran Law (SJLA 24; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977), 32, n. 78; Albert Baumgarten, "The Name of the Pharisees," JBL 102 (1983): 420-422; Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 284-285; Schiffman, Reclaiming, 250; idem "The Pharisees and their Legal Traditions According to the Dead Sea Scrolls," DSD 8 (2001): 266, 277; James C. VanderKam, "Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law," in Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov (VTSup 94; ed. S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, and L. H. Schiffman; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 466. Others maintain that גָּלוֹת need not be taken as a description of Pharisaic interpretive activities and therefore argue that רָמָה may not refer to the Pharisees. See, e.g., John P. Meier, "Is There Halaka (the Noun) at Qumran," JBL 75 (1956): 92; Newsom, Self as Symbolic Space, 308-309.
serve to define the boundaries of his community with reference to this activity.\textsuperscript{130} Those who receive the revelation and Torah interpretation of the Teacher become part of the elect whereas those who listen to his rivals remain deceived.

The hymns of the community also portray divinely granted knowledge as a privilege of the entire community (e.g., 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 6:8-9, 12-13; 18:27-28; 19:12-17, 27-28; 20:13-14), and reinforce the elect status of the Qumran group by indicating that other humans cannot comprehend God apart from receiving this exclusive gift of knowledge (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 5:19-21; 18:2-9; 20:19, 33-34; 21:4-5). Although the community hymns do not explicitly identify the Jewish scriptures as the content of this knowledge, allusions to scripture permeate the \textit{Hodayot} to such an extent that they have been described as a “mosaic of the Scriptures.”\textsuperscript{131} 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 7:25-26b provides a particularly apt example of this type of intertextuality since it uses a scriptural allusion to reinforce the view that the community possesses a privileged ability to understand the will of God:\textsuperscript{132}

7:25 [vacant] But I know, by means of the understanding that comes from you (יִודְעָה בִּין) that it is not through the power of the flesh [that an individual may be righteous, nor] does the way of a

\textsuperscript{130} Similarly, in 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 10:3-19, the hymnist describes himself as a mediator of knowledge of wondrous mysteries (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 10:13 כתובות לעיני התה) who provides a foundation of truth and knowledge (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 10:10), and becomes an open source of knowledge for all who understand (1QH\textsuperscript{a} 10:18). By contrast, he depicts his opponents as “mediators of error” (כּוֹנֵן אֲנָפָיו) and “men of deceit” (כּוֹנֵן תַּכְיָא) who oppress the hymnist. As Newsom, \textit{Self as Symbolic Space}, 309-310, notes, 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 10:13-16 creates a series of binary opposites that show the outsiders of the community to be opponents of both the Teacher and his followers. The contrast therefore simultaneously reinforces the authoritative status of the Teacher and creates boundaries for the community.


\textsuperscript{132} My citations of Jer 10:23 and 1QH\textsuperscript{a} 7:25-26 here follow Newsom, \textit{Self as Symbolic Space}, 213. For further discussion of this scriptural allusion, see Hughes, \textit{Scriptural Allusions}, 71-72; Holm-Nielsen, \textit{Hodayot}, 230.
Compare this allusion with the scriptural passage itself:

I know, O LORD, that the way of a person does not belong to himself, nor does it belong to a man, as he walks, to direct his steps.
(Jer 10:23)

The hymnist alludes to Jer 10:23 but supplements this prophetic text with the confession that he possesses knowledge from God. He therefore applies Jer 10:23 to himself and, by implication, the members of the community and uses this scriptural passage to support his claim that God had destined them to become exclusive recipients of divine knowledge.

Newsom argues that the application of Jer 10:23 to the circumstances of the community resembles the relationship created between the original prophetic message and inspired interpretation in the pesharim. Furthermore, she suggests that the hymnist veils the reference to Jer 10:23 so that only the discerning reader would recognize the allusion. In this way, the hymnist “rewards the increasingly proficient reader with the evidence that he is indeed one who knows.” Similarly, Maxine Grossman argues that “from a sectarian perspective, the ability to understand a text – to really know what it is saying – would separate a sectarian from an outsider, and a higher-ranking sectarian from a new volunteer.” In this sense, the allusion to and exegesis of Jer 10:23 in 1QH* 7:15-

---

133 See also the similar expressions in 1QH* 6:12 and 9:19.
16b serve to divide insiders from outsiders, as well as to distinguish between initiates and higher-ranking members of the community.

Although references to the Jewish scriptures in the Hodayot are rarely overt, 1QHα 7:15-16 and 12:5-29 demonstrate that both the community and its Teacher were steeped in scriptural traditions. Moreover, even as the descriptions of the divine revelatory experiences of the Teacher support his claim to possess a privileged understanding of the Torah, so the interpretation of Jer 10:23 validates the community’s claim to possess a revelatory understanding of the will of God. In this sense, descriptions of divine revelation and scriptural interpretation in the Hodayot become mutually supportive. Together, these passages articulate the self-understanding of the members of the community: they represent those who possess a privileged knowledge of the Jewish scriptures and the will of God over against others who do not.

CD and 1QS

The description of scriptural interpretation in the Damascus Document (CD) also closely links exegetical activity with the origins of the community that it represents. Although the provenance and dating of CD is widely disputed, most scholars agree that the group responsible for its composition has strong links with the Qumran group.138 Regardless of the precise identity of the community behind the text, it provides us with

---

another example of how claims to inspired scriptural interpretation influenced the development of the self-understanding of a Second Temple Jewish group.\textsuperscript{139}

In the section of the \textit{Damascus Document} known as the Admonition (CD 2:14-6:11a), the covenanters twice associate the emergence of their community with Torah interpretation. In the first passage, CD 2:14-3:17, the speaker exhorts his audience to listen to him and announces that he will open their eyes so that they can see and understand the works of God (CD 2:14-15). He then proceeds with an account of world history that describes the failure of humanity to follow God (CD 2:17-3:1). Within this narrative, CD 3:2-3 presents Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as exceptional individuals who remain faithful to God’s precepts and covenant. They stand in contrast to the rest of Israel who reject God’s covenant and therefore experience exile to Babylon (CD 3:4-11). Immediately following this scathing account of Israel’s past infidelity, the text identifies a remnant who “remained steadfast in God’s precepts,” like the patriarchs before them:

\begin{quote}
3:12b But with those who remained steadfast in God’s precepts,
3:13 with those who were left from among them, God established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing to them the hidden matters \textsuperscript{140} in which all Israel had gone astray: His holy sabbaths and his glorious feasts, his just stipulations and his truthful paths, and
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{139} Maxine L. Grossman, \textit{Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study} (STDJ 45; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 37-40, takes a “new historiographical” approach to CD in which she attends to the development of the history and ideology of the covenant community over time, rather than focusing upon the events “behind the text” (39). This involves studying “ideological constructions rather than historical events” (39) and evokes a different set of questions that include the following: “what the covenanters thought about their own history, how they understood their role in the world and their own communal identity, and how their understanding of their texts may have changed over time” (40). For a similar perspective, see, e.g., Philip R. Davies, \textit{The Damascus Document: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document} (JSOTSup 25; Sheffield: SAP, 1983), 1-47; Albert Baumgarten, “The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document,” in \textit{The Damascus Document, A Centennial Discovery: Proceedings of the Third International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 4-8 February, 1998} (STDJ 34; ed. Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick; Boston: Brill, 2000), 1-15
the wishes of his will which
man must do in order to live by them. He disclosed (these
matters) to them and they dug a well of plentiful water;
and whoever spurns them shall not live.

By portraying the founding of the community as a type of post-exilic restoration, CD 2:14-3:17 shows the emergence of a faithful remnant to be a climax in the history of Israel. The passage also highlights the exclusivity of this restoration; like the patriarchs, the remnant remains steadfast in the precepts of God over against the rest of Israel. Accordingly, they alone become the true heirs of the patriarchs and the proper continuation of Israel. Moreover, an intrinsic part of their liberation from exile relates to their reception of a special revelation of the “hidden matters” (מהרהות) that enable them to interpret Torah correctly. Through the claim to have received this gift of knowledge, the covenanters validate their scriptural interpretation and link their elect identity to revelatory insight.

---

140 The references to “holy sabbaths” and “glorious feasts” suggests that the “hidden matters” relate to knowledge of calendrical cycles. See Grossman, *Reading for History*, 81; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 34.
141 Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 33; Grossman, *Reading for History*, 118.
142 Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 34.
143 Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel,” 33-37, suggests that CD 3:13-14 (cf. CD 1:4) describes the end of “old” Israel and the emergence of “new” Israel. He notes the double use of Israel in this passage: the term refers to the community through which God’s covenant becomes re-established (3:13-14) and to those who continue to go astray (3:14). Nevertheless, as Davies notes, the new group claims to receive divine revelation and a new founder so that it becomes “not so much an Israel recovered as an Israel reborn” (33). Davies argues that CD 7:10-21 implies that Jews outside the Damascus community stand in continuity with the “old” Israel who rejected the laws of God.
144 As Jonathan G. Campbell, *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20* (BZAW 228; New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995), 77, points out, לְמַעַרְחַת (Deut 29:28 but transforms the meaning of the biblical phrase. Deut 29:28 indicates that “the secret things (לְמַעַרְחַת) belong to the LORD our God” and that “the revealed things” (נְלַכֶּת) belong to Israel. By way of comparison, CD 3:13b-14 asserts that God has given the hidden things (לְמַעַרְחַת) to the covenanters as an exclusive gift; cf. Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 418-419.
145 Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 418-419, rightly argue that the divine revelation given to the community also involves their active participation in the study of Torah. CD 3:16 refers both to God’s disclosure of revelation and to the digging of a well of water, the latter of which symbolizes Torah study and interpretation (cf. CD 6:3-9). See also Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 35.
Another passage in the Admonition, CD 5:15b-6:11a, recounts essentially the same story as CD 2:14-3:17 and again emphasizes the central role that revelatory knowledge and Torah interpretation play in the genesis of the community. Here, as in CD 2:14-3:17, the text contrasts the Damascus community with the rest of Israel, and uses the metaphor of a well to describe the emergence of the chosen group:

5:15 For already in ancient times
5:16 God visited their deeds and his wrath flared up against their actions, for it is not an intelligent people (חכמ אבות));
5:17 they are a people bereft of counsel in that there is no intelligence in them (חכם כָּל זְכָרָה אַחַר מָצַאֵר אַחַר מָצַאֵר).
5:18 In ancient times there arose
5:19 Moses and Aaron, by the hand of the prince of lights, and Belial with his cunning, raised up Jannes and
5:20 his brother during the first deliverance of Israel. [space] [space]
5:21 And in the age of devastation of the land there arose those who shifted the boundary and caused Israel to go astray (טוּPAGE)
5:22 And the land became desolate, for they spoke of rebellion against God’s precepts (given) through the hand of Moses and also
6:1 of the holy anointed ones. They prophesied deceit in order to cause Israel to divert (ותשלם אל ישראל) from following
6:2 God. But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers [space]. And he raised from Aaron men of knowledge (בכורות) and from Israel
6:3 wise men (א../../../מקים), and caused them to listen (א..........מקים). And they dug a well: Num 21:18 “A well which the princes dug, which
6:4 the nobles of the people delved with the staff.” The well is the law. And those
6:5 who dig it [space] are
6:6 the converts of Israel (שֶׁבֶר צְרָאָם) who left the land of Judah and lived in
6:7 the land of Damascus,
6:8 all of whom God called princes, for they sought him and their renown has not been repudiated
6:9 in anyone’s mouth. [Space] And the staff is the interpreter of the law,146 of whom
6:10 Isaiah said: Isa 54:16 “He produces a tool for his labor.” [space] And the
6:11 nobles of the people are
6:12 those who came to dig the well with the staves that the sceptre decreed,
6:13 to walk in them throughout the whole age of wickedness, and without which
6:14 they will not obtain it, until there arises
6:15 he who teaches justice at the end of days.147 [space]

---

146 In Num 21:18, the term חכם refers to a sceptre but here to the “interpreter of the law.” For the post-biblical use of חכם to denote scribal authority and interpretive skills, see Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 60, n. 46. As Knibb, Qumran Community, 50, notes, חכם derives from the verbal root חכם which means “to decree” or “to prescribe.” The “staves” (תורבדים) that subsequent community members use to “dig the well” also plays on this meaning of חכם.

147 Although Davies, Damascus Document, 124, argues that “he who teaches justice” (וורוד צדק) refers to the Teacher of Righteousness who returns in the eschatological age, Jassen, Mediating the Divine,
The passage explains that Israel's lack of understanding incites the wrath of God against them (CD 5:16-17). In their gullibility, they follow leaders who prophesy deceitfully and incite rebellion against the precepts of Moses and the prophets (CD 5:21-6:1). To remedy the lack of perception that led to the Babylonian exile and desolation of the land, God raises up men of wisdom and understanding who, with the assistance of the "Interpreter of the Torah," restore Israel through their scriptural interpretation (cf. CD 6:14). The founders of the Damascus community thus stand in direct contrast to those who formerly deceived Israel, as the repeated use of " Shibbe yisra’el (who interpret the scriptures correctly)." In this way, the passage presents

148 As Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 46, notes CD 5:16 alludes to Isa 27:11 and CD 5:17 alludes to Deut 32:28 to characterize former Israel as a people who were incapable of understanding God.


150 Fishbane, "Scribalism," 453, rightly notes that the well in this passage represents the interpretations of the Torah that God had opened up for the community. Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 61-62, explains that the text portrays the Interpreter as the instrument with which the community opens the Torah. According to Fraade, this suggests that the Interpreter prescribed the rules by which the community could open the well so that both the founders and later community members could "dig the well" (i.e., interpret the Torah; CD 6:3, 9) "according to the interpretation of the Torah" (כמשר הדורין) that he had introduced (cf. CD 4:8; 6:14).

151 Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 13, suggests that the phrase Shibbe yisra’el (who interpret the scriptures correctly) represents a shortened version of Shibbe yisra’el from Isa 59:20. If so, the emphasis would be upon their turning from the impiety of the rest of Israel. As Grossman, *Reading for
“proper covenantal knowledge” as the key to redemption, and relates this knowledge to the exegetical activity of the elect community, which represents renewed Israel.

The Community Rule (1QS), a text that outlines the way of life and beliefs of the Qumran community, also presents the proper interpretation of the scriptures as a central identifying characteristic of the group. In the opening chapter of this text, we read that those who enter the community “refine their knowledge in the truth of God’s decrees” (1QS 1:12) and “establish a covenant before God in order to carry out all that he commanded” (1QS 1:16-17). This statement suggests that the community originated with the express purpose of acquiring knowledge about how to be faithful to the commands of God. 1QS 5:7b-11 further develops this theme by showing compliance with the correct interpretation of the Torah to be a prerequisite to entrance to the community:

5:7b Whoever enters the council of the Community
5:8 enters the covenant of God in the presence of all who freely volunteer. He shall swear with a binding oath to revert (ָשׁוּם) to the Law of Moses, according to all he commanded, with whole
5:9 heart and whole soul, in compliance with all that has been revealed (ָנֵבּו לֵב) to the sons of Zadok, the priests who keep the covenant and interpret his will and to the multitude of the men of their covenant
5:10 who freely volunteer together for his truth and to walk according to his will. He should swear by the covenant to be separated from all the men of injustice who walk
5:11 along the path of wickedness. For they are not included in his covenant since they have neither sought nor examined his decrees in order to know the hidden matters (הנניא) in which they err
5:12 by their own fault and because they treated the revealed matters (הנניא) with disrespect; this is why wrath will rise up for judgment in order to effect revenge by the curses of the covenant, in order to administer fierce punishments for everlasting annihilation without there being any remnant.

The individual who wishes to enter the community must commit himself to return to the Torah by complying with the revelation that the priestly leadership and the community as

History, 181-182, explains, CD 6:1-11a portrays as those who turn away from the sin of the rest of Israel and toward the will of God and correct Torah interpretation.

Grossman, Reading for History, 124-126.
a whole possesses. This description both underscores the privileged knowledge of the entire group, and demonstrates the vital relationship between joining the community and gaining access to the correct interpretation of the scriptures (cf. 1QS 1:7-9; 8:14-16; 9:17-19). The passage presents this knowledge as a revelation (的知识) that the community obtains through the study of the Torah, on the one hand, but as something hidden (的知识) from outsiders who do not search the decrees of God, on the other.

1QS 5:7b-13 thus defines the elect status of the community in terms of its exclusive knowledge and capacity to interpret the Torah, and uses this description as the basis for contrasting them with other Jews.

1QS 8:11-16a draws a similar link between the identity of the Qumran community and its collective interpretation of the scriptures, and describes this activity as the end-time realization of prophecy:

8:11b And every matter hidden (knowledge) from Israel but which has been found out by
8:12 the Interpreter (the Interpret of the Torah), he should not keep hidden (的知识) from them for fear of a spirit of desertion. And when these have become / a community / in Israel

---

153 As Fraade, "Interpretive Authority," 53, points out, 1QS 5:8-10 indicates that the new member commits himself to the divine revelation that has been disclosed to the priestly leaders as well as to the community as a whole. He argues that the passage portrays entrance to the community as tantamount to engaging in the study and practice of its "esoteric" Torah (cf. 1QS 6:13-15), and maintains that the correct knowledge and practice of the Torah were revealed to the entire community through their ongoing study and interpretation. Similarly, P. Wernberg-Moller, The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction (STDJ 1; Leiden: Brill, 1957), 95, suggests that in 1QS 5:9 refers to the particular interpretations that are revealed to the community through their Torah study. See, also, 1QS 6:6-8, a passage that describes the responsibility of the entire community to study the Torah continually (cf. CD 13:2-3).

154 In other words, what is hidden from outsiders is revealed exclusively to the community. See Lawrence H. Schiffman, The Halakhah at Qumran (SJLA 16; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 24; cf. Wernberg-Moller, Manual, 95; Fishbane, "Scribalism," 449. As Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 334-336, notes, 1QS 5 envisions two forms of nigleh, one referring to the exclusive understanding of the community (5:8-9) and the other referring to the Torah itself which all Israel possesses (1QS 5:10-11). He argues that the key to understanding 1QS 5:8-11 lies in recognizing these two different uses of nigleh.

155 Wernberg-Moller, Manual, 89, rightly argues that Torah study represents the primary activity of the community.
8:13 in compliance with these arrangements / they are to be segregated from within the dwelling of the men of sin to walk to the desert in order to open there His path.

8:14 As it is written (Isa 40:3) “In the desert, prepare the way of *****, straighten in the steppe a roadway for our God.”

8:15 This is the study (מדרש) of the law which he commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, ( Memories תקף ות uy). [Blank]

8:16a and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit (כאמר נני הנביאים ברוח קדוש). [Blank]

Here the text attempts to show the legitimacy of the exegesis of the Qumran community in at least three ways. First, by indicating that the knowledge of the Interpreter was hidden (ה𩾇חר) from the rest of Israel, but disclosed to the community, 1QS 8:11 highlights that only the community possesses the knowledge necessary to interpret the scriptures. Second, the passage asserts the legitimacy of the ongoing interpretive activity of the group by portraying it as a continuation of the periodic revelation that began with the Moses and the prophets. Third, by representing the scriptural interpretation of the entire community as the fulfillment of Isa 40:3, 1QS 8:14-15 gives their exegetical activity prophetic sanction and shows it to be the outcome of God’s pre-ordained plan. These descriptions of the privileged knowledge and scriptural interpretation of the community thus seek to demonstrate the authoritative status of their exegetical activity and present it as the essential key to the proper observance of the Torah.

Summary

This brief overview of some key texts from the Qumran literature draws attention to the various ways that this community attempted to demonstrate the authoritative status

---

156 Jassen, Mediating the Divine, 334-339. Since in 1QS 9:13, the Maskil replaces the prophets as the recipient of periodic revelation, we can infer that the study of the law in 1QS 8:15 represents a continuation of the periodic revelatory activity of the prophets. Compare 1QS 9:13 – “He (the Maskil) should fulfill the will of God in compliance with all revelation for every period; he should acquire all the wisdom that has been gained according to the periods” – with 1QS 8:15-16.

of its scriptural interpretation and to define itself with reference to this exegetical activity. Various claims to possess divine revelation or a special insight from God point up the legitimacy of the scriptural interpretation of the community and, in turn, function as a means of distinguishing between insiders and outsiders. Moreover, by linking the origins of the community to the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, the group could provide scriptural justification for its existence. This claim to continuity with the Jewish scriptures was also closely linked with the claim that they possessed an end-time revelation of the correct meaning of the scriptures.

1.5 Conclusion

In the first part of this chapter, I offered a brief survey of texts that provide evidence of the emergence of inspired exegesis as a mode of revelation during the Second Temple period. In the second part, I explored how certain Jewish interpreters claimed to possess this inspired understanding of the Jewish scriptures and used such claims to present their groups as the elect of Israel over against other Jews. Although they were expressed in diverse ways, these self-defining strategies often included the following characteristics: 1) the claim to possess a privileged knowledge or ability that enabled an interpreter or group to understand the scriptures correctly (e.g., Jubilees; Daniel; 1QH<sup>a</sup>; 1QpHab; CD; 1QS); 2) the claim to possess direct continuity with the revelation of the ancient prophets or patriarchs (e.g., Daniel 9; 1QpHab 7; CD 2-3); 3) the presentation of this special knowledge as an eschatological gift and end-time fulfillment of the scriptures (1Enoch 85-90; 93; 1QS 8); 4) the presentation of the origins of or entrance to the community as the adoption of this knowledge and correct scriptural interpretation (e.g.,
CD 5-6; 1QS 5, 8; 1QHª 12-13); and 5) the use of the claim to the correct understanding of the scriptures to differentiate between insiders and outsiders to the community, or to present the in-group as true Israel (e.g., Daniel 11-12; 1 Enoch 85-90; 93; CD 2-3; 5-6; 1QS 5, 8; 1QHª 7, 12-13). In these various ways, descriptions of authoritative exegesis provided early Jewish groups with a means of articulating community identity.

In the chapters that follow, I will explore the use of similar strategies in the writings of Luke and Justin. In chapter two, I will compare their attempts to demonstrate that Christ-believers possess an inspired ability to understand the Jewish scriptures and to use this claim to define the boundaries of the Christ-believing community. Here I will also evaluate their respective configurations of the continuity between the revelation of ancient prophecy and the inspired exegesis of these sacred texts by Christ-believers.

Subsequently, in chapter four, I will compare and contrast their depictions of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as an eschatological gift that fulfills scriptural promises, and consider how this type of claim provides scriptural justification for their respective distinctions between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community. Finally, in chapter five, I will discuss the differing ways that Luke and Justin appropriate the Jewish scriptures as part of an attempt to present members of their group as the true heirs of the heritage and scriptural promises of Israel.
Chapter Two:

Exegesis and Community Identity in the Writings of Luke and Justin

2.1 Introduction

Even as some early Jewish exegetes mapped the boundaries for their groups by asserting that they had access to special knowledge or a divine revelation of the true meaning of the Jewish scriptures, so the Jesus movement emerged as an early Palestinian Jewish sect that also laid claim to these sacred texts by asserting that it possessed an authoritative ability to interpret them. Over time, however, this group came to be comprised of both Jews and non-Jews. Despite this shift in ethnic composition, the community continued to present scriptural exegesis as the special province of Christ-believers. The writings of Luke and Justin Martyr serve as important examples of how this early Christian tradition took form. As noted in the introduction, a number of studies have examined Justin’s reinterpretation of the Jewish scriptures for the non-Jewish Christian church.  


80
LXX as a means of presenting the events that he narrates as the fulfillment of ancient prophecy.\(^2\) Even more significant to my study, however, is their common attempt to appropriate the Jewish scriptures for Christ-believers by conferring a special authority upon their scriptural interpretation.\(^3\) Like a number of early Jewish authors, Luke and Justin present the exegesis of their group as divinely inspired revelation and use this type of claim to show that the Christ-believing community held a privileged status in relation to the Jewish scriptures.

In this chapter, I will first provide an analysis of this common self-defining strategy in the writings of Luke and Justin. To do so, I will compare the following aspects of their representations of scriptural interpretation: 1) their portrayal of the exegesis of Christ-believers as an outcome of a divine revelatory experience and of instruction from the risen Christ, and 2) their depiction of the connection between this inspired interpretation and entrance to the Christ-believing community. Subsequently, I will point out some of the differences between the way that Luke and Justin attempt to demonstrate the authoritative status of the exegesis of Christ-believers and consider the

---


\(^3\) By describing the exegesis of Christ-believers in this way, I am borrowing from Hindy Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379-410, who uses this type of terminology to describe the way that different early Jewish interpreters present their own writings and the scriptural interpretation therein as authoritative.
impact that these differences have upon their respective descriptions of the knowledge of the Christ-believing community.

Although scholars have long observed that the writings of Luke and Justin bear significant similarities, determining the precise genealogical relationship between their works remains elusive. Consequently, I will not here attempt to determine the specific literary relationship between Luke and Justin. Instead, I will treat them as “independent theologians” who sometimes use parallel Jesus traditions but develop these sources in both similar and disparate ways. Whereas their similarities suggest that Luke and Justin may have been part of the same “theological movement,” as Overbeck, O’Neill, and Hyldahl have argued, the differences between them help to demonstrate the diversity of theological viewpoints among even proto-orthodox Christian groups of this era.


6 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 432.

7 For further discussion, see pages 12-15 of the introduction. Although Overbeck and O’Neill share similar views, F. Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg,” *ZWT* 15 (1872), 305-349, offers a more nuanced position than that of O’Neill. Although he holds that the basic views of Acts and Justin are comparable, he recognizes and discusses notable distinctions between them, especially as these relate to Justin’s development of the relationship between Christian theology and philosophical ideas, Logos theology, and a more hostile attitude toward Jews. See also Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialogue Justins* (Acta Theologica Danica IX; Copenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966), 261-272.
2.2 A Common Emphasis: Scriptural Interpretation and the Christian Message

Both Luke and Justin present scriptural interpretation as a vital part of their own message, as well as the message of Jesus and his followers. Luke expresses this emphasis in two important ways. First, within his account, he frequently presents scriptural exegesis as an essential element of the proclamation of Jesus and Christ-believers. The inaugural sermons of Jesus, Peter, and Paul serve as particularly important examples of this emphasis because they function as paradigmatic scenes that exemplify what occurred on other occasions where the details are not included. As such, they demonstrate the central role that the scriptures play in the message of Christ and Christ-believers. In Luke 4:16-20, Jesus reads and interprets Isa 61:1-2 and Isa 58:6b in a synagogue setting on the Sabbath. That Luke presents the reading and interpretation of scripture as the focal point of such an inaugural event suggests its centrality to the whole ministry of Jesus. Similarly, the first sermons of Peter and Paul contain lengthy

---


9 Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory & Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity* (ASNU 22; Livonia: Dove, 1961), 226, suggests that the synagogue sermon in Nazareth demonstrates the way in which “Jesus began to expound the Scriptures during the period of his earthly ministry” (226) and maintains that Luke 4:16-30 gives a programmatic and paradigmatic description of the work of Jesus. Furthermore, Luke indicates that this type of scriptural reading and teaching was customary for Jesus: ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγινώσκων (Luke 4:16).


Whether Luke regards the synagogue as a public institution or a more private voluntary association, Sabbath teaching in this type of context would typically include the reading and interpretation of the scriptures. This is how Luke elsewhere presents the activities of the synagogue (e.g., Acts 9; 13; 18). For further discussion of evidence for scriptural study in first-century synagogues, see Anders Runesson, *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Sourcebook* (Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 72; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 208-254.

Second, Luke opens his gospel by likening it to an “account of the events that have been fulfilled among us” (Luke 1:1) and as a narrative of the events which were handed down by “eyewitnesses and servants of the word” (Luke 1:2). These introductory statements have the effect of presenting the narrative that follows as a type of scriptural exposition; they indicate that it contains an account that explains how the Jewish scriptures have been realized through recent events. By beginning his story in this way, Luke presents his own writings as an ongoing expression of the exegetical tradition that began with Christ and was passed down to the first disciples.12 Even as Luke reports several episodes in which Jesus and the apostles proclaim the fulfillment of the scriptures, so he himself narrates the story of how these sacred texts have been fulfilled.

Like Luke, Justin portrays the Jewish scriptures as central to the proclamation of Christ-believers. This emphasis takes a slightly different form in the works of Justin,
however, since Luke and Justin write in different genres. Luke narrates the first-century story of Jesus and the birth of the Jesus movement,\(^\text{13}\) whereas the writings of Justin take the literary form of an apologetic address to the Roman Emperor Antonius Pius (138-160 CE)\(^\text{14}\) and, in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a debate with a Jewish refugee of the Bar

---


\(^{14}\) In his first *Apology*, Justin presents a fictional address to members of the imperial court: the Roman emperor Antoninus Pius, his son Marcus Aurelius (Verissimus), and the philosopher Lucius. Some past scholars assumed that this document was read by the imperial court. See, e.g., Aimé Puech, *Les apologistes grecs du Ier siècle de notre ère* (Paris: Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1912), 4-5; Arnold Ehrhardt, “Justin Martyr’s Two Apologies,” *JEH* 4 (1953): 5; P. Keresztes, “The Literary Genre of Justin’s First Apology,” *VC* 19 (1965): 109. Others have argued convincingly that the *Apologies* are a fictitious literary creation. See Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 82-84; cf. Charles Munier, *Saint Justin. Apologie pour les chrétiens: Édition et traduction* (Paradosis 39; Fribourg: L’Université de Fribourg, 1995), 182. Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 82, suggests that the opening appeal to the emperor in *1 Apology* was used to ensure that the work would receive a sympathetic hearing by the Roman public. P. Lorraine Buck, “Justin Martyr’s Apologies: Their Number, Destination, and Form,” *JTS* 54 (2003), 56-59, has more recently argued that the form and content of this address had an “inappropriate and disparaging” tone, which would have served as a fictional challenge to emperors. She argues that Justin was presenting himself in the role of a Greek philosopher who exercised *parrhesia*, the traditional right to “instruct and reprove rulers.” Others have questioned the usefulness of classifying Justin’s work as *apologia*. See, e.g., Laura Nasarella “Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic,” *HTR* 98 (2005): 283-314, who argues that the category of “second sophistic” may be a better model for understanding Justin than the category of apologist; cf. Rebecca Lyman, “Justin and Hellenism: Some Postcolonial Perspectives,” in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (ed. Sara Parvis and Paul Foster; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 162-168.

Sarah Parvis, “Justin Martyr and the Apologetic Tradition,” in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds*, 115-116, argues that, rather than doing away with the category, the tradition needs to be understood differently. She suggests that Justin, in essence, invented the genre of *apologia* in its classical form. For further discussion, see Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, and Christopher Rowland, “Introduction” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland, New York: OUP, 1999), 1-13; cf. chapter three, footnote 1, page 130.
Kokhba war (135 CE). Despite these differences, in a manner not unlike Luke, Justin presents the Jewish scriptures as an essential part of the message of Christ-believers and casts himself in the role of a herald of the gospel who perpetuates this exegetical tradition. Moreover, as in the prologue to Luke-Acts, Justin draws an explicit link between the written traditions about Jesus and the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures.

Justin gives privilege of place to scriptural interpretation in both *I Apology* and the *Dialogue*. In *I Apology* 23.1, for example, he indicates that his message comes from both the prophets and Christ, and explains that the scriptures will form the basis for his defense:

To make this [the uniqueness of the incarnation and the work of Christ] clear to you, we shall present the following arguments to prove that whatever statements we make, because we learned from Christ and the prophets who preceded him, are alone true,

---

15 Justin patterns the *Dialogue* after the form of a Socratic dialogue. Although there is no way to determine for certain whether the *Dialogue* reflects an authentic debate, Justin certainly shapes and restricts the role of Trypho in his discourse so that often he functions as little more than a 'straw man' who asks leading questions that serve Justin's apologetic purposes. So Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 90; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 106. Graham N. Stanton, “Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho: Group Boundaries, ‘Prosylytes’ and ‘God-fearers’” in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Judaism and Christianity* (ed. Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa; Cambridge: CUP, 1998), 263, concurs that Trypho often functions as “little more than a puppet” but notes that many of the arguments between Justin and Trypho occur in other writings from that period. This suggests to Stanton that the issues raised in the *Dialogue* were not fabricated by Justin. There is considerable debate surrounding the issue of whether the *Dialogue* represents a genuine dialogue between Justin and Trypho. Some suggest that an actual debate took place around 135 CE which was recorded but later revised and expanded. See, e.g., E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, (1885-1924), 2:375, 555-560; B. J. Kidd, *History of the Church* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1922) 1:90; and O. Zöckler, *Geschichte des Apologie der Christentums* (Gütersloh, 1907), 44. Others, such as Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 91-95; Niels Hyl Dahl, “Tryphon and Tarphon,” ST (1956): 77-88; and L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), 24-25, oppose this view. Both Tessa Rajak, “Talking at Trypho,” 73, and Hirshman, *Rivalry*, 34-41, maintain that the tone of the *Dialogue* is so vitriolic that a true exchange would have been impossible. For a survey of the scholarly debate surrounding the origins of the *Dialogue*, see Timothy J. Horner, “Listening to Trypho”: *Justin Martyr’s Dialogue Reconsidered* (CBET 28; Paris: Leuven, 2001), 16-38. For an overview of scholarly theories regarding the intended audience of the *Dialogue*, see the recent discussion in Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Edition Critique, Traduction, Commentaire* (Paradiso 47/1; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2005), 1:129-166.

16 E.g., *I Apol.* 33.1; 34.1; 35.1; 40.1; 45.1; 47.1; 48.1, 4; 49.6; 50.1; 51.6, 8; 52.7; 59.1; 60.8; *Dial.* 22.1; 39.4; 56.6; 62.4; 85.7; 86.1; 87.3; 139.3.

17 Compare, for example, Luke 1:1-2 with *Dial.* 101.3; 102.5; 104.1-2; 105.1-6; 106.1-4. See also Hyl Dahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 267-268.
and are older than all writers, and that we should be believed not because we speak
the same things as the writers, but because we speak the truth.
(1 Apol. 23.1)

Throughout 1 Apology, moreover, Justin exhorts his readers to recognize the truth of the
Jewish scriptures by listening to his explanation of how Christ fulfilled them, and he
repeatedly cites and interprets scriptural prophecy in an attempt to prove the veracity of
the story and message of Christ (see especially 1 Apology 31-53). According to Justin,
Christ-believers do not trust in statements without proof but in events that were foretold
before they happened (1 Apol. 30.1). In this way, Justin presents the Jewish scriptures as
predictions which authenticate the story of Jesus and the birth of the Christ-believing
community.

Not surprisingly, this emphasis upon the scriptures is still more pointed in the
Dialogue, where Justin has Trypho describe the entire discourse as a “study of the
scriptures” (ἐξετάζοντες αὐτοὺς τοὺς λόγους; Dial. 142.1).18 As Philip Bobichon
observes, the Dialogue is, in essence, an exegetical exposition of the scriptures that takes
a dialogical format.19 After the prologue of the Dialogue, Justin launches a sustained
exegetical discussion in the attempt to present Christ as the New Law (Dialogue 10-47)
and Messiah (Dialogue 48-108), and to depict Christ-believers as true Israel (Dialogue
109-142). He maintains that he bases his argument “on the scriptures and facts” (Dial.
28.2), and sees his participation in this type of exegetical debate as a God-given
responsibility and stewardship:

18 In the Dialogue, Justin uses both the terms λόγος and γράφη to refer to the Jewish scriptures.
For this use of λόγος, see, e.g., Dial. 14.3; 25.7; 30.2; 31.2, 7; 32.6; 34.3; 37.3; 38.2; 49.8; 50.2; 51.1; 55.2;
56.3, 4; 60.5; 62.1, 3; 62.4; 63.5; 64.4; 67.7; 69.4; 73.1; 77.4; 79.3; 85.6, 8; 86.3; 87.2, 3; 92.5, 6; 93.3;
102.4; 110.3; 114.1; 117.4; 122.1; 126.6; 129.1, 2; 130.1; 131.1; 137.1; 141.2.
19 Bobichon, Justin Martyr, 1:126-127.
One must therefore speak in the hope that his words will, somehow, fall upon good ground. For at his coming, my mighty and powerful Lord will demand his property from all, and will not denounce his steward when he realizes that, because the steward knows that his Lord is mighty and will come again to require the return of his possession, he has entrusted it to every bank, and has not, for any cause whatsoever, dug up the earth and hidden it therein. (Dial. 125.1-2; cf. Matt 13:3-8; 25:18-27)

By alluding to the synoptic gospels’ parable of the sower and Matthew’s parable of the talents in this passage, Justin represents his exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as a message analogous with the earlier proclamation of Jesus and his followers. Even as they first proclaimed the true meaning of the scriptures (see, e.g., 1 Apol. 49.5; 50.12; Dial. 53.5; 76.6), so Justin acts as an heir and steward of this exegetical tradition.20

In sum, both Luke and Justin present the exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as a core element of the message of Christ and Christ-believers, and their own writings as an extension of this interpretative activity. Although the other synoptic gospels affirm that Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, Luke more pointedly presents scriptural exposition as a central part of the message of Jesus and his followers.21 Justin writes in a different genre, and draws upon a wider variety of sources and different proof texts in his representation of the exegesis of Christ-believers.22 Nevertheless, like Luke, he presents scriptural interpretation as a central activity of the Christ-believing community.

20 Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 11-13, 256.
22 Both authors appear to draw upon other sources in their compositions. Luke implies that he has used sources that include eyewitness accounts of the events that he narrates (Luke 1:1-4). Justin appears to use the synoptic gospels and other sources in his writings; see also pages 4-8 of the introduction. Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 432, notes that Luke and Justin cite and expound notably different passages from the Jewish scriptures, even though they have a common emphasis upon the transmission of scriptural interpretation in their writings.
2.3 Authoritative Instruction and Revelatory Illumination

Luke

The most notable similarities between the accounts of Luke and Justin occur in their respective reports of the post-resurrection teachings of the risen Christ. Their explanations of these events have common peculiarities which are not found in other NT and early second-century Christian writings.²³ That other authors do not describe these post-resurrection episodes in the same way makes the correspondence between Luke and Justin all the more significant.²⁴ Both authors indicate that the risen Christ provided an explanation of how he had fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, and both indicate that this was part of his earlier message to them.²⁵ In these accounts, moreover, Luke and Justin each explain how Christ-believers came to possess an inspired interpretation of the Jewish

²³ These similarities between their records of the passion predictions and post-resurrection teachings of Christ (Luke 9:45; 18:31-32; 24:13-53; Acts 1:1-11; 1 Apol. 50.12; Dial. 53.5; 76.6; 106.1), in particular, lead Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 11-13, 256, and Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 284-287, to conclude that Justin probably knew and depended on Lukan traditions, either directly or indirectly.

²⁴ Compare the commissioning of the twelve in the *Epistle of the Apostles* 30 (cf. ch. 19): “But he said unto us: Go and preach unto the twelve tribes, and preach also unto the heathen, and to all the land of Israel from the east to the west and from the south unto the north, and many shall believe on <me> the Son of God... Go and preach the mercifulness of my Father, and that which he hath done through me will I myself do through you, for I am in you, and I will give you my peace, and I will give you a power of my spirit, that ye may prophesy to them unto life eternal.” Although this text indicates that the apostles would teach Paul about how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures (see ch. 31), it does not refer to scriptural interpretation in its account of the commissioning of the twelve. See also the account of this commissioning in the *Kerygma Petrou*: “Accordingly, in the Preaching of Peter, the Lord says to the disciples after the resurrection, ‘I have chosen you twelve disciples, judging you worthy of me,’ whom the Lord wished to be apostles, having judged them faithful, sending them into the world to the men on the earth, that they may know that there is one God, showing clearly what would take place by the faith of Christ; that they who heard and believed should be saved; and that those who believed not, after having heard, should bear witness” (Strom. VI:6, Clement of Alexandria). Although fragments of the *Kerygma Petrou* refer to the scriptural interpretation of the apostles (Strom. XV:128), they do not associate the exegesis of the apostles with their commissioning by Christ nor do they present it as the outcome of a revelation from the risen Christ. Note also that no mention of scriptural interpretation occurs in the description of the commissioning of the apostles in the *Apology of Aristides* 2 or in the descriptions of the mission of the apostles in *The Shepherd of Hermes* (X:17.1-4; 25.2).

scriptures, and they use similar strategies to portray this exegesis as authoritative.

For Luke, the process by which the first disciples arrive at a correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures involves two important prerequisites: the instruction of the risen Christ and divine revelation. In Luke 24:25-27 and 24:46-47, Jesus explains how the scriptures foretell his death and resurrection, and the inclusion of the nations. By providing this explanation, he in essence teaches the disciples how to read the Jewish scriptures correctly:

Then he said to them, “Oh, how foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have declared! Was it not necessary that the Messiah should suffer these things and then enter into his glory?” Then beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures. (Luke 24:25-27)

Then he said to them, “These are my words that I spoke to you while I was still with you — that everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled.” Then he opened their minds to understand the scriptures, and said to them: “Thus it is written, that the Messiah is to suffer and to rise from the dead on the third day and that repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things. And see, I am sending upon you what my Father promised; so stay here in the city until you have been clothed with power (δύναμις) from on high.” (Luke 24:44-49)

These passages have a uniquely Lukan flavor. Whereas Matthew has Jesus commission the eleven to make disciples of all nations by teaching them to observe all that he had commanded them (Matt 28:19-20), and the longer secondary ending of Mark has Jesus indicate that the disciples “proclaimed the good news everywhere” after the ascension of Jesus (Mark 16:19-20), the Lukan Jesus interprets the scriptures for the disciples (Luke 24:25-27)\(^\text{26}\) and charges them with the mission of perpetuating this message (Luke 24:44-

\(^{26}\) Luke does not have Jesus cite a particular passage from the Jewish scriptures in Luke 24:25-27, 44-47, but refers to the necessity of his fulfillment of the law of Moses, the prophets, and the Psalms: in other words, the totality of scripture. The particularly Lukan character of these passages has long been noted, and the risen Christ’s exposition of the mystery of the passion in light of his fulfillment of the Jewish
Luke does not simply indicate that the disciples recall certain scriptural passages and from this perceive how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures. Rather, he carefully reports that the risen Christ divulged the true meaning of the scriptures directly to the disciples and, in so doing, demonstrates the authoritative origin of their exegesis.


In addition to demonstrating the need for this initial revelatory experience of the eleven, Luke sometimes indicates that other Christ-believers also require special revelation to understand the Jewish scriptures. For example, in the scene where the Lukan Jesus explains the Jewish scriptures to the two disciples on the road to Emmaus (Luke 24:25-27), Luke indicates that the identity of Jesus was revealed to them (Luke 24:31). The use of the passive verb διηνόιξαν in the phrase αὐτῶν ἐκ διηνόιξης αὐτῶν suggests that they received a supernatural experience similar to that of the eleven (compare διηνόιξεν in Luke 24:45). Moreover, the description of the experience of the eleven in Luke 24:45 resembles the description of Lydia in Acts 16:14b: “The Lord opened her heart to listen eagerly to what was said by Paul” (ὁ κύριος διηνόιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλομένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Παύλου). Since Luke typically associates scriptural interpretation with proclamations that occur in this type of context (e.g., Luke 4:16-21; Acts 13:13-41), he probably assumes that the preaching at a “place of prayer” on the Sabbath day includes exposition of the Jewish scriptures.
the scriptural interpretation of Jesus. Indeed, immediately prior to this revelatory encounter, Luke recalls their inability to understand Jesus’ previous explanations of how he would fulfill the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:44; 18:31-33). The use of the passive constructions in these earlier contexts – Ἰν τῷ ῥῆμα τούτῳ κεκρυμμένον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν in Luke 18:34 (cf. Luke 9:45) – suggests that their lack of understanding was due to divine concealment; the confusion of the disciples was not simply a matter of being unable to make sense of what Jesus was saying. By having Jesus recall these earlier scenes directly before he opened the minds of the disciples, Luke emphasizes that the correct interpretation of the scriptures required more than a simple exposition of them. A revelation from Christ, together with his exegetical instruction, was essential to their


30 Note also the use of the passive in Luke 24:16. Marshall, Luke, 394, also argues that the use of κρύπτω in Luke 18:34 (Ἰν... κεκρυμμένον ἀπ’ αὐτῶν) expresses this idea; the concealment from the disciples represents a “divine ‘veiling’ of what was said” (691). Similarly, Darrell L. Bock, Luke (2 vols. BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994-1996), argues that Luke 9:45 and 18:34 imply that God or some other spiritual force withheld comprehension from the disciples: “Putting the pieces together was an ability that God had not yet granted to the disciples” (2:1499; cf. 1:889); cf. François Bovon, A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50 (Hermeneia; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 393; Craig Evans, To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation (JSNTSup 64; Sheffield: SAP, 1989), 120. A. F. Loisy, L’Evangile selon Luc (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924), 280, notes that although Mark presents the disciples as stubborn and therefore unable to understand, Luke attributes their misunderstanding to God. Against this consensus, Litwak, Scripture in Luke-Acts, 138-139, argues that the inability of the disciples “to grasp Jesus’ statements was not based on divine veiling but on the inability of their imaginations to integrate what Jesus was saying to them with their understanding of Jesus” (138). He asserts that Luke 9:45; 18:34; 24:44-47 do not indicate that there was a supernatural element related to the disciples’ misunderstanding but only a hermeneutical one. He maintains that the disciples could not understand the suffering and shame in the message of Jesus because it did not correspond to their expectations; cf. Joel B. Green, The Gospel of Luke (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 661. To reach this conclusion, however, Litwak must argue that the explanation in Luke 24:44-47 was somehow able to correct their misunderstanding in a manner that his former explanation in Luke 18:31-34 did not. This seems unlikely since both passages contain parallel explanations of Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures: he would suffer, die, and rise on the third day. Since the disciples received essentially the same explanation in both passages, their inability to perceive the scriptures would probably not be remedied by the repeated explanation in Luke 24:44-47 if their difficulty was only hermeneutical.
proper understanding of the true meaning of these sacred texts. Moreover, Luke indicates that further divine enablement to proclaim this message would come through the empowerment of the Spirit (Luke 24:49; cf. Acts 1:8).

The post-resurrection instruction and revelatory experience of the disciples serves as part of the process by which they become authoritative transmitters of the interpretive tradition that Christ entrusted to them. Only after Jesus opened their minds and explained the scriptures to them did they receive the mandate to bear witness to his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:48). Yet Luke also demonstrates how subsequent Christ-believers gain access to and participate in proclaiming this revelation. For example, he presents the preaching of Peter, Philip, and Paul as a continuation of the scriptural interpretation that Jesus entrusted to the disciples in Luke 24:44-47. Luke thus confers authority upon the scriptural interpretation of the eleven by showing how it originates with the teaching and divine enablement of the risen Christ and portrays this exegetical tradition as a revelation that subsequent Christ-believers perpetuate.

The story of the encounter between Philip and the Ethiopian official (Acts 8:26-40) serves as an especially clear example of how Luke illustrates the continuation of the

---

31 In the context of Luke 24:44-47, the phrase ἰμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων in Luke 24:48 almost certainly indicates that Luke sees Christ's fulfillment of the scriptures as a central part of the message of the disciples. See further discussion of this phrase in chapter four, pages 166-167 below.

scriptural interpretation that originated with the risen Christ. Scholars have often noted the links between Acts 8:26-40 and the post-resurrection instruction of Christ in Luke 24:25-27, 44-47, so Philip provides an exegetical explanation of Isa 53:7-8 for the Ethiopian that enables him to understand this ancient text. By placing the citation of Isa 53:7-8 at the center of his account, Luke highlights the significance of scriptural

---


34 The chiastic structure of Acts 8:26-40 places the citation from Isa 53:7-8 and the Ethiopian’s questions about its interpretation at the center of the account (Acts 8:30-34). Although scholars draw varying conclusions about the precise center of the chiastic structure, they often note the presence of chiasm in Acts 8:26-40 and generally conclude that the citation and interpretation of scripture serve as a central part of the passage. See, e.g., R. F. O’Toole, “Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25-40),” *JSNT* 17 (1983): 25-34, who discusses the analysis of the chiastic structure of Acts 8:25-40 provided by Dionisio Minguez, “Hechos 8:25-40: análisis estructural del relato,” *Bib* 57 (1976): 168-191, and suggests that the three questions of Philip form the center of the passage (Acts 8:30-38). This differs from

Through his presentation of the question-answer interaction in this passage, Luke provides a close-up account of how Philip helps the Ethiopian to understand the scriptures (Acts 8:30-35). When Philip hears him reading from Isaiah, he poses an initial question: “Do you understand what you are reading?” (Acts 8:30b). Such a query assumes that the meaning of the text is not self-evident; that the Ethiopian could read the

---


The absence of detailed scriptural exposition in this context stands in contrast with some of the other speeches in Acts. Compare, for example, Acts 2:17-36 and 13:13-52. The only question that the Ethiopian asks about the text relates to the referent of the prophecy: “About whom does the prophet say this? Is it concerning himself or someone else?” (Acts 8:34b).

As von Mueller, “Leserorientierte,” 46, observes, the story of the Ethiopian provides a model of one who is in search of God and truth; cf. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 411, who argues that the episode “teaches Christians how they must learn to interpret the Hebrew Scriptures and learn from others, even as the eunuch sought understanding from Philip.” As Tyson, “Gentile Mission,” 623, maintains, the “crux of the matter [in this episode] is the correct interpretation of a prophetic scripture.”

On the significance of the question-answer format as a means of demonstrating searching and vivid communication in the ancient world, see von Mueller, “Leserorientierte,” 28, 46-47. According to von Mueller, the account provides a paradigm of a person who is searching for God and the truth. In his view, the question-answer format deepens the faith process and orients the reader to identify with this aspect of the account.
passage did not ensure that he could understand it. Similarly, the question that the
Ethiopian asks in response to Philip’s question—“How can I, unless someone guides
me?” (Acts 8:31a) — suggests that correct interpretation requires the proper instruction of
an informed interpretive guide.\(^{38}\) Accordingly, in response to the third question of the
Ethiopian official—“About whom, may I ask you, does the prophet say this, about
himself or about someone else?” (Acts 8:24) – Philip provides an explanation that
indicates how the Jewish scriptures refer to Christ (Acts 8:35). These elements of the
dialogue between Philip and the Ethiopian demonstrate Philip’s status as an authoritative
interpreter of scripture; he possesses the proper instructional insight that will enable the
Ethiopian to understand the scriptures correctly.

Although Luke closely links scriptural interpretation to divine revelation in this
account, he does so by emphasizing the inspired status of Philip rather than by describing
the revelatory experience of the Ethiopian. For example, he prefaces their encounter with
a description of the divine direction that Philip receives: the angel of the Lord instructs
him to go to the road that runs from Jerusalem to Gaza (Acts 8:26). Luke also indicates
that the Spirit directed Philip to approach the chariot of the Ethiopian (Acts 8:29). By
opening the scene in this way, Luke shows how the entire exchange between them was
arranged by God. As one who has been sent by God, Philip acts as divinely inspired

\(^{38}\) Just as Luke portrays the need for Jesus to transmit the correct interpretation of the Jewish
scriptures in Luke 24:25-27, 44-47, so he indicates in Acts 8:30-31 that proper perception of the scriptures
requires someone to guide the interpretive process. As Barrett, *Acts*, 1:428, observes, these passages
indicate that Luke does not regard the Jewish scriptures as self-explanatory. They require the mediation of
Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 130. George T. Montague, *Understanding the
Bible: A Basic Introduction to Biblical Interpretation* (New York: Paulist, 1997), 7-8, suggests that Philip
acts as just such an interpreter.
emissary who discloses the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures to the Ethiopian.

Subsequent to Philip’s exposition of the Jewish scriptures and proclamation of Jesus, the Ethiopian asks a final question: “What is to prevent me from being baptized?” (Acts 8:36). The implicit answer—“nothing”—suggests that all the requirements for his baptism have been met; nothing hinders his inclusion once he believes Philip’s authoritative scriptural interpretation and proclamation about Jesus.39 Thus, in addition to presenting Philip as a divinely inspired messenger and informed exegete of the Jewish scriptures, the story demonstrates how the positive reception of the message and scriptural interpretation of the disciples of Jesus functions as a precursor to entrance to the Christ-believing community.40

Justin

Justin refers to the post-resurrection exegetical instruction of Christ in four different passages, which attests to his emphasis upon this element of the mission of the apostles. In his first Apology, he indicates that the apostles proclaimed the message about Christ to the nations and entrusted the scriptures to them:

The nations who had never even heard anything of Christ until his apostles went from Jerusalem and preached about him, and entrusted the prophecies to them, were filled

---

39 Apparently, the cryptic description of the Ethiopian’s conversion was problematic for some early interpreters since some Western manuscripts provide an additional statement: “Then Philip said, ‘If you believe with all your heart, you may.’ And he answered and said, ‘I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God’” (E, many minuscules, it⁶ vi⁴ vi⁵ syrᵃᵃ with * cop⁴ arm). In A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition (Stuttgart: UBS, 1998), 315, Bruce M. Metzger explains the addition in this way: “Its insertion into the text seems to have been due to the feeling that Philip would not have baptized the Ethiopian without securing a confession of faith, which needed to be expressed in the narrative.” The insertion itself suggests that Luke did not provide criteria for baptism other than the Ethiopian’s reception of the scriptural interpretation that Philip provides.

40 Marshall, Acts, 161, summarizes the event: “The Ethiopian is led to faith by the realization that the prophetic scriptures are fulfilled in Jesus.”
with joy and faith, and turned away from their idols and dedicated themselves to the
unbegotten God through Christ.

(1 Apol. 49.5)

As he explains in 1 Apol. 50.12 and Dial. 53.5, this means that the apostles transmitted
the interpretation of the biblical prophecies that Christ handed down to them after his
resurrection:

Afterward, when he arose from the dead, and appeared to them, and taught them to read the
prophecies in which all the above happenings were predicted as about to take place,
and after they had seen him ascending into heaven, and had believed, and had
received power (δυνάμεις) he then sent to them they went forth to every nation to teach these
things, and they were called apostles.

(1 Apol. 50.12)

The same Zechariah foretold that Christ would be struck, and his disciples scattered
(Zech 13:7), which actually happened. For, after he was crucified, his disciples were
dispersed until he arose again from the dead, and proved to them that it had been
predicted that he would have to suffer. When they were convinced of this, they went
out to all the world teaching these things.

(Dial. 53.5)

Similarly, in Dial. 76.6-7, Justin asserts that no one was able to understand the prophecies
of scripture – not even the apostles – before Christ explained their meaning:

Now, if the prophets foretold cryptically that Christ would suffer first and then
be Lord of all, it was well nigh impossible for anyone to grasp the full meaning
of such prophecies, until Christ himself convinced his apostles that such things
were explicitly proclaimed in the scriptures.

(Dial. 76.6-7)

By presenting the risen Christ as the source of the apostles’ understanding of the
scriptures (1 Apol. 49.5; 50.12; Dial. 53.5; 76.6-7) and indicating that they received
power from him to proclaim the correct interpretation of the scriptures (1 Apol. 50.12),
these accounts demonstrate the authoritative origin of their scriptural exegesis.

The description in Dial. 76.6-7 especially demonstrates the dependence of the
apostles upon Christ for their understanding of the scriptures: no one could grasp their

41 Although the wording in Luke 24:49 differs from 1 Apol. 50.12, both authors indicate that the
disciples would receive “power” (δυνάμεις) to proclaim the correct interpretation of the scriptures.
full meaning apart from the convincing explanation of Christ. Furthermore, Justin elsewhere reports that the risen Jesus reminded the disciples that he had predicted his sufferings and explained how his death would fulfill the Jewish scriptures even before his passion: “The apostles [who] after he arose from the dead and convinced them that he had warned them before the passion that he had to suffer, and that this was foretold by the prophets, were most sorry that they had abandoned him at his crucifixion” (Dial. 106.1). This part of Justin’s account closely parallels the recollection of Christ’s passion predictions in Luke 24:44 (cf. Luke 18:31-33).\textsuperscript{42} In a manner very similar to Luke, Justin attempts to demonstrate the authoritative status of the exegesis of the apostles by showing it to be a disclosure that only the risen Christ could effect.

Elsewhere, Justin indicates that Christ-believers possess a privileged understanding of the scriptures by attributing their exegesis to divine revelatory insight, just as Luke also does. For example, in the opening of the \textit{Dialogue}, Justin recounts his attempts to discover the truth about God through the study of different branches of philosophy. During this search, he encounters a mysterious “old man” who explains that the Jewish scriptures were the only reliable source of truth about God:

\begin{quote}
A long time ago . . . there lived blessed men who were just and loved by God, men who spoke through the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and predicted events that would take place in the future, which events are now taking place. We call these men the Prophets. They alone knew the truth and communicated it to humans, whom they neither deferred [to] nor feared. With no desire for personal glory, they reiterated only what they heard and saw when inspired by the Holy Spirit. Their writings are still extant, and whoever reads them with the proper faith will profit greatly in his knowledge of the origin and end of things, and of any other matter that a philosopher should know . . . . Above all, beseech God to open to you the gates of light, for no one can perceive or understand these truths [i.e., the writings of the prophets] unless
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{42} As Gregory, \textit{Reception of Luke}, 285, and Skarsaune, \textit{Proof from Prophecy}, 256, both note, the link between Christ’s pre-passion predictions from the scriptures and his post-resurrection teaching regarding Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures is peculiar to Luke and Justin.
The "old man" indicates that no one could perceive the truth of scriptural prophecy apart from receiving illumination and understanding from God and his Christ (Dial. 7.3). In the passage that immediately follows, moreover, Justin describes his own conversion to Christianity as just such a moment of divine enablement: a fire ignites in his soul and a love for the prophets and for those who were the "friends of Christ" possesses him (Dial. 8.1). Besides indicating that correct understanding of the scriptures requires inspired revelation, then, Justin directly links this revelatory ability with the experience of becoming a Christ-believer.

Throughout the Dialogue, Justin repeatedly identifies Christ-believers as those who have received a divine enablement, or "grace," to understand the Jewish scriptures (Dial. 30.1; 58.1; 78.10-11; 92.1; 100.2; 119.1). Although Justin does not explicitly

---

43 Although Falls, Justin Martyr, 160, translates the last phrase "unless he has been enlightened by God and his Christ," the rendering above provides a more literal translation of εἰ μὴ τῷ θεῷ δῷ συνιέναι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ. The present active infinitive συνιέναι functions as a direct object in my translation.

44 Note also that, in Dial. 23.3, Justin refers to back to this encounter with the old man and indicates that he received "heavenly doctrine" (θείου λόγου) from him.

45 G. N. Stanton, Jesus and Gospel (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 97, suggests that the phrase "friends of Christ" refers to the apostles and, by implication, their writings; cf. Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, 229. J. C. M. Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine (Philosophia Patrum 1; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 118-119, suggests instead that the phrase refers to Christ-believers of Justin’s own time, especially martyrs; cf. Oskar Skarsaune, “The Conversion of Justin Martyr,” ST 30 (1976): 58. Since Justin elsewhere uses the phrase τὰ ἀπομνημονεύματα τῶν ἀποστόλων to refer to the writings of the apostles (1 Apol. 33.5; 66.3; Dial. 100.4; 101.3; 102.5; 103.6, 8; 104.1; 105.1, 5, 6; 106.1, 3, 4), it is not certain that the phrase “friends of Christ” in Dial. 8.1 refers to these writings.


47 The terminology and syntax that Justin uses to describe the gift of understanding which Christ-believers receive differs slightly in these passages but the meaning in each case is essentially the same. See, for example, Dial. 30.1 (χάριν τού [παρὰ θεοῦ] γνώσει); Dial. 58.1 (χάρις παρὰ θεοῦ μόνη εἰς τὸ συνιέναι τὰς γραφὰς αὐτοῦ); 78.10-11 (χάριν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ...μαθάνειν); 92.1 (χάριτος τῆς παρὰ θεοῦ λάβοι νοησία τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ γεγενημένα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν); 100.2 ("Ἀπεκάλυψεν οὐν ἡμῖν πάντα ἃα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ νεοφήκαςμεν); 119.1 (ἐλάβομεν χάριν τοῦ νοησάτα).
outline what he means by the phrase “grace to understand,” through his emphasis upon the necessity of praying for illumination (Dial. 7.3) and his description of the inability of humans to perceive God apart from the agency of the Holy Spirit (Dial. 3.6; 4.1), he implies that the experience of receiving “grace to understand” the scriptures requires a divine, or supernatural, enablement. Justin thus attempts to identify Christ-believers as recipients of a divine revelation that enables them to comprehend the Jewish scriptures, even as Luke also does.

For Justin, the special ability of Christ-believers to understand the scriptures corresponds closely to the divinely-inspired status of the Jewish scriptures themselves. In his view, the writings of the prophets were the only reliable source of truth because these ancient figures did not produce their compositions through their own efforts to perceive

---

48 The meaning of the phrase “grace to understand” is widely disputed. David Aune, “Justin Martyr’s Use of the Old Testament,” BETS 9 (1966): 182, 186-187, argues that Justin saw himself as analogous to the Hebrew prophets and understood his ability to perceive their writings as “charismatic illumination.” Similarly, N. Pycke, “Connaissance rationelle et connaissance de grace chez saint Justin,” ETL 37 (1961): 52-85, maintains that Justin views his ability to understand the scriptures as a supernatural endowment of knowledge. By contrast, R. Joly, Christianisme et Philosophie: Études sur Justin et les Apologistes grecs du Deuxième Siècle (Bruxelles: l'Université de Bruxelles, 1973), 104-113, argues that “grace to understand” refers to his ability to provide rational proof from the Jewish scriptures. According to Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 12, “grace to understand” refers to the transmission of Christ’s teachings rather than to a charismatic experience. Following Skarsaune, Anette Rudolph, “Denn wir sind jenes Volk...”: Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht (Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte 15; Bonn: Borengässer, 1999), 92-94, suggests that Justin regards his role as an exegete of the Jewish scriptures as continuous with a line of interpretive tradition that ran directly from Christ down through the apostles to him: “Die Traditionslinie verläuft damit vom auferstandenen Christus über die Apostel direct zu Justin. Er ist in seiner Schriftauslegung Schüler der Apostel und gibt die von ihnen empfangene Lehre weiter” (94). With Skarsaune, she regards Justin’s references to “grace to understand” as the reception of this apostolic teaching (e.g., Dial. 58.1). The conclusions of Skarsaune and Rudolph, however, do not adequately account for the way that Justin describes his own conversion as the experience of having his soul “set on fire” (Dial. 8.1), nor do they appear to take into consideration the old man’s description of the need for illumination (Dial. 7.3). Although the phrases “gates of light,” “grace to understand,” and “set on fire” do not explain the precise nature of the revelation that Justin received, they imply that correct understanding occurred as a result of divine, or supernatural, intervention. Moreover, in Dial. 58.1 and 78.10-11, Justin indicates that the source of this “grace to understand” the scriptures was God. These descriptions suggest that receiving “grace to understand” includes divine agency as well as the transmission of the apostles’ teaching.
God. Rather, they wrote only “what they heard and saw when inspired by the Holy Spirit” (Dial. 7.1; cf. 4:1). 49 By juxtaposing this description of the Jewish prophets with the exhortation to pray for divine enlightenment (Dial. 7.3), Justin draws an important connection between the inspired status of the scriptures and revelatory gift of those who read them correctly. Even as the prophets “alone knew the truth and communicated it to humans” because the Holy Spirit inspired them (Dial. 7.1) so only those who read their writings with faith (Dial. 7.2) and with a divinely bestowed capacity to understand their meaning (Dial. 7.3) would gain access to the ancient knowledge that the Jewish scriptures provide.

Summary

Although they express themselves in distinctive ways, and write in different genres, Luke and Justin attempt to confer authority upon the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers in a notably similar manner. Both emphasize that Christ-believers have received exegetical instruction from the risen Christ himself and both assert that Christ-believers alone have received divine inspiration to interpret these sacred texts. Moreover, both also link the acquisition of the proper understanding of the scriptures with entrance to the Christ-believing community. Like a number of early Jewish exegetes, Luke and Justin attempt to show the legitimacy of their exegesis by describing their special

49 Even as the human mind required the assistance of the Holy Spirit to perceive God (Dial. 4.1), so the prophets wrote about what the Holy Spirit enabled them to hear and see (Dial. 7.1). For further discussion of the connection between Dial. 4.1 and 7.1, see Van Winden, Philosopher, 70. By contrast, Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christendom, 191-192, denies a conceptual link between the two passages and even argues that the original text of Dial. 4.1 would not have included the phrase μὴ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι κεκοσμημένος. This forms part of Hyldahl’s wider argument that Justin does not mention the Christian faith until later in the Dialogue.
capacity to understand the Jewish scriptures and, in turn, define their group members with reference to this interpretive activity.

2.4 Differences between the Representations of Exegesis in the Writings of Luke and Justin

Although Luke and Justin similarly assert that Christ-believers possess an authoritative ability to interpret the Jewish scriptures, certain aspects of their representation of this exegesis differ. To introduce my discussion of these differences, I will compare their use of a near-parallel Jesus saying. Both Luke and Justin cite the same saying to highlight the importance of understanding the truth that Jesus reveals, but each contextualizes the tradition in a distinctive manner. Luke 10:21-24 describes the special revelation that Jesus mediates to his disciples as a disclosure from the Father:

> At that same hour Jesus rejoiced in the Holy Spirit and said, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because you have hidden these things from the wise and the intelligent and have revealed them to infants; yes, Father, for such was your gracious will. All things have been handed over to me by my Father; and no one knows who the Son is except the Father, or who the Father is except the Son and anyone to whom the Son chooses to reveal him.” Then turning to the disciples, Jesus said to them privately, “Blessed are the eyes that see what you see! For I tell you that many prophets and kings desired to see what you see, but did not see it, and to hear what you hear, but did not hear it.”
> (Luke 10:21-24)

The passage follows immediately after a discussion between Jesus and the seventy, upon their return from announcing the kingdom throughout Judaea (Luke 10:17-20). After explaining how their mission effected the defeat of demonic forces, Jesus praises God for his revelation of what had long been hidden from human perception, and exclaims that prophets and kings had longed to hear and see the events that the disciples had witnessed. The Jesus saying in this context thus depicts the knowledge and power of the kingdom

---

50 Compare also the slightly different version of this Jesus saying in Matt 11:27.
that Jesus mediates to his followers as the object of revelation, and Luke presents this manifestation of the kingdom as the culmination of what the prophets had anticipated.

In *Dial*. 100.1b-2a, Justin places a near-parallel saying of Jesus within the context of a lengthy verse-by-verse citation and exposition of LXX Psalm 21 (*Dial*. 98-106). He cites the saying as evidence that “the gospel” affirms his conclusions about the mysterious interpretation of this psalm:

> And the words, “But you dwell in the holy place, Thou praise of Israel” (LXX Ps 21:4), signified that he would do something worthy of praise and admiration, which he did when through the Father he arose again from the dead on the third day after the crucifixion. I have indeed pointed out earlier that Christ is called both Jacob and Israel, and that not only in the blessing of Joseph and Judah have things been predicted mysteriously of Him, but also in the Gospel it is written that He said: *All things have been delivered to Me by My Father; and no one knows the Father except the Son; nor does anyone know the Son except the Father, and those to whom the Son will reveal Him* (Matt 11:27; Luke 10:22). He thus revealed to us (‘Απεκάλυψεν δὲν ἡμᾶς) all that we have learned from the scriptures by his grace, so that we know him as the First-begotten of God before all creatures, and as the Son of the patriarchs, since he became incarnate by a virgin of their race, and condescended to become a man without comeliness or honor, and subject to suffering.

(*Dial*. 100.1-2)

Through his use of the inferential conjunction φῦ at the beginning of *Dial*. 100.2, Justin applies the Jesus saying to a revelation from the Jewish scriptures that Christ gives to his followers. As a result of this special understanding, he explains, Christ-believers are able to recognize that he is the “First-begotten” (πρωτότοκος) of God. Within the wider

---

51 As Marshall, *Luke*, 434, notes, the antecedent of “these things” (ταῦτα) in Luke 10:21 is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, the context of this passage strongly suggests that ταῦτα refers to the message and power of the kingdom (e.g., Luke 9:1-6; 10:1-12).


53 Note that Justin uses the term “First-begotten” (πρωτότοκος) to refer to the pre-existent Christ, or Logos (e.g., *I Apol*. 23.2; 46.2; 63.15).
context of the *Dialogue*, this statement can be understood as a reference to how the Jewish scriptures themselves provide revelation about the pre-existent *Logos* of God.\(^4\)

Both Luke and Justin indicate that knowledge from Christ is necessary for arriving at a correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures, but each emphasizes a different aspect of this revelation. Whereas Luke uses the Jesus saying to present the proclamation of the kingdom as the locus of correct understanding, to which the ancient prophets attest, Justin uses the saying to portray the Jewish scriptures as the primary object of revelation, to which the traditions about Jesus attest.\(^5\) In other words, Luke uses the Jewish scriptures as a lens through which to interpret the story of Jesus while Justin uses the story of Jesus as a lens through which to interpret the Jewish scriptures.

This difference between Luke and Justin can be attributed, in part, to the different genres in which they write. In his preface, Luke indicates that he aims to record the story of Jesus and the birth of the Jesus movement, and to present its inception and growth as

\(^4\) In *Apology* 63, Justin uses a near-identical Jesus saying to draw a similar conclusion. He twice repeats the saying – “No one knows the Father except the Son, nor does anyone know the Son except the Father, and those to whom the Son will reveal him” (*Apol.* 63:2; cf. 63:15) – to argue that Jews have not recognized the nature of God or his Son, the *Logos*. Justin argues that since the angel identified himself as “I am who I am, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob” (Ex 3:14-15; cf. *Apol.* 63:11), Jews wrongly assume that the “angel” who spoke with Moses was really the Father. He contends that Jews do not understand Exod 3:14-15 correctly because they do not recognize that the pre-existent Christ, the *Logos*, spoke to Moses from the burning bush. The saying in this context thus serves as an indictment of Jews for their inability to understand how the scriptures bear witness to the pre-existent *Logos*.

\(^5\) Justin typically uses the sayings of and traditions about Jesus, which he often describes as “the memoirs of the apostles,” as historical evidence that the predictions from the Jewish scriptures had come true. For him, this material verifies the authenticity of the Jewish scriptures and serves as a hermeneutical key that unlocks their true meaning. Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*, 23-28, notes that *Dial.* 100.1 (cited above) serves as a good example of this use of the “memoirs” in the writings of Justin. He observes that Justin uses a combination of material that parallels Matt 11:27 and Luke 10:22 to support his interpretations of LXX Ps 21:3, and proceeds “to quote from and allude to the Gospels as historical support for his interpretations of Psalm 22 in *Dial.* ci; cii; cv; cvi; and cvii” (25); cf. Helmet Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990), 41-42; Henry Chadwick, “Justin Martyr’s Defense of Christianity,” *BJRL* 47 (1964-1965): 283; Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho* (VCSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 98-102.
the fulfillment of ancient promises (Luke 1:1-4).\(^56\) Naturally, this type of account leads him to portray the words and actions of the characters within his story as the primary locus of revelation, while the Jewish scriptures serve as a framework, or lens, for interpreting the events that he narrates.\(^57\) By way of contrast, Justin's *Apologies* are set in the form of an address to the emperor, and his *Dialogue with Trypho* purports to recount his conversation with the Jew Trypho in the guise of a lively debate. In both of these settings, Justin seeks to demonstrate the truth and legitimacy of Christianity through argumentation from the Jewish scriptures.\(^58\) The Jewish scriptures thus serve as the logical object of his discourse, while the traditions and sayings of Jesus function as an interpretive lens through which to read the Jewish scriptures properly.\(^59\)


\(^{57}\) A number of studies note and describe this tendency of Luke to use the Jewish scriptures to interpret the events that he narrates. For example, Bock, *Proclamation*, 274, concludes that Luke’s approach to the Jewish scriptures is best described as “proclamation from prophecy and pattern” because “Luke sees the Scripture fulfilled in Jesus in terms of the fulfillment of the OT prophecy and in terms of the reintroduction and fulfillment of the OT patterns that point to the presence of God’s saving work” (274). The recent studies of Denova, Pao, and Litwak also demonstrate the way in which Luke uses scriptural themes to provide a framework for the events he narrates. See also pages 18-19 of the introduction.

\(^{58}\) A central part of the argument in the *Apologies* involves citing and expounding the Jewish scriptures to persuade the audience of the antiquity and authenticity of the Christ-believing group (see *1 Apol.* 30-53). Also, from *Dialogue* 10 onward, Justin records a debate that centers upon the exegesis of the Jewish scriptures.

\(^{59}\) By noting this difference between Luke and Justin, I am not suggesting that Justin did not regard the sayings of Jesus as authoritative. In certain instances, Justin cites large blocks of material from the synoptic gospels (e.g., *1 Apology* 15-16). See also his references to the “memoirs of the apostles” (*1 Apol.* 33.5; 66.3; 67.3; *Dial.* 100.4; 101.3; 102.5; 103.6, 8; 104.1; 105.1, 5, 6; 106.1, 3, 4; 107.1). Moreover, as Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel*, 93-99, has demonstrated, Justin had a very high regard for the Jesus traditions.
Yet this variation between Luke and Justin also can be explained, in part, by considering an important difference between the way that they depict Christ as the authoritative source for understanding the Jewish scriptures correctly. Among the various approaches that Second Temple Jewish interpreters use to present their exegesis as authoritative, two overlapping strategies are particularly relevant to our discussion of this difference between Luke and Justin. First, as noted in chapter one, rival Jewish groups often asserted that they possessed an exclusive understanding of the Jewish scriptures, in part, because they had access to a privileged form of knowledge that helped them unlock the true meaning of the scriptures. Second, as Jassen observes, some interpreters attempt to configure lines of continuity between the ancient prophets and their exegesis in order to present the latter as the proper continuation of the former. To be sure, both Luke and Justin clearly indicate that Jesus is the Messiah who fulfills the Jewish scriptures; in their view this knowledge provides the key to understanding these

that he calls “memoirs of the apostles” (ἐπομνομέμενα τῶν ἀποστόλων) and also identifies them as “gospels” (1 Apol. 66.3). Others, such as Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 41-42, suggest that Justin does not view the “Gospels” and “Memoirs of the Apostles” in the same light as the Jewish scriptures but as reliable historical records; cf. Harry Gamble, *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning* (Guides to Biblical Scholarship New Testament Series; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 27-29, who argues that although Justin mentions that the memoirs of the apostles were read along with the prophets (1 Apol. 67.3), he does not regard them as authoritative in the same way as the prophets. Charles H. Cosgrove, “Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho,” *VG* 36 (1982): 215-8, more emphatically argues that Justin moved away from, rather than towards, esteeming the writings of the apostles as scripture.

60 See chapter one, pages 30-34. As Carol A. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 67-69, observes, certain Jewish groups in the Second Temple period maintained that correct interpretation of the scriptures required the possession of other privileged knowledge. See also Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41-68, 74-98.

61 For example, the Qumran group attempts to depict ancient prophets as mediators of legislative revelation, and to draw lines of continuity between this activity and their own exegesis and legislative activities. According to Jassen, *Meditating the Divine*, 331-342, “The deliberate alignment of the community’s legislative program with the similar activity of the ancient prophets is intended to identify the sectarian system of lawgiving as a contemporary realization of classical prophets (333). See also Jassen’s discussion of 1QS 5:8-12; 8:15-16.
sacred texts correctly. Moreover, as we have seen, both authors indicate that Christ-believers possess a special knowledge of the scriptures because of the divine revelation and post-resurrection instruction of Christ. Despite these parallels, Luke and Justin do not describe Christ as the source of privileged knowledge in precisely the same way, nor do they show how he provides continuity between the message of the ancient prophets and the exegesis of Christ-believers identically.

2.4.1 Luke: “The Word of the Lord”

Besides aiming to illustrate how the events of his narrative represent the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, Luke makes a concerted effort to present the story of Jesus as an extension of the biblical past by saturating his narrative with biblical language, themes, and models so that it reads as a continuation of the biblical story.62 Numerous examples illustrate how Luke envisages this type of continuity,63 but his

---


63 For example, in the opening chapters of Luke and Acts, we read the announcements of the dawning of a new day for God’s people, the Jews: Israel’s victory over its enemies (Luke 1:46-55, 67-79); the coming experience of consolation, salvation, and glory for Israel (Luke 2:25-32); the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit; and the signs and wonders of the last days (Acts 2-5). As Augustin George,
emphasis upon the prophetic identity and message of Jesus is particularly relevant to my study because of the way that its sheds light upon Luke’s configuration of the continuity between ancient prophecy and the inspired exegesis of Christ-believers.

In a more marked way than Matthew or Mark, Luke emphasizes the role of Jesus as a prophet, and depicts his followers as divinely-inspired messengers who also carry out his prophetic mission. In continuation with the prophetic ministry of John the Baptist and the prophets to Israel that preceded him, Jesus acts as a Spirit-anointed herald who is “mighty in word and deed” (Luke 24:19). At times, Luke parallels the activities of


As Tiede, Prophecy and History, 11, notes, Luke presents the impetus for the preaching of John the Baptist as the coming of the “word of the Lord” upon him (Luke 3:1-2). This was typical of the inaugural experience of a Jewish prophet. Regarding Luke 3:2, David Miller, “Luke’s Conception of Prophets Considered in the Context of Second Temple Literature” (PhD diss., McMaster University, 2004), 100-101, notes that the phrase ἐγένετο ῥήμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰσραήλ in Luke 3:2 resembles the introductory formula γίνομαι + ῥήμα that occurs in LXX Gen 15:1; 1 Kgdms 15:10; 2 Kgdms 7:4; 3 Kgdms 17:2, 8, but observes that the use of γίνομαι + λόγος is more common (e.g., Mic 1:1; Jon 1:1; Jer 1:2). Luke later records that Jesus calls John more than a prophet (Luke 7:26), but this statement does not suggest the denial of a prophetic role for John. Instead, it emphasizes the special nature of his activity in preparing the “way of the Lord” (Luke 1:15, 76; 7:26; cf. Luke 3:1-18). So also Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:671.

By contrast, Conzelmann, Luke, 23-25, 101-103, 160-161, argues that Luke 16:16-17 expresses a division between the epoch of the Law and the prophets, and a new era of salvation history. In Conzelmann’s view, John the Baptist is the last of the prophets of Israel whereas Jesus inaugurates a new stage in redemptive history by announcing the kingdom of God. Notwithstanding this conclusion, Conzelmann recognizes that Luke attempts to demonstrate continuity between “epochs.” Fitzmyer, Luke, 2:1115-1116, also argues that Luke 16:16 indicates that, prior to John, “the law of Moses and the preaching of the prophets (and their books) were the way in which God’s presence and will toward Israel were made manifest” (1115) whereas from the time of John onward, a “new era of salvation-history was initiated” (1116). Marshall, Luke, 626-630, instead maintains that Luke 16:16 refers to the period during which the Law and prophecy were produced whereas Luke 16:17 places stress upon their ongoing validity. Certainly, Luke 16:16 sets Jesus and his message apart from all who have preceded him but this should not be taken as a negation of his role as a prophet who stood within the traditions of Israel. Although Luke 1-3 makes clear that John and Jesus announce and inaugurate a new era of God’s salvation (cf. Luke 16:16), Luke also presents Jesus as a prophet to Israel (e.g., Luke 4:24, 27; 7:16; 9:8; 13:33; 24:19; Acts 2:22, 3:22-23; 7:37),
Jesus with those of prophets such as Elijah and Elisha, or likens him to “one of the ancient prophets” (Luke 4:25-27; 7:11-17, 51-56, 57-62; 9:7-9, 19) whereas, in other contexts, he portrays Jesus as a prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22-23; 7:22-53; cf. Luke 9:28-36). The disciples of Jesus also engage in this prophetic ministry. Like Jesus, they receive the empowerment of the Spirit, proclaim the message of God, and perform the signs and wonders that were associated with activities of ancient prophets.


Furthermore, by using the phrases “the word of God” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) and “word of the Lord” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου), Luke presents the message of both Jesus and his followers as analogous to the depictions of the prophetic word in the LXX.⁶⁹ The inclusion of the genitive qualifiers τοῦ θεοῦ or τοῦ κυρίου clarify that God is the source of their proclamation.⁷⁰ Within Israel’s prophetic tradition, then, Luke depicts Jesus and his followers as appointed delegates of God who, in continuity with the prophets of old, communicate his message to the people.⁷¹

activities, could be defined as prophets, he maintains that since Luke never uses προφητική terminology to refer to them, he did not regard them as such. He attributes this to “Luke’s desire to connect Jesus’ followers to Jesus” (155) rather than to portray them as prophets.⁶⁹ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ - Luke 5:1; 8:11, 21; 11:28; Acts 4:31; 6:2, 7; 8:14; 11:1; 12:24; 13:5, 7, 46, 48; 16:32; 17:13; 18:11; 19:20; ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου - Acts 8:25; 13:44, 46, 49, 15:35, 36; 16:32; 19:10; 20:35. See also Acts 10:36 — τὸν λόγον ἄπεστελεν τοῖς ὑπότις Ἰσραήλ. The LXX uses similar terminology to refer to the messages from the Lord which are given to and spoken by a prophet: ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου - 2 Sam 12:9; 24:11; 1 Kgdm 15:24; 2 Kgdm 12:9; 14:17; 23:2; 24:11; 3 Kgdm 12:22, 24; 13:20; 16:1; 4 Kgdm 7:1; 9:36; 15:12; 20:16, 19; 24:2; 1 Chron 10:13; 11:3, 10; 12:24; 17:3; 22:8; 2 Chron 11:2; 12:7; 18:18; 35:6; 36:5, 21; Hos 1:1, 2; 4:1; Amos 5:1; 7:16; 8:11-12; Mic 1:1; 4:2; 6:1; Joel 1:1; Jon 1:1; 3:1; Zeph 1:1; 2:5; Hag 1:1, 3; 2:10, 20; Zech 1:1; 7:4, 6, 8; 6:9, 7:1, 4, 8; 8:1, 18; 9:1; 11:12; 12:1; Mal 1:1; Isa 2:1, 3; 28:14; 38:4; 39:5, 8; Dan 9:2; and numerous instances throughout Jeremiah (59 times) and Ezekiel (60 times); ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ - Jud 3:20; 1 Chron 25:5; Jer 1:2; 9:19.


It is this prophetic word from God, moreover, which functions as the vehicle for proclaiming the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. As such, it provides the proper perspective, or privileged revelatory knowledge, required to understand the Jewish scriptures correctly. Indeed, Luke rarely presents scriptural citation and interpretation outside of this framework. In the opening chapters of his gospel, for instance, he places prophetic announcements of the coming of Christ upon the lips of angels, Mary, a priest, and a prophet (Luke 1:13-17, 26-38, 46-55, 67-80; 2:29-35). Notably, each of these predictions contains a description of how John the Baptist or Jesus would fulfill the scriptures. Similarly, Luke often presents the message of Jesus as a prophetic discourse.

---


73 The only two clear exceptions are Luke 3:4-6 and 19:38. Although Acts 1:15-26 and 15:15-17 may not be considered as part of the prophetic message of Jesus that his followers continue, they could be interpreted as instances of Spirit-inspired scriptural interpretation.
that includes an exposition of how the Jewish scriptures ought to be interpreted or applied.\(^{74}\) In Acts, Luke extends this theme by portraying the followers of Jesus as messengers who continue his prophetic mission, and the substance of their message as the exegesis of the Jewish scriptures.\(^{75}\) Luke thus presents the proclamation of Jesus and his followers as a type of prophetic message that provides the privileged knowledge required for understanding the Jewish scriptures properly. Correct exegesis both occurs within the context of this type of prophetic message and stands in continuity with the revelation that the ancient prophets received.

The account of the first sermon of Jesus in Luke 4 serves as a particularly important example of how Luke depicts Jesus as both prophet and exegete of the Jewish scriptures.\(^{76}\) On the Sabbath day, the Lukan Jesus enters the synagogue and reads from the Isaiah scroll (Luke 4:16-20). After citing a combination of Isa 61:1-2 and 58:6b, Jesus provides an explanation of these passages that serves to announce his mission as prophet and messiah to Israel: “Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing” (Luke 4:21).\(^{77}\) When the Nazareth crowd expresses wonder at this announcement (Luke

---


\(^{76}\) For further discussion of Luke 4:16-30, see chapter 5, pages 251-255.

Jesus declares that "no prophet is accepted in the prophet’s hometown" (Luke 4:24) and appeals to scriptural stories about Elijah and Elisha to describe how his ministry will benefit outsiders (Luke 4:24-27; cf. 1 Kgs 17:8-24; 2 Kgs 5:1-19).

Although these references to the ancient prophets serve to explain why Jesus would not meet the expectations of his audience, the recollection of such figures also highlights the way that Luke draws a line of continuity between the ministry of Jesus and theirs.79

Moreover, in this account, Luke fuses the identity of Jesus as prophet with his role as an

---

78 Some scholars argue that the crowd responds negatively to Jesus’ reading and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures by challenging him to prove that he fulfills them. E.g., Marshall, Luke, 187-188; Nolland, Luke, 1:200; Bock, Luke, 1:416-419; Fitzmyer, Luke, 1:535. If this reading is correct, Luke 4:23 may express the doubtful rejection of the initial interpretation of scripture provided by Jesus. In line with this interpretation of Luke 4:23, the subsequent statement that “no prophet is accepted in the prophet’s hometown” (Luke 4:24) describes the rejection of Jesus by his kinsfolk and the references to the ministry of Elijah and Elisha to outsiders in Luke 4:25-27 illustrate the outcome of the unbelief of the Nazareth crowd. In this case, the latter serves as a warning that the unbelief of the people who seem to be closest to Jesus, his own kin, will lead to a transfer of the blessing of his ministry to outsiders. Alternatively, the statement of Jesus in Luke 4:23 may describe the crowd’s positive expectation that Jesus would implement the fulfillment of the promises of Isaiah 61 by engaging in ministry in his hometown, with his own relatives. In this case, the subsequent statement in Luke 4:24 could indicate that no prophet communicates a message that pleases (δεκτός) his own people, and the description of the ministries of Elijah and Elisha in Luke 4:25-27 may represent the continued explanation of Isa 61:1-2, 58:6. If so, the Lukan Jesus may be challenging the understanding and positive expectations of his hometown audience. See, e.g., Sanders, “Isaiah 61,” 99; cf. “Isaiah in Luke,” 154; Koet, Five Studies, 49-55; Charles A. Kimball, Jesus’ Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke’s Gospel (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994),114-115.

inspired exegete of the Jewish scriptures: as a Spirit-anointed prophet to Israel, Jesus reads from the Jewish scriptures and proclaims how he will fulfill them.\(^80\)

The sermon of Peter in Acts 3:12-26 provides a cogent example of the way that Luke also portrays the preaching of the followers of Jesus as a continuation of the message of Jesus:

> And now, friends, I know that you acted in ignorance, as did also your rulers. In this way God fulfilled what he had foretold through all the prophets, that his Messiah would suffer. Repent therefore, and turn to God so that your sins may be wiped out. . . . Moses said, "The Lord your God will raise up (ἀναστήσεται) for you from your own people a prophet like me. You must listen to whatever he tells you. And it will be that everyone who does not listen to that prophet will be utterly rooted out of the people" (Deut 18:15 -16a, 19 and Lev 23:29). And all the prophets, as many as have spoken, from Samuel and those after him, also predicted these days. You 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." When 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 3:19-26)

Here the Lukan Peter cites a combination of Deut 18:15-16a, 19 and Lev 23:29,\(^81\) and interprets these passages as a prediction about Christ. According to Peter, the texts point to an end-time figure whom "all the prophets" had anticipated and whom God raised up to bless Israel at the very time when he was delivering his message to fellow-Jews (i.e., in

---

\(^80\) Notably, prophetic and exegetical activities are similarly intertwined in certain early Jewish texts and in the Hebrew Bible. For example, the Chronicler presents the inspired speech of the prophetic figure, Azariah, as scriptural interpretation (2 Chron 15:1-8) and Ezra 7:6-10 depicts scriptural instruction of Ezra as divinely inspired activity analogous to prophetic revelation. For further discussion, see chapter one, pages 34-40.

\(^81\) In Acts 3:22, Peter cites Deut 18:15 but changes the second-person pronouns from singular (σοι, σου) to plural (ὑμῖν, ὑμῶν) to address his audience more directly. The addition of ὅσα ἄν λαλήσῃ πρὸς υἱὸς to the end of the citation in Acts 3:22 recalls ὅσα ἄν λαλήσῃ from Deut 18:19. After the citation, Acts 3:22 has an additional πρὸς υἱῷς, which again draws attention to the audience of Peter and their need to respond to his message. For further discussion of these adaptations, see Rese, *Alttestamentliche*, 66-67; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:207-209; Bock, *Acts*, 178-179.
“these days”). How did Jesus continue to bless Israel in “these days”? If we take the verb ἀνίστημι to refer to the resurrection of Jesus, then it is possible that Luke wishes to indicate that the risen Jesus effected blessing and repentance by speaking through the message of Peter. Alternatively, we could interpret ἀνίστημι as a reference to the appointment of Jesus as a prophet who called Israel to repentance during his earthly ministry. In either case, the sermon of Peter functions as an extension of the call to repentance that Jesus initiated during his earthly ministry. As Jesus preached repentance to Israel, so Peter, one of his appointed delegates, continues this message by calling his compatriots to repent. Luke thus portrays Jesus as the eschatological prophet that Moses foretold and, in turn, asserts the authority of the proclamation of Peter by presenting it as an extension of the same prophetic message.

---

82 As Miller, “Luke’s Conception of Prophets,” 248, suggests, “these days” probably include the messianic activities of Jesus and the period of the early church; cf. Barrett, Acts, 1:210-211, who argues that the phrase “these days” refers to “the times just spoken of, the last days, of which the events of resurrection, ascension, and the gift of the Spirit mark the first” (211).


84 Miller, “Luke’s Conception of Prophets,” 257. Johnson, Literary Function, 66-67, argues that ἀνίστημι refers to the raising up of Jesus as a prophet during his earthly ministry but maintains that ἀνίστημι also recalls his resurrection, at which time God raised him up as the definitive and eschatological prophet.


86 As John T. Carroll, Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts (SBL Dissertation Series 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 137-138, 148, 160-161, notes, both Jesus and his disciples fulfill the same mandate: “Whoever listens to you listens to me, and whoever rejects you rejects me, and whoever rejects me rejects the one who sent me” (Luke 10:16). Therefore, even if ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:22 and 3:26 does not refer to the resurrection, the context of Acts 2-3 suggests that the
As one who continues the message of Jesus, the prophet like Moses, Peter conveys a revolutionary understanding of the Jewish scriptures that aims to correct previous misunderstanding. In Acts 3:15-18, Peter indicates that he knows that the Jerusalem Jews acted in ignorance when they killed Jesus and therefore inadvertently fulfilled what the prophets had predicted about him. The explanation implies that, had they understood the Jewish scriptures correctly, they would not have acted in this way (cf. Acts 13:27). Subsequently, in Acts 3:19-24, Peter calls the Jerusalem Jews to repent from this blindness and to recognize Jesus as the prophet predicted by Moses; that is, Peter exhorts them to understand how Jesus fulfilled the Jewish scriptures in “these days,” to respond appropriately to this realization, and to receive the promised blessing through him (Acts 3:24-26). His exegesis thus stands in continuity with the message of Jesus, the prophet like Moses, and reorients the Jewish people to a proper understanding of their scriptures.

The story of the Ethiopian further exemplifies Luke’s configuration of a connection between the exegesis of Christ-believers and the message and activities of the ancient prophets (Acts 8:26-40). In this episode, Luke draws parallels between the actions of Philip and those of the ancient prophet Elijah (1 Kings 17-18). Like Elijah, Philip receives divine instructions to go to a desert setting (Acts 8:26; cf. 1 Kgs 18:2, 5), hears the command to “rise and go” (Acts 8:26; cf. 1 Kgs 17:9), outruns a chariot (Acts 8:27; cf. 1 Kgs 18:41). For further discussion of the parallels that Luke draws between Jesus and the disciples, and his presentation of the message and ministry of the disciples as an extension of the message and ministry of Jesus, see Johnson, *Literary Function*, 38-69.

Luke thus depicts Philip as a type of prophetic emissary who resembles the prophet Elijah. In his role as inspired messenger of the Lord, moreover, Philip unveils the true meaning of the Jewish scriptures to the Ethiopian. By reporting the event in this way, Luke shows the message and exegesis of Philip to be the proper continuation of the words and activities of the ancient prophets.

The episodes in Luke 4 (Jesus), Acts 3 (Peter), and Acts 8 (Philip) serve as but a few examples of how Luke presents the exegesis of Christ-believers as part of a prophetic word from God. His use of the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ or ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου further demonstrate that, for Luke, the divinely inspired proclamation of Christ-believers stands in continuity with the words of the ancient prophets. It is their message, moreover, which Luke presents as the source of additional revelatory knowledge that enables one to hear and understand the Jewish scriptures correctly. Given this emphasis, it is not surprising that Luke presents the message of Jesus and his followers, together with their exegesis of the Jewish scriptures, as the focal point of revelation from God (Luke 10:22-24).

2.4.2 Justin: The Logos

Although Justin recognizes that Jesus was empowered by the Spirit and engaged in the activities of a prophet, he does not emphasize these aspects of the ministry of Jesus

---

nor does he use phrases such as ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ or ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου to present their message as a prophetic word from God. 89 Rather, in both the Dialogue and the Apologies, Justin uses λόγος-terminology to depict Christ as a pre-existent figure who mediates the revelation necessary to interpret the Jewish scriptures correctly. 90

According to Justin, the Logos functions as a messenger who communicates the mind and will of the transcendent God. 91 In his pre-existent state, he provided revelatory knowledge about God for the patriarchs by appearing to them in the theophanies recorded in the Jewish scriptures (e.g., Dialogue 48; 56-64; 75; 86; 113; 126-129), and revealing to them “the discourses of the Father” (Dial. 128.4). 92 Therefore, the Jewish scriptures do not simply foretell Christ; they also provide a record of how he acted as the pre-existent

89 Instead, Justin argues that John the Baptist was the last prophet of Israel in order to assert the discontinuity between the Jewish people and Christ-believers. Note, for example, the description of Jesus in Dialogue 87-88. In this context, Justin acknowledges that Jesus possessed the Spirit and prophetic gifts but argues that he did not need them since he existed as God before he became incarnate. Justin asserts that the gifts of the Spirit were given to Christ in order that there would no longer be prophets among the Jewish people (cf. Dial. 49.3; 51.1). Furthermore, Justin asserts that the words of Christ also affirm this reality (Dial. 51.3; cf. Luke 16:16; Matt 11:12, 14-15).

90 Justin uses λόγος to refer to the pre-existent Christ but he also uses several other appellations for this figure, including the following: ἐκ τῆς ἡμέρας (e.g., 1 Apol. 63.5; Dial. 56.4); πρωτότοκος (e.g., 1 Apol. 63.15; Dial. 100.2; 129.4; 138.2); Ἀρχή (e.g., Dial. 61.1; 62.4). For a discussion of these and other titles that Justin applies to the pre-existent Christ, see Goodenough, Justin Martyr, 163-175.

91 For Justin, God does not make himself visible on the earth but dwells in the “super-celestial realms” (τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανῶν ἀπανταί; Dial. 60.2) and cannot be contained in any place within the created universe (Dial. 127.1-3). For this reason, God sent the pre-existent Logos to mediate his mind and will on earth (Dial. 127.3-5).

92 Justin’s writings are the earliest known to interpret the theophanies described in the Jewish scriptures as appearances of the pre-existent Christ. See Demetrius C. Trakatellis, The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr (HDR 6; Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 58-59. Although Philo also identifies the mediator of revelation in these theophanies as the Logos, he does not, of course, identify this entity as Christ (compare the account of the theophanies to Abraham at Mamre and Sodom in Dialogue 56 [cf. 126] with Philo’s Mut. Nom. 15 and Leg. All. III, 217-219; to Jacob in Dialogue 58 with Philo’s Som. I.228-230; and to Moses in 1 Apology 62-63; Dialogue 59-60 with Philo’s Vit. Mos. I.66). Furthermore, as Trakatellis, Pre-Existence, 85, notes, the descriptions of these theophanies in the writings of Philo and Justin differ insofar as Philo attempts to provide an explanation for the theophanies themselves whereas Justin does not try to explain them as much as use them as scriptural evidence for the pre-existence of Christ.
Logos within biblical history. Consequently, those who wish to understand the Jewish scriptures properly must recognize Christ as the Logos and comprehend how these ancient texts attest to his pre-existent activities (e.g., 1 Apol. 63.10-16; Dial. 100.1-2).

Justin also uses the concept of Christ as the pre-existent Logos to show the continuity between the exegesis of Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures. To draw this connection, he explains that the Logos was the source of inspiration for the initial composition of these sacred texts (e.g., 1 Apol. 36.1-2; 2 Apol. 10.7-8), and that the same Logos subsequently disclosed their true meaning after his incarnation (e.g., 1 Apol. 23.2-3; 1 Apol. 33.1-6; 63.1-17). Dialogue 98-106 provides a lengthy exegesis of LXX

---

93 Trakatellis, Pre-Existence, 48-49, 91-92. Several passages also mention his existence prior to creation and his incarnation in the same context (1 Apol. 21.1; 23.1; Dial. 48.1.2, 3; 87.2; 105.3) or assume the incarnation when discussing his pre-creational existence (Dial. 61.1; 62.4; 129.4). Justin also indicates that Christ existed before and participated in creation (e.g., 1 Apol. 64.5; 2 Apol. 6.1-3; Dialogue 61-62). Notably, the concept of the Logos as an agent in the act of creation is also present in the LXX (e.g., Gen 1:3, 6, 9; Ps 33:6). See also the anthropomorphic representation of wisdom in Proverbs 8.

94 Justin also frequently discusses the way that scripture contains typological or allegorical references to Christ (e.g., Dialogue 41-42; 90-91; 75; 97; 111-115; 132; 134; 140), but I will confine my discussion to his references to the activity of Christ as the pre-existent Logos. Moreover, that these categories are not mutually exclusive for Justin. For example, he can describe how LXX Psalm 21 refers to the passion of Christ in a mystical parable (Dial. 97.3) but also explain how the pre-existent Christ inspired the words of this psalm (e.g., Dial. 101.1-3). Similarly, in Dial. 75.1, Justin argues that Moses spoke cryptically of Jesus in Exod 23:20-21, but maintains that this reference to Jesus depicts his pre-existent state when he appeared to Joshua. Again, in Dialogue 113-114, Justin indicates that scripture describes Christ in hidden ways, but argues that these hidden references disclose information about his pre-existent and incarnate appearances by using figurative language. Justin also asserts that there are other forms of knowledge required to understand the Jewish scriptures correctly (e.g., knowledge of the two advents of Christ [1 Apol. 52.3; Dial. 14.8; 32.2; 36.1; 40.4; 45.4; 49.2, 7-8; 51.2; 52.1, 4; 110.2, 5; 111.1; 118.2; 121.3]; the possession of an authentic translation of the LXX [1 Apol. 31.2-5; Dial. 68.7; 71.1; 120.5]), but such forms of knowledge do not occupy as prominent a place as his doctrine of the Logos nor does Justin use them to provide a framework for explaining the continuity between the exegesis of Christ-believers and the revelation found in the Jewish scriptures.

95 In 1 Apol. 38.1, Justin also attributes the inspiration for prophecy to the Holy Spirit.

96 1 Apol. 33.1-6 especially demonstrates Justin’s understanding of the close relationship between the incarnate Logos and inspiration of the Jewish scriptures because it interweaves the description of the prophetic prediction of the incarnation and the assertion that the scriptures themselves were inspired by the divine Logos. As Trakatellis, Pre-Existence, 48-49, notes, Justin also links the pre-creation existence of Christ with his incarnation. Several passages mention these two states in the same context (1 Apol. 21.1; 23.1; 32.10; 1 Apol. 6.3-5; Dial. 48.1, 2, 3; 87.2; 105.1) or assume the incarnation when discussing his pre-creational existence (Dial. 61.1; 62.4; 129.4).
Psalm 21 that illustrates how Justin configures this type of continuity. In the process of interpreting LXX Psalm 21, Justin moves almost seamlessly between the pre-existent and incarnate identities of Christ:

Now, the next words of the psalm are these: “In you have our fathers hoped; they have hoped and you have delivered them. They cried to you, and they were saved; they trusted in you and were not confounded. But I am a worm, and no man; the reproach of men, and the outcast of the people” (LXX Ps 21:5-7). This passage proves that he [the pre-existent Christ] acknowledges as his fathers those who trusted in God and were saved by him, who were also the fathers of the virgin by whom he was born and became a man, while he states that he will be saved by the same God, and in his humility does not claim to do anything of his own will or power. He did the same when he was on earth [italics mine]. For when one of his followers said to him, “Good master,” he asked, “Why do you call me good? One is good; that is, My Father who is in heaven” (Matt 19:16-17). And when he said, “I am a worm, and no man; the reproach of men, and the outcast of the people,” he foretold what would clearly take place and happen to him. . . . He predicted what would happen to himself [italics mine]. (Dial. 101.1-3)

This passage presents LXX Ps 21:5-7 as a detailed prediction that the pre-existent Christ uttered about himself. What he foretold in his pre-existent state corresponds to what he said and did when he became incarnate (cf. Dial. 103.2; 104.1; 105.2-3; 106.3). This aspect of Justin’s interpretation of LXX Psalm 21 also parallels his description of the dual revelation provided by the Logos in 2 Apol. 10.7-8. Here Justin explains that the Logos initially “predicted things to come through the prophets” and then taught “these doctrines” when he became incarnate (cf. 1 Apol. 36.1-3). The revelation that the pre-existent Logos uttered through the prophets therefore stands in direct continuity with the actions and words of the incarnate Logos.

By indicating that Christ, the Logos, acted within biblical history, inspired the Jewish scriptures, and fulfilled them when he became incarnate, Justin presents this

---

97 For a discussion of Justin’s dependence upon the canonical gospels in Dialogue 98-106, see Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 220-223.
98 Note also 1 Apol. 38.1-8 which states that the prophets spoke in the name of Christ when they described instances of suffering in the first person.
figure as the primary point of connection between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community. Within this framework, the scriptures do not function as the sacred texts of the Jewish people as much as they record the utterances and deeds of the Logos which also presage his incarnation.\textsuperscript{99} The key link between the revelation of the Jewish scriptures and the exegesis of the Christ-believing community thus lies in Christ-believers' knowledge of the Logos. Moreover, according to Justin, the identity of the pre-existent Christ also forms the basis for his argument that Christ-believers comprise an entirely new race: "Now since Christ was the First-born (πρωτότοκος) of every creature, he founded a new race which is regenerated by him" (Dial. 138.2). In Justin's view, the Christ-believing community represents an entirely new type of people who nevertheless possess a connection with the Jewish scriptures because of their relationship to the Logos. Since they have received revelation from the incarnate Logos,\textsuperscript{100} Christ-believers recognize that these ancient texts are, from start to finish, a source of information about him.\textsuperscript{101} Given this configuration of the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and Christ, it is natural for Justin to present the recognition of the presence of the Logos

\textsuperscript{99} Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss," 306-307, similarly concludes that the Logos in the writings of Justin represents an innovation that provides continuity between the revelation in the Jewish scriptures and the revelation at the incarnation of Christ: "Deren Hülle warf dann der Logos ab, als er seine Offenbarung vollendend persönlich in die Menschengeschichte trat, und von dieser seiner höchsten Offenbarung sind die Denkwürdigkeiten der Apostel eben nur die Berichte, nicht wie die Schriften des A. T.'s eine Logosoffenbarung selbst" (307).

\textsuperscript{100} Christ-believers receive the implantation of the Logos and therefore possess complete understanding of the truth (1 Apol. 32.8; 2 Apol. 13.5-6).

\textsuperscript{101} See, especially, 1 Apol. 63.1-17. As Koester, Ancient Christian Gospels, 36-37, has argued, the close connection that Justin draws between the Jewish scriptures and his citations of Matthew and Luke aim to refute the challenge of Marcion that the gospel cannot be reconciled with the Jewish scriptures. This aim may also stand behind his presentation of the Logos as the revelation that links even non-Jewish Christ-believers to the Jewish scriptures.
within the Jewish scriptures as the primary source of revelation about Christ (\textit{Dial.} 100.1-2).

Beyond simply providing an explanation of the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and Christ-believers, the concept of Christ as the pre-existent \textit{Logos} helps Justin to demonstrate the close relationship between the knowledge of Christ-believers and non-Jewish traditions.\textsuperscript{102} Speculation about the \textit{logos} occurs in various forms within different strands of Greco-Roman philosophy and conveys a wide variety of theories about the nature of this entity.\textsuperscript{103} In the \textit{Apologies}, Justin adapts the Middle Platonist idea of the \textit{logos} as an immanent expression of the transcendent God in order to portray Christ, the pre-existent \textit{Logos}, as the source of all noble philosophy and knowledge (1


\textsuperscript{103} Stoics held the belief that the \textit{logos spermatikos} was sown within all living things by the divine \textit{Logos}. Subsequently, some first- and second-century Middle Platonists fused this Stoic concept with Platonic thought to arrive at a definition of the \textit{logos} as a rational principle that emanated from God. For further discussion of this progression, see Goodenough, \textit{Justin Martyr}, 1-32; Emily J. Hunt, \textit{Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian} (Routledge Early Church Monographs; New York: Routledge, 2003), 74-94; Robert Doran, \textit{Birth of a Worldview: Early Christianity in its Jewish and Pagan Context} (Boulder, Colorado: Westview: 1995), 34-37. A number of scholars have attributed Justin’s concept of Christ as the pre-existent \textit{Logos} to the influence of Middle Platonic thought. See, e.g., A. von Harnack, \textit{Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte auflage} (3 vols.; Freiburg, Leipzig & Tübingen: Mohr, 1894-1897), 1:511; Carl Andresen, \textit{“Justin und der mittlere Platonismus,”} \textit{ZNW} 44 (1952): 157-195; M. J. Edwards, \textit{“On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr,”} \textit{JTS} 42 (1991): 17-34. Others argue that Justin developed his \textit{Logos} theory primarily through dependence upon Philo, the Fourth Gospel, the concept of wisdom in the LXX, or all three. See, e.g., R. Holte, \textit{“Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin’s Apologies,”} \textit{ST} 12 (1958): 109-168; R. M. Price, \textit{“Hellenization’ and Logos doctrine in Justin Martyr,”} \textit{VC} 42 (1988): 19-20; Trakatellis, \textit{Pre-Existence}, 173. For a detailed discussion of the differing scholarly positions regarding Justin’s dependence upon Platonic philosophy, see Nahm, \textit{“Debate,”} 129-151. Although it is impossible to determine the extent to which Justin was influenced by Middle Platonism, it is clear that he did use Greek thought and terminology in his writings.
For example, in *Apol.* 5.1-4, Justin refers to the “unreasonable passion” (ἀλόγως πάθει) of those who persecute Christ-believers but portrays both Christ-believers and Socrates as those who suffer unjustly because they attempt to draw men to “true reason” (λόγῳ ἀληθείᾳ). Similarly, in *Apol.* 46.2-3, he indicates that Christ is “the Logos of whom all humankind partakes” and that those who lived by reason in the past were Christians, even though they lived prior to the incarnation of Christ. Justin thus presents Christ, the pre-existent Logos, as the sole source of reasonable thought and knowledge.

Notwithstanding these descriptions of the close affinities between the knowledge of Christ-believers and Greek philosophy, Justin ultimately demonstrates the superiority of Christ-believers to Greek philosophers.

---

104 The terminology that Justin uses in these passages has fueled considerable discussion regarding the extent to which he relied on Middle Platonism for his understanding of the human acquisition of truth. Andresen, “Justin,” 170-180, holds that Justin borrowed the Middle-Platonic concept of logos spermatikos as an ethical and moral form that was implanted in all humans. According to Andresen, Middle Platonists assimilated Cicero’s doctrine of semina virtutum with the Stoic concept of world-pneuma to arrive at their ethical understanding of the logos spermatikos. Holte, “Logos Spermatikos,” 136-142, also recognizes that Justin relies on Stoic and Middle-Platonic thought to describe the human possession of truth (e.g., *Apol.* 8.1; cf. 6.3), but argues that Justin transforms this concept by presenting the truth and virtue that philosophers acquire as only a seed or incomplete form of the ultimate truth found in Christ, the divine Logos. Holte also notes that Justin distinguishes between Christ, the divine Logos, and mere human imitation of the truth (*Apol.* 13.6) and maintains that the concepts of λόγος σπερματικός (*Apol.* 8.3; 13.3) and τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου (*Apol.* 8.1; cf. 6.3; 13.5) in Justin’s writings should not be regarded as identical. In his view, λόγος σπερματικός refers to the divine activity of the Logos as the disseminator of truth and τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου to human possession of knowledge.

105 Cf. *Apol.* 7.3; 10.4-8. E. Benz, “Christus und Socrates in der alten Kirche,” *ZNW* 43 (1950-1951): 195-224, argues that Justin forges this link between Christ-believers and Socrates primarily because he sees in Socrates the model of a Christian martyr; as Christ-believers of Justin’s day were accused and martyred for being atheists, so was Socrates; cf. Skarsaune, “Justin Martyr,” 64.

106 As Oskar Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from His Portrait of Socrates,” in *Geschichte–Tradition– Reflexion: Festschriften für Martin Hengel zum 70 Geburtstag* (vol. 3: Frühes Christentum; ed. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 604, explains, Justin links the role of Christ as Logos and mediator of creation with his concept of human reason: “It is precisely as created by God and through the agency of His Logos that men are endowed with ‘human logos’ (*Apol.* 10.8).” He suggests that this connection stands behind Justin’s references to the logos spermatikos (*Apol.* 8.3; 13.3). In his view, the activity of Christ as Logos spermatikos (σπερματικὸς λόγου in *Apol.* 8.3; 13.5) corresponds to the “seed of reason (σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου) implanted in all humankind” (*Apol.* 8.1; cf. 13.5).
of the insight of the Christ-believing community. He argues that ancient philosophers, like Christ-believers, received their inspiration from the pre-existent Logos (2 Apol. 10.4-8; 13.1-6) and drew upon the writings of Moses and the prophets in an attempt to attain the truth (1 Apol. 44.8-11; 59.1-60.11). Nevertheless, he maintains that only a limited number of ancient philosophers acquired what was in fact a very partial understanding of the truth, because they did not fully comprehend the Logos and the Jewish scriptures (1 Apol. 44.8-10; 2 Apol. 13.3). By contrast, he asserts that Christ-believers possess the most ancient and complete form of truth because of their knowledge of the incarnate Logos and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. For this reason, Justin concludes that "the truths which people in all lands have rightly spoken belong to us Christians" (2 Apol. 13.4; cf. 1 Apol. 23.1-3).

Despite his emphasis upon the similarity between ancient Hellenistic philosophers and Christ-believers, Justin denies affinity between Christ-believers and Greco-Roman religion. As Peter Widdicombe, "Justin Martyr, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Greek Myths," SP 31 (1997): 234-239, explains, Justin also expresses a similar ambivalence in his attitude toward Greek mythology. He uses Greek mythology positively to argue that myths represent an expression of Christian faith, albeit a distorted version of it, and negatively insofar as he argues that Greek myths were inspired by demons to lead people astray. Similarly, Annette Reed, "The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr," JECS (2004): 163, 168, observes that Justin paradoxically holds opposite views of Hellenistic ideals by arguing, on the one hand, for Plato's dependence upon Moses for his conception of creation (e.g., 1 Apology 59) but asserting, on the other, that demons deceive people by mimicking Mosaic prophecy (e.g., 1 Apology 54-55). According to Arthur J. Droge, Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture (HUT 26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 55, Justin follows a philosophical tradition which critiqued popular Greek religion. Although philosophers such as Plutarch and Xenocrates criticized Greek religion in order to purge it from certain characteristics which they found unseemly, Justin critiques all forms of Greek religion. For further discussion regarding the presentation of Greek religion and philosophy as opposites in the writings of Justin, see Skarsaune, "Judaism and Hellenism," 594-597; Trakatellis, Pre-Existence, 10-14.

Adolf Harnack, History of Dogma (trans. Neil Buchanan; 7 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1896-1905), 2:169-187, and M. Engelhardt, Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der katholischen Glaubenslehre (Erlangen: Andreas Deichert, 1878), 223-241, have argued that Justin presents Christianity as a philosophy in which the prophets and Christ taught the same timeless truths concerning monotheism, virtue, and immortality. According to this view, Justin creates a link between the Christ-believing community and Greek philosophy by positing a close affinity between the basic beliefs and approaches of both. More recently, however, scholars have rightly contested this view by demonstrating that Justin does not promote a close connection between Christ-believers and
Summary

Luke develops a complex network of links between the traditions and scriptures of Israel and the Jesus movement. Within this portrait of continuity, he presents Jesus and his followers as prophetic messengers who communicate God’s revelation to the people of Israel by declaring how the Jewish scriptures have been fulfilled. Rather than appealing to – or perhaps even conceiving of – the concept of Christ as pre-existent Logos to develop this continuity, Luke uses λόγος-terminology to depict the message of Jesus and his followers as a prophetic word to the Jewish people. In so doing, he presents their proclamation as the proper continuation of the message of the ancient contemporary philosophers but only between Christ-believers and ancient Hellenistic philosophers. See, e.g., Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism,” 596-597; Reed, “Trickery,” 166. R. M. Price, “Are there ‘Holy Pagans’ in Justin Martyr?” SP 31 (1997): 168-170, also argues that Justin refers only to a “special and limited class” of philosophers when referring to those who were enlightened by the Logos. As Lyman, “Postcolonial Perspectives,” 167, concludes, Justin did not present Christian truth as “wholly other” from cultural truth but rather asserted that it “was the original type from which others drew their usually inferior imitation”; cf. Droge, Homer or Moses, 66-68.

Luke emphasizes the role of Jesus as a prophet, but also recognizes other aspects of his identity, as noted in footnote 71 above. Richard Bauckham, “The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus,” in The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus (JSJSup 63; ed. Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 60-64, also points out that Acts 2:33-35 portrays Christ as the exalted king of Israel who pours out the gift of the Spirit (cf. Ps 110:1), and even in his gospel Luke portrays the cosmic impact of the earthly activities of Jesus (Luke 10:17-24). Recently, Simon J. Gathercole, The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), has argued that the synoptic gospels contain references to the pre-existence of Christ, especially in the citation and interpretation of LXX Ps 109:3 (Mark 12:35-37; Matt 22:41-45; Luke 20:41-44), the use of the formulaic phrase “I have come in order to . . . ” and the phrase “when the day shall dawn upon us from on high.” For a discussion of this argument with reference to the gospel of Luke (Luke 1:78; 12:49-51; 19:10; 22:41-44), see especially 161-170, 236-242. L. W. Hurtado, Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 323, argues that the absence of any mention of the preexistence of Christ in the synoptic gospels does not necessarily indicate that they were ignorant of this concept.

prophets and as the privileged knowledge, or proper perspective, with which to
understand the Jewish scriptures correctly. By contrast, Justin presents the pre-existent
Logos as the special source of knowledge required to understand the scriptures correctly
and as the figure that provides continuity between the Jewish scriptures and the exegesis
of Christ-believers. Furthermore, by depicting the Logos, who inspired the Jewish
scriptures, as the sole source of primordial truth, Justin can present the knowledge and
exegesis of Christ-believers as a superior alternative to non-Jewish sources of truth.111

2.5 Conclusion

Like early Jewish interpreters who assert that they possess an authoritative ability
to interpret the Jewish scriptures because of their access to divine inspiration and proper
instruction, so Luke and Justin use similar strategies to show the legitimacy of the
exegesis of the Christ-believing community. Both authors attempt to demonstrate the
authority of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers by attributing its origins to the
instruction of the risen Christ and presenting it as an outcome of divine revelation. Like
the Qumran community, Luke and Justin present the founder of their group as an
authoritative exegete who teaches the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures to his
followers. Moreover, even as the Qumran group associates the adoption of the correct
understanding of the Jewish scriptures with entrance to their community, so Luke and
Justin present the acquisition of the proper interpretation of the scriptures as a necessary
pre-requisite to becoming a member of the Christ-believing community. Luke and Justin

111 Notably, although Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss,” 321-322, argues that both Acts and
Justin present “pagan” culture in a more positive light than does Paul, he concludes that Justin develops
more comprehensive links between Christianity and Greco-Roman philosophy.
thus knit their interpretative claims together with community identity in a manner that
bears significant resemblance to the exegetical claims of certain early Jewish interpreters.

Although these commonalities between them also suggest that Luke and Justin
held similar theological views, the approach of Justin differs significantly from that of
Luke insofar as he configures a different type of continuity between the Jewish scriptures
and his community. Luke portrays the message and exegesis of Christ-believers as a
continuation of the message of the ancient Jewish prophets whereas Justin outlines a
connection between the Jewish scriptures and Christ-believers that does not depend on
their possession of a direct link with Jewish origins. Not only does his depiction of the
pre-existent \textit{Logos} enable Justin to assert that the Jewish scriptures had always attested to
the beliefs of Christ-believers rather than those of Jews;\textsuperscript{112} it also facilitates his argument
that the former possess an ancient form of philosophical truth that pre-dates and rivals
non-Jewish traditions. Justin thus asserts the superiority of the knowledge and exegesis
of Christ-believers in relation to the wider Greco-Roman world as well as to Jews.

\textsuperscript{112} According to Frances Watson, \textit{Text and Truth: Re-defining Biblical Theology} (Grand Rapids:
Eerdmans, 1997), 324-325, this type of Christological reading of scripture does not abandon the Jewish
roots of Christianity but radically reinterprets them in order to provide theological coherence between the
Jewish scriptures and the beliefs of the Christian movement. Judith M. Lieu, \textit{Christian Identity in the
Jewish and Graeco-Roman World} (New York: OUP, 2004), 83, suggests that the dilemma facing Christians
surrounded their need “to claim the continuity with the past without admitting the Jews’ own claim, which
would entail losing a sense of separate identity”; cf. Jean Daniélou, \textit{Gospel Message and Hellenistic
Culture} (trans. John Austin Baker; vol. 2 of \textit{A History of Early Christian Doctrine}; Philadelphia:
Chapter Three:
Competing for Identity Within a Greco-Roman Milieu

3.1 Introduction

As I noted at the end of chapter two, Justin uses the concept of Christ as Logos, in part, to assert the superiority of the exegesis of the Christ-believing community over non-Jewish sources of knowledge. Although this aspect of Justin’s appropriation of the Jewish scriptures differs from that of Luke and early Jewish apocalyptic groups, it closely corresponds to the exegetical aims of early Jewish and Christian apologists.\(^1\) The latter authors appealed to the Jewish scriptures in an attempt to compete for group recognition within the Roman Empire. To do so, they present the Jewish scriptures as more ancient than non-Jewish traditions and the exegesis of their groups as a rival form of philosophical inquiry. To be sure, early Christian apologists had to assert that the sacred texts of Jews were the special province of Christ-believers, but they did not use this type of claim for the sole purpose of distinguishing Christ-believers from Jews. Instead, they

---

\(^1\) Scholars of early Judaism and Christianity frequently discuss the difficulties associated with identifying some ancient writings as “apologetic” literature. When I refer to “apologists” and “apologetic” in this chapter I use such terminology to describe authors or works that defend or compete for the recognition of their groups in relation to non-Jewish traditions within the Greco-Roman world. For an insightful discussion surrounding the difficulties associated with the use of the category of “apology” to describe early Christian writings, see Sarah Parvis, “Justin Martyr and the Apologetic Tradition,” in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds* (ed. Sarah Parvis and Paul Foster; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 115-117; cf. Bernard Poudron, *Les apologistes grecs du IIe siècle* (Paris: du Cerf, 2005), 138. Notably, Eusebius uses the term *apologia* to refer to works that address an emperor in a trial speech in defense of Christians (e.g., *HE.* 4.3.1-3; 4.18.2; 4.26.1-2; 5.5.5; 5.17.5). See also Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, and Christopher Rowland, “Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price in association with Christopher Rowland; New York: OUP, 1999), 1; Frances Young, “Greek Apologists of the Second Century,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, 103-104; Richard A. Norris Jr., “Apologists,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth; Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 36-37; Rebecca Lyman, “Justin and Hellenism: Some Postcolonial Perspectives,” in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds*, 162-168; Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford: OUP, 2001), 1-38.
combined their claim to possess a privileged understanding of the Jewish scriptures with assertions about the antiquity or superiority of the Jewish scriptures over non-Jewish textual traditions.

The claim to antiquity was important in the ancient world because it served as proof of originality; a group that could not trace its origins to the ancient past would be subject to the allegation of dependence and consequently have no claim to autochthony. Similarly, this type of argument finds ongoing expression in the Greek notion that philosophy was at its purest form during the earliest period of human history. Greco-Roman philosophical schools asserted that they possessed a superior form of truth and sought to demonstrate continuity between their writings and a primordial, or ancient, Urphilosophen. Accordingly, both early Jewish and Christian apologists appropriate the Jewish scriptures as part of an attempt to present their knowledge and origins as more ancient than non-Jewish traditions, and their exegesis as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals the study of other ancient bodies of literature.

---


3 According to J. H. Waszink, “Some Observations on the Appreciation of the ‘Philosophy of the Barbarians’ in Early Christian Literature,” in *Mélanges offerts à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann* (Utrecht: Spectrum, 1963), 41-56, this view is found in essentially two forms: either in the argument that the highest point in the history of philosophy goes back to the earliest Greek philosophy or in the assertion that it goes back to the earliest point in human history before the initial period of Greek philosophy; cf. Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 90.

4 Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 49-75, has argued that the presentation of the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures by Justin and other early apologists represents an attempt to portray it as a superior alternative to the Greek paideia. Even as Greco-Roman culture appealed to Homer as a means of educating its members, so Justin sought to replace this tradition by portraying the Jewish scriptures as the preferred source of ancient tradition and the basis for the formation of Christian culture. From a slightly different perspective, Lyman, “Postcolonial Perspectives,” 162-168, argues that Justin does not deny the differences between Christianity and Greek philosophy but provides a “sophisticated argument for a truth whose antiquity,
Scholars have long noted that early Christian apologists follow their early Jewish counterparts in appealing to the Jewish scriptures to defend the status of their groups in relation to non-Jewish traditions. Many also suggest that Luke wrote with the similar aim of gaining recognition for Christ-believers within Greco-Roman society. Indeed, explanation for evil, and universal practice offer an original blend of complicity and resistance to traditional paideia. . . . Justin as an 'apologist' did not translate an existing religion – that is, Christianity – into an external culture for explanation or defense, but reflects an attempt within Roman Hellenism by an educated provincial to address contemporary problems of religious authenticity and multiple authorities" (166). Similarly, Whitmarsh, Greek Literature, 88, argues that sophists of the first and second centuries frequently imitated classical texts. This mimesis of classical Greek culture involved an ongoing process of negotiating the relationship between the past and the present.


those who have argued that Luke and Justin hold parallel theological perspectives often point to commonalities between their representations of Greek philosophy and Roman political power.\(^7\) In particular, O’Neill and Hyldahl have suggested that the parallel emphasis upon the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures in the writings of Luke and Justin serves a similar apologetic purpose, namely, to demonstrate the ancient origins of the Christ-believing community and therefore its legitimacy in the eyes of the non-Jewish world.\(^8\) More recently, Gregory E. Sterling has argued that Luke-Acts stands within the genre of “apologetic historiography” and concludes that both Jewish historiographers and Luke appeal to the Jewish scriptures to describe the remote origins and distinct identity of their respective groups within the Roman Empire.\(^9\)

\(^7\) See pages 12-13 of the introduction.


In this chapter, I will explore the extent to which Luke and Justin lay claim to the Jewish scriptures as part of an effort to gain recognition for the Christ-believing community within their wider Greco-Roman context. To provide a framework for this comparison, I will briefly note the most common ways that early Jewish and Christian apologists appeal the Jewish scriptures for this purpose: 1) the claim that the Jewish scriptures represent a source of truth which is older than, or superior to, non-Jewish traditions; 2) the presentation of the study of the scriptures as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals that of Greek philosophical schools; and 3) the portrayal of the Mosaic law as an exemplary, or superior, form of legislation and ethical guidance. Subsequently, I will consider the extent to which Luke and Justin use these strategies. Although a number of scholars have correctly concluded that Luke uses Hellenistic historiographical methods and expresses apologetic concerns, I will here argue that his appropriation of the Jewish scriptures differs substantially from that of Justin as well as other early Jewish and Christian apologists.

3.2 The Jewish Scriptures in the Writings of the Early Apologists

As part of their bid for cultural recognition, certain early Jewish authors appeal to the Jewish scriptures to present their race and scriptural heritage as older than those of Greeks and other peoples. For example, Eupolemus draws upon biblical history to depict Moses as the originator of philosophy, the alphabet, and written laws (P.E. 9.26; Strom. (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 99-101, argues that the description of the fulfillment of prophecy in Luke-Acts represents an appeal to antiquity commensurate with the common Hellenistic practice of tracing the origins of a people group to the ancient past.

134
These claims serve to demonstrate the originality and superiority of Jewish traditions. Similarly, Artapanus expands the biblical accounts of Abraham, Moses, and Joseph in order to demonstrate that these biblical heroes, rather than Egyptians and Greeks, were the founders of culture. Furthermore, the first known Jewish philosopher, Aristobulus, asserts the superiority of Mosaic law by arguing that Plato, Socrates, and Pythagoras imitated this legislation. He maintains that these later philosophers marveled at the wisdom and divine inspiration of Moses and therefore used his writings in their own works.

Subsequently, in the Roman era, the Jewish historian Josephus describes himself as an inspired interpreter of the Jewish scriptures (e.g., B.J. 3.351-354, 400-402; 4.312). Rather than using this type of claim to compete with other Jews, however, Josephus appeals to the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the superior status of his people and their traditions. In the Antiquities, he portrays significant Jewish ancestors as exemplars or

---


11 Alexander Polyhistor preserved the works of Eupolemus and Artapanus in On the Jews, a composition which Eusebius preserved in fragmentary form in chapter nine of his Praeparatio evangelica. See also Clement of Alexandria's Strom. 1.23; 1.41.1-4; 1.53.4; 1.154.2-3. For discussion of date and provenance of Artapanus, see Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 168-169; Collins, Athens and Jerusalem, 32-33; Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 106.

12 Aristobulus lived and wrote in the second century BCE but his writings are extant only in fragmentary form in the writings of Eusebius (H.E. 7.32.16-18 and P.E. 8.9.38-8.10.17; 13.12.1-16) and Clement of Alexandria (Stromateis, books 1, 5, and 6).

13 Although Josephus characterizes himself as an inspired exegete, this theme is not nearly as prominent as his attempts to demonstrate the superiority of the Jewish scriptures over all other ancient traditions.
originators of the most ancient and noblest aspects of human civilization: Abraham as the figure who taught science to the Egyptians (A.J. 1.154-168), Moses as the originator of the best political constitution (A.J. 3.223), and the ancient writings of Jews as predictions about the entire plan of world history (A.J. 10.266-281; 11.1-3, 331-339). In his treatise Against Apion, or On the Antiquity of the Jews, Josephus likewise contrasts the culture, knowledge, and records of Greeks with the Jewish scriptures (C. Ap. 1.6-14), and argues that the latter represent a more ancient and accurate record of history (C. Ap. 1.29-37).

Josephus further attempts to assert the superiority of the Jewish scriptures over competing Greco-Roman traditions by portraying the Mosaic law as a superior form of legislation. In the Antiquities, he maintains that the Mosaic code is better than other forms of legislation because it originates from the contemplation of God and corresponds to the nature of the universe (A.J. 1.18-24). Similarly, in Against Apion, he asserts that the law of Moses benefits all humanity (C.A. 2.282-284, 293-295). The latter description addresses critics who accused Jews of contributing nothing useful to civilization (C.A. 2.282-284, 293-295).
2.135-136, 148, 182). Far from producing no eminent wise men or inventors, Josephus argues, the Jewish nation originated the most ancient and excellent constitutional system (C. Ap. 2.149-156), one that others have attempted to imitate because of its universal value and significance (C. Ap. 2.168, 281-286).

Josephus further aims to demonstrate the superiority of the Mosaic law over competing Greco-Roman traditions by portraying it as an ancient source of philosophy. He indicates that those who study and follow the Law of Moses will find it “profound and highly philosophical” (ἡ θεωρία καὶ λίαν φιλόσοφος; A.J. 1.25; cf. 1.18) and will experience “a happy life” (εὐδαιμονία βίον; A.J. 1.20; cf. 3.84). This description corresponds to the Greek notion that happiness (εὐδαιμονία) was the aim of philosophical inquiry (e.g., Aristotle, N.E. 10.6.1; Epictetus Diss. 1.4.32).\(^{17}\) Elsewhere, he presents different groups within Judaism as philosophical schools (A.J. 13.171-173; 15.371; 18.12-20; cf. J.W. 2.162-166) and key figures in the history of Israel as philosophers in their own right (e.g., A.J. 1.154-168, 238; 2.7, 291; 4.328; 5.118; 7.158; 8.34, 42, 167; 10.193).\(^{18}\) Moreover, in Against Apion, Josephus presents himself as one who is thoroughly trained in the “philosophy (φιλοσοφίας) of the sacred writings of Jews” (C. Ap. 1.54), and asserts that Greek philosophers depended upon Moses for their concept of

\(^{17}\) Moreover, the ideal constitution was a topic of discussion for philosophers and philosophy itself was regarded as the practice of a particular way of life. See Feldman, Antiquities, xxix-xxx; Mason, “Social and Literary Context,” 187.

\(^{18}\) On this theme in the Antiquities, see Feldman, Ancient World, 210-214, 261-263; idem, Antiquities, xxix-xxxii; Carl H. Holladay, Théos Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology (SBLDS 40; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977), 102. There are also significant points of contact between the writings of Josephus and Stoic thought. For example, he presents Abraham as a Stoic-like philosopher (A.J. 1.156) and Moses as a Stoic sage (A.J. 2.229), and uses Stoic terminology to describe God (e.g., πρόνοια, εὐμενεία; A.J. 2.219; 4.180, 185).
God (C. Ap. 2.167-168, 257, 281). By depicting the Mosaic law in this way, Josephus not only claims antiquity for the Jewish scriptures; he also presents their superiority over Greek philosophical traditions.

The struggle of the Jewish people for recognition within a competing non-Jewish culture also influences the presentation of the Jewish scriptures in the writings of Philo of Alexandria. Like Josephus, Philo portrays the scriptures as a source of philosophical inquiry. He describes Abraham and Moses as all-wise philosophers (Abr. 13; Mos. 1.18-29, 48), and himself as an inspired interpreter of scripture who functions as a philosopher through this exegetical activity (e.g., Cher. 27, 48; Somn. 2.252; Spec. 3.1-6). Philo also presents the synagogue study of the Jewish scriptures as the engagement of Jews in their “ancestral philosophy” (πατρία φιλοσοφία; Somn. 2.127; Mos. 2.216; Legat. 156, 245; Spec. 2.61-62), and the allegorical exegesis of the Therapeutae as a revelatory experience in which they practice “sacred philosophy” (ἱερὰ φιλοσοφία; Contemp. 25-26, 28, 67, 69, 89). He thus presents the Jewish scriptures as an ancient source of

19 Notably, 4 Maccabees also associates the study of and loyalty to the Mosaic law with philosophy (see, e.g., 4 Mace 1:1, 17; 7:9).
21 Notably, both Philo and Josephus also describe other Jewish groups as philosophical schools (e.g., Prob. 67, 80; J.W. 2.119).
philosophical truth and the exegesis of the Jewish people as a superior form of philosophical inquiry.  

Philo also advances arguments to demonstrate the superiority of the Mosaic law. He argues that Greek philosophers depended upon the writings of Moses to develop their thought and legislation (Prob. 57; Aet. 17-19; Leg. Alleg. 1.108; Leg. 4.61; Her. 214), and presents the Mosaic code as a divinely-inspired source of wisdom, piety, and virtue (Mos. 2.8-11, 45-65; cf. Leg. 1.56-59; 4.133-135; Contemp. 28). Furthermore, in his view, those who follow the law of Moses conduct their lives in a manner which is harmonious with nature, the order of the universe, and right reason (e.g., Mos. 2.11, 14, 48-52; Q.E. 2.19; cf. Opif. 3, 171d-172; Prob. 46-47). As such, the Mosaic law serves as a written representation of an unwritten universal law and so functions as "a law for the whole world" (Q.E. 2.42). Philo thus presents the Mosaic law as a form of legislation and moral guidance that rivals all other traditions.

---

22 Peder Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” in Jewish Writings, 262; idem, Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time (NovTSup 86; Brill: Leiden, 1997), 9-10; Sterling, “Platonizing Moses,” 102-103; David T. Runia, Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria (Hampshire: Variorum, 1990), 189-190; Wolfson, Philo, 1:141-143.


24 Notions of unwritten law and natural justice stretch as far back as the fifth century BCE (e.g., Plato, Sophocles), but Stoics were the first to develop the concept of a universal natural law. Cicero provides an especially clear description of the law of nature and develops this concept more than his predecessors (e.g., De Rep. 3.33; De Leg. 1.18-19). So John W. Martens, One God: One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law (AMMTC 5; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 1-30; cf. Gisela Striker, “Origins of the Concept of Natural Law,” in Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 209-220; Hindy Najman, “The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law,” SPhilo 11 (1999): 55-73; Richard A. Horsley, “The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero,” HTR 71 (1978), 36-40. Although the concept of a universal law, or law of nature, derives from a combination of Stoic traditions and an eclectic form of Platonic philosophy, Philo transforms this idea by associating it
The survival of the writings of early Jewish apologists depended, in part, on church fathers who recognized their significance for the development of the early Christian apologetic tradition (e.g., Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Eusebius). Although it is difficult to determine the extent to which the earliest Christian apologists drew upon the works of these Jewish authors, those who appeal to the Jewish scriptures do so with a notably similar aim; namely, to demonstrate the superiority of these sacred texts over competing non-Jewish traditions. Accordingly, early Christian apologists lay claim to the Jewish scriptures by asserting that Christ-believers alone understand them correctly, but they combine this claim with arguments that present the knowledge and practices of Christ-believers as a superior alternative to Greek traditions and philosophy.

A number of second-century Christian apologists show evidence of early stages in the development of this approach. In his Embassy on Behalf of Christians, for example, Athenagoras affirms that the Greek poets and philosophers rightly believe in one deity, but do not fully understand God because they rely upon their own conjectures; each comes to his own conclusions about God through guesswork and approximation. By contrast, he argues, Christ-believers possess a knowledge of God to which the Jewish

---


26 As Norris, "Apologists," 42, notes, the date of Athenagoras’s Embassy can be determined by the addressees – Marcus Aurelius (died – 180 CE) and Lucius Aurelius Commodus (became associated with his father as emperor in 176 CE). This suggests that the work was written between 176-180 CE.
scripts attest (Leg. 7.3; cf. Leg. 9.1-2). According to Athenagoras, the divine origin of the message of the prophets confirms the beliefs of Christ-believers and thus demonstrates the authenticity of their knowledge over that of Greek philosophers.

Tatian, a disciple of Justin, develops a more thorough contrast between the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures and Greek thought than does Athenagoras.\footnote{27} In his \textit{Oration to the Greeks}, Tatian harshly denigrates Greek philosophy and practices (e.g., \textit{Or.} 1-3, 8-11, 16-19, 22-28), and subsequently reports that he experienced liberation from the error of Greek doctrines when he received divine revelation while reading the Jewish scriptures (\textit{Or.} 29.1-2).\footnote{28} Besides contrasting Greek thought with the Christian interpretation of the Jewish scriptures, the account of his conversion has a philosophical dimension: in his search for truth, Tatian was convinced by the compelling antiquity, monotheism, cosmology, and anthropology of the Jewish scriptures (\textit{Or.} 29.1-2).\footnote{29} Moreover, Tatian subsequently presents himself as “a disciple of philosophy” who has discovered the most ancient source of truth through his reading of the Jewish scriptures (\textit{Or.} 42.1).

\footnote{27} Although Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr, his orthodoxy remains a matter of debate. Epiphanius (\textit{Panarion} 1.3.46) indicates that Tatian broke away from the church in 150 CE whereas Eusebius (\textit{Chron.} XII) reports that he did so in 172 CE. For further discussion, see Molly Whittaker, \textit{Tatian: Oration ad Graecos and Fragments} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), ix; Robert M. Grant, “The Heresy of Tatian,” \textit{JTS} 4-6 (1954): 62-68; Gerald F. Hawthorne, “Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks,” \textit{HTR} 57 (1964): 166; Emily J. Hunt, \textit{Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian} (London: Routledge, 2003), 20-51.

\footnote{28} In \textit{Or.} 29.1-2, Tatian indicates that the “barbarian writings” (i.e., the Jewish scriptures) liberated him from error and that, in this process, his “soul was taught by God.” Elsewhere, Tatian reiterates both the importance of the Jewish scriptures as a source of knowledge (\textit{Or.} 20.2) and the role of the “divine spirit” in obtaining knowledge about God (\textit{Or.} 13.3; cf. 15.1).

Elsewhere, Tatian assumes that the Jewish scriptures rightly belong to Christ-believers because they have adopted these ancient texts as their system of philosophy. He identifies the Jewish scriptures as “our philosophy,” “our history,” “our prophets,” and “our way of life and history according to our laws” (*Or.* 31.1; cf. 32.1; 35.1, 2; 36.2; 42.1). He also describes Christ-believers as “those who follow the word of God” or “those who obey the word of God” (*Or.* 25.3; 26.3; 30.1). Tatian thus concludes that the Jewish scriptures are the special province of Christ-believers because they possess a revelatory understanding of them and use these texts as their source of philosophy and practice. This argument, together with the claim that the Jewish scriptures represent the most ancient source of truth, enables Tatian to present the knowledge and practices of Christ-believers as a superior alternative to Greek traditions and philosophy.

Shortly after the time of Justin, Theophilus, a second-century apologist and bishop from Syrian Antioch, composed a collection of three treatises known as *Ad Autolycum* (169 CE). In this work, he contrasts the Jewish scriptures with Greek traditions by arguing that Greek authors plagiarized the predictions of the Jewish prophets (*Ad Auto.* 2.12, 37), advancing a chronological argument to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jewish scriptures as compared with other sources (*Ad Auto.* 3.16-30), presenting the Mosaic law as the proper corrective to the immoral and idolatrous practices of Greeks (*Ad Auto.* 2.34-35), and asserting that the prophets composed a more accurate record of early history than Greek authors because the Spirit and the *Logos* inspired them (*Ad Auto.* 2.10, 30, 33; cf. 3:26).

---

30 In these contexts, “the word of God” appears to refer to the Jewish scriptures.
Alongside his presentation of the antiquity and moral superiority of the Jewish scriptures, Theophilus asserts that these texts are the special possession of Christ-believers. He argues that Christ-believers understand the Jewish scriptures correctly because they have been instructed by the same Logos and Spirit that inspired the prophets (Ad Auto. 2.30, 33; cf. 2.22). Apparently, for Theophilus, this revelatory ability to interpret the scriptures enables Christ-believers to claim the sacred texts of Jews as their own. He refers to Moses as "our prophet" (Ad Auto. 3.18), describes the Jewish scriptures as "the books which belong to us," "our scriptures," or "our sacred writings" (Ad Auto. 2.30; 3.1, 26), and depicts the patriarchs as "our forefathers" (Ad Auto. 3.20).31 Furthermore, Theophilus describes the Mosaic covenant as a "divine law" which God gave for the benefit and restoration of the entire human race (Ad Auto. 3.9-10; cf. 2.14, 34-35), and argues that those who obey the law and the prophets (i.e., Christ-believers) receive the benefits promised to those who follow the divine commands of God (Ad Auto. 1.14; 2.30, 33).32 Through their correct understanding of and fidelity to the Jewish scriptures, Theophilus argues, Christ-believers lay claim to a source of knowledge which is "not only more ancient but also more true than all historians and poets" (Ad Auto. 2.30; cf. 2.9-10; 3.1, 16-17, 26, 29).33

31 Despite these claims, Theophilus still acknowledges that Jews hold a special place as heirs of the promises of the Jewish scriptures. For example, in Ad Auto. 3.9, he indicates that God gave the divine law "not only to all the world but especially to the Hebrews" and in this context refers to Jews as the "righteous seed of pious and holy men, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob." Similarly, in Ad Auto. 3.11, he states that Isaiah spoke generally to all humans but especially to Israel.


33 In the final section of book three, Theophilus also provides a chronological argument which aims to demonstrate the antiquity of the Jewish scriptures as compared with other sources (Ad Auto. 3.16-30). He concludes that this chronology shows the antiquity of the prophets and the divine nature of the
Summary

Both early Jewish and Christian apologists use the Jewish scriptures to defend or gain recognition for their groups by presenting these sacred texts as superior to non-Jewish textual traditions. Early Christian apologists clearly stake out a special claim upon the Jewish scriptures by asserting that Christ-believers possess a privileged knowledge of them. Yet, like early Jewish apologists, they situate such claims within the context of rivalry with non-Jewish traditions. Not surprisingly, then, both early Jewish and Christian apologists deploy similar strategies when they appeal to the Jewish scriptures. In the majority of cases, these authors claim that the Jewish scriptures are more ancient than non-Jewish traditions or represent these texts as a superior source of philosophical inquiry. Furthermore, some authors also depict the written Mosaic code as a superior form of legislation or ethical guide. Through this type of argumentation, both early Jewish and Christian apologists attempt to show the legitimacy of the origins of their groups within the non-Jewish world.

3.4 Justin: The Recovery of Primordial Truth

Since I have already outlined the way that Justin uses the concept of Christ as pre-existent Logos to demonstrate the superiority and antiquity of the exegesis of Christ-believers, a brief review of some key passages in his writings will serve to illustrate the close affinity between some of his appeals to the Jewish scriptures and those of other early Jewish and Christian apologists. For this reason, I will first discuss select passages

Christian message (3.29). Notably, the chronology appears to rely on material from Against Apion (compare Ad Auto. 3.20-25 with C. Ap. 1.93-154). For an evaluation of the parallels between the two works, see Hardwick, Josephus, 12-14.
from his *I Apology* and the *Dialogue* before turning to a more lengthy consideration of the extent to which the use of scripture in Luke-Acts fits into the same type of apologetic tradition.

Perhaps Justin should be identified as the Christian apologist who first develops an apologetic approach to the Jewish scriptures. As with his description of Christ as the pre-existent *Logos*, Justin presents the Christian exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as a form of knowledge that rivals Hellenistic philosophy. In the *Apologies*, this type of argument plays a central role in Justin’s defense of the doctrine and practices of Christ-believers. Initially, he attempts to show the similarity between the teachings of Christ-believers and the writings of Greek philosophers, and asks why the former are punished as criminals when they hold views which are similar to the latter (*I Apol.* 7.3; 20.1-22.6; 26.6). Ultimately, however, Justin draws a contrast between the two. He presents the Jewish scriptures as the most ancient source of truth (*I Apol.* 23.1-2; 44.8; 54.5; 59.1) and as a repository of Spirit-inspired predictions about Christ (*I Apology* 31-35; 37-40; 45; 47-53), on the one hand, and the writings of Greek philosophers as demon-incited

---

34 Note that Athenagoras, Tatian, and Theophilus all composed their works shortly after the time of Justin. For further discussion of Justin as the inventor of the genre of Christian apology in its classical form, see Parvis, “Apologetic Tradition,” 115-127.

35 He argues that the incarnation and earthly ministry of Christ bear similarity to myths about Mercury, Perseus, and Aesculapius (*I Apol.* 22.1-6), and notes points of agreement between Christian doctrine and the teachings of Plato, Stoics, and other Greek philosophers and poets (*I Apol.* 20.1-5; cf. 8.1-5; 2 *Apol.* 13.1-3). See also Justin’s description of the connection between the persecution of Socrates and Christ-believers in *I Apology* 5. R. M. Price, “Are there ‘Holy Pagans’ in Justin Martyr?” *SP* 31 (1997): 168-169, maintains that Justin links Greek philosophers and Christ-believers because he sees them as fellow victims of persecution; cf. Oskar Skarsaune, “Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr,” in *Geschichte – Tradition – Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag* (3 vols.; Frühes Christentum; ed. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 3:596-597. As Skarsaune observes, however, Justin asserts continuity between ancient philosophers and Christ-believers but does not draw the same connection between Christ-believers and contemporary Greek philosophers: “Justin must have been fully aware that this [that is, his assertions about Socrates] was no longer true of Platonists of his time” (596).
mimicry and distortion of the prophets (1 Apol. 54.1-55.8; 56.1-4; 57.1; 58.1-3; 62.1; 64.1; Dial. 69.2; 70.1), on the other. Justin asserts that Greek philosophers and poets borrowed from Moses and other Jewish prophets but did not fully understand the predictions about Christ in these sacred texts; as a result, they did not arrive at an understanding of the truth (1 Apol. 44.8-10; cf. 59-60). By contrast, Justin argues, Christ-believers possess a knowledge of Christ that enables them to decipher the full meaning and import of the Jewish scriptures (e.g., 1 Apol. 23.1-2; 31.1-32.14; 33.1-2; 36.1-3; 39.1-4; 43.1-2; 49.5; 53.1-3). In this way, he presents both the Jewish scriptures and the Christian understanding of them as superior to Greek philosophy and writings.

In the opening of the Dialogue, Justin again presents the inspired exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of knowledge that rivals Greco-Roman philosophical inquiry. Here he argues that contemporary philosophers failed to arrive at truth because they lost the original essence of philosophy and became divided into different schools (Dial. 2.1-2). By contrast, he argues, the Jewish prophets provide the only reliable knowledge of God because their writings are more ancient than other sources and because they received

---


37 Although the pre-Christian Justin argues that his pursuit of Platonic philosophy enabled him to arrive at a knowledge of God, the “old man” provides a series of arguments that refute this claim. In Dial. 3.4, the pre-Christian Justin defines philosophy as ἐπιστήμη ἐστι τοῦ δύνατος καὶ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐπίγνωσις. This description appears to draw upon the Platonic concept of God (ὁ τευχόμενος τοῦ δύνατος; Phaedo 66 a 8) but expands it to include themes that will become part of Justin’s description of Christian truth (see επιγνώσι τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Dial. 8.2 and το ἐπιγνώσαι τὴν ἀλήθεια τοῦ θεοῦ in Dial. 110.6). For further discussion of the correspondences between this account and Platonic thought, see J. C. M. Van Winden, An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine (Philosophia Patrum 1; Leiden: Brill, 1971), 58-110; Hyldahl, Philosophie und Christentum, 185-224; Erwin R. Goodenough, The Theology of Justin Martyr (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 57-100.
their information through divine inspiration \((\text{Dial. 7.1-2})\).\(^{38}\) In this passage, Justin depicts the Jewish scriptures as that which “a philosopher ought to know” \((\text{Dial. 7.2})\), identifies the words of the “old man,” i.e., the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures, as “the only sure and useful philosophy” \((\text{Dial. 8.1-2})\), and declares that his discovery of the true interpretation of the Jewish scriptures led him to become a philosopher \((\text{Dial. 8.2})\).

Although Justin will go on to contrast the exegesis of Christ-believers with that of Jews, in this opening segment of the \textit{Dialogue}, he depicts the Christian exegesis of the Jewish scriptures as the recovery of the ancient, primordial philosophy which the splintered and degenerate philosophies of his contemporaries had lost.\(^{39}\)

\(^{38}\) Scholars of Justin Martyr often refer to the conversion of Justin in the opening section of the \textit{Dialogue} as an account of his discovery of ‘true philosophy.’ For example, Hyldahl, \textit{Philosophie und Christentum}, 112-140, argues that \textit{Dialogue} 1-8 describes the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures as the rediscovery of primordial philosophy (“die wiedergefundene Urphilosophie”); cf. Van Winden, \textit{Philosopher}, 112-118. Skarsaune, “Justin Martyr,” 70-71, maintains that the account of the conversion of Justin in \textit{Dialogue} 1-8 aims to describe his “conversion from pseudophilosophy to True Philosophy” (71).

\(^{39}\) Justin’s conception of the relationship between the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures and ancient Greek philosophy in \textit{Dialogue} 1-8 has been discussed at length. R. Holte, “Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin’s Apologies,” \textit{ST} 12 (1958): 164-165, argues that \textit{Dialogue} 2.1 presents the Jewish scriptures as the “original and authentic philosophy” (165) from which Greek philosophers borrowed but which they did not understand and therefore distorted. Holte argues that this view resembles the perspective found in the \textit{Apologies}: philosophers derived their understanding of the truth “partly from the Old Testament, partly from the seed of Logos planted in all people” (165). Hyldahl, \textit{Philosophie und Christentum}, 234, maintains that Justin regards primordial philosophy (Urphilosophie) as an ancient form of philosophy that was accessible to all of the wise in primeval times; the prophets formed part of this group but were not the only wise ones. He suggests that Justin derived this idea from the theory of the first ‘wise men’ and subsequent philosophical degeneration found in Poseidonios’s \textit{Protrepticus}. Although Hyldahl asserts that Justin thought that the Jewish prophets represented only some of the primeval wise ones, he maintains that Justin indicates that the Jewish scriptures contained the only source of primordial truth still extant \((\text{Dial. 7.1-3})\). This thesis leads Hyldahl to conclude that Justin affirms Christianity as the rediscovery of primordial philosophy but denounces contemporary Greek philosophy as degenerate and therefore superfluous: “Das Epochemachende an dieser These und an der Aussage in Dial. 8,1-2 besteht nicht in erster Linie in der Erklärung, dass das Christentum eine Philosophie oder sogar die einzige wahre Philosophie ist – das könnte jedermann behaupten! – sondern vielmehr in der Erkenntnis, dass die Urphilosophie, aus welcher die degenerierte griechische Philosophie entsprungen ist, wiedergefundene und nunmehr allen zugänglich ist. Die griechische Philosophie ist damit überflüssig geworden!” For an extended explanation of this position, see Hyldahl, \textit{Philosophie und Christentum}, 112-140, 227-255. Van Winden, \textit{Philosopher}, 2-3, 42-44, 112-118, concurs with Hyldahl that the concept of philosophical decay from Posidonius’s \textit{Protrepticus} forms the background for Justin’s
Justin’s theory of the present-day fragmentation of philosophy and his assertion that Moses and the prophets were the most ancient source of truth also resemble the views held by some Middle Platonists. For example, Numenius of Apamea, a second-century Pythagorean Platonist, attempted to trace Greek philosophies back to ancient origins, especially oriental sources. Although only fragments of the works of Numenius have survived, it is possible to reconstruct a partial picture of his attitude toward ancient literature. Besides citing and interpreting the writings of the Jewish prophets, Numenius uses these ancient texts, as well as other sources, to show the legitimacy of his own ideas (On the Good, F 1a [E. des Places] = Eusebius, P. E. 9.7.1). Numenius argues that the traditions of Plato and Pythagoras agree with those of the famous nations, concept of primordial philosophy, but with qualifications. He argues that Justin regards the writings of the prophets not as the only surviving form of ancient wisdom but as the only source of truth and wisdom that ever was available (see, e.g., the reference to the prophets as “the only ones who saw the truth” in Dial. 7.1). He further notes that Justin refers to Jewish prophets as more ancient than all philosophers (Dial. 7.1) and to their writings as the source of all philosophical knowledge (Dial. 7.2). Thus Van Winzen rightly concludes, against Hyldahl, that Justin did not adopt the idea that wisdom was generally available in primeval times. Instead, he argues that Justin considered the Jewish prophets as the only source of primordial philosophy, which had been rediscovered in Christianity. Robert Joly, Christianisme et philosophie: Études sur Justin et les apologistes grecs du deuxième siècle (Belgique: L’ Université de Bruxelles, 1973), 23-26, criticizes Hyldahl’s theory of dependence upon Posidonius more curtly: “Je suis convaincu au contraire que la thèse de Hyldahl concernant Posidonius et son influence médiata sur Justin est une de ses constructions les plus arbitraires” (24). Nevertheless, he agrees that Justin describes the decline of philosophy. Skarsaune, “Justin Martyr,” 56-59, affirms the basic conclusion of Hyldahl and maintains that Christianity represents the recovery of true philosophy, but also highlights the way that Justin presents a radical break with Platonism. Holte, Hyldahl, and Skarsaune all correctly observe that Justin emphasizes the superiority of the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures over contemporary Greek philosophy in Dial. 1-8. For further discussion regarding the scholarly debate surrounding the influence of Greek philosophy upon the theology of Justin, see Charles Nahm, “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr.” Second Century 9 (1992): 129-151.


41 According to Robert Lamberton, Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1986), 58-59, Numenius divides his own activities into two categories — philosophical pursuit of wisdom and truth and satirical “scandalmongering history” (59). Numenius viewed the latter as a type of diversion or game but took the former very seriously.
including Jews, and draws a comparison between Plato and Moses when he states: “What is Plato but Moses in Attic Greek?”42 In so doing, he harmonizes the doctrines of non-Greeks with his own Middle Platonic system of thought.43 Like Numenius, Justin integrates Greek philosophical thought with his representation of the Jewish scriptures, but he differs from Numenius insofar as he privileges the Jewish scriptures as a superior source of philosophical truth and asserts that Plato borrowed from, but did not fully grasp, their true meaning (e.g., 1 Apol. 33.1-9; 44.8-11; 60.1-2; cf. 2 Apol. 13.1-3).

Justin further defends the status of Christ-believers in relation to both Jewish and non-Jewish traditions by presenting the ethical requirements of Mosaic law, which Christ-believers practice, as the embodiment of Greek values. He explains that the ethical elements of the Mosaic law promote piety and the practice of justice (θεοσέβειαν καὶ δικαιοπραξίαν) whereas its ritual requirements function as a concession for Jews to prevent them from committing idolatry (Dial. 44.2). By using this terminology, Justin appeals to Greek notions of virtue and piety to describe the part of the Mosaic law that Christ-believers observe. Furthermore, he explains that Christ, the new covenant and Law, indicates which Mosaic precepts are “eternal” and “fit for every race” and which are suited for the hardness of the hearts of Jews (Dial. 67.10). This description presents

42 Numenius F 8 in Clement, Strom. 1.22.150.4. According to Origen, Numenius also drew upon the writings of the Jewish prophets and read them allegorically (see, e.g., Numenius F1c + 10a [E. des Places]; Contra Celsus, 4.51). As Lamberton, Homer, 81, notes, to read a text allegorically was to treat it with dignity and importance. For further discussion regarding the links between Numenius and second-century Christian authors, see Mark Edwards, “On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr,” JTS 42 (1991): 17-34; Droge, Homer or Moses, 62-63, 70-72.

43 According to Rebecca Lyman, “Hellenism and Heresy,” JECS 11 (2003): 214, Numenius provided a universal Pythagorean philosophy that included the works of Plato and Egyptian, Hebrew, and Persian writings. He also argued that the multiplicity in contemporary philosophy was due to a decline from the original unity of philosophy. For further discussion regarding the links between Numenius and second-century Christian authors, see Edwards, “Platonic Schooling,” 17-34; Droge, Homer or Moses, 62-65, 68-72.
the ethical parts of the written Mosaic law as a type of universal, or natural, law.

Moreover, in *Dial.* 45.3-4, Justin explains that people who obeyed the Mosaic law before Christ would be saved because they observed the parts of this code that are good, pious, and just (καλὰ καὶ ἐὔσεβη καὶ δίκαια) and so performed acts "which are universally, naturally, and eternally pleasing to God." Justin's division between the ritual and ethical requirements of the Mosaic law helps him to differentiate between the piety of Christ-believers and that of Jews, but it also enables him to demonstrate that those who embrace Christ and his interpretation of the Mosaic code become paragons of Greek justice and piety (δικαιοσύνη καὶ εὐσέβειαν; *Dial.* 93.1-3). 44 In this way, he deploys Greek concepts and terminology to depict the fidelity of Christ-believers to the Mosaic code as an exemplary embodiment of Greek ideals. 45 Furthermore, by identifying parts of the Mosaic legislation as a written representation of unwritten universal law, Justin indirectly argues for its universal relevance and superiority over other written law codes. 46

44 Justin frequently uses such terms to appeal to Greco-Roman sensibilities. For example, in the *Apologies*, he addresses the emperor and his sons as philosophers and pleads with them to judge the case of Christ-believers in a manner that is in keeping with their exemplary piety and philosophy (εὐσεβείς καὶ φιλοσόφους; *I Apol.* 2.1; cf. 1.1; 2.2; 3.2-3; 12.5; 2 *Apol.* 2.16; 15.5). These descriptions correspond to the Greco-Roman ideal of a virtuous philosopher-king who governs with wisdom, justice, and piety, and thus brings happiness (εὐδαιμονία) to his subjects (*I Apol.* 3.3). In this context, he also attempts to address charges of impiety and injustice (ἀδέσποταυ καὶ ἀδικίαν) against Christ-believers (*I Apol.* 4.7-8; cf. 23.3; 2 *Apol.* 3.2). He explains that Christ-believers teach that God approves of those who imitate his inherent virtues, namely temperance, justice, love of man (σωφροσύνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη καὶ φιλανθρωπία), and any other virtues that are proper to God (*I Apol.* 10.1). For further discussion of the use of these terms and values in Greco-Roman, Jewish, and Christian literature, see J. M. Lieu, "The Race of God-fearers," *JTS* 46 (1995): 483-501; cf. Attridge, *Biblical History*, 63-66; Martens, *One God, One Law*, 56-65; Sarah Broadie, "Rational Theology," in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy* (ed. A. A. Long; Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 205-224.

45 Despite this affirmation of the ethical parts of the law, in *Dial.* 95.1-2, Justin explains that Christ had to die because no one can keep the law completely and all are under a curse (cf. Gal 3:10-13).

46 Since Hellenistic philosophers typically contrasted written legislation with universal law and believed that the latter transcended the former, the presentation of Mosaic law as universal law serves as a description of its superiority over other types of legislation. For further discussion, see footnote 24 above.
Although Justin frequently contrasts the exegesis of Christ-believers with the scriptural interpretation of Jews who do not believe in Jesus, this brief discussion outlines some of the primary ways that he also appeals to the Jewish scriptures to seek recognition for the Christ-believing group within their wider Greco-Roman context. Like other early Jewish and Christian apologists, Justin uses the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the antiquity of the origins of his community as well as the superiority of their knowledge and practices over competing non-Jewish traditions.

3.5 Luke: Competition with Jews

A number of scholars have argued that the emphasis upon the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts serves to demonstrate the antiquity, and therefore legitimacy, of the Christ-believing movement in the eyes of Rome. For example, Sterling has stressed that the Lukan Paul appeals to the Jewish scriptures and to his Jewish ancestors in a series of defense speeches to demonstrate that Christ-believers stood "within an ancient tradition" and therefore were politically innocent. Sterling maintains that both the emphasis upon the fulfillment of scriptures in Luke-Acts and the claim that Christ-believers belong to an "ancestral tradition" function as a means of portraying this group as a distinct entity which held its own place and ancient heritage within the wider Greco-Roman world.

There is no question that Luke draws upon the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the unique relationship between these sacred texts and the Christ-believing community;

---

47 See pages 132-133 above.
48 Sterling, Historiography and Self-Definition, 385-386.
49 Sterling, Historiography and Self-Definition, 378-389.
but, rather than using the Jewish scriptures to defend the status of Christ-believers in relation to their Greco-Roman competitors, he consistently evokes the scriptures in settings that outline inner-Jewish concerns and debate. For example, when Luke attempts to demonstrate that the events of his narrative fulfill scriptural prophecy, he repeatedly shows how God fulfills his promises to the Jewish people.  

Certainly he reports numerous conflicts over how the scriptures ought to be interpreted and obeyed, but these reflect a struggle between Christ-believing and non-Christ-believing Jews. Moreover, in scenarios where Luke appeals to the traditions of Jewish ancestors, he has key Jewish figures address the concerns of other Jews rather than those of non-Jewish competitors.  

Although this evidence suggests that Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures and heritage to define Christ-believers in relation to Jews who do not believe in Jesus rather than to establish their identity within the non-Jewish world, Sterling and others have argued that the references to the Jewish scriptures and traditions in Luke-Acts nevertheless imply that the Christ-believing community deserves recognition within the Roman Empire. For example, in his study of Acts 6-7, Todd Penner builds upon

---

52 Acts 3:13; 5:30; 15:10; 22:14; 24:14; 26:6; 28:17. In all but two of these references, a Jewish Christ-believer expresses solidarity with all Jews by referring to their ancestors as “our fathers” and to their ancestral traditions as those of “our fathers.” See also the phrase “our ancestral law” in Acts 22:3.
Sterling's thesis that Luke wrote in the tradition of apologetic historiography and drew upon the Jewish scriptures "to construct a particular identity within the community and to promote it without." He argues that the speech of Stephen in Acts 7:1-53 exemplifies the approach to the scriptures that we find in Josephus and Philo because it resembles their retelling of the Exodus event and uses Greek rhetorical strategies to valorize Moses and his founding of a Jewish politeia. As Penner himself explains, however, the use of the Jewish scriptures in the Stephen speech creates polarity between Christ-believing Jews and other Jews, and aims to demonstrate the superiority of the Christ-believing community over Jews who oppose them. Moreover, whereas Philo and Josephus portray Moses as philosopher and legislator of a superior constitution (e.g., Josephus, A.J. 1.18-25; Philo, Mos. 2.49-51), the speech of Stephen nowhere indicates that the knowledge or legislation of Moses was superior to that of other peoples. Instead, it highlights his authority as a paradigmatic Jewish prophet who transmits "living oracles" to the Jewish people (Acts 7:37-38). Therefore, although Penner correctly points out that the Stephen speech uses Hellenistic terms and categories to glorify Moses, the appeal to

---


55 Penner, Christian Origins, 300-330, also argues that Luke uses the literary and cultural theme of philanthropia to depict the ideal relationships of the Christ-believing community, but Luke never uses this terminology in Acts 6-7 or elsewhere to describe Christ-believers. The only instance of φιλανθρωπία occurs in Acts 28:2 where it refers to the kindness of the people of Malta. Furthermore, Luke only uses πολιτεία once to refer to Paul's Roman citizenship (Acts 22:28). He does not use this terminology to describe the Christ-believing community or the Jewish people.

56 Penner, Christian Origins, 303-323. See also my discussion of Stephen's speech in chapter five, pages 231-235 below.

57 See, especially, Acts 7:22, where we read that Moses received exceptional instruction from the Egyptians (ἐπαύξεσθαι Μωυσῆς [ἐν] πάση οἰκίᾳ Ἀγγέλων) and displayed unusual power (ἠν δὲ δυνατός ἐν λόγοις καὶ ἔργοις αὐτοῦ). This description of Moses does not occur in the Jewish scriptures but is comparable to glorifications of Moses in early Jewish writings (e.g., Philo, De Vit. Mos. 1.21-24; Josephus,
the Jewish scriptures therein seeks to differentiate Jewish Christ-believers from other Jews, and to claim the ancestry of Moses and other Jewish prophets for the former group.

Early Jewish and Christian apologists who appeal to the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the antiquity, or superiority, of their groups invariably juxtapose this claim with a denigrating description of the traditions of their non-Jewish competitors. By contrast, Luke never appeals to the Jewish scriptures to assert the antiquity or cultural priority of the Christ-believing movement over against competing non-Jewish religions or schools of thought. Even in the trial scenes of Paul (Acts 22:30-23:10; 24:1-23; 24:24-25; 25:6-12; 26:1-32), settings which most closely resemble the context of early Christian apologists, the appeals to the Jewish scriptures focus solely upon inner-Jewish theological concerns. The Lukan Paul answers the charges of Jews who question his

---


fidelity to Jewish customs (Acts 24:10-22; cf. 25:8; 26:2-23) by arguing that he worships the God of his Jewish ancestors, hopes in the promises that God made to them, and believes and preaches everything that the prophets and Moses wrote (Acts 24:14; 26:6, 22). This use of the scriptures and ancestral traditions of Jews may help to demonstrate that the activities of Paul did not violate Roman law; it shows that the conflict related only to internal Jewish issues. In contrast to the apologists’ appeal to the Jewish scriptures to assert the antiquity and superior status of the Christ-believing community over against competing non-Jewish groups within the Roman Empire, however, the Lukian Paul uses Jewish scriptures and ancestral traditions to defend himself, and by implication Christ-believers, against the accusations of other Jews who doubt his fidelity to the texts that both groups hold as sacred.

does not develop an understanding of the emergence of the Christ-believing community which is based upon wider world history. Likewise, Dibelius, Studies, 279, argues that the five trial scenes emphasize that Christ-believers have not rebelled against the temple or the law, and attempt to demonstrate that the main dispute between this group and other Jews lies in the question of the resurrection. Roman officials also repeatedly conclude that Paul is innocent of violating Roman law and that the dispute between Paul and his opponents relates only to the religious matters of Jews (e.g., Acts 18:13-15; 25:18-22, 26-27; 26:30-32), and Claudius Lysias and Felix only hold him as a prisoner to defer to the Sanhedrin (Acts 22:30; 23:10, 30; 24:27). For further discussion of this theme in Luke-Acts, see Maddox, Purpose, 93-97.

60 This conclusion stands at odds with that of Abraham J. Malherbe, “‘Not in a Corner’: Early Christian Apologetic in Acts 26:26,” SC 5:4 (1985/1986), 193-210, who argues that Luke presents the appeal to the Jewish scriptures in Acts 26:22-29 as analogous to “the Christian apologists’ insistence that the prophets were philosophical” (210). Malherbe asserts that the phrase “these things have not been done in a dark corner” in Acts 26:26 alludes to the popular view that an ideal philosopher does not confine his discourse to private conversation but boldly participates in public life (e.g., Plato, Gorgias 485D; Cicero, De orat. 1.13; de rep. 1.2.2; Seneca, Consol. Ad Polyb 13.3; Ep. 68.2; Plutarch, De curios, 516B; Lucian, Deor. Conc. 1.1; Epictetus, Diss. 1.29.36, 55-57; 2.12.17; 2.13.24-26; 3.22.95.8). Accordingly, Malherbe concludes that when the Lukian Paul indicates to Agrippa that “these things have not been done in a dark corner” (Acts 26:26), he is referring to himself as an ideal philosopher who speaks publicly and boldly. Malherbe also argues that the terminology in Festus’ exclamation “Paul, you are mad!” (μαίνεσθ, Παῦλε;) in Acts 26:24 and Paul’s denial of madness and words of self-defense – “I am speaking the sober truth (ἀλήθειας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι) . . . and . . . I speak freely (προφητείας ἀπειρόμενος λαλῶ)” (Acts 26:25-26) – further confirms that Luke here presents Paul as a philosopher. He draws this conclusion because some Greek authors who were contemporaries of Luke used terms such as μαίνεσθ to depreciate inappropriate philosophy and used σωφροσύνη or προφητεία to affirm exemplary philosophy (e.g., Dio
To be sure, on rare occasions, Luke does juxtapose the beliefs of Christ-believers with non-Jewish traditions (Acts 14:8-19; 17:16-34). The most notable example of this occurs in the address of Paul at the Areopagus (Acts 17:16-34). Like many early Jewish and Christian apologists, in this context, Luke uses philosophical themes to demonstrate the relevance of the message of Paul to his Greco-Roman audience. Besides situating the speech in Athens, a city which represented the apex of Greek culture, Luke presents Paul as a new Socrates. For example, in Acts 17:17-18, when certain philosophers encounter Paul in the agora they exclaim: “He seems to be a preacher of foreign divinities” (ἐνῶν δαμονίων δοκεὶ καταγγέλεις εἶναι) and, after leading him to the Areopagus, they describe him as a teacher of “certain strange things” (ξενίζωντα... τινα; Acts 17:20). These accusations recall the charges that Athenians leveled against

---

Chrysostom, *Discourse* 34; Or. 45.1; 66.25; 77/78.42-42; Plutarch, *Quodomodo adulator* 71E; Lucian, *Demonax* 3). Two aspects of this argument present difficulties. First, since the phrase “these things have not been done in a dark corner” in Acts 26:26 refers to the story of Jesus and the emergence of the Christ-believing community, rather than to the preaching of Paul, it is difficult to interpret the phrase as a description of Paul as a philosopher. Instead, the phrase more simply seems to indicate that the activities of the Christ-believing movement were well-known. Second, the terms μαίνομαι, παρρησία, and σωφροσύνη do not always depict the activities of philosophers but have a wider range of meaning. For example, in Acts 12:15, Luke reports that people regarded Rhoda as mad (μαίνη), or crazy, when she reported that Peter was at the door. Luke also uses παρρησία in a number of scenarios to demonstrate the boldness of the preaching of the apostles (e.g., Acts 2:29; 4:13, 29, 31; 28:31) without once implying that they also function as philosophers in these contexts. Similarly, the term σωφροσύνη is used in other NT writings in a non-philosophical way (1 Tim 2:9, 15). Since there are no clear contextual clues in Acts 26:22-29 to suggest that Luke uses μαίνομαι, παρρησία, and σωφροσύνη to depict Paul as a philosopher, it is difficult to conclude with certainty that he intends this meaning for the terms.


Socrates and are significant because the story of the trial and defense of Socrates became a Hellenistic model for philosophical integrity (see, e.g., Lucian of Samosata, Demonax 11). Luke thus portrays Paul as a philosophical figure who debates with Epicureans and Stoics (Acts 17:19) and uses their ideas to introduce his message of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 17:22-31).

Notwithstanding this philosophical context, Luke does not use Areopagus episode to present the Jewish scriptures as the ultimate source of philosophical truth. Although the speech appears to draw upon biblical concepts, it relies more explicitly upon Greek thought. As a number of scholars have noted, the descriptions of God as Creator of the

---

64 Barrett, Acts, 2:828-830, also notes that the noun ἄγορα in Acts 17:17 recalls Xenophon, Memorabilia 1.1.10 and that the phrase πρὸς τοὺς παρατιθέμενος recalls Plato, Apology, 29d. He further observes the similarity between the phrase ζῶντων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεῖς εἶναι in Acts 17:18 and the use of δαιμόνων in Xenophon, Memorabilia 1.1.2 and the phrase ἐπὶ ἐν δαιμόνι καὶ ναῷ in Plato, Apology, 24B-C. See also Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2:214; Haenchen, Acts, 518; Witherington, Socio-Rhetorical Commentary, 514-515; Bock, Acts, 562; Johnson, Acts, 313-314.

65 Barrett, Acts, 2:72-75, maintains that Luke specifically mentions Epicureans and Stoics because Paul addresses the basic tenets of their philosophies in his speech. He notes, for example, that the unity of humankind (vs. 26), the divine appointment of the seasons and natural boundaries (vs. 26), and the natural kinship of humans with God (vs. 28) all have points of contact with Stoic doctrines. Barrett also concludes that Paul uses the rational criticism of the Epicureans "to attack the folly and idolatry of popular religion, and the theism of the Stoics to establish (against the Epicureans) the immediate and intimate nearness of God" (75). Alternatively, Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2:216-217, argues that the Lukan Paul expresses criticism of the religion of the Athenians but not of their philosophers: "Paul is telling them that the religion in Athens does not live up to the insights of philosophers and poets" (217); cf. Haenchen, Acts, 525. The speech itself, however, does not appear to provide sufficient evidence to draw a firm conclusion regarding either of these theories.

universe who cannot be contained in a temple (Acts 17:24-25) recall biblical themes as well as Greek concepts of God.67 Similarly, the descriptions of the origins of humankind, the boundaries of their existence, and their attempts to find God (Acts 17:26-27) have points of contact with both Jewish and Greek sources.68 Rather than citing and expounding the Jewish scriptures, however, Luke has Paul quote Stoic poets to illustrate the immanence of God: “For ‘in him we live and move and have our being’; as even some of your own poets have said, ‘For we too are his offspring’” (Acts 17:28).69

67 The idea of God as sole Creator of the universe in Acts 17:24 occurs in the Jewish scriptures (e.g., Isa 42:5; Gen 1:1-2; Ex 20:11) and in Greek literature (e.g., Epictetus 4.7.6; Corpus Hermeticum 4.1). Similarly, the idea in Acts 17:25 that God cannot be contained in a temple occurs in Greek sources (Euripides frg. 968) and in the Jewish scriptures (1 Kgs 8:27; Isa 66:1-2). For further discussion of the use of these and other sources in Acts 17:24-25, see Dibelius, Studies, 45-46; Gärtner, Areopagus, 171-172, 211; Wilson, Gentile Mission, 198-200; Johnson, Acts, 315; Barrett, Acts, 2:839-841; Fitzmyer, Acts, 608.

68 Some interpret the phrase Ευς Εν Εν Θεος ουκ Εν Θεος in the phrase Ευς Εν Θεος παν Θεος ουκ Ανθρωποι in Acts 17:26 as a reference to Adam. If παν Θεος ουκ Ανθρωποι refers to the entire human race, as Dibelius, Studies, 29-32, argues, it would articulate a Hellenistic view of humanity whereas if we render παν Θεος ουκ Ανθρωποι as “every nation of men” (RSV), Acts 17:26 would more clearly provide a biblical view that all the nations of the earth originated from one man, Adam. The meaning of the terms καιροις and οροθεσιας in the phrase οροθεσιας προστατευμενος καιρως και τας οροθεσιας της κατοικίας αυτων in Acts 17:26 is also debated. Gärtner, Areopagus, 154, maintains that καιροις means “epochs of history” and οροθεσιας means “national boundaries,” and concludes that the phrase expresses the biblical view of the history of the nations which is divided into pre-determined epochs (e.g., Dan 8:19; Deut 32:8). Dibelius, Studies, 28-29, argues that καιροις should be interpreted as “seasons of the year” and οροθεσιας as “zones.” If so, Acts 17:26 would describe the philosophical idea that the universe has five zones, two of which humans inhabit (Vergil, Georg. 1.237-238; Cicero, Tusc. Disp. 1.28.68-69). Similarly, the language of seeking, groping for, and finding God (ζητειν των θεων, ει θαρε η φηλαφρειαν αυτων και ειροιεν) can be taken as a rational search for God through philosophy (Plato, Apology 19b; 23b; Gorgias 457d; Rep. 449a) or as a reference to seeking God in biblical texts (e.g., Isa 55:6; 65:1; Ps 14:2; Pr 8:17; Jer 29:13). For further discussion, see Dibelius, Studies, 28-34; Gärtner, Areopagus, 152-161; Wilson, Gentile Mission, 200-206; Barrett, Acts, 2:842-844; Marshall, Acts, 287-288; Witherington, Socio-Rhetorical Commentary, 526-528; Bock, Acts, 566-568. As Barrett, Acts, 2:846, notes, the difference between biblical and philosophical ideas in this passage may reflect the concern of modern interpreters rather than distinctions that Luke himself would draw.

69 The source of the phrase Εν αυτω γαρ ζωει και κενοτεθα και εσθηειν is difficult to identify. A Syriac writer called Isho'dad (ninth century) cited a passage in which Minos of Crete describes Zeus in this way, but Clement of Alexandria ascribes it to Epimenides of Crete (Strom. 1.14.59). The phrase τοι γαρ και γενος εσθηειν appears to derive from the poet Aratus who wrote in praise of Zeus (Phaenomena 5), and
philosophical context, then, it is Stoic traditions, rather than the Jewish scriptures, that serve as the primary supporting texts for Paul’s message. The Areopagus sermon of Paul does not present the Jewish scriptures as a form of ancient philosophical truth that rivals Greco-Roman philosophies, but uses non-Jewish traditions to introduce a call to repentance (Acts 17:29-31).

Clement of Alexandria links the phrase to this source (Strom. 1.19, 91). Diogenes Laertius also ascribes a similar phrase to Epimenides (Lives of Philosophers 1.112) and a similar line occurs in Cleanthes’ Hymn to Zeus. For further discussion of these sources, see Marshall, Acts, 288-289; Barrett, Acts, 2:846-848; Johannes Munck, The Acts of the Apostles (AB 31; Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), 171; Wilson, Gentile Mission, 296-309; Johnson, Acts, 316; Bock, Acts, 568-569.

Luke elsewhere provides little evidence of associating the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers with philosophy. The description of Paul’s movement from the synagogue to the lecture hall of Tyrannus in Acts 19:8-10 may imply that he expounded the scriptures in a philosophical setting. The brevity of the description of Paul’s activities in Acts 19:8-10, however, does not readily suggest that Luke wanted to emphasize this event or to present the scriptural interpretation of Paul as a type of philosophical inquiry. Gregory E. Sterling, “‘Athletes of Virtue’: An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16),” JBL 113/4 (1994): 679-696, argues that the summary descriptions in Acts 2:41-47, 4:32-35, and 5:12-16 follow a Hellenistic literary tradition in which authors attempt to describe a group as a type of religious-philosophical community, there is little evidence to confirm this conclusion. Gregory posits, for example, that the references to the exemplary sharing and common life of the Christ-believing community, and the phrases ἀπανταῖα κοινά and ψυχή μία (cf. Aristotle, EN 9.8 1168b; Diogenes Laertius 10.11) suggest that “readers should think of the [Christ-believing] community in philosophical terms.” To support this view, Sterling notes that this type of terminology also occurs in Acts (2:44-45; 4:32-35), Philo (Prob. 85-86), and Josephus (J.W. 2.119; A.J. 18.11). From this parallel, he concludes that all three authors present the groups which they describe as philosophical communities. What Sterling fails to point out, however, is that Philo and Josephus both explicitly represent the Jewish groups that they describe as philosophical communities. For example, Philo indicates that the Essenes practice philosophy (φιλοσοφίας; Prob. 80) and presents the study of the scriptures by the Therapeutae as “the sacred philosophy” (τῆς ἱερᾶς φιλοσοφίας) and as “the ancestral philosophy” (τὴν πατρίου φιλοσοφίαν; Contemp. 25-26, 28). Similarly, Josephus describes the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as three forms of “Jewish philosophy” (Ἰουδαϊκος εἴδη φιλοσοφεῖται; J.W. 2.119). By contrast, Luke nowhere describes Christ-believers as a philosophical school and never depicts their scriptural interpretation as a type of philosophical inquiry. Although the presence of Hellenistic terminology in the writings of all three authors demonstrates that they similarly employ Greek ideals to describe the exemplary unity of these communities, such a parallel hardly serves as warrant for concluding that Luke presents Christ-believers as a philosophical community. Notably, κοινωνία was also a civic virtue within the Greco-Roman world (see, e.g., Dionysius, Ant. rom. 1.8.2; 7.65.3, 5). Moreover, although Luke uses the term αἵρεσις to refer to the Christ-believing community, as well as to other Jewish groups, and this term can be used to refer to a philosophical group, Luke gives no contextual clues that would suggest that he intends to portray the Christ-believing community as a philosophical school when he uses αἵρεσις to describe the group. Instead, he consistently uses αἵρεσις to depict Christ-believers, as well as other Jewish groups, as a religious party, or sect, of Judaism (Acts 5:17; 15:5; 24:5, 14; 26:5; 28:22). See also Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature 3rd. ed., revised and edited by Frederick William Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 27-28.
Furthermore, although Luke draws upon Stoic traditions to describe an understanding of God that all humans receive, he does not associate the Mosaic code—in Acts 17 or elsewhere—with this universal form of knowledge. Unlike Justin, Luke does not distinguish between ethical and ritual aspects of the Mosaic law nor does he appeal to Greek concepts of piety, virtue, or natural law to describe the Mosaic code. Instead, he highlights the piety of Jesus and Jewish Christ-believers in a manner that upholds Jewish values by outlining their observance of the entire Mosaic law (e.g., Luke 1:6; 2:21-24, 27, 39; 5:14-15; 17:14; 23:56; Acts 21:20, 24; 22:12; 24:14). Furthermore, although Luke depicts conflicts between Jesus and his followers, on the one hand, and other Jews, on the other, over what proper observance of the Mosaic law entails (e.g., Luke 6:1-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6; Acts 6:11, 13, 14; 7:53; 18:13-15; 21:20-28; 23:29; 25:8; 28:17), he does not 

71 In Luke 10:25-28, the Lukan Jesus affirms the lawyer’s conclusion that certain moral requirements of the Mosaic law (i.e., loving God and neighbor) are essential for attaining eternal life but, unlike Mark, he does not indicate that these elements of the Mosaic law are more important than its ritual requirements (cf. Mark 12:31-33).

juxtapose the Mosaic law with non-Jewish traditions. In short, Luke does not revise his concept of the Mosaic law to compete with other forms of legislation within the Greco-Roman world nor does he transform it into a set of moral guidelines that appeal to Greek notions of virtue and piety or to the concept of a universal law.

3.6 Conclusion

Although Luke writes within a Hellenistic historiographical tradition, his appropriation of the Jewish scriptures does not appear to serve the same aim as that of early Jewish and Christian apologists. The theory that Luke emphasizes the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures and ancestral traditions of Jews in order to demonstrate the legitimacy of the Christ-believing community within the Greco-Roman world remains just that — a theory. Surely Luke does attempt to show that Christ-believers truly understand the Jewish scriptures, rather than non-Christ-believing Jews. Nevertheless, the contexts in which he situates this type of claim make it differ significantly from appeals to the scriptures which occur in the writings of early apologists.

In contrast to the appropriation of the Jewish scriptures by early apologists, Luke never once juxtaposes these texts with non-Jewish traditions nor does he attempt to show that they are more ancient than or superior to other writings. Moreover, he does not present the exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of philosophical inquiry and his writings show no evidence of an attempt to present the Mosaic law as a superior or universal form of legislation. The complete absence of these strategies provides us with little reason to conclude that Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to gain recognition for Christ-believers within their wider Greco-Roman context. Rather than describing the
antiquity of the Jewish scriptures in relation to non-Jewish traditions, Luke depicts a competition between Christ-believers and other Jews for primacy over the same sacred texts. This approach more narrowly resembles the self-defining strategies of the early Jewish apocalyptic groups who laid claim to the Jewish scriptures as part of a struggle for recognition within an inner-Jewish context.

Justin, like Luke, lays claim to the Jewish scriptures in order to define the privileged status of Christ-believers in relation to Jews. Yet, unlike Luke, he also asserts the antiquity and superiority of the Jewish scriptures over non-Jewish traditions and presents the exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals Greco-Roman philosophy. Furthermore, he presents the ethnical requirements of the Mosaic law as an exemplary guide to Greek piety and as a type of legislation that has eternal, or universal, relevance. Clearly, these interpretive strategies stand squarely within the exegetical tradition forged by early Jewish and Christian apologists, who appealed to the Jewish scriptures to defend or gain recognition for their communities within the Roman Empire; but they depart significantly from the representations of the Jewish scriptures and scriptural interpretation in the writings of Luke.
Part II: The Recipients of Scriptural Promises

In the first part of my study, I explored the way that Luke and Justin lay claim to the Jewish scriptures for Christ-believers by describing their authoritative ability to interpret these texts and, in the case of Justin, by asserting that the Jewish scriptures were an authoritative source of truth that rivaled Greco-Roman traditions. In this section of my study, I will compare their attempts to claim the Jewish scriptures for the Christ-believing community by representing them as the recipients of scriptural promises. This will involve a consideration of their depictions of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as an eschatological gift that fulfills end-time scriptural predictions (chapter four) and an evaluation of their portrayal of Christ-believers as recipients of the promises that were originally made to the Jewish people (chapter five).

Chapter Four: Revelation at the End of the Age

4.1 Introduction

As noted in chapter one, certain early Jewish groups present their knowledge and scriptural interpretation as an eschatological gift. This type of claim aims to demonstrate the elect status of these early Jewish communities: as the chosen people of God, they receive revelatory knowledge and so participate in the blessings of the final stages of history. A similar strategy also finds expression in the writings of Luke and Justin. Both

---

1 For example, 1 En. 90:20-38 portrays the enlightenment of some Jews as a revelation of the proper meaning of the Mosaic law that the elect receive at the end of the age; the maskilim of Daniel represent an enlightened group who gain access to the revelation of end-time events and to the interpretation of prophecy that Daniel had earlier recorded (Dan 11:33, 35; 12:3, 10); 1QpHab 7 presents the scriptural interpretation of the Righteous Teacher as a revelation of how the prophecies of Habakkuk would be fulfilled for the “last generation”; and 1QS 8:11-16 portrays the scriptural interpretation of the community as the fulfillment of Isa 40:3. Similarly, 1QH^4 presents the community as a group that had already begun to enjoy the privileges of the eschatological age (e.g., 1QH^4 14:13-14; 19:12-14) and as recipients of divine revelatory knowledge (e.g., 1QH^4 10:10-18; 12:6, 27; 15:19-26; 17:31-32). For further discussion, see chapter one, pages 50-78.
authors portray the inspired understanding of the Jewish scriptures as an end-time gift that Christ-believers receive. In so doing, they present Christ-believers as those who receive the fulfillment of long-awaited scriptural promises. Moreover, by linking the exegesis of the community to the realization of scriptural predictions, Luke and Justin provide scriptural justification for their claim that this group alone possesses an authoritative understanding of the Jewish scriptures.

Even as Luke and Justin aim to show the legitimacy of the exegesis of Christ-believers in this way, so they appeal to the Jewish scriptures to provide an explanation for

---

the rejection of their message and exegesis: those who do not accept their preaching and scriptural interpretation are seen as the objects of prophetic oracles of judgment. For Franz Overbeck, this parallel between Luke and Justin represents a common "antijudaistische" use of scripture and furnishes proof for his conclusion that the writings of Luke and Justin arose out of common non-Jewish theological circles. He maintains that both authors appeal to prophetic warnings of judgment to support their common view that Jews had become darkened in unbelief. Notwithstanding this similarity between Luke and Justin, I will argue that each author provides a different type of rationale for their common assertion that the revelatory knowledge of Christ-believers and the "darkening" of their opponents represent the fulfillment of scriptural promises. This difference, moreover, demonstrates an important distinction between their respective depictions of the identity of the Christ-believing community.

In what follows, I will explore the way that Luke and Justin each present the exegetical revelation of Christ-believers, on the one hand, and the darkening of outsiders, on the other, as evidence that the end-time promises of God are coming to fulfillment. This will entail a comparison of the following elements of their writings: 1) their common attempt to present the ability of Christ-believers to understand the Jewish scriptures as the realization of end-time promises; 2) their similar use of scriptural oracles

---

3 According to F. Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhaltniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg,” ZWT 15 (1872): 339-343, both Acts and Justin contrast non-Jewish belief with Jewish unbelief and use Isa 6:10 to support this view. He argues that Luke applies the Jewish prophets in an anti-Jewish way in Acts 7:49ff; 13:47; 28:26ff and maintains that this closely parallels the perspective of Justin (e.g., Dialogue 12, 19-24, 39, 93, 131-133). Although Overbeck notes that Justin expresses greater hostility toward Jews than does Acts, he does not see this difference as an absolute contrast but maintains that Justin derives his thought from Acts: "nirgends aber steht Justin zur AG. in unbedingtem Gegensatz, durchgängig ist vielmehr gerade der Standpunkt des Justin in der AG" (342-343).
of judgment to validate their conclusions about the “darkened” status of outsiders to the Christ-believing community; 3) their differing configurations of the distinction between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community; and 4) their differing uses of prophetic traditions to provide the rationale for this division.


4.2.1 Luke and the Witnesses

Scholars often note how Luke casts Paul and the eleven in the role of the servant, or witness, that Isaiah 40-55 describes (Luke 24:44-49; Acts 1:8; 13:46-47; 26:12-23), or they discuss his particular emphasis upon scriptural interpretation in such contexts. To my knowledge, however, no one has pointed out the way that Luke presents their revelatory exegesis as part of the restoration and illumination that Isaiah foretells (e.g., Isa 42:6-7; 49:6).

In Luke 24:44-49, as we have seen, Luke presents scriptural interpretation as a central element of the post-resurrection teachings of Christ and of the subsequent mission

---


of his followers. Richard Dillon argues that the phrase ἐμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων (Luke 24:48) describes “the risen Christ’s self-disclosure through the interpretation of the scriptures” [italics mine] and “becomes the mandated ‘ministry of the word.’” The context of Luke 24:48 strongly suggests that τούτων refers to two elements that would comprise the content of the testimony of the disciples: the resurrection of Christ and his explanation of how he fulfilled the scriptures. Yet the identification of the disciples as μάρτυρες in Luke 24:48 (cf. Acts 1:8) also highlights the wider significance of their mission and message. By describing the disciples as “witnesses” (μάρτυρες) in Luke 24:48 and Acts 1:8, and indicating that they would proclaim their message “to the end of the earth” (ἐως ἐξάτων τῆς γῆς) in Acts 1:8, Luke recalls LXX Isa 43:10-12 (γένεσθέ μοι....

---


7 Immediately prior to the commissioning of the eleven as witnesses, Christ proves that he has risen from the dead (Luke 24:36-43), explains how he has fulfilled the scriptures (Luke 24:44, 46-47), and opens their minds to understand the scriptures (Luke 24:45). John Nolland, Luke (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word Books, 1989-1993), 3:1220, rightly argues that “from the immediate context, we can infer that the disciples are directed to witness because they have experienced and are therefore in a position to testify about (i) the pre-passion teaching of Jesus with its emphasis on the fulfillment of Scripture in reference to himself; (ii) the post-resurrection illumination of the Scriptures by the risen Lord; (iii) the passion events themselves; (iv) the reality of Jesus’ resurrected state; (v) the need for universal proclamation of the message of forgiveness in Jesus’ name . . . and (vi) the need to begin this proclamation in Jerusalem” (1220). A. F. Loisy, L’Evangile selon Luc (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924), 590, also recognizes that the τούτων must refer both to “la mort et la résurrection de Jésus” and “du témoignage biblique et de l’accomplissement des prophéties dans le Christ” but suggests that the latter is subordinate to the former. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981-1985), 2:1584, suggests that the referent of τούτων is the “ministry of Jesus.” Gerhard Schneider, Lukas, Theologe der Heils geschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk (BBB 59; Königstein/Ts.-Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1985), 66, 201-202, maintains that other passages in Acts indicate that the disciples were witnesses of the resurrection (Acts 1:22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39) and therefore concludes that the resurrection of Christ constitutes the most central part of their testimony.

8 Luke refers to the disciples and Paul as “witnesses” on a number of occasions (Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8, 22; 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 10:39, 41; 13:31; 22:15, 20; 26:16). Although he does not always allude to their role in fulfilling the promises of Isaiah in these contexts, and sometimes refers more broadly to those who were witnesses of the resurrection (e.g., Acts 2:32; 3:15; 5:32; 13:31), Luke appears to use the term “witnesses” in Luke 24:48; Acts 1:8, 22; 10:39, 41, to identify the first disciples as those who fulfilled promises from Isaiah that refer to Israel as the “witness” or “servant” of YHWH.
These passages from Isaiah outline the role of the servant of YHWH who brings restoration to Israel and light to the nations (cf. LXX Isa 42:1-6). By alluding to these themes from Isaiah in Luke 24:48 and Acts 1:8, not only does Luke cast the first disciples in the role

---


10 Luke 24:49 also links the descent of the Spirit with Isaianic promises by indicating that Jesus commanded the disciples to “wait in the city until you are clothed with power from on high” (ἵππος δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐν ἰσοδύναμος ἐξ ὦκους ὄ水准νυ). This phrase appears to recall LXX Isa 32:15a, a text that anticipates a future time when the Spirit would be poured out from on high upon God’s people (ἐν ἰσοδύναμος ἐξ ἰς ἰσοδύναμος ἐξ ὦκους ὄ水准νυ).
of the witness, or servant, that Isaiah foretells; he also indicates that their declaration of
the resurrection of Christ and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures would be the means
by which they would effect a long-awaited restoration of Israel and illumination of the
nations. Through their message and scriptural interpretation, the disciples both receive
and participate in the fulfillment of Isaianic promises.

Luke also appears to portray the scriptural interpretation of Philip (Acts 8:26-40)
in a similar way. Scholars frequently suggest that the scene of the Ethiopian’s return
from Jerusalem worship (Acts 8:27) evokes a recollection of the eschatological image
found in Isa 56:3-5. Although Deut 23:2 indicates that a sexually mutilated man could
not enter “the assembly of the LORD,” the prophecy from Isa 56:3-5 announces that this
type of individual would gain full access to Jewish worship at the time of Israel’s
restoration. If Luke here wishes to portray the Ethiopian official as a eunuch who

12 As Tiede, “Exaltation,” 286, has argued, “The logic stems directly from Second Isaiah: the
promise of God’s reign is not simply the restoration of the preserved oflsrael, but the renewal of the
vocation of Israel to be a light to the nations to the end of the earth”; cf. Turner, Power, 301-302; James M.
have placed emphasis on the way in which Acts 1:8b can serve as an outline for the entire book – the
expansion of the gospel from Jerusalem to Judaea, Samaria, and to the end of the earth. See, e.g., Martin
Dibelius, The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology (trans. Mary Ling; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), 75;

Apostles (SP 5; Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992), 155, 158-159; Marshall, Acts, 162; Wilson, Gentile
in Acts: Suffering as God’s ‘Plan’ (βουλή) For the World for the ‘Release of Sins,’” in History, Literature
Parsons, “Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker,” in Jesus and the Suffering Servant (ed.

14 The term “eunuch” ευνουχός (Hebrew = וּנֵו) can refer to a castrated man or a person who holds
a high political office. Some suggest that since Luke also describes the Ethiopian as a court official and
treasurer for Candace, the queen of Ethiopia (διοικήτης Κανδάκης βασιλέως Αἴθιων, δι’ ἐν ἐπὶ πᾶσιν
τῆς γάζης αὐτῆς), it would be redundant to use ευνουχός to depict his role as an official. For this reason,
experiences the fulfillment of Isa 56:3-5, he does so in a novel way. Rather than becoming a full participant in the Temple worship in Jerusalem, as the prophecy suggests, the Ethiopian gains access to God and his end-time salvation through a revelation of the true meaning of the Jewish scriptures. In the words of Darrell Bock, this episode in Acts signals that “the hope of worship expressed in Isa 56 is beginning to take place.” As such, it serves as another example of how Luke presents the proclamation and positive reception of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as a form of participation in the fulfillment of end-time Isaianic promises.

Luke also alludes to passages from Isaiah to depict the role that Paul plays in effecting restoration for Israel and light for the nations. In Acts 13:46-47, for example,
Luke has Paul and Barnabas cite and interpret Isa 49:6b to describe their mission to non-Jews:17

Then both Paul and Barnabas spoke out boldly, saying, "It was necessary that the word of God (τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) should be spoken first to you [Jews]. Since you reject it and judge yourselves to be unworthy of eternal life, we are now turning to the Gentiles. For so the Lord has commanded us, saying, 'I have set you to be a light for the Gentiles, so that you may bring salvation to the ends of the earth.'"18 When the Gentiles heard this, they were glad and praised the word of the Lord (ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου); and as many as had been destined for eternal life became believers. Thus the word of the Lord (ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου) spread throughout the region. (Acts 13:46-49)

In this context, Luke refers to the message of Paul and Barnabas as ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ.

The phrase recalls the sermon that Paul preached on the previous Sabbath in the synagogue at Pisidia of Antioch (Acts 13:16-41).19 In this earlier sermon, Paul cites and interprets the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate how Christ, through his death and resurrection, fulfilled them. By having Paul and Barnabas subsequently declare that they would take this same message to non-Jews, Luke indicates that they will effect the illumination of the nations that Isaiah promises by proclaiming how the scriptures have been fulfilled through Christ.

---


18 Notably, the phrase "as a covenant of a race" (ἐἰς διαθήκην γένους) does not appear in Acts 13:47b, but is present in some manuscript traditions of LXX Isa 49:6b. Fitzmyer, Acts, 521, suggests that this difference represents the removal of a reference to Jewish people in Acts; cf. Barrett, Acts, 1:657. As Pao, Isaiahic Exodus, 96-97, points out, however, the same part of Isa 49:6b is also omitted from the Alexandrian manuscript group of the LXX (i.e., A; Q; 26; 86; 106; 710), and has no equivalent in the MT. Therefore, it is possible that Luke relied on a Greek version of the Jewish scriptures that did not include "as a covenant for a race" (ἐἰς διαθήκην γένους); cf. F. F. Bruce, The Book of Acts (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 315.

19 Since, in Acts 13:26, Paul refers to his message as ὁ λόγος τῆς σωτηρίας and, in Acts 13:44, Luke indicates that the whole city gathered to hear τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου on the following Sabbath, we can infer that the phrase τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 13:46 refers back to the sermon in Acts 13:16-41.
Again, in Acts 26:12-23, Luke presents Paul’s mission as the fulfillment of

Isaianic promises of restoration and illumination:

With this in mind, I was traveling to Damascus with the authority and commission of the chief priests, when at midday along the road, your Excellency, I saw a light from heaven, brighter than the sun, shining around me and my companions. When we had all fallen to the ground, I heard a voice saying to me in the Hebrew language, “Saul, Saul, why are you persecuting me? It hurts you to kick against the goads.” I asked, “Who are you, Lord?” The Lord answered, “I am Jesus whom you are persecuting. But get up and stand on your feet; for I have appeared to you for this purpose, to appoint you as a servant and witness to the things in which you have seen me and to those in which I will appear to you. I will rescue you from your people and from the Gentiles – to whom I am sending you to open their eyes so that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan to God, so that they may receive forgiveness of sins and a place among those who are sanctified by faith in me.” . . . For this reason the Jews seized me in the temple and tried to kill me. To this day I have had help from God, and so I stand here, testifying to both small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets and Moses said would take place: that the Messiah must suffer, and that, by being the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light both to our people and to the Gentiles.

(Acts 26:12-23)

Although the Lukan Paul declares that Christ was the first to proclaim “light” to the Jewish people and the nations (cf. Luke 2:32; Isa 42:6; 49:6), he also alludes to promises from Isa 42:6-7; 49:6 to describe his own mission. He presents his initial encounter with Christ as a revelation of light, reports that he was commissioned to open the eyes of both Jews and non-Jews, and recounts his appointment as a witness of the Lord (cf. Acts 9:15; 13:46-47; 22:15). By further explaining that he fulfilled this mission through his declaration of what the prophets and Moses predicted (26:22-23), the Lukan Paul indicates that his scriptural exposition functioned as a primary means of effecting

---

illumination. Luke thus presents Paul as a type of servant or witness, like the figure that Isaiah 42:6-7; 49:6 describes, and his message and exegesis as the mediation of restoration and light that such passages from Isaiah foretell. Luke thus shows the legitimacy of the revelatory exegesis of Paul by presenting it as the realization of end-time promises.

4.2.2 “You Will Indeed Look but Never Perceive”

Besides depicting the message and exegesis of Christ-believers as an eschatological revelation, Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures to justify the denunciation of those who do not understand, or reject, their exegetical conclusions. In Luke 8:10, for example, the Lukan Jesus cites an excerpt from LXX Isa 6:9-10 to support his distinction between those who possess the ability to know “the secrets of the kingdom of God” and those who do not:

---

21 The description of the message of Paul in Acts 26:22-23 also recalls Luke 24:44-47. For further discussion of this parallel, see Dupont, “La portée christologique,” 141-143; idem, Salvation, 145-146; Pao, **Isaianic Exodus**, 89.

22 Although Turner, **Power**, 343, 402, 432, suggests that Luke depicts the first disciples, in particular, as witnesses who bring the restoration of Israel and light to the nations that Isaiah promised, other Jewish Christ-believers appear to take up a similar role, even though Luke does not appeal to passages from Isaiah when describing them. In Acts 7-8, for example, Stephen and Philip proclaim the message of Christ in a manner similar to that of the apostles, and in Acts 13 both Paul and Barnabas declare that they are fulfilling the role of the servant that Isa 49:6 describes. Furthermore, as Karl A. Kuhn, “Beginning the Witness: The αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται of Luke’s Infancy Narrative,” *NTS* 49 (2003): 237-255, has recently argued, the figures in Luke 1-2 undergo a transformation parallel to that of the disciples in Luke 24; as a result of receiving a manifestation of God’s salvation in Christ, these early figures also become witnesses of his salvation. This view differs from the argument of Richard J. Dillon, “Previewing Luke’s Project from his Prologue,” *CBQ* 43 (1981): 215, that αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται τοῦ λόγου in Luke 1:2 refer to those who became ministers of the word through their post-resurrection encounter with Christ (Luke 24:44-48). Against Dillon, Kuhn suggests that the phrase αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται γενόμενοι τοῦ λόγου reflects a pattern throughout Luke-Acts “in which individual characters are confronted with the reality of God’s in-breaking reign in Jesus and respond in praise and in testimony” (254). If Kuhn’s conclusions are correct, Luke may implicitly extend the role of the servant that Isaiah describes to all Jews who perceive and respond positively to the revelation of Christ.

23 In contrast to the darkened state of “the others” (τοῖς λοιποῖς), the disciples receive the ability to know the mysteries of the kingdom. Compare the phrase ὡμεν δέδοται γνώσιν τὰ μυστήρια τῆς βασιλείας...
He said, “To you it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God; but to others I speak in parables, so that (ταύτα) 'looking they may not perceive, and listening they may not understand’” (Isa 6:9-10).24 (Luke 8:10)

By retaining the Markan ταύτα (Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10b) rather than changing it to ὅτι as Matthew does (Matt 13:13), Luke indicates that Jesus gave the disciples the capacity to know the “mysteries of the kingdom” but spoke in parables “to others” with the express purpose of ensuring that the latter group would not perceive their true meaning.25 The citation of Isa 6:9-10 justifies this distinction by showing the misunderstanding of those


25 The meaning of ταύτα in this context is debated, since it is difficult to distinguish whether it indicates purpose or result. For example, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:706, suggests that Luke softens Mark’s explanation by having the disciples ask about only one parable (Mark 4:11 and Matt 13:10 refer to parables that are hidden from those outside) and by shortening the citation from Isa 6:9-10 (compare Mark 4:12 and Matt 13:13-15); cf. Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994-1996), 1:727. Although ταύτα often expresses purpose, I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 323, argues that the citation from Isa 6:9-10 suggests that the ταύτα expresses the meaning: “so that the scripture is fulfilled which says that.” Craig E. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: SAP, 1989), 117, suggests that Luke’s use of γυνώματι as an infinitive of purpose in the previous clause stands “roughly parallel” to the ταύτα in Luke 8:10. This leads him to conclude that both clauses denote purpose: “To you it has been given (in order that you may) know . . . , but to the rest (it has been given) in parables in order that seeing they should not see . . .”; cf. J. Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (SANT 3; Münich: Kösel, 1961), 45-48. Whether Jesus spoke in parables to “the others” in order that they might not understand, or with the result that they might not understand, the essential difference between these two interpretations is barely distinguishable. If we take the ταύτα to mean “with the result that,” it is still the case that the Lukan (and Markan) Jesus deliberately chose to speak in parables to “the others” even though he knew that this action would produce the outcome of misunderstanding. Thus, whether we interpret the ταύτα as purpose or result, the context in Luke, and Mark, suggests that Jesus intended to conceal the mysteries of the kingdom from people who were not his disciples; cf. Walter Bauer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd. ed., revised and edited by Frederick William Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 475-477.
who did not perceive the message of Jesus to be congruent with the description of those who misunderstood, or rejected, the message of the prophet Isaiah.26

Although Luke does not here clearly describe the referent of “the secrets of the kingdom of God,” his emphasis upon the knowledge of the kingdom and his identification of the seed as “the word of God” suggests that the gift of knowledge which the disciples receive includes the correct interpretation of the scriptures. Because Luke identifies the seed as “the word of God” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) in his version of the parable of the sower,27 his description of receiving the knowledge of the kingdom exerts a wider, thematic influence in his narrative.28 Through the repetition of this phraseology, Luke creates a link between the parable of the sower and subsequent scenes that describe the growth of “the word of God” in Acts (e.g., Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20).29 In these latter contexts, the early Christ-believing community represents the good soil upon which the word fell and took root. That is, “the word of God” functions as the creative force that causes the growth of the church.30 Since Luke uses the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ

Note that the identification of the seed as the “word of God” in Luke 8:11 may allude to Isa 55:10-11, and refer to the ability of the word of God to produce its intended result. If so, Isa 55:10-11 would provide positive scriptural assurance that the message of Jesus and his followers would be fruitful. For further discussion regarding the possible allusion to Isa 55:10-11 in the parable of the sower, see Craig E. Evans, “On the Isaianic Background of the Sower Parable,” CBQ 47 (1985): 464-468.

27 Compare with Mark 4:13-20 (ὁ λόγος) and Matt 13:18-23 (ὁ λόγος and ὁ λόγος τῆς βασιλείας).


λόγος τοῦ κυρίου, and ὁ λόγος to refer to proclamations that focus upon scriptural interpretation and produce this type of growth (e.g., Acts 2:41; 4:4; 13:5, 15, 26, 44, 46, 48, 49; 17:11, 13; 18:5, 11; 19:8-10), we can infer that his differentiation between those who perceive the mysteries of the kingdom and those who do not in Luke 8:10 also points forward to a distinction between those who receive and reject the message and exegesis of the followers of Jesus. The appeal to Isa 6:9-10 to denounce those who are not disciples in Luke 8:10 therefore further applies to those who reject the message and scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers in subsequent reports of the proclamation of “the word of God.”

Similarly, the more lengthy citation of LXX Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-28 functions as a scriptural warrant for the exclusion of those who reject the message and scriptural interpretation of Paul. Prior to citing Isa 6:9-10, the Lukan Paul testifies about “the kingdom of God” to Jews in Rome and tries “to convince them about Jesus both from the law of Moses and from the prophets” (Acts 28:23). When division ensues as a result of

---

31 The syntax of Acts 28:23 makes it difficult to determine whether Luke intends to present Paul’s scriptural interpretation as an elaboration of his testimony about the kingdom or to portray his testimony...
his message and exegesis (Acts 28:24-25), Paul explains the condition of those who reject his preaching in the following way:

The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your ancestors through the prophet Isaiah, “Go to this people and say, you will indeed listen, but never understand, and you will indeed look, but never perceive. For this people’s heart has grown dull, and their ears are hard of hearing, and they have shut their eyes; so that they might not look with their eyes, and listen with their ears, and understand with their heart and turn-- and I would heal them” (Isa 6:9-10).

(Acts 28:25-27)

Paul thus cites Isa 6:9-10 to provide a scriptural explanation for the failure of some Jews to believe, or understand, his exposition of the Jewish scriptures. Whereas in Luke 8:10, LXX Isa 6:9-10 appears to provide a warrant for the decision of Jesus to speak in parables to Jews who were not disciples of Jesus in order that they would be unable to understand his message, Paul cites LXX Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27 to depict the hardness of the audience of Paul and thus their inability to understand his message. 32

As with Luke’s version of the parable of the sower, so the final sermon of Paul exerts a wider thematic influence upon Luke-Acts. Scholars have often noted that Luke repeats the pattern of a transfer of the message of Paul from Jews to non-Jews in Acts about the kingdom and his exegesis of scripture as two different parts of his message: Ταξάμενοι δὲ αὐτῷ ἡμέραν ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰς τὴν ξενίαν πλεῖονες οἱς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοῖς περὶ τοῦ Ἰσχοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου Μωυσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπὸ προϊ ἐώς ἑσπέρας. If we take πείθων . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου Μωυσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν as an appositional phrase, then we would conclude the former. Alternatively, if we read διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ and πείθων . . . ἀπὸ τοῦ νόμου Μωυσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν as coordinate participle phrases that indicate two different parts of his message, we would conclude the latter. 32

Barrett, Acts, 2:1245, maintains that Luke cites from LXX Isa 6:9-10 to characterize those who had “made up their minds not to understand, not to hear, not to see.” The wording of the LXX citation in Acts 28:26-27 also confirms this interpretation. The MT of Isa 6:10 indicates that the prophet was commissioned to cause the heart of the people to grow dull and their ears heavy, and to cause their eyes to be shut (see the hiphil forms צָעַר and יֹשֵׁב in Isa 6:10) so that they could not understand the message of God, repent, and be healed. By contrast, LXX Isa 6:10-11 indicates that their inability to hear and understand was due to a condition of dullness and hardness that preceded their hearing of the message of God through the prophet.
13:46-47; 18:6; and 28:23-28. The parallels between these three accounts especially suggest that Acts 28:25-28 represents the culmination of the ministry of Paul to fellow-Jews. Accordingly, the citation of LXX Isa 6:9-10 in this final scene serves as a denunciation that applies to all three episodes. Just as Luke presents the scriptural proclamation of Paul and Barnabas as the positive fulfillment of end-time Isaianic promises (Acts 13:46-47), so he justifies the exclusion of those who do not understand, or


35 Furthermore, as David P. Moessner, “Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 101-102, notes, in his earlier sermons the Lukan Paul also cites or alludes to scriptural passages in order to present the judgment of those who reject the message of Paul as the fulfillment of scripture (Acts 13:41 [cf. LXX Hab 1:5]; Acts 18:6 [cf. Ezek 33:4, 5]). According to Moessner, “Paul fulfills Isaiah’s calling to announce God’s inexorable judgment against a calloused folk whose ears have grown ‘thick’ and whose eyes are ‘shut’” (102). Moessner also suggests that the three announcements of judgment upon those who reject the message of Paul in Acts 13, 18, and 28 follow the pattern of judgment announced against Israel because of its rejection of the message of Jesus and his followers in the gospel of Luke. In his view, Luke-Acts continues a pattern of Israelite history that is marked by the ongoing stubbornness of its people and their rejection of its prophets. See also Luke 13:31-35.
reject, it by presenting their negative response as part of a scriptural pattern of obduracy.36

4.3 End-Time Revelation and Darkening in the Writings of Justin

4.3.1 “For Out of Zion Shall Go Forth the Law”

Like Luke, Justin presents the proclamation of the apostles as the realization of end-time scriptural promises and the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as the illumination of the nations that Isa 49:6 foretells. Nevertheless, Justin develops this theme in a manner which is distinct from Luke insofar as he depicts the apostles and the recipients of their message as participants in the eschatological pilgrimage described in Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4).37

In Dial. 121.1-3, Justin indicates that Christ fulfilled LXX Ps 71:17 by enlightening the nations with his message of “truth and wisdom” and defeating demonic


He argues that this illumination was so brilliant during the first advent of Christ that it caused some from every nation to repent from their former wicked way of life, and even to suffer torment rather than deny their faith in Christ. Subsequently, Justin describes this enlightenment as the present realization of Isa 49:6:

We, therefore, were endowed with the special grace of hearing and understanding, of being saved by Christ, and knowing all the truths revealed by the Father. Thus, he says to him: “It is a great thing for you that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to bring the dispersions of Israel back. I have given you to be a light of the nations, that you may be their salvation even to the farthest part of the earth (εἰς σωτηρίαν αὐτῶν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς)” (LXX Isa 49:6).  

(Dial. 121.4)

Since elsewhere in the Dialogue, the grace that Christ-believers receive to hear, understand, and know revealed truth relates to their reception of the correct interpretation of the scriptures, this description of the illumination of the nations probably refers to the endowment of a special capacity to understand Christ and his fulfillment of the Jewish

---

38 In Dial. 121.1, Justin asserts that the words of LXX Ps 71:17 – “His name shall endure forever; it shall rise above the sun; and all nations shall be blessed in him” – refer only to Christ because the text does not say “in his seed” (see parallel references to Abraham in Gen 12:2; 22:18) but “in him.” For Justin, this indicates that the Abrahamic and Davidic blessings promised for the nations come through only one individual, namely, Christ (see also Dialogue 120). Furthermore, in Dial. 121.1, Justin appears to shorten and adapt εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ πᾶσα αἱ φυλai τῆς γῆς πάντα τὰ ἔθη μακαρίωσιν αὐτῶν (LXX Ps 71:17b) to read ἐν εὐλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ ἔθη. This adaptation helps him to argue more clearly that the promised blessings for the nations come solely through Christ. Compare also Dial. 121.1 with Dial. 34:6 and 64:6, where Justin follows the wording of LXX Ps 71:17b. For further discussion of the different version of LXX Ps 71:17 in Dial. 121.1 and the sources that Justin may have used, see Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 84-85.

39 Justin draws a similar conclusion from his reading of LXX Ps 109:1-4 in Dial. 83.1-4: “But, although our Jesus has not yet returned in glory, he has sent forth into Jerusalem the sceptre of power, namely, the call to repentance to all the nations over which the demons used to rule” (Dial. 109.4; cf. 1 Apol. 45.2-4; Dial. 83.2-4).

It would appear that Justin regards the revelatory exegesis of Christ-believers as the fulfillment of Isa 49:6.

The section immediately following *Dial.* 121.1-4 also strongly suggests that, for Justin, the exegesis of Christ-believers represents the realization of Isaianic promises. In *Dialogue* 122, Justin outlines a lengthy contrast between the revelatory knowledge of the Jewish scriptures which Christ-believers possess and the adoption of the Mosaic law by proselytes to Judaism. In this passage, he argues that Trypho and his companions wrongly believe that Isa 49:6 refers to the latter group: “You really suppose that the above-cited passage [Isa 49:6] refers to the stranger and the proselyte, but in reality it refers to us Christians who have been enlightened by Jesus” (*Dial.* 122.1). He then cites and expounds Isaiah 42:6-7 as further scriptural proof for his own conclusion:

“And in another place he exclaims: ‘I the Lord have called you in justice, and will take you by the hand, and strengthen you, and I will give you for a covenant of the people, for a light of the nations, to open the eyes of the blind, and to bring forth the prisoner out of the prison’ (Isa 42:6-7). These words, also, gentlemen, have been spoken of Christ and concern the enlightened nations. Or do you again assert that he speaks of the Law and the proselytes?” Then some of those who had come on the second day started to shout as though they were in a theatre: “Why not? Does he not mean the Law and those enlightened by it? These are, of course, the proselytes.” “No,” I replied, looking straight at Trypho, “for if the Law had the power to enlighten the nations and all those who possess it, what need would there be for a new covenant? But, since God foretold that he would send a new covenant, and an eternal law and commandment, we should not apply the above-quoted passage to the old law and its proselytes, but to Christ and his proselytes, that is, us nations whom he has enlightened.” (*Dial.* 122.3-5)

By referring to Christ as the new covenant and to Christ-believers as “proselytes,” Justin provides an interpretation of Isa 49:6 (cf. 42:6-7) that directly counters the view that this

---

41 Compare, for example, the verbal and conceptual parallels in passages that refer explicitly to Christ-believers’ possession of the correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures (*Dial.* 7.1-3; 30.1; 58.1; 78.10-11; 92.1; 100.2; 119.1).
passage refers to a non-eschatological illumination provided by the Mosaic law. Justin reasons that if the Mosaic law had the power to enlighten people, scripture would not speak of a future new covenant. Since it does speak of such a covenant, however, he asserts that Isa 42:6 must also predict this new covenant, and therefore refer to Christ. By reading into Isa 42:6-7 the concept of a new covenant (LXX Jer 38:31), Justin affirms his eschatological, messianic interpretation of both Isa 49:6 and 42:6-7 over against the historical, non-messianic reading of Trypho and his associates. In so doing, he presents

42 Luke refers to a “new covenant” (Luke 22:20) only once and does not develop this concept in his writings. Justin may have developed the idea of Christ as the new covenant from Paul (e.g., Rom 11:27; 1 Cor 11:25; 2 Cor 3:6, 14-15), the author of Hebrews (e.g., Heb 7:22; 8:6, 8-10; 10:16; 12:24; 13:20), or Barn. 14:6-7, but he also shapes this concept in his own way and develops it in relation to his interpretation of Isa 42:6-7 and 49:6 in a manner that these other writers do not.

43 This interpretation implicitly depends on the assumption that “covenant” in Isa 42:6-7 refers to the new covenant promised in LXX Jer 38:31 (cf. Dial. 11.3) rather than the one made on Sinai. Justin does not refer to LXX Jer 38:31 in this context, but in Dial. 11.3 he joins Isa 55:4-5 with LXX Jer 38:31 to present Christ as the new covenant and law, and the referent of “covenant” in both of these passages. See also Dial. 24.1.

44 Compare also Rom 2:17-20. The interpretation of Isa 49:6 and 42:6-7 that Justin attributes to Trypho – whether real or constructed – provides the framework for his own reading of these passages. As Oskar Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 353-354, has noted, some Jewish sources describe the conversion of a proselyte to Judaism in terms reminiscent of the illumination of the nations described in Isa 49:6 and 42:6-7. For example, Joseph and Aseneth refers to the conversion of proselytes as a movement from “darkness to light, from error to truth” and associates obedience to the Law with illumination (8:10; 15:12). Similarly, Philo indicates that the Mosaic law has the capacity to give non-Jews “sight” and enlightenment in exchange for their darkness: “they have now received their sight, beholding the most brilliant of all lights instead of the most profound darkness” (Virt. 175; cf. Mos. 2:27.44). A Jewish-Christian text, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (TP), which underwent a series of Christian redactions in the second century CE, similarly depicts the law as a type of illumination. T. Lev. 19.1-2 refers to illumination as knowledge that comes from the “law of the Lord”: “And now, my children, you have heard all; choose, therefore, for yourselves either the light or the darkness, either the law of the Lord or the works of Beliar” (cf. T. Lev. 18.9). T. Lev. 14.3-4 indicates that the law was entrusted to Israel for the purpose of illuminating all peoples. Although the Christian redaction of this text prevents us from isolating its Jewish traditions in a definitive way, the language and concepts that T. Lev. 14.3-4 uses to describe the illumination provided by the law resembles the interpretation of Isa 49:6 and 42:6-7 that Justin attributes to Trypho (note, especially, the common use of φωτίζω and cognate terms). Marc Hirshman, “Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries,” HTR 93 (2000): 101-115, also points out that a number of tannaitic sources portray Israelites as mediators of Torah and assert that the Torah was available to all humankind (e.g., Sîfîrî Lev 18:1-5; Sîfîrî Num 18:20; m. Avot 1.12; 3.12-13; Mekîlîta de R. Ishmael, Tractate of Amalek, Exod 17:8-16). Hirshman argues that these three sources probably represent the same school of thought during approximately the same time period (second-third century CE), and present a form of universalism that is not messianic and eschatological, but historical; all humankind has access to God’s commandments and
the acceptance of Christ and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures as the only means of practicing proper covenant fidelity.\(^{45}\)

According to Justin, the message and scriptural interpretation that the apostles proclaim also initiates a preliminary realization of the blessings promised in Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4). For example, in \textit{I Apol.} 39.1-4, Justin likens the message of the apostles to the Law that would go forth from Zion in the eschatological age, and explains that both their preaching and its effects fulfill the promises of Isa 2:3-4:

But when the prophetic Spirit speaks, as foretelling what is going to happen, his words are the following: “For the Law shall come forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge the nations, and rebuke many people; and they shall turn their swords into ploughshares, and their spears into sickles; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they be exercised in war” (Isa 2:3-4). That this prophecy, too, was verified you can readily believe, for twelve illiterate men, unskilled in the art of speaking, went out from Jerusalem into the world, and by the power of God they announced to the men of every nation that they were sent by Christ to teach everyone the word of God; and we, who once killed one another, not only do not wage war against our enemies, but, in order to avoid lying or deceiving our examiners, we even meet death cheerfully, confessing Christ. (\textit{I Apol.} 39.1-4)

Similarly, in \textit{Dial.} 109.1-110.3, Justin evokes the image of an eschatological pilgrimage to describe the mission of the apostles and cites parallel material from Mic 4:1-7. In this latter context, Justin also attempts to refute an argument which he attributes to the teachers of Trypho. Justin explains that these teachers mistakenly conclude that Mic 4:1-

\(^{45}\) Francis Watson, “Have you not Read . . . ?” Christians, Jews and Scripture in Justin’s \textit{Dialogue with Trypho},” The Ethel M. Wood Lecture, University of London, 3 March 2005, 9-10, argues that Justin develops his interpretations of scripture “in dialogue with a Jewish non-messianic interpretation” (10), and maintains that this influences the development of his scriptural argument. Although this is true of Justin’s interpretation of Isa 49:6 (cf. 42:6-7) in \textit{Dialogue} 121-123, the same cannot be said of his interpretation of Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4) in \textit{Dialogue} 109-110 (cf. \textit{I Apology} 39). In \textit{Dial.} 110.1, Justin indicates that the teachers of Trypho apply Mic 4:1-7 to a future messiah. Against these teachers, he argues that the promises in this text have already been fulfilled by Jesus and the preaching of the apostles. Therefore, Justin does not attribute their misunderstanding of this scripture to their non-messianic, historical interpretation but to their failure to understand how Christ fulfilled Micah 4 (cf. Isaiah 2) during his first coming.
7 has not yet been fulfilled because they do not recognize the two advents of Christ, one in which he suffered without glory and another in which he will come from heaven in glory:

Permit me now to quote a few passages from Micah . . . to prove that the nations would repent of their sinful manner of life, after they heard and learned the doctrine of the apostles from Jerusalem. . . . When I had concluded this quotation [Mic 4:1-7], I remarked, ‘Gentlemen, I am aware that your teachers admit that this whole passage refers to Christ; I also know that they affirm that Christ has not yet come. But they say that even if he has come, it is not known who he is, until he shall become manifest and glorious; they say, he shall be known. Then, they state, everything foretold in the above-quoted prophecy will be verified, as if not a word of the prophecy had yet been fulfilled. What brainless beings! For they have missed the point of all the cited passages, namely, that two advents of Christ have been proclaimed: the first, in which he is shown to be subject to suffering and the crucifixion, without glory and honor; and the second, in which he will come from the heavens in glory.

(Dial. 110.1-2)

Justin thus presents the message of the apostles as an initial fulfillment of scriptural promises that foretell an eschatological pilgrimage of the nations but explains that a future fulfillment of Mic 4:1-7 will also occur.46

Although Justin does not identify the preaching of the apostles as scriptural interpretation in these contexts, his explicit description of this element of their kerygma elsewhere (e.g., 1 Apol. 49.5; 50.12; Dial. 53.5-6; 76.6-7) makes it possible to infer that the phrases “they were sent by Christ to teach everyone the word of God (τὸν τὸῦ θεοῦ λόγον)” in 1 Apol. 39.3 and “the word (τὸν λόγον) preached by the apostles from Jerusalem” in Dial. 109.1 includes the declaration of how Christ fulfilled the scriptures.47

For Justin, then, the preaching and scriptural interpretation of the apostles represents the “Law” and the “word of the Lord” that went out from Zion and Jerusalem in the last days.

46 See also 1 Apol. 45.1-6.
47 Justin’s use of logos terminology in 1 Apology 39 and Dialogue 109-110 appears to emerge from his dependence upon Isa 2:3-4 and Mic 4:1-7, even though elsewhere he uses logos terminology to refer to the pre-existent Christ.
Justin also indicates that the current behavior of Christ-believers furnishes proof that the prophecies of Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4) have been fulfilled as a result of the first advent of Christ:

For we Christians, who have gained a knowledge of the true worship of God from the Law and the word which went forth from Jerusalem by way of the apostles of Jesus, have run for protection to the God of Jacob and the God of Israel. And we who delighted in war, in the slaughter of one another, and in every kind of iniquity have in every part of the world converted our weapons of war into implements of peace – our swords into ploughshares, our spears into farmers’ tools – and we practice piety, justice, brotherly charity, faith, and hope, which we derive from the Father through the crucified Savior; each one of us sitting under his vine, that is, each one living with only his own wife. (Dial. 110.2-3)

In response to the end-time proclamation of the apostles, Christ-believers repent of their former sinful practices (Dial. 109.1) and turn from violence to a peaceful, pious, and righteous way of life (Dial. 109.3; cf. 1 Apol. 39.1, 3). Accordingly, Justin represents this repentance and change in practice as proof of their involvement in the initial realization of an eschatological pilgrimage: as a result of their reception of the “Law” and “Word,” Christ-believers gain “a knowledge of the true worship of God” (Dial. 109.2), turn their “weapons of war into implements of peace,” “swords into ploughshares,” and “spears into farmers’ tools” (Dial. 110.3; cf. 1 Apol. 39.3), and sit peacefully under their “own vine” (Dial. 110.3). Justin thus seeks to show the legitimacy of the message and scriptural interpretation by presenting the apostles and the

---

48 Moreover, Christ-believers continue these new practices even when under the threat of persecution and death (1 Apol. 39.3-4; Dial. 110.4).
49 Justin makes this explicit in Dial. 110.1-2 where he explains that part of Mic 4:1-7 has been fulfilled as a result of the first advent of Christ, and the consequent worship and practices of the Christ-believing community, but indicates that other parts of this prophecy will be realized at his second advent. See also Dial. 121.3.
recipients of their message as participants in the end-time pilgrimage that Isaiah 2 (Micah 4) predicts. 50

4.3.2 “The Lawgiver Has Come but You Do Not See Him”

Even as Justin portrays the exegesis and proclamation of Christ-believers as the fulfillment of end-time scriptural promises, so he provides scriptural warrant for his negative characterization of those who misunderstand, or reject, their scriptural interpretation and message. In numerous contexts, he appeals to prophetic oracles of judgment to justify his conclusion that this misunderstanding was also part of God’s plan. 51 In the majority of these passages, moreover, Justin contrasts the positive responses of insiders to the Christ-believing community with the negative responses of outsiders.

Within the Apologies, 1 Apol. 49.1-5 serves as an important example of how Justin uses scriptural prophecy to describe this type of a division between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community:

Consider, too, how this same Isaiah foretold that the Gentiles, who did not look forward to the Messiah, should worship him, but the Jews, who were always awaiting his arrival, should not recognize him when he did arrive. These are his words spoken as in the name of Christ himself: “I was manifest to those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me. I said, ‘Behold me’ to a nation that did not call upon my name. I stretched out my hands to an unbelieving and contradicting people, who walk along a way that is not good, but follow after their own sins; a people who provoke me to anger before my face” (Isa 65:1-3). The Jews

50 In Dial. 24.1-3, Justin also describes the fulfillment of Isa 2:3 (cf. Isa 55:3; LXX Jer 38:31) and attempts to demonstrate how the experiences of those who receive this message represent their participation in the eschatological pilgrimage.

51 1 Apol. 36.3-37.1 (Isa 1:3-4); 49.1-3 (Isa 65:1-3); Dial. 12:1-2 (Isa 55:3-5; Isa 6:10 [see also the allusion to Isa 6:10 in Dial. 33.1 and possibly 69.4]); 24.3-4 (Isa 65:1-3); 27.4 (Isa 29:13); 32.5 (Isa 29:14); 34.1-6 (LXX Ps 18:7; 71:1-20); 78.10-11 (Isa 29:13-14); 114.5 (Jer 2:13); 118.3-4 (Isa 52:15; 53:1); 119.1-2 (Deut 32:16-23); 123.2-4 (Isa 29:14); 140.1-2 (Jer 2:13; Isa 29:13). In these passages, Justin describes the inability of Jews to recognize and understand prophetical references to Christ (e.g., 1 Apol. 36.3-37.1; 49.1-3; Dial. 32.5; 78.10-11; 114.5; 118.3-4) and the true intent and nature of the law (Dial. 12.1-2; 24.3-4; 27.4; 34.1-6; 123.2-4).
in truth, who had the prophecies and always looked for the coming of Christ, not only did not recognize him but, far beyond that, even mistreated him. But the Gentiles who have never even heard anything of Christ until his apostles went from Jerusalem and preached about him and gave them the prophecies, were filled with joy and faith, and turned away from their idols, and dedicated themselves to the Unbegotten God through Christ. 

(1 Apol. 49.1-5)

He maintains that Jews should have recognized Christ since they always had the prophecies which predicted his coming. He argues, however, that non-Jews instead became the recipients of these prophecies because they recognized the truth of the exegesis of the apostles. For Justin, Isa 65:1-3 justifies this tragic outcome since it predicts the correct understanding of non-Jewish Christ-believers ("I was manifest to those who did not ask for me; I was found by those who did not seek me . . . to a nation that did not call upon my name"; Isa 65:1) and foretells the obduracy and unbelief of Jews ("I stretched out my hands to an unbelieving and contradicting people, who walk along a way that is not good, but follow after their own sins; a people who provoke me to anger before my face"; Isa 65:2-3). Through this appropriation of Isa 65:1-3, Justin provides scriptural justification for both the misunderstanding of the scriptures by Jews and the correct understanding of non-Jewish Christ-believers.

Similarly, in the Dialogue, Justin frequently appeals to the Jewish scriptures to justify his distinction between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community. For example, in Dialogue 11, Justin appeals to Isa 51:4-5 and Jer 31:31-32 to depict Christ as the new law and covenant, and to describe Christ-believers as those who have correctly understood and become adherents of this new law. Subsequently, in Dial. 12.1-

---

52 See the similar use of Isa 65:1-2 in Rom 10:20-21.
2, he cites Isa 55:3-5 together with Isa 6:10 to portray both the reception and rejection of Christ’s fulfillment of the scriptures as the fulfillment of prophecy:

I also cited this quotation from Isaiah: “Hear my words, and your soul shall live, and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, the sure mercies of David. Behold, I have given him for a witness to the people; behold nations that do not know you shall call upon you, and people that did not know you shall run to you, because of the Lord your God, and for the Holy One of Israel, for he has glorified you” (Isa 55:3-5). You have scorned this very law [i.e., Christ], and have made light of his new holy covenant, and even now you don’t accept it, nor are you repentant of your evil actions. Jeremiah has indeed exclaimed: “For you ears are closed, your eyes are blinded, and your heart is hardened” (Isa 6:10);\(^{53}\) but still you won’t listen. The lawgiver has come, but you do not see him; “the poor have the gospel preached to them, the blind see” (Matt 11:5; Luke 7:22) yet you do not understand.\(^{121.1-2}\)

According to Justin, Isa 55:3-5 predicts the positive reception of Christ by non-Jews whereas Isa 6:10 describes Jews who have not recognized or accepted Christ as the new covenant and law.\(^{54}\) In other words, those who embrace his explanation of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures become recipients of Isaianic promises of salvation whereas those who reject this fulfillment embody the blindness that Isaiah predicted.

### 4.4 Luke and Justin: Differing Configurations of Insiders and Outsiders

Although Luke and Justin similarly attempt to construe both the acceptance and rejection of the exegesis of Jesus and his followers as the fulfillment of end-time scriptural promises, they do not distinguish between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community in precisely the same way. A comparison of Luke 8:10 and \textit{Dial.} 121.4-122.1 illustrates both the similarity and difference between Luke and Justin:\(^{55}\)

---

\(^{53}\) Justin incorrectly attributes this passage to Jeremiah.

\(^{54}\) Moreover, he appeals to a saying from the double tradition to accentuate his description of the blindness and misunderstanding of Jews. Whereas Matthew and Luke use this tradition to answer the question posed by the disciples of John the Baptist about the identity of Christ, Justin applies this saying to the misunderstanding of his ostensibly Jewish audience.

\(^{55}\) To my knowledge, no one has noted these verbal parallels or suggested that Justin depended on a gospel tradition in \textit{Dial.} 121.4. Clearly, Justin was familiar with the parable of the sower (see \textit{Dialogue...}}
Luke 8:10:

He said, "To you it has been given to know (ιδεῖν δὲ θεοῦ γνῶναι) the secrets of the kingdom of God; but to [the] others I speak in parables, so that 'looking they may not perceive, and listening (ἀκούοντες) they may not understand' (συνιστῶν)" (cf. Isa 6:9-10).

Dial. 121.4-122.1:

We, therefore, were endowed (ημεῖς οὖν ἐδόθη) with the special grace of hearing (ἀκούσατε) and understanding (συνιστάτε), of being saved by Christ, and of knowing (ἐπιγινώσκατε) all truths revealed by the Father. Thus, he says to him: "It is a great thing for you that you should be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob . . . (Isa 49:6)." You really suppose that the above-cited passage refers to the stranger and the proselyte, but in reality it refers to us Christians who have been enlightened by Christ.

Their use of common themes and terminology to describe the difference between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community suggests that Luke and Justin may have drawn upon a common source, or that Justin relied upon a synoptic tradition. Despite this similarity, the divergent contexts of these similar passages demonstrate an important difference between them.

In Luke 8:10-15 and 8:19-21, Luke outlines the difference between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community by emphasizing the importance of hearing, understanding, and obeying "the word of God." In Luke 8:11-15, he portrays three types of recipients of the message of God in whom the word does not take root, as Matthew and Mark also do. Unlike the other synoptic gospel writers, however, Luke characterizes the fourth group as those who hear the "word of God" with honest and good hearts, hold it

125) but it is not certain if he here uses the terminology from the parable to describe the correct understanding of Christ-believers. For a detailed comparison of Dial. 125.1 and the synoptic versions of the parables of the sower, see A. J. Bellinzoni, The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr (NovTSup 17; Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), 127-130; Andrew Gregory, The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century (Tübingen: Mohr Seibeck, 2003), 255-257. Bellinzoni concludes that Justin based his text in Dial. 125.1-2 upon the canonical gospels because Dial. 125.1 demonstrates wording that is peculiar to the three synoptic accounts. Gregory argues that Justin could have used a form of the tradition that was independent from the synoptic gospels.
fast, and bear fruit with endurance. Luke thus associates proper understanding of the message of God with moral integrity, endurance, and obedience. Subsequently, in Luke 8:19-21, he reinforces this defining characteristic of Christ-believers by having Jesus declare that those who hear and obey the “word of God” are his true family: “And he answered them saying: ‘My mother and my brothers are those who hear and do the word of God’” (Luke 8:21). In other words, Luke has Jesus replace a traditional means of self-definition – family ties – with a different group boundary marker – hearing and obeying the message of God. The repetition of the phrase “the word of God” in Luke 8:10 and 8:21 underscores the connection between these two passages. Together, they depict correct understanding of and obedience to “the word of God” as central boundary markers that distinguish Christ-believers from other Jews.


57 The apparent disregard of Jesus for his immediate family members in Luke 8:21 corresponds closely to the portrayal of a conflict between Jesus and his kinship group in Luke 4:16-30. In Luke 4, Jesus interprets the Jewish scriptures in such a way that his hometown audience does not represent the primary beneficiaries of his fulfillment of them. Similarly, in Luke 8:21, Jesus rejects the demands of his immediate family members and presents those who hear and obey the “word of God” as his true relatives.

58 Robinson, “Preaching the Word,” 133.

Although Justin presents correct understanding and righteous behavior as identifying marks of Christ-believers (I Apol. 39.1-4; Dial. 109.1-110.3; 121.2-3), he also develops a sharp contrast between non-Jews who believe in Jesus and Jews and their proselytes in Dial. 122.1-123.4. As the new law and covenant, Christ illumines the nations, Justin argues, whereas Jews wrongly assume that they can enlighten proselytes by instructing them in the Mosaic law (Dialogue 122.1-123.4). According to Justin, Jews cannot possibly fulfill the role of illuminating others because they remain darkened and ignorant themselves; their inability to recognize Christ as the new covenant and law proves them unfit to know or teach the will of God. Justin in this way aligns his differentiation between those who understand the Jewish scriptures and those who do not with a distinction between Jews and non-Jews, as if these two types of contrasts were complementary (cf. I Apol. 49.1-5; 53.5-8; Dial. 11.4-12.2; 24.3-4; 34.1-6; 78.10-11; 114.2-5).

Elsewhere in his writings, Justin frequently draws a similar type of contrast between the imperceptiveness of Jews and the perceptiveness of non-Jews. He almost invariably denounces the Jewish nation as whole and repeatedly describes their failure to understand the true message of the Jewish scriptures. To be sure, Justin recognizes that a small number of Jews have come to believe in Jesus as Messiah (I Apol. 53.3-12; Dial.

(c.f. 18:28-30): this is 'the Israel after the spirit.' Significantly, perhaps, the parallel passages in the other synoptic accounts do not make the same connection to "the word" (Matt 12:50; Mark 3:35); they portray the family of Jesus as those who do the will of God without reference to hearing and understanding the message of Jesus or the "word of God."

60 See citation and discussion of Dial. 123.2-4, pages 209-210 below.

61 E.g., I Apol. 31.5; 36.3; 37.1; 49.1-7; 53.6-12; 63.1-3; Dial. 12.2-3; 27.3; 32.5; 34.1; 38.2; 55.3; 62.2-3; 68.7; 78.10-11; 83.1; 93.5; 110.1-2; 112.2-4; 113.1; 114.3; 117.4; 120.5; 123.2-3; 126.1-2; 134.1-2; 136.2-3; 140.1-2.
39.2; 55.3), and he hopes that others will too (Dial. 32.2; 125.1). Notwithstanding this positive affirmation, Justin still identifies Jews who believe in Jesus as an exceptional few whom God spared so that the Jewish race would not be completely obliterated (I Apol. 53.7-8; Dial. 55.3; 32.2). When it comes to non-Jews, Justin asserts that scriptural prophecy predicts that “the nations” (τὰ ἔθνη) would be especially predisposed to recognizing and embracing the message of how Christ fulfilled the scriptures. Accordingly, even though Justin recognizes that some Jews believe in Jesus, he frequently contrasts non-Jewish Christ-believers with Jews, as if these two labels served as fitting designations for insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community, respectively.

At first sight, Luke appears to develop a similar distinction between Jews and non-Jews, especially in the scenes where he has Paul report that he will transfer his ministry to τὰ ἔθνη (Acts 13:46-47, 18:6, and 28:25-28). Nevertheless, in each of these
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elsewhere presents a positive correlation between the Jewish reception of the message of Paul and astuteness in scriptural interpretation: those Jews who examined the scriptures carefully were convinced of the truth of Paul’s message. Thus, although Luke describes the rejection of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers by some Jews, he does not align his distinction between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community with a contrast between non-Jews and Jews in the same way that Justin does.

A comparison of Acts 13:27-28 and 1 Apol. 31.5 further illustrates this difference between Luke and Justin:

Because the residents of Jerusalem and their leaders did not recognize him or understand the words of the prophets that are read every Sabbath (τούτων ἀγγειοσαυτες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πέναν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένες), they fulfilled those words by condemning him. Though they could charge him with nothing deserving death, yet they asked Pilate to have him killed (ἠθέασαντο Πιλάτον ἀναρεθήναι αὐτῶν).

(Acts 13:27-28)

After this was accomplished [i.e., the translation of the LXX], the books remained in the possession of the Egyptians from that day to this, as they are also in the possession of all Jews everywhere, who, though they read the things that are said, fail to grasp their meaning (παντραί πάσιν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίοις, δι καὶ ἀναγινωσκομένες οὐ συνιάζει τὰ εἰρημένα), and consider us [Christians] their enemies and adversaries, killing us and punishing us (ἀναρρούσις καὶ κολάζουσις ἴμαξ), just as you [i.e., Justin’s Greco-Roman audience] also do, whenever they are able to do so, as you can readily imagine.

(1 Apol. 31:5)

Although these accounts take place in very different contexts – Justin describes the translation of the LXX whereas Luke has Paul preach a sermon to Diaspora Jews – both present a similar trajectory: Jews had the scriptures in their possession, but failed to

---

68 For example, although Luke indicates that “some” Jews believe in Thessalonica (Acts 17:4; cf. Acts 28:24), he reports that “many” Jews believe in Berea (Acts 17:12) and attributes the positive response of the latter group to their attentiveness to the Jewish scriptures: “These Jews were more receptive than those in Thessalonica, for they welcomed the message very eagerly and examined the scriptures every day to see whether these things were so. Many of them therefore believed, including not a few Greek women and men of high standing” (Acts 17:11-12). Compare this positive reception with the rejection of the message of Paul by some non-Jews (e.g., Acts 13:50; 14:2, 4-5; 18:4; 19:10-20).
understand them and so acted out violently against Christ, or Christ-believers.69

Nevertheless, whereas Luke describes the misunderstanding and guilt of “residents of Jerusalem and their leaders,” Justin makes a global statement about the misperception and culpability of all Jews everywhere.70 If Justin relies on the thought of Luke to describe the incomprehension of Jews in 1 Apol. 31.5, he appears to develop his portrait of the Jewish misunderstanding of the scriptures beyond the characterization of Jews in Luke-Acts. Moreover, in the passage that follows (1 Apol. 31.7-8), Justin asserts that the “books of the prophets” predicted that “he would send certain persons to every nation to make known these things [about how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures], and that former non-Jews rather [than Jews] would believe in him” (1 Apol. 31.7-8). Justin in this way reiterates his distinction between the misunderstanding of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι and the perceptiveness of τὰ ἐθνών, and attempts to present both of these outcomes as complementary realizations of the fulfillment of prophecy.71

4.5 Differing Applications of the Deuteronomistic Principle

The differences between the way that Luke and Justin configure a division between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community corresponds, in part, to

---


70 This difference is all the more notable when we remember that, for Luke, large numbers of Jerusalem Jews repent and believe on Jesus after his death. See, e.g., Acts 2:41; 5:14; 21:20.

71 Subsequently, in 1 Apology 32, Justin reiterates this perspective by arguing that the phrase “The scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor the ruler’s staff from between his feet, until he comes to whom it belongs” in Gen 49:10 foretells the end of Jewish leadership and the beginning of a new era in which the promised descendent of Judah would become the “expectation of nations.” Through this line of argumentation, Justin transforms the prophecy into a negative prediction for Jews and a positive prediction for the nations.
the differing ways that they apply the Deuteronomistic principle. O. H. Steck has argued that a Deuteronomistic concept of prophecy permeates early Jewish and NT literature (200 BCE-100 CE). He maintains that authors of these texts drew upon certain elements of the scriptural accounts of the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles in order to depict the repetition of the following pattern in their writings: the disobedience of Israel, the warning of Israel through the prophets of the Lord, the rejection and persecution of these prophets, and the consequent punishment when Israel does not heed these warnings.72 This view of Israel’s history helps authors of early Jewish and Christian literature to describe the en masse disobedience of corporate Israel over against the covenant fidelity of a select group who recognize their leaders as prophetic mediators of the message of God.73 The eschatological orientation of a number of these texts heightens their depiction of this division: those who listen to the prophetic warnings of God’s messengers represent the chosen few who comprise the true people of God whereas the rest of Israel experiences a final exclusion because of its infidelity.

The observations of Steck provide a useful framework for comparing and contrasting the way that Luke and Justin apply the Deuteronomistic principle in their descriptions of the fulfillment of prophecy. In his narrative, Luke portrays a division

72 Odil Hannes Steck, Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 60-80, 153-169. Steck sees the beginning of this pattern emerging already in the Hebrew Bible (e.g., 2 Kings 17; Nehemiah 9). He surveys a number of early Jewish texts, including those that have an eschatological or apocalyptic orientation. Notably, he discusses the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90), the Apocalypse of Weeks (93:1-10; 91:12-19), and select passages from the so-called sectarian documents from Qumran. See especially his discussions of 1QS 1-2; 8; CD 1:3-13; 7:17-18; 1QpHab 2:9.

73 Although Steck, Israel, 169, argues that the Qumran group directs the final call to repentance to the community alone, rather than to all Israel, the descriptions of the incorporation of new adherents to the community (1QS 5:8-25; 6:13-27; 1Q28a 1-2) suggest that the group thought that outsiders could join and in this way become part of the elect.
between Jews on the basis of their response to the prophetic message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus. Likewise, he indicates that the inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community depends upon their positive reception of this same proclamation. Both types of groups thus experience inclusion within or exclusion from the Christ-believing community as a result of their responses to the warning and scriptural interpretation of God’s messengers. By contrast, because Justin typically creates a distinction between non-Jews and Jews, he interprets scriptural texts that evoke a Deuteronomistic warning of judgment for obdurate Jews as predictions about or descriptions of the Jewish nation as a whole. Correspondingly, he applies prophetic oracles of salvation and blessing to non-Jews who believe in Jesus.

4.5.1 Luke: “You Are Like Your Ancestors”

Throughout his narrative, Luke characterizes Jewish Christ-believers as those who stand in continuity with the ancient prophets and faithful Israel of the past, and Jews who do not believe in Jesus as descendents of Jewish ancestors who rejected the prophets and therefore incurred God’s wrath. Moreover, Luke heightens the urgency of hearing and obeying the message of Jesus by portraying him as the eschatological prophet like Moses. Jews who fail to repent when they hear the message of Jesus forfeit their status as the people of God whereas those who hear and obey it experience inclusion within the

---


75 Of course, as noted in chapter two (page 112, footnote 71 and page 127, footnote 109), Luke portrays Jesus as more than a prophet. His emphasis on this aspect of his identity, however, serves to portray a division between Christ-believing and non-Christ-believing Jews on the basis of their response to the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers.
community. Since the scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers forms part of their prophetic message, their exegesis functions as a dividing agent within this framework.


77 For further discussion of this passage, see pages 114-116 of chapter two and pages 251-255 of chapter five.


80 No parallels with Matthew or Mark.

81 Note especially the woe oracles outlined in Luke 21:5-33. In this passage, the Lukan Jesus describes his prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem as the “fulfillment of all that is written” (Luke 21:22), and thereby merges the prophetic predictions of Jesus with his exegetical activity. Johnson,

In Acts 2-3, Luke more pointedly outlines this division. Here he depicts the proclamation and scriptural interpretation of Peter as another opportunity for the Jerusalem Jews to repent and accept the message of Jesus (Acts 2:17-36; 3:11-26). This perspective is especially vivid in Acts 3:11-26 where Peter exhorts his fellow-Jews to recognize how the scriptures were fulfilled through the suffering of Christ (Acts 3:17-19) and to listen to Jesus, the eschatological prophet like Moses (Acts 3:22; cf. Deut 18:15, 18). In this context, Peter utters an ominous warning: “And it will be that everyone who does not listen to that prophet will be utterly destroyed out of the people” (Acts 3:23; cf. Deut 18:19; Lev 23:29). By adding the phrase ἐξόλοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ (Lev 23:29) to the citation of Deut 18:19, Luke has Peter accentuate the dire and final consequence of failing to heed the message of Jesus – exclusion from the people of God.

Furthermore, the addition of ἐσταὶ δὲ to the beginning of his citation of Deut 18:19 makes it roughly parallel to καὶ ἐσταὶ in Acts 2:21. This link between Acts 2:21

---

86 See further discussion of this passage, see chapter two, pages 116-119.

87 The phrase ἐξόλοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ in Lev 23:39 refers to those who fail to observe the day of atonement but Luke has Peter apply it to those who fail to listen to Jesus, the prophet like Moses. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 54, argues that Luke depicts the rejection of the message of Jesus and the apostles as “a purging of the unrepentant portion of the people from Israel.” He asserts that, for Luke, believing Jews comprise Israel whereas unbelieving Jews forfeit their right to be part of Israel. Similarly, Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 122, argues that the indication that those who do not listen will be destroyed (Acts 3:23) does not mean that the people as a whole will be abandoned. Lohfink, *Sammlung*, 60-61, argues that the summons of Peter in Acts 3:17-26 represents the ultimate call to repentance and the means by which Israel is judged and gathered: “Glauben sie an Jesus, so bleiben sie in dem Segen, der auf Israel liegt. Glauben sie nicht, so werden sie aus dem Volke ausgerottet, das heißt, sie hören auf, Mitglieder des Gottesvolkes zu sein. Das Geschehen seit Pfingsten ist also nichts anderes als die letzte und tiefgreifendste Krisis Israels” (61). Those who respond positively to the message of Peter in Acts 3:17-26 become true Israel and heirs of the promises of God outlined therein whereas those who reject his message forfeit their status as Israel, according to Lohfink. Regardless of whether Luke wishes to present a restored Israel of old or a new Israel, it is clear that he makes hearing and responding to the message of Jesus, and the declaration of how he fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, a central prerequisite to inclusion within the people of God in Acts 3:17-23. In light of other passages throughout Luke-Acts that stress the need to hear, understand, and obey the message of Jesus and the apostles, and their interpretation of the Jewish scriptures, Acts 3:22-23 can be understood as a reorientation of the identity of the people of God that is based upon the correct understanding of and response to the will of God as it is expressed by Jesus, the prophet like Moses.
and 3:23 coordinates the positive statement about eschatological inclusion within the 
people of God in Acts 2:21 (cf. LXX Joel 3:5) – “And it shall be (καὶ ἐσταξι) that 
everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” – with the negative 
statement about exclusion in Acts 3:23 – “And it shall be (ἐσταξαὶ δὲ) that every person 
who does not listen to the prophet like Moses shall be cut off from the people.”

Taken together, Acts 2:21 and 3:23 demonstrate how Luke portrays a division among Jews on
the basis of their contrasting responses to the message and exegesis of Jesus and his
followers. Those Jews who hear and respond positively to the message of how Christ
fulfilled the Jewish scriptures will experience scriptural promises of salvation (Acts 2:21)
whereas those who do not listen will experience the exclusion from God’s people that the
Jewish scriptures also foretell (Acts 3:22-23).

The speech of Stephen (Acts 7) and the sermon of Paul (Acts 28) further illustrate
this pattern of division. Luke portrays Stephen as a prophetic spokesperson within a long
line of righteous ancestors and prophets (Joseph, Moses, Jesus). In his lengthy review

---

88 Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gütersloh: Gerd
Mohn/Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 66-67; R. J. Dillon, “The Prophecy of Christ and his Witnesses

eds. I. Howard Marshal and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 257-274, argues that Peter
acts as a spokesman for the apostles and functions as a prophetic preacher of repentance. He maintains
that, “at least during the initial stages of witness in Jerusalem, repentance and belief in Jesus was preached
within the ancient prophetic framework of calling the chosen people of God to return to the God of their
Fathers” (263).

90 Attempts to reconstruct the historical situation behind the speech of Stephen go as far back as F.
C. Baur. For a discussion of differing treatments of this issue, see W. G. Kümmel, *The New Testament:
The History of the Investigation of Its Problems* (trans. S. Mclean and Howard C. Kee; Nashville:
Abingdon, 1972), 127-130; Earl Richard, *Acts 6.1-8.4: The Author’s Method of Composition* (SBLDS 41;
Saint* (Analecta Biblica 34; Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1968) suggests that the speech expresses the views
of the historical Stephen and as well as a Samaritan viewpoint. M. Simon, “Saint Stephen and the
Jerusalem Temple,” *JEH* 2 (1951): 139-140, also argues that the speech goes back to the historical Stephen.
Others regard the speech as a Lukan creation. See, e.g., H. J. Schoeps, *Theologie und Geschichte des*
of biblical history, the Lukan Stephen expresses a Deuteronomistic view of Israel's past rejection of the messengers of God (cf. 2 Kgs 17:7-20; Neh 9:26; 2 Chron 36:14-16). He argues that just as former Israelites received "living oracles" from Moses but refused to obey them (Acts 7:38-39), so his accusers both killed Christ and refused to keep the law (Acts 7:51-53). Moreover, throughout the speech, Stephen describes Abraham as "our ancestor" (Acts 7:2), and other patriarchs and ancient Israelite leaders as "our ancestors" (Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 19, 38, 39, 44, 45 [2x]), thereby expressing his solidarity with other Jews. This pattern shifts in Acts 7:51-53, however, where Stephen identifies past Israelites who resisted Moses and other prophets with his opponents by calling them "your ancestors":

---


92 See also the description of the rejection of Joseph by his brothers (Acts 7:9-16).


Heinz-Werner Neudorfer, "The Speech of Stephen," in Witness to the Gospel, 281-283, argues that the speech of Stephen expresses harsh criticism of his opponents but maintains solidarity between Jewish Christ-believers and their Jewish heritage. He suggests that the denunciation of Jews by the Lukan Stephen resembles Josephus's conclusion that the violation of the temple and law by Jews led to the military invasion by the Romans (e.g., Jewish War 5:376-419, 451); cf. Barrett, Acts, 1:336. Johnson, Acts, 120, suggests that other early Jewish texts such as Jubilees, Genesis Apocryphon, and the Damascus Document review biblical history in a similar way. See also my discussion of CD 2:14-3:17 in chapter one, pages 71-72. Notably, Josephus does not outline a definitive distinction between a separate elect group of Jews and larger Israel whereas the Damascus Document does. See also Moessner, Lord of the Banquet, 87-90.

You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you are forever opposing the Holy Spirit, just as your ancestors used to do. Which of the prophets did your ancestors not persecute? They killed those who foretold the coming of the Righteous One, and now you have become his betrayers and murderers. You are the ones that received the law as ordained by angels, and yet you have not kept it.

(Acts 7:51-53)

By changing from "our ancestors" to "your ancestors," Stephen identifies his audience, but not himself or his group, with a particular segment of the Jewish people: namely, those Jews who disobeyed the Mosaic law and resisted the prophets. As C. K. Barrett concludes:

They share a common origin in the call of Abraham, in God’s promise to him, and in the fulfillment of the promise in the living oracles given to Moses; but Christianity belongs to that critical prophetic strand of Judaism which refused to substitute institutions for the word of God, and claims that the final conflict between the two came to a head in the story of Jesus.

Luke presents the opponents of Stephen as heirs of those who persecuted the prophets (Acts 7:51) and disregarded the Mosaic law (Acts 7:53), but portrays Stephen, and, by implication, the Christ-believing community as successors of righteous people and prophets who were persecuted at the hands of obdurate Jews. In faithfulness to the God

---


of Israel, Stephen proclaims the message of Jesus and the correct interpretation of the scriptures (7:1-53) and, as a result, experiences the death of a prophet (7:54-60).  

Similarly, as noted above, the Lukan Paul cites and interprets Isa 6:9-10 in order to attribute the inability of Jews to understand his message to a chronic hardness and imperceptivity that began with their ancestors (Acts 28:23-28). By referring to those who rejected the message of Isaiah as “your ancestors” immediately prior to his citation of Isa 6:9-10 (Acts 28:25), Paul draws an implicit contrast between his own heritage and the lineage of those who reject his message. Whereas Paul stands in continuity with the prophet Isaiah, and functions as a representative of the group who remains faithful to the scriptures and message of God, Jews who reject his message stand in continuity with their ancestors who did not listen to or perceive the message of Isaiah. The past rejection of the prophet Isaiah by Jews thus serves as a scriptural precedent that explains the present behavior of those who reject the message of Paul.

---


99 Although the Lukan Paul elsewhere refers to the predecessors of fellow-Jews as “our ancestors” (Acts 13:17; 22:14; 26:6) in Acts 28:25, he distinguishes between his heritage and the ancestry of those who reject his message by referring to the latter as “your ancestors.”

100 See also Luke 6:23: “Rejoice in that day and leap for joy, for surely your reward is great in heaven; for that is what their ancestors did to the prophets”; 11:48: “So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of your ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs”; 13:33-34: “Yet today, tomorrow, and the next day I must be on my way, because it is impossible for a prophet to be killed outside of Jerusalem. Jerusalem, Jerusalem, the city that kills the prophets and stones those who are sent to it! How often have I desired to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wings, and you were not willing”; Acts 7:51-53: “You stiff-necked people, uncircumcised in heart and ears, you are forever opposing the Holy Spirit, just as your ancestors used to do. Which of the prophets did your ancestors not persecute? They killed those who foretold the coming of the Righteous One, and now you have become his betrayers and murderers.”

Rather than radically changing this framework to account for the inclusion of non-Jews, Luke continues to portray the acceptance of the message of the followers of Jesus as the basis for determining who belongs to the Christ-believing community. The transition and geographical movement outward from Jerusalem in Acts 8-11 demonstrates the initial stages of the progression of the message to non-Jews. In Acts 8:1-24, for example, Luke describes the proclamation of the “word of God” to Samaritans (Acts 8:1-24), a marginal group insofar as Luke distinguishes them from Jews living in Judaea. Similarly, in his story of the Ethiopian official, Luke depicts Philip as a prophetic messenger who mediates the correct interpretation of the scriptures to a figure who stood on the margins of Judaism (Acts 8:26-40).

than a final denunciation of the nation as a whole. See also Moessner, “Christ Must Suffer,” 254, who argues that Luke portrays Paul as a “prophetic pleader of repentance to Israel” in this scene. Scholars often note the geographical movement outward from Jerusalem in Acts 8-11 and suggest that this section of the narrative represents the transition from a Jewish to a non-Jewish mission, and the fulfillment of the prediction of Jesus in Acts 1:8. See, e.g., Haenchen, Acts, 314; Conzelmann, Acts, xliii; Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 102f; Johnson, Acts, 150; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, The Acts of the Apostles (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 134. Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2:108, also suggests that the location of Ethiopia was associated with the “end of the earth” since some Greco-Roman historians indicate that Ethiopians lived at the “end of the earth” (e.g., Homer, Odyssey, 1.23; Herodotus III.25, 114; Strabo, Geography, I.1.6; I.2.24); cf. T. C. G. Thornton, “To the End of the Earth: Acts 1:8,” ExpTim 89 (1977-1978): 375; Spencer, Philip in Acts, 151; F. F. Bruce, “Philip and the Ethiopian,” JSS 34 (1989): 379. For a discussion of the mission to the Samaritans in Acts as part of the restoration of Israel, see David Ravens, Luke and the Restoration of Israel (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: SAP, 1995), 72-92; cf. Pao, Isaianic Exodus, 129; Jervell, Luke and the People of God, 123, 128.

Although the mission to the Samaritans marks a new stage in the narrative, Luke appears to regard Samaritans as distinct from non-Jews, since he clearly identifies Cornelius and his household as the first group of non-Jews whom God visits and chooses (Acts 15:14). Luke at times presents Samaritans in a favorable light and as participants in Jerusalem temple worship (Luke 10:33-37; 17:11-19) but he also records an instance of tension between the Samaritans and the disciples (Luke 9:52-56). Fitzmyer, Acts, 400, describes Samaritans as a group that was “remotely related to Judaism.” Similarly, Barrett, Acts, 1:396, suggests that they were not Jews but “by no means totally different from or unrelated to them.” A number of other scholars suggest that Luke regards the Samaritans as representatives of the “lost sheep” or outcasts of Israel who were in need of restoration. See, e.g., Jervell, Luke and the People of God, 126-127; Marshall, Acts, 153. Ravens, Restoration of Israel, 72-92, argues that Luke intended to present the inclusion of the Samaritans as the restoration of the divided kingdom; cf. Pao, Isaianic Exodus, 129.

For further discussion of Acts 8:26-40, see chapter two, pages 94-98, 119-120 and pages 169-170 above.
The message of Peter to Cornelius in Acts 10:34-43 provides a paradigmatic example of the extension of this prophetic program. Peter receives divine direction to go to Cornelius, and those gathered to hear his message regard Peter as a divinely inspired emissary who speaks for God: “So now all of us are here in the presence of God to listen to all that the Lord has commanded you to say” (Acts 10:33b). In the speech that follows, moreover, Peter appears to expound the scriptures in his role as a messenger of God. Although some conclude that the absence of explicit scriptural citations in the speech indicates that Luke has omitted this element in the Cornelius account, others correctly point out that the speech contains a number of scriptural allusions. Since

105 See, e.g., Rese, *Alttestamentliche*, 117, who attributes this absence to the type of audience, namely, a non-Jewish one. See also Wilckens, *Missionreden*, 50, who suggests that there are no citations of scripture because the message of Peter is not a sermon but a report about the life of Jesus. Similarly, Joseph B. Tyson, “The Gentile Mission and Scripture in Acts,” *NTS* 35 (1987): 628, argues that “scripture plays almost no role whatsoever” in the Cornelius episode (Acts 10). As Richard I. Pervo, *Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis; Fortress, 2009), 277, rightly explains, however, the speech is compressed and provides only a brief outline of what was said; cf. Marion L. Soards, *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1994), 70-77; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 356. Accordingly, the allusions and references to scripture prove significant for determining what the speech in its entirety would have contained; namely, a proclamation of Jesus and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. As Dibelius, *Studies*, 111, concludes, the speech of Peter in Acts 10:34-43 parallels the format of other speeches in Acts by including kerygma (Acts 10:37-41), proof from scriptures (Acts 10:43b), and an exhortation to repentance (Acts 10:42, 43a).

Acts 10:34-43 is probably intended to represent a main outline rather than a complete record of the content of the speech, these allusions to the Jewish scriptures serve as important indicators of its subject matter. The concluding words of Peter further suggest that Luke wishes to portray scriptural exposition as a central part of his message: “All the prophets testify about him that everyone who believes in him receives forgiveness of sins through his name (τούτῳ πάντες οἱ προφήται μαρτυροῦσιν ἡφειν ἄμαρτών λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τῶν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν).” In fulfillment of his role as a type of prophetic messenger, then, Peter communicates what the Lord commanded him to say, a proclamation that included the declaration of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures.

As with the Jewish people, so the response of non-Jews to the message and scriptural interpretation of the followers of Jesus serves as a qualifying criterion for their inclusion within the Christ-believing community. In the case of Cornelius and his household, for example, Luke indicates on more than one occasion that they experience inclusion as a result of their acceptance of and faith in the message of Peter. Similarly, these and other scriptural allusions in Acts 10:34-43, see Conzelmann, Acts, 83; Marshall, Acts, 188-193; Bock, Proclamation from Prophecy, 230-240; Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2:137-141.

107 Notably, this statement recalls Luke 24:46-47 (εἰπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὗτος γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν . . . κηρυχθήσεται ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἡφειν ἄμαρτῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ θεῖα. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἑλληστῆρι). As such, it strongly suggests that Luke wishes to present the speech of Peter as a form of scriptural exposition commensurate with the message which Christ first commissioned the disciples to proclaim. Furthermore, in his sermon, Peter describes the ministry of Jesus (Acts 10:36-38) and presents himself as a witness who was commissioned to continue this work (Acts 10:39-43). In Acts 10:39-42, the description of the disciples’ role as witnesses (ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες πάντων . . . μάρτυρον τοῖς προκεχειροτομημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) recalls the earlier scenes in his narrative where Jesus interpreted the Jewish scriptures for them, and commissioned them as witnesses of his resurrection and of his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:48 ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων; Acts 1:8 ἐσσεθέ μου μάρτυρες).

108 Luke repeatedly emphasizes this criterion when rehearsing the story of Cornelius. In Acts 11:1b, he summarizes the event by indicating that “the Gentiles had also accepted the word of God.” In Acts 15, Luke has Peter explain that the action of God in sending the Spirit to Cornelius and his household...
when Luke has Paul announce that he will turn to non-Jews with the “word of God,” he portrays his subsequent message as parallel to his preaching to Jews (e.g., Acts 13:46-47; cf. 18:5-6; 28:25-28). Throughout his mission to non-Jews, the message and exegesis of Paul evoke the same type of divided response as it did from Jews.\(^\text{109}\) Although, in some instances, non-Jews respond more positively than do Jews,\(^\text{110}\) Luke presents the mission to non-Jews as the continuation of the message and scriptural interpretation that God first

signified his equal acceptance of both Jewish and non-Jewish believers on the basis of their faith in his message (Acts 15:7-9; cf. 10:47; 11:15). In Acts 15:8, Peter explains that God bore witness to Cornelius and his household by giving them the Spirit. The immediate context of Acts 15:7b suggests that God affirmed this group as a result of their hearing of and faith in his message: “God made a choice among you, that I should be the one through whom the Gentiles would hear the message (ἀκοῦσαι τα θυν του λόγου) of the good news and become believers (πιστεύοι).” Barrett, *Acts*, 2:715, argues that the context of Acts 15:7-9 suggests that “God bore witness to the fact that Cornelius had fulfilled all the conditions (hearing and believing the Word) necessary for being a Christian, and thus was qualified to receive the Holy Spirit.” Luke thus indicates that the favorable attitude of God toward those who fear him and do what is right (Acts 10:34) depends upon their positive response to the message proclaimed by God’s appointed representative. The speech of Peter in 10:34-43 describes God’s inclusion of all people on the basis of their reception of the message of Jesus. As Loisy, *Acts*, 444, indicates, “Pierre conclura (v. 43) en disant que le salut est pour tous dans la foi; il ne veut donc pas signifier ici que le païen est sauvé par le mérite de sa piété et de sa vertu naturelles, mais que Dieu recrute ses élus indifféremment chez les Juifs et chez les païens.” H. H. Wendt, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK Part 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913), 249, expresses a similar view: “nicht eine absolute Gottgefälligkeit, sondern eine solche, welche abzweckt auf die Antheilgabe am christlichen Evang”; cf. Johnson, *Acts*, 194-195; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 83; Marshall, *Acts*, 189-190; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 426-463; Haenchen, *Acts*, 351. By contrast, W. C. van Unnik, “Background and Significance of Acts X 4 and 35,” *Sparsa Collecta*, 238-256, argues that the language used to describe the acceptance of Cornelius’s alms and prayers in Acts 10:4 (αι προσευχαι σου και αι ελπιστια γου ον άνβησαν εις μιμω του θεου; cf. Acts 10:31) indicates that God was regarding him as an Israelite. Accordingly, he maintains that the declaration of God’s impartiality and acceptance of all who fear him and do what is right in Acts 10:34-35 serves as an indication that Cornelius was being “numbered amongst Israel” (256) and therefore qualified to hear the message that Peter proclaimed. This conclusion suggests that Cornelius was accepted by God even prior to believing the gospel. From a slightly different vantage point, Jouette M. Bassler, “Luke and Paul on Impartiality,” *Bib* 66 (1985): 546-552, argues that unlike Paul, who in Bassler’s view dispenses with all categories of human acceptability in favor of “a new dispensation of grace,” Luke interprets the impartiality of God (Acts 10:34) as “the opening of one category to worthy members of another” (552); Cornelius gains acceptance into the Christ-believing community because of his piety according to Jewish standards. Both van Unnik and Bassler correctly argue that Acts 10 presents the piety of Cornelius in terms of Jewish requirements for non-Jews. What these scholars fail to point out, however, is that Luke also emphasizes Cornelius’s faith in and reception of the message of God. The piety of Cornelius may pre-dispose him to faith but his inclusion within the Christ-believing community ultimately depends upon the latter in Luke’s telling.


\(^{110}\) Note especially the final assertion of Paul in Acts 28:28 where he states the expectation that non-Jews will listen to his message.
sent to Jews through Jesus; even as Jesus functioned as a Spirit-anointed prophet to Israel so his followers continue his prophetic activities by performing signs and wonders and proclaiming his message to both Jews and non-Jews. The response to this prophetic message thus serves as the primary criterion for the inclusion or exclusion of non-Jews, as it also does for Jews.\textsuperscript{111}

4.5.2 Justin: The Prophets Predicted Your Unbelief

Whereas Luke associates Jews who reject Jesus with past Jews who persecuted the prophets, and attributes the exclusion of both groups to their failure to heed God’s prophets, Justin frequently draws a contrast between the Jews and non-Jews, and applies ancient prophetic oracles of judgment to the Jewish nation as a whole.\textsuperscript{112} In the \textit{Dialogue}, as we have seen, Justin outlines a contrast between the nations who believe in Jesus, on the one hand, and Jews and their proselytes, on the other. Within his development of this theme, Justin cites and interprets Isa 29:13 as a description of the Jewish people who, in his telling, do not understand, or accept, his exegetical explanation of the fulfillment of Isa 49:6 and 42:6-7 (cf. \textit{Dial.} 121.4-122.5):

Besides, it is even more absurd for you to believe that the eyes of the proselytes are opened but that your own are not; and that you should be called deaf, but they, enlightened. And it will be still more absurd if you assert that the Law was given to the Gentiles, but that you yourselves do not know that Law. . . . “Who is blind, but my servant? And deaf, but they who rule over them? And the servants of God are blind. You often see, but have not observed; your ears were open, you have not heard” (Isa 42:19-20). . . . Even though you hear these words often, you are not ashamed, nor do you tremble when God threatens for you are a stupidly stubborn people. “Therefore, behold, says the Lord, I will proceed to remove this people, and I will remove them, and


\textsuperscript{112} E.g., \textit{1 Apol.} 36.3-37.1; 49.1-5; \textit{Dial.} 12.1-3; 24.3-4; 34.1-6; 78.10-11; 114.2-5; 122.1-123.4; 136.1-3; 140.1-2.
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I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and will hide the understanding of the prudent" (Isa 29:14). And justly so. For you are neither wise nor understanding, but sly and treacherous; wise only for evil actions, but utterly unfitted to know the hidden will of God, or the trustworthy covenant of the Lord, or to find the everlasting paths. (Dial. 123.2-4)

Justin appeals to Isa 29:14, together with Isa 42:19-20, to provide scriptural justification for his conclusion that Jews are blind, obdurate, and unable to understand the Jewish scriptures. In his view, the entire Jewish nation becomes the object of such oracles of judgment because, in their lack of wisdom, they fail to recognize how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures. As a result, they experience the exclusion that Isa 29:14 foretells.

Similarly, in Dial. 78.10-11, Justin appeals to Isaiah 29:13-14 to show the legitimacy of his claim that Jews had failed to understand the scriptures correctly and to validate his assertion that their correct interpretation had been transferred to Christ-believers:

It would be to your advantage my friends [i.e., to the advantage of Trypho and other Jews], to learn what you do not understand from us Christians, who have received grace from God, and not to exert every effort to defend your peculiar teachings and scorn those of God. Isaiah shows why this grace was transferred (μετατίθημι)¹¹³ to us [i.e., to Justin and other non-Jewish Christ-believers], when he says: “This people draws near to me, with their lips they glorify me, but their heart is far from me. But in vain they worship me, teaching the precepts and doctrines of men. Therefore, behold, I will proceed to remove (τὸ μεταθέτω) this people, and I will transplant them (μεταθήκω). And I will take away the wisdom of their wise, and will bring to nought the understanding of their prudent” (Isa 29:13-14).¹¹⁴ (Dial. 78.10-11)


¹¹⁴ Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 57-58, notes that there are minor variants in the form of Isa 29:14 which Justin cites in Dial. 32.5, 78.11, and 123.4 and attributes these differences to the mistakes of careless copyists.
Not only does Justin use Isa 29:13-14 to argue that scripture foretells the darkened condition of Jews; he also maintains that this passage explains why "grace" and "wisdom" to understand the scriptures were transferred to Christ-believers. According to Justin, the false worship and teaching of Jews render them unfit to receive wisdom from God. Moreover, in this context, Justin plays on the term μετάθησις to highlight the dire consequences of this reallocation of knowledge. Even as Justin argues that the scriptures predicted that "grace to understand" the scriptures would be transferred (μετάθησις) from Jews to non-Jewish Christ-believers, so he argues that the scriptures foretell the removal (ταύτα μεταθέσια, μεταθήσατο) of Jews as the people of God. This unequivocal contrast between Jews and non-Jews thus leads to the application of the negative denunciation of Isa 29:13-14 to Jews as a whole and to a pronouncement of their exclusion.

In Dial. 27.3-4, Justin similarly argues that ancient prophecy describes their ongoing misunderstanding and susceptibility to sinfulness:

And he exclaims: “All have turned out of the way, they are become unprofitable together. There is none that understands, no not one. With their tongues they have dealt deceitfully, their throat is an open sepulcher, the venom of asps is under their lips; destruction and misery are in their paths, and the way of peace they have not known.” Thus, as your sinfulness was the reason why God first issued those precepts [i.e., the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law], so now because of your enslavement to sin, or rather your greater inclination to it, by means of the same precepts, he calls you to remember and to know him. But you Jews are a ruthless, stupid, blind, and lame people, children in whom these is no faith. As God himself says: “Honoring him only with your lips, but your hearts are far from him, teaching your own doctrines and not his” (Isa 29:13).

(Dial. 27.3-4)
Although he appears to use a set of citations, or allusions to scripture, that also occur in Rom 3:11-17, Justin interprets these texts in a different manner than Paul.\(^{116}\) Whereas Paul uses the catena to describe the sinful condition of all humanity, both Jews and non-Jews, Justin appeals to the same group of passages to describe the sinful state of Jews. He attempts to argue that God imposed the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law in order to curb their propensity toward idolatry (\textit{Dial.} 27.1-3; cf. 18.2; 44.2; 46.5, 7; 47.2; 67.4, 10), and reads Isa 29:13 as a description of the long-standing blindness and sinful condition of all Jews.\(^{117}\)

Besides this, Justin treats past prophetic denunciations of ancient Israel as if they described, or directly addressed, Jews who lived at the time of Christ or later. For example, in \textit{1 Apol.} 49.1, Justin asserts that Isaiah predicted that non-Jews would believe in Jesus and that Jews would fail to recognize him. Subsequently, he cites Isa 65:1-3 as a prophetic utterance that foretells the misunderstanding and obduracy of Jews who rejected Jesus (cf. \textit{1 Apol.} 36.3-37.9).\(^{118}\) Similarly, in \textit{1 Apology} 63, Justin explains that

\(^{116}\) Compare \textit{Dial.} 27.3 with Rom 3:11-17 (cf. Eccl 7:20; Pss 5:9; 10:7; 14:2-3; 140:3; Isa 59:7-8).

\(^{117}\) For further discussion of Justin’s argument that God imposed the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law upon Jews because they were prone to practicing idolatry and needed such rituals to prevent them from going astray, see Theodore Stylianopoulos, \textit{Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law} (SBL 20; Missoula: Scholars, 1975), 62-76; Skarsaune, \textit{Proof from Prophecy}, 313-324. Compare also Acts 7:48-50 with \textit{Dial.} 22.11; in both of these passages the Lukan Stephen and Justin assert that God does not need a temple for a dwelling place. Although Marcel Simon, \textit{Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135-425} (New York: OUP, 1986), 112, argues that Justin derives his punitive concept of the law from Acts 7, as Skarsaune notes, Luke does not depict the Mosaic precepts as a punishment or accommodation for the sin of Israel. To be sure, the speech of Stephen in Acts 7 denounces the infidelity and idolatry of Jews, but it nowhere indicates that the law was imposed as a punishment or accommodation for this condition. Rather, Stephen describes the Mosaic law as “living words” (Acts 7:38), indicates that it was “ordained by angels” (Acts 7:53), and accuses his opponents of infidelity toward the law (Acts 7:53). These descriptions suggest that Luke wished to portray Stephen’s high regard for the Mosaic law.

\(^{118}\) For a full citation of \textit{1 Apol.} 49.1-5 and further discussion of this passage, see pages 186-187 above. Note also that in \textit{1 Apol.} 63.2 and 12 Justin indicates that the phrase “Israel has not known me, and
the “prophetic Spirit,” through the words of the prophet Isaiah, reproaches present-day Jews because they do not recognize how the Jewish scriptures attest to the pre-existence of Christ (I Apol. 63:1-3, 12-15), and in this context attributes their consequent persecution of Christ to the inspiration of demons (I Apol. 63.10). Likewise, in Dial. 136.2-3, Justin indicates that God foreknew the ignorance and sinfulness of Jews who killed Christ and therefore predicted their future condition through the words of Isaiah (cf. Dial. 17.1-2 [Isa 3:9-11; 5:18-20]; 133.1-5 [Isa 3:9-15; 5:18-25]). Beyond simply evoking a Deuteronomistic pattern of sin-exile-return, then, Justin argues that the words of the ancient prophets describe the Jewish nation as a whole and predict the darkened condition of Jews who lived during his own era.

In the Dialogue, Justin justifies this approach to reading prophecy by arguing that the prophets sometimes spoke of events as if they had already happened even though these texts actually refer to future events: “And when he says, ‘I have stretched out my hands to a disobedient and contradicting people’ (Isa 65:2), and, ‘Lord, who has believed our report’ (Isa 53:1), he . . . speaks of events as though they had already happened” (Dial. 114.2). In this particular context, Justin explains that the prophet was actually predicting how the teachers of Trypho would fail to grasp the meaning of ancient

---

my people have not understood me” from Isa 1:3 refers to the inability of contemporary Jews to recognize references to the pre-existent Christ in the Jewish scriptures.

119 Similarly, in Dial. 16.4-5, Justin argues that God foreknew the violence of Jews against Christ and Christ-believers and thus spoke out against them through Isaiah (Isa 57:1-4).


121 In I Apology 42, Justin provides a similar explanation of why prophecy that is spoken in the past tense refers to future events.
prophecy and therefore misinterpret the Jewish scriptures (Dia. 114.3). Subsequently, he draws a contrast between the correct interpretation of Christ-believers and the misunderstanding of the scriptures by Jews (Dia. 114.4-5):

But you fail to grasp the meaning of my words, because you do not know the things which, it was foretold, Christ would do, nor do you believe us when we refer you to the scriptures. For Jeremiah thus exclaims: “Woe to you, because you have forsaken the Living Fountain and have dug for yourselves broken cisterns that can hold no water” (Jer 2:13).

(Dia. 114.5)

Rather than arguing that some of his Jewish contemporaries were like past Jews who resisted the prophets, Justin asserts that both Isaiah and Jeremiah foresaw and predicted the darkened condition of the Jewish nation of his own day. Again, at the end of the Dialogue, Justin appeals to Jer 2:13 and Isa 29:13 in an attempt to provide scriptural support for his estimation of Trypho and his teachers:

---

122 In this context, Justin also charges the teachers of Trypho with failing to recognize references to the pre-existent Christ and the figurative meaning of the scriptures.

123 Throughout the Dialogue, Justin uses similar reasoning to develop his portrait of the condition of Trypho’s teachers. He maintains that the Jewish teachers of Trypho lack the necessary knowledge and skill to interpret the scriptures correctly (Dia. 110.1-2; 112.2-4; 114.3; 134.2). For example, in Dia. 110.1-2, Justin indicates that, unlike Christ-believers, Jewish teachers miss the point of scriptural passages that foretell the first advent of Christ because they fail to understand that there are two advents of Christ, rather than one. He also indicates that the interpretations of the teachers of Trypho are faulty because they do not recognize the predictive, symbolic, or typological meaning of the Jewish scriptures. He argues that these teachers wrongly focus on base and insignificant details, or attempt to read the scriptures literally (Dia. 112.2-4; 114.3; 134.2). He also maintains that the teachers of Trypho extort and expunge parts of the Jewish scriptures in order to make them correspond to their opinions. For example, he attempts to explain in Dia. 43.4-7 that Isa 7:10-16 prophesied the virgin birth of Christ but argues in Dia. 43.8 that Trypho and his teachers have insisted that the real words of Isa 7:14 are not “behold a virgin (μαθαύνως) shall conceive” but “behold a young woman (σπέρματος) shall conceive.” This unwarranted change, Justin argues, distorts the prophetic meaning of Isa 7:14 so that Jewish teachers incorrectly interpret it as a prediction about Hezekiah rather than a prophecy about Christ. In this context, as elsewhere, Justin presents the view that Trypho and his teachers believe that Isa 7:14 refers to Hezekiah. Similarly, in Dia. 83.1 Justin argues that the teachers of Trypho wrongly assume that LXX Ps 109.1-4 refers to Hezekiah. Moreover, in Dia. 62.2-4, Justin accuses Trypho and his teachers of interpreting a plural reference to God in Gen 1:26-28 as an instance of God talking to himself, or to the elements, rather than to another divine entity. Justin also charges the teachers of Trypho with denying the authenticity of the LXX (Dia. 68.7; 71.1; 120.5) and, in Apol. 31.2-5, appeals to the legend from the Letter of Aristeas to commend his scriptural citations. According to Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 26-46, however, the discrepancies between what Justin refers to as the “translation of the seventy” and the Greek translations that he attributes to Jews appear to be due to Justin’s reliance upon a Christian testimonia source rather than the LXX.
Now, we are the children and co-heirs of Christ, though you cannot understand it, because you are unable to drink from the living fountain of God, but only from broken wells which can retain no water, as the scriptures tell us (Jer 2:13). They really are broken wells that hold no water which your teachers have dug for you, as the scriptures express it, “teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men” (Isa 29:13) (Dial. 140.1-2)

According to Justin, the words of Jer 2:13 and Isa 29:13 describe the instruction given by these Jewish teachers. Their words are like broken wells because they originate from human doctrines and therefore render their students unable to recognize the truth about God and Christ. Justin in this way appropriates the reproofs of ancient prophets as if they were descriptions of the ineptness and incomprehension of his Jewish contemporaries.

Some may argue that Luke and Justin draw the same conclusion: Jews as a whole have rejected the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers whereas non-Jews have embraced their proclamation. Certainly, in some instances, Luke portrays an en masse Jewish rejection in a manner similar to Justin. Nevertheless, whereas Luke evokes a Deuteronomistic perspective of the prophets to describe a long-standing division between faithful and unfaithful Jews, Justin applies prophetic oracles of judgment to all Jews and interprets such passages as statements that confirm the pre-determined destiny of the Jewish nation as a whole.

---

124 Note the similar use of Isa 29:13 in Matt 15:9 and Mark 7:7.
125 Similarly, in Dial. 38.2, Justin indicates that the teachers of Trypho “are convicted by the prophetic Spirit of being incapable of understanding the truths spoken by God” and in Dial. 48.2 he indicates that God testifies that Jews are only interested in the things of their teachers (τα τῶν διδασκάλων ὑμῶν), although he does not cite particular passages that affirm these assertions.
4.6 Conclusion

By presenting the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as an eschatological gift that fulfills end-time prophecies, Luke and Justin provide scriptural justification for their claim that this group alone possesses an authoritative understanding of the Jewish scriptures. As the rightful recipients of these scriptural predictions, Christ-believers participate in the long-awaited end-time illumination and salvation that the Jewish scriptures predict. Conversely, according to both authors, the Jewish scriptures also provide warrant for the exclusion of those who do not understand, or reject, the message and exegesis of the Christ-believing community. These explanations of how insiders and outsiders experience the fulfillment of scriptural promises serve as a means of strengthening the identity of the Christ-believing community; insiders alone receive the promised gift of understanding whereas outsiders realize the fulfillment of oracles that predict darkening and exclusion. Furthermore, the common attempt of Luke and Justin to delineate the boundaries of the Christ-believing community in this way resembles the self-identifying strategies of some early Jewish groups who claimed that they were the rightful recipients of end-time revelation and that their opponents were objects of God’s wrath.

Notwithstanding these similarities, Luke and Justin also distinguish between insiders and outsiders to the Christ-believing community differently. Like some early Jewish interpreters, Luke uses a Deuteronomistic concept of prophecy to present Christ-believing Jews as those who embrace the message of God’s appointed delegates over against the majority of Israel who reject this proclamation. Since Luke presents scriptural
interpretation as a central part of their prophetic message, the exegesis of Jesus and his followers plays an important role in delineating a division between the elect and the unfaithful of Israel. Rather than radically changing this model to describe the mission to non-Jews, Luke continues to depict the positive reception of the prophetic message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus and his followers as a primary defining characteristic of community members, regardless of whether they are Jews or non-Jews.

Justin draws a sharper distinction between non-Jews and Jews than does Luke, and aligns his contrast between those who understand the Jewish scriptures and those who do not with a division between Jews and non-Jews, as if these two types of division were mutually complementary. Accordingly, he interprets past prophetic denunciations of Israel as descriptions that apply to the misunderstanding and obduracy of the entire Jewish nation – both past and present – or as predictions of the misunderstanding of contemporary Jews. In this way, he presents both the exclusion of the Jewish people and the acceptance of non-Jewish Christ-believers as the fulfillment of scriptural promises and as the realization of God’s pre-determined plan.
Chapter Five: Whose Promises Are They?

5.1 Introduction

In previous chapters, I explored the attempts of Luke and Justin to present the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as a means of defining the boundaries of the Christ-believing community: those who understand the scriptures, and the message of God, form part of the true people of God whereas those who do not are excluded. Along the way, I noted that this self-defining strategy resembles that of certain early Jewish interpreters who also aim to define their groups by describing their authoritative exegesis. For Luke and Justin, however, the widespread inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community introduced new challenges to this means of self-definition. Since the Christ-believing group disregarded some boundary markers that typically distinguished Jews from non-Jews, it had to mediate between its Jewish roots, on the one hand, and its new identity as a group distinct from Judaism, on the other.  

This change in the terms of reference for the Christ-believing community meant that its relationship to the Jewish scriptures required further explanation. Although Luke and Justin each present Christ-believers as those who participate in the realization of scriptural promises through their correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures, it does not necessarily follow from this claim that the Christ-believing community – comprised of Jews and non-Jews – becomes heir to the scriptural promises that were originally made.

---

1 Ben Zion Bokser, “Justin Martyr and the Jews,” *JSQ* 64 (1973): 100-101, argues that the scriptural interpretation of Justin resembles that of Jewish interpreters but also “breaks the boundaries of Judaism” (101) by demonstrating that the Christian understanding of the Jewish scriptures supersedes some of the central legal requirements of the Hebrew bible. Similarly, Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (New York: OUP, 2004), 83, argues that the attempts of early Christ-believers to claim continuity with the Jewish scriptures presented a dilemma: “How to claim continuity with the past without admitting Jews’ own claim, which would entail losing a sense of separate identity.”
to the Jewish people. To argue that non-Jewish Christ-believers were the rightful recipients of promises addressed to Jews would involve an adjustment in their self-understanding in relation to Judaism.

In this chapter, I will evaluate the manner in which Luke and Justin each attempt to articulate the identity of the Christ-believing community by presenting Christ-believers as the rightful heirs of promises from the Jewish scriptures. To do so, I will compare and contrast their appropriation of three types of promise traditions: 1) their description of the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises; 2) their explanation of the fulfillment of Isaianic promises; and 3) their presentation of the descent of the Spirit as the realization of scriptural promises. To be sure, an analysis of these three themes does not represent an exhaustive treatment of their representations of the fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, it does provide a significant cross-section of data for evaluating their respective attempts to describe Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises.

5.2 History of Scholarship


Scholars typically discuss Luke’s presentation of Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises in the course of evaluating the way that Luke portrays the identity of the people of God in his writings. Three representative positions of the treatment of this topic in Luke-Acts are as follows: (1) the non-Jewish church replaces Jews as the true people of God and as heirs to the scriptural promises originally made to Jews (e.g., Conzelmann; O’Neill); (2) Jewish Christ-believers represent restored Israel to whom non-Jewish Christ-believers are added as an associate people but both groups gain a share in
scriptural promises (e.g., Jervell); 3) Jews tragically reject the salvation for Israel that God offers in Jesus and therefore experience exclusion from the scriptural heritage that was intended for them (Tannehill).

According to the first view, espoused by Hans Conzelmann, Luke portrays a progression in which the non-Jewish church becomes the replacement for Jews. He maintains that Luke initially emphasizes the fidelity of the primitive Jewish Christian community to Judaism in order to show the continuity between the epochs of *Heilsgeschichte*: the period of Israel, Jesus, and the church.² Within this framework, Conzelmann argues that Luke attempts to demonstrate continuity between the promises of the Jewish scriptures and their fulfillment in Christ in order to forge a link between the past epoch of Israel and the present epoch of the church; the time of Jesus thus forms a bridge between these two stages. In his view, Jews fail to understand the exegesis of Christ-believers and therefore forfeit their scriptures (Acts 3:17; 13:27) whereas “the Church appears as the legitimate heir of Israel; Scripture belongs to the Church, for she is in possession of the correct interpretation.”³ Although Conzelmann does not elaborate on this assertion, he appears to assume that Luke equates the acquisition of a correct

---


understanding of the Jewish scriptures with becoming heir to these sacred texts and their promises.

A number of other scholars have more recently drawn similar conclusions regarding Luke’s depiction of non-Jewish Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. For example, Robert Maddox maintains that Luke presents Jews as excluded “from the fulfillment of their own ancestral promises” but portrays non-Jews as the recipients of these promises because they accepted their fulfillment through Christ. In other words, the Jewish rejection of Christ’s fulfillment of the scriptures did not invalidate these promises but led to their fulfillment for another group of people.4 Similarly, David Pao has argued that Luke uses the “Isaianic new exodus” theme to provide a re-definition of the people of God. He maintains that Luke presents Christ-believers as a new community who became “the legitimate heirs of the ancient Israelite traditions.” According to Pao, Luke re-defines the people of God as an entity distinct from Judaism and focuses upon portraying non-Jewish Christ-believers as the recipients of Isaianic promises.5

A second view, argued by Jervell, maintains that Jewish Christ-believers are, for Luke, restored Israel to whom non-Jewish Christ-believers are added as an “associate” people.6 Jervell indicates that Luke presents scriptural promises, which are fulfilled in Christ, as the possession of Christ-believing Jews: “The author sketches a picture of

---

Israel for whom the promises are fulfilled; he does not show us a new Israel arising out of
the rejection of the old, but he speaks of the old Israel for whom the promises are
fulfilled.” 7 Within this argument, Jervell seems to affirm that non-Jews receive a part in
the scriptural promises made to Jews:

Scripture has been fulfilled in that the promises made to the people of God were
given to Gentiles. This has not occurred in such a way that they have been transferred
from Jews to Gentiles but that they have come to the Gentiles through repentant Israel. 8

Although Jervell does not develop this part of his argument, he implies that the Christ-
believing community, which is comprised of Jews and non-Jews, becomes heir to
scriptural promises, even those made specifically to Jews. 9 Therefore, although Jervell
argues that the narrative of Luke-Acts provides an account of the fulfillment of scriptural
promises for Jews, like Conzelmann, he appears to conclude that the Christ-believers –
both Jews and non-Jews – become recipients of the same scriptural promises. 10

A third position, expressed by Robert Tannehill, maintains that Luke narrates a
story of God’s comprehensive work of salvation for both Israel and the nations, but

---

(Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 14-15, 61-75; *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht,


9 In his more recent commentary, *Apostelgeschichte*, 90-105, Jervell reasserts a similar position
but does not provide further clarity regarding his view of how non-Jewish Christ-believers become heirs to
the scriptural promises made to Jews: “Das Ergebnis ist die Restitution des Gottesvolkes, die nun die
Voraussetzung für die Aufnahme von Heiden in das Gottesvolk ist, 1,6; 15,15ff. Das Heil von Nichtjuden,
also Heiden, ist ein Teil der Verheissungen an Israel, Lk 2,29-32; Apg 2,39; 3,25; 13,47; 15,15ff. Die
Kirche ist also das Gottesvolk in der Endszeit. Weil das Volk Israel durch das Kommen des Messias in
sich gespalten wird, kommt es nicht zu einer Verwerfung des Volkes; denn das bussfertige Israel lebt in der
Kirche weiter” (93). Therefore, it is difficult to know for certain if Jervell thinks that non-Jews who
believe in Jesus become joint-heirs to the same promises that God made to Jews or if he concludes that they
partake of scriptural promises that refer to the blessing of the nations (e.g., Isa 49:6; 42:6-7).

10 Like Jervell, John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in
Jewish Christ-believers alongside Jewish Christ-believers, rather than portraying the exclusion of Jews en
masse. Nevertheless, he concludes that, as the composition of the Christ-believing community became
increasingly non-Jewish, they continued to present themselves as heirs to the scriptures, heritage, and
promises of Israel.
concludes that this initiative of God repeatedly encounters Jewish resistance. This resistance tragically leads to the frustration of God’s plan for Israel; imperceptiveness to God’s message and purpose prevents Jews from receiving the scriptural promises intended for them. For Tannehill, however, Luke demonstrates that a Jewish rejection of this fulfillment of scriptural promises does not change God’s intentions for Israel:

Discussion of the Lukan attitude toward Israel must take account of two fundamental points: a persistent concern with the realization of scriptural promises that, the narrator recognizes, apply first of all to the Jewish people, and the stinging experience of rejection of the message that the hope of Israel is now being fulfilled.

Although the contradiction between these two realities creates tension in the narrative, Tannehill argues, Luke does not attempt to resolve this difficulty. Instead, he continues to attest to the reality of God’s faithfulness to offer the fulfillment of his promises to Jews even in the face of their rejection of this heritage.

Justin

Scholars of Justin Martyr commonly agree that he portrays an antithetical relationship between Christ-believers and Jews, and depicts the former as the replacement for Israel and the rightful heirs of the scriptural promises originally made to Jews. For example, John O’Neill argues that Justin describes a radical break between the Christ-

---

believing community and Judaism, and maintains that this perspective of Justin parallels
the portrait of separation between the non-Jewish church and Jews in Acts.\textsuperscript{16} Within this
discussion, O’Neill asserts that “Acts represents a theology in which the church has
abandoned the People and appropriated the Book,”\textsuperscript{17} and concludes that the significance
of the Jewish scriptures for both Luke and Justin lies in the way that they “foretell Christ
and provide lessons for the Church.”\textsuperscript{18} According to O’Neill, the common claim of Luke
and Justin that Christ-believers truly understand the Jewish scriptures leads both to
conclude that this group alone represents true Israel and embodies the proper continuation
of this heritage.\textsuperscript{19}

In contrast to O’Neill, Oskar Skarsaune argues that Justin goes further than his
predecessors, including Luke, in arguing that Christ-believers are true Israel and heirs of
the blessings originally promised to Jews. Skarsaune maintains that Justin relies on a
combination of sources that hold opposing views regarding the ultimate fate of the Jewish
people.\textsuperscript{20} In particular, he suggests that some sources present Jews who believe in Jesus
as true Israel whereas other sources hold that the Jewish nation as a whole was rejected as
God’s chosen people. Although he notes that the writings of Luke and Justin exhibit
“striking parallels,” especially in their presentation of the origin and purpose of scriptural

\begin{footnotes}
\item[19] Unfortunately, O’Neill, \textit{Theology of Acts}, 171, 175, does not give specific examples that
illustrate this conclusion.
\end{footnotes}
Skarsaune argues that Justin sharpens the motif of Jewish rejection in a manner that Luke and some of his other sources do not. Accordingly, in his view, Justin presents non-Jewish Christ-believers as heirs to the identity and heritage of Jews in a more thoroughgoing manner than Luke.  

More recently, Denise Kimber Buell has also argued that Justin portrays Christ-believers as the replacement for Israel. Yet she maintains that Justin redefines what constitutes the people, or race, that is chosen by God. In Kimber Buell’s view, Justin presents membership within the Christ-believing community in a manner analogous to membership within a particular ethno-racial group even though belonging is attained through faith, obedience, and religious rites rather than through physical descent.  

Within her discussion, Kimber Buell notes that Justin uses the Jewish scriptures to define this new people by arguing that, because they possess a privileged understanding of the Jewish scriptures, they have become heirs to the scriptural promises given to Israel.  

---

22 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 326-352. In this discussion, Skarsaune notes that P. Richardson, *Israel in the Apostolic Church* (SNTSt 10; Cambridge: CUP, 1969), 9-16, 165, argues that Justin is the first to claim that the church is “Israel.” Skarsaune himself suggests that “the only Christian writer prior to Justin who refers ‘Israel’ directly to the church as such is I Clement. But even here, this is not his own language. ‘Israel’ occurs within OT quotations applied to Christians” (329; see I Clem. 29:2 where Deut 32:8-9 is applied to the church).
23 Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 98-99, notes that Justin portrays Christ-believers as true and spiritual Israel and the race of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham (Dial. 11.5; 123.8; 125.5; 135.3), as a high priestly race (Dial. 116.3), as another people (Dial. 119.3; 123.1; 124.1; 134.4), and another Israel (Dial. 123.6; 130.3; 135.5-6).
25 For example, Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 101-103, notes that in Dial. 138.2-3, Justin describes Christ as the progenitor of a “new race” that is founded on baptism, faith, and the cross. Similarly, she points out that Justin describes Christ-believers as a new people who came into existence after the death of Christ: “we sprouted up afresh as another people, and shot forth as new and thriving ears” (Dial. 119.3; cf. Dial. 123.8; 135.5-6).
In what follows, I will argue that both Luke and Justin indicate that Christ-believers become recipients of scriptural promises on the basis of their correct understanding of and obedience to the Jewish scriptures. Insofar as Luke and Justin use these criteria to describe the division between faithful and unfaithful Jews, their conclusions correlate with each other, and with those of early Jewish interpreters who assert that only those Jews who understand and live faithfully according to the scriptures become beneficiaries of the promises therein (e.g., CD 1-3; 1QS 3-4; 5; 8; 1 En. 90:6-38; 93:8-9). Nevertheless, because Luke and Justin also need to account for the inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community, they must explain how this group could also benefit from the promises of scripture. On this latter point, their different explanations of how and why non-Jews become recipients of scriptural promises have significant ramifications for their respective descriptions of the Christ-believing community. I will argue that although Justin portrays all Christ-believers – both Jews and non-Jews – as recipients of the promises that God originally gave to Israel, Luke distinguishes between the types of promises that apply to each group. Notably, this position differs from that of Conzelmann who argues that Luke presents the non-Jewish church as heir to the scriptures and heritage of Jews. Yet it also differs from the conclusion of Jervell who appears to conclude that Luke portrays non-Jews as co-partakers with Jews in the scriptural promises that were originally made to the Jewish people.

27 See discussion of these passages in chapter one, pages 50-78.
28 1 En. 90:30-41 also describes the inclusion of non-Jews in its depiction of the descent of the eschatological temple and return to a primordial era but the inclusion of non-Jews is a more central theme in the writings of Luke and Justin.
5.3 Abrahamic Promises

5.3.1 Abrahamic Promises in Luke-Acts

Luke presents Jews who believe in Jesus as the recipients of the promises made to the offspring of Abraham. For him, the repentance and obedience of such Jews qualifies them to become heirs to Abrahamic promises. When Luke refers to non-Jews who participate in the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises, however, he does not indicate that they also receive the promises which God intended for the seed of Abraham. Rather, they partake of the part of the promise to Abraham which declares that “all the families of the earth” would receive blessing through his seed.

Qualifications for the Descendants of Abraham

In the opening chapters of his gospel, Luke has leading figures express the expectation that God would help the Jewish people by fulfilling the promises that he made to Abraham. In the Magnificat (Luke 1:54-55) and the Benedictus (Luke 1:69-75), Mary and Zechariah exclaim that, in fidelity to Abraham, he would rescue his people by sending a mighty Davidic leader to save them. Luke soon qualifies these glowing expectations, however, with the admonitions of John the Baptist. In Luke 3:7-9, John warns the crowds that their status as physical descendants of Abraham would not secure their position as the recipients of the blessings associated with this heritage:

John said to the crowds that came out to be baptized by him, “You brood of vipers! Who warned you to flee from the wrath to come? Bear fruits worthy of repentance. Do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our ancestor’; for I tell you, God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham. Even now the ax is lying at the root of the trees; every tree therefore that does not bear good fruit is cut down and thrown into the fire.”
(Luke 3:7-9)
By having John address the crowds (οἱ ὄχλοι) with this warning, rather than only the Sadducees and Pharisees (compare Matthew 3:7-10), Luke calls the efficacy of the Abrahamic descent of Jews into question. Although God sent Jesus because of his mercy toward the fathers and in remembrance of the promises that he made to Abraham (Luke 1:72-73), only those Jews who repent become eligible to receive the benefits of these promises.

The further declaration of John that God could raise up children for Abraham from “these stones” to replace unrepentant Jews (Luke 3:8b) leads some commentators to suggest that Luke wishes to depict future non-Jewish Christ-believers as the children of Abraham. The description of new stones might serve as a proleptic reference to the inclusion of the nations; by looking forward to the acceptance of non-Jews by God, the

---


statement could appeal to a non-Jewish readership of Luke-Acts. Nevertheless, the description of new stones could simply mean that God was able to change stones into additional physical descendants of Abraham. Furthermore, the subsequent portrayal of the response of the crowds (οἱ ὁχλοὶ) in Luke 3:10-14 suggests that Luke still has the Jewish people primarily in view in this context. At first, Luke implies that the crowds were overconfident of their status as the children of Abraham: “Do not begin to say to yourselves, ‘We have Abraham as our father’” (Luke 3:8). Nevertheless, after the warnings of John, and his command to produce (ποιήσατε) fruit worthy of repentance, the same crowds express a different attitude by repeatedly asking: “What then should we produce (ποιήσωμεν)” (Luke 3:10, 12, 14). This latter reference to οἱ ὁχλοὶ in Luke 3:10-14 suggests that these Jews wish to heed John’s warning to produce (ποιήσω) fruit worthy of repentance. If so, their positive response to his message secures their position as true children of Abraham and their status as the recipients of the benefits promised to his descendants.

A similar emphasis upon repentance emerges in Luke 13:22-30, where Luke has Jesus portray the exclusion of some Jews from future blessings associated with the figure of Abraham. The Lukan Jesus prefaces his description of the eschatological banquet with

---

33 Although the use of ποιήσω to describe producing, or bearing, fruit typically has a different nuance than the use of ποιήσω to describe the performance of an action (“to do”), Luke’s repeated use of the term in this context appears to play on its double-meaning to create a connection between the metaphor of producing fruit and the action needed for repentance. By repeating the term, Luke demonstrates how the crowd takes seriously the command to repent and the warning that the tree that does not produce fruit will be cut off and cast into the fire.
a warning about the necessity of striving to enter "the narrow door" that leads to salvation (Luke 13:22-24). 34 Subsequently, Jesus describes the circumstances of those who will not gain access to the future banquet:

When once the owner of the house has got up and shut the door, and you begin to stand outside and to knock at the door, saying, "Lord, open to us," then in reply he will say to you, "I do not know where you come from." Then you will begin to say, "We ate and drank with you, and you taught in our streets." But he will say, "I do not know where you come from; go away from me, all you evildoers!" There will be weeping and gnashing of teeth when you see Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and all the prophets in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrown out. Then people will come from east and west, from north and south, and will eat in the kingdom of God. Indeed, some are last who will be first, and some are first who will be last. (Luke 13:25-30)

Whereas the parallel account in Matthew clearly presages the future inclusion of non-Jews by setting the description of the eschatological feast in a context where Jesus marvels at the faith of a non-Jew, 35 the Lukan version focuses upon the agonized response of unfaithful Jews when they see Abraham and other patriarchs at the feast. To be sure, Luke envisages a group of pilgrims who will gather from the four corners of the earth for the feast, but he does not clearly indicate whether these people are Diaspora Jews or non-Jews. 36 The absence of a clear description of this group suggests that

---

34 The description of the narrow door serves as a response to the question "Lord, will only a few be saved?" (Luke 13:23) and occurs in the context of Jesus' foregoing declaration that only Jews who repent would escape the coming judgment (Luke 13:1-9). Since in antiquity the description of the narrow way represented the way of righteousness, the image of a narrow door in this passage probably highlights the need to strive to act in a righteous manner as part of choosing the path of repentance. Compare, for example, 1 Enoch 92-105; 1QS 3-4; T. Ash. 1:3-6:3; Matt 7:13-14.


depicting the inclusion of non-Jews was not the foremost concern for Luke. Furthermore, Luke depicts those who cannot enter the banquet as “evildoers” (Luke 13:27). This description, together with Luke’s emphasis upon the need to enter the kingdom through “the narrow door” (Luke 13:24), underscores the immoral, or unrepentant, condition of Jews who are excluded from the feast. The account thus reinforces the warning of John the Baptist that not all Jews will qualify to receive the benefits of their physical lineage.

Again, in the speech of Stephen, Luke indicates that Jews who commit idolatry and refuse to listen to the messengers of God forfeit their Abrahamic inheritance. Although scholars often attempt to determine the extent to which the speech in Acts 7 represents the views of Stephen, Luke, or traditional material, the present form of the address fits with the literary account of Luke-Acts. As such, the Stephen speech contributes to our understanding of the Lukan representation of Abrahamic promises and their fulfillment.


37 See footnote 92, page 201, chapter four.


39 Although Gen 11:31-12:3 indicates that God called Abraham from Haran, Stephen indicates that God called Abraham when he was still living in Chaldea. Note, however, that Gen 15:7 and Neh 9:7 both indicate that God brought Abraham out of Ur of the Chaldeans.
Moreover, in Acts 7:6-7, the description and adaptation of Gen 15:13-14 also revises the content and goal of the promises that God gave to Abraham:

And God spoke in these terms, that his descendants would be resident aliens in a country belonging to others, who would enslave them and mistreat them during four hundred years. “But I will judge the nation that they serve,” said God, “and after that they shall come out and worship me in this place.”

(Acts 7:6-7)

The citation of Gen 15:13-14 in Acts 6:6-7 changes the phrase “and afterward they shall come out with great possessions,” from Gen 15:14b, to “and after that they shall come out and worship me in this place.” The latter phrase appears to be an excerpt from Ex 3:12 – “you shall worship God on this mountain” – but contains a further adaptation in which “this mountain” becomes “this place.” The combination of scriptural texts thus links the promise that Abraham’s descendants would inherit the land with their worship, or service, of God in the land. By arranging the citation in this way, Luke has Stephen present worship in the land as the ultimate realization of Abrahamic promises.


Note that Luke 1:72-75 also associates the fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham with a deliverance that would enable his descendants to worship, or serve, God without fear. In both Luke 1:74 and Acts 7:7, Luke associates λατρεία, a term typically used to describe the worship of a deity (e.g., Ex 7:16, 26; Num 16:9; Deut 8:19; 12:2; 13:3; Josh 22:27; 23:7; 24:14; Ezek 20:32; 2 Chron 7:19), with the fulfillment of the promises made to Abraham. Luke also uses the term to describe the activities of Christ-believers or those waiting for the arrival of Christ (e.g., Luke 2:37; Acts 24:14; 26:7; 27:23).

This interpretation of Gen 15:13-14 in Acts 7:6-7 enables Luke to demonstrate how the refusal to listen to Moses and the subsequent idolatry of the children of Israel frustrated the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises. In Acts 7:17, Luke has Stephen introduce the story of the deliverance from Egypt through Moses by indicating that God intended to fulfill the promise he made to Abraham through this event: “But as the time drew near for the fulfillment of the promise that God had made to Abraham, our people in Egypt increased and multiplied” (Acts 7:17). According to Stephen, however, this era of fulfillment was not realized because, after they were delivered, the people fell into false worship:

Our ancestors were unwilling to obey him; instead, they pushed him aside, and in their hearts they turned back to Egypt, saying to Aaron, “Make gods for us who will lead the way for us; as for this Moses who led us out from the land of Egypt, we do not know what has happened to him.” At that time they made a calf, offered a sacrifice to the idol, and reveled in the works of their hands. But God turned away from them and handed them over to worship the host of heaven, as it is written in the book of the prophets: “Did you offer to me slain victims and sacrifices forty years in the wilderness, O house of Israel? No; you took along the tent of Moloch, and the star of your god Rephan, the images that you made to worship; so I will remove you beyond Babylon.” (Acts 7:39-43)

Rather than securing the fulfillment of the Abrahamic promise by worshipping God in the land (Acts 7:6-7; cf. Gen 15:13-14), the children of Israel resisted Moses and fell into perverted worship. As a result of their idolatry, God turned away from them and “handed them over to worship the host of heaven” (7:42). Subsequently, Stephen attributes the Babylonian exile to the false worship of Israel (Acts 7:43), a conclusion that again links their idolatry with a failure to receive the promise that the offspring of Abraham would

---

inherit the land. According to the speech of Stephen, then, disobedience and idolatry prevent the children of Israel from receiving the promises made to Abraham and his descendants.

As noted in chapter four, Luke has Stephen describe Abraham as “our ancestor” (Acts 7:2), and other patriarchs and ancient Israelite leaders as “our ancestors” (Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 19, 38, 39, 44, 45 [2x]) to express his solidarity with other Jews; all were physical descendants of Abraham and potential recipients of Abrahamic promises.

Nevertheless, by changing “our ancestors” to “your ancestors” in Acts 7:51-53, Stephen identifies his audience, but not himself or his group, with a particular segment of the physical descendants of Abraham: namely, those idolatrous Jews who resisted Moses.

Even as their forefathers committed idolatry, resisted Moses, and killed the prophets, so

---


46 Luke also has other characters in the narrative refer to Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their descendants as “our fathers” (Luke 1:55, 72; Acts 3:13; 5:30; 13:17; 22:14; 26:6), and has Stephen use “our fathers” to refer to the patriarchs (Acts 7:11, 12, 15, 32), to the Exodus generation (Acts 7:19, 38, 39, 44), or to Israelites of a later period (Acts 7:45).
the opponents of the Christ-believing community follow in their footsteps by rejecting and killing Jesus, the "Righteous One" (Acts 7:52). The accusation implies that these opponents, like their ancestors, "disinherit themselves from God’s promises to the offspring of Abraham." By having Stephen also describe this group as "uncircumcised in heart and ears" (Acts 7:51), Luke implies that, although they were circumcised in the physical sense, they stood outside the covenant of circumcision given to Abraham (Acts 7:8). The speech of Stephen thus distinguishes between different types of physical descendants of Abraham and concludes that Jews who do not obey the prophets, Moses, and Jesus, do not qualify to become recipients of the Abrahamic promises.

47 For further discussion of this passage, see chapter four, pages 201-203.
The Descendants of Abraham and the Inclusion of Non-Jews

Luke attempts to describe how non-Jews would participate in the blessings promised to Abraham in only one passage:

You are the descendants (οἱ νεότις) 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 (ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου ἐνευλογηθοῦται πάσαι αἱ πατρίαι τῆς γῆς)” (Gen 12:3; 22:18). When God raised up his servant, he sent him first to you, to bless you (ἐνευλογοῦτα ἕμασί) by turning each of you from your wicked ways. (Acts 3:25-26)

The reference to “all the families of the earth” in Acts 3:25 suggests that Luke here wishes to indicate that God would fulfill his promises to Abraham by bringing blessing to non-Jews. What remains less than certain, however, is the referent of τῷ σπέρματι σου, the seed through whom this blessing would come.

In Acts 3:26, we read that God raised up Jesus to bless Jews by turning them from their wicked ways. By having Peter state in Acts 3:26 that Jesus would bless (ἐνευλογοῦτα) the Jewish people, Luke creates a link between this action of Jesus and the promise to Abraham that all peoples would be blessed (ἐνευλογηθήσονται) “in your descendants” (ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου). This would suggest that Luke wishes to portray offspring. By contrast, those Jews who earnestly worship God and hope to attain the hope of the resurrection retain their status as chosen descendants of Abraham (see, e.g., Acts 26:6-7).


The source of the citation in Acts 3:25b is not entirely clear. The reference to the seed of Abraham (τῷ σπέρματι σου) occurs in Gen 22:18 (ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου πάντα τὰ θηνη τῆς γῆς) whereas Gen 12:3 refers to Abraham but not his seed (ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πάσαι αἱ φυλai
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Jesus as the chosen seed (σπέρματίσ) through whom the Abrahamic promises would be fulfilled for both Jews and non-Jews. Nevertheless, since in Acts 3:25a the Lukan Peter refers to his Jewish audience as the “descendants (οἱ υἱοί) . . . of the covenant that God made . . . to Abraham,” it is possible that the phrase τὸ σπέρματί σου in Acts 3:25b refers to Jews who repent and believe in Jesus. As the offspring of Abraham, they become a blessing to all peoples (Gen 22:18; cf. Gen 12:3; 26:4). Furthermore, the statement in Acts 3:26 that God sent Jesus to Jews first suggests that, even though Jesus initially fulfils the promises made regarding the offspring of Abraham, Jews who believe in Jesus also have a special role as participants in the Abrahamic promises. As Fitzmyer observes, “the blessing . . . was to come to and through Abraham’s offspring . . . and then through them to all others.”


52 Conzelmann, Acts, 30, argues that “seed” in Acts 3:25b does not refer to a collective but only to Christ; cf. Jackson and Lake, Beginnings, 4:39; Haenchen, Acts, 209; Bruce, Acts, 146; Wilson, Gentile Mission, 220-222. Similarly, Bock, Proclamation, 196-197, maintains that the seed and suffering servant are linked and fulfilled in Jesus. Likewise, Rese, Alttestamentliche, 74-75, interprets ἐν τῷ σπέρματι σου in Acts 3:25b as a reference to Christ.

53 Fitzmyer, Acts, 292. Similarly, Dennis Hamm, “Acts 3:12-26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame,” PRS 11 (1984): 214, argues that Abrahamic promises are fulfilled first for Jews, who prove to be the true people of God by accepting the messiah, and then to non-Jews.
In Acts 3:26, Luke clearly explains that God sent Jesus to bless Israel, an assertion that identifies him with the offspring of Abraham and the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises. Since Luke portrays both Jesus and repentant Jews as descendants of Abraham in this context, however, it seems that he does not wish to restrict τὸ σπέρματί σου to only one referent but to indicate that both Jesus and repentant Jews have a part in receiving and participating in the promises made to Abraham regarding his descendants.\(^{54}\) Within this explanation, moreover, non-Jews do not become recipients of the blessings promised for the descendants of Abraham. Rather, they receive the blessing that Christ and Christ-believing Jews mediate to all peoples in their role as the offspring of Abraham (Gen 12:3; 22:18).\(^{55}\)

**5.3.2 Abrahamic Promises in the Writings of Justin**

Like Luke, Justin warns that the status of Jews as physical descendants of Abraham does not guarantee that they will become recipients of Abrahamic promises. Moreover, in some cases, he describes a division between faithful and unfaithful Jews in a manner that parallels the thought of Luke. Despite this similarity, Justin more frequently draws a contrast between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers when describing the recipients of Abrahamic promises, and presents the latter as the true children of Abraham.

**Qualifications for the Descendants of Abraham**

In *Dial. 44.1*, Justin cautions Trypho not to rely on his Abrahamic pedigree:

---

\(^{54}\) Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 119-120, also suggests this view.

\(^{55}\) Tannehill, "Paul's Mission," 87-88, argues that this passage shows that the narrator still regards "scriptural promises quite concretely as promises to the Jewish people, even though Jewish scripture also promises salvation for all nations."
And you are sadly mistaken if you think that, just because you are descendants of Abraham according to the flesh, you will share in the legacy of benefits which God promised would be distributed through Christ. No one can by any means participate in any of these gifts, except those who have the same ardent faith of Abraham, and who approve all the mysteries [of the Jewish scriptures]. . . . There is no other way but this: that you come to know our Christ, be baptized with the baptism which cleanses you of your sin (as Isaiah testified), and thus live a life free of sin. (Dial. 44.1-2, 4)

He indicates that physical Jews need to meet certain criteria to become beneficiaries of their legacy: they must possess the same faith as Abraham, approve of the mysteries of the Jewish scriptures, and receive cleansing through baptism. Although these particular qualifications differ from those described in Luke-Acts, Justin similarly asserts in this context that a physical genealogical connection to Abraham would not ensure participation in the blessings promised to his descendants.

Again, in his portrayal of the eschatological feast, Justin highlights the necessity of repentance in a manner that corresponds to the emphasis in Luke. In Dial. 76.3-5, Justin appears to follow a source that resembles Matt 8:11-12, but he contextualizes his presentation of this material in order to draw attention to the plight of the wicked and

---

56 In this context, approval of "all the mysteries" refers to the recognition and acceptance of the mysterious manner in which some of the commandments of scripture were arranged to contain coded truths about "the mystery of Christ" (Dial. 44.2). Similarly, in Dial. 125.3-5, Justin argues that Jews wrongly reassure themselves that they will be saved because they are descendants of Jacob, rather than making an effort to comprehend how the Jewish scriptures foretell Christ. Theodore Stylianopoulos, Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law (SBLDS 20; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975), 53-63, concludes that Justin uses a ה - מ construction in Dial. 44.2 to describe three differing types, or divisions, of Mosaic commandments: ethical commandments, commandments as types or prophecies that mysteriously refer to Christ, and ritual commandments that serve as accommodations for the hardness of Israel's heart. Against Stylianopoulos, Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 323-324, argues that Justin describes three functions for the Mosaic law in Dial. 44.2. According to Skarsaune, Justin can treat ritual observances both as types that presage Christ and as commands that aim to prevent Israel from idolatry. For further discussion of the law as a preventative measure for Israel's inclination to idolatry, see Marcel Simon, Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135-425 (New York: OUP, 1986), 166, who asserts that Justin uses this argument to demonstrate the transitory nature of the law.

57 The descriptions of the eschatological feast in Dial. 76.4, 120.5-6, and 140.4 are almost identical to each other, with a few minor variations, and clearly rely on a source parallel to Matt 8:11-12. For further discussion see A. J. Bellinzoni, The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr (NovTSup 17; Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), 28-30.
their need for repentance. For example, he prefaces his description of the eschatological feast by contrasting those who please the Father with those who withdraw from his will:

For he [Christ] openly taught the great counsels that the Father intended for those who either were or shall be pleasing to him, as well as for those humans or angels who withdrew from his will. Here are his words of instruction: “They shall come from east and west, and shall sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom shall be cast out into exterior darkness” (cf. Matt 8:11-12). And “Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, did we not eat and drink and prophesy and cast out devils in you name? And then I will say to them: Depart from me” (cf. Matt 7:22-23). Again, in other words, with which he will condemn them who are not worthy to be saved, he said: “Depart into exterior darkness, which the Father has prepared for the devil and his angels” (cf. Matt 25:41).

(Dial. 76.3-5)

Through the addition of two other Matthean sayings, Justin emphasizes the rejection of the wicked; those who are not worthy to be saved will experience exclusion. Thus, although Justin relies on Matthean material, he highlights the exclusion of the wrong-doers in a manner that corresponds to the emphasis in Luke 13.

Again, in Dial. 120.5-6, Justin refers to the end-time feast in the course of describing a division between wicked and righteous Jews. Prior to referring to the eschatological feast, Justin explains that the martyrdom of Isaiah, by being sawn in half, served as a symbolic representation of a division of the Jewish nation:

This incident [the death of Isaiah], too, was a symbol of Christ, who is going to cut your nation in two, and to admit the worthy half into his eternal kingdom with the holy patriarchs and prophets. But the rest, he has said, he will condemn to the undying flames of hell, together with all those of all the nations who are likewise disobedient and unrepentant. Indeed, he said: “For many will come from the east and from the west, and will sit down with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven; but the children of the kingdom will be put forth into darkness outside” (cf. Matt 8:11-12).

(Dial. 120.5-6)

In this context, Justin describes a division between worthy and unworthy Jews and consigns the disobedient and repenentant to eternal punishment. Again, this parallels the

---

58 Compare 1 Apo!. 16.9-13 where Justin combines a similar set of sayings in order to stress the necessity of obedience. In this context, however, Justin does not clearly refer to the eschatological feast.
exclusion of wicked Jews in Luke 13. For Justin, however, the division more clearly involves the nations as well;⁵⁹ both Jews and non-Jews receive or are excluded from the future blessings associated with Abraham on the basis of their obedience and repentance.⁶⁰

Although Jeffrey Siker argues that Justin uses the portrait of an eschatological pilgrimage and feast to illustrate a contrast between non-Jewish Christ-believers and Jews,⁶¹ this does not seem to be Justin’s primary concern in his use of this image. To be sure, Justin elsewhere typically draws a contrast between these two groups, and frequently describes the exclusion of the Jewish nation. Nevertheless, the descriptions of an end-time feast in *Dial.* 76.3-5 and 120.5-6 serve as rare examples where Justin does not correlate a division between the obedient and disobedient with a distinction between Jews and non-Jews. Instead, he indicates that Jews who repent and obey would qualify to receive Abrahamic blessings in the coming age.

⁵⁹ Although the phrase “many will come from east and west, north and south” in Luke 13:29 may foreshadow the inclusion of the nations, Luke does not make this explicit nor does he describe a division between righteous non-Jews and unrepentant Jews in this parable.

⁶⁰ In *Dialogue* 139-140, Justin prefaces yet another reference to the eschatological feast by asserting that the descendants of “Japheth” (symbolizing the Romans) would eventually take the promised land away from Jews as part of the fulfillment of Gen 9:24-27. In this context, he further warns that the children of Abraham who are “sinners, and faithless, and disobedient towards God” should not expect to receive an everlasting kingdom in the eschatological age. He maintains that although Daniel, Noah, and Jacob might pray for sons and daughters, their request would not be granted since every person will receive reward and punishment for their own actions (*Dial.* 140.3; cf. Ezek 14:20; 18:4-20; Deut 24:16). Subsequently, he describes the eschatological feast (*Dial.* 140.4; cf. Matt 8:11-12) and emphasizes the role of volition in determining one’s plight in the eschatological future: “Besides, I have already shown that they who were foreknown as future sinners, whether humans or angels, do become so, not through God’s fault, but each through his own fault.” Similarly, in *Dialogue* 25-26, Justin warns that the physical descendants of Abraham should not assume that they will receive part of the “divine legacy” and an inheritance with the patriarchs if they do not repent.

⁶¹ Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews,* 182-183. Rodney Werline, “The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho,*” *HTR* 92 (1999): 86-87, also asserts that Justin uses Matt 8:11-12 as source because it places Christ-believers at the feast together with the patriarchs. Werline argues that Justin in this way attempts to present Christ-believers as the true descendants and heirs of Abraham in *Dial.* 120.6, although he does not explain how he arrives at this conclusion.
The Descendants of Abraham and the Inclusion of Non-Jews

As Skarsaune and O'Neill have both noted, the speech of Stephen in Acts 7 expresses a view that resembles the description of Jews in the writings of Justin: the Lukan Stephen and Justin accuse Jews of resisting the prophets, killing the “Just One,” and practicing idolatry. For both authors, this behavior disqualifies Jews from receiving the promises designated for the descendants of Abraham. Despite this common conclusion, Justin develops these themes beyond Acts 7 by drawing a further contrast between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers, and asserting that the latter would receive the promises and heritage originally intended for the physical descendants of Abraham.

In *Dial.* 92.1-5, for example, Justin argues that physical circumcision has no benefit since Abraham was justified because of his faith. This faith, Justin argues, represents a “circumcision of the heart” that enables non-Jewish Christ-believers to

---

62 Note also the allusion to their murder of the “Righteous One” in *Dial.* 119.2, which parallels the accusation in Acts 7:52. See also *Dial.* 16.4, a text that associates the killing of Jesus, “the Just One” (ὁ δίκαιος), with persecution of the prophets before him and with persecution of Christ-believers after him (cf. *Dial.* 108.2). This resembles the description of the death of Jesus in Acts 7:51. Compare also *Dial.* 17.2; 133.1-2; 136.3; 137.3. These latter passages cite LXX Isa 3:10 in reference to the persecution of ὁ δίκαιος. As O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 82-93, 142-143, notes, Luke and Justin both use the title ὁ δίκαιος in similar ways; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 288-295; Acts 3:14; 7:52; cf. *1 Apology* 47-49; *Dial.* 16.4; 93.4; 108.2-3; 119.3; 133.2; 136.3.

63 Compare especially *Dialogue* 22 with Acts 7 and the citation of Isa 66:1-2 in both of these texts. Both *Dial.* 22.3-4 and Acts 7:42-43 also cite from Amos 5:25-26 (cf. *1 Apol.* 37.3-8). Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 124, 314-315, maintains that the differences between the forms of these citations suggests that Justin uses a written source that was different from Acts. Nevertheless, he suggests that the polemical use of Isa 66:1-2 in Acts 7:49-50 may lie behind the testimony source that Justin used. He rightly notes, however, that Justin’s description of temple worship as a practice that was permitted to prevent the idolatry of Jews (see, e.g., *Dial.* 18.5; 19.5-6; 20.4; 22.1-3, 11; 43.1; 67.8; 73.6; 102.6; 131.4; 132.2; 133.1; 136.3) differs from positive sentiments expressed toward the temple and the law in Luke-Acts (see, e.g., Luke 1:59; 2:21; Acts 7:8; 16:3; 21:21-26). By contrast, Marcel Simon, *Verus Israel*, 86, argues that the speech of Stephen already contained the sentiments of Justin, including the idea that God only tolerated cultic worship and allowed it as a concession to prevent idolatry.

64 Justin often links the figure of Abraham with discussions about circumcision (*Dial.* 11.5; 16.2; 19.4; 23.3-4; 26.1; 27.5; 33.2; 43.1; 46.3-4; 47.1-4; 92.2-3; 113.6-7; 114.3-4). For further discussion, see Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 165-170.
become just and pleasing to God apart from physical circumcision.\textsuperscript{65} Subsequently, Justin contrasts this group with Jews and asserts that God permitted the latter to practice rituals, sacrifices, and temple worship in order to prevent them from committing idolatry (\textit{Dial. 92.4}).\textsuperscript{66} Justin even asserts in this context that God permitted circumcision so that Jews could be marked off for punishment; that is, their circumcision served as a means of identifying Jews for expulsion from Jerusalem after the Bar Kokhba revolt (\textit{Dial. 92.2}).\textsuperscript{67} Thus, although both Luke and Justin link the idolatry of Jews with their failure to receive the inheritance promised to the descendants of Abraham, Justin goes further than Luke by expressing a sharper critique of Jews and Jewish practices,\textsuperscript{68} presenting non-Jews as heirs to the legacy of Abraham, and characterizing the entire Jewish people as disobedient and therefore unfit to inherit the blessings of Abraham.\textsuperscript{69}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{65} Elsewhere, Justin explains that “circumcision of the heart” represents the proper understanding and reception of the words of the apostles and Christ that frees Christ-believers from idolatry (\textit{Dial. 113.6-7}; 114.3-4; cf. \textit{Dial. 28.2-3}). He also refers to a “spiritual circumcision” that Christ-believers receive through baptism (\textit{Dial. 43.2}).
\item \textsuperscript{66} According to Justin, God instituted circumcision and ritual law because of his foreknowledge of Israel’s unbelief and disobedience (\textit{Dial. 12.3}; 18.2; 21.1; 22.2; 43.1; 44.2; 46.5; 67.8; 92.4).
\item \textsuperscript{67} This represents but one of Justin’s descriptions of the removal of Jews from the land of promise (\textit{1 Apol. 32.3}; 53.3; \textit{Dial. 16.2}; 25.5; 40.2). Justin maintains that the expulsion of Jews from their land in 135 CE occurred as punishment for sin and as the fulfillment of prophecy (\textit{Dial. 16.2}; 25.5).
\item \textsuperscript{68} Although the speech of Stephen outlines the past idolatry of Israel (Acts 7:39-43) and indicates that “the Most High does not dwell in houses made with human hands” (7:48), these descriptions of Jews and their temple do not go beyond those found in the Jewish scriptures (see discussion in footnote 44 above).
\item \textsuperscript{69} See also Odil Hannes Steck, \textit{Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum} (WMANT 23; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967), 60-80, 153-169, who notes that certain early Jewish interpreters also transform the Deuteronomistic pattern of sin-exile-return to describe a final rejection at the end of the age that would forever exclude unfaithful Jews (e.g., CD 1-2; 3:12-21; 6:1-21; 1 QS 1:16-21; 5:1-13; 8:5-19; 1 En 93:1-10). Although Skarsaune, \textit{Proof from Prophecy}, 429, suggests that Justin relies on a Deuteronomistic concept of sin-exile-conversion-return and uses the motif of the Jewish murder of the prophets to describe the persecution of Christ and Christ-believers, he rightly points out that Justin also transforms this Deuteronomistic preaching by developing an anti-circumcision polemic based on Hadrian’s decree. That is, he claims that God gave circumcision to Abraham because he anticipated the future disobedience of Jews and knew that they would need to be marked off from other peoples in order to be punished by expulsion from Jerusalem (see, e.g., \textit{Dial. 16.2};
\end{itemize}
Similarly, in *Dial.* 130.1-4, Justin interprets Deut 32:43—“Rejoice, O Gentiles with his people”—as a description of how non-Jews receive the inheritance promised to the descendants of Abraham. Although Justin affirms that certain Jews will receive an inheritance—the patriarchs, prophets, and “every Jew who is pleasing to God” (*Dial.* 130.2)—he proceeds to argue that the dispersion at the tower of Babel and the subsequent election of Israel was nothing but a symbolic foreshadowing of the election of non-Jewish Christ-believers:

Now, gentlemen, I wish to call to your attention other passages from Moses, from which you will perceive that in the beginning God dispersed all men according to nationality and language, and from all these nations he chose for himself yours—a useless, disobedient, and faithless nation. And he showed that those of every nationality who were chosen have obeyed his will through Christ, whom he calls Jacob, and surnames Israel, so those [Christ-believers] should also be called Jacob and Israel, as I have proved at length. For, when he exclaims, “Rejoice, you Gentiles, with his people” (Deut 32:43), he gives them a share in a similar legacy and attributes to them a similar name; but calling them “Gentiles,” and stating that they rejoice with his people, he does so as a reproach to your nation. For just as you angered him by your acts of idolatry, so he has deemed them, though they were likewise idolaters, worthy to know his will and share in his inheritance. (*Dial.* 130.3-4)

Justin here describes Jews as “a useless, disobedient, and faithless nation” (*Dial.* 130.3) and asserts that God reproaches them because he was angered by their idolatry (*Dial.* 130.4). Conversely, he claims that non-Jewish Christ-believers have become heirs of the legacy of “Israel” and “Jacob” on the basis of their obedience (*Dial.* 130.4).

19.5; 92.2; cf. *I Apology* 47-48). Justin therefore argues that Jews are by nature disobedient and therefore unfit to become heirs to the Abrahamic legacy (e.g., *Dial.* 92.3-5); cf. Annette Reed, “The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr,” *JECS* (2004): 155-156.

70 Although Falls translates the phrase εἰδολολάτρας δυτας as “though they are likewise idolaters,” A. Cleveland Coxe, James Donaldson, and Alexander Roberts, eds., *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Translations of the Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325* (10 vols.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 1:265, render it as “those who were idolaters.” Noting that Justin elsewhere refers to the former idolatrous practices of Christ-believers (*Dial.* 30.3; 46.7; 111.4), Marcovich here suggests the addendum εἰδολολάτρας [πάλαι] δυτας.
Dialogue 119 provides an especially vivid example of both the similarities and differences between the presentation of the recipients of Abrahamic promises in the writings of Luke and Justin. In Dial. 119.1-2, Justin reads Deut 32:16-23 as a denunciation of the idolatry of present-day Jews but interprets Zech 2:11 and Isa 62:12 as descriptions of Christ-believers, the new and holy people of God:

They provoked me with strange gods; they stirred me up to anger with their abominations. They sacrificed to devils whom they knew not. . . . And the Lord saw, and was jealous, and was moved to wrath by reason of the anger of his sons and daughters, and he said: “I will hide my face from them, and I will show what their last end shall be; for they are a perverse generation, children in whom there is no faith. . . .” (Deut 32:16-23). And after the Just One was put to death, we blossomed forth as another people, and sprang up like new thriving corn, as the prophet exclaimed: “And many nations shall flee unto the Lord that day for a people; and they shall dwell in the midst of the whole earth” (Zech 2:11). But we Christians are not only a people, but a holy people, as we have already shown: “And they shall call it a holy people, redeemed by the Lord” (Isa 62:12).

(Dial. 119.2-3)

To some extent, this distinction between Christ-believers and Jews resembles the contrast between Christ-believing Jews and their opponents (e.g., Cyrenians, Alexandrians, and the Sanhedrin) in Acts 7. Beyond distinguishing between faithful and idolatrous Jews, however, Justin asserts that non-Jews who believe in Jesus become the offspring of Abraham. In Dial. 119.4, Justin argues that, by promising Abraham that he would be the father of many nations (Gen 17:4), God did not refer to Arabs, Idumeans, and other peoples, but rather to a specific people who became his descendants:

We are not a contemptible people, nor a tribe of barbarians, nor just any nation as the Carians or the Phyrgians, but . . . For, this is really the nation promised to Abraham by God, when he told him that he would make him a father of many nations, not saying in particular that he would be the father of the Arabs or the

Egyptians or the Idumeans, since Ishmael became the father of a mighty nation and so did Esau.  

In his view, since Christ-believers hear and obey the voice of Christ, they represent the righteous nation promised to Abraham:

What greater favor, then, did Christ bestow on Abraham? This: that he likewise called with his voice, and commanded him to leave the land wherein he dwelt.

And with that same voice he has also called of us, and we have abandoned our former way of life in which we used to practice evils common to the rest of the world. And we shall inherit the holy land together with Abraham, receiving our inheritance for all eternity, because by our similar faith we have become children of Abraham. For, just as he believed the voice of God, and was justified thereby, so have we believed the voice of God (which was spoken again to us by the prophets and the apostles of Christ) and have renounced even to death all worldly things. Thus, God promised to Abraham a religious and righteous nation of like faith, and a delight to the Father; but it is not you, “in whom there is not faith” (Deut 32:20). (Dial. 119.5-6)

For Justin, then, obedience and faith in the words of the prophets and the testimony of the apostles qualifies non-Jews to become heirs of the land and blessings that God promised to the descendants of Abraham (cf. Dial. 138.3; 139.5). Indeed, in his view, Christ-believers really are the nation that God promised to Abraham (Dial. 119.4).

In Dial. 119.5-6, the reasoning that Justin uses to present non-Jewish Christ-believers as descendants of Abraham resembles the arguments of Paul in Romans 4 and Galatians 3: non-Jews become heirs to the legacy of Abraham because they are blessed with and justified by the same faith as Abraham. By also arguing that the repentance,
piety, and obedience of Christ-believers commend them as descendants of Abraham, Justin adds an element to the Pauline description of justification by faith that resembles the emphasis in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 3:7-9; 13:22-30; Acts 7:2-53). Justin thus follows a Pauline line of thought insofar as he argues that non-Jewish Christ-believers have become descendants and heirs of Abraham but follows a Lukan line of thought insofar as he presents repentance and obedience as central qualities of the children of Abraham (Dial. 119.6; cf. 11.5).

Summary

Both Luke and Justin portray repentance and obedience as distinguishing marks of Jews who receive the blessings and heritage promised to the seed of Abraham. This perspective resembles that of a number of early Jewish interpreters who differentiate between their groups and other Jews on the basis of their repentance and covenant fidelity, as well as their interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. Nevertheless, whereas Luke describes a division between repentant and unrepentant Jews and defines only the former group as the true children of Abraham, Justin more typically presents non-Jewish Christ-believers as the true Israel. This difference in perspective is significant in understanding Justin's treatment of the relationship between Jews and Gentiles.

---

75 Certainly, Paul also describes the piety of Christ-believers, and their repentance from idolatry (see, especially, 1 Thess 1:9). Although Paul also highlights the central role of obedience in the lifestyle of Christ-believers (e.g., Romans 6-8; Galatians 5), for Justin, these attributes demonstrate that Christ-believers are the true children of Abraham. This differs from Paul's emphasis on faith as the qualifying characteristic of the descendants of Abraham.

76 Likewise, in Dial. 11.4, Justin highlights the repentance and obedience of Christ-believers, and presents this transformation in their lifestyle as evidence that they have become the descendants and heirs of Abraham. Again, in Dial. 23.4-5, Justin affirms that Abraham was justified because of his faith, but further argues that the righteousness of Christ-believers is determined through "acts of piety and justice" (Dial. 23.5).
Christ-believers as the descendants of Abraham and rightful heirs of the promises originally made to Jews.

5.4 Isaianic Promises

5.4.1 Isaianic Promises in Luke-Acts

As noted in chapter four, Luke depicts the scriptural interpretation and message of the Christ-believing community as the realization of the illumination of the nations that Isaiah foretells (e.g., Luke 2:30-32; 3:4-6; 4:16-31; 24:44-49; Acts 1:8; 13:46-47; 26:17-18, 23). In his development of this theme, moreover, Luke indicates that Jews and non-Jews become recipients of different aspects of Isaianic promises – those that relate to Israel and to the nations respectively.

5.4.1.1 Isaianic Promises, Israel, and the Nations

Besides presenting Jesus as the mediator of restoration for Israel and illumination for the nations, Luke presents the Twelve, Paul, and Barnabas as servants of YHWH who announce salvation for Jews and non-Jews through their proclamation of the message of Jesus and his fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures (Luke 24:44-49; cf. Acts 1:8; Acts 13:46-47; 26:17-18, 23). In this sense, both Jesus and leading Jewish Christ-believers participate in the fulfillment of Isaianic promises that refer to the servant of YHWH while Jews and non-Jews who embrace their message and scriptural interpretation become recipients of the restoration and illumination promised in passages such as Isa 42:6-7 and 49:6.

has Simeon identify Jesus as the source of salvation for all peoples but distinguish between Jews and non-Jews as beneficiaries of his intervention:

Master, now you are dismissing your servant in peace, according to your word; for my eyes have seen your salvation, which you have prepared in the presence of all peoples, 

(Luke 2:29-32)

The translation above places the term “light” (φως) in apposition to the phrase “your salvation” (τὸ σωτηρίου σου) and interprets “for” (εἰς) as the governing preposition of both “revelation” (ἀποκάλυψιν) and “glory” (δόξαν). This rendering characterizes the salvation of God as a type of enlightenment for both Israel and the nations. Similarly, in Luke 3:6, Luke presents the “salvation” (τὸ σωτηρίου) brought about by Christ as a form of illumination that “all flesh” will see ( Isa 40:3-5). Notwithstanding this

---


presentation of the equal treatment of all peoples, Luke 2:32 refers to Jews and non-Jews as distinct entities. To Israel, the coming salvation and light would be “for glory” whereas, to the nations, it would be “for revelation.”

Similarly, the Lukan Paul indicates that he was commissioned as a witness and mediator of the illumination that Isaiah promised by indicating that God sent him to open people’s eyes, and turn them from darkness to light (Acts 26:16-18; cf. Isa 42:6-7). Nevertheless, he differentiates between Jews and non-Jews in this description by indicating that he was commissioned to open the eyes of God’s “people” (λαός) and “the nations” (ἔθνος). Likewise, when Luke has Paul describe Jesus as the mediator of this illumination, he distinguishes between Jews and non-Jews by explaining that Jesus proclaims light “both to our people and to the nations” (τῷ τε λαῷ καὶ τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, Acts 26:23). Therefore, although Luke indicates that all people receive the salvation and illumination that Isaiah promises, he recognizes that they do so as Jews and non-Jews. This interpretation corresponds to the Isaianic promise that the servant of YHWH would effect God’s salvation for Israel and the nations.

Despite the effort of Luke to present Jews and non-Jews as legitimate heirs of Isaianic promises made to Israel and the nations, he also indicates that some Jews reject the deliverance that Jesus provides for them (e.g., Luke 4:16-31; Acts 13:46-47). Moreover, because Luke also presents non-Jews as beneficiaries of the fulfillment of ministry of Jesus; cf. Marshall, Luke, 137. Numerous scholars also argue that Luke includes the part of Isa 40:5 that contains the reference to “all flesh” since this is in keeping with his interest in demonstrating the universality of God’s salvation. See, e.g., Fitzmyer, Luke, 1: 461; Marshall, Luke, 137; Schüremann, Lukas, 1:160-161.

81 For further discussion of Acts 26:16-18, see chapter four, pages 172-173.
Isaianic promises, it is possible that, in some instances, he envisions a transfer of scriptural promises from Jews to non-Jews. Because Luke 4:16-18 and Acts 13:46-47 explicitly cite passages from Isaiah that foretell the restoration of Israel in contexts where Jews also reject the message of Christ and Christ-believers, they serve as important test cases for exploring this possibility.

In Luke 4:16-21, the Lukan Jesus announces that he will effect a liberation for the people of God that Isaiah foretold (Isa 61:1-2; cf. Isa 58:6).82


And He came to Nazareth, where He had been brought up; and as was His custom, He entered the synagogue on the Sabbath, and stood up to read. And the book of the prophet Isaiah was handed to Him. And He opened the book, and found the place where it was written, “The Spirit of the Lord is upon Me, Because He anointed Me to preach the gospel to the poor. He has sent Me to proclaim release to the captives, And recovery of sight to the blind, To set free those who are downtrodden, to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord.” And He closed the book, and gave it back to the attendant, and sat down; and the eyes of all in the synagogue were fixed upon Him.

And He began to say to them, “Today this Scripture has been fulfilled in your hearing.” (Luke 4:16-21)

The four infinitival phrases in his citation of Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 outline the activities that he will perform in this role: “to preach the good news to the poor,” “to proclaim release to prisoners (κηρύξας αἶχμαλώτοις ἀφεσιν) and sight to the blind,” “to let the oppressed go free (ἀποστείλας τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφεσί);” and “to proclaim the favorable year of the Lord.” The added phrase “to let the oppressed go free” from Isa 58:6 accentuates the element of release (ἄφεσις) in his ministry. This addition, together with the reference to

...
“the favorable year of the Lord” (Luke 4:19), suggests that Luke also wishes to portray Jesus as the agent of an end-time Jubilee liberation (ἀφεσίς). By having Jesus present himself as the herald of a Jubilee release, Luke indicates that Jesus both announces and effects the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Israel.

Initially, the people of Nazareth receive the declaration of Jesus favorably, and seem to expect that they will become the primary beneficiaries of his fulfillment of scriptural promises (Luke 4:22). The mood of the group soon changes, however, when Jesus explains that his ministry will not meet their expectations:

He said to them, “Doubtless you will quote to me this proverb, ‘Doctor, cure yourself!’ And you will say, ‘Do here also in your hometown the things that we have heard you did at Capernaum.’” And he said, “Truly I tell you, no prophet is accepted in the prophet’s hometown. But the truth is, there were

---


many widows in Israel in the time of Elijah, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, and there was a severe famine over all the land; yet Elijah was sent to none of them except to a widow at Zarephath in Sidon. There were also many lepers in Israel in the time of the prophet Elisha, and none of them was cleansed except Naaman the Syrian.” When they heard this, all in the synagogue were filled with rage. (Luke 4:23-28)

A number of scholars suggest that this negative reaction represents the beginning of a pattern that continues throughout Luke-Acts and culminates in Acts 28: Jews reject Jesus and his declaration of how he fulfils the Jewish scriptures, and therefore themselves experience exclusion. Closely related to this assertion is the conclusion that Luke has Jesus appeal to the Elijah-Elisha narratives to portray non-Jews, rather than Jews, as the primary beneficiaries of the fulfillment of scriptural promises that he announces (Luke 4:25-27).85


Although the opposition of the Nazareth crowd in Luke 4:16-30 appears to prefigure Jewish opposition to the message of Jesus in Acts, it is possible to argue that Luke does not use the Elijah-Elisha elements in the narrative to portray a transfer of Isaianic promises from Israel to non-Jews.\(^{87}\) Rather than describing how Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 would be fulfilled, Luke 4:24-27 illustrates the prophetic role of Jesus, both in his experience of rejection and in his ministry to outsiders.\(^{88}\) From this perspective, Luke uses two different types of scriptural precedents to describe the ministry of Jesus. In Luke 4:16-21, he has Jesus appeal to texts that foretell the restoration of Israel (Isa 61:1-2; 58:6) and announce that he is fulfilling these scriptural promises for Jews in the “here and now” in Nazareth and the surrounding regions (Luke 4:21; cf. 4:14-15, 31-44). When Luke foreshadows the inclusion of non-Jews, however, he has Jesus describe himself as a prophet and refer to scriptural stories that recount the ministry of prophets of Israel to non-Jews (1 Kgs 17:17-24; 2 Kgs 5:1-14).

The immediate narrative context exhibits a similar pattern and confirms this interpretation of Luke 4:16-30 (Luke 4:31-7:22). In Luke 7:22, Jesus responds to the

---

\(^{87}\) As C. J. Schreck, “The Nazareth Pericope, Luke 4,16-30 in Recent Study,” in *L’Evangile de Luc-The Gospel of Luke* (BETL 32; ed. Frans Neirynck; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 399-471, notes, however, the “rejection by Nazareth ... and Israel neither implies nor entails a reciprocal rejection by Jesus” (447). The promises of God are not necessarily transferred to non-Jews simply because Jews reject Jesus’ fulfillment of them.

inquiry of the disciples of John the Baptist regarding his identity (Luke 7:19a, 20) by stating the following: “Go and tell John what you have seen and heard: the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them” (Luke 7:22b). Although this report originates from the double tradition, it echoes terminology and themes from Luke 4:18-19. The parallel passages in Luke 4:18-19 and 7:21-22 thus form an inclusio that marks off the initial events in the ministry of Jesus. Accordingly, the narrative material between Luke 4:16-30 and 7:21-22 provides the immediate context for recognizing how Luke portrays the realization of Isaianic promises.


89 Compare Matt 11:4-6.
91 As David P. Moessner, “The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel’s Glory,” in Eight Critical Perspectives, 44, correctly observes, Luke 4:18-20 and 7:22 illustrate how Jesus effects liberation for Israel: “Israel’s consolation is indeed of Israel, by Israel, and for Israel.”
subsequently declare that he must proclaim his message throughout the whole Jewish land (Luke 4:42-44). When Luke does recount the healing of the servant of a non-
Jewish centurion in Luke 7:1-10, however, he casts Jesus in the role of Elisha and likens this event to the intervention of Elisha on behalf of Naaman, a non-Jew. Luke in this way presents Jesus as the source of salvation for all people who express faith in him, but he does not equate this inclusiveness with a transfer of scriptural promises from Jews to non-Jews. Instead, he applies scriptural promises originally made to Israel to Jews (Isa 61:1-2; 58:6) but uses stories from the Jewish scriptures that depict the ministry of prophets to people outside of the borders of Israel as models for the ministry of Jesus to non-Jews (2 Kgs 5:1-14). 


93 The healing of the servant of the Roman centurion in Luke 7:1-10 resembles the healing of Naaman by Elisha (2 Kgs 5:1-14) and the raising of the son of the widow of Nain (Luke 7:11-17) resembles the story of Elijah and the widow in Sidon (1 Kgs 17:17-24; cf. 2 Kgs 4). As Siker, "First to the Gentiles," 88, notes, the references to Elijah and Elisha in Luke 4:25-27 also correspond to these two episodes in Luke 7.

94 Luke has Jesus describe the exemplary faith of the centurion, which seems to be part of the reason for the positive response of Jesus to him (Luke 7:9).

95 Later in the narrative, Luke reiterates this perspective when he has Peter allude to Isa 61:1-2, the passage which was cited in Luke 4:16-21. The links between Luke 4:18-19 and Acts 10:36-38 have been well-established. The phrases τὸν λόγον ἂν ἀπέστειλεν and εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην in Acts 10:36 correspond to the phrases ἀπέσταλκέν με and εὐαγγελίσασθαι πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους in Luke 4:18, and both passages also refer to Isa 61:1. The description of the anointing of Jesus in Acts 10:38 (ὡς ἐχρισων αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἀγίω καὶ δυνάμεις) recalls the phrase "the Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me" (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπὶ ἐμὲ ὡς ἐγὼ ἐνυκεκό ἐχρισόμεν ἐμὲ) from Luke 4:18 (cf. Luke 4:14), and the reference to his healing and delivery ministry in Acts 10:38 corresponds more generally to his activities. For further discussion of these narrative links, see Conzelmann, Acts, 83; Rese, Alttestamentliche Motive, 117; Dupont, Salvation, 143, 152, 156; Bock, Proclamation, 233; Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 1:140-141; Max Turner, Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness (JPThSup 9; Sheffield: SAP, 1996), 262; Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 236-237. The connections between Luke 4 and Acts 10 strongly suggest that the latter passage alludes to the former. As such, the speech of Peter provides us with another window on Luke’s understanding of how the ministry of Jesus fulfilled Isa 61:1-2 on behalf of Jews. In Acts 10:36, Peter states explicitly that Jesus proclaimed his message to Israel: "You know the message he sent to the people of Israel, preaching peace by Jesus Christ – he is Lord of all." Although Peter clearly affirms the

universal lordship of Jesus in this context, he also pointedly indicates that God sent this message to Israel and alludes to his fulfillment of the promises of Isa 61:1-2 for the Jewish people (Acts 10:38). Furthermore, when Luke has Peter describe the scriptural basis for the inclusion of Cornelius and his household, he does not indicate that the promises of Isa 61:1-2 apply to non-Jews but rather explains how the Jewish scriptures foretell the forgiveness of sins for all peoples (Acts 10:43).  

Consequently, Paul and Barnabas declare that they will turn to non-Jews, in fulfillment of Isa 49:6. Despite this description of a transfer of "the word of God" from Jews to non-Jews, Luke does not indicate for this reason that the scriptural promises originally intended for Jews were given to non-Jews. Instead, he casts Paul and Barnabas in the role of the servant of YHWH, so that they participate in the part of this Isaianic promise that relates to Israel, but indicates that non-Jews receive "the word of God" on the scriptural basis that God had always planned to provide illumination for the nations through the servant of YHWH (Isa 49:6).\footnote{Some scholars attempt to argue that Luke presents Christ as the servant of YHWH in Acts 13:46-47. See, e.g., Pierre Grelot, "Note sur Actes, XIII, 47," \textit{RB} 88 (1981): 368-372; J. Dupont, \textit{Nouvelles études sur les Actes des apôtres} (LD 118; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 345-349. The majority rightly conclude, however, that Acts 13:46-47 applies this role to Paul and Barnabas. See, e.g., Haenchen, \textit{Acts}, 414; Jervell, \textit{Luke and the People of God}, 41-61; Conzelmann, \textit{Acts}, 106; Marshall, \textit{Acts}, 230; Pao, \textit{Isaianic Exodus}, 100-101. Fitzmyer, \textit{Acts}, 521, suggests that the use of the second person singular pronoun in the citation — "I have made you (οὐκ) a light for the nations" — does not correspond well to Paul's use of the second person plural pronoun "us" (ὑμῖν) in his preface to the citation. This leads him to the tentative conclusion that Luke applies the citation to Christ, who illuminates non-Jews through the ministry of Paul and Barnabas. Because Paul prefaces his citation of Isa 49:6 with "thus the Lord has commanded us (ὑμῖν)," however, it is difficult to read the Isaiah passage as anything but a reference to the missionaries themselves.}

Furthermore, in the sermon immediately prior to the announcement of Acts 13:46-47, Luke has Paul pointedly describe how Christ fulfilled scriptural promises made to Jews in numerous ways (Acts 13:13-41).\footnote{As Tannehill, \textit{Narrative Unity}, 2:166, notes, the sermon in Acts 13 "is a speech by a Jew to Jews, for it concerns God's promise to the Jewish people."} In the first place, the introduction to the sermon affirms the elect status of Israel and God's faithful care for this nation (Acts 13:17). Second, Luke has Paul declare Jesus to be the Davidic messiah who, through his resurrection, fulfilled the scriptural promises made to the Jewish people (Acts 13:33b-41;
Third, in Acts 13:38, Paul indicates that his audience receives forgiveness in fulfillment of God’s promise of salvation to Jews: “Let it be known to you (ὑμῖν) therefore, my brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you (ὑμῖν).” Fourth, throughout his speech in Acts 13:16-41, Paul repeatedly declares how this fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures applies to Jews:

Acts 13:23 – Of this man's posterity God has brought to Israel a Savior, Jesus, as he promised
Acts 13:26 – My brothers, you descendants of Abraham's family, and those who fear God among you, the message of this salvation has been sent

99 The application of scriptural promises to the Jewish people is especially emphatic in Acts 13:34b where Paul cites LXX Isa 55:3b. Since LXX Isa 55:3b uses the plural pronoun ὑμῖν to describe the recipients of Davidic promises — “I will give you (ὑμῖν) the holy promises made to David” — the citation of Isa 55:3b has the effect of applying the fulfillment of this scriptural passage to the Jewish people as a whole rather than to a single Davidic heir. Bock, Acts, 457, maintains that ὑμῖν refers to Jews and proselytes to Judaism in this context; cf. Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2:171. Barrett, Acts, 1:647-648, suggests that Luke intends to communicate that the phrase τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά refers to the holy and sure promises which were originally made to David but now apply to “the Christian generation.” Note the difference between Paul’s citation (δῶσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά) and LXX Isa 55:3b (διαθήκημαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ πιστά). The meaning of the phrase τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά in Acts 13:34 is not entirely certain. Barrett, Acts, 1:649, suggests that it refers to the promises, that is, the prophetic words, spoken by David. Johnson, Acts, 235, argues that τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά refers to what was promised to David but would be given to the present generation. Fitzmyer, Acts, 517, takes the phrase to refer to the “covenant benefits assured to David.” Walter Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature 3rd ed., revised and edited by Frederick William Danker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000), 728, suggests that τὰ ὅσια in Acts 13:34 refers to divine decrees rather than human ones. J. Dupont, “ΤΑ ΡΩΣΙΑ ΔΑΥΙΔ ΠΙΣΤΑ (Ac XIII 34 = Is LV3),” RB 68 (1961): 95, argues instead that the phrase refers to religious duties. Tannehill, “Paul’s Mission,” 86-87, suggests that τὰ ὅσια refers to the kingdom and duties of the heir of David. Regardless of its precise meaning, the phrase demonstrates that Luke presents the Jewish nation as the recipients of the heritage of David.


Acts 13:32-33a – And we bring you the good news that what God promised to our ancestors he has fulfilled for us, their children,

Acts 13:38 – Let it be known to you therefore, my brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you.

Luke therefore has Paul pointedly depict his Jewish audience as the heirs of the scriptural promises originally made to Jews even though the narrative will soon demonstrate that a number of Jews ultimately reject the fulfillment that God offers in Jesus. As Tannehill rightly affirms, Luke does not attempt to reduce the tension between his conviction that God fulfilled his promises for Israel and the rejection of these promises. He does not
attempt to mitigate this apparent contradiction by redirecting the scriptural promises made to Jews to a new group of non-Jewish recipients.

Numerous other scenes in Luke-Acts demonstrate a similar type of tension between the affirmation that God fulfilled the promises he made to Jews and the rejection by some of the salvation that he offers. For example, in Luke 2:30-32, Simeon expresses the expectation that Israel will experience “glory” as part of the fulfillment of Isa 49:6 (cf. 42:6-7) but also anticipates the “falling and rising of many in Israel” (Luke 2:34-35). Similarly, Luke 3:1-6 declares the fulfillment of a deliverance for Israel that Isa 40:3-5 foretells even as John the Baptist warns that not all Jews will become recipients of this salvation (Luke 3:7-8). Again, at the end of Acts, Paul indicates that he stands on trial because of his hope in the promises that Israel will attain (Acts 26:6-7) and states that he experiences imprisonment because of this hope (Acts 28:20). In this context, however, he also harshly rebukes Jews who reject his message and scriptural interpretation (Acts 28:25-28). Thus, although Luke indicates that Jews who reject Jesus forfeit the benefits provided by his fulfillment of scriptural promises, he continues to assert that God’s positive intentions for the Jewish people remain firm.

5.4.2 Isaianic Promises in the Writings of Justin

Although Justin, like Luke, frequently cites and interprets Isaianic passages to demonstrate how Christ has fulfilled them by bringing light to the nations, he develops

---

106 Other passages exhibit a similar tension without referring to Isaianic promises. For example, in Acts 2:22-23, Peter indicates that Jews killed Jesus but also emphasizes that God raised Jesus who then sent the Spirit to Jews (cf. Acts 3:15-17, 25-26, 5:30-32).

107 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2:352-357.
his interpretation of these promises in a direction that Luke does not.\footnote{Skarsaune, \textit{Proof from Prophecy}, 348-353, suggests that Justin relies on two different strata of tradition when interpreting Isaianic promises— one that presents non-Jewish Christ-believers as true Israel (e.g., \textit{Dial.} 123.8-9, and 135.3) and another that held the view that non-Jewish Christ-believers form part of the people of God together with Christ-believing Jews (e.g., \textit{Dial.} 121.4-123.2). As Skarsaune notes, however, Justin transforms his source material in \textit{Dial.} 121.4-123.2 in an attempt to prove that Christ-believers are the true descendants of Jacob. Thus, even when Justin relies on traditions that do not attempt to prove that the church was true Israel, he harmonizes them with his own view that Christ-believers replace Jews as the true people of God. See also the interpretation of Isa 42:6-7 (49:6-7) in \textit{Barn.} 14:5-8 and the assertion that Jesus made a covenant with Christ-believers that replaces the Mosaic covenant. This latter source, like Justin, indicates that non-Jews rather than Jews become recipients of the covenant inaugurated by Christ.} By presenting Christ as the new covenant and light of the nations, he argues that only those who believe his message practice proper covenant fidelity and so embody the identity of “true Israel.” In this way, Justin attempts to depict non-Jewish Christ-believers as the rightful heirs of the scriptural promises and legacy originally designated for Jews.

\textit{Dialogue 10-12}

The interpretation of passages from Isaiah in the \textit{Dialogue} is both shaped by and contributes to the wider debate surrounding what proper covenant fidelity entails.\footnote{Although Justin provides a concentrated discussion of the Mosaic law and presents Christ as the new covenant and law in \textit{Dialogue} 10-47, he frequently returns to this theme throughout the \textit{Dialogue}. Anette Rudolph, “\textit{Denn wir sind jenes Volk...}: Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht” (Studien zur Alten Kirchengeschichte 15; Bonn: Borengässer, 1999), 228, argues that Justin presents a new universal worship of God, which is carried out by all people who believe in Christ, as the religion that the Jewish scriptures always intended for humans to practice. This theme, she argues, runs throughout \textit{Dialogue} 12-108 and is summarized again at the conclusion of the \textit{Dialogue}.} In \textit{Dial.} 10.3, Justin introduces his interaction with Trypho by having him express his surprise that Christ-believers do not observe the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law. Trypho argues that such an oversight amounts to scorning the covenant and spurning the commands of God. Accordingly, he doubts that anyone who lives in this way truly knows God: “But you, forthwith, scorn this covenant, spurn the commands that come afterwards, and then you try to convince us that you know God, when you fail to do those
things that every God-fearing person would do” (Dial. 10.4). These charges form the basis for Trypho’s approach to the Jewish scriptures; in his view, only those who observe the entire Mosaic code have a proper knowledge of God and his covenant.

In response to the concern voiced by Trypho, Justin begins his scriptural interpretation in the Dialogue by attempting to demonstrate that Christ-believers have remained faithful to the covenant and Jewish scriptures even though they do not practice the rituals prescribed in the Mosaic law. To prove this, he asserts that Christ’s fulfillment of Isaianic and other scriptural promises nullifies the need to follow the Mosaic law as it was promulgated on Horeb.

But our hope is not through Moses or through the Law, otherwise our customs would be the same as yours. Now, indeed, for I have read, Trypho, that there should be a definitive law and a covenant, more binding than all others, which now must be respected by all those who aspire to the heritage of God. The law promulgated at Horeb was obsolete, and was intended for Jews only, whereas the law of which I speak is simply for all humans. Now, a later law in opposition to an older law abrogates the older; so, too, does a later covenant void an earlier one. An everlasting and final law, Christ Himself, and a trustworthy covenant (Isa 24:5; 55:3) has been given to us, after which there shall be no law, or commandment, or precept. Have you not read these words of Isaiah: “Give ear to me, and listen to me, my people; and you kings, give ear to me: for a law shall go forth from me, and my judgment shall be a light to the nations. My just one approaches swiftly, and my savior shall go forth, and nations shall trust in my arm” (Isa 51:4-5)? Concerning this new covenant, God thus

Francis Watson, “Have you not read...?” Christians, Jews and Scripture in Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho” (The Ethel M. Wood Lecture, University of London, 3 March 2005), 1-14, maintains that these two approaches to interpreting the Jewish scriptures arise from “different rules of engagement with the texts, reflecting divergent and incommensurable systems of belief and practice” (2). Justin’s hermeneutic gives priority to a messianic reading of scripture whereas Trypho “gives absolute priority to the practice of Torah” (2). As Watson argues, neither interpretive approach explains the meaning of the Jewish scriptures in their entirety. He summarizes, “one reading gives hermeneutical priority to the law, the other to the prophets, and there are not neutral criteria for determining which of the two options is the more appropriate... What begins as an argument about a text ends by demonstrating the incommensurability of the two religious cultures” (9). Similarly, in Dial. 10.4, Trypho argues that non-Jewish Christ-believers “scorn this covenant” (ταύτας τις διαθήκες καταφρονήσατες) by not keeping the Mosaic law whereas, in Dial. 12.1-2, Justin argues that Trypho and other Jews have “dishonored this very law, and have made light of his new holy covenant” (ημιμόλοσσες τον νόμον και την κανών άγιων αυτού διαθήκης ενεπελάσατε) by rejecting the teaching that Isa 55:3-5 refers to Christ, the new covenant. Each accuses the other of unfaithfulness to the covenant even though they mean very different things when they speak of covenant fidelity.

This also forms part of Justin’s argument that Christ-believers worship the same God as Jews, an affirmation that probably represents a response to the claims of Marcion (cf. 1 Apol. 26.5-6; 58.1-2).
spoke through Jeremiah: “Behold the days shall come, says the Lord, and I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel, and with the house of Judah: not according to the covenant which I made with their fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them out of the land of Egypt” (Jer 31:21-32). 
(Dial. 11.1-3)

Here Justin joins Jer 31:31 with Isa 51:4-5 in order to present Christ as both the light of the nations and as a new law and covenant. In so doing, he attempts to show that Christ has instituted a new order which replaces observance of the Mosaic code (Dial. 11.2) and to present this new means of covenant fidelity as the proper way to gain access to the “heritage of God” (Dial. 11.2).

Subsequently, Justin aims to display the efficacy of this new order by outlining the pious behavior of non-Jewish Christ-believers:

If, therefore, God predicted that he would make a new covenant, and this for a light to the nations (Isa 42:6; 49:6), and we see and are convinced that, through the name of the crucified Jesus Christ, people have turned to God, leaving behind them idolatry and other sinful practices, and have kept the faith and have practiced piety even unto death, then everyone can clearly see from these deeds and the accompanying powerful miracles that he is indeed the New Law, the new covenant, and the expectation of those who, from every nations, have awaited the blessings of God. We have been led to God through this crucified Christ, and we are the true spiritual Israel, and the descendants of Judah, Jacob, Isaac, and Abraham, who, though uncircumcised, was approved and blessed by God because of his faith and was called the father of many nations. All this shall be proved as we proceed with our discussion. 
(Dial. 11.4-5)

According to Justin, the exemplary faith and piety of Christ-believers both demonstrates the ability of Christ to function effectively as the new law and covenant and enables them

---

112 See also the reference to and explanation of Christ as a “new covenant” in Dial. 122.5. According to Rudolph, “Denn wir sind jenes Volk,” 254, the concept of true Israel begins in Dial. 11.3 and controls the concluding section of the Dialogue, especially chapters 122-135.

113 This description stands in direct contrast to the declaration of Trypho that obeying the Mosaic law represents the universal means of pleasing God. In Dial. 10.4, Trypho indicates that performing the Mosaic law is what all those who fear God do (πράσοντες ὁ δὲ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν) whereas, in Dial. 11.1-5, Justin indicates that all who wish to become the true people of God must embrace Christ as the new law and covenant. As Kimber Buell, New Race, 109-111, observes, “Justin positions Trypho as representing a ‘particular’ way of life, linked to his ancestors (Dial. 10.1; 11.1, 3) whereas Justin claims to offer a universal and eternal law for all humans (Dial. 11.2, 4)” (110).
to become “true spiritual Israel.” For Justin, then, not only has Christ become a light for the nations; he also provides non-Jews with the means of practicing covenant fidelity and therefore of becoming heirs to the heritage and promises that God originally made to Jews (cf. Dial. 123.7-9; 135.3).

Justin also indicates that the preaching of the apostles fulfills the intended function of the Mosaic law insofar as it leads people to turn from idolatry and sin to piety and worship of the true God (1 Apol. 39.1-3; Dial. 109.1-110.3). Moreover, Justin describes this proclamation as a “second circumcision.” For example, in Dialogue 24, he portrays Christ as the new law that has proceeded from Zion (implicitly through the preaching of the apostles) and as the mediator of a new circumcision: “Another covenant, a new Law, has come out of Zion. As was taught of old, Jesus Christ circumscribes with knives of stone all those who want it, that they may become a righteous nation, a faithful, truthful, and peace-loving people” (Dial. 24.1-2). Subsequently, in Dial. 113.6-7 and 114.4-5, Justin associates this second circumcision with the capacity to understand the true meaning of the scriptures and indicates that it is administered through the preaching of the apostles:

---

114 According to Kimber Buell, New Race, 98-115, Justin identifies Christ-believers as true Israel, in part, by redefining membership within this group in terms of belief and practice, and contrasting these beliefs and practices with circumcision and adherence to other aspects of Mosaic law.

115 For citation and further discussion of these passages, see chapter four, pages 183-185.

116 The phrases “as taught of old” and “knives of stone” allude to the second circumcision that Joshua administered before the Israelites entered the land of Canaan (Josh 5:2).

117 Justin also contrasts the “true” or “second” circumcision of Christ-believers with physical circumcision (e.g., Dial. 28.3-5; 43.1-2; 92.2-4; 114.4; 137.1-2), and maintains that the latter type was administered because of the hardness of the hearts of the Jewish people (Dial. 18.2-3; 27.2; 43.1; 45.3; 46.5; 7; 47.2; 61.4; 10; 114.4). Although J. E. Morgan-Wynne, “The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr,” VC 2 (1984): 173, argues that the “second circumcision” described in Dial. 114.4 refers to the Holy Spirit, this passage clearly identifies “the words uttered by the apostles” as the administration of
Unless I comprehend the operation of his *Logos*, I shall not understand the [scriptural] passage. Then I would be like your teachers, who imagine that the Father of the universe, the unbegotten God, has hands and feet and fingers and a soul like a compound creature. As a result of this belief, they claim that the Father appeared to Abraham and Jacob [i.e., they do not understand that scripture refers to the *Logos* in these passages]. We who have received the second circumcision with stone knives are indeed happy. For your first circumcision was and still is administered by iron instruments, in keeping with your hardness of heart. But our circumcision, which is the second, for it was instituted after yours, circumcises us from idolatry and every other sin by means of sharp stones, namely, by the words uttered by the apostles of him who was the Cornerstone and the Stone not cut with human hands. Indeed, our hearts have been so circumcised from sin that we even rejoice as we die for the name of that noble Rock . . . . But you fail to grasp the meaning of my words, because you do not know the things which, it was foretold, Christ would do, nor do you believe us when we refer you to the scriptures.

(Dial. 114.4-5)

By presenting the message of the apostles as a proclamation of a new law from Zion and as a “second circumcision” that produces repentance from error, sin, and idolatry, Justin shows their preaching and scriptural interpretation, and its positive reception, to be the fulfillment of Isaianic promises.\(^{118}\) Beyond simply receiving the illumination that Isaiah foretells, however, non-Jews who believe the message of the apostles gain access to a form of covenant membership that replaces the Mosaic law.

---

this “second circumcision.” There is also no reference to the Spirit in Dial. 114.4 but only a reference to “living water” which Wynne takes as a depiction of the Holy Spirit.

\(^{118}\) Moreover, by contrasting this new status of Christ-believers with the failure of Jews to understand the Jewish scriptures, Justin also associates this second circumcision with the mediation of a correct understanding of the Jewish scriptures (cf. I Apol. 49.5: 50.12; Dial. 53.5-6; 76.6-7). Note that Justin also links Christian baptism with new circumcision and illumination. In Dial. 14.1-2, Justin associates baptism with repentance, the knowledge of God, and Christian piety; in Dial. 43.1-2, he indicates that spiritual circumcision occurs through baptism; and in I Apol. 61.12-13; and 65.1, he connects baptism with illumination, the understanding of truth, observance of the law (presumably not the Mosaic law), and eternal salvation. L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), 140-141, suggests that the link between baptism and illumination in I Apol. 61.12-13 follows concepts from Heb 4:4; 10:32; 2 Cor 4:4; Eph 1:18; 2 Tim 1:10 but notes that Justin is apparently the first to use the noun φωτισμός. He maintains that Justin believed that at baptism people were enlightened with the *Logos* which would enable them to live a pious life; cf. Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 266. William S. Kurz, “The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976), 240-242, suggests that, through his use of enlightenment language (φωτισμός; φωτίζω), Justin links baptism with the understanding that the Christ-believer receives the fulfillment of Isa 49:6. Allert, *Revelation*, 243-248, argues the illumination that Justin associates with baptism relates to catechetical teaching and the special ability to understand the Jewish scriptures; cf. E. Ferguson, “Baptismal Motifs in the Ancient Church,” *RestQ* 7 (1963): 202-216; S. G. Hall, *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), 16-17.
In the section of the *Dialogue* that Justin devotes to a description of the true people of God (109-140), he reiterates that Christ became the new covenant and law and so provides illumination for the nations (cf. Isa 49:6; 42:6-7). As in the beginning of his discussion with Trypho, Justin again states that the repentance, faith, and piety of Christ-believers represents the new way of being faithful to the Jewish scriptures and the God of Israel (*Dial.* 121.1-4; cf. *Dial.* 11.4; cf. 12.1-3; 14.2-3). He characterizes Christ-believers as those “who obey the precepts of Christ” (*Dial.* 123.9) and argues that this obedience represents proper covenant fidelity. Whereas Trypho and other Jews purport to mediate light to their proselytes through their interpretation of the Mosaic law, Justin concludes that they could not possibly provide illumination for non-Jews because they fail to comprehend the true intent of the law (*Dial.* 123.2-3; cf. Isa 29:14). They neither teach nor embody covenant faithfulness because they do not recognize how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures (*Dial.* 122.1-6; cf. *Dial.* 11.4-5; 12.1-3).

---

119 See further discussion of *Dialogue* 121-123 in chapter four, pages 179-182, 188-190.

120 As Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 360-363, notes, Justin presents Christ as the new law because, in his view, “he accomplishes the most important function of the Law . . . *He turns men from idolatry and iniquity to worship of God and a pious life*” (363). According to Skarsaune, Justin argues that the piety of Christ-believers finds expression in their refusal to practice idolatry (*Dial.* 18.2-3; 110.2-4) which, in Justin’s view, stands in contrast to a Jewish hardness and proneness to idolatry (e.g., *Dial.* 34.7-8; 46.6; 92.3-4; 93.1-4; 130.4; 131.2). Justin also presents the piety and repentance of Christ-believers as the observance of a new Sabbath and the circumcision of the heart as the replacement of observance of the ritual requirements of the Mosaic law (e.g., *Dial.* 12.3; 14.3; 18.2; 24.1-2; 26.1; 28.2-3; 43.1-2; 92.4; 113.1-114.5).

121 Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 363, argues that these descriptions of the piety and obedience of Christ-believers demonstrate that Christ-believers keep all the requirements of the law except the ritual commandments. He notes that the terms τεοδεσία, θεοδεσία and their cognates are often used in Hellenistic Jewish writings (especially 4 Maccabees and Josephus) to describe law-abiding Jews and suggests that Justin uses these terms to depict Christ-believers in a similar way (see, e.g., *Dial.* 11.4; 47.5; 91.3; 93.2; 110.2-3; 131.2).
Finally, in *Dialogue* 123, Justin concludes his exposition of Isa 49:6 and 42:6-7 by providing the natural corollary of his presentation of Christ as the new covenant and law: those who receive enlightenment through him become the true people of God. In this passage, he joins three citations —Jer 31:27, Isa 19:24-25, and Ezek 36:12 — in order to argue that God has raised up “another Israel” in the place of Jews, who have misunderstood the will and covenant of God:

For this reason he says: “I will raise up to Israel and Judah a human seed and a seed of beasts” (Jer 31:27). And through Isaiah he speaks thus of another Israel: “In that day shall Israel be third among the Assyrians and the Egyptians, blessed in the land which the Lord of Hosts blessed, saying: ‘Blessed shall my people be which is in Egypt, and which are among the Assyrians, and my inheritance is Israel’” (Isaiah 19:24-25). Since God blesses and calls this people Israel, and announces aloud that it is his inheritance, why do you not feel compunction both for fooling yourselves and imagining that you alone are the people of Israel. . . Indeed, when he spoke to Jerusalem and the surrounding communities, he said: “And I will beget people upon you, my people Israel, and they shall inherit you, and you shall be their inheritance, and you shall no more be bereaved by them of children” (Ezek 36:12). (Dial. 123.5-6)

Although the precise meaning of this passage is not entirely clear, the question that Trypho asks in *Dial.* 123.7 elucidates the intent of Justin’s argument: “Are you Israel and does he speak these things about you?” In response to this question, Justin provides an interpretation of Isa 42:1-4 that aims to demonstrate that those who have been illuminated by Christ become true Israel:

Again, in Isaiah, if you have ears to hear it, God, speaking of Christ in parable, calls him Jacob and Israel. Thus it says: “Israel is my servant, I will uphold him; Israel is my elect, I will place my Spirit upon him, and he shall bring forth judgment

---

122 Commenting on Justin’s use of Jer 31:27, Prigent, *l’Ancien Testament*, 296, suggests that Justin depicts a division of the Jewish people: “Notre auteur entend evidemment qu’Israël va se scinder den deux: les chretiens sont la descendance humaine, les betes ce sont les juifs”; cf. Isa 1:2-4 in *Apol.* 37.1-2. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 351, suggests that Justin intends Isa 19:24-25 to refer to an “Israel” that does not consist of Jews. He also argues that the reference to Ezek 36:12 ought to be interpreted in light of the use of Isa 65:9 in *Dial.* 136.2. This latter passage implies a rejection of Israel and the inheritance of another “seed of Jacob.”

123 Cf. *Dial.* 125.3-5, where Justin argues that the name Israel referred to the pre-existent Christ who blessed Jacob by giving him his own name. See also *Dial.* 134.6 where Justin repeats that “Israel has been demonstrated to be the Christ.”
for the nations. He will not strive nor cry out, nor shall anyone hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed he will not break and a smoldering wick he will not put out, but he will bring forth judgment to truth. And he shall shine and shall not be crushed until he places judgment on the earth. And in his name the nations shall hope" (Isa 42:1-4).  

Therefore, as from that one person Jacob, who was also called Israel, all of your nation has been designated Jacob and Israel; so we from Christ, who begot us to God, as also Jacob and Israel and Judah and Joseph and David, we are called and are true children of God, who keep the commandments of Christ. (Dial. 123.8-9)

Earlier, in Dial. 122.1-123.4, Justin argues that Isa 42:6-7 refers to Christ as the new covenant and law, but in Dial. 123.8-9 he asserts that Isa 42:1-4 refers to Christ as Israel. Since Christ is Israel, he deduces, those who are begotten by Christ and keep his commandments partake of this identity too. Thus, for Justin, non-Jews who believe in Jesus not only experience the illumination of the nations that Isaiah promises; they also become true Israel because they are descendants of Christ.

Summary

Both Luke and Justin appeal to Isaianic promises to indicate that the correct understanding of the scriptures and message of God represents the realization of a promised end-time illumination, but they develop their explanations of how Christ-believers become the recipients of this type of promise in different ways. Luke presents Jewish Christ-believers as recipients of Isaianic promises related to the restoration of

---

124 Regarding the two different versions of Isa 42:1-4 that Justin quotes in Dial. 123.8-9 and 135.1-3, and their relative dependence upon Matt 12:18b-20a, see Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 60-61; cf. Prigent, L' Ancien Testament, 297-298. Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 187-188, also notes that the allusions to Jer 31:27 and Ezek 36:12 (Dial. 123.5-6) recur in Dial. 135.4-136.2, a passage that focuses on the exegesis of Isa 65:8-12 and attempts to demonstrate that Christ-believers are the legitimate seed of Jacob.

125 Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 187-188, 349-353, argues that a number of translations overlook the òç that introduces the phrase “Jacob and Israel and Judah and Joseph and David” (Dial. 123.9) and notes that this passage does not say explicitly that Christ-believers are Israel. The passage nevertheless strongly implies this by indicating that Christ-believers have attained the same status as Jacob and Israel. Note also that Justin elsewhere explicitly identifies Christ-believers as “true Israel” and “the true Israelite race” (Dial. 11.5; 135.3).

126 In Dial. 135.1-3, Justin also cites Isa 42:1-4 as part of his argument that “Jacob” and “Israel” in this passage refer to Christ and Christ-believers.
Israel and non-Jews as recipients of the promised enlightenment of the nations. Moreover, even when he describes a contrast between Jews who reject the message of Jesus and non-Jews who accept it, Luke does not portray non-Jews as the recipients of scriptural promises originally made to Jews. By way of contrast, Justin indicates that Christ and his message bring about the promised illumination of the nations because they fulfill the intended function of the Mosaic law. Through their faith in Christ, non-Jewish Christ-believers practice proper covenant fidelity and so become the rightful heirs of the identity and scriptural heritage of Israel.

5.5 The Promise of the Spirit

In the same way that Luke and Justin portray repentance and correct understanding of the scriptures as defining characteristics of Christ-believers, so they present the Spirit as a gift that all who believe in Jesus possess. Furthermore, both also depict the gift(s) of the Spirit as the realization of scriptural promises. Nevertheless, whereas Luke presents the descent of the Spirit upon Jews and non-Jews as the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Israel and the nations, respectively, Justin depicts a transfer of the Spirit from the Jewish people to non-Jews.

5.5.1 The Promise of the Spirit in Luke-Acts

For Luke, as we have seen, the activity of the Spirit empowers Jesus to function as the agent through whom God’s promises for the Jewish people would be realized (Luke 4:16-21). Like Matthew and Mark, he reports that the Spirit descended upon Jesus
at his baptism and in this context alludes to scriptural passages in order to portray him as the Spirit-anointed messiah, or prophetic deliverer, of Israel (Luke 3:21-22; cf. Mark 1:9-11; Matt 3:13-17). Yet Luke also highlights the activity of the Spirit more than the other synoptic gospel writers by indicating that Jesus returned from his wilderness experience “in the power of the Spirit” (Luke 4:14), and by having Jesus declare that the Spirit empowered him to announce and effect a long-awaited Jubilee release of God’s people (Luke 4:16-31; cf. Isa 61:1-2; 58:6; Lev 25:8-12).

At the end of his gospel and the opening chapters of Acts, Luke depicts the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples as a continuation of the work of the Spirit that began with Jesus (Acts 1:5; cf. Luke 3:16), and as the further realization of scriptural promises for Jews. In this context, Luke has Jesus tell the disciples that he will send “the promise of the Father” upon them. He instructs them to wait “until you are clothed with power from on high (ἐως οὗ ἐνδύσῃ ἐξ ὑψους δύναμιν),” a phrase that recalls LXX Isa 32:15 (ἐως ἀν ἐπέλθη ἐφ’ ὕμας πνεῦμα ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ) and refers to the imminent outpouring of the Spirit (Luke 24:49). Similarly, in Acts 1:4-8, the Lukan Jesus


129 Compare Mark 1:14a and Matt 4:12. Also, when Peter later recounts the ministry of Jesus, he does so by explaining how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and power (Acts 10:38).


reiterates that the disciples should wait in Jerusalem “for the promise of the Father” (Acts 1:5), refers to this gift as the descent of the Spirit (Acts 1:5; cf. Luke 3:16), and associates the empowerment of the Spirit with the fulfillment of Isa 49:6 (Acts 1:8). For Luke, the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples represents part of the fulfillment of God’s promises to restore the Jewish people. In the words of Darrell Bock, “the Spirit’s coming represents the inauguration of the kingdom blessing promised by the Father in the OT.”

In an even more pointed way, on the day of Pentecost, the Lukan Peter indicates that the first outpouring of the Spirit upon the disciples represents the dawning of the eschatological age and the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Jews:

But Peter, standing with the eleven, raised his voice and addressed them, “Men of Judea and all who live in Jerusalem, let this be known to you, and listen to what I say. For these men are not drunk, as you suppose, since it is only the third hour of the day; no, this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel: ‘And in the last days (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) it shall 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 shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall


dream dreams; even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.\footnote{The phrase καὶ προφητεύουσιν at the end of Acts 2:18 does not occur in LXX Joel 3:2. Fitzmyer, \textit{Acts}, 253, suggests that Luke added this phrase to depict the gift of the Spirit as prophetic utterance and to link it to the inspired speech described in Acts 2:4. He also suggests that the phrase is omitted in D and the \textit{Vetus Latina} because of haplography but notes the argument of P. R. Rogers, "Acts 2:18, καὶ προφητεύουσιν." \textit{JTS} \textbf{38} (1987): 95-97, that the version with the phrase omitted is more original. Barrett, \textit{Acts}, 1:137, also suggests that Luke probably added καὶ προφητεύουσιν. For further discussion of the addition of this phrase and Luke's presentation of the gift of the Spirit in Acts as a prophetic empowerment, see Turner, \textit{Power}, 270-272, 352-356.} And I will show portents in the heaven above and signs on the earth below, blood, and fire, and smoky mist. The sun shall be turned to darkness and the moon to blood, before the coming of the Lord's great and glorious day. Then everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved.\footnote{Pao, \textit{Isaianic Exodus}, 158, suggests that the phrase εν ταις εσχαταις ἡμεραις alludes to Isa 2:2; cf. Bruce, \textit{Acts}, 121. A number of scholars suggest that this phrase gives the entire citation from LXX Joel 3 an eschatological orientation. See, e.g., Fitzmyer, \textit{Acts}, 252; Marshall, \textit{Acts}, 73; Barrett, \textit{Acts}, 1:136; Johnson, \textit{Acts}, 49; Carroll, \textit{End of History}, 132. Haenchen, \textit{Acts}, 179, argues that μετὰ ταῦτα is the original form of citation (found in manuscripts B and 076) and concludes that this phrase is most consistent with Lukan theology; cf. idem, "Schriftzitate und Textübelieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," \textit{ZTK} \textbf{51} (1954): 162. Others suggest that the phrase εν ταις εσχαταις ἡμεραις corresponds to post-apostolic thought and therefore should not be considered as Lukan. See, e.g., Rese, \textit{Alttestamentlich Motive}, 51-52; cf. Traugott Holtz, \textit{Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas} (TU 104; Berlin: Academie-Verlag, 1968), 7-8. Nevertheless, the textual evidence more strongly supports εν ταις εσχαταις ἡμεραις (N A D). For further discussion of this and other textual adaptations to the citation of LXX Joel 3:1-4 in Acts 2:17-21, see Rese, \textit{Alttestamentlich Motive}, 46-55; Bock, \textit{Proclamation}, 157-168; Barrett, \textit{Acts}, 1:136-139.} (Acts 2:14-21; cf. LXX Joel 3:1-4)

By exchanging the phrase μετὰ ταῦτα in LXX Joel 3:1 for εν ταις εσχαταις ἡμεραις in Acts 2:17,\footnote{The repetition of ἡ ἐπαγγελία in Acts 2:39 links this statement with the earlier references to the promise of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4-5; 2:33). So Bock, \textit{Acts}, 144. As Barrett, \textit{Acts}, 1:155, notes, however, the reference to ἡ ἐπαγγελία may also refer more widely to God's covenant with his people and his faithfulness to it; cf. Bruce, \textit{Acts}, 130. Fitzmyer, \textit{Acts}, 266, also suggests that Acts 2:39 may refer to the promise that God would give his Spirit to his people in a new sense (e.g., Ezek 36:26-27; 37:14). Franklin, \textit{Christ the Lord}, 98-99, understands Acts 2:39 as a text that addresses the renewal of Israel that} Luke depicts the descent of the Spirit as an end-time phenomenon in which all members of the Jewish nation – the young and old, slaves and free, men and women – would participate. Subsequently, in Acts 2:39a, Luke reiterates that the Jewish people would receive the promise of the Spirit and of forgiveness of sins, by having Peter state: "the promise is for you and for your children."\footnote{The repetition of ἡ ἐπαγγελία in Acts 2:39 links this statement with the earlier references to the promise of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4-5; 2:33). So Bock, \textit{Acts}, 144. As Barrett, \textit{Acts}, 1:155, notes, however, the reference to ἡ ἐπαγγελία may also refer more widely to God's covenant with his people and his faithfulness to it; cf. Bruce, \textit{Acts}, 130. Fitzmyer, \textit{Acts}, 266, also suggests that Acts 2:39 may refer to the promise that God would give his Spirit to his people in a new sense (e.g., Ezek 36:26-27; 37:14). Franklin, \textit{Christ the Lord}, 98-99, understands Acts 2:39 as a text that addresses the renewal of Israel that} Both the Jewish audience of Peter and subsequent generations of Jews were the intended recipients of this gift.
Luke also attributes the descent of the Spirit to the fulfillment of Davidic promises. In Acts 2:33, the Lukan Peter explains that Jesus poured out the Spirit after he was exalted to the right hand of the Father: “Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this that you both see and hear” (Acts 2:33), a description that links the enthronement of Christ with the outpouring of the Spirit that Peter has already explained in Acts 2:14-21. In this context, moreover, Peter declares that God raised Jesus from the dead in fulfillment of promises made regarding a Davidic messiah (Acts 2:23-32; cf. LXX Ps 15:8-11; 131:11; 2 Sam 7:12-13) and identifies Jesus as “the Lord” about whom LXX Ps 109:1 speaks (Acts 2:34-35). Luke thus has Peter demonstrate from scripture that

will lead to the inclusion of non-Jews; cf. Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 347; Bock, *Proclamation*, 167, 210. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 231-232, argues that Luke intentionally excludes the part of LXX Joel 3:5 that refers to the restoration of Zion and Jerusalem in order to emphasize the inclusion of non-Jews. The citation of LXX Joel 3:5 in Acts 2:39, however, removes the phrase “those who are on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem” and replaces it with the phrase “you and your children, and all those who are far off.” In other words, Luke does not remove the emphasis upon the fulfillment of LXX Joel 3:1-5 for Jews but rephrases the prophecy so that it applies to the Jewish audience of Peter in a specific way; cf. Dupont, *Salvation*, 22-23.


138 The wording of the citation of LXX Ps 15:8-11 in Acts 2:25-28 is exact and the wording of the citation of LXX Ps 131:11 in Acts 2:30-31 is close to the LXX. The latter passage also alludes to 2 Sam 7:12-13.


Besides presenting the descent of the Spirit as the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Jews in Acts 2:17-39, Luke appears to foreshadow the bestowal of the Spirit upon all peoples. For example, in Acts 2:17, he has Peter declare that, in fulfillment of the words of the prophet Joel, God would pour out his Spirit "upon all flesh" (Acts 2:17;
cf. LXX Joel 3:1) and that “everyone who calls upon the name of the Lord shall be saved” (Acts 2:21; cf. LXX Joel 3:5a). Again, in Acts 2:39b, the Lukan Peter alludes to Joel 3:5b in his announcement that the Spirit and forgiveness of sins would also benefit “all who are far away, everyone whom the Lord our God calls to him” (Acts 2:39b; cf. LXX Joel 3:5b; Isa 57:19). Although these references do not clearly indicate that non-Jews would receive the Spirit, a number of commentators conclude that Luke alludes to LXX Joel 3:5b in Acts 2:39b, together with Isa 57:19 (τοῖς μακρῶν), in order to affirm the inclusion of all peoples. If this is Luke’s intention, his use of LXX Joel 3 surely departs from its original context, which describes eschatological blessing for Israel and punishment for the nations (Joel 3-4). Nevertheless, even here, Luke does not transform LXX Joel 3:1-5 so as to apply promises originally made to Jews to non-Jews. Instead, he uses this passage to emphasize that God has acted to restore the Jewish people while concomitantly alluding to a future inclusion of non-Jews.

When Luke turns to an explicit narration of the inclusion of the first non-Jews, he attempts to demonstrate their full acceptance by God, in part, by presenting the first descent of the Spirit upon this group as an experience equivalent to the first descent of the Spirit.

---

142 Compare Acts 2:39b (πάσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρῶν Ὀσους ἐν προσκαλέσθαι κύριος ὁ θεός ημῶν) with LXX Joel 3:5b (οἷς κύριος προσκέκληται).
Spirit upon Jewish disciples.\textsuperscript{144} Indeed, the numerous connections that Luke draws between the two episodes (Acts 2 and 10-11) lead a number of scholars to conclude that Luke portrays the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as a “Gentile Pentecost.”\textsuperscript{145} He describes the effects of the outpouring of the Spirit as inspired speech in a manner that recalls the Pentecost experience (Acts 10:46),\textsuperscript{146} and indicates that Cornelius and his household received “the same gift of the Holy Spirit” that the first disciples received (Acts 10:45; cf. 11:17).\textsuperscript{147} Furthermore, Luke has Peter voice the following conclusions about this event: “these people . . . have received the Holy Spirit just as we have” (Acts 10:47),\textsuperscript{148} “the Holy Spirit fell upon them just as it had upon us at the beginning” (Acts 11:15; cf. 15:8), and “God . . . testified to them by giving them the Holy Spirit, just as he did to us” (Acts 15:8).\textsuperscript{149} Within Luke’s story, these descriptions

\textsuperscript{144} Although some would identify the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch as the first conversion of a non-Jew, Luke presents the conversion of Cornelius and his household as the first inclusion of non-Jews (Acts 15:14).


\textsuperscript{148} Johnson, \textit{Acts}, 194, suggests that the phrase ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς in Acts 10:47 is the key premise which demonstrates the common experience of the Spirit by the disciples in Acts 2 and the new believers in Acts 10. Witherington, \textit{Socio-Rhetorical Commentary}, 360, argues that the phrase does not necessarily mean that the phenomenon of tongues was identical in both Acts 2 and 10, but only that the same Spirit was received. Barrett, \textit{Acts} 1:116, also maintains that the inspired speech may have had different forms.

\textsuperscript{149} The phrase θεός ἑμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς διὸ τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ ἀγίου in Acts 15:8 may indicate that God testified to non-Jews by giving them the Holy Spirit; that is, he provided evidence for them by giving them the Spirit. So Parsons and Culy, \textit{Acts}, 288-289; cf. \textit{BDAG}, 618. Alternatively, the phrase could mean that God showed his approval of non-Jews by giving them the Spirit. For example, the New Jerusalem Bible translates the phrase as “God . . . showed his approval of them by giving the Holy Spirit” and the New King James Version has “God . . . acknowledged them by giving them the Holy Spirit.” For this latter
of the action of the Spirit upon non-Jews serve to legitimate their entrance to the Christ-believing group; that the Spirit descended upon non-Jewish Christ-believers in the same way as it did upon Jewish Christ-believers verifies that the equal inclusion of the former group occurred at God’s initiative (Acts 10:47-48; 11:17; 15:8). Luke thus establishes the experience of the Spirit as part of the new basis for membership within the Christ-believing community.¹⁵⁰

Although Luke clearly presents the first descents of the Spirit upon Jews and non-Jews as parallel episodes (Acts 2 and 10), he does not use the same scriptural passages to portray these two events as the fulfillment of God’s plan. In Acts 2, he presents the descent of the Spirit upon Jews as the fulfillment of scriptural promises for Israel (LXX Joel 3:1-5; Ps 15:8-11; 131:11; 2 Sam 7:12-13) but, in the context of the Apostolic council in Acts 15, he depicts the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as the realization of God’s promise to enable non-Jews to seek him:

Simeon¹⁵¹ has related how God first looked favorably on the Gentiles, to take from among them a people for his name (ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέπτατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἔθνων λαόν τῷ ὄντῳ τούτῳ). This agrees with the words of the prophets, as it is written, “After this I will return (μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω), and I will rebuild the tent of David (τὴν σκηνήν Δαυίδ), which has fallen; from its ruins I will rebuild it, and I will set it up (ἀνακοσμεῖσα καὶ ἀναρθώσω αὐτήν),¹⁵² so that (ὅπως) all other peoples may seek the Lord -- even all the Gentiles over whom my name has been called. Thus says the Lord, who has been making these things known from long ago.”¹⁵³ (Acts 15:14-18)

¹⁵⁰ Johnson, Acts, 198; Witherington, Socio-Rhetorical Commentary, 360-361; Barrett, Acts, 1:494-495, 533-534; Bruce, Acts, 264, 270. Peter views the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as evidence that he should affirm their full inclusion in the Christ-believing community through baptism (Acts 10:47-48).

¹⁵¹ “Simeon” is the name that James uses for Peter in this account.

¹⁵² The phrase ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνακοσμεῖσα αὐτήν in Amos 9:11b is here changed to ἀνακοσμεῖσα καὶ ἀναρθώσω αὐτήν.

¹⁵³ Lake and Cadbury, Beginnings, 4:176, suggest that the variations in the citation of LXX Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:15-18 are small, but others attribute a number of these changes to allusions to other
This passage describes a Davidic restoration, even as Acts 2 also does (Acts 2:22-36). Here, however, Luke has James cite and interpret LXX Amos 9:11-12, a passage that anticipates both the rebuilding of “the tent of David” (ἡ σκηνὴ Δαυὶδ) and the resulting inclusion of non-Jews.¹⁵⁴

Scholars frequently discuss two issues that are closely related to this interpretation of LXX Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15. First, in Acts 15:14, Luke has James refer to Cornelius and his household as λαὸς τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ. Since Luke elsewhere uses λαὸς to refer to Jews as the people of God,¹⁵⁵ some conclude that λαὸς τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ in this context extends the identity, or covenant status, of Israel to non-Jews.¹⁵⁶ Others

¹⁵⁴ Compare the MT of Amos 9:12 which depicts the subjugation, rather than the inclusion, of non-Jews (לָאוֹן יִירֵשׁ אֶת־שָׁאוֹר אָרוֹם הָאָרֹם אֵשֶׁר לְשָׁו אָשֶׁר לְשָׁו שֶם יְהוָה נַפְס הָיוֹת לְשָׁו) with the LXX (ὁ λαὸς ἐκείνων οἱ καταλύοντα πᾶν ἅπασαν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ᾽ οὐς ἐπικέκληται τὸ δύναμα μου ἐπὶ αὐτούς λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα). The LXX version of Amos 9:11-12, in particular, serves Luke’s (James’) purpose because of its depiction of the inclusion of non-Jews.


¹⁵⁶ Johnson, Acts, 264: “By having God choose ‘a people’ from among Gentiles he suggests both an extension of the meaning of ‘Israel’ defined in terms of faith rather than in terms of ethnic or ritual allegiance, and a claim for the continuity of the Gentile mission with biblical history” (264). Similarly, Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 168-169, argues that ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ derives from the phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὐς ἐπικέκληται τὸ δύναμα μου ἐπὶ αὐτούς (LXX Amos 9:12) and expresses the ownership of God, which in the Jewish scriptures usually refers to Israel, the people over whom the name of YHWH is invoked (Deut 28:10; 2 Chron 7:14; Jer 14:9; Dan 9:19; cf. Isa 43:7). By contrast, non-Jews are those over whom his name is not invoked (Isa 63:19). Bauckham suggests that the prediction of LXX Amos 9:11-12 and this concept of ownership has the effect of extending Israel’s covenant status and privilege to the nations; cf. Adna, “James’ Position,” 149-150.
suggest instead that Luke uses the term λαός in a more generic way in Acts 15:14. In this case, the phrase ο θεός ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἑθνῶν λαόν τῷ ὄνυματι αὐτοῦ would not designate Cornelius and his household as a distinct cultural unit that replaces Israel. 157 To be sure, the phrase explains that God chose a group of non-Jews as his special possession, and this action parallels his selection and ownership of Israel. Nevertheless, neither Acts 15:14-21 nor LXX Amos 9:11-12 equate the status of non-Jews as the possession of God with a change in their identity or covenant status. Rather than seeking to present non-Jews as Israel, Luke has Peter and James assert that they become recipients of the end-time blessings of God as non-Jews. 158 Furthermore, since the point of the argument and the apostolic decree in Acts 15 is that non-Jews need not change their status or identity as non-Jews to become part of the Christ-believing community, it


from LXX Amos 9:11-12; since Luke elsewhere uses \( \text{ανιστημι} \) to describe the resurrection of Christ or his status as the prophet like Moses (see, e.g., Luke 16:31; 18:33; 24:7, 46; Acts 2:24, 32; 3:22, 26; 7:37; 10:41; 17:3, 31), the use of \( \text{ανοικοδομησω} \) rather than \( \text{αναστησω} \) may suggest that Luke did not here wish to refer to Christ or his resurrection. Still, the subsequent replacement of \( \text{ανοικοδομησω αυτην} \) (LXX Amos 9:11b) with \( \text{ανορθωσω αυτην} \) (Acts 15:16b) may evoke the image of the establishment of David’s throne. The prevalence of the descriptions of Christ as the Davidic king and messiah elsewhere in Luke-Acts (e.g., Luke 1:32, 68-71; Acts 2:22-36) also makes it difficult to exclude the possibility that “the tent of David” refers in some way to the establishment of Christ as Davidic messiah and king in Acts 15:16-18. Moreover, as Max Turner aptly concludes, the restoration of David’s rule and of Israel are virtually inseparable since the establishment of a Davidic king for Israel would include the restoration of Israel itself.\(^{166}\)


\(^{164}\) See the use of \( \text{ανορθωσω} \) in LXX Sam 7:13, 16, 26; 1 Chron 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10.

\(^{165}\) Dupont, “Je rebâtirai,” 19-32, and Strauss, Davidic Messiah, 185-192, conclude that the rebuilding of “the tent of David” refers to the Christ event on the basis of the following arguments: 1) In the Amos context, the phrase \( \text{την σκηνην Δαυιδ την πετωκουν} \) probably serves as a metaphor for the weakness of the Davidic dynasty; 2) 4QFlor 1:12-13 cites Amos 9:11 and portrays the fallen tent of David as “he that shall arise to save Israel”; 3) the change from \( \text{ανοικοδομησω αυτην} \) in the latter phrase of LXX Amos 9:11 to \( \text{ανορθωσω αυτην} \) in Acts 15:16 recalls the establishment of David’s throne in LXX Sam 7:13, 16, 26; 1 Chron 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10; cf. Isa 16:5); 4) the emphasis upon Jesus’ fulfillment of 2 Sam 7:13-14 elsewhere in Luke-Acts (e.g., Acts 2:25-36; 13:23, 32-37). For further discussion and analysis of the differing views regarding the referent of “the tent of David” in Acts 15:16, see Turner, Power, 313-315.

\(^{166}\) Turner, Power, 313-315.
The likelihood that "the tent of David" refers in some way to the Christ-believing community has important repercussions for our interpretation of Acts 15:14-21. If the phrase serves as a metaphor for the restoration of Israel, as some scholars argue, Acts 15:14-21 would indicate that Jews who believe in Jesus represent the rebuilt "tent of David" and non-Jewish Christ-believers the nations who seek the Lord as a result of this Jewish restoration.  

Alternatively, if "the tent of David" refers to the reconstitution of a new group, then the phrase would serve as a reference to both Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers. This latter interpretation, however, seems improbable since both Acts 15:16 and LXX Amos 9:11 depict "the tent of David" as an entity that remains distinct from the nations. To suggest that non-Jews form a part of the rebuilt "tent of David" makes the subsequent description of non-Jews who seek the Lord as a result of this rebuilding redundant. The phrase "the tent of David" therefore probably refers to Jewish Christ-believers, or possibly to the Jerusalem church. Accordingly, Jews who believe in Jesus become heirs to the part of the promise of LXX Amos 9:11-12 that describes the rebuilding of "the tent of David" whereas non-Jews who believe in Jesus, such as Cornelius and his household, become heirs to the part of the promise that depicts the inclusion of the non-Jews.

---

167 The use of ὃνωκ in Acts 15:17 (cf. LXX Amos 9:12) indicates that the rebuilding of "the tent of David" took place in order that the rest of humankind might seek the Lord.

5.5.2 The Promise of the Spirit in the Writings of Justin

The descriptions of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus in the *Dialogue* contain a number of elements that also occur in the gospel of Luke. According to both authors, the Holy Spirit descended upon Jesus in the form (εἴδει) of a dove immediately after his water-baptism (Luke 3:22; *Dial.* 88.3, 8)\(^{169}\) and a voice from heaven pronounced the words ‘you are my son’ (Luke 3:22; *Dial.* 88.8).\(^{170}\) Moreover, the prominence that Justin gives to the “powers” (δυνάμεις) of the Spirit (*Dial.* 87.2, 3, 4; 88.1, 2) resembles Luke’s emphasis upon the power of the Spirit in the ministry of Jesus,\(^{171}\) and both Luke and Justin link the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus with the fulfillment of scriptural prophecy (Luke 4:18-21 [Isa 61:1-2; 58:6]; *Dial.* 87.2 [Isa 11:1-3]). Thus, even though Justin appears to draw upon more than one source to describe the baptism of Jesus,\(^{172}\) he tells

\(^{169}\) In *Dial.* 88.3, Justin also indicates that the “memoirs of the apostles” record that the Spirit took the shape of a dove. See also Mark 1:10; Matt 3:16.


\(^{171}\) Luke stresses the “power” of Jesus’ ministry and links it more closely to the anointing of the Spirit than do the other Synoptic accounts. For example, Jesus returns from his wilderness temptations “in the power of the Spirit” (Luke 4:14; compare Mark 1:14a and Matt 4:12); the Spirit empowers Jesus’ ministry (Luke 4:18-19, 36; compare Mark 6:1-6a and Matt 13:53-58, where the “powers” of Jesus are mentioned); power (presumably from the Spirit) goes out of Jesus and heals people (Luke 5:17; 6:19; 8:46; compare Mark 3:10 and Matt 9:21; 14:36); Peter recounts Jesus’ ministry by explaining how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power (Acts 10:38).

\(^{172}\) As Graham N. Stanton, “The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr” in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn* (eds. Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton; Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2004), 324, notes, Justin draws upon a non-Synoptic tradition when he recounts that a fire was kindled in the Jordan at the baptism of Jesus (*Dial.* 88.3).
the same basic story as Luke, and even emphasizes some elements that are unique, among
the Gospel accounts, to the Lukan narrative.173

Despite the similarity between their descriptions of the descent of the Spirit upon
Jesus, Luke and Justin do not portray this event and its effects in an entirely congruent
manner. Whereas Luke has Jesus cite LXX Isa 61:1-2 (cf. 58:6) to demonstrate how the
Spirit empowered him for ministry, Justin has Trypho cite LXX Isa 11:1-3 in order to
challenge the pre-existent identity of Jesus:174

Explain to me the following words of Isaiah: “There shall come forth a rod out of
the root of Jesse . . . the spirit of God shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and
understanding, the spirit of counsel and fortitude, the spirit of knowledge and piety;
and he shall be filled with the spirit of the fear of the Lord” (Isa 11:1-3). Now you
have admitted (he said) that these words were spoken of Christ, who, you claim,
already existed as God, and, becoming incarnate by the will of God, was born of a
virgin. This, then, is my question: How can you prove that Christ already existed,
suggests, however, that the link between the Spirit and fire in the account of Jesus’ baptism may be drawn
from the Q tradition (Matt 3:11; Luke 3:16). See also Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 199, who posits
that Justin harmonized the synoptic accounts but also used a non-synoptic source in his description of the
baptism of Jesus.173 Perhaps it is also significant that neither Luke nor Justin explicitly report that John baptized

174 Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 274-275, suggests that the citation of Isa 11:1 and 11:2 as
well as the description of Christ as the recipient and sender of the Spirit in Dialogue 39 and 87 closely
parallel T. Lev. 18:6-7 and T. Jud. 24:2-3. By evoking a number of scriptural references to the restoration
of Israel (e.g., Num 24:17; Mal 4:2; Zech 12:10; Joel 2:28-29) when describing the descent of the Spirit
upon Jesus, T. Jud. 24 appears to assume continuity between this event and the fulfillment of God’s
promises for Israel. T. Lev. 18.6-9 recounts a similar version of the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus at his
baptism, but some versions of this text (manuscripts other than b and k) also depict the darkening and
diminishment of Israel. Notably, this latter description resembles that of Justin in Dialogue 87. M. De
Jonge, Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament as Part of Christian Literature: The Case of The Testaments
of the Twelve Patriarchs and The Greek Life of Adam and Eve (SVTP 18; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 101-104,
suggests that Christian redactors of the TP attempt to portray Jesus as the savior of non-Jews and Jews.
That this report of Jesus’ baptism is Christian material perhaps goes without saying, but part of the debate
surrounding the date and origins of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs is noteworthy. H. C. Kee,
Charlesworth; Garden City: Doubleday, 1983), 1:775-780, affirms that the Christian interpolations of the
TP probably date from early in the second century CE, but argues that the document is primarily Jewish
and from the 2nd century BCE. Alternatively, H. W. Hollander and M. De Jonge, The Testaments of the
Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary (SVTP 8; Leiden: Brill, 1985), 154, argue that the text in its redacted
form contains a diverse collection of biographical, apocalyptic, and exhortatory traditions, making a
reconstruction of the original document as exclusively Christian or Jewish next to impossible. As these
authors rightly conclude, Christian material permeates the text, thereby precluding a straightforward
distinction between its Jewish and Christian elements.
since he is endowed with those powers of the Holy Spirit which the above-quoted passages of Isaiah attribute to him as though he had lacked them?
(Dial. 87.2)

Although Justin subsequently affirms that Christ fulfilled LXX Isa 11:1-3 (Dial. 87.3), he argues that Christ in no way needed the power of the Spirit to perform his messianic role.\(^{175}\) To suggest that he did could lead to the conclusion that Christ did not exist as God prior to his birth as a human.\(^{176}\) To avoid this conclusion, Justin offers a different explanation for the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus:

> The scriptures state that these gifts of the Holy Spirit were bestowed upon him, not as though he were in need of them, but as though they were to rest upon him, that is, to come to an end in him, in order that there would be no more prophets among your people as of old (τοῦ μὴ κτέν τῷ γενέσθαι οὐκ ἐκαθέ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθος προφήτας γενήσοντα)\(^{177}\) (as is plainly evident to you, for after him there has not been a prophet among you).
(Dial. 87.3)

Rather than providing Jesus with the ability to fulfill his prophetic and messianic role, Justin argues, the gifts of the Spirit rested on him in the sense that there would be no more prophets among the Jewish people.\(^{178}\) Therefore, although Justin affirms that the

\(^{175}\) Although Justin frequently uses δύναμις, often in conjunction with λόγος, to describe Christ prior to his incarnation (1 Apol. 23.3; 32.10; 33.6; Dial. 105.1; 125.3; 128.4), he uses the term δυνάμεων in Dial. 87.2 to communicate that the powers of the Spirit were distinct from and unnecessary for Christ; because he was pre-existent, he already had “power” and therefore did not need the “powers” of the Spirit. For a discussion of the Christological use of the term δυνάμεων, see Demetrius C. Trakatellis, The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr (HDR 6; Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 27-37.

\(^{176}\) According to Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 195-199, Justin suppresses source material that links the baptism of Jesus with Isa 11:2-3 in order to avoid promoting an adoptionist theology (Dialogue 49-51; 87); cf. Goodenough, Justin Martyr, 186-187. This also seems to be the intent of the description of the baptism of Christ in Dial. 88.3-4 where Justin asserts that Christ did not need to go to the Jordan for baptism but did it solely “for the sake of humankind” (Dial. 88.4); that is, he underwent baptism to prove to those who watched the event that Jesus was God’s son.

\(^{177}\) If we interpret τοῦ γενήσοντα as an infinitive of purpose, Justin’s account of the bestowal of the Spirit upon Jesus reads as an event that occurred in order to bring an end to the activity of the Spirit among Israel’s prophets.

\(^{178}\) According to Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 197, Justin’s argument that the Spirit and gifts of the Spirit were no longer among Israel in Dialogue 87 relates to his assertion that Jesus made John, a prophet to Israel, stop prophesying and baptizing (Dialogue 49-51). For further discussion of this passage, see Rudolph, Denn wir sind jenes Volk, 165-167, who maintains that the descriptions of John the Baptist and Jesus in Dialogue 49-52 are closely tied to Justin’s concept of universality.
anointing of Jesus took place in fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures, even as Luke also does, he argues that Jesus did not need the powers of the Spirit, and maintains that the blessings promised in LXX Isa 11:2-3 found their fulfillment by being directed away from rather than toward the Jewish people.

After presenting his version of how the Spirit came to rest upon Jesus, Justin states that Jesus then transferred the Spirit to Christ-believers. According to Justin, the powers that once resided with Jews now rest upon those who believe in Jesus as messiah:

The Spirit therefore rested, that is, ceased, when Christ came. For, after man’s redemption was accomplished by him, these gifts were to cease among you [i.e., from among the Jewish people], and, having come to an end in him, should again be given, as was foretold, by him, from the grace of his Spirit’s powers, to all his believers according to their merits.

(Dial. 87.5-6)

In Justin’s telling, then, the Spirit-baptism of Jesus led to the cessation of its activity among the Jewish people and to its subsequent descent upon Christ-believers. For Justin, moreover, the presence of the gifts of the Spirit among Christ-believers furnishes proof that this transfer had certainly taken place: “From the fact that even to this day the gifts of prophecy exist among us Christians, you should realize that the gifts which once resided among your people have now been transferred to us” (Dial. 82.1; cf. 88.1).

Following his explanation of the transfer of the Spirit from the Jewish people to Christ-believers, Justin marshals a Luke-like explanation for this event. He states that the

---
179 See also the parallel material in Dialogue 49-51 where Justin indicates that Christ brought the ministry of John the Baptist to a close. Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 197, suggests that “just as Jesus made John cease prophesying and baptizing, so he puts an end to the distribution of the gifts of the Spirit among the Jews.” In Dial. 51.3, Justin indicates that Christ, the new covenant, replaces the Jewish prophets and cites a saying from the double tradition to validate this conclusion (Matt 11:12-15; cf. Luke 16:16). In this context, Justin follows Matthew more closely than Luke and omits the affirmation of the Mosaic law expressed in Luke 16:17.
scriptures foretell that the Spirit would descend upon believers after the departure of
Jesus to heaven:

I have already affirmed, and I repeat, that it had been predicted that he would do
this after his ascension into heaven. It was said, therefore: "He ascended on high;
he led captivity captive; he gave gifts to the sons of men" (LXX Ps 67:19). And
in another prophecy it is said: "And it shall come to pass after this, that I will pour
out my Spirit upon all flesh, and upon my servants, and upon my handmaids, and
they shall prophesy" (LXX Joel 3:1-2).

This statement highlights that the descent of the Spirit occurred through the agency of
Jesus after his ascension and according to God’s foreknowledge and plan. Such a
description parallels Luke’s account where we read that, in fulfillment of God’s pre­
determined plan, Jesus ascended to the right hand of the Father and poured out the
promised Holy Spirit (Acts 2:17-36). Furthermore, both Luke and Justin cite LXX Joel
3:1-2 to prove that the descent of the Spirit upon believers was the fulfillment of ancient
prophecy (Acts 2:17-21; Dial. 87.6), and both forge a link between the activity of the
Spirit and prophecy such that the Spirit’s descent upon Christ-believers can be summed
up as a prophetic empowerment.

---

180 Skarsaune, Proof from Prophecy, 100, 275, and Stanton, “Spirit,” 332, indicate that Justin
appears to follow the quotation of LXX Ps 67:19 found in Eph. 4:8, suggesting his dependence on the
latter. Gregory, Reception of Luke, 287, concludes that both Luke (Acts 2:33) and Justin (Dial. 39.4; 87.6)
may rely on LXX Ps 67:19 to describe the ascension of Jesus. The evidence for this conclusion from Acts
2, however, is weak. For further discussion of the possible reference to LXX Ps 67:19 in Acts 2, see
footnote 141 above.

181 Stanton, “Spirit,” 332, notes that Justin’s use of μετὰ τῶν ἔχοντας rather than ἐν ταῖς ἔχοντας ημέραις (Acts 2:17) which makes this part of the citation closer to LXX Joel 3:1. He observes, however,
that the phrase ἐπὶ τῶν δουλῶν μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου used by Justin corresponds more closely to
Acts 2:18 than to the parallel phrase in LXX Joel 3:2a (ἐπὶ τῶν δούλων καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας).

182 In Dial. 87.3-4, Justin describes how the presence and gifts of the Spirit were upon the ancient
prophets, and in Dial. 87.5 he explains how the same empowerment and gifts were distributed to Christ­
believers. In so doing, he portrays the descent of the Spirit as a form of prophetic inspiration. Similarly,
Luke highlights the prophetic aspect of the descent of the Spirit by adding the phrase “and they will
prophesy” (καὶ προφητεύωσιν) at the end of his citation of LXX Joel 3:1-2 (Acts 2:18), and by indicating
that the descent of the Spirit upon the disciples led to inspired speech (Acts 2:4, 11).
Although these notable similarities may suggest that Justin relied on Luke for this part of his description of the Spirit, or that they drew upon a common source, their respective descriptions of how Christ fulfilled scriptural promises for Jews and non-Jews differ. Luke has Peter appeal to LXX Joel 3:1-5 to portray the descent of the Spirit as the fulfillment of God’s promises for the Jewish people, and explicitly indicate that it applies to this group (“the promise is for you, for your children”; Acts 2:39). Luke also alludes to LXX Joel 3 to foreshadow the inclusion of non-Jews, but he never indicates in this passage that non-Jews replace Jews as the recipients of the Spirit. By contrast, Justin cites LXX Ps 67:19 and Joel 3:1-2 in order to legitimate his conclusion that Jesus transferred the Spirit from Jewish prophets to non-Jewish Christ-believers. Accordingly, in his view, the latter group becomes the new beneficiary of the scriptural promises that were originally intended for Jews. If Justin did use Acts as a source for his description of the descent of the Spirit, he also transformed its interpretation of LXX Joel 3 so that the promises therein no longer applied to Jews.

In view of this difference, the manner in which Luke and Justin each cite LXX Joel 3 may also be significant. Luke follows a version of LXX Joel 3 which affirms his view that the Jewish audience of Peter were the beneficiaries of the end-time blessing of the Spirit; it states that “your sons and your daughters,” “your young men,” and “your elders” would become the recipients of the Spirit (Acts 2:17). Notably, this element of

---

As Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 126-128, observes, the transfer of the Spirit represents a transfer of the promises of Israel to Christ-believers which legitimates their status as the true people of God: “Nicht die Tatsache, dass im neuen universalen Gottesvolk Wunder und Charismen lebendig sind, ist der Beweis seiner Gottgewirktheit, sondern dieser Beweis liegt in der Tatsache, dass die Wunder und Geistesgaben, die die Christen aufzuweisen haben, von den Propheten vorhergesagt wurden. Die Erfüllung dieser Verheissung im Leben der Christen und somit in der Geschichte zeigt, dass das neue Gottesvolk von Gott legitimiert ist” (127).
the citation does not appear in *Dial.* 87.6. Such an omission may be intentional since the inclusion of the second person plural pronouns would interfere with Justin’s claim that the Spirit had been transferred from Jews to non-Jews. Although it is possible that Justin relied on a different version of the citation,\(^{184}\) it seems telling that he (or the source upon which he relied) neglected the specific segment of the passage that explicitly applied the promises of LXX Joel 3:1-2 and Ps 67:19 to the restoration of the Jewish people.\(^{185}\)

In *Dial.* 135.1-6, Justin asserts in an even more pronounced way that non-Jewish Christ-believers had become recipients of the Spirit and heirs of the scriptural promises made to Jews. He begins this argument by claiming that Christ is the referent of “Israel” and “Jacob” in Isa 42:1-4 and that those who “are hewn out of the side of Christ” also

---

\(^{184}\) In *Proof from Prophecy,* 122-123, Skarsaune expresses his uncertainty regarding this unusual citation – he wonders if it is the unique work of Justin, a composition from someone who used the Hebrew text rather than the LXX, or a condensed version of the Acts citation. Stanton, “Spirit,” 332-333, suggests that Justin uses a condensed version of the Acts citation to emphasize the gift of prophecy, since a discussion of the gifts, especially prophecy, follows in *Dial.* 88.1. The complete citation of Acts 2:17-18 would have placed greater emphasis upon prophecy, however, because of the addition of the phrase “and they shall prophesy” (καὶ προφητεύονται) in Acts 2:18. Prigent, *L'Ancien Testament,* 114, suggests direct dependence upon Acts 2:17-21.

\(^{185}\) The discrepancies between the form of LXX Joel 3:1-2 in the Alexandrian textual tradition and the form of the citation in the Codex Bezae of Acts 2:17, 39 are also noteworthy. The Codex Bezae rendering of LXX Joel 3:1-2 changes the second-person plural pronouns after “sons” and “daughters” to the third-person and removes the second-person plural pronouns from “young men” and “elders.” This, in addition to the change of the phrase “upon all flesh” from the singular (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα) to the plural form (ἐπὶ πᾶσας σάρκας), makes the citation read as a universalistic statement that has no particular application to Jews: “I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh and their sons and their daughters shall prophesy and young men shall see visions and elders shall dream dreams.” Codex Bezae also renders Acts 2:39 as a promise that may apply more specifically to the apostles and their group rather than as a promise for Jews in the audience of Peter: “For the promise is for us and for our children.” Regarding these differences in the text of Codex Bezae, Eldon Jay Epp, *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts* (SNTSMS 3; Cambridge: CUP, 1966), 69, argues that the “conception of Peter’s address as envisioning Gentiles is contradictory to the Lucan conception that the sermon here was directed only toward Jews (though they were Jews from all over the world) and that the Gentile mission first began later with Cornelius.” For a more recent discussion of Acts 2:17-39 in the Bezan text, see Josep Rius-Camps and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger, *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition* (JSNTSup 257; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 169-191.
possess the identity of true Israel (Dial. 135.1-3). This discussion leads into his citation and interpretation of Isa 65:9-12:

But let us listen to the words of scripture: “And I will bring forth the seed of Jacob and of Judah, and it shall inherit my holy mountain. My elect and my servants shall inherit it. . . . But as for you, who forsake and forget my holy mountain . . . I will deliver you up to the sword . . . you did evil in my eyes, and you have chosen the things that displease me” (Isa 65:9-12). There you have the very words of scriptures. You can readily see that the seed of Jacob mentioned here is of another kind. For you cannot understand it as referring to your people. It is absurd to think that those who are of the seed of Jacob should leave a right of entrance to them who are born of Jacob, or that he who repudiated his people as being unworthy of his inheritance should promise it again to them. But the prophet says, “And now . . . he has dismissed his people, the house of Jacob; because their land was filled, as from the beginning, with oracles and divinations” (Isa 2:5-6). So we must here conclude that there were two seeds of Judah, and two races, as there are two houses of Jacob: the one born of flesh and blood, and the other of faith and the Spirit. (Dial. 135.5-6)

Since Justin deems Jews unworthy of inheriting the blessings promised to them in Isa 65:9-10, he argues that there must be another type of “seed” that receives this inheritance. Subsequently, he cites Isa 2:5-6 to reiterate that God rejected the Jewish people because of their sin (Isa 2:5-6). This enables him to conclude that the “seed” which is born of faith and the Spirit (i.e., Christ-believers), rather than physical descendants of Jacob and Judah, becomes heir to the eschatological blessings promised to Jews.

Although Justin clearly argues that God transferred the Spirit and scriptural promises from Jews to non-Jews in Dialogue 87 and 135, it is important to note that he

---

186 Compare this description of Christ-believers with the possible allusion to the metaphor of hewn rock in Isa 51:1 from the double tradition: “God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham” (Luke 3:8; cf. Matt 3:9).
187 Moreover, in Dial. 136.1-2, Justin further explains that since God was angry with the Jewish people and threatened to save only a few (Isa 65:8), those who inherit his mountain must refer to others whom he would “sow and beget.”
188 Note the corresponding theme in Galatians 3 where Paul asserts that non-Jews receive the promise of the Spirit through faith (Gal 3:14) and become heirs of the promises made to the seed of Abraham (Gal 3:19-28).
also recognizes that Jews who repent and believe in Jesus receive the Spirit. In

particular, he indicates in Dial. 39.2-4 that a remnant of Jews, like the seven thousand

who did not bow their knee to Baal during the days of Elijah,\(^{189}\) have become disciples of

Christ and so receive the gifts of the Spirit:

Therefore, just as God did not show his anger on account of those seven thousand

men, so now he has not exacted judgment of you, because he knows that every day

(καθ' ἡμέραν) some of you are forsaking your erroneous ways (τήν ὀδόν τῆς

πλάνης) to become disciples in the name of Christ, and this same name of Christ

enlichtens you to receive all the graces and gifts according to your merits. One

receives the spirit of wisdom, another of counsel, another of fortitude, another of

healing, another of foreknowledge, another of teaching, and another of the fear of

God.\(^{190}\) For it was predicted that, after his ascension into heaven, Christ would

free us from the captivity of error (τῆς πλάνης) and endow us with gifts. Here are

the words of the prophecy: “He ascended on high; he led captivity captive; he
gave gifts to men” (LXX Ps 67:19).

(Dial. 39.2-4)

As in Dialogue 87, Justin here indicates that Christ distributed the gifts of the Spirit after

his ascension and in fulfillment of prophecy. Moreover, Justin refers to the daily (καθ’

ἡμέραν) repentance and salvation of Jews, a description which bears some similarity to

the reports of the daily (καθ’ ἡμέραν) growth of the Jewish Christ-believing community in

Acts (Acts 2:47; 16:5). Nevertheless, even in this context, Justin contrasts Jews with

Christ-believers by stating that “you Jews hate us Christians who have grasped the

meaning of these truths” (Dial. 39.1) and by reiterating the blindness of Jews: “you ‘who

are wise in your own eyes and prudent in your own sight’ (Isa 5:21) are in reality stupid,

for you honor God and his Christ only with your lips” (Dial. 39.5). Justin thus frames his

\(^{189}\) See also Paul’s description of a remnant of Jews who were chosen by God’s grace (Rom 11:1-

4).

\(^{190}\) As Stanton, “Spirit,” 332, notes, the list of the gifts of the Spirit in this passage is similar to the

list in Dial. 87.2 but here Justin does not refer explicitly to Isa 11:1-3. Stanton also suggests that Justin

depends upon 1 Corinthians 12 – either directly or indirectly – in his references to gifts of “healing” (1 Cor

12:9b), “foreknowledge” (1 Cor 12:10b), and “teaching” (1 Cor 12:28); cf. Prigent, l’Ancien Testament,

112.
recognition that a remnant of Jews believe in Jesus with negative statements about the misunderstanding of the Jewish nation as a whole.

Summary

Both Luke and Justin portray the gift of the Spirit as the possession of all Christ-believers, but their explanations of how the descent of the Spirit fulfills scriptural promises for Jews and non-Jews differ. Justin describes the descent of the Spirit upon Jesus as a transfer of this gift away from Jews. He argues that, in fulfillment of LXX Joel 3:1-2 and Ps 67:19, Christ removed the Spirit from Jews and redistributed this gift to the Christ-believing community. By contrast, Luke presents the outpouring of the Spirit upon Jewish Christ-believers as the fulfillment of scriptural promises made to Jews (e.g., LXX Joel 3:1-2) but depicts the descent of the Spirit upon non-Jews as the realization of promises that foretell the inclusion of the nations (e.g., LXX Amos 9:11-12).

5.6 Conclusion

Important similarities between the thought of Luke and Justin emerge from my comparison of their respective treatment of Abrahamic and Isaianic promises, and the descent of the Spirit. Both authors characterize Jewish Christ-believers with reference to their possession of the following defining qualities or gifts: 1) repentance and obedience; 2) correct understanding of the scriptures and the message of God; and 3) the gift of the Spirit. For Luke and Justin, moreover, these particular characteristics demonstrate that the Christ-believers alone receive the benefits of Christ’s fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. In this sense, Luke and Justin similarly articulate the identity of the Christ-believers with reference to their distinct status as recipients of the promises of scripture.
Notwithstanding this similarity, their respective descriptions of the inclusion of non-Jews as the recipients of scriptural promises diverge. Luke presents Jewish Christ-believers as heirs of the scriptural promises that God made to Israel but portrays non-Jewish Christ-believers as heirs of the promises that predict the inclusion of the nations. Even when he narrates a Jewish rejection of the message of Jesus, Luke does not attempt to revise his depiction of Jews as heirs to the promises that God made to them. Instead, he persistently demonstrates the fidelity of God to fulfill his promises to the Jewish people and depicts Jews who believe in Jesus as the beneficiaries of this fulfillment. By way of contrast, Justin presents a more thoroughgoing revision of the identity of the people of God. For him, the experience of the Spirit, repentance, and the correct understanding of the scriptures serve as proof that the entire group – both Jews and non-Jews – has attained proper covenantal status and the right to become recipients of the scriptural promises and legacy of Jews. Accordingly, he maintains that these characteristics authenticate their status as true Israel, and show them to be the rightful heirs of the scriptural promises made to the Jewish people.
Conclusion

In this study, I have compared the way that Luke and Justin laid claim to the Jewish scriptures for the Christ-believing community by considering two aspects of their representation of the relationship between this group and the sacred texts of Jews: the authoritative exegesis of Christ-believers (part one) and their identity as recipients of scriptural promises (part two). In part one, I argued that a number of early Jewish texts provide evidence of the emergence of divinely inspired exegesis as a mode of revelation during the Second Temple period and concluded that, for some early Jewish groups, the claim to possess an authoritative ability to interpret the scriptures also served as a means of articulating group identity (chapter one). Subsequently, I outlined the ways that Luke and Justin use similar exegetical claims to define Christ-believers as those who possess an exclusive understanding of the Jewish scriptures (chapter two).

Although both Luke and Justin lay claim to the Jewish scriptures in order to define the identity of the Christ-believing community in relation to Jews, at the end of chapter two and in chapter three, I also pointed out that Justin develops this theme further: he asserts that the Jewish scriptures are more ancient than and therefore superior to non-Jewish traditions, and presents the exegesis of Christ-believers as a form of philosophical inquiry that rivals Greco-Roman philosophy. This self-defining strategy involves juxtaposing the Jewish scriptures with competing sources of ancient knowledge and stands squarely within early Jewish and Christian apologetic traditions. Moreover, it differs significantly from the exegetical approach of Luke, who never describes the superiority of the Jewish scriptures over non-Jewish traditions and consistently confines
his depictions of the exegesis of Christ-believers to contexts in which interaction with Jews or Jewish traditions occurs. These findings call into question the conclusions of scholars who argue that Luke appeals to the Jewish scriptures in order to demonstrate the antiquity of the Christ-believing community in relation to non-Jewish traditions within the Roman Empire.

In the second part of my study, I evaluated the manner in which Luke and Justin portray Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. In chapter four, I discussed their common presentation of the exegesis of Christ-believers as a manifestation of the fulfillment of end-time scriptural predictions. Correspondingly, I noted that they appeal to prophetic texts to provide a scriptural warrant for the exclusion of those who reject their message and exegesis. These mutually supporting explanations of how insiders and outsiders experience the fulfillment of scriptural predictions serve as a means of strengthening the identity of the Christ-believing community as the only group who truly understands the Jewish scriptures and the will of God.

Notwithstanding their deployment of these complementary themes, I argued that the perspectives of Luke and Justin are not wholly congruent. Luke portrays a division among Jews on the basis of their response to the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus. To those who embrace this proclamation, he applies ancient oracles of blessing whereas, to those who reject it, he applies ancient oracles of judgment. By way of contrast, Justin typically aligns his division between those who understand the Jewish scriptures and those who do not with a division between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers, as if these two types of contrasts were overlapping distinctions. Accordingly,
he interprets prophecies that express a Deuteronomistic warning of judgment as predictions about the Jewish nation as a whole but applies prophetic oracles of salvation to non-Jews who believe in Jesus. This part of my comparison demonstrates that Justin develops a contrast between non-Jewish Christ-believers and Jews in a manner that extends beyond the thought of Luke. It also highlights the way that the emphasis in Luke-Acts rests more squarely upon a distinction between those who understand and those who misunderstand, or reject, the message and scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers than upon a denunciation of the Jewish people. Rather than equating the division over the exegesis and message of Christ-believers with a distinction between Jews and non-Jews, Luke envisages the inclusion or exclusion of all peoples on the basis of their acceptance or rejection of this proclamation.

Finally, in chapter five, I evaluated their respective representations of Christ-believers as the recipients of scriptural promises. Here, too, the use of similar traditions from the Jewish scriptures shows a close affinity between the writings of Luke and Justin (Abrahamic promises, Isaianic promises, and the promise of the Spirit). Despite these parallels, however, their descriptions of how and why Jewish and non-Jewish Christ-believers benefit from the promises of scripture differ. For Justin, the possession of the gift of the Spirit, repentance, and the correct understanding of the scriptures serve as proof that all Christ-believers – both Jews and non-Jews – have attained proper covenantal status; as “true Israel,” this group becomes heir to the scriptural promises and legacy of Jews. Luke also presents the gift of the Spirit, repentance, and the correct understanding of the scriptures as defining characteristics of Christ-believers, but he does
not for this reason conclude that non-Jews and Jews become heirs to the promises that God originally made to Jews. Instead, Luke distinguishes between how Christ-believing Jews and non-Jews benefit from the promises of scripture: the former receive the promises made to Israel and the latter become beneficiaries of the promises that predict the inclusion of the nations. Thus, although both Luke and Justin define the boundaries of the Christ-believing community, in part, by identifying Christ-believers as the group which possesses an exclusive understanding of and fidelity to the Jewish scriptures, they do not describe insiders in precisely the same way. Unlike Justin, Luke distinguishes between the identity and heritage of Jews and non-Jews within the Christ-believing community. In so doing, he recognizes the distinct status of the Jewish people in relation to their scriptures even as he excludes Jews who do not embrace the exegesis and message of Christ-believers.

The concern of Luke to differentiate between the way that Jews and non-Jews become recipients of scriptural promises suggests that he sees a vital role for both groups within the Christ-believing community. Justin, however, frequently describes the Christ-believing community primarily as a non-Jewish group, and regards Jewish Christ-believers as an anomaly. This difference may indicate that Justin wrote at a significantly later date or, at the very least, in a different context than Luke. That Luke does not use the Jewish scriptures to demonstrate the antiquity of the Christ-believing community or present them as an object of philosophical inquiry further suggests that he wrote during a period prior to the development of this use of the Jewish scriptures within the Christian tradition.
Although the precise reasons for the differences between the thought of Luke and Justin may be difficult to determine with certainty, it remains clear that each author configured the relationship between Christ-believers and the Jewish scriptures in his own way. Broadly speaking, their use of common themes and ideas confirms their participation in what we might refer to as a similar form of proto-orthodox Christianity. Nevertheless, the differences between their development of these themes also demonstrate that Luke and Justin should not be considered as participants in a monolithic form of "Gentile Christianity" that saw itself as the unequivocal replacement for the Jewish people. In his configuration of the continuity between the Jewish scriptures and the Christ-believing community, Luke makes room for an ongoing role for the Jewish people as the recipients of the promises that God pledged to Israel. By way of contrast, Justin envisions the non-Jewish church as true Israel and therefore presents this group as heir to the legacy that God originally promised to Jews.
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