

SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION  
IN LUKE-ACTS AND JUSTIN MARTYR

TO HEAR AND PERCEIVE:  
SCRIPTURAL INTERPRETATION AND COMMUNITY SELF-DEFINITION  
IN LUKE-ACTS AND THE WRITINGS OF JUSTIN MARTYR

By

SUSAN WENDEL, B. Ed., M. A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

Copyright by Susan Wendel, June 2009

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (2009)

McMaster University  
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: To Hear and Perceive: Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-  
Definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr

AUTHOR: Susan Wendel

SUPERVISOR: Stephen Westerholm

NUMBER OF PAGES: vii, 299

## ABSTRACT

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 Whereas Justin argues that Christ-believers have become the rightful recipients of the scriptural promises that God originally made to Jews, Luke envisages an ongoing role for the Jewish people as the recipients of the promises that God pledged to Israel.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am pleased to acknowledge those who have helped me to accomplish this project. My research was undertaken with the support of two Ontario Graduate Scholarships, a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Grant, the Ashbaugh Graduate Scholarship, and the Abby Goldblatt Memorial Scholarship. For this generous financial assistance I am thankful.

My research supervisor, Stephen Westerholm, provided wise and timely advice throughout the course of this work. I am deeply grateful for his thorough feedback; he inspired me to think carefully and honestly about my project. The counsel of the other members of my committee, Eileen Schuller and Peter Widdicombe, was also invaluable for the completion of this study. At critical points along the way, they read my thesis and offered penetrating comments that helped me to clarify my ideas.

My husband, Bruce, also deserves a heartfelt thank you for his constant support and encouragement. He spent several hours discussing different aspects of my research with me and kindly read portions of this work. Finally, our children, Richard, Joshua, Elizabeth, and Jason, were a continual source of encouragement to me and made the entire project more enjoyable.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Introduction**

1.	History of Scholarship	4
	The Literary Relationship between Luke and Justin	4
	Date of Writing	8
	Previous Comparisons of Luke and Justin	12
	The Use of Scripture in the Writings of Luke and Justin	15
2.	Aims, Rationale, and Proposed Plan of Study	19
	Why Compare Luke and Justin?	20
	“Judaism” and “Christianity”	22
	Marcion	24
	Plan of Study	25

**Part I: Authoritative Scriptural Interpretation and Group Identity****Chapter One: Early Jewish Exegetes and Community Identity**

1.1	Introduction	27
1.2	Recent Studies of Early Jewish Scriptural Interpretation	28
1.3	Exegesis as a Mode of Revelatory Experience	34
1.4	Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition	43
	1.4.1 Early Jewish Apocalypses	45
	1.4.2 Qumran Literature	57
1.5	Conclusion	78

**Chapter Two: Exegesis and Community Identity in the Writings of Luke and Justin**

2.1	Introduction	80
2.2	A Common Emphasis: Scriptural Interpretation and the Christian Message	83
2.3	Authoritative Instruction and Revelatory Illumination	90
2.4	Differences between Representations of Exegesis in the Writings of Luke and Justin	104
	2.4.1 Luke: “The Word of the Lord”	109
	2.4.2 Justin: The <i>Logos</i>	119
2.5	Conclusion	128

**Chapter Three: Competing for Recognition within a Greco-Roman Milieu**

3.1	Introduction	130
3.2	The Jewish Scriptures in the Writings of the Early Apologists	134
3.3	Justin: Recovery of Primordial Truth	144
3.4	Luke: Competition with Jews	151

3.5	Conclusion	161
-----	------------	-----

## **Part II: The Recipients of Scriptural Promises**

### **Chapter Four: Revelation at the End of the Age**

4.1	Introduction	163
4.2	End-Time Revelation and Darkening in Luke-Acts	166
	4.2.1 Luke and the Witnesses	166
	4.2.2 “You Will Indeed Look but Never Perceive”	173
4.3	End-Time Revelation and Darkening in the Writings of Justin	179
	4.3.1 “For Out of Zion Shall Go Forth the Law”	179
	4.3.2 “The Lawgiver Has Come but You Do Not See Him”	186
4.4	Differing Configurations of Insiders and Outsiders	188
4.5	Differing Applications of the Deuteronomistic Principle	195
	4.5.1 Luke: “You Are Like Your Ancestors”	197
	4.5.2 Justin: The Prophets Predicted Your Unbelief	209
4.6	Conclusion	216

### **Chapter Five: Whose Promises Are They?**

5.1	Introduction	218
5.2	History of Scholarship	219
5.3	Abrahamic Promises	227
	5.3.1 Abrahamic Promises in Luke-Acts	227
	5.3.2 Abrahamic Promises in the Writings of Justin	238
5.4	Isaianic Promises	248
	5.4.1 Isaianic Promises in Luke-Acts	248
	5.4.2 Isaianic Promises in the Writings of Justin	261
5.5	The Promise of the Spirit	270
	5.5.1 The Promise of the Spirit in Luke-Acts	270
	5.5.2 The Promise of the Spirit in the Writings of Justin	284
5.6	Conclusion	293

<b>Conclusion</b>	295
-------------------	-----

<b>Bibliography</b>	300
---------------------	-----

## 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.<sup>1</sup> Although the influence of Hellenism led to a widespread adoption of variegated forms of this Greek *paideia* from the fifth century BCE onward,<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, competing interpretations of classical texts and the emergence of rival forms of philosophy led to “the multiplicity of

---

<sup>1</sup> David Dawson, *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992), 17, 23-72; Robert Lamberton, *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition* (The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 9; Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989), 11-23; Tim Whitmarsh, *Ancient Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Polity, 2004), 20-21; Peter T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton: PUP, 2004), 1-20.

<sup>2</sup> As Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation* (Oxford: OUP, 2001), 5-11, explains, the Greek *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.

<sup>3</sup> 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,” *PEQ* 110 (1978): 115-126; Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSupp LXIV; Leiden: Brill, 1992), 103-136; cf. Samuel K. Eddy, *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.<sup>4</sup> Differing groups interpreted and appropriated their own ancient written sources in order to compete for cultural primacy and recognition.<sup>5</sup>

From as early as the Persian period, the scriptures of Israel<sup>6</sup> 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).<sup>7</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature*, 5-7.

<sup>5</sup> 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.

<sup>6</sup> 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).

<sup>7</sup> Carol A. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 26; cf. Anders Runesson, *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study* (ConBNT 37; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001), 277.

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.”<sup>8</sup>

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

---

<sup>8</sup> Michael Fishbane, “From Scribalism to Rabbinism: Perspectives on the Emergence of Classical Judaism,” in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 445.

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,<sup>9</sup> and identifies his written sources of Jesus sayings as “memoirs of the apostles,”<sup>10</sup> “gospels,”<sup>11</sup> or “memoirs of the apostles and their successors.”<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> Furthermore, in many cases, Justin uses what appears to be a harmonized form of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.<sup>14</sup> 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,

---

<sup>9</sup> Compare, e.g., Matt 5:28; 19:12-11; 6:1, 19-20 with *1 Apol.* 15.1, 4, 11, 15, 17; Luke 12:48b with *1 Apol.* 17.4; Luke 10:19 with *Dial.* 76.6; Luke 23:46 with *Dial.* 105.5.

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., *1 Apol.* 66.3; 67.3-4; *Dial.* 100.4; 101.3; 102.5; 103.6, 8; 104.1; 105.1, 5, 6; 106.1, 3, 4; 107.1.

<sup>11</sup> As Graham N. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel* (Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 99, points out, this plural use of εὐαγγέλιον (εὐαγγέλια in *1 Apol.* 66.3) is unusual and represents the first occurrence of the plural form of εὐαγγέλιον in Christian writings; even Irenaeus only rarely uses the plural form of εὐαγγέλιον.

<sup>12</sup> *Dial.* 103.8. Stanton, *Jesus and Gospel*, 100-101, notes that the phrase ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἐκείκνοις παρακολουθησάντων in *Dial.* 103.8 suggests that Justin recognized at least four written sources – more than one of which were written by the apostles and more than one of which were written by their followers. As Stanton cautions, however, these sources do not necessarily correspond to the four canonical gospels; cf. Anette Rudolph, ‘Denn wir sind jenes Volk...’. *Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht* (Bonn: Borengrässer, 1999), 56-57.

<sup>13</sup> *Dial.* 88.3; 106.1-2.

<sup>14</sup> Compare, e.g., Matt 22:30 and Luke 20:35-36 with *Dial.* 81.4; Matt 13:3b-8; Mark 4:3-8; Luke 8:5-8 with *Dial.* 125.1.

or dependence upon a post-synoptic gospel harmony.<sup>15</sup> Within this debate, still others maintain that it is impossible to prove that Justin used sources other than the canonical gospels.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup> Helmut Koester maintains that Justin read the synoptic gospels as reliable records of the life of Jesus but did not regard them as

---

<sup>15</sup> A. J. Bellinzoni, *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr* (NovTSup 17; Netherlands: E. J. Brill, 1967), 138, 140; H. Koester, “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century,” in *Gospels in the Second Century* (ed. W. L. Petersen; Notre Dame: London, 1989), 28-33. Earlier, William Sanday, *The Gospels in the Second Century* (London, 1876), 136-138 and Ernst Lippelt, *Quae Fuerint Justini Martyris ΑΠΙΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ Quaeque Ratione Cum Forma Syro-Latina Cohaeserint* (Halle, 1901), 35, also argued that Justin was citing from a harmonized version of the synoptic gospels.

<sup>16</sup> Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 1-2, provides the following summary of explanations for the use of variant gospel traditions in the writings of Justin: 1. Failure of memory – Karl Semisch, *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus* (Hamburg, 1848), 389ff; Theodor Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* (Erlangen, 1888), 463-585. 2. Use of extra-canonical gospels – Carl August Credner, *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften* (Halle, 1832), 266, argued that Justin relied on the *Kerygma Petrou*, a document that he thought was parallel to Tatian’s *Diatessaron*, and the *Gospel of Hebrews*. Adolf Hilgenfeld, *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justin’s, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion’s* (Halle, 1850), 21f, 31-45, suggested that Justin used *Kerygma Petrou* and the *Protoevangelium of James*. G. Volkmar, *Über Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien* (Zurich, 1853) argued that Justin knew a fifth canonical gospel. 3. Use of pre-synoptic traditions – Wilhelm Bousset, *Die Evangelienzeit Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik* (Göttingen, 1891), 114-116. 4. Dependence upon a post-synoptic harmony – Moritz von Engelhardt, *Das Christenthum Justins des Märtyrers* (Erlangen, 1878), 335-340; Sanday, *Second Century*, 136-138; Lippelt, ΑΠΙΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ, 35. 5. Use of canonical gospels exclusively – Brooke Foss Westcott, *A General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament* (London, 1870), 133, 148; Aloys Baldus, *Das Verhältniss Justins des Märtyrers zu unsern synoptischen Evangelien* (Munster, 1895), 98ff. For summaries of these earlier discussions, see Bousset, *Die Evangelienzeit*, 1-12; Credner, *Beiträge*, 133-149; Hilgenfeld, *Kritische*, 31-45; and Semisch, *Die apostolischen*, 16-60. See also the survey of recent scholarship in Bellinzoni, *Sayings of Jesus*, 2-6; cf. Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (WUNT 169; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 211-222, 300-308.

<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup>

Although Justin frequently combines material from the synoptic gospels and, in some cases, relies more heavily upon what appears to be a Matthean source,<sup>19</sup> 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; *1 Apol.* 39.2-4; 49.5; 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 76.6; 106.1).<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> Helmut Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development* (London: SCM, 1990), 41-42, concludes that Justin did not regard the "memoirs of the apostles" or the "gospels" as inspired writings, but as historical records that confirmed his interpretation of the Jewish scriptures; cf. Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 7, 23-28; 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. C. H. Cosgrove, "Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho," *VG* 36 (1982): 209, further argues that Justin clearly affirms the inspired status of the Jewish scriptures but devalues the authority of NT writings. Charles E. Hill, "Justin and the New Testament Writings," *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 42-48 rightly points out, however, that Justin's "circumspect use" of the synoptic gospels and other NT sources leaves us with limited evidence for determining his view of the authority of these writings, as well their relationship to each other and to other sources.

<sup>19</sup> Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 386.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g., Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 8-9; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), xxx-xxxii. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 250-251, 256-259, 361-362, argues that Justin probably read Luke and Acts and concludes that he uses a "Lukan tradition" which he may have obtained through an intermediary source.

<sup>21</sup> J. C. O'Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 12-16, 28-42, asserts that Justin used neither Luke nor Acts; cf. Albrecht Ritschl, *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas* (Tübingen, 1846), 135-151, who argued, on the basis of the discrepancies between the accounts of Jesus traditions in the writings of Luke and Justin, that Justin did not use Luke's gospel. Although Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 255-259, 362, 431-432, argues that Justin

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.”<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

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

---

probably knew and read Luke-Acts, the notable differences between their writings lead him to conclude that Justin developed his thought independently from Luke-Acts; he posits that some of the Lukan features in the writings of Justin were handed down to him via other sources. In this way, Skarsaune distinguishes between Justin’s knowledge of and direct dependence upon Luke-Acts. C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998), 1:41-44, maintains that if Justin knew Acts “he made little use of it, and made some statements that cannot be easily harmonized with it” (44). Similarly, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 31; New York: Doubleday), 53, voices doubts about the literary dependence of Justin upon Acts.

<sup>22</sup> Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 8; cf. Helmet Koester, *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern* (TUGAL 65; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957), 3.

<sup>23</sup> 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,<sup>24</sup> the paucity of evidence for dating these texts makes it difficult to ascertain the exact time of their composition.<sup>25</sup> 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

---

<sup>24</sup> For example, Raymond E. Brown, *An Introduction to the New Testament* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), 273, suggests a date of 80-85 CE for Luke and Acts; Werner Georg Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament* (trans. Howard Clark Kee; Nashville, Abingdon, 1975), 151, suggests a range of 70-90 CE; cf. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; New York: Doubleday, 1981), 1:57 and *Acts*, 54. I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992 [reprint]), 35, suggests that Luke was written around 70 CE; John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1989), 1:xxxvii, argues for an early 60s dating for Luke’s gospel; and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922), xxix, notes a possible range from 63 CE to 100 CE. Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte*, 17<sup>th</sup> ed. (KEK 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 86, suggests a date of 70 CE for Luke and 80-90 CE for Acts. F. Scott Spencer, *Acts* (Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 16, suggests a range of 70-100 CE for Acts. Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 2, suggests a date of 70-80 CE for Acts.

<sup>25</sup> 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, Cerfaux, 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).<sup>26</sup> 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.<sup>27</sup> 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."<sup>28</sup>

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).<sup>29</sup> Although some point out the various textual difficulties in his extant writings,<sup>30</sup> discuss the complex relationship between the first and second *Apologies*,<sup>31</sup> and note the disparity between the date and setting that Justin ascribes to the *Dialogue* (Ephesus, 135 CE) and the probable

---

<sup>26</sup> Henry Cadbury, "Subsidiary Points," in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; 5 vols.; London: MacMillan, 1920-1933), 2:349-359. suggests, however, that a range of 70-115 CE is more probable.

<sup>27</sup> John T. Townsend, "Date of Acts," in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. Charles Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984), 47-62; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:15, who observes that there are virtually no witnesses to Acts until Irenaeus. James Hardy Ropes, *The Text of Acts*, vol. 3 of *Beginnings*, clxxxvi, suggests that Justin alludes to the 'Western' text of Acts 2:17 in *Dial.* 87.6 but Pierre Prigent, *Justin et l'Ancien Testament: L'argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la Première Apologie* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1964), 144, argues that Justin does not rely upon Acts 2:17; cf. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 122-123.

<sup>28</sup> 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.

<sup>29</sup> 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.

<sup>30</sup> For summaries of the relevant evidence and scholarly discussion, see Miraslov Marcovich, ed., *Iustini 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.

<sup>31</sup> 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,<sup>32</sup> these issues do not have a significant impact on the range of date for his writings (~135-160 CE).<sup>33</sup>

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

---

<sup>32</sup> 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., Chadwick, “Defense,” 280, and Samuel Krauss, *The Jewish-Christian Controversy: From the Earliest Times to 1789* (edited and revised by William Horbury; J.C.B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1995), 104. Eusebius identifies Trypho as a prominent Jew and some have tried to associate him with “Rabbi Tarfon” (e.g., E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. [Leipzig, 1901-1909], 2:375, 555-556; B. J. Kidd, *History of the Church* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1922], 1:90; and O. Zöckler, *Geschichte der Apologie der Christentums* [Gütersloh, 1907], 44). Others, such as Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 91-95; Niels Hyldahl, “Tryphon and Tarphon,” *StTh* (1956): 77-88; and Barnard, *Justin Martyr*, 24-25, oppose this view. Although Goodenough argues that Trypho is, at least in part, the creation of Justin, he suggests that Trypho nevertheless represents authentic Jewish opposition to Christian claims; cf. Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century* (London, T&T Clark, 1996), 104. Both Tessa Rajak, “Talking at Trypho,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (Oxford: OUP, 1999), 73, and M. Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (trans. Batya Stein; New York: State University of New York Press, 1996), 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* (Paris: Leuven, 2001), 16-38. Regarding the plethora of scholarly views surrounding the intended audience of the *Dialogue*, see the recent discussion by Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Edition Critique, Traduction, Commentaire* (Paradosis 47/1; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005), 129-166.

<sup>33</sup> 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. *1 Apol.* 26.5-6 refers to Marcion as a contemporary opponent, which would suggest a date after 144 CE; in *1 Apol.* 39.3-4, Justin makes reference to the prefecture of Felix, who held his office from 148-154 CE; Justin indicates in *1 Apol.* 46.1 that the current date was 150 years after Christ; and *2 Apol.* 1.1 makes mention of Urbicus, the prefecture who was in office between 144-160 CE. Buck makes the further observation that *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 *1 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 (*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 *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,<sup>34</sup> J. C. O’Neill,<sup>35</sup> N. Hyldahl,<sup>36</sup> Oskar Skarsaune,<sup>37</sup> and William Kurz<sup>38</sup> 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 “Heidenchristenthum” which had abandoned its Jewish roots.<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup> Following Overbeck, O’Neill calls attention to a

---

<sup>34</sup> F. Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg,” *ZWT* 15 (Leipzig, 1872): 305-349.

<sup>35</sup> O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 10-53.

<sup>36</sup> Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins* (Acta theologica danica 9; Kopenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966), 261-272.

<sup>37</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 100-105, 256-259, 361-362, 431-432.

<sup>38</sup> William S. Kurz, “The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin” (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976).

<sup>39</sup> 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 evidenten sein, als dass die A.G. das jüdische Christenthum als solches preisgibt und auf einem Standpunkt geschrieben ist, welchem das Heidenchristenthum als das in der Gemeinde durchaus vorherrschende Element gilt” (xxxix). 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 Christenthum” (“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.

<sup>40</sup> Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins,” 340-341.

number of the same similarities between the theology and motives of Acts and those of Justin.<sup>41</sup> 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.”<sup>42</sup> 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.<sup>43</sup>

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,<sup>44</sup> in part, by arguing that Christ-believers possess the proper understanding of the Jewish scriptures.<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup> Since the goal of Hyldahl’s study lies in providing a detailed discussion of *Dialogue* 1-8, however, he limits his comparison of

---

<sup>41</sup> O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 10-12, 168-175.

<sup>42</sup> O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 171.

<sup>43</sup> 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.

<sup>44</sup> Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 264-265.

<sup>45</sup> 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.”

<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> 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.”<sup>49</sup>

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.<sup>50</sup> 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.

---

<sup>47</sup> Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 155-244, 250-255.

<sup>48</sup> 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.

<sup>49</sup> Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 15.

<sup>50</sup> 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,<sup>51</sup> he recognizes that they develop such traditions in distinct ways, as "independent theologians who had ideas of their own."<sup>52</sup> 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.<sup>53</sup>

### 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');<sup>54</sup> exegetical methods, Christological interpretation, and use of the Mosaic law;<sup>55</sup> and reliance upon

---

<sup>51</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256-259, 361-362; cf. footnote 21 on page 7 above.

<sup>52</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 431-432.

<sup>53</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 288-289, 326-333.

<sup>54</sup> A. Hilgenfeld, "Die alttestamentlichen Citate Justins in ihrer Bedeutung für die Untersuchung über seine Evangelien," *Theologische Jahrbücher* 9 (1850): 385-439; Bousset, *Die Evangeliencitate*; J. Smit Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr I: The Pentateuch* (Leiden: Brill, 1963); P. Katz, "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll," in *StPatr* 1 (1957): 343-353; Prigent, *l'Ancien Testament*; T. Christensen, "Justin og *Testimonia* Traditionen," *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 84 (1983): 39-62; J. L. Marshall, "Some Observations on Justin Martyr's Use of Testimonies," *StPatr* 16 (1985): 197-200; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*; Martin C. Albl, "And the Scripture Cannot Be Broken": *The Form and Function of Early Christian Testimonia Collections* (NovTSup 96; Leiden: Brill, 1999).

<sup>55</sup> K. L. Grube, "Die hermeneutischen Grundsätzen Justins des Märtyrers," *Der Katholik* 60 (1880): 139-159; L. Goppelt, *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen* (BFCT 43; Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939); Cecil L. Franklin, *Justin's Concept of Deliberate Concealment in the Old Testament* (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961); Shotwell, *Biblical Exegesis*; David Aune, "Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament," *BETS* 9 (1966): 179-197; William H. C. Frend, "The O. T. in the Age of the Greek Apologists A. D. 130-180" *SJT* 26 (1973): 129-150; Kurz, "Christological Proof"; Robert Joly, *Christianisme et philosophie: Études sur Justin et les apologistes grecs du deuxième siècle* (Belgique: L' Université de Bruxelles, 1973), 94-124; Theodore Stylianopoulos, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (SBLDS 20; SBL and Scholars Press, 1975).

Greco-Roman and Jewish interpretive methods.<sup>56</sup> 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;<sup>57</sup> dependence upon the LXX and Semitic influences;<sup>58</sup> and application of particular exegetical methods or narrative strategies that influence the approach to the Jewish scriptures in Luke-Acts.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> P. Heinisch, *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese: Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria* (Münster i. W., Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1908); Leslie W. Barnard, "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr," *VT* 14 (1964): 394-406; Osborn, *Justin Martyr*, 87-119; F. Manns, "L'Exegese de Justin dans le *Dialogue avec Tryphon*," *Analecta* 12 (1977): 130-152; M. Hirshman, "Polemical Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho*," *JQR* 83 (1993): 369-384; idem, *Rivalry*, 31-66; Lieu, *Image and Reality*, 103-153; idem, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (New York: OUP, 2004), 27, 37-45, 77-86; Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2002), 49-75.

<sup>57</sup> L. Cerfaux, "Citations scripturaires et traditions textuelles dans le livre des Actes," in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel* (ed. P. Menoud and O. Cullmann; Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1950); Ernst Haenchen, "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," *ZST* 51 (1954): 153-167; René Laurentin, *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II* (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957); Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969); John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976); M. D. Goulder, *The Evangelists' Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture* (London: SPCK, 1978).

<sup>58</sup> For studies of the use of the LXX in Luke-Acts, see William Kemp Lowther Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," in *Beginnings*, 2:66-105; J. Dupont, *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LD 45; Paris: Cerf, 1967); Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968); N. Turner, "The Quality of the Greek in Luke-Acts," in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text* (ed. J. K. Elliot; Leiden: Brill, 1976), 387-400; Gert J. Steyn, *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Act Apostolorum* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995); William J. Larkin Jr., "Luke's Use of the Old Testament in Luke 2-23" (PhD diss., University of Durham, 1974); Wayne Douglas Litke, "Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of Citations in Luke-Acts" (PhD diss., McMaster University, 1993). Regarding Aramaic sources and Semitic influences, see C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Cambridge, HUP, 1916); M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946); Max E. Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1965), 21-55; door Jan Willem Doeve, *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954); J. Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form," *NTS* 14 (1967-1968): 96-111; J. A. Emerton, "A Review of *The Semitisms of Acts*," *JSS* 13 (1968): 284-290; H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms in St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 1 (1950): 16-28.

<sup>59</sup> These types of studies often depict the use of the scriptures in Luke-Acts as having a "Christological," "proof from prophecy," "promise-fulfillment," or "apologetic" function. Perspectives on and descriptions of the use of scripture in Luke-Acts are quite diverse, as the following list of representative studies demonstrates: Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: MacMillan, 1927), 303-305 (apologetic and Christological use of scripture); Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; Harper & Brothers: New York, 1960), 149-169 (Christological and apologetic use of scripture; promise-fulfillment scheme); E. Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte," *EvT* 14 (1954): 256-275 (proof from prophecy); P. Schubert, "The Structure and

Significance of Luke 24,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* (BZNW, 21; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), 165-186 (proof from prophecy and Christological use of scripture); M. D. Goulder, *Type and History in Acts* (London: SPCK, 1964), 1-12 (typological use of scripture similar to 1 Maccabees); I. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970) (proof from prophecy and Christological use of scripture); E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975) (proof from prophecy; Christological use of scripture; scriptures used to interpret activities of Jesus); Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist, 1979), 129-159 (Christological and apologetic use of the scriptures); Charles Talbert, “Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology,” in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (ed. Charles Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984), 91-103 (promise-fulfillment; apologetic; and typological use of scripture); C. K. Barrett, “Luke-Acts,” in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars* (ed. Donald A. Carson and Hugh G. M. Williamson; Cambridge: CUP, 1988), 231-244 (apologetic and proof from prophecy); Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive* (Christological and typological use of the scriptures; challenges Schubert’s “proof from prophecy” model and suggests that scriptures interpret and explain events in Luke-Acts); Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; JSOT Press, 1987) (Christological and typological use of scripture; Christ fulfills divine patterns from Jewish scriptures); B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (SNTA 14; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989) (Luke presents Jesus and Paul as skilled interpreters of the Jewish scriptures); Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus’ Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke’s Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield, SAP, 1994) (Christological use of scripture with an emphasis on eschatological fulfillment); C. A. Evans, “Old Testament in the Gospels,” in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* (ed. Joel Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall; Downers Grove: Intervarsity, 1992), 579-590 (legal, prophetic, and analogical use of scripture); Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis; Fortress, 1993) (a collection of essays that explore Luke’s understanding of the scriptures and their nature and function in his writings); Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: SAP, 1995) (Christological and apologetic use of scripture and “proclamation from prophecy and pattern” motif [following Bock]); Nils Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 87-98 (Luke-Acts provides a continuation of the biblical past); Joel B. Green, “The Problem of a Beginning: Israel’s Scriptures in Luke 1-2,” *BBR* 4 (1994): 61-86 (events of narrative are linked to past history of Israel and represent a continuation of this story); Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup; Sheffield: SAP, 1997) (typological use of scripture; prophetic tradition within the structural pattern of Luke-Acts provides continuity between the history of Israel and the story of Jesus and the early church); David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) (the Isaianic exodus program “provides the structural framework for the narrative of Acts” and “provides the foundation story through which the identity of the early Christian movement can be constructed”[250]); Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T&T Clark International, 2005) (Luke’s use of scripture as intertext; use of scriptures to validate the Christ-believing community); Robert Brawley, *Text to Text Pours forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1995) (Luke’s intertextual approach to the scriptures with an emphasis on their theocentric focus); W. J. C. Weren, “Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: an Intertextual Study,” in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel* (ed. S. Draisma; Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1989), 189-203 (Luke’s use of scripture as intertext); Thomas L. Brodie, “Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative,” in *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed. Earl Richard; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990); idem, *The Crucial Bridge: Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000) (Luke’s *mimesis* of the Elijah-Elisha narrative in his depiction of the mission of Jesus); François Bovon, “The Role of the Scriptures in the Composition of the Gospel Accounts: The Temptations of Jesus (Lk 4.1-13 par.) and the Multiplication of the Loaves (Lk 9.10-17 par.),” in *Luke*

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.<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> 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.<sup>62</sup> For example, Rebecca Denova maintains that Luke derives the “structural

---

*and Acts* (ed. Gerald O’Collins and Gilberto Marconi; New York: Paulist Press, 1991), 26-31 (events in Luke’s narrative imitate the biblical story, demonstrate the fulfillment of prophecy, and project an understanding of the “scriptural norm”). For further summary of recent studies that discuss the use of scripture in Luke-Acts, see Bock, *Proclamation*, 19-23, François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty Years of Research (1950-2005)* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 106-117; Litwak, *Echoes*, 1-30.

<sup>60</sup> An exception is the recent study of Rudolph, *Denn wir sind jenes Volk*, 266-273. Rudolph argues that Justin appeals to the Jewish scriptures in an attempt to demonstrate that scriptural prophecy had long predicted the coming of Christ and the proper form of worship, which the Christ-believing community originated. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 327-352, provides a helpful treatment of Justin’s depiction of the “new people of God” but does not make this topic the primary emphasis of his inquiry. Judith M. Lieu, *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World* (New York: OUP, 2004), 82-83; 160-161, Young, *Biblical Exegesis*, 57-67, 288-291, and Denise Kimber Buell, *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), 94-115, provide insightful discussions regarding the relationship between Justin’s use of scripture and his description of Christ-believers, but do not provide detailed analyses of his thought. Other shorter studies have addressed the use of the Jewish scriptures by Justin to bolster the identity of Christ-believers over against Jews and to validate the continuity between the practices of Christ-believers and the prophecies from the Jewish scriptures, but they tend to deal with one or two limited aspects of this theme. See, e.g., Ben Zion Bokser, “Justin Martyr and the Jews,” *JQR* 64 (1973): 97-122, who compares Christian and Jewish interpretations of the Mosaic law and its significance, and D. Jeffrey Bingham, “Justin and Isaiah 53,” *VC* 54 (2000): 248-261, who argues that Isaiah 53 played a significant role in validating the practices of Justin’s community.

<sup>61</sup> Two exceptions are I. Howard Marshall and Hans Conzelmann. I. Howard Marshall, “Luke and his ‘Gospel,’” in *Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982 / hrsg. von Peter Stuhlmacher* (WUNT 28; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983), 289-308, argues that Luke aims to show the correspondence between prophecy and fulfillment in order to show how the “church has come together as a company of believing Jews and Gentiles and how it is related to the Jewish roots from which it sprung” (302). Conzelmann, *Theology*, 157, 162-163, also maintains that Luke uses the Jewish scriptures to describe the true people of God. He suggests that Luke draws upon the scriptures to show how salvation has been transferred from Jews to non-Jews. For further discussion of the position of Conzelmann, see chapter five, pages 219-221.

<sup>62</sup> Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 7-8, especially stresses that past studies have emphasized the Christological function of scriptural interpretation to the neglect of its ecclesiological function. Similarly,

pattern” of his story from the Jewish scriptures and argues that he uses this interpretive approach “to bind the [Christ-believing] community to Israel.”<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup> 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.<sup>65</sup> 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.

<sup>63</sup> Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 210.

<sup>64</sup> Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 250.

<sup>65</sup> 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.<sup>66</sup> 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

---

<sup>66</sup> 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.<sup>67</sup> 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.<sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup> Second, as John O'Neill has observed, both

---

<sup>67</sup> 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.

<sup>68</sup> 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, Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom*, 260-261, has argued that the theology of Luke provides a closer point of comparison with Justin than the thought of the apostolic fathers.

<sup>69</sup> 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.<sup>70</sup> 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.”<sup>71</sup> 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

---

observes, Luke expands and refines this understanding so that it includes events in the life of the Christ-believing community, applies to the whole of his narrative (Luke 1:1 διήγησιν περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων) and expresses the necessity (δεῖ) of the fulfillment of scripture.

<sup>70</sup> O’Neill, *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).

<sup>71</sup> Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom*, 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.<sup>72</sup> These observations suggest that an early and clearly defined separation between “Jewish” and “Gentile” Christians can no longer be assumed.<sup>73</sup> 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,<sup>74</sup> 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.<sup>75</sup> Moreover, because of the uncertainties

---

<sup>72</sup> Raymond E. Brown, “Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Two Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity,” *CBQ* 45 (1983): 74-79; cf. Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam H. Becker, “Introduction,” in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (TSAJ 95; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 5.

<sup>73</sup> Brown, “Types,” 74.

<sup>74</sup> Reed and Becker, “Introduction,” 15. See also the descriptions of multiple “Judaisms” by Jacob Neusner, *Studying Classical Judaism: A Primer* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 33, and Robert A. Kraft, “The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity,” in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 174-199.

<sup>75</sup> 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”<sup>76</sup> – and aim to refute Marcion’s exclusion of the Jewish scriptures from the Christian canon.<sup>77</sup> 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.

<sup>76</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, 24. See also footnote 28 on page 10 above.

<sup>77</sup> Tyson, *Marcion*, 125-128; cf. Charles H. Talbert, *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lucan Purpose* (Nashville, Abingdon, 1966), 33-48, who argues that Luke depicts Jesus and the disciples as true interpreters of the Jewish scriptures over against false interpreters, whom Talbert identifies as Gnostics. If these conclusions are correct, the context and aims of Luke-Acts correspond very closely to the aims of Justin in his opposition against Marcion. The Roman church excommunicated Marcion in 144 CE and Justin, who held his catechetical school in Rome, attempted to refute Marcion in the now lost work known as *Syntagma Against all Heresies* (1 *Apol.* 26.5-8; cf. 58.1). Irenaeus also mentions a written work that Justin composed against Marcion (*Haer.* 4.6.2) and, in *Dial.* 35.2-5, Justin identifies other opponents, including Valentinians, Basilidians, and Saturnilians. For further discussion, see Adolf von Harnack, *Marcion. Das Evangelium von fremden Gott* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; TU 46; Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924; repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996), 8; Koester, *Ancient Christian Gospels*, 35-37; Hans Freiherr von Campenhausen, *Formation of the Christian Bible* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977), 165-184; Stylianopoulos, *Mosaic Law*, 20-33; Sebastian Moll, “Justin and the Pontic Wolf,” in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*, 145-151.

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.<sup>78</sup> 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

---

<sup>78</sup> 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.

## **Part I: Authoritative Scriptural Interpretation and Group Identity**

### **Chapter One: Early Jewish Exegetes and Community Identity**

#### **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.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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”

---

<sup>1</sup> Carol A. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (STDJ 52; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 75.

<sup>2</sup> David E. Aune, “Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity,” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; ed. J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993), 149.

exegesis during the Second Temple period.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.”

<sup>4</sup> For a recent, nuanced description of this shift, see Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 197-211. For further discussion of this phenomenon within Second Temple Judaism, see, e.g., John Barton, *Oracles of God: Perception of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986), 179-213; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Ancient Judaism* (Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 3; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 1977), 128-132; William H. Schniedewind, *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period* (JSOTSup 197; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995); John J. Collins, “Jewish Apocalypticism against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment,” *BASOR* 220 (1975): 27-36; Michael Fishbane, “From Scribalism to Rabbinism,” 439-456; idem, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1985), 108-143, 458-499.

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<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.”<sup>7</sup> 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.”<sup>8</sup> 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).<sup>9</sup> 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

---

<sup>5</sup> “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.

<sup>6</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 4.

<sup>7</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 5.

<sup>8</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 5-6.

<sup>9</sup> 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 Peshet 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.<sup>10</sup> 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.”<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

---

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

<sup>11</sup> 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).

<sup>12</sup> Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 34.

<sup>13</sup> Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 28.

Newsom argues that various groups within Second-Temple Judaism attempted to gain cultural influence by rendering some aspect of the scriptural interpretation problematic.<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup>

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.<sup>17</sup> 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.<sup>18</sup> Najman maintains that *Jubilees* underscores the legitimacy of its claim to a special knowledge of the Pentateuch by indicating that the revelation in this

---

<sup>14</sup> Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 70-71.

<sup>15</sup> Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 23-75 (especially 65-75).

<sup>16</sup> 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.

<sup>17</sup> Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJSup 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 41-53, at 53.

<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> Likewise, she notes that the Temple Scroll validates its revelation by representing the text in the first person voice of God.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup>

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;<sup>22</sup> they are the chosen community of the last days who

---

<sup>19</sup> Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 60-65; cf. Aharon Shemesh and Cana Werman, “Halakah at Qumran: Genre and Authority,” *DSD* 10 (2003): 106-112.

<sup>20</sup> Najman, *Seconding Sinai*, 63, 67-68.

<sup>21</sup> 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.

<sup>22</sup> 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;<sup>23</sup> 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,<sup>24</sup> and even support the view that their group alone represents “true Israel.”<sup>25</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> 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,” 51-63, 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 García Martínez and Mladen Popović; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1-11; Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 70-75; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 74-75; Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 81.

<sup>24</sup> See, e.g., Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 55-75; idem, “Constructing ‘We, You, and the Others’ through Non-polemical Discourse,” in *Defining Identities*, 13-21; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts,” in *Defining Identities*, 23-31; Grossman, “Cultivating Identity,” 1-3; Brooke, “Justifying Deviance,” 84-87; Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 51-52.

<sup>25</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 4-6; Nickelsburg, “Revealed Wisdom,” 80; Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 68-69; George Brooke, “Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (OTS 427; ed. Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 163-164; Philip R. Davies, “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference,” in *Defining Identities*, 33-41; James C. VanderKam, “Sinai Revisited,” in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; ed. Matthias Henze; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 44-60; John J. Collins, “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books,” in *Judaism in Late Antiquity Part 5 Volume 1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Theory of Israel* (Handbook of Oriental Studies: Section One: The Middle East 56; ed. Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce Chilton; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 25-42.

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.<sup>26</sup> This development in Chronicles occurs through the portrayal of certain individuals who receive divine inspiration even though they are not identified as prophets.<sup>27</sup> 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).<sup>28</sup> 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

---

<sup>26</sup> For further discussion of this transition, see, e.g., Schneidewind, *Word of God*; Rex Mason, *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile based on the “Addresses” in Chronicles, the Speeches in Ezra and Nehemiah and the Post-Exilic Books* (Cambridge: CUP, 1990); David L. Petersen, *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles* (SBL Monograph Series 23; Missoula: Scholars, 1977); Gerhard Von Rad, “The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles,” in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 267-280.

<sup>27</sup> Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 127, concludes that the Chronicler presents prophets as “interpreters of events” but depicts another group of divinely inspired messengers who provide “inspired interpretation of authoritative texts.” See also Thomas Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung* (FRLANT 106; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 215-244; I. L. Seeligmann, “Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung,” in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977* (VTSup 29; Leiden: Brill, 1978), 254-284.

<sup>28</sup> Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 108-120; cf. Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 208. Schneidewind and Jassen both suggest that Neco’s report that he had received a command from God represents a fifth example (2 Chron 35:20-22).

prophets like Nathan, Gad, and Jehu.<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> 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:<sup>31</sup>

(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.  
(2 Chron 15:1-8)

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

---

<sup>29</sup> Sara Japhat, *I-II Chronicles: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1993), 2:717. Compare, for example, 1 Chron 17:3; 21:9; 2 Chron 19:2.

<sup>30</sup> As Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Prophets in the Book of Chronicles,” in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist* (OTS 45; ed. Johannes C. de Moor; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 47, notes, the Chronicler used the narrative of 1 Kgs 15:9-24 but the majority of his narrative does not come from the earlier account. As such, the account of Azariah represents the work of the Chronicler.

<sup>31</sup> For further discussion of possible allusions to earlier scriptural material in 2 Chron 15:1-7, see Japhat, *I-II Chronicles*, 716; Von Rad, “Levitical Sermon,” 271; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 48-49; Michael A. Fishbane, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel,” in *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989), 14-16; Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 114-115; Beentjes, “Prophets in Chronicles,” 51.

circumstance requiring cultic reform.<sup>32</sup> 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.<sup>33</sup> 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.<sup>34</sup> 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.<sup>35</sup>

The “resignification” of the phrase “word of YHWH” (דבר יהוה) in Chronicles represents another indicator of this implicit emphasis upon the interpretation of written revelation.<sup>36</sup> This phrase occurs 241 times in the Hebrew Bible and almost always refers

---

<sup>32</sup> Beentjes, “Prophets in Chronicles,” 49-50, and others have suggested that 2 Chron 15:2 also alludes to the Deuteronomistic theology of Deut 4:29-30 and Jer 29:13-14; cf. Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 114.

<sup>33</sup> Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 114; Fishbane, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 15; idem, *Biblical Interpretation*, 388-392; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 48-51; Japhat, *I-II Chronicles*, 2:719; I. L. Seelingmann, “The Beginnings of Midrash in Chronicles,” *Tarbiz* 49 (1979-1980), 20-21. Whereas Hosea emphasizes the role of political leadership, the Chronicler highlights the necessity of the priest and teaching. Fishbane also suggests that the phrase מְהוּמָת רַבּוֹת in 2 Chron 15:5b recalls Amos 3:9 and that 2 Chron 15:2-4 parallels Deut 4:29-30; cf. Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 114.

<sup>34</sup> So Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 48-49; Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 114-115; Beentjes, “Prophets in Chronicles,” 51-52. See especially the common terms and phrases “there is no peace” (אין שלום), “distress” (צרה, צר) and “for him who went out and came in” (לַיֵּצֵא וּלְבֹא). Beentjes also notes the parallel phraseology between 2 Chron 15: 7 (כִּי יֵשׁ שָׂכָר לַפְּעֻלַּתְכֶם) and Jer 31:16 (כִּי יֵשׁ שָׂכָר לַפְּעֻלַּתְךָ).

<sup>35</sup> Japhat, *I-II Chronicles*, 716; Fishbane, “Inner-Biblical Exegesis,” 16; Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 50; Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 115.

<sup>36</sup> Schneidewind, *Word of God*, 130.

to a prophetic oracle (221 times).<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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 Schniedewind, 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:<sup>39</sup> “Once the ‘word of YHWH’ becomes the *Torah*, then the

---

<sup>37</sup> O. Grether, *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament* (BZAW 64; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934), 76; cf. Gerhard Von Rad, *Old Testament Theology* (2 vols.; trans. David Muir Gibson Stalker; New York: Harper & Row, 1962-1965), 2:87.

<sup>38</sup> 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 דִּבְרַי הַאֱלֹהִים; 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).

<sup>39</sup> According to Schniedewind, *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.”<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup>

## 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).<sup>42</sup> Indeed, as Alex Jassen notes, the role of Ezra as a scribal expert “characterizes his entire mission.”<sup>43</sup> 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,

---

<sup>40</sup> Schniedewind, *Word of God*, 138. See also Willi, *Die Chronik als Auslegung*, 215-244, who argues that the prophets in Chronicles function as exegetes who promote the concept of a historical written tradition; cf. Rosemarie Micheel, *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik* (BBET 18; Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983), 67.

<sup>41</sup> 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.

<sup>42</sup> H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (WBC 16; Waco, Word Books, 1985), 92, suggests that the description of Ezra as a “skilled scribe” indicates his astuteness in study and exposition of the Law (cf. Ps 45:2); cf. Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988), 137.

<sup>43</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 210. See, especially, the descriptions of Ezra in 7:10, 12, 14, 25-26.

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 (לְדַרְוֹשׁ) 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.<sup>44</sup> 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.”<sup>45</sup> Moreover, Ezra 7:10 uses the infinitive construct לְדַרְוֹשׁ, 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.<sup>46</sup> The textual study of Ezra therefore becomes analogous to classical oracular prophecy.<sup>47</sup> 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

---

<sup>44</sup> See e.g., Ezek 1:3; 3:14, 22; 8:1; 33:22; 37:1; 40:1; 2 Kgs 3:15; Isa 8:11; Jer 15:17. Peter R. Ackroyd, *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament* (ed. G. Johannes Botterweck; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 5:421; G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936), 6, 42; Moshe Greenberg, *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 22; Garden City, Doubleday, 1983), 41; J. J. M. Roberts, “The Hand of Yahweh,” *VT* 21 (1971): 244-251. In a number of instances, the “hand of YHWH” produces prophetic ecstasy and indicates the urgency and power with which the prophet speaks.

<sup>45</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 211; cf. Fishbane, “Scribalism,” 440-441.

<sup>46</sup> Of the 16 times that לְדַרְוֹשׁ 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 דָּרַשׁ 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).

<sup>47</sup> Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129.

became a community guided by the inspired study and reinterpretation of ancient written revelation.<sup>48</sup>

### 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.<sup>49</sup> 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

---

<sup>48</sup> 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.

<sup>49</sup> See, e.g., R. Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch* (Berlin: Reimer, 1906), 1:xxiii; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period* (trans. John Bowden; London: SCM, 1974), 139, 160; Alexander A. Di Lella and Patrick W. Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes* (AB 39; New York: Doubleday, 1987), 75-76; Bruce M. Metzger and Roland E. Murphy, eds., *The New Annotated Apocrypha: The Apocryphal/ Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament* (New York: OUP, 1991), 86; George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 57; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 130.

understood as interpretation of the Mosaic law;<sup>50</sup> 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),<sup>51</sup> Ben Sira characterizes his interpretation of the Mosaic law as a form of divine revelation that stands in continuity with the ancient prophetic tradition.<sup>52</sup>

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

---

<sup>50</sup> Leo G. Perdue, “Ben Sira and the Prophets,” in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* (CBQMS 38; ed. Jeremy Corley and Vincent T. M. Skemp; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005), 137; Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (OTS 427; ed. Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 148-149; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 60; Randal A. Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment* (SBLEJL 8; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 56-57; Di Lella and Skehan, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 337-338; Markus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity* (WUNT II.36; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990), 59.

<sup>51</sup> 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 προφητεῖαν). This suggests that the translator may have regarded the content of the instruction as a type of prophecy.

<sup>52</sup> Beentjes, “Prophets in Ben Sira,” 148-149; Perdue, “Ben Sira,” 137; John G. Gammie, “The Sage in Sirach,” in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East* (ed. John G. Gammie and Leo Perdue; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 370-371; Helge Stadelmann, *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrtum* (WUNT 2; Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980), 259; Blenkinsopp, *Prophecy and Canon*, 129; Burton L. Mack, *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 225-226; Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 134-135.

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);<sup>53</sup> 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.<sup>54</sup> 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."<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> 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."

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

<sup>55</sup> Perdue, "Ben Sira," 139. See also Rudolph Smend, *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*, 2:254, who notes that Ben Sira describes the prophetic inspiration of Elisha in a similar way. Compare the phrase πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται in Sir 39:6 with the phrase Ἐλισαίε ἐνεπλήσθη πνεύματος αὐτοῦ in Sir 48:12.

<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup>

#### 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.<sup>58</sup> In differing

---

*Wisdom*, 99, the discovery of divine wisdom within the ancient texts enables the scribe to declare his own wisdom. Likewise, Perdue, “Ben Sira,” 141, suggests that “pour forth words of wisdom of his own” (39:6) refers to the scribe’s interpretation of the scriptures as well as his own teachings. Beentjes, “Prophets in Ben Sira,” 147, also suggests that the passage emphasizes the revelatory aspect of the interpretation of prophecies and Torah (note the inclusio of 38:34d [“the law of the Most High”] and 39:8b [“the law of the Covenant of the Lord”]). See also Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 87-88; Bockmuehl, *Revelation*, 59; Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature*, 60. The phrase “will glory in the law of the Lord’s covenant” in Sir 39:8b further suggests that the content of the divine wisdom that the scribe receives includes interpretation of the scriptures.

<sup>57</sup> Note also that a similar transition from oracular prophet to scribal exegete occurs in Greco-Roman literature. See, for example, 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; Peter T. Struck, *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004), 162-203; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 452-453; L. Silberman, “Unriddling the Riddle,” *RevQ* 3 (1961): 330-331; A. Finkel, “The Peshier of Dreams and Scriptures,” *RevQ* 4 (1963): 357-370.

<sup>58</sup> As Hindy Najman, “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies,” *JSJ* 30 (1999): 379, notes, the different approaches to scriptural interpretation may also have been due to “diverse views about how to interpret and apply this authoritative writing” (379).

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:<sup>59</sup> 1) descriptions of the select status and privileged knowledge of the interpreter(s)<sup>60</sup> and 2) assertions of a direct line of continuity between the revelatory experience of the interpreter(s) and the ancient prophets.<sup>61</sup> 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.

---

<sup>59</sup> 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.

<sup>60</sup> 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. idem, *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.

<sup>61</sup> 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 Peshar 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<sup>62</sup> 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

---

<sup>62</sup> John J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), suggests that ספרים in Dan 9:2 refers to the books of the Prophets; cf. James A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927), 360. Gerald H. Wilson, “The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29,” *JSOT* 48 (1990): 92-93, argues instead that ספרים in Dan 9:2 refers to letters of Jeremiah written during the time of exile. Others suggest that the term refers to a more general body of sacred scriptures. See, e.g., R. H. Charles, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1929), 225; Pierre Grelot, “Soixante-dix semaines d’années,” *Bib* 50 (1969): 169; Louis F. Hartman and Alexander Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel* (AB 23; Garden City: Doubleday, 1978), 241. The context seems to suggest a collection of sacred writings, whether of prophets or a larger body of material.

9:15-19).<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup> 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). The

---

<sup>63</sup> Although Daniel never requests divine assistance to understand the prophecy of Jeremiah in this prayer, some suggest that the prayer represents a request for exegetical illumination, since the act of fasting (Dan 9:3) can be used as preparation for revelation (cf. Dan 10:2-3; Ex 34:28; Deut 9:9; 4 Ezra 5:13, 20) and since the verb שָׁקַב can refer to seeking God for revelation (Amos 8:12; 2 Sam 21:2; Hos 5:15). See, e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 360; Hartman and Di Lella, *Daniel*, 241, 245; John E. Goldingay, *Daniel* (WBC 30; Dallas: Word Books, 1989), 253; André Lacocque, “The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9,” *HUCA* 47 (1976): 121. Others rightly argue that the primary purpose of the prayer is penitential. See, e.g., Collins, *Daniel*, 349; Raymond Hammer, *The Book of Daniel* (CBCOT; Cambridge: CUP, 1976), 46-47; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 217. Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 488-489, also argues that Daniel’s confession of sin represents an interpretation of Leviticus 26, a text that warns Israel of the punishment for covenant infidelity. The passage indicates that if the punished people confess their sins, God will forgive and restore them (Lev 26:40). According to Fishbane, the purpose of Daniel’s prayer was not just to signal that the punishment of Israel was complete but to provide hope that repentance would bring their captivity to an end. Similarly, Norman W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965), 138, suggests that the phrase “the curse and the oath written in the law of Moses” in Dan 9:11 refers to Num 5:21; Lev 26:14-39; and Deut 28:15-68. Daniel’s belated act of confession is the proper Deuteronomistic response that leads to renewal of hope.

<sup>64</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 347-348, suggests that a key issue in the modern interpretation of Daniel 9 relates to the seemingly contradictory relationship between Daniel’s prayer (vv. 4-19) and the rest of Daniel 9. The prayer expresses a Deuteronomistic perspective, is written in fluent Hebrew, and uses terminology not found elsewhere in Daniel. By contrast, the rest of the chapter is written in difficult Hebrew, contains frequent Aramaisms, and communicates a deterministic outlook. For further discussion of these differences, see, e.g., Charles, *Daniel*, 226; L. H. Ginzberg, *Studies in Daniel* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948), 33, 41; Montgomery, *Daniel*, 362; Lacocque, “Liturgical Prayer,” 119-142; Porteous, *Daniel*, 135-136; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 236-237; Bruce William Jones, “The Prayer in Daniel IX,” *VT* 18 (1968): 488-493; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 487. The differences between the prayer and its context lead the majority of scholars to suggest that the prayer itself is a secondary insertion. Some argue that it was a late interpolation, in which case the author of Daniel was not involved in shaping it. See, e.g., Charles, *Daniel*, 226; Ginzberg, *Daniel*, 33, 41. Others suggest that it was a traditional prayer (compare 1 Kings 8; Ezra 9; Nehemiah 1, 9) that was inserted and adapted by the author of Daniel. See, e.g., Montgomery, *Daniel*, 361-362; Jones, “Prayer,” 488-493; Porteous, *Daniel*, 135-136; Goldingay, *Daniel*, 236-237; Collins, *Daniel*, 347-348; Lacocque, “Liturgical Prayer,” 141; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 487-488. Mark J. Boda, “Form Criticism in Transition: Penitential Prayer and Lament, *Sitz im Leben* and Form,” in *Seeking the Favor of God Vol. 1, The Origins of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBLEJL 21; ed. Mark J. Boda, Daniel K. Falk, and Rodney A. Werline; Atlanta: SBL, 2006), 190, argues that there was an “enduring interest” in using penitential prayer after the Babylonian exile, “especially for those who remained in exilic contexts, such as Nehemiah (Neh 1) and Daniel (Dan 9).” The correspondence between the language of the prayer and its context in Daniel 9 suggests that the prayer itself underwent considerable redaction.

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.<sup>65</sup>

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 (דבר; Dan 9:23) and the message that came to Jeremiah (דבר יהוה; Dan 9:2, 25), the author draws an implicit connection between the revelatory exegesis of Gabriel and the original prophetic message.<sup>66</sup> By

---

<sup>65</sup> 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” (חתך) 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).

<sup>66</sup> Although most commentators suggest that דבר 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 דבר 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.<sup>67</sup> Essentially, it infuses the new exegetical revelation with a status commensurate with the earlier prophetic oracle.<sup>68</sup>

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” (לְהַשְׁכִּילָךְ בִּינָה) in Dan 9:22 with the description of Daniel and his friends: “To these four young men God gave knowledge and skill (מִדָּעָ וְהַשְׁכָּל) in every aspect of literature and wisdom; Daniel also had insight (הַבִּינָה) 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” (וּבִינָה), “understand” (וְהַבִּינָה), “know” (וּתְדַע) and “consider” (וְהַשְׁכָּל) 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.<sup>69</sup> 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 דְּבַר as the message that “went forth” from God through Gabriel when Daniel first began to pray.

<sup>67</sup> Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 218-220; Fishbane, *Biblical Interpretation*, 484.

<sup>68</sup> 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.”

<sup>69</sup> 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” (בִּינָה) 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” (משכלים; 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 (והמשכלים יבינו)” (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.”<sup>70</sup> Through their eschatological gift of insight, the *maskilim* “know their God” and “give understanding to many (ומשכילי עם יבינו לרבים)” (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).<sup>71</sup> 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,

---

<sup>70</sup> 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).

<sup>71</sup> 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 בִּיַן 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.<sup>72</sup>

## 1 Enoch

Since 1 Enoch never explicitly quotes or paraphrases biblical passages,<sup>73</sup> 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.<sup>74</sup> For example, the

---

<sup>72</sup> Collins, *Daniel*, 392-394, 402-403; cf., Lacocque, *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).

<sup>73</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2001), 57.

<sup>74</sup> Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 7. Nickelsburg, *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, *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 *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 *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 *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”(71). 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

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.<sup>75</sup>

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.<sup>76</sup> 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

---

the same side as the Zadokite group that they formerly opposed. For further discussion of the use of scripture in the Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1-36), see Kenneth E. Pomykala, “A Scripture Profile of the Book of the Watchers,” in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders* (BibInt 28; ed. Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 263-284. For discussion of the presentation of the Enochic revelations in 1 Enoch as authoritative scripture, see Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 265; Argall, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 31. For a more general treatment of the use of scripture in 1 Enoch, see also James C. VanderKam, “Biblical Interpretation in 1 Enoch and Jubilees” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation* (JSPSup 14; Sheffield; JSOT, 1993), 96-125.

<sup>75</sup> As Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 267, notes, the Apocalypse of Weeks begins by referring to the revelation that he received from the “heavenly tablets” (1 En. 93:1-2). According to Jassen, this “revelatory encounter” forms the basis of his claim to possess knowledge about the “ultimate fate of the righteous” (268); cf. James C. VanderKam, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984), 150-151. Similarly, the Animal Apocalypse begins by describing the revelation therein as a dream vision (1 En. 85:1-2). See also Patrick A. Tiller, *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBLEJL 4; Atlanta: Scholars, 1993), 22, who suggests that the Animal Apocalypse reviews events from Genesis 1 to Ezra-Nehemiah from the perspective of “divine and angelic activity”; cf. Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 32.

<sup>76</sup> For further discussion of the parallels between the Animal Apocalypse and the Apocalypse of Weeks, see Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 399-400.

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.<sup>77</sup>  
 (1 En. 93:8-10)<sup>78</sup>

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

---

<sup>77</sup> 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 שבעה פ[עמי]ן חכמה ומדע.

<sup>78</sup> 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.<sup>79</sup> From the perspective of the author, then, this newly constituted group represents true Israel.<sup>80</sup> Furthermore, the author indicates that this community emerged with the express purpose of receiving divine gifts of wisdom and knowledge.<sup>81</sup>

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 altering 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).<sup>82</sup> Shortly thereafter,

---

<sup>79</sup> 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.

<sup>80</sup> 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.

<sup>81</sup> 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, *Mediating 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.

<sup>82</sup> Scholars have linked the first opening of the eyes of Israel, described in 1 En. 89:28, to a number of different events. François Martin, *Le livre d'Hénoch: Documents pour l'étude de la Bible, traduit sur le texte éthiopien* (Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1906), 209, and Günter Reese, "Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums: Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4 Esrabuches" (PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karl-Universität zu Heidelberg, 1967), 34, suggest that it refers to Exod 14:31, where Israel sees the power of God in delivering Israel from the Egyptians. Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 292, suggests that it refers to Exod 15:25b-26, where the emphasis rests upon keeping the commands of God. James C. VanderKam, "Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (1 Enoch 85-90)," in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel* (JSJSup 83; ed. Hindy

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),<sup>83</sup> 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).<sup>84</sup> Finally, in what appears to be an account of the authors' own time period,<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup>  
(1 En. 90:6-10a)

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 (1En. 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.

<sup>83</sup> 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."

<sup>84</sup> 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.

<sup>85</sup> 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.

<sup>86</sup> 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<sup>87</sup> which strongly suggests that the authors wish to depict Jews who receive this illumination as those who gain a renewed understanding of Mosaic law.<sup>88</sup> 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.<sup>89</sup>

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.<sup>90</sup> From this perspective, the accounts present the knowledge of a particular group as a manifestation of the final intervention of God. Their divinely-

---

<sup>87</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 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.

<sup>88</sup> Nickelsburg, *1 Enoch*, 381; VanderKam, “Open and Closed Eyes,” 292. Similarly, Tiller, *Animal Apocalypse*, 292, argues that the accounts of eye-opening in the *Animal Apocalypse* depict “possession of God’s law and obedience to it.”

<sup>89</sup> 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, *Animal Apocalypse*, 382, posits that this imagery also suggests a return to “the way shown by Moses” (382).

<sup>90</sup> 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, *1 Enoch and Sirach*, 46-47.

bestowed gifts of revelation confirm their elect status as the chosen remnant and renewed Israel.<sup>91</sup>

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).<sup>92</sup> These contrasts further define group identity with reference to wisdom and Torah

---

<sup>91</sup> 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* (2<sup>nd</sup> 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* and the Damascus Document. Boccaccini, *Essene Hypothesis*, 16, 165-196, argues that “Enochic Judaism 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.

<sup>92</sup> George W. E. Nickelsburg, “The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature,” *JJS* 33 (1982): 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).<sup>93</sup> From this perspective, the task of the interpreter involves gaining an understanding of the relevance of the prophecy to contemporary circumstances.<sup>94</sup> The *pesharim* texts from Qumran exemplify this exegetical process since they attempt to correlate ancient prophecy with present and eschatological events.<sup>95</sup> 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

---

<sup>93</sup> 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), 255-256; Collins, "Prophecy and Fulfillment," 304-307.

<sup>94</sup> 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.

<sup>95</sup> 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 (1977): 27-34; F. F. Bruce, *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959), 68. Nevertheless, as Annette Steudel, "אחרית הימים in Texts from Qumran," *RevQ* 16 (1993-94): 225-246, has 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.<sup>96</sup>

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:<sup>97</sup>

- 1:16 [Look, O traitors (בוגדים),<sup>98</sup> and] s[ee;]  
 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 (הבוגדים) together with the Man of

---

<sup>96</sup> Early scholars of the Dead Sea Scrolls, such as J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (trans. J. Strugnell; Naperville: Alec Allenson, 1959), 11, regarded Peshar Habakkuk as an autograph, but this assumption has since been refuted. See, e.g., Horgan, *Pesharim*, 3-4. Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran* (Philadelphia: JPS, 1994), 226, suggests that Peshar Habakkuk was composed around 84-63 BCE but attempts to depict the earlier history of the sect. Similarly, Hartmut Stegemann, *On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus* (The Library of Qumran; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 131-132, maintains that Peshar 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 Peshar Habakkuk by Loren T. Stuckenbruck, “Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the *Habakkuk Peshar* (1QpHab),” in *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 the those of the Teacher of Righteousness. The precise historical time frame of the text, however, remains difficult to determine since Peshar Habakkuk contains no real historical names. Moshe J. Bernstein, “Peshar Habakkuk,” in the *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 Peshar Habakkuk was written around the time that Pompey took Jerusalem (63 CE). Nevertheless, the inner-Jewish conflict that Peshar Habakkuk describes could refer to the early part of the Hasmonean era, rather than to the time of Alexander Jannaeus. Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*, 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.

<sup>97</sup> The English citations of 1 QpHab follow Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*.

<sup>98</sup> This reconstruction of the lemma – Hab 1:5 – presents the phrase “upon the nations” (בגוים) in the MT as “traitors” (בוגדים). 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, *Mediating the Divine*, 31, suggests that בוגדים occurred in the *Vorlage* that the pesherist used; cf. Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*, 54. For further discussion, see William H. Brownlee, *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,]  
 ([הבוגדים בברית], f[or] they were not  
 2:4 faithful to the covenant of God [. . .]<sup>99</sup> his holy name.  
 2:5 And thus (VACAT) the interpretation of the passage [concerns the trait]tors  
 ([על הבוגדים]) at the latter  
 2:6 days. They are the ruthless [ones of the cove]nant<sup>100</sup> 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 priest<sup>101</sup> to whom God gave into [his heart discernme]nt to interpret<sup>102</sup> 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 . . . ]<sup>103</sup>

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 (לפשוט) all the words of the prophets (1QpHab 2:8).<sup>104</sup> Although the passage does not define the exegetical method of the Teacher, it clearly portrays his interpretation as one that originated from God.<sup>105</sup>

<sup>99</sup> Possibly "and they profaned."

<sup>100</sup> This restoration (עריצנים בברית) was first proposed by Erik Sjöberg, "The Restoration of Column II of the Habakkuk Commentary of the Dead Sea Scrolls," *ST 4* (1952): 121-127. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 56, prefers Sjöberg's reconstruction to "the ruth[less of the nati]ons" עריצי האומות 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.

<sup>101</sup> In this context, the "priest" refers to the Teacher. So Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 57; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 32; Aune, "Charismatic Exegesis," 134; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 225.

<sup>102</sup> Although the infinitive construct לפשוט 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 פשר which, in his view, here refers to the "secret prophetic meaning which only an inspired interpreter may expound" (57).

<sup>103</sup> Possibly restore as "and up[on his congregation]."

<sup>104</sup> Here I am following the reconstruction of a number of scholars who present 1QpHab 2:8a as ה[בין] ב[לבנו] ב[ינ]ה. See, e.g., Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 53; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 30. Rabinowitz, "Columns," 33, supplies הכמה rather than בינה, 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.

<sup>105</sup> 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.*)<sup>106</sup> the last generation, but the fulfillment of the period (גמר הקץ)  
 he did not make known to him (לוא הודיעו).  
 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 (הודיעו)  
 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 (לוא הודיעו)<sup>107</sup> how the prophecy would be fulfilled at the end of time (גמר הקץ).<sup>108</sup> By contrast, God *did* make known (הודיעו) 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.<sup>109</sup> This description

<sup>106</sup> The doubling of the preposition על at the end of line 1 and the beginning of line 2 appears to be a result of dittography.

<sup>107</sup> 1QpHab 7:2 has the *hiphil* form of ידע with the third masculine singular pronoun written defectively: הודיעו. Compare this with the full orthography in 1QpHab 7:4 (הודיעו).

<sup>108</sup> A number of scholars interpret the phrase גמר הקץ as a reference to the final end of time. See, e.g., the translations in Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (England: Clays Ltd., 2004), 512, “when time would come to an end”; Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998), 1:17, “the consummation of the era”; Horgan, *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, *Midrash Pesher*, 110, argues that the phrase גמר הקץ 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, *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).

<sup>109</sup> The phrase “mysteries of the words of his servants the prophets” (רזי דברי עבדיו הנבאים) suggests that the message of the prophets in some way needed to be deciphered. Compare the use of the Aramaic רזי in Dan 2:18, 19, 27, 29, 30, 47; 4:6 to refer to mysteries that need interpretation or decoding (פשר; 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, *Pesharim*, 37-38, 237; Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 112-113; Jassen, *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.<sup>110</sup> 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.<sup>111</sup>

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" (בוגדים) 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.

<sup>110</sup> The verb "may run" (ירויץ) 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 למען from "for the sake of" to "in order that." The meaning of ירויץ in 1QpHab 7:3 also presents an interpretive challenge. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 108, notes that ירויץ 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 פציץ but Silberman maintains that the same meaning has been applied to ירויץ. Brownlee, *Midrash Pesher*, 111, suggests that the term ירויץ may be intended as a wordplay on the term "mystery" (רז); the Teacher of Righteousness provides interpretations that divulge the mysterious meanings of the words of the prophets.

<sup>111</sup> The use of the definite article with the participle הקורא 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 קורא in the MT of Hab 2:2.

reject or become unfaithful to the message of the Teacher (1QpHab 2:1-2, 3-4, 6).<sup>112</sup>

Silberman suggests that these three groups of “traitors” correspond to three periods in the history of the sect.<sup>113</sup> If so, the peshar 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.<sup>114</sup> By contrast, the pesharist 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 Peshar 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.<sup>115</sup> The scriptural interpretation of the Teacher provided a foundation for community members who could identify with the Jewish

---

<sup>112</sup> See Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 31-32; Brownlee, *Midrash Peshar*, 54-56; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 23-24.

<sup>113</sup> 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 Peshar*, 54-56; Horgan, *Pesharim*, 24.

<sup>114</sup> 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 Peshar 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; 4QpPsa 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.

<sup>115</sup> 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 Peshet Habakkuk uses his exegesis to define the boundaries of the community and to provide scriptural warrant for its existence.

### **The *Hodayot* (1QH<sup>a</sup>)**

Although the *Hodayot* contain what appear to be two independent literary units – the hymns of the Teacher (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10-17) and the hymns of the community (1QH<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>116</sup> The hymns of the Teacher portray him as a conduit of divine revelation. As such, he receives knowledge (דעת), understanding (בינה, שכל), truth (אמת), and “wondrous mysteries” (רזי פלא), and mediates this knowledge and revelation to the elect.<sup>117</sup> Similarly, the community hymns

---

<sup>116</sup> 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*.

<sup>117</sup> 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” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:10-18); “You have lightened my face for your covenant . . . like perfect dawn you have revealed yourself to me with perfect light” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:6); “Through me you have enlightened the face of the Many . . . for you have shown me your wondrous mysteries” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 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” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 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 (1QH<sup>a</sup> 17:31-32). The

contain frequent expressions of thanksgiving for the revelation that God gives to the community.<sup>118</sup> Indeed, this theme permeates the *Hodayot* to such an extent that it represents one of the most central concepts within the collection.<sup>119</sup> Moreover, the descriptions of divine revelation in the *Hodayot* relate closely to the presentation of scriptural interpretation in these hymns.

1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:5-29, the first unit in a hymn of the Teacher (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:5-13:4), links the gift of divine revelation with the ability to interpret the Torah:<sup>120</sup>

- 12:5 I give thanks, Lord, because you have enlightened my face for your covenant (לבריתכה) and
- 12:6 [...] I have looked for you. Like perfect dawn you have revealed yourself to me (הופעתה לי) with perf[ect] light. But they, your people [...]
- 12:7 [...] ... they lure them, and mediators of deceit (ומליצי רמיה) [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 (מליצי כזב) and seers of deceit (והווי רמיה), they have plotted a devilish thing against me {...} to change your Law, which you engraved in my heart, for flattering teachings (בהלקות)
- 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] stut[ter]ing 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

---

centrality of this theme has been widely recognized. See, e.g., Menahem Mansoor, *The Thanksgiving Hymns* (STDJ 3; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961), 65-74; J. Licht, "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll," *IEJ* 6 (1956): 97-99; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 282-289; Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 366-371.

<sup>118</sup> See also pages 68-69 below.

<sup>119</sup> Licht, "Doctrine," 89.

<sup>120</sup> English citations from 1QH<sup>a</sup>, 1QS, and CD follow the translation of Florentino García Martínez and Eibert Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998).

- that! But you, O God, will answer them, judging them  
 12:19 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.  
 12:20 At the judgment 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,  
 12:21 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 your heart,  
 12:22 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  
 12:23 they do not esteem me, even though you exhibit your power in me and reveal yourself in me with your strength as perfect light (ותופע לי בכוחכה לאורתום). You have not covered in disgrace the face of  
 12:24 all those sought by me, those who unite / together / for your covenant (לבריתכה). Those who walk on the path of your heart have listened to me, they have aligned themselves before you  
 12:25 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  
 12:26 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,  
 12:27 (ובי האירותה פני רבים) you have increased them, so that they are uncountable, for you have shown me your wondrous mysteries (כי הודעתני ברזי פלאכה).  
 12:28 By your wondrous counsel you have strengthened my position and worked wonders in the presence of the Many on account of your glory, and to show  
 12:29 your powerful acts to all living things.

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

<sup>121</sup> 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).

<sup>122</sup> Vermes, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 268, translates this phrase “by your covenant” but Mansoor, *Thanksgiving Hymns*, suggests that the ל in the phrase לבריתכה 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<sup>a</sup> 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 (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:5), appeared to him (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:6 הופעתה; cf. 12:23 ותופע לי),<sup>123</sup> and caused him to know wondrous mysteries (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:27 הודעתני ברזי פלאכה).<sup>124</sup> 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 (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:5), and God engraves the Torah in his heart (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:10).<sup>125</sup>

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 (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:24), gain access to eschatological salvation (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:25),<sup>126</sup> and receive illumination (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:27

---

<sup>123</sup> The *Hodayot* use the verbal roots גלה and יפע to describe revelatory experiences (גלה in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5:8-9; 9:21; 19:17; 20:32-34; יפע in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:6, 23; 17:31; 23:5-7). This parallels language of revelation found in the Hebrew Bible. See Jassen, *Mediating the Divine*, 368.

<sup>124</sup> For other descriptions of the “wonders,” “wondrous mysteries,” and mystery of wisdom that God gives to the Teacher and the community, see, e.g., 1QH<sup>a</sup> 9:21; 15:26-27; 18:14-15; 19:4, 10, 28; 20:11-13, 20.

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

<sup>126</sup> 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 במוד קודשים in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:25 may refer to angels. Compare צבא קודשים in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 11:22. See also the description of the community in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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. Émile 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.

ובי האירותה פני רבים). 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 (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:7 מליצי רמיה; 12:9-10 מליצי כוזב; cf. 10:31)<sup>127</sup> who search for divine revelation through illegitimate means (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:14-16),<sup>128</sup> reject the “vision of knowledge” of the Teacher (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:18), and deny people the “drink of knowledge” (1QH<sup>a</sup> 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 (1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:10).<sup>129</sup> These contrasting descriptions both show the superiority of the scriptural interpretation of the Teacher over that of rival leaders and

---

<sup>127</sup> The term מליץ derives from the root לייץ in the Hebrew Bible and means “to interpret” or “to intercede” in the *hiphil* form. The *hiphil* participle מליץ 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, *Hodayot*, 35, suggests that מליץ in the *Hodayot* refers to an intermediary of either truth or error. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 107, uses the more neutral term “spokesmen” to translate מליץ. Michael C. Douglas, “Power and Praise in the Hodayot: 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.

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

<sup>129</sup> They exchange the Torah which God has engraved on his heart for “flattering teachings” (בהלקות). In 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:15, 31, the expression “flattering teachings” or “smooth things” (הלקות) occurs within the phrase “seekers of smooth things” (דורשי הלקות) 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” (הלקות) represents a pun on הלכות, 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 הלכות need not be taken as a description of Pharisaic interpretive activities and therefore argue that דורשי הלקות 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.<sup>130</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> 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 *Hodayot* to such an extent that they have been described as a “mosaic of the Scriptures.”<sup>131</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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:<sup>132</sup>

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

---

<sup>130</sup> Similarly, in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:3-19, the hymnist describes himself as a mediator of knowledge of wondrous mysteries (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:13 מלא ברזי דעת מליין דעת ברזי מלא) who provides a foundation of truth and knowledge (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:10), and becomes an open source of knowledge for all who understand (1QH<sup>a</sup> 10:18). By contrast, he depicts his opponents as “mediators of error” (מליצי תעות) and “men of deceit” (אנשי רמיה) who oppress the hymnist. As Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 309-310, notes, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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.

<sup>131</sup> Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 301-351, at 320. The process of identifying scriptural allusions therefore becomes difficult and elusive, as Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 42-55, points out. Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 213, suggests that the use of intertextual allusions to scripture in the *Hodayot* is so immense that it “exceeds every attempt to organize and classify it”; cf. Bonnie Kittel, “The Problems of Biblical Language,” *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary* (SBLDS 50; Missoula, MT: Scholars, 1981), 48-55.

<sup>132</sup> My citations of Jer 10:23 and 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:25-26 here follow Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 213. For further discussion of this scriptural allusion, see Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 71-72; Holm-Nielsen, *Hodayot*, 230.

7:26b person (ולא לאדם דרכו) belong to himself,  
nor is a man able to direct his steps (להכין צעדו).  
(1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:15-16b)

Compare this allusion with the scriptural passage itself:

I know (ידעתי), O LORD, that the way of a person does not belong to himself (כי לא לאדם דרכו), nor does it belong to a man, as he walks, to direct his steps (והכין את-צעדו).  
(Jer 10:23)

The hymnist alludes to Jer 10:23 but supplements this prophetic text with the confession that he possesses knowledge from God (בבינתך).<sup>133</sup> He therefore applies Jer 10:23 to himself and, by implication, the members of the community<sup>134</sup> 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.<sup>135</sup> 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.”<sup>136</sup> 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.”<sup>137</sup> In this sense, the allusion to and exegesis of Jer 10:23 in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:15-

<sup>133</sup> See also the similar expressions ידעתי מבינתך in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 6:12 and ידעתי מבינתכה in 9:19.

<sup>134</sup> Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 71.

<sup>135</sup> Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 213-214.

<sup>136</sup> Newsom, *Self as Symbolic Space*, 214; cf. Hughes, *Scriptural Allusions*, 54.

<sup>137</sup> Grossman, “Cultivating Identity,” 4-10, explores a similar use of scripture in the Damascus Document; cf. Christopher D. Stanley, “The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method,” in *Early*

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, 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>138</sup>

Regardless of the precise identity of the community behind the text, it provides us with

---

*Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals* (JSNTSup 148; ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 44-58.

<sup>138</sup> The provenance and dating of CD is widely disputed. Some suggest that the text describes the origins of the Qumran community; see, e.g., F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran Modern Biblical Studies* (Garden City: Anchor Books, 1961), 81-82; Schiffman, *Reclaiming*, 90-94; Geza Vermes, "The History of the Essenes," in *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 58-59; Michael A. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJWC 2; Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 7. Others suggest that CD was composed within the context of a parent, or related, community. See, e.g., Milik, *Discovery*, 87-93; H. Stegemann, *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde* (Bonn, 1971); J. A. Fitzmyer, "Prolegomenon," in Solomon Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries* vol. 1 (New York: Ktav, 1970), 16.

another example of how claims to inspired scriptural interpretation influenced the development of the self-understanding of a Second Temple Jewish group.<sup>139</sup>

In the section of the *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:

- 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  
 3:14 the hidden matters (לגלות להם נסתרות) in which all  
 Israel had gone astray: His holy sabbaths and his  
 3:15 glorious feasts,<sup>140</sup> his just stipulations and his truthful paths, and

---

<sup>139</sup> Maxine L. Grossman, *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, *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 *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  
 3:16 man must do in order to live by them. He disclosed (these  
 matters) to them and they dug a well of plentiful water;  
 3:17 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.<sup>141</sup> 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.<sup>142</sup> Accordingly, they alone become the true heirs of the patriarchs and the proper continuation of Israel.<sup>143</sup> Moreover, an intrinsic part of their liberation from exile relates to their reception of a special revelation of the “hidden matters” (נִסְתָּרוֹת) that enable them to interpret Torah correctly.<sup>144</sup> Through the claim to have received this gift of knowledge, the covenanters validate their scriptural interpretation and link their elect identity to revelatory insight.<sup>145</sup>

---

<sup>140</sup> 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.

<sup>141</sup> Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 33; Grossman, *Reading for History*, 118.

<sup>142</sup> Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 34.

<sup>143</sup> 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.

<sup>144</sup> 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, לְנִגְלוֹת לַיהוָה נִסְתָּרוֹת in CD 3:13b-14 alludes to Deut 29:28 but transforms the meaning of the biblical phrase. Deut 29:28 indicates that “the secret things (נִסְתָּרוֹת) belong to the LORD our God” and that “the revealed things” (נִגְלוֹת) belong to Israel. By way of comparison, CD 3:13b-14 asserts that God has given the hidden things (לְנִגְלוֹת לַיהוָה נִסְתָּרוֹת) to the covenanters as an exclusive gift; cf. Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 418-419.

<sup>145</sup> 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 (כי לא עם בינות);  
 5:17 they are a people bereft of counsel in that there is no intelligence in them (הם גוי אבד עצות מאשר אין בהם בינה).  
 For in ancient times there arose  
 5:18 Moses and Aaron, by the hand of the prince of lights, and Belial with his cunning, raised up Jannes and  
 5:19 his brother during the first deliverance of Israel. [space] [space]  
 5:20 And in the age of devastation of the land there arose those who shifted the boundary and caused Israel to go astray (ויתעו).  
 5:21 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 (להשיב את ישראל) from following  
 6:2 God. But God remembered the covenant of the forefathers [space]. And he raised from Aaron men of knowledge (נבונים) and from Israel  
 6:3 wise men (ומישראל חכמים), and caused them to listen (וישמיעם). 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 who dug it [space] are  
 6:5 the converts of Israel (שבי ישראל) who left the land of Judah and lived in the land of Damascus,  
 6:6 all of whom God called princes, for they sought him and their renown has not been repudiated  
 6:7 in anyone's mouth. [Space] And the staff is the interpreter of the law,<sup>146</sup> of whom  
 6:8 Isaiah said: *Isa 54:16* "He produces a tool for his labor." [space] And the nobles of the people are  
 6:9 those who came to dig the well with the staves that the sceptre decreed,  
 6:10 to walk in them throughout the whole age of wickedness, and without which they will not obtain it, until there arises  
 6:11 he who teaches justice at the end of days.<sup>147</sup> [space]

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

<sup>147</sup> Although Davies, *Damascus Document*, 124, argues that "he who teaches justice" (יורה 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).<sup>148</sup> 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,”<sup>149</sup> restore Israel through their scriptural interpretation (cf. CD 6:14).<sup>150</sup> The founders of the Damascus community thus stand in direct contrast to those who formerly deceived Israel, as the repeated use of *שוב* and *hiphil* verbal forms demonstrate: whereas the false prophets altered the covenant and so caused Israel to go astray (ויתעו) and to turn (להשיב את ישראל) from following God, God causes the covenanters to listen (וישמיעם) so that they become the “turning ones of Israel” (שבי ישראל) who interpret the scriptures correctly.<sup>151</sup> In this way, the passage presents

---

193, opines that this figure should be identified as the eschatological prophet. The phrase *יורה צדק* in this passage is similar but not identical to *מורה צדק*, a phrase that elsewhere refers to the “Teacher of Righteousness” (e.g., CD 1:11; 20:32).

<sup>148</sup> As Knibb, *Qumran Community*, 46, notes *עם בינות* in CD 5:16 alludes to Isa 27:11 and *הם גוי אבד עצות אין בהם בינה* in CD 5:17 alludes to Deut 32:28 to characterize former Israel as a people who were incapable of understanding God.

<sup>149</sup> Most scholars conclude that the “Interpreter of the Torah” in CD 6:7 represents the Teacher of Righteousness. See, e.g., Jeremias, *Lehrer*, 272; Knibb, *Qumran Community*, John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995), 148; idem, *Apocalyptic Imagination*, 147; Fishbane, “Scribalism,” 453. Davies, *Damascus Document*, 119-125, suggests instead that the “Interpreter of the Torah” refers to an earlier leader of the community, perhaps its founder; cf. Fraade, “Interpretive Authority,” 62.

<sup>150</sup> 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” (כפשר התורה) that he had introduced (cf. CD 4:8; 6:14).

<sup>151</sup> Chaim Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958), 13, suggests that the phrase *שבי ישראל* (cf. CD 4:2; 8:16) represents a shortened version of *שבי פשע ישראל* 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,<sup>152</sup> 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 (לשוב) 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 (לכול הנגלה)  
       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 (הנסתרות) in which they err  
 5:12   by their own fault and because they treated the revealed matters (הנגלות)  
       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  
 5:13   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 שבי ישראל as those who turn away from the sin of the rest of Israel and toward the will of God and correct Torah interpretation.

<sup>152</sup> Grossman, *Reading for History*, 124-126.

a whole possesses.<sup>153</sup> 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 (הנגלה) that the community obtains through the study of the Torah, on the one hand, but as something hidden (הנסתרות) from outsiders who do not search the decrees of God, on the other.<sup>154</sup> 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.<sup>155</sup>

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 (הנסתרת) from Israel but which has been found out by  
 8:12 the Interpreter (לְאִישׁ הַדְּרוֹשׁ), he should not keep hidden (אֵל יִסְתַּרְהוּן) from them for fear of a spirit of desertion. And when these have become / a community / in Israel

<sup>153</sup> 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 לְכוּל הַנְּגִלָה 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).

<sup>154</sup> 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*.

<sup>155</sup> 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 wh[i]ch he commanded through the hand of Moses, in order to act in compliance with all that has been revealed from age to age, (ככול הנגלה עת בעת)
- 8:16a and according to what the prophets have revealed through his holy spirit (וכאשר גלו הנביאים ברוח קודשן). [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 (הנמטר) 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.<sup>156</sup> 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.<sup>157</sup> 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

---

<sup>156</sup> 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.

<sup>157</sup> Shemesh and Werman, “Hidden Things,” 421.

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; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> Likewise, scholars of Luke-Acts frequently discuss Luke's use of the

---

\*All English citations of the New Testament are taken from the New Revised Standard Version unless otherwise indicated. English citations of Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho* and *1-2 Apologies* are taken from Thomas B. Falls, *The Writings of Saint Justin Martyr* (The Fathers of the Church; New York: Christian Heritage, 1948), with slight modifications. The Greek version of the New Testament is taken from the United Bible Societies Greek New Testament (fourth revised edition) and the Greek texts of Justin Martyr's writings are taken from Miraslov Marcovich, ed., *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis* (PTS 38; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1994); idem, *Dialogus cum Tryphone* (PTS 47; New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1997).

<sup>1</sup> See, e.g., Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 97; Willis A. Shotwell, *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr* (London: SPCK, 1965), 7; Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Beiträge Zur Historischen Theologie, 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 165-167; Marc Hirshman, *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity* (trans. Batya Stein-Hirshman; Albany: State University New York Press, 1996), 19-21; Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 137-138; Tessa Rajak, "Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*," in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians* (ed. Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price in association with

LXX as a means of presenting the events that he narrates as the fulfillment of ancient prophecy.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

Christopher Rowland, New York: OUP, 1999), 61-62, 68-69; Jeffrey S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991), 184.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969); Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987); B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989); Craig A. Evans and James A. Sanders, *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: SAP, 1995); Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup; Sheffield: SAP, 1997); David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000).

<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> determining the precise genealogical relationship between their works remains elusive.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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,<sup>7</sup> the differences between them help to demonstrate the diversity of theological viewpoints among even proto-orthodox Christian groups of this era.

---

<sup>4</sup> See pages 12-15 of the introduction. As Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 259, notes, “concerning his understanding of the origin and purpose of scriptural proof, and concerning its setting, Justin exhibits striking parallels with Luke-Acts” (259).

<sup>5</sup> See pages 4-8 of the introduction. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 250-251, 256-259, 361-362, 431-432, maintains that Justin knew Luke-Acts and, in some cases, drew upon Lukan theology, but concludes that it is too simplistic to attribute all of the similarities between them to Justin’s direct dependence upon Luke; cf. Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 8. Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 285-290, affirms that Justin depended on Luke, either directly or indirectly, but he remains uncertain about Acts. Similarly, both J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 53, and C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998), 1:44, conclude that evidence for a direct literary relationship between Acts and Justin remains inconclusive.

<sup>6</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 432.

<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup> Similarly, the first sermons of Peter and Paul contain lengthy

---

<sup>8</sup> So M. Scheckenburger, *Ueber den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte: Zugleich eine Ergaenzung der neueren Commentare* (Bern: C. Fischer, 1841), 127-51; cf. e.g., Philippe H. Menoud, “Le Plan des Actes des Apôtres,” *NTS* 1 (1954): 47; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986-1990), 2:164-166; I. Howard Marshall, “Luke’s Portrait of the Pauline Mission” in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission* (ed. Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson; Downers Grove: IVP, 2000), 99-113; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 99. Furthermore, as Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:2, 21-22, 294, explains, key scenes in Luke-Acts enable the reader to recognize major developments in the narrative. He suggests that such scenes provide previews and reviews of central events, indicate the mission that certain individuals must complete, cite scripture to interpret narrative developments, and place the interpretation of significant developments on the lips of a “reliable character.” Each of these inaugural sermon scenes, as well as Luke 24, fulfill all of these criteria and therefore cue the reader to recognize the important role that scriptural interpretation plays within the development of the narrative.

<sup>9</sup> 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: Καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς Ναζαρά, οὗ ἦν τεθραμμένος, καὶ εἰσῆλθεν κατὰ τὸ εἶωθός αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν καὶ ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι (Luke 4:16).

expositions of the Jewish scriptures that extend the message of Jesus (Acts 2:17-36; 13:13-52). Moreover, Jesus and Paul often teach in Jewish synagogues (e.g., Luke 4:16-30, 31-32, 44; 6:6; 13:10; Acts 13:13-52; 14:1ff; 17:1ff; 18:4ff; 19:8), a location that strongly suggests the inclusion of scriptural reading and exposition.<sup>10</sup> Therefore, although Luke does not always identify the message of Jesus and his followers as scriptural citation and exegesis (e.g., Luke 5:1; 6:47-49; 8:11; 9:35; 10:38-42; 14:35; 21:33; Acts 4:29, 31; 8:4, 14, 25; 12:24; 15:36; 16:6, 32; 19:20), a number of pivotal scenes in his narrative indicate that, for Luke, scriptural interpretation stood at the core of their proclamation.<sup>11</sup>

---

Several scholars also argue that Luke 4:16-20 serves as a “prototype” of preaching scenes in Acts. See, e.g., John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke’s Gospel: A Study of Early Christian Historiography* (Atlanta: John Knox, 1976), 87; cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 78-84; Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 34-38; Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKZNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1982-1994), 1:238; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels : eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (SANT 39; München: Kösel-Verlag, 1975), 44-46; Dom Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist Press, 1967), 19-33; Robert C. Tannehill, “The Mission of Jesus According to Luke 4:16-30,” in *Jesus in Nazareth* (ed. Erich Grässer; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 59-63; Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 40-41; Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987), 164-168; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981-1985), 1:537; Joseph B. Tyson, “The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 619-31.

<sup>10</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup> At times Luke uses “the word of God” (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), “the word of the Lord” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου – Luke 8:25; 13:44, 46, 49; 15:35, 36; 16:32; 19:10; 20:35), or “word” (ὁ λόγος – Luke 4:22, 32, 36; 6:47; 8:12, 13, 15; 9:26, 28, 44; 10:39; 21:33; 24:19, 44; Acts 2:22, 40-41; 4:4; 6:4; 8:4; 10:36, 44; 11:19; 13:26; 14:3, 25; 15:7; 16:6; 17:11; 20:7, 32) to refer to discourse that does not explicitly refer to scriptural interpretation. In other contexts, however, he uses such terminology to refer to messages that clearly focus upon the proclamation of the scriptures (e.g., Luke 4:31-32; Acts 2:41; 4:4; 6:2, 4, 7; [probably 10:44; 15:7]; 13:5, 15, 26, 44, 46, 48, 49; 17:11, 13; 18:5; [possibly 18:11]; 19:8-10; [possibly 19:20]). Luke also uses λόγος to refer to the preaching of Jesus, Peter, and Paul in contexts where scriptural interpretation forms a central part of their proclamation. In Luke 4:31-32, Luke uses ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ to refer to the message that Jesus preached in Capernaum on the Sabbath day. Both the Sabbath

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.<sup>12</sup> 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,

---

synagogue context and the preceding sermon of Jesus in the Nazareth synagogue (Luke 4:16-30) suggest that Luke assumed that “his message” (ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ) in Luke 4:31-32 centers upon citation and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. Similarly, in Acts 2:41, Luke uses τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ to refer to a message of Peter that essentially consists of scriptural citation and exposition (Acts 2:17-36). Again, in Acts 4:4, Luke uses τὸν λόγον to refer back to the message of Peter in Acts 3:12-26, which clearly includes the citation and interpretation of scripture. Likewise, Luke uses the term λόγος (Acts 13:15) and the phrases τὸν λόγον τοῦ κυρίου (Acts 13:44; cf. 13:48-49) and τὸν λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ (Acts 13:46) to refer to Paul’s first synagogue sermon at Pisidian Antioch, a message that clearly centers upon scriptural exposition. Furthermore, in Acts 6:1-5, the Twelve recognize the importance of attending to the “word of God” (λόγον τοῦ θεοῦ) and therefore devote themselves to prayer and the “ministry of the word” (διακονίαν τοῦ λόγου). This description suggests that their early activities included the study of the Jewish scriptures. Commentators rarely attempt to describe what Luke might mean by the “ministry of the word” in Acts 6:4. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:313, suggests that this activity refers to the preaching of the apostles, since this is how he interprets the use of the term “word” throughout Acts; cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 183; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 260. Gerhardsson, *Memory & Manuscript*, 245, argues that the “ministry of the word” in Acts 6:1-5 would have included the reading of scripture, together with the recitation of oral traditions about Jesus, as “the process of ‘taking stock’ of that which is given in the Scriptures and the tradition of Christ, and that which was revealed in the yet unfinished miraculous course of salvation” (245). In view of the emphasis upon scriptural interpretation throughout Luke-Acts, this latter conclusion seems probable.

<sup>12</sup> Robert G. Hall, *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography* (JSPSup 6; Sheffield: SAP, 1991), 172, notes that Luke attempts to show that he shares the task and message of the disciples, including their inspired interpretation of the Jewish scriptures.

however, since Luke and Justin write in different genres. Luke narrates the first-century story of Jesus and the birth of the Jesus movement,<sup>13</sup> whereas the writings of Justin take the literary form of an apologetic address to the Roman Emperor Antonius Pius (138-160 CE)<sup>14</sup> and, in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, a debate with a Jewish refugee of the Bar

---

<sup>13</sup> There is not wide agreement regarding the precise genre of Luke-Acts but proposals include the following: biography (C. Talbert); novel (R. Pervo); epic (D. MacDonald); and history. Among those who regard Luke-Acts as history, four historical subgenres have been proposed: general history (D. Aune); political history (D. Balch); Deuteronomistic history (T. Brodie); and apologetic history (G. Sterling). The majority of scholars hold that Luke-Acts belongs within the genre of historiography but also recognize that Luke draws upon a wide variety of literary techniques. For helpful resources that discuss this issue at length, see Thomas E. Phillips, “The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus?” *CBR* 4 (2006): 365-396; cf. Joel B. Green and Michael C. McKeever, eds. *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography* (IBR Bibliographies 8; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994); Loveday Alexander, “Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts,” *NTS* 44 (1998): 380-399; Bock, *Acts*, 8-12. I am taking the prologue in Luke 1:1-4 as an introduction for both Luke and Acts. Regardless of the specific genre in which Luke writes, he clearly aims to narrate an account that describes the life of Jesus and the birth of the Jesus movement. This type of composition differs significantly from the writings of Justin.

<sup>14</sup> 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 IIe 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’University de Fribourg, 1995), 182. Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 82, suggests that the opening appeal to the emperor in *I 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).<sup>15</sup> 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.<sup>16</sup> 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.<sup>17</sup>

Justin gives privilege of place to scriptural interpretation in both *1 Apology* and the *Dialogue*. In *1 Apol.* 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,

---

<sup>15</sup> 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, ‘Proselytes’ 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 Hyldahl, “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* (Paradosis 47/1; Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2005), 1:129-166.

<sup>16</sup> E.g., *1 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.

<sup>17</sup> Compare, for example, Luke 1:1-2 with *Dial.* 101.3; 102.5; 104.1-2; 105.1-6; 106.1-4. See also Hyldahl, *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).<sup>18</sup> As Philip Bobichon observes, the *Dialogue* is, in essence, an exegetical exposition of the scriptures that takes a dialogical format.<sup>19</sup> 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:

---

<sup>18</sup> 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.

<sup>19</sup> 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.<sup>20</sup>

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.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, like Luke, he presents scriptural interpretation as a central activity of the Christ-believing community.

---

<sup>20</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 11-13, 256.

<sup>21</sup> Compare Luke 4:16-30 with the initial preaching of Jesus in Mark 1:14-15 and Matt 4:17, where Jesus announces the kingdom but does not interpret scripture. Compare also Mark 6:1-6 (cf. Matt 13:53-58), an account that resembles Luke 4:16-30 but does not emphasize scriptural interpretation as Luke does. See also the discussion of Luke 24 on pages 90-94 below.

<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup> 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.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> In these accounts, moreover, Luke and Justin each explain how Christ-believers came to possess an inspired interpretation of the Jewish

---

<sup>23</sup> 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.

<sup>24</sup> 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* (IX:17.1-4; 25.2).

<sup>25</sup> Compare Luke 24:44-46; *1 Apology*, 50.12; *Dial.* 53.5; 106.1. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256, and Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 284-285, also note these distinctive elements in the gospel of Luke and the writings of Justin.

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 (δύναμιν) 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)<sup>26</sup> and charges them with the mission of perpetuating this message (Luke 24:44-

---

<sup>26</sup> 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

48). Luke does not simply indicate that the disciples recall certain scriptural passages and from this perceive how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures.<sup>27</sup> 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.

Besides highlighting that the risen Christ himself explained the correct meaning of the scriptures to the disciples, Luke indicates that they required a revelatory experience to comprehend them: Jesus had to open their minds (Luke 24:45).<sup>28</sup> This reference to the mind-opening of the disciples suggests that they needed supernatural assistance to grasp

---

scriptures is also commonly recognized as a Lukan theme. See, e.g., Conzelmann, *Luke*, 157-159; U. Wilckens, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (WMANT 5; Neukirchener Verlag, 1974), 98 n. 1; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (AB 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 167; I. Howard Marshall, “The Resurrection of Jesus in Luke,” *TynBul* 24 (1973): 91; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:294. Scholars typically suggest that the references to scripture in Luke 24 serve as a means of explaining how Christ has fulfilled scriptural promises. See, e.g., P. Schubert, “The Structure and Significance of Luke 24,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* (BZNW 21; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), 176; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 203-225; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 905; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1581; John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word Books, 1989-1993), 3:1220. By contrast, Kenneth Duncan Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God’s People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T&T Clark, 2005), 118-146, argues that the references to the totality of scripture in Luke 24:25-27, 44-47 describe a general pattern of suffering, death, and vindication found throughout and attested by all the Jewish scriptures. In Litwak’s view, Luke presents the prophetic destiny of Jesus in a manner that corresponds to this general pattern of scripture and therefore serves as a means of understanding the plan of God. In my view, the phrase “everything written about me in the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled” in Luke 24:44b does not support Litwak’s view since Luke here has Jesus indicate that the Jewish scriptures spoke specifically about him, rather than about a general pattern to which his actions correspond.

<sup>27</sup> Compare, e.g., John 2:17, 22; 12:16; 20:9.

<sup>28</sup> 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 διηνοιχθησαν in the phrase αὐτῶν δὲ διηνοιχθησαν οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ἐπέγνωσαν αὐτόν suggests that they received a supernatural experience similar to that of the eleven (compare διήνοιξεν 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 διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις 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).<sup>29</sup> The use of the passive constructions in these earlier contexts – ἦν τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο 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.<sup>30</sup> 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

---

<sup>29</sup> Luke indicates that the disciples did not understand how the death of Jesus would fulfill the Jewish scriptures whereas Matthew and Mark indicate that they did not understand Jesus' own predictions about his death. Compare the following passages: Matt 20:17-19; Mark 9:32; 10:32-34; Luke 18:31-34. William Wrede, *The Messianic Secret* (trans. J. C. G. Greig; Greenwood, SC: Attic Press, 1971), 170, 179, argues that Luke changed the Markan messianic secret to a passion secret; cf. Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 24.

<sup>30</sup> 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 (ἦν . . . 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'Évangile 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).<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup> 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

---

<sup>31</sup> In the context of Luke 24:44-47, the phrase ὑμεῖς 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.

<sup>32</sup> E.g., Acts 2:22-36; 3:17-26; 8:26-40; 10:34-43; 13:16-41; 26:22-23; 28:23-25. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:285, points out that the speeches in Acts stand in continuity with the preparation of the apostles for mission in Luke 24 and similarly assert that Jesus' death fulfilled the plan of God (Acts 2:23; 4:28) and the Jewish scriptures (Acts 3:18; 13:27-29); cf. Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991), 403. Similarly, Dupont, *Salvation*, 129-154, demonstrates that the essential three points from Jewish scriptures that Jesus outlines in Luke 24:44-49 (Christ must suffer, Christ must rise from the dead, and his message must be proclaimed to the nations) correspond to the central points of the preaching of his followers in Acts (e.g., Acts 2:17-36; 3:17-26; 10:34-43; 13:13-41; 26:22-23). For further discussion regarding the close correspondence between the themes outlined in Luke 24:44-49 and the sermons in Acts, see Conzelmann, *Luke*, 157; Wilckens, *Missionreden*, 99-100; Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 212-215; Hall, *Revealed Histories*, 188-189.

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.<sup>33</sup> Even as Jesus unlocks the true meaning of the scriptures to the disciples 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,<sup>34</sup> Luke highlights the significance of scriptural

---

<sup>33</sup> A number of scholars suggest that Luke draws a parallel between the descriptions of scriptural interpretation in Luke 24 and Acts 8:26-40. See, e.g., Barrett, *Acts*, 1:428, who sees a parallel between the Ethiopian's failure to understand the meaning of Isa 53:7-8 and the description of the disciples in Luke 24:13-35. He also suggests a close link between the description of the process of scriptural interpretation in both contexts (Luke 24:27 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν; Acts 8:35 ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης), and a more distant connection between Luke 24:47 and Acts 8:35; cf. David P. Moessner, "The Script of the Scriptures in Acts: suffering as God's 'plan' (βουλή) for the world for the 'release of sins,'" in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington III; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 230-232. Darrell Bock, "Scripture and the Realisation of God's Promises," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 53-54, suggests that Acts 8:35 and Luke 24:43-47 provide parallel summary appeals to scripture "where one text is cited, but others exist on the theme" (54); cf. Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 112, notes the parallel design of Acts 8:26-39 and Luke 24:17-27. In particular, he mentions that both Philip and the risen Christ meet travelers, engage in dialogue with them, and provide an exposition of the scriptures; cf. A. Loisy, *Luc*, 574; Joseph A. Grassi, "Emmaus Revisited: Luke 24, 13-35 and Acts 8, 26-40," *CBQ* 26 (1964): 464-465; J. Wanke, "Wie sie in beim Brotbrechen erkannten: zur Auslegung der Emmauszählung Lk 24:13-35," *BZ* 18 (1974): 192. I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 162-163, argues that even as the truth of the scriptures needs to be unlocked by Jesus in Luke 24:25-27, 44-47, so Philip helps the Ethiopian to understand the true meaning of the scriptures. Similarly, Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 2003), 143, has noted that Acts 8:29-38, like Luke 24:44-47, provides an important window on Luke's understanding of scripture. She describes the relationship between the two passages in this way: "Earlier, the risen Jesus himself discloses the meaning of Scripture for his followers (Luke 24:44-47), and here Philip interprets Scripture through the events of the gospel" (143). F. Scott Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations* (JSNTSup 67; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 141-145, argues that the links between Acts 8:26-40 and Luke 24 relate to the mission to non-Jews. Asserting that the Ethiopian is a non-Jew, he concludes that Philip, like Peter (Acts 10:41-43) and Paul (Acts 13:47), functions as "one authorized by the resurrected Christ to evangelize the Gentile nations" (145).

<sup>34</sup> The chiasmic 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 chiasmic 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 chiasmic structure of Acts 8:25-40 provided by Dionisio Mínguez, "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

interpretation for this episode and reiterates how the Jewish scriptures predict that the messiah must suffer (cf. Luke 24:46). As in Luke 24:44-47, Luke does not here provide a detailed description of the scriptural interpretation itself.<sup>35</sup> Instead, he reports a dialogue that serves as a model for what occurs through the ongoing scriptural interpretation of the Christ-believing community.<sup>36</sup> In continuity with his depiction of the authoritative exegesis of the first disciples, moreover, Luke uses this episode to demonstrate the legitimacy of the scriptural interpretation and proclamation of Philip.

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).<sup>37</sup> 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

---

Mínguez’s suggestion that the Ethiopian’s second question, together with Philip’s answer (Acts 8:34-35), forms the center of the story. Spencer, *Philip in Acts*, 132, suggests that Acts 8:32-35 forms the center of the chiasmic structure. Without considering its precise placement at the center of a chiasm, Christopher von Mueller, “Leserorientierte Fragen im Erzählwerk des Lukas,” *TGI* 93 (2003): 45, rightly notes that the citation and discussion of scripture provides the central theme of Acts 8:25-40 and stands at the center of the episode. For further discussion of the role that scriptural citation plays in this passage, see Mikael C. Parsons, “Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker,” in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins* (ed. William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer; Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998), 106-107.

<sup>35</sup> 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).

<sup>36</sup> 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.”

<sup>37</sup> 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.<sup>38</sup> 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

---

<sup>38</sup> 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 an informed, or authoritative, interpreter; cf. Jacob Jervell, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and 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.<sup>39</sup> 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.<sup>40</sup>

### 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

---

<sup>39</sup> 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, it<sup>g1g</sup>.h vg<sup>mss</sup> syr<sup>h</sup> with \* cop<sup>G67</sup> 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.

<sup>40</sup> 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 (δύναμιν)<sup>41</sup> 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

---

<sup>41</sup> Although the wording in *Luke* 24:49 differs from *1 Apol.* 50.12, both authors indicate that the disciples would receive "power" (δύναμις) 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).<sup>42</sup> 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 *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:

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

---

<sup>42</sup> As Gregory, *Reception of Luke*, 285, and Skarsaune, *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.

God and his Christ give him understanding.<sup>43</sup>  
(*Dial.* 7.1-3)

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).<sup>44</sup> 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”<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup>

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).<sup>47</sup> Although Justin does not explicitly

---

<sup>43</sup> 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 δῶ συνιέναι καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ. The present active infinitive συνιέναι functions as a direct object in my translation.

<sup>44</sup> 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” (θεῖον λόγον) from him.

<sup>45</sup> 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. Hyldeahl, *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.

<sup>46</sup> Notably, A. Hofer, “The Old Man as Christ in Justin’s Dialogue with Trypho,” *VC* 57 (2003): 1-21, argues that Justin attempts to model his conversion story after Luke 24.

<sup>47</sup> 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 τοῦ [παρὰ θεοῦ] γινώσκειν); *Dial.* 58.1 (χάρις παρὰ θεοῦ μόνη εἰς τὸ συνιέναι τὰς γραφὰς αὐτοῦ); 78.10-11 (χάριν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ . . . μαθηθῆναι); 92.1 (χάριτος τῆς παρὰ θεοῦ λάβοι νοῆσαι τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ γεγενημένα ὑπὸ τῶν προφητῶν); 100.2 (Ἀπεκάλυψεν οὖν ἡμῖν πάντα ὅσα καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν γραφῶν διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ νενόηκαμεν); 119.1 (ἐλάβομεν χάριν τοῦ νοῆσαι).

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.<sup>48</sup> 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

---

<sup>48</sup> 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 rationnelle 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: Etudes 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).<sup>49</sup> 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

---

<sup>49</sup> 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 μή 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.*”<sup>50</sup> 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

---

<sup>50</sup> 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,<sup>51</sup> and Luke presents this manifestation of the kingdom as the culmination of what the prophets had anticipated.<sup>52</sup>

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 (Ἀπεκάλυψε ὄν ἡμῖν) 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 ὄν 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.<sup>53</sup> Within the wider

---

<sup>51</sup> 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).

<sup>52</sup> Although Matt 11:25-27 and 13:16-17 recount material parallel to Luke 10:21-22, Luke alone links the saying with the mission of the seventy (Luke 10:17-24).

<sup>53</sup> Note that Justin uses the term “First-begotten” (πρωτότοκος) to refer to the pre-existent Christ, or *Logos* (e.g., *1 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.<sup>54</sup>

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.<sup>55</sup> 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

---

<sup>54</sup> In *1 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” (*1 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. *1 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*.

<sup>55</sup> 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; ciii; civ; 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).<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup> 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.<sup>58</sup> 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.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> According to Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:1-12, the guiding theme of Luke-Acts is the "realization of God's purpose in the world" (2). For further discussion regarding the motif of fulfillment in Luke-Acts, see Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Crossroad, 1997), 2-3; Darrell L. Bock, "Scripture and the Realization," 46; John T. Squires, "The Plan of God in the Acts of the Apostles" in *Witness to the Gospel*, 37-8; William Kurz, "Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts," in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke's Narrative Claim upon Israel's Legacy* (ed. David P. Moessner; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999), 148; Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: MacMillan, 1927), 303-305; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 8-12; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 12-13, 60; Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 183.

<sup>57</sup> 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.

<sup>58</sup> 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.

<sup>59</sup> 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.<sup>60</sup> 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.<sup>61</sup> 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” (ἀπομνημονεύμα 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, 1985), 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.

<sup>60</sup> 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.

<sup>61</sup> 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, *Mediating 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.<sup>62</sup> Numerous examples illustrate how Luke envisages this type of continuity,<sup>63</sup> but his

---

<sup>62</sup> Some scholars argue that Luke draws upon and writes in the style of the LXX whereas others have suggested that he uses a Semitic style; see introduction, page 16, footnote 58. The majority concur, however, that his story, especially the birth narratives, reads like a continuation of the Jewish scriptures. As W. Ward Gasque, “A Fruitful Field: Recent Study of the Acts of the Apostles,” *Int* 42 (1988): 120, notes, this emphasis in Luke-Acts is widely recognized. Brian S. Rosner, “Acts and Biblical History,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (ed. Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke; vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*, ed. Bruce W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 68-70, suggests that Luke uses this style because he intends to present his story as biblical history. Similarly, Joseph Fitzmyer, “The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts,” *SBL Seminar Papers, 1992* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1992), 524-538, argues that Luke uses formulas to introduce quotations from the Scriptures so that his narrative reads as “a continuation of biblical history.” Others draw similar conclusions. See, e.g., Nils Dahl, *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 87-98; Drury, *Tradition and Design*, 3-8; Daryl Schmidt, “The Historiography of Acts: Deuteronomistic or Hellenistic?” in *SBL Seminar Papers* (ed. Kent Harold Richards; Atlanta: Scholars, 1985), 417-427; Joel B. Green, “The Problem of a Beginning: Israel’s Scriptures in Luke 1-2,” *BBR* 4 (1994): 457-472; Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 26. James L. Kugel, “The Messiness of History,” in *Early Biblical Interpretation* (LEC; ed. James L. Kugel and Rowan A. Greer; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 40-51, notes and discusses the tendency of early interpreters and writers to incorporate the present into biblical history by giving current events or recent history a biblical aura.

<sup>63</sup> 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 it 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,<sup>64</sup> 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,<sup>65</sup> Jesus acts as a Spirit-anointed herald who is "mighty in word and deed" (Luke 24:19).<sup>66</sup> At times, Luke parallels the activities of

---

"Israel dans L'œuvre de Luc" *RB* 75 (1968): 488, observes, Luke portrays the coming of Jesus in Luke 1-2 as a renewal of ancient days of Israel: "Au moment où le Nouveau Testament apparaît dans la person de Jésus, Israël est encore dans le temps de L'Ancien Testament." David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 11, argues that Luke presents the founding of the Christian community that stands in continuity with God's saving past.

<sup>64</sup> Luke includes three Markan references to the popular opinion that Jesus was a prophet (Compare Luke 9:8 and Mark 6:15; Luke 9:19 and Mark 8:28 [cf. Matt 16:14]; Luke 22:64 and Mark 14:65 [cf. Matt 26:68]) but develops this theme to a far greater extent than Mark or Matthew.

<sup>65</sup> 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 ῥῆμα θεοῦ ἐπὶ Ἰωάννην in Luke 3:2 resembles the introductory formula γίνομαι + ῥῆμα 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.

<sup>66</sup> 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).<sup>67</sup> 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.<sup>68</sup>

---

as a number of scholars affirm. See, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, 124-128; Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 67-69; F. Schneider, *Jesus der Prophet* (OBO 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973), 89-190; P. S. Minear, *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation According to Luke* (New York: Seabury, 1976), 69, 102-121; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 29-126; David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 46-79; John A. Darr, *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization* (Sheffield: SAP, 1998), 128-131; F. Danker, *Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1976), 29-30; A. Hastings, *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke* (Baltimore: Helicon, 1958), 50-75.

<sup>67</sup> For further discussion of the links between Luke-Acts and the Elijah-Elisha narratives, see R. A. Hammer, “Elijah and Jesus: A Quest for Identity,” *Judaism* 19 (1970): 207-218; R. E. Brown, “Jesus and Elijah,” *Perspective* 12 (1971): 85-104; R. A. Hausman, “The Function of Elijah as a Model in Luke-Acts” (PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1975); Thomas L. Brodie, *The Crucial Bridge: The Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 82-85. For descriptions of the portrayal of Jesus as a prophet like Moses in Luke-Acts, see Minear, *To Heal and Reveal*, 102-121; Johnson, *Literary Function*, 70-77; Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 46-79. See also Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:213; N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 147-97; Scot McKnight, *A New Vision for Israel: The Teachings of Jesus in National Context* (Studying the Historical Jesus 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 4-5.

<sup>68</sup> Empowerment from the Spirit (Jesus – e.g., Luke 3:22; 4:1, 14, 18; Acts 10:38; disciples – e.g., Acts 4:8; 5:32; 6:3; 7:55; 11:24; 13:9), proclamation of the message of God (Jesus – e.g., Luke 4:16-30, 31-36; 5:1; 6:17-49; 8:9-21; cf. Acts 10:36; disciples – e.g., Acts 4:13, 29, 31; 5:42; 8:4, 12, 25, 40; 11:20; 13:5, 32, 46; 14:7; 15:35; 28:31), and performance of signs and wonders (Jesus – e.g., Luke 4:38-41; 5:12-16; 6:6-11; 7:1-10, 11-16; cf. Acts 2:22; 10:38; disciples – e.g., Acts 3:1-11; 4:30; 5:12-16; 6:8; 8:6; 14:3; 15:12). Like the message of Jesus, the preaching of the disciples also evokes responses of acceptance or rejection among the people (Jesus – e.g., Luke 4:16-30; 12:49-53; 13:33-34; disciples – e.g., Acts 4:1-22; 5:17-42; 6:8-14; 7:54-60; 13:42-52; 17:1-9; 18:1-6; 28:23-28). Johnson, *Literary Function*, 59, asserts that Luke deliberately portrays the Twelve, the Seven, and Paul and Barnabas, as prophets; cf. Darr, *Herod the Fox*, 128-129; Leo O’Reilly, *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lukan Theology* (AnGreg 243; Rome: Editrice Pontifica Universita Gregoriana, 1987), 182-185; David P. Moessner, “‘The Christ Must Suffer’: New Light on the Jesus – Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts,” *NovT* 28 (1986): 255; Minear, *To Heal and Reveal*, 123; Tannahill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:33; Richard J. Dillon, “The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses According to the Discourses of Acts,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 546. In his discussion of the prophetic activities of the Twelve and the Seven, Miller, “Luke’s Conception of Prophets,” 146-158, argues that Luke does not identify the Twelve and the Seven as prophets. Although he acknowledges that the disciples carry on the same prophetic activities as Jesus and, by nature of their

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.<sup>69</sup> The inclusion of the genitive qualifiers τοῦ θεοῦ or τοῦ κυρίου clarify that God is the source of their proclamation.<sup>70</sup> 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.<sup>71</sup>

---

activities, could be defined as prophets, he maintains that since Luke never uses προφητ- 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.

<sup>69</sup> 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 [ὄν] ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ. The LXX uses similar terminology to refer to the messages from the Lord which are given to and spoken by a prophet: λόγος κυριοῦ - 2 Sam 12:9; 24:11; 1 Kgdms 15:24; 2 Kgdms 12:9; 14:17; 23:2; 24:11; 3 Kgdms 12:22, 24; 13:20; 16:1; 4 Kgdms 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; 11:11; 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); λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ - Jud 3:20; 1 Chron 25:5; Jer 1:2; 9:19.

<sup>70</sup> Whether we read τοῦ θεοῦ as a subjective genitive (e.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:565) or as a genitive of source (e.g., Bock, *Luke*, 1:453), the addition of τοῦ θεοῦ to ὁ λόγος highlights that God is the originator of the message. As Claus-Peter März, *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas: Die lukanische Worttheologie als Frage an die neuere Lukasforschung* (ETS 11; Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1974), 9-11, argues, the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ have the effect of emphasizing that the message originates not from humans but from God. Bovon, *Luke*, 168, argues that the phrase “word of God” highlights the role of Jesus as a delegate of God. The only other two instances of the phrase “the word of God” in the gospels occur in Mark 7:13 and Matt 15:6. In these two cases, the phrase clearly refers to a particular commandment in the Jewish scriptures. Scholars often interpret Luke’s use of the phrase “the word of God” as a reference to the *kerygma* of Jesus and the apostles in Luke-Acts; see, e.g., Marshall, *Luke*, 323-324; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:711; Johnson, *Luke*, 133-134; Bock, *Acts*, 264; William J. Larkin Jr., *Acts* (IVP New Testament Commentary Series; Downers Grove: IVP, 1995), 102; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:316. According to Bovon, *Luke*, 168-169, the phrase refers to the proclamation of Jesus in Luke (5:1; 8:11, 21; 11:28) and to the post-Easter *kerygma* in Acts (4:31; 6:2,7; 8:14; 11:1; 13:5, 7, 44, 46, 48; 16:32; 17:13; 18:11). Moreover, Luke frequently presents scriptural interpretation as a central part of this proclamation.

<sup>71</sup> Of course, Luke also portrays Jesus as more than a prophet. In his infancy stories, for example, he identifies Jesus as the Davidic Messiah and servant that Isaiah foretells (Luke 1:69; 2:26, 30-32; cf. 2:11). In Luke 3-4, moreover, Luke presents Jesus as the “Son of God” (cf. Luke 9:35) and as a messianic agent of deliverance (Luke 4:16-21). Note also the confession of Peter in Luke 9:20: “You are the Messiah of God.”

It is this prophetic word from God, moreover, which functions as the vehicle for proclaiming the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures.<sup>72</sup> 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.<sup>73</sup> 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

---

<sup>72</sup> O'Reilly, *Word and Sign*, 90-121, notes that the preaching of the apostles, which Luke often identifies as “the word,” includes scriptural citations and an explanation of how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures, but maintains that the primary constituents of “the word” are the name of Jesus and the call to salvation. This conclusion seems to ignore that the sermons which describe how Christ fulfills the Jewish scriptures often provide the means by which the disciples call their audiences to salvation and faith in the name of Jesus. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 161-167, argues that Luke hypostatizes “the word of God” and portrays it as an instrument of conquest in the travel narratives in Acts. In his view, the three summary descriptions of the growth of “the word of God” in Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 further this argument because ὁ λόγος appears as the subject of the verb ἀξάνω. Similarly, Daniel Marguerat, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (SNTSMS 121; trans. Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham; Cambridge: CUP, 2002), 37-38, argues that the foundation of Luke's use of λόγος-terminology is Christological and maintains that Luke portrays “the Word” as an entity that “grows” (Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20), spreads throughout the region (Acts 13:49), is received (Acts 2:41; 8:14; 11:1; 17:11), praised (Acts 13:48), and possesses its messengers (Acts 18:5). März, *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas*, 12-13, also maintains that Luke presents ὁ λόγος as a hypostatic entity and suggests that this use of ὁ λόγος originates from the presentation of יהוה דבר in the Hebrew bible (e.g., Ps 107:20). Jerome Kodell, “‘The Word of God Grew’: The Ecclesial Tendency of the Λόγος in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20,” *Bib 55* (1974): 508-509, suggests that ὁ λόγος, when used together with ἀξάνω (see Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20), describes the growth of the Christian community, but he recognizes that elsewhere Luke uses ὁ λόγος to refer to the Christian message. As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:82, rightly notes, however, Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 function as summary descriptions that show the continuing influence of Luke 8:4-15, and represent a *metaphor* that serves as a vehicle for understanding the vitality of the word: “It is not just a human report of God's activities but the way in which God continues to act in fulfilling his divine purpose” (82); cf. Yun Lak Chung, “The Word of God” in Luke-Acts: A Study of Lukan Theology” (PhD diss., Emory University, 1995), 215. This description highlights what Pao and others have misinterpreted. Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 function metaphorically to portray the vitality of the Christian message rather than to present the “word of God” as a hypostatic agent.

<sup>73</sup> 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.<sup>74</sup> 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.<sup>75</sup> 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.<sup>76</sup> 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).<sup>77</sup> When the Nazareth crowd expresses wonder at this announcement (Luke

---

<sup>74</sup> Luke 4:16-27; 6:1-5; 7:26-30; 8:9-10; 10:25-37; 11:29-32, 51; 13:29-30, 35; 18:18-25, 31-34; 19:41-44; 45-46; 20:9-19, 20-25, 27-40, 41-44; 21:5-33; 22:35-38, 69; 23:28-31; 24:25-27, 44-49.

<sup>75</sup> Acts 2:14-40; 3:11-26; 4:8-12; 7:1-53; 8:26-40; 10:34-43; 13:13-52; 17:1-3, 10-12; 18:1-6; 19:8-10; 26:19-23; 28:23-28.

<sup>76</sup> For further discussion of Luke 4:16-30, see chapter 5, pages 251-255.

<sup>77</sup> Scholars frequently debate whether Luke 4:18 refers to a messianic or prophetic anointing of Jesus (ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἄφεσει). Proponents of the former view include Alfred A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1922), 121; Cadbury, *Luke-Acts*, 276-277; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 229; Rese, *Alltestamentliche*, 148; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:58; Jack Dean Kingsbury, “Jesus as the ‘Prophetic Messiah’ in Luke’s Gospel,” in *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck* (ed. A. J. Malherbe and W. A. Meeks; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1993), 34; Christopher M. Tuckett, “The Christology of Luke-Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002), 147. Proponents of the latter view include Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 119-120; Marshall, *Luke*, 178; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:532; Nolland,

4:22-23),<sup>78</sup> 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.<sup>79</sup>

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

---

*Luke*, 1:196; Johnson, *Luke*, 81; J. Severino Croatto, “Jesus, Prophet like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher like Moses in Luke-Acts,” *JBL* 124 (2005): 455. Miller “Luke’s Conception of Prophets,” 104, 112-115, correctly points out that the categories of prophet and Messiah in Luke-Acts need not be mutually exclusive; cf. Bovon, *Luke*, 154; U. Busse, *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus. Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*. (FzB 24; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979), 388. Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness* (JPTS 9; Sheffield: SAP, 1996), 234-236, also offers a mediating position by arguing that “Luke’s eschatology . . . suggests that he understands Jesus as *the messianic prophet*” (235).

<sup>78</sup> 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.

<sup>79</sup> See, e.g., Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBL 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 6-27; Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 138-139, 149; B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 50-52.

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.<sup>80</sup>

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 (ἀναστήσει) 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,<sup>81</sup> 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

---

<sup>80</sup> 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.

<sup>81</sup> 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 ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς to the end of the citation in Acts 3:22 recalls ὅσα ἐὰν λαλήσῃ from Deut 18:19. After the citation, Acts 3:22 has an additional πρὸς ὑμᾶς, 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, *Alltestamentliche*, 66-67; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:207-209; Bock, *Acts*, 178-179.

“these days”). How did Jesus continue to bless Israel in “these days”?<sup>82</sup> 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.<sup>83</sup> 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.<sup>84</sup> 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.<sup>85</sup> 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.<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> 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).

<sup>83</sup> A number of scholars interpret ἀνίστημι in Acts 3:22 and 3:26 as references to the resurrection of Christ and argue that Luke presents the risen Jesus as the prophet like Moses who calls Israel to repentance through his disciples. See, e.g., Robert F. O’Toole, *The Christological Climax of Paul’s Defense (Ac 22:1-26:32)* (AnBib 78; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978), 119; idem, “Activity of the Risen Jesus in Luke-Acts,” *Bib* 62 (1981): 480, 496; Dennis Hamm, “Acts 3:12-26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame,” *PRS* 11 (1984): 212-213; Jacques Dupont, “Les discours de Pierre dans les Actes et le chapitre 24 de l’évangile de Luc,” in *Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques* (BETL 32; Belgium: Peeters, 1973), 353; Dillon, “Prophecy,” 544-549; O’Reilly, *Word and Sign*, 114-119; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:56; Croatto, “Prophet-Teacher,” 460.

<sup>84</sup> 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.

<sup>85</sup> For a discussion of the role of Peter as an eschatological prophet who proclaims repentance to Israel, see Hans F. Bayer, “The Preaching of Peter in Acts” in *Witness to the Gospel*, 262-267; cf. Moessner, “Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel,” *NTS* 34 (1988): 101-103.

<sup>86</sup> 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.<sup>87</sup> 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

---

exhortation to listen to Jesus and his message in Acts 3:22-23 should be taken as the equivalent of a command to hear and heed the preaching of his followers who speak as his representatives. 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.

<sup>87</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:57.

8:30; cf. 1 Kgs 18:46), and is snatched away by the Spirit (Acts 8:39; cf. 1 Kgs 18:12).<sup>88</sup>

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

---

<sup>88</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:108. Some commentators suggest that Luke portrays Philip as an Elijah figure in order to draw a parallel between Philip's encounter with Simon and Elijah's defeat of the prophets of Baal in 1 Kings 18. See, e.g., Spencer, *Philip in Acts*, 136; cf. Étienne Trocmé, *Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957), 180. For further discussion of the parallels between Philip and the prophet Elijah, see Bruce, *Acts*, 225; T. L. Brodie, "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Sources in Acts: 2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8, 9-40," *Bib* 67 (1986): 41-67; Spencer, *Philip in Acts*, 135-141; Rick Strelan, "The Running Prophet (Acts 8:30)," *NovT* 43 (2001): 32-33.

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.<sup>89</sup> 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.<sup>90</sup>

According to Justin, the *Logos* functions as a messenger who communicates the mind and will of the transcendent God.<sup>91</sup> 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).<sup>92</sup> Therefore, the Jewish scriptures do not simply foretell Christ; they also provide a record of how he acted as the pre-existent

---

<sup>89</sup> 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).

<sup>90</sup> Justin uses λόγος to refer to the pre-existent Christ but he also uses several other appellations for this figure, including the following: ἄγγελος (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.

<sup>91</sup> For Justin, God does not make himself visible on the earth but dwells in the “super-celestial realms” (τὰ ὑπὲρ οὐρανὸν ἅπαντα; *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).

<sup>92</sup> 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.<sup>93</sup> 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).<sup>94</sup>

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),<sup>95</sup> 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).<sup>96</sup> *Dialogue* 98-106 provides a lengthy exegesis of LXX

---

<sup>93</sup> 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.

<sup>94</sup> 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*. It should be noted, 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.

<sup>95</sup> In *1 Apol.* 38.1, Justin also attributes the inspiration for prophecy to the Holy Spirit.

<sup>96</sup> *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.<sup>97</sup> 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*.<sup>98</sup>

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

---

<sup>97</sup> For a discussion of Justin’s dependence upon the canonical gospels in *Dialogue* 98-106, see Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 220-223.

<sup>98</sup> 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.<sup>99</sup> 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*,<sup>100</sup> Christ-believers recognize that these ancient texts are, from start to finish, a source of information about him.<sup>101</sup> 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*

---

<sup>99</sup> 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).

<sup>100</sup> 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).

<sup>101</sup> 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 (*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 *Logos* helps Justin to demonstrate the close relationship between the knowledge of Christ-believers and non-Jewish traditions.<sup>102</sup> Speculation about the *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.<sup>103</sup> In the *Apologies*, Justin adapts the Middle Platonist idea of the *logos* as an immanent expression of the transcendent God in order to portray Christ, the pre-existent *Logos*, as the source of all noble philosophy and knowledge (*I*

---

<sup>102</sup> A. H. Armstrong, “The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries,” in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition: The Self-Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism* (ed. E. P. Sanders; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 74-99, maintains that the apologists of the second century aimed to define Christianity in the face of their Greco-Roman environment; cf. Puech, *Les apologistes*, 94-102, 158-160, 178-183; cf. Richard A. Norris Jr., “The Apologists,” in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature* (ed. Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth; Cambridge: CUP, 2004), 39-40. Charles Nahm, “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr,” *Second Century* 9 (1992): 130, suggests that apologists either expressed hostility toward Greek culture and philosophy (e.g., Tatian and Tertullian) or a more positive attitude toward it (e.g., Justin and Athenagoras).

<sup>103</sup> Stoics held the belief that the *logos spermatikos* was sown within all living things by the divine *Logos*. Subsequently, some first- and second-century Middle Platonists fused this Stoic concept with Platonic thought to arrive at a definition of the *logos* as a rational principle that emanated from God. For further discussion of this progression, see Goodenough, *Justin Martyr*, 1-32; Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian* (Routledge Early Church Monographs; New York: Routledge, 2003), 74-94; Robert Doran, *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 *Logos* to the influence of Middle Platonic thought. See, e.g., A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte auflage* (3 vols.; Freiburg, Leipzig & Tübingen: Mohr, 1894-1897), 1:511; Carl Andresen, “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus,” *ZNW* 44 (1952): 157-195; M. J. Edwards, “On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr,” *JTS* 42 (1991): 17-34. Others argue that Justin developed his *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, “Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin’s Apologies,” *ST* 12 (1958): 109-168; R. M. Price, “‘Hellenization’ and Logos doctrine in Justin Martyr,” *VC* 42 (1988): 19-20; Trakatellis, *Pre-Existence*, 173. For a detailed discussion of the differing scholarly positions regarding Justin’s dependence upon Platonic philosophy, see Nahm, “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.

*Apol.* 5.3-4; 46.2-5; *2 Apol.* 8.1-3; 9.2; 10.4-8; 13.1-6).<sup>104</sup> For example, in *1 Apol.* 5.1-4, Justin refers to the “unreasonable passion” (ἀλόγῳ 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 ἀληθεῖ).<sup>105</sup> Similarly, in *1 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.<sup>106</sup> 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

---

<sup>104</sup> 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., *2 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 (*1 Apol.* 13.6) and maintains that the concepts of λόγος σπερματικός (*2 Apol.* 8.3; 13.3) and τὸ σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου (*2 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.

<sup>105</sup> Cf. *2 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.

<sup>106</sup> 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’ (*2 Apol.* 10.8).” He suggests that this connection stands behind Justin’s references to the *logos spermatikos* (*2 Apol.* 8.3; 13.3). In his view, the activity of Christ as *Logos spermatikos* (σπερματικοῦ λόγου in *2 Apol.* 8.3; 13.5) corresponds to the “seed of reason (σπέρμα τοῦ λόγου) implanted in all humankind” (*2 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).<sup>107</sup> 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).<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> 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,” *J ECS* (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.

<sup>108</sup> Adolf Harnack, *History of Dogma* (trans. Neil Buchanan; 7 vols.; Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1896-1905), 2:169-187, and M. Engelhardt, *Das Christentum 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,<sup>109</sup> Luke uses *λόγος*-terminology to depict the message of Jesus and his followers as a prophetic word to the Jewish people.<sup>110</sup> 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.

<sup>109</sup> 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.

<sup>110</sup> M. J. Edwards, "Justin's Logos and the Word of God," *J ECS* 3 (1995): 277, sees continuity between Luke 8:11 and Justin's conception of Christ as *Logos*, but this conclusion seems to be founded upon a misunderstanding of Luke 8:11. He argues that Luke personified the "word of God" in Luke 8:11 by identifying the word as sower, but this verse identifies the seed, rather than the sower, as the word of God. Moreover, Luke 8:5 clearly distinguishes between the identity of the sower and the seed: "The sower went out to sow the seed." Although the word and Jesus are at times closely linked in Luke-Acts (e.g., Acts 10:36; 13:26-27), nowhere does Luke depict Jesus as the "word." For further discussion of the use of *λόγος*-terminology in Luke-Acts, see footnotes 69, 70, and 71 above.

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.<sup>111</sup>

## 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

---

<sup>111</sup> 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 *Logos* enable Justin to assert that the Jewish scriptures had always attested to the beliefs of Christ-believers rather than those of Jews;<sup>112</sup> 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.

---

<sup>112</sup> According to Frances Watson, *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, *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, *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture* (trans. John Austin Baker; vol. 2 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine*; Philadelphia: Westminster, John Knox, 1973), 199.

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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 Pouderon, *Les apologistes grecs du II<sup>e</sup> 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., *H.E.* 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.<sup>2</sup> 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*.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Arthur J. Droge, *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture* (HUT 26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989), 1-5; cf. R. A. Oden, "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography," *PEQ* 110 (1978): 122; Per Bilde, *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance* (JSPSup 2; Sheffield: JSOT, 1988), 93-94.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> Many also suggest that Luke wrote with the similar aim of gaining recognition for Christ-believers within Greco-Roman society.<sup>6</sup> 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.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., Johannes Geffcken, *Zwei griechische apologeten* (Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1907), ix; B. Z. Wacholder, *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (HUCM 3; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974), 57-70; H. Koester, “Early Christian Literature,” in *Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume* (ed. Keith Crim; Nashville: Abingdon, 1976), 555; Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 8; Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 159-160; Norris, “Apologists,” 36.

<sup>6</sup> For example, a number of commentators suggest that Luke writes to portray Christ and Christ-believers as innocent of violations against Rome or Roman law (e.g., Luke 23:4, 13-16, 20-22; Acts 23:28; 25:8-12; 26:30-32) and to defend their position in relation to Greco-Roman religious practices and thought (Acts 14:15-18; 17:22-31). The label of “apologetic” to describe these aims in Luke-Acts goes as far back as C. A. Heumann, “Dissertatio de Theophilo cui Lucas Historiam Sacram Inscriptis,” *Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica*, Classis IV (Bremen, 1720), 483-505. E. Zeller, *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht* (Stuttgart: C. Macken, 1854), 365-369, suggested that Luke wanted to demonstrate that Christianity was not a politically dangerous movement; cf. F. Overbeck, *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte, Von W. M. L. de Wette, Vierte Auflage bearbeitet und stark erweitert von Franz Overbeck* (Leipzig, 1870), 270-271, 367-368. As Loveday Alexander, “Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text,” in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire*, 15-38, notes, however, scholarly positions regarding the apologetic aims of Luke-Acts can be categorized in a number of different ways: “Acts as internal apologetic: apologia as inner-church polemic” that seeks to address rival interests within the church such as the rejection of Paul, the concerns of Jewish-Christians, or ‘Gnosticism’ (e.g., C. K. Barrett, *Luke the Historian in Recent Study* [London: Epworth Press, 1961], 63); “Acts as sectarian apologetic: apologia as self-defence in relation to Judaism” that seeks to address the relationship between Christ-believing groups and Jews (e.g., Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972], 153-183); “Acts as an apologetic work addressed to Greeks: apologia as propaganda/evangelism” (e.g., Arthur J. Droge, “Apologetics in the NT,” in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary* [ed. David Noel Freedman; New York: Doubleday, 1992], 302-307), “Acts as political apologetic: apologia as self-defence in relation to Rome” (e.g., Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* [New York: MacMillan, 1927], ch. 20); and “Acts as apologetic addressed to insiders: apologia as legitimation/self-definition” (e.g., Gregory E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* [NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 1992], 328, 385-386; Phillip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: the Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* [SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: CUP, 1987], 222). For further discussion of these and other views, see also Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 205-219; Richard J. Cassidy, *Society and Politics in Acts of the Apostles* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1988), 158-170; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 22-23; Bertil Gärtner, *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation* (ASNU 21; Uppsala: Almqvist

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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

---

& Wiksells, 1955), 203-228; J. C. O’Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 13-14, 168-174.

<sup>7</sup> See pages 12-13 of the introduction.

<sup>8</sup> Niels Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christendom: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins* (Acta theologica danica 9; Kopenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966), 266-269; cf. O’Neill, *Theology*, 170-171.

<sup>9</sup> Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 17, 297-310, 369-389, defines the genre of “apologetic historiography” as “the story of a subgroup of people in an extended prose narrative written by a member of the group who follows the group’s own traditions but Hellenizes them in an effort to establish the identity of the group within the setting of the larger world” (17). He argues that Jewish, as well as other Oriental, historiographers sought to champion the identity and antiquity of their particular people groups within the Hellenistic world. This position is held by a number of scholars of Luke-Acts, albeit with varying nuances. Some scholars formerly held to a *religio licita* theory which posits that Rome had a list of permitted, or licensed, religions. See, e.g., Eckhard Plümacher, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (SUNT 9; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972), 84; Burton Scott Easton, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts, and Other Papers* (London, SPCK, 1955), 41-57. Although the *religio licita* theory has been successfully challenged (see, especially, H. J. Cadbury, “Some Foibles of New Testament Scholarship,” *JBR* 26 [1958]: 215-216; Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* [Studies of the New Testament and its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982], 91-93), Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 214-219, argues that Luke nevertheless attempts to present the Christ-believing community as an “ancestral religion” in order to show the legitimacy of the movement and to demonstrate that it represented no threat to Rome; cf. Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, SCM, 1951), 172, 174; Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 102; Bruce, *Acts*, 22; John B. Polhill, *Acts* (NAC 26; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 444; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 539-544; Nils A. Dahl, “The Purpose of Luke-Acts,” in *Jesus and the Memory of the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976), 87-98; Robert Karris, *What are They Saying about Luke and Acts?* (New York: Paulist, 1979), 118-119. Similarly, Charles H. Talbert, “Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology,” in *Luke-Acts*

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.

1.23).<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.<sup>12</sup>

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).<sup>13</sup> 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

---

<sup>10</sup> Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Volume 1: Historians* (Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 20; Chico: Scholars, 1983), 93-107, regards Eupolemus as an important forerunner of Josephus and argues that his work is the first representation of the tradition that Josephus would later embody; cf. Wacholder, *Eupolemus*, 83-84. For discussion of the date and provenance of Eupolemus, see John J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 30, 46-47; Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 207; Droge, *Homer or Moses*, 13-14.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

<sup>12</sup> 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).

<sup>13</sup> 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:<sup>14</sup> 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).<sup>15</sup> In his treatise *Against Apion*, or *On the Antiquity of the Jews*,<sup>16</sup> 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.*

---

<sup>14</sup> Louis H. Feldman, *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton: PUP, 1993), 210-232; idem, *Judean Antiquities Books 1-4* (vol. 3. Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary; ed. Steve Mason; Leiden: Brill, 2000), xxvi-xxviii; Harold W. Attridge, *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus* (Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 63-66, idem, "Josephus and His Works," in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period* (CRINT 2.2; ed. Michael E. Stone; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984), 224-225; Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 64-66.

<sup>15</sup> Feldman, *Antiquities*, xxiii-xxiv; Steve Mason, "The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy," in *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (AGJU 34; ed. Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 200-201.

<sup>16</sup> Josephus does not give this subsequent work the title *Against Apion*. Jerome appears to have used the title *Contra Apionem* (see, e.g., *Ep.* 70.3; *De vir. Ill.* 13; *Adv. Iov.* 2.14) but it is somewhat misleading since Apion, an Egyptian who lived in the first part of the first century CE, could not have been familiar with the *Antiquities*. Notably, Origen (*C. Cels.* 1.16; 4.11) and Eusebius (*H.E.* 3.9.4; *P.E.* 8.7.21; 10.6.15) refer to the work as *On the Antiquity of the Jews* apparently because it was written as a response to critics of the *Antiquities* who argued that Jews were a relatively modern race (*C. Ap.* 1.216).

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” (εὐδαίμονια βίον; *A.J.* 1.20; cf. 3.84). This description corresponds to the Greek notion that happiness (εὐδαίμονία) was the aim of philosophical inquiry (e.g., Aristotle, *N.E.* 10.6.1; Epictetus *Diss.* 1.4.32).<sup>17</sup> 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).<sup>18</sup> 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

---

<sup>17</sup> 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.

<sup>18</sup> On this theme in the *Antiquities*, see Feldman, *Ancient World*, 210-214, 261-263; idem, *Antiquities*, xxix-xxxii; Carl H. Holladay, *Theios 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, εὐμένεια; *A.J.* 2.219; 4.180, 185).

God (*C. Ap.* 2.167-168, 257, 281).<sup>19</sup> 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).<sup>20</sup> 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).<sup>21</sup> He thus presents the Jewish scriptures as an ancient source of

---

<sup>19</sup> Notably, 4 Maccabees also associates the study of and loyalty to the Mosaic law with philosophy (see, e.g., 4 Macc 1:1, 17; 7:9).

<sup>20</sup> G. E. Sterling, “Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism,” *SPhilo* 5 (1993): 99-100; David M. Hay, “Philo’s View of Himself as an Exegete: Inspired, but not Authoritative,” *SPhilo* 3 (1991): 44-50. Some suggest that Philo portrays his allegorical exegesis as a revelatory experience analogous to the revelation Moses received (*Cher.* 27-29; *Somn.* 2.252; *De Migr. Abr.* 47-49; *Mos.* 1.66; 2.250-252, 280-281). See, e.g., David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983), 147-149; cf. John R. Levison, “Philo’s Personal Experience and the Persistence of Prophecy,” in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (OTS 427; ed. Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak; New York: T&T Clark, 2006), 194-209. Others correctly point out, however, that Philo infrequently describes his experiences of inspiration and does not appear to claim a unique status as inspired exegete. Moreover, the reverence he expresses toward the Jewish scriptures implies that he ascribes a special status to them which he does not claim for himself. See, e.g., Hay, “Philo’s View,” 47-50; H. A. Wolfson, *Philo* (2 vols.; Cambridge: HUP, 1948), 2:52, 54.

<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

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).<sup>23</sup> 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).<sup>24</sup> Philo thus presents the Mosaic law as a form of legislation and moral guidance that rivals all other traditions.

---

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> For further discussion of Philo’s emphasis upon piety and virtue, as well as the relationship between these values and Greek philosophy, see John M. Dillon, *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 200* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1977), 149-153. For a consideration of the manner in which Philo associates Mosaic laws with Greek virtues, see Naomi G. Cohen, “The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: an Elucidation of *De Specialibus Legibus* IV 133-135,” *SPhilo* 5 (1993), 9-19.

<sup>24</sup> 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).<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup> By contrast, he argues, Christ-believers possess a knowledge of God to which the Jewish

---

with a written legislation. Such a fusion would have been alien to early Hellenistic philosophers who contrasted written law codes with natural law and believed that the latter transcended the former (e.g., Cicero, *Off.* 3.69). For further discussion, see Hindy Najman, *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism* (JSJ 77; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 76; Borgen, *Philo of Alexandria*, 140-157; Helmet Koester, “NOMOS ΦΥΣΕΩΣ: The Concept of Natural Law in Greek Thought,” in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SHR 14; Leiden: Brill, 1968), 522-527; Richard D. McKirahan Jr., “Chapter 19: The NOMOS-PHYSIS Debate,” in *Philosophy Before Socrates: An Introduction with Texts and Commentary* (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994), 390-413.

<sup>25</sup> Borgen, “Philo of Alexandria,” 280; Michael E. Hardwick, *Josephus As An Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius* (Brown Judaic Studies 128; Atlanta: Scholars, 1989), 1-2.

<sup>26</sup> 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.

scriptures 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.<sup>27</sup> In his *Oration to the Greeks*, Tatian harshly denigrates Greek philosophy and practices (e.g., *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 (*Or.* 29.1-2).<sup>28</sup> 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 (*Or.* 29.1-2).<sup>29</sup> 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 (*Or.* 42.1).

---

<sup>27</sup> Although Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr, his orthodoxy remains a matter of debate. Epiphanius (*Panarion* I.3.46) indicates that Tatian broke away from the church in 150 CE whereas Eusebius (*Chron.* XII) reports that he did so in 172 CE. For further discussion, see Molly Whittaker, *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1982), ix; Robert M. Grant, “The Heresy of Tatian,” *JTS* 4-6 (1954): 62-68; Gerald F. Hawthorne, “Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks,” *HTR* 57 (1964): 166; Emily J. Hunt, *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian* (London: Routledge, 2003), 20-51.

<sup>28</sup> In *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 (*Or.* 20.2) and the role of the “divine spirit” in obtaining knowledge about God (*Or.* 13.3; cf. 15.1).

<sup>29</sup> Whittaker, *Oratio*, xv; Michael McGehee, “Why Tatian Never ‘Apologized’ To The Greeks,” *J ECS* (1993): 154.

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).<sup>30</sup> 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).

---

<sup>30</sup> 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).<sup>31</sup> 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).<sup>32</sup> 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).<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup> 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.

<sup>32</sup> For further discussion of the salvific function of the Mosaic law in the *Ad Autolycum*, see Rick Rogers, *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop* (New York: Lexington Books, 2000), 3-29.

<sup>33</sup> 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 *1 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.<sup>34</sup> 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 (*1 Apol.* 7.3; 20.1-22.6; 26.6).<sup>35</sup> Ultimately, however, Justin draws a contrast between the two. He presents the Jewish scriptures as the most ancient source of truth (*1 Apol.* 23.1-2; 44.8; 54.5; 59.1) and as a repository of Spirit-inspired predictions about Christ (*1 Apology* 31-35; 37-40; 45; 47-53), on the one hand, and the writings of Greek philosophers as demon-incited

---

<sup>34</sup> 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.

<sup>35</sup> He argues that the incarnation and earthly ministry of Christ bear similarity to myths about Mercury, Perseus, and Aesculapius (*1 Apol.* 22.1-6), and notes points of agreement between Christian doctrine and the teachings of Plato, Stoics, and other Greek philosophers and poets (*1 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 *1 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.<sup>36</sup> 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).<sup>37</sup> 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

---

<sup>36</sup> For further discussion of Justin's descriptions of the demon-incited mimicry of the Jewish scriptures, see Peter Widdicombe, "Justin Martyr, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Greek Myths," *SP* 31 (1997): 234-239; 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," *J ECS* (2004): 164-165. See also chapter two, page 126, footnote 107.

<sup>37</sup> 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 ἐστὶ τοῦ ὄντος καὶ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἐπίγνωσις. This description appears to draw upon the Platonic concept of God (ὁ τευζόμενος τοῦ ὄντος; *Phaedo* 66 a 8) but expands it to include themes that will become part of Justin's description of Christian truth (see ἐπιγνόντι τὸν Χριστόν in *Dial.* 8.2 and τὸ ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν ἀλήθειαν 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 (*Dial.* 7.1-2).<sup>38</sup> In this passage, Justin depicts the Jewish scriptures as that which “a philosopher ought to know” (*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” (*Dial.* 8.1-2), and declares that his discovery of the true interpretation of the Jewish scriptures led him to become a philosopher (*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 *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.<sup>39</sup>

---

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

<sup>39</sup> Justin’s conception of the relationship between the Christian teaching of the Jewish scriptures and ancient Greek philosophy in *Dialogue* 1-8 has been discussed at length. R. Holte, “Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy According to St. Justin’s Apologies,” *ST* 12 (1958): 164-165, argues that *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 *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, *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 Poseidonius’s *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 (*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, wiedergefunden und nunmehr allen zugänglich ist. Die griechische Philosophie ist damit überflüssig geworden!” For an extended explanation of this position, see Hyldahl, *Philosophie und Christentum*, 112-140, 227-255. Van Winden, *Philosopher*, 2-3, 42-44, 112-118, concurs with Hyldahl that the concept of philosophical decay from Posidonius’s *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.<sup>40</sup> Although only fragments of the works of Numenius have survived, it is possible to reconstruct a partial picture of his attitude toward ancient literature.<sup>41</sup> 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 Winden 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 médiante 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.

<sup>40</sup> For further discussion of the connection between Justin's writings and Middle Platonism, see A. H. Armstrong, “Pagan and Christian Traditionalism in the First Three Centuries,” *SP* 25 (1984): 426; Robert Grant, *The Letter and the Spirit* (London: SPCK, 1957), 18-30.

<sup>41</sup> 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 “scandal mongering 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?”<sup>42</sup> In so doing, he harmonizes the doctrines of non-Greeks with his own Middle Platonic system of thought.<sup>43</sup> 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 (θεοσεβειαν 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

---

<sup>42</sup> 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.

<sup>43</sup> According to Rebecca Lyman, “Hellenism and Heresy,” *J ECS* 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 εὐσεβῆ 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 (δικαιοσύνην καὶ εὐσέβειαν; *Dial.* 93.1-3).<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> 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 (εὐσεβεῖς καὶ φιλοσόφους; *1 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 (*1 Apol.* 3.3). In this context, he also attempts to address charges of impiety and injustice (ἀσεβειαν καὶ ἀδικίαν) against Christ-believers (*1 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 (σωφροσύνην καὶ δικαιοσύνην καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν), and any other virtues that are proper to God (*1 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.

<sup>45</sup> 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).

<sup>46</sup> 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.<sup>47</sup> 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.<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup>

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;

---

<sup>47</sup> See pages 132-133 above.

<sup>48</sup> Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition*, 385-386.

<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup> Certainly he reports numerous conflicts over how the scriptures ought to be interpreted and obeyed,<sup>51</sup> 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.<sup>52</sup>

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.<sup>53</sup> For example, in his study of Acts 6-7, Todd Penner builds upon

---

<sup>50</sup> Luke 1:1-4, 17, 31-33, 46-55, 68-79; 2:30-32; 3:4-6; 4:16-30; 24:25-27, 44-47; Acts 1:15-20; 2:17-36; 3:11-26; 4:25-31; 7:2-53; 8:26-40; 10:34-43; 13:13-52; 15:18-21.

<sup>51</sup> Luke 6:1-11; 11:25-37; 20:9-19, 27-39, 41-44; Acts 6-7; Acts 13:13-42, 46-47; 18:5-6; 24:5-21; 26:4-11, 24-29; 28:23-28.

<sup>52</sup> 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.

<sup>53</sup> See Phillip E. Satterthwaite’s, “Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric,” in Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke, eds., *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting* (vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*; ed. Bruce W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 360-361, 376-377, for a discussion of Luke’s use of “implicit commentary” and “covert persuasion”; cf. Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986-1990), 1:8-9.

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.”<sup>54</sup> 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*.<sup>55</sup> 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.<sup>56</sup> 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,<sup>57</sup> the appeal to

---

<sup>54</sup> Todd C. Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (Emory Studies in Early Christianity; New York: T&T Clark, 2004), 260-261, 303-330, at 261.

<sup>55</sup> 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.

<sup>56</sup> Penner, *Christian Origins*, 303-323. See also my discussion of Stephen’s speech in chapter five, pages 231-235 below.

<sup>57</sup> See, especially, Acts 7:22, where we read that Moses received exceptional instruction from the Egyptians (ἐπαιδεύθη Μωϋσῆς [ἐν] πάσῃ σοφίᾳ Αἰγυπτίων) and displayed unusual power (ἦν δὲ δυνατὸς 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,<sup>58</sup> the appeals to the Jewish scriptures focus solely upon inner-Jewish theological concerns.<sup>59</sup> The Lukan Paul answers the charges of Jews who question his

---

*A.J.* 2.205, 210, 216, 224, 229-231, 236). See also C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998), 1:355-356; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 269; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 291; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP; Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992), 125; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 376.

<sup>58</sup> Notably, eight of the ten instances of ἀπολογέομαι in the NT occur in Luke-Acts (Luke 19:11; 21:14; Acts 19:33; 24:10; 25:8; 26:1, 2, 24) and five of these occur in the defense speeches of Paul (Acts 24:10; 25:8; 26:1, 2, 24; cf. 19:33). See also the use of ἀπολογία in Acts 22:1 and 25:16. For further discussion of the use of legal language in these scenes, see Allison A. Trites, “The Importance of Legal Scenes and Language in the Book of Acts,” *NovT* 16 (1974): 278-284.

<sup>59</sup> Unlike Sterling’s description of Luke-Acts as apologetic historiography, Alexander, “Apologetic Text,” 23-44, argues that Acts “lacks the formal structure of an *apologia*” (27) and maintains instead that Luke creates a series of “dramatic situations which call for apologetic speech” (28). She suggests that these types of scenes function as “apologetic scenarios” which are “embedded in the text as dramatic scenes” (28). Alexander notes that Luke stresses the political innocence of Christ-believers, which is why some scholars conclude that he wrote with political apologetic aims, but observes that Luke does not develop a refutation of political charges against them. Instead, the primary concerns in the majority of scenes in Acts that include apologetic speech relate to theological and Jewish issues (Acts 4:1-22; 5:17-42; 6:8-7:60; 17:1-8; 18:12-17; 22:1-21; 23:1-10; 24:1-21; 26:1-32). This leads Alexander to conclude that “Acts is a dramatized narrative of an intra-communal debate, a plea for a fair hearing at the bar of the wider Jewish community in the Diaspora, perhaps especially in Rome” (43). Similarly, Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1960), 144-148, 167-169, argues that Luke never uses the dispute over the scriptures between Christ-believers and other Jews to address wider Greco-Roman concerns. He maintains that the political apologetic themes in Acts remain distinct from the internal conflict over the Jewish scriptures and heritage, and argues that Luke

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.<sup>60</sup> 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 Lukan 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.<sup>61</sup>

---

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.

<sup>60</sup> 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 Claudias 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.

<sup>61</sup> 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 Lukan 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's exclamation "Paul, you are mad!" (μαίνῃ, Παῦλε) in Acts 26:24 and Paul's denial of madness and words of self-defense – "I am speaking the sober truth (ἀληθείας καὶ σωφροσύνης ῥήματα ἀποφθέγγομαι) . . . and . . . I speak freely (παρρησιαζόμενος 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 μαίνομαι to depreciate inappropriate philosophy and used σωφροσύνη or παρρησία 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).<sup>62</sup> 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.<sup>63</sup> 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” (ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι) and, after leading him to the Areopagus, they describe him as a teacher of “certain strange things” (ξενίζοντα . . . τινὰ; 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.

<sup>62</sup> As Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 515, notes, “Ἀρειον πάγον (Acts 17:19) can refer to a location, a council, or both. Barrett, *Acts*, 2:832, maintains that the Areopagus governed Roman Athens and functioned as its chief court. He suggests, however, that “Ἀρειον πάγον in Acts 17:19 may refer to a location – Aeropagus hill. Although Johnson, *Acts*, 314, cites authors that describe trials before the Areopagus (e.g., Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of the Philosophers*, 7.168-169), he concludes that the tone of Acts 17:16-34 does not warrant the conclusion that this passage reports a legal hearing; cf. I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 284-285. B. W. Winter, “On Introducing Gods to Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:18-20,” *TynBul* (1996): 71-90, argues that Paul does not undergo a formal trial at the Areopagus but appears before the council for an initial hearing.

<sup>63</sup> Stanley Kent Stowers, “Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul’s Preaching Activity,” *NovT* 26 (1984): 60-61.

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).<sup>64</sup> 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).<sup>65</sup>

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.<sup>66</sup> As a number of scholars have noted, the descriptions of God as Creator of the

---

<sup>64</sup> Barrett, *Acts*, 2:828-830, also notes that the noun ἀγορά in Acts 17:17 recalls Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.1.10 and that the phrase πρὸς τοὺς παρατυγχάνοντα recalls Plato, *Apology*, 29d. He further observes the similarity between the phrase ξένων δαιμονίων δοκεῖ καταγγελεὺς εἶναι in Acts 17:18 and the use of δαιμόνιον in Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 1.1.2 and the phrase ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καινὰ 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.

<sup>65</sup> 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), the divine environment in which humans live and move (vs. 28), 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.

<sup>66</sup> Studies of Acts 17:16-34 often emphasize either the Greek philosophical elements of the speech or the Jewish and scriptural ideas which are present in it. For example, Dibelius, *Studies*, 26-83, provides a detailed description of how the speech does not rely on biblical ideas but on Greek philosophical sources; cf. Phillip Vielhauer, “On the ‘Paulism’ of Acts,” *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 36-37; David L. Balch, “The Areopagus Speech: An Appeal to the Stoic Historian Posidonius against Later Stoics and the Epicureans,” in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Festschrift for Abraham J. Malherbe* (ed. David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne Meeks; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 52-79. Others argue that the speech relies upon ideas from the Jewish scriptures and other Jewish sources. See, e.g., Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 66-169; Bock, *Acts*, 559; Polhill, *Acts*, 373. E. Norden, *Agnostos theos: Untersuchungen zur formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1913), 3-83, suggests, it is more probable that Luke draws upon both biblical and Hellenistic sources; cf. W. Nauck, “Die Tradition und Komposition der Areopagrede,” *ZTK* 53 (1956): 11-12; Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS

universe who cannot be contained in a temple (Acts 17:24-25) recall biblical themes as well as Greek concepts of God.<sup>67</sup> 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.<sup>68</sup> 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).<sup>69</sup> In this

---

23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 198; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 517-518. Barrett, *Acts*, 2:825, 849, argues that the speech contains themes which Hellenistic Christ-believers “inherited from Hellenistic Jews” (825), but rightly notes that the Greek sources of the speech are more prominent: “The Greek side is unmistakable” (849).

<sup>67</sup> 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.

<sup>68</sup> Some interpret the phrase ἐξ ἑνὸς in the phrase ἐξ ἑνὸς πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων in Acts 17:26 as a reference to Adam. If πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων refers to the entire human race, as Dibelius, *Studies*, 29-32, argues, it would articulate a Hellenistic view of humanity whereas if we render πᾶν ἔθνος ἀνθρώπων 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 καιρούς and ὁροθεσίας in the phrase ὁρίσας προστεταγμένους καιροὺς καὶ τὰς ὁροθεσίας τῆς κατοικίας αὐτῶν in Acts 17:26 is also debated. Gärtner, *Areopagus*, 154, maintains that καιρούς means “epochs of history” and ὁροθεσίας 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 καιρούς should be interpreted as “seasons of the year” and ὁροθεσίας 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 (ζητεῖν τὸν θεόν, εἰ ἄρα γε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ εὔροιεν) 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.

<sup>69</sup> The source of the phrase ἐν αὐτῷ γὰρ ζῶμεν καὶ κινούμεθα καὶ ἐσμέν 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 τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμέν 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).<sup>70</sup>

---

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.

<sup>70</sup> 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 ἅπαντα κοινά and ψυχὴ 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 πάτριον φιλοσοφίαν; *Contemp.* 25-26, 28). Similarly, Josephus describes the Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes as three forms of "Jewish philosophy" (Ἰουδαίους εἶδη 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* 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.<sup>71</sup> 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).<sup>72</sup> 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

---

<sup>71</sup> 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).

<sup>72</sup> Luke's treatment of the Mosaic law is unsystematic and therefore does not lend itself to drawing firm conclusions about his view of the law. On the one hand, Luke can report instances that demonstrate how Jesus and Christ-believers show respect for the Mosaic code (e.g., Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19) but, on the other, he refers to the Mosaic law as "a yoke that neither our ancestors nor we have been able to bear" (Acts 15:10) and to its inability to provide justification (Acts 13:38-39). Furthermore, in some instances, Luke presents the authority of Jesus as greater than that of the Mosaic law. For example, in Luke 6:1-5, Jesus asserts his authority to allow his disciples to pick heads of grain on the Sabbath by arguing that "the Son of Man is lord of the Sabbath" (Luke 6:5). F. Overbeck, "Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg.," *ZWT* 15 (1872): 323-324, maintains that Acts hardly knows anything about the criticism of Judaism as a religion of the Law. He suggests that the positive view of the Mosaic law in Acts differs from "des paulinischen Antinomismus." He concludes that both Luke and Justin do not argue for the abolition of the Mosaic law in the same absolute sense as Paul does, and notes that both also recognize that some Jewish Christians observe the Mosaic law. More recently, some scholars of Luke-Acts have interpreted the references to the fidelity of Jewish Christ-believers to Mosaic law in Luke-Acts as evidence that Luke regards the Mosaic law as valid for Jews. See, e.g., Jacob Jervell, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *HTR* 64 (1971): 21-36; Esler, *Community and Gospel*, 110-130. Others argue, however, that Luke presents the Mosaic law as valid only until the coming of Christ. See, e.g., Max B. Turner, "The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke-Acts" in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation* (ed. D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982), 99-158; Craig Blomberg, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 22 (1984): 53-80; M. A. Seifrid, "Jesus and the Law in Acts," *JSNT* 30 (1987): 39-57. For a more comprehensive discussion of Luke's treatment of the Mosaic law, see S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSMS 50; Cambridge: CUP, 1983).

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.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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<sup>a</sup> presents the community as a group that had already begun to enjoy the privileges of the eschatological age (e.g., 1QH<sup>a</sup> 14:13-14; 19:12-14) and as recipients of divine revelatory knowledge (e.g., 1QH<sup>a</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup> For Luke, the resurrection and ascension of Christ, the mission of the apostles and Paul, and the sending of the Spirit represent events that mark the beginning of the reign of Christ and the initial signs of the final age (e.g., Luke 24:44-49; Acts 1:8; 2:17-36; 13:46-47; 26:12-23), even though he certainly anticipates a more complete renewal in the future (e.g., Acts 3:17-26). For Justin, the first coming of Christ and the subsequent proclamation of the apostles represent an initial realization of end-time prophecies. Although he expects a future, more complete fulfillment at Christ's second coming (see, e.g., *Dial.* 14.8; 31.1; 34.2; 36.1; 49.2; 110.2; 121.3; *1 Apol.* 52.3), Justin regards the proclamation of the apostles, and its effects, as a manifestation of the beginning of Christ's reign in the present (see, e.g., *1 Apol.* 39.1-5; 45.5; *Dial.* 109.1-110.6; 121.3-122.6). For a discussion of the range of views regarding Luke's eschatology, see John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBL 92; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 1-36. Major proponents of the view that Luke responded to the delay of the parousia by presenting the church as "an entity of world history" are R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, vol. 2 (trans. K. Grobel; London: SCM, 1955), 116-117; Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St. Luke* (trans. G. Buswell; New York: Harper and Row, 1961), 97, 123, 232; and Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 150-152. Others have concluded that Luke sees eschatology unfolding in historical events, or as having a two-stage dimension with strands of both imminent expectation and delay. See, e.g., R. M. Smith, "The Eschatology of Acts and Contemporary Exegesis," *CTM* 29 (1958): 641-663; S. G. Wilson, "Lukan Eschatology," *NTS* 15 (1969-1970): 330-347; idem, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 67-87; B. R. Gaventa, "The Eschatology of Luke-Acts Revisited," *Enc* 43 (1982): 27-42. For further discussion of Justin's two-stage eschatology, see Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (Leiden: Brill, 1987), 155-157, 159, 285-288; cf. Erwin R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr* (Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923), 279-291; L. W. Barnard, *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought* (Cambridge: CUP, 1967), 157-168; Eric Francis Osborn, *Justin Martyr* (Beiträge Zur Historischen Theologie 47; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973), 186-198. As William S. Kurz, "The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin" (PhD diss., Yale University, 1976), 177-179, rightly notes, Justin develops a more pronounced periodization of history than Luke does. Notably, this perspective also frequently shapes his approach to scriptural interpretation. He argues that some scriptural passages were fulfilled at the first coming of Christ while others will be fulfilled in his second coming, and asserts that interpreting the scriptures correctly entails understanding this principle (*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 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup> According to F. Overbeck, “Ueber das Verhältniss 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 Standpunct 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 End-Time Revelation and Darkening in Luke-Acts

### 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),<sup>4</sup> or they discuss his particular emphasis upon scriptural interpretation in such contexts.<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> See, e.g., Thomas Moore, “The Lucan Great Commission and the Isaianic Servant,” *BibSac* (1997): 47-60; cf. Jacques Dupont, “La portée christologique de l’évangélisation des nations d’après Luc 24, 47” in *Neues Testament und Kirche für Rudolf Schnackenburg [z. 60. Geburtsag am 5. Jan. 1974 von Freunden u. Kollegen gewidmet]* (ed. Rudolf Schnackenburg and Joachim Gnilka; Freiburg: Herder, 1974), 136-137; D. L. Tiede, “The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1,” *HTR* 79 (1986): 285-286; Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness* (Sheffield: SAP, 1996), 343; Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986-1990), 1:297; I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 906. For a discussion of the use of Isa 49:6 in Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8; 13:46-46; 26:12-23, see David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 84-101.

<sup>5</sup> See, e.g., Henry J. Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York: MacMillan, 1927), 303-308; P. Schubert, “The Structure and Significance of Luke 24,” in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* (BZNW 21; ed. W. Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954), 176-186; Richard J. Dillon, *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24* (AB 82; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978), 203-220; J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 206; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998), 1:79.

of his followers. Richard Dillon argues that the phrase ὑμεῖς 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.’”<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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,<sup>8</sup> and indicating that they would proclaim their message “to the end of the earth” (ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς) in Acts 1:8, Luke recalls LXX Isa 43:10-12 (γένεσθέ μοι

---

<sup>6</sup> Dillon, *Eye-Witnesses*, 169; cf. Jürgen Roloff, *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen* (Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965), 191.

<sup>7</sup> 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 Heilsgeschichte: 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.

<sup>8</sup> 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.

μάρτυρες . . . ὑμεῖς ἐμοὶ μάρτυρες)<sup>9</sup> and LXX Isa 49:6 (ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς).<sup>10</sup> 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).<sup>11</sup> 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

---

<sup>9</sup> Haenchen attributes the references to the disciples as μάρτυρες in Acts 1:8 (cf. Luke 24:48) to an allusion to LXX Isa 43:10; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:79; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 92-93. Tiede, “Exaltation,” 278-86, argues that Acts 1:8 (cf. Luke 24:48) alludes to Isa 49:6 with the purpose of depicting the “renewal of the vocation of Israel to be a light to the nations and to the end of the earth” (286); cf. Turner, *Power*, 36-37, 300-302, 342-344, 420-421. Turner suggests that, in Acts 1:8, Luke depicts the imminent descent of the Spirit as a prophetic endowment that enables the disciples to fulfill the role of the servant of the Lord described in Isaiah (Isa 49:6).

<sup>10</sup> Haenchen, *Acts*, 142, suggests that ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς refers to the geographical expansion of the church. Similarly, Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 7, maintains that the phrase refers to Rome since *Ps. Sol.* 8.15 uses the phrase to speak of God bringing Pompey from the “ends of the earth.” Henry J. Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955), 15, suggests that ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς in Acts 1:8 refers to Ethiopia. Since the phrase is quite rare (5x in LXX: Isa 8:9; 48:20; 49:6; 62:11; *Pss. Sol.* 1:4; cf. Acts 1:8 and 13:47), and since a direct citation of Isa 49:6 occurs in Acts 13:47, Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:17, argues that Acts 1:8 draws upon Isa 49:6. Nevertheless, like Cadbury, he argues that the phrase itself refers to the “extreme limit of the world” (17); cf. W. C. van Unnik, “Der Ausdruck ‘ΕΩΣ ἑΣΧΑΤΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ (Apostelgeschichte 1:8) und sein alttestamentliche Hintergrund” in *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik* (NovTSupp 29; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1973), 399-400. As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:109, notes, the belief that Ethiopians lived at the end of the earth is also well-documented in ancient literature (Homer, *Odyssey* 1.23; Herodotus III.25; III.114; Strabo, *Geography* I.1.6; I.2.24). This leads him to conclude that Acts 8:26-40 depicts the anticipation of the fulfillment of Acts 1:8. Earle Ellis, “The End of the Earth,” *BBR* 1 (1991): 124, asserts that Acts 1:8 contains a conscious allusion to Isa 49:6 and argues that ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς refers to a geographical area, i.e., Spain, which has implications for a mission to non-Jews. Thomas S. Moore, “‘To the End of the Earth’: The Geographical and Ethnic Universalism of Acts 1:8 in Light of Isaianic Influence on Luke,” *JETS* 40 (1997): 393-394, suggests that the phrase has ethnic significance in Acts 1:8 because of its use in the context of non-Jews sharing in salvation in LXX Isa 45:22 and Jer 16:19. He also notes the explicit mention of “all the nations” in Luke 24:47, a text that parallels Acts 1:3-8, and suggests that Luke 24:47 should inform our understanding of Acts 1:8. Richard Bauckham, “The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (JSJSup 72; ed. James Scott; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 475, points out that the use of the singular “end of the earth” in Acts 1:8, and in the citation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:47, makes it clear that Luke alludes to Isa 49:6. He argues that the phrase does not have geographical significance but relates to the disciples’ role as witnesses to all the nations; cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 85-86. The allusion to Isa 49:6 is quite certain, even though the precise referent of ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς remains somewhat unclear.

<sup>11</sup> 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” (ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε ἐν τῇ πόλει ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσθητε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν). 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 (ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ’ ὕψιλου).

of the witness, or servant, that Isaiah foretells;<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup> 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.<sup>14</sup> If Luke here wishes to portray the Ethiopian official as a eunuch who

---

<sup>12</sup> 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 of Israel, 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. Scott, "Acts 2:9-11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations," in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles* (ed. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 109. Others 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; Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating; New York: Paulist Press, 1967), 12, 17; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 7.

<sup>13</sup> A. F. Loisy, *Les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920), 377; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 410; Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (ECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007), 342; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992), 155, 158-159; Marshall, *Acts*, 162; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 171-172; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:108-109; David P. Moessner, "The Script of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's 'Plan' (βουλή) For the World for the 'Release of Sins'," in *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington III; New York: CUP, 1996), 231-232; Mikeal C. Parsons, "Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker," in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant* (ed. William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer; Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998), 111-113; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 141-142. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:426, however, doubts that Luke had Isaiah 56 in mind.

<sup>14</sup> The term "eunuch" εὐνοῦχος (Hebrew = עַמְּוִי) 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 (δυναστείας Κανδάκης βασιλείσσης Αἰθιοπῶν, ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γᾶς αὐτῆς), it would be redundant to use εὐνοῦχος 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.<sup>15</sup> 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.”<sup>16</sup> 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,

---

they suggest that term εὐνοῦχος in Acts 8 probably refers to sexual mutilation. See, e.g., Marshall, *Acts*, 162; Johnson, *Acts*, 155. Parsons, “Isaiah 53 in Acts 8,” 108-109, notes that his position as an official for royalty makes it probable that the Ethiopian was castrated, since males in this type of role were often castrated (see, e.g., Herodotus, 8.105; Esther 2:3, 14; 4:4-5). Parsons further notes that the repeated use of the term εὐνοῦχος (8:27, 34, 36, 38, 39) to describe the Ethiopian suggests that his physical condition, rather than his role as a court official (δυνάστης), is the point of emphasis for Luke. These latter observations suggest that the term εὐνοῦχος in this context refers to sexual mutilation. Furthermore, the term only occurs elsewhere in the NT in Matt 19:12, where it is associated with a sexual defect.

<sup>15</sup> Although the ethno-religious status of the Ethiopian remains ambiguous in Acts 8, it seems probable that Luke wants to present him as a marginal figure in relation to Judaism. If he was a non-Jew, his participation in Judaism would most certainly be limited. If he was a Jew but was sexually mutilated, he could not have participated fully in the Temple cult when he went up to Jerusalem to worship (Acts 8:27; Deut 23:2). Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 171, maintains that the Ethiopian was a proselyte since Luke presents Cornelius as the first non-Jewish convert (Acts 10-11, 15; see especially Acts 15:14). Similarly, Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 410, regards the eunuch as a Jew, or at least as a proselyte; cf. Henry J. Cadbury, “The Hellenists,” in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake; London: MacMillan, 1920-1933), 5:66; Johnson, *Acts*, 159. Against this view, F. Scott Spencer, *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations* (JSNTSup 67; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 172, asserts that the eunuch was a non-Jew; cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:110; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:425-426; Loisy, *Actes*, 377. Haenchen, *Acts*, 314, suggests that Luke intentionally leaves the precise identity of the Ethiopian ambiguous; cf. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 68. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 141, rightly suggests that the most significant aspect of the Ethiopian’s identity rests in his role as a type of outcast.

<sup>16</sup> Bock, *Acts*, 342.

Luke has Paul and Barnabas cite and interpret Isa 49:6b to describe their mission to non-Jews:<sup>17</sup>

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.’”<sup>18</sup> When the Gentiles heard this, they were glad and praised the word of the Lord (τὸν λόγον 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).<sup>19</sup> 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.

---

<sup>17</sup> Some scholars attempt to argue that Acts 13:46-47 presents Christ as the “servant of the Lord” foretold by Isaiah. See, e.g., Pierre Grelot, “Note sur Actes, XIII, 47,” *RB* 88 (1981): 368-372; Jacques Dupont, *Nouvelles études sur les Actes des apôtres* (LD 118; Paris: Cerf, 1984), 345-349. The majority maintain, however, that Acts 13:46-47 applies this role to Paul and Barnabas. See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 414; J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 41-61; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 106; Marshall, *Acts*, 230.

<sup>18</sup> Notably, the phrase “as a covenant of a race” (εἰς 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, *Isaianic 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” (εἰς διαθήκην γένους); cf. F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 315.

<sup>19</sup> 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).<sup>20</sup> 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

---

<sup>20</sup> The phrases ἀνοιξαι ὀφθαλμούς and ἀπὸ σκοτόυς εἰς φῶς appear to allude to Isa 42:7, 16. So Haenchen, *Acts*, 686; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 211; Marshall, *Acts*, 396-397; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 760; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 85. The use of the term "witness" (μάρτυς) for Paul in Acts 26:16 further identifies him with Isaianic promises (Isa 43:10, 12; 44:8). Dennis Hamm, "Paul's Blindness and Healing: Clues to Symbolic Intent (Acts 9, 22 and 26)," *Bib 70* (1990): 63-67, describes the intent of Acts 26:23 in the following way: "the light that Paul experiences (that opened his eyes and moved him out of spiritual darkness) became the light that he mediated to others (opening their eyes)."

illumination.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup> 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.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> 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.

<sup>22</sup> 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.

<sup>23</sup> 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 *ὑμῖν* δέδοται γινῶναι 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 (ἵνα) ‘looking they may not perceive, and listening they may not understand’” (Isa 6:9-10).<sup>24</sup>  
(Luke 8:10)

By retaining the Markan ἵνα (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.<sup>25</sup> The citation of Isa 6:9-10 justifies this distinction by showing the misunderstanding of those

---

τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 8:10 (cf. Matt 13:11) with ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον δέδοται τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ in Mark 4:11. As Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:707-708, notes Luke and Matthew both describe “God’s gift to the disciples as a cognitive experience of the kingdom” (707).

<sup>24</sup> Note the longer citation of Isa 6:9-10 in the parallel account in Matt 13:14-15, and the slightly longer version of the citation in Mark 4:12. Although Luke only cites a small excerpt of Isa 6:9-10 in Luke 8:10, his lengthier citation in Acts 28:26-27 demonstrates the significance of this Isaiah passage to his narrative and thought. Virtually the same form of the citation of LXX Isa 6:9-10 occurs in Matt 13:14-15 and Acts 28:25-28. This leads Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 102-108, to conclude that Luke “transposes” the citation to the end of his narrative, rather than leaving it with the parable of the sower. In his view, this change in the order serves to contrast the message of Luke 3 with the pessimistic ending of Acts.

<sup>25</sup> The meaning of ἵνα 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 ἵνα 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 ἵνα 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 γινῶναι as an infinitive of purpose in the previous clause stands “roughly parallel” to the ἵνα 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; München: 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 ἵνα 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 ἵνα 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*, 3<sup>rd</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup>

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,<sup>27</sup> his description of receiving the knowledge of the kingdom exerts a wider, thematic influence in his narrative.<sup>28</sup> 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).<sup>29</sup> 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.<sup>30</sup> Since Luke uses the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, ὁ

---

<sup>26</sup> 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.

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

<sup>28</sup> William C. Robinson, Jr., “On Preaching the Word of God,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; New York: Abingdon, 1966), 132, notes Luke’s emphasis upon “the word of God” in the parable of the sower and argues that this adaptation of the parable has the effect of applying it to the preaching of the church.

<sup>29</sup> Note the repetition of the phrases ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤξανε καὶ ἐπληθύνετο in Acts 6:7, ὁ δὲ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤξανε καὶ ἐπληθύνετο in Acts 12:24, and τοῦ κυρίου ὁ λόγος ἤξανε καὶ ἴσχυεν in Acts 19:20. This terminology corresponds to ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in Luke 8:11 and to the metaphor of growth and multiplication of the seed in the parable of the sower.

<sup>30</sup> Jerome Kodell, “‘The Word of God Grew’: The Ecclesial Tendency of the Λόγος in Acts 1:7; 12:24; 19:20,” *Bib* 55 (1974): 505-520, argues that the parable of the sower inspired Luke’s emphasis on the growth of the word in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20; cf. J. Dupont, “La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc,” in *Apophoreta: Festschrift für E. Haenchen* (ed. W. Eltester et F. H. Kettler; BZNW 30; Berlin: A.

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).<sup>31</sup> When division ensues as a result of

---

Töpelmann, 1964), 97-108; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:82. See also François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian: Fifty-five Years of Research (1959-2005)* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., rev.; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 271, 459, who argues that Acts portrays the incipience and growth of the Jesus movement as the story of the “diffusion of the Word” (271). Kodell maintains that Luke made ὁ λόγος in Acts 6:7, 12:24, and 19:20 “involve the meaning of ‘church’ or ‘community’” (518), in part, because the accompanying verbs αὐξάνω and πληθύνω in these summaries allude to the growth and expansion of the people of God in the LXX (Gen 1:22, 28; 8:17; 9:1, 7; 17:20; 28:3; 35:11; 47:27; 48:4; Ex 1:7; Lev 26:9; Jer 3:16); cf. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 167-171. For further discussion, see footnote 72, chapter two, page 113-114. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:82, rightly distinguishes between the growth of the word and the growth of the church by explaining that, for Luke, the proclamation of the message of Jesus (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ) is the creative force behind the growth of the church; cf. François Bovon, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (Hermeneia; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002), 168. This distinction is clear in Acts 6:7 where we read that the word of God increases *and* that the number of disciples multiplies (Καὶ ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἤξανε καὶ ἐπληθύνετο ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν μαθητῶν). Although the growth of the word produces the growth of the church, these are still two distinct concepts.

<sup>31</sup> 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.<sup>32</sup>

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 πλείονες οἷς ἐξετίθετο διαμαρτυρόμενος τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ θεοῦ, πείθων τε αὐτοὺς περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν, ἀπὸ πρῶτῃ ἕως ἑσπέρας. If we take πείθων . . . ἀπὸ τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως 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 τε τοῦ νόμου Μωϋσέως καὶ τῶν προφητῶν as coordinate participle phrases that indicate two different parts of his message, we would conclude the latter.

<sup>32</sup> 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 גַּמְשׁוּתָם and שָׁמְטוּ 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.<sup>33</sup> The parallels between these three accounts especially suggest that Acts 28:25-28 represents the culmination of the ministry of Paul to fellow-Jews.<sup>34</sup> Accordingly, the citation of LXX Isa 6:9-10 in this final scene serves as a denunciation that applies to all three episodes.<sup>35</sup> 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

---

<sup>33</sup> See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 729; Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987), 135; Joseph Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), 140-142; Bruce, *Acts*, 541; Bock, *Acts*, 756.

<sup>34</sup> Scholars also frequently discuss how this conclusion to the book of Acts relates to Luke's view of the ultimate fate of Jews. Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 174-178, argues that the acceptance of Paul's message in Acts 28:24 is an example of the response of individual Jews, whereas the rejection in 28:25-28 designates the corporate Jewish response to the message of Paul. He concludes that Luke celebrates the responses of individual Jews but regards the mission to Jews, on the whole, as a failure; cf. J. B. Polhill, *Acts* (NAC 26; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 545. Jack T. Sanders, "The Jewish People," in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed. Joseph B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 58-73, also argues that Jews ultimately reject the gospel and so are rejected in Luke-Acts; cf. idem, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 75-83; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 227; Haenchen, *Acts*, 730. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:344-456, maintains that the majority of Jews reject the gospel, which leads to a tragic ending of the narrative. Regarding the end of Luke-Acts, Jacob Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (KEK 3; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 621, draws a similar conclusion: "Die Mission ist vor allem eine Mission an Israel, und jetzt ist Israel als Ganzes erreicht. Israel ist in Gläubige und Ungläubige gespalten und das ungläubige Judentum von Gott durch die Schrift verurteilt und verworfen, weil sie in der Tat das Judentum verleugnet haben. Von nun an ist die Kirche von dem ungläubigen Teil des Judentums getrennt. So ist auch das wahre Israel aus allen Juden der Welt gesammelt, denn allein die Kirche aus Juden und gottesfürchtigen Heiden ist das Gottesvolk." Others, such as Bauckham, "Restoration of Israel," 435-487, maintain that Luke presents an open, and potentially positive, future for Jews; cf. David P. Moessner, "The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory," *Eight Critical Perspectives*, 35-50, who argues that Acts 28:26-28 affirms the positive fulfillment of God's promises, even if they are fulfilled for only a remnant of Jews.

<sup>35</sup> 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 fulfils 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.<sup>36</sup>

### 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).<sup>37</sup>

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

---

<sup>36</sup> This reading of Luke’s description of the fulfillment of Isaianic promises differs from Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 104-108. Whereas Pao argues that Luke demonstrates a repeated Jewish rejection of the message of Paul and cites Isa 6:9-10 to show a dramatic reversal of the fate of Israel (compare Luke 3:6 [Isa 40:5] with Acts 28:27 [Isa 6:10]), I am interpreting Luke’s use of different Isaiah passages (e.g., Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:46 and Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:25-28) as an attempt to present both the acceptance and the rejection of the scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers as complementary parts of the scripturally-ordained plan of God.

<sup>37</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 360, argues that Justin borrows the concept of an eschatological pilgrimage from Luke-Acts. Although Luke nowhere cites or alludes to Isa 2:2-4, Skarsaune maintains that this theme is “deeply embedded in the overall structure of Acts” (360). Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 122-124, also suggests that Luke relies on the basic theme of Isa 2:2-4. See also the discussion of ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου in Birger Gerhardsson, *Memory & Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity with Tradition & Transmission in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 214-225. Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 158-159, argues that the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις in Acts 2:17 alludes to Isa 2:2 since this phrase appears nowhere else in the LXX. Pao also argues that “the phrase ‘the word of the Lord from Jerusalem’ (Isa 2:3) becomes a one sentence summary statement of the journey of the word in Acts.” For further discussion regarding the possible connections between Acts 2 and the Pentecost celebration of the Sinai tradition of the giving of the Law, see J. H. E. Hull, *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Lutterworth, 1967) 53-55; A. Jaubert, “Le calendrier des Jubiles et de la secte de Qumran. Ses origines bibliques,” *VT* (1953): 250; Turner, *Power*, 280-282. Robert F. O’Toole, “Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 245-258, rightly argues, however, that Acts 2 contains no certain references to the law of Moses or the Sinai covenant. Likewise, clear allusions to Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4) are absent from Luke’s account.

powers.<sup>38</sup> 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,<sup>39</sup> 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).<sup>40</sup>  
(*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

---

<sup>38</sup> 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 πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη μακαριοῦσιν αὐτόν (LXX Ps 71:17b) to read ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ ἔθνη. 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.

<sup>39</sup> Justin draws a similar conclusion from his reading of LXX Psa 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).

<sup>40</sup> W. S. Kurz, “Christological Proof,” 241, suggests that Justin’s addition of αὐτῶν to LXX Isa 49:6 emphasizes that non-Jews have become the recipients of the light that Christ mediates. Compare the phrase from LXX Isa 49:6: εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

scriptures.<sup>41</sup> 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

---

<sup>41</sup> 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.<sup>42</sup> Justin reasons that if the Mosaic law had the power to enlighten people, scripture would not speak of a future new covenant.<sup>43</sup> 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.<sup>44</sup> In so doing, he presents

---

<sup>42</sup> 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.

<sup>43</sup> 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.

<sup>44</sup> 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., *Sifre Lev* 18:1-5; *Sifre Num* 18:20; m. Avot 1.12; 3.12-13; *Mekilta 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.<sup>45</sup>

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 *1 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.

(*1 Apol.* 39.1-4)

Similarly, in *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-

---

through them salvation. He notes, however, that Isaiah 40-66 was not a prominent scriptural source for these early rabbis.

<sup>45</sup> 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, 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 *Dialogue* 121-123, the same cannot be said of his interpretation of Isaiah 2 (cf. Micah 4) in *Dialogue* 109-110 (cf. *1 Apology* 39). In *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.<sup>46</sup>

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 τοῦ 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.<sup>47</sup> 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.

---

<sup>46</sup> See also *1 Apol.* 45.1-6.

<sup>47</sup> 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).<sup>48</sup> 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).<sup>49</sup> Justin thus seeks to show the legitimacy of the message and scriptural interpretation by presenting the apostles and the

---

<sup>48</sup> Moreover, Christ-believers continue these new practices even when under the threat of persecution and death (*1 Apol.* 39.3-4; *Dial.* 110.4).

<sup>49</sup> 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.<sup>50</sup>

#### 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.<sup>51</sup> 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

---

<sup>50</sup> 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.

<sup>51</sup> *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 prophetic 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).<sup>52</sup> 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-

---

<sup>52</sup> 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);<sup>53</sup> 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. (*Dial.* 12.1-2)

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.<sup>54</sup> 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 *Dial.* 121.4-122.1 illustrates both the similarity and difference between Luke and Justin.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> Justin incorrectly attributes this passage to Jeremiah.

<sup>54</sup> 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.

<sup>55</sup> To my knowledge, no one has noted these verbal parallels or suggested that Justin depended on a gospel tradition in *Dial.* 121.4. Clearly, Justin was familiar with the parable of the sower (see *Dialogue*

Luke 8:10:

He said, “To you it has been given to know (ὑμῖν δέδοται γινῶναι) 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’ (συνιῶσιν)” (cf. Isa 6:9-10).

*Dial.* 121.4-122.1:

We, therefore, were endowed (ἡμῖν οὖν ἐδόθη) with the special grace of hearing (ἀκοῦσαι) and understanding (συνεῖναι), of being saved by Christ, and of knowing (ἐπιγινῶναι) 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 Siebeck, 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.<sup>56</sup> 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.<sup>57</sup> The repetition of the phrase “the word of God” in Luke 8:10 and 8:21 underscores the connection between these two passages.<sup>58</sup> Together, they depict correct understanding of and obedience to “the word of God” as central boundary markers that distinguish Christ-believers from other Jews.<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>56</sup> Compare Matt 13:19, 23, which presents understanding the word as essential to bearing fruit. Similarly, Mark 4:20 indicates that those who hear and accept the word will bear fruit. Walter Grundmann, “ἀγαθός,” and “καλός,” in *Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words* (10 vols.; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1975), 1:11-12; 3:538-544, notes that, in Hellenistic sources, the phrase “honest and good” (καλῆ καὶ ἀγαθῆ) used in Luke 8:15 conveys the concept of moral integrity. A similar phrase is also used to describe a righteous individual in Tob. 5:14 (τῆς καλῆς καὶ ἀγαθῆς). So also 2 Macc. 15:12 (καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν); 4 Macc. 4:1 (καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν); cf. Bock, *Luke*, 1:738; Marshall, *Luke*, 327; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:714; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:387; Dupont, “La parabole du semeur [Luc],” 107. The verb “hold fast” (κατέχω) conveys the idea of faithfully retaining the word; see BDAG, 533. This faithfulness to the word thus corresponds closely to the idea of perseverance (ὑπομονή). Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), 222, suggests that ὑπομονή represents the opposite of ἀφίστανται in Luke 8:13 and argues that Luke 8:15 provides a description of a successful hearer that stands as the opposite of the three preceding classes of hearers.

<sup>57</sup> 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.

<sup>58</sup> Robinson, “Preaching the Word,” 133.

<sup>59</sup> Kodell, “The Word of God,” 517, states that hearing and accepting “the word” leads to inclusion within the community of God’s people; cf. Dupont, “La parabole du semeur,” 97-98, 108, who argues that this element is Lukan. Similarly, Birger Gerhardsson, in the essay, “The Parable of the Sower,” *NTS* 14 (1968): 183, suggests that Luke is “depicting how the new fellowship is formed round Jesus, a ‘family’ of those who are bound together spiritually rather than by ties of blood: they hear the word of God and do it

Although Justin presents correct understanding and righteous behavior as identifying marks of Christ-believers (*1 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.<sup>60</sup> 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. *1 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.<sup>61</sup> To be sure, Justin recognizes that a small number of Jews have come to believe in Jesus as Messiah (*1 Apol.* 53.3-12; *Dial.*

---

(cf. 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.”

<sup>60</sup> See citation and discussion of *Dial.* 123.2-4, pages 209-210 below.

<sup>61</sup> E.g., *1 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).<sup>62</sup> 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.<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup>

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).<sup>65</sup> Nevertheless, in each of these

---

<sup>62</sup> In *Dial.* 39.1-5 and 55.3, Justin admits that an exceptional few Jews will be saved but at the same time tells Trypho that Jews, on the whole, remain unable to understand the Jewish scriptures. In this way, he acknowledges the salvation of some Jews while also sustaining his contrast between the correct understanding of the scriptures by Christ-believers and the misunderstanding of Jews.

<sup>63</sup> *I Apol.* 31.7-8; 32.4; 39.3; 40.7; 42.3-4; 49.5; 53.3-12; *Dial.* 11.4; 12.1-2; 41.2-3; 109.1-110.2; 120.4-5; 121.1-4; 122.1-6; 130.1-4. For further discussion of this sentiment in the writings of Justin, see David Rokeah, *Justin Martyr and the Jews* (Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 5; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 10-11.

<sup>64</sup> E.g., *I Apol.* 31.5-7; 49.1-5; 53.3-12; *Dial.* 12.1-2; 41.2-3; 108.1-109.3; 122.1-123.4. At times, Justin also draws a contrast between Jews and Christians (οἱ Χριστιανοί). See, e.g., *Dial.* 78.10-11; 93.4-5; 96.1-2; 117.1-3. This type of contrast also aligns Jews with outsiders and perhaps finds its fullest expression in the debate between Trypho and Justin. In *Dial.* 39.1-5, for example, Justin tells Trypho that “you [i.e., you Jews] hate us [i.e., us Christians] who have grasped the meaning of these truths [i.e., the truths of scripture] . . . you [Jews] ‘who are wise in your own eyes and prudent in your own sight’ (Isa 5:21), are in reality stupid . . . We [Christians], on the other hand, . . . have been well instructed in his whole truth” (cf. *Dial.* 32.5; 41.2-3; 64.1; 77.3.; 78.10-11; 82.1; 87.5; 88.1; 92.4; 108.1-3; 131.2).

<sup>65</sup> I am keenly aware that I am here wading into a long-standing debate over the significance of Paul’s repeated announcements that he is turning to non-Jews. The major proponents of the view that Luke portrays the replacement of Jews with non-Jews in Acts 13:46-47, 18:4-6, and 28:23-28 are well known. Haenchen, *Acts*, 100-103, 414, 417-418, 730, argues that the book of Acts shows a progression of the

episodes, Luke seems to avoid drawing a clear-cut distinction between τὰ ἔθνη and οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι. For example, even though Luke indicates in Acts 13:42-47 that some Jews reject the message of Paul, he also reports that other Jews in this setting embrace his proclamation of the Jewish scriptures.<sup>66</sup> Again, in Acts 18:4-8, Luke indicates that some Jews oppose Paul but at the same time reports the positive response of other Jews.<sup>67</sup> Subsequently, in Acts 28:23-28, where Luke has Paul cite Isa 6:9-10 to denounce Jews who do not understand, or reject, his interpretation of the scriptures, he still reports that some Jews believe the message of Paul (Acts 28:24). Thus, even in instances where Luke contrasts the rejection of the message and scriptural interpretation of Christ-believers by Jews with its positive reception by non-Jews, he resists portraying Jews as unequivocal ‘others’, or outsiders to the Christ-believing community. Furthermore, Luke

---

gospel from Jews to non-Jews. He maintains that Acts 13:46-47 serves as a pattern of Jewish rejection, which is repeated on similar occasions (Acts 18:6; 19:9; 28:28); cf. Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 39-41, 53, 77-83; Loisy, *Actes*, 938-940; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 222-224; Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 142-144. By contrast, Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41-74, argues that the conversion of Jews takes place alongside reports of opposition, which also come from Jews. He notes the repetition of this pattern in chapters 4, 5, 6, 13, 14, and 17 of Acts and asserts that the gospel produces a division among Jews. This view bears some resemblance to the earlier argument of Adolf Harnack, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New Testament Studies 3; trans. Rev. J. R. Wilkinson; Williams & Norgate, 1909), xxiii-xxv, who maintains that the writings of Luke describe the rejection of the gospel by some Jews and the positive reception of the message by significant numbers of other Jews. Others have followed Jervell’s attempt to understand the conflict in Acts as an inner-Jewish struggle. See, e.g., David L. Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 48-49; Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBLMS 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 35-50; J. Dupont, *Études sur les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 343-349, 457-511. While not wishing to deny that Luke here portrays a Jewish rejection of the message of Paul, I hope to highlight that the divisions in Acts 13:46-47, 18:4-6, and 28:23-28 occur in response to Paul’s message and interpretation of the scriptures and to demonstrate that Luke does not draw as firm a distinction between Jews and non-Jewish Christ-believers as Justin does.

<sup>66</sup> The sermon of Paul in Acts 13:13-41, which focuses upon biblical history and scriptural interpretation, is the referent of ὁ λόγος τοῦ κυρίου and ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 13:42-47.

<sup>67</sup> The synagogue context suggests that Paul’s attention to “the word” included the study and interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. Some translations appear to interpret ἐπειθέειν in Acts 18:4 as a conative imperfect and thus take it to mean that Paul was “trying to persuade” Jews and Greeks in the synagogue on the Sabbath (see, e.g., NRSV, NIV). If this is the meaning that Luke intends, it is not certain that Paul was successful in his attempt to persuade people. Nevertheless, since Luke subsequently reports that Crispus, the synagogue leader, and his household were baptized (Acts 18:8), it appears that some Jews were persuaded by the message of Paul.

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.<sup>68</sup> 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 (τοῦτον ἀγνοήσαντες καὶ τὰς φωνὰς τῶν προφητῶν τὰς κατὰ πᾶν σάββατον ἀναγινωσκομένας), they fulfilled those words by condemning him. Though they could charge him with nothing deserving death, yet they asked Pilate to have him killed (ἤτησαντο Πιλάτον ἀναιρεθῆναι αὐτόν).  
(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 (πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσιν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίοις, διὰ καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες οὐ συνιᾶσι τὰ εἰρημένα), and consider us [Christians] their enemies and adversaries, killing us and punishing us (ἀναιροῦντες καὶ κολάζοντες ἡμᾶς), 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

---

<sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup>

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*.<sup>70</sup> 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 ἔθνη, and attempts to present both of these outcomes as complementary realizations of the fulfillment of prophecy.<sup>71</sup>

#### 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

---

<sup>69</sup> As Judith M. Lieu, *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of Christians in the Second Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 180, notes, in this context, Justin does not claim that Jews falsified the LXX, although he does so in the *Dialogue*. See footnote 123, page 214 below. Note also Oskar Skarsaune’s discussion of Justin’s differing uses of the Aristeas legend in “From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church,” in *Immanuel* 24-25 (1990), 207-219.

<sup>70</sup> 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.

<sup>71</sup> 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.<sup>72</sup> This view of Israel's history helps authors of early Jewish and Christian literature to describe the *en mass* 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.<sup>73</sup> 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

---

<sup>72</sup> 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.

<sup>73</sup> 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 descendants of Jewish ancestors who rejected the prophets and therefore incurred God's wrath.<sup>74</sup> Moreover, Luke heightens the urgency of hearing and obeying the message of Jesus by portraying him as the eschatological prophet like Moses.<sup>75</sup> 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

---

<sup>74</sup> Steck, *Israel*, 50-58, 266-269, also notes this theme in Luke and Acts. He draws the conclusion that the purpose of the speeches to Jews in Acts was to call the people to return from sin to covenantal relationship with God. For further discussion of the development of this theme in Luke-Acts, see David P. Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 82-222; Tiede, *Prophecy and History*, 42-55; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts* (Missoula: Scholars, 1977), 79-126.

<sup>75</sup> 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.<sup>76</sup> 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.

Several examples illustrate the role of exegesis in the development of this theme in the gospel of Luke. Luke presents Jesus as a prophetic figure who experiences a rejection of his interpretation of the Jewish scriptures at the very outset of his mission (Luke 4:16-30).<sup>77</sup> Throughout the course of his ministry, moreover, Jesus encounters opposition because he challenges the teaching and practices of those who were regarded as experts in the Law (cf. Luke 6:1-11; 11:37-54; 13:10-17; 14:1-6).<sup>78</sup> As he travels toward Jerusalem, Jesus anticipates further opposition and suffering upon his arrival because of the city's refusal to recognize his prophetic visitation (Luke 13:31-35;<sup>79</sup> cf. 11:49-50; 19:41-44).<sup>80</sup> When Jesus finally reaches Jerusalem, the climactic destination of his journey as a prophet (Luke 13:32-33), he immediately cleanses the temple and begins to teach there (Luke 19:45-47; cf. 20:1; 21:37). In this setting, Luke again portrays the exposition of the Jewish scriptures as a significant part of the message of Jesus (Luke 20:9-19, 27-40, 41-44; 21:20-28).<sup>81</sup> Although many Jerusalem Jews respond

---

<sup>76</sup> Johnson, *Literary Function*, 124, maintains that salvation is offered to Jews a first time through the message of Jesus and a second time through the message of his followers; cf. David P. Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus-Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts," *NovT* 28 (1986): 226.

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

<sup>78</sup> Some similar descriptions occur in the other synoptic Gospels. Compare Luke 6:1-11 with Matt 12:1-14; 10:1-4 and Mark 2:23-3:6; 3:1-6. There are no parallels with Luke 13:10-17 and 14:1-6.

<sup>79</sup> Cf. Matt 23:37-39.

<sup>80</sup> No parallels with Matthew or Mark.

<sup>81</sup> 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,

favorably to him (Luke 19:48; 20:21; 21:38),<sup>82</sup> their leaders reject his teaching (Luke 19:47; 20:1-7, 19, 26).<sup>83</sup> Subsequently, at the trial of Jesus, Luke presents his teaching as the primary cause of his rejection.<sup>84</sup> The prophetic message and exegesis of Jesus thus produces a division among the Jewish people.<sup>85</sup>

---

*Literary Function*, 107-109, also suggests that the teaching of Jesus serves as the focal point of the entire journey to Jerusalem (Luke 9:51-19:44). He argues that, throughout this section, the message of Jesus distinguishes between different groups within Israel: “To the disciples, Jesus speaks what is essentially positive catechesis concerning his identity, their mission, the nature of service and authority within the community . . . etc” (108; Luke 9:1-6, 18-21, 26-28, 43-55; 10:1-12, 17-23; 10:38-11:13; 12:1-12, 22-53; 16:1-13; 17:1-10; 17:22-18:8). “To the crowds, Jesus speaks words of warning, threat, and calls to repentance” (108; 9:23-27, 57-62; 10:13-15; 11:14-36; 12:13-21; 12:54-13:30; 14:25-35). “Against the Pharisees and lawyers, Jesus uses the language of attack and condemnation” (108-109; Luke 10:25-37; 11:37-53; 13:31-14:24; 15:1-32; 16:14-31; 17:20-21; 18:9-14).

<sup>82</sup> Matthew and Mark have no parallel references to Luke 19:48 and 21:38. Luke 20:21 also elaborates on the positive qualities of the teaching of Jesus more than Matt 22:16 and Mark 12:14.

<sup>83</sup> Parallel scenes occur in Matthew and Mark, but only Luke emphasizes this activity by repeatedly indicating that Jesus taught daily in the temple when he arrived at Jerusalem (Luke 19:47; 20:1; 21:37) and reporting the positive and negative responses to his message.

<sup>84</sup> Although the people of Jerusalem initially respond favorably to the message and scriptural interpretation of Jesus, Luke implicates both the people and their leaders in his death: “Then Pilate said to the chief priests and the crowds, ‘I find no basis for an accusation against this man.’ But they were insistent and said, ‘He stirs up the people by teaching throughout all Judea, from Galilee where he began even to this place’” (Luke 23:4-5; cf. Luke 23:13-25). Matthew and Mark have no parallel references. Luke also indicates that Jerusalem Jews reject Jesus and instigate his death, but he describes the repentance of large numbers of Jerusalem Jews in the book of Acts (Acts 2:41; 5:14; 21:20). Their repentance distinguishes them as part of the faithful over against those who reject the scriptural interpretation of the followers of Jesus (e.g., Acts 2:37-41; 4:1-22).

<sup>85</sup> Johnson, *Literary Function*, 79-126, argues that a primary division within Israel occurred between the leaders, who rejected Jesus, and the rest of the people. So also Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israel: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (Münich: Kösel, 1975), 41-42, who argues that Luke depicts a gap between the people and their leaders throughout the gospel of Luke. He rightly observes, however, that this contrast disappears in Luke 23:1-5, 13-25 where Luke implicates both the leaders and the people in the death of Jesus. Note especially the way that Luke has Jews accuse Jesus falsely (Luke 23:2; compare Mark 15:3), and portrays their determination to see his destruction (Luke 23:5, 18, 21, 23). Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 225, suggests that Luke implicated the people as well as their leaders in Luke 23 in order to justify subsequent accusations that Jews killed Jesus in Acts (e.g., Acts 2:23; 3:17; 13:27). He maintains that this portrayal of Jews serves as one of many steps toward Luke’s increasingly negative characterization of Jews in the book of Acts. Conzelmann, *Luke*, 87, argues that Luke places blame upon the Jews as part of a political apologetic that aimed to depict Pilate and Jesus as innocent. Pilate declares the innocence of Jesus three times (Luke 23:4, 14, 22), and states that he wants to release him (Luke 23:20) whereas the Jewish people and their leaders insist on his execution. Luke also omits the account of the mockery of Roman soldiers (Mark 15:17-20). See also Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 92-93; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1487-1489.

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).<sup>86</sup> 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 ἐξολεθρευθήσεται 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.<sup>87</sup> Furthermore, the addition of ἔσται δέ to the beginning of his citation of Deut 18:19 makes it roughly parallel to καὶ ἔσται in Acts 2:21. This link between Acts 2:21

---

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

<sup>87</sup> The phrase ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ in Lev 23:29 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 ἔσται) 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 (ἔσται δέ) that every person who does not listen to the prophet like Moses shall be cut off from the people.”<sup>88</sup> 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.<sup>89</sup> 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).<sup>90</sup> In his lengthy review

---

<sup>88</sup> 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 according to the Discourses of Acts,” *NTS* 32 (1986): 547.

<sup>89</sup> Hans Bayer, “The Preaching of Peter in Acts,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (eds. I. Howard Marshall 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).

<sup>90</sup> 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; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978), 22-31; Bruce, *Acts*, 191-192. M. H. Scharlemann, *Stephen: A Singular 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).<sup>91</sup> He argues that just as former Israelites received "living oracles" from Moses but refused to obey them (Acts 7:38-39),<sup>92</sup> so his accusers both killed Christ and refused to keep the law (Acts 7:51-53).<sup>93</sup> 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]),<sup>94</sup> 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":

---

*Judenchristentums* (Tübingen: 1949), 441; J. Bihler, "Der Stephanusbericht (Apg 6,8-15 un 7,54-8,2)," *BZ* 3 (1959): 252-270. Still others maintain that the speech represents a combination of traditional and Lukan material. See, e.g., Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, SCM, 1951), 167-170; U. Wilckens, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditions-geschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchener: Verlag, 1974), 208-221; Haenchen, *Acts*, 286-289.

<sup>91</sup> Steck, *Israel*, 66-68, 74-77; Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 260-262; Bock, *Acts*, 277.

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

<sup>93</sup> The dispute surrounding the arrest of Stephen appears to be related to opposing interpretations of the Mosaic law. False witnesses accuse Stephen of speaking against the Law (Acts 6:11, 13-14) and Stephen accuses his opponents of not keeping the Law and opposing the Holy Spirit and the prophets (Acts 7:51-53). Ernst Haenchen, "Judentum and Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte," *ZNW* 54 (1963): 165-166, argues that the purpose of the speech of Stephen was to establish Christ-believers as those who were truly in continuity with the Jewish scriptures and to represent other Jews as deviant; cf. B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 73-96. 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.

<sup>94</sup> Some manuscripts omit ἡμῶν in Acts 7:19. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition* (Stuttgart, UBS, 1998), 303, suggests that external evidence favors the omission but notes that the preceding ἡμῶν (four words earlier) may have led to its omission by copyists. The phrase "our fathers" also appears in other speeches in Acts (13:17; 15:10; 22:14; 26:6).

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.<sup>95</sup> 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.<sup>96</sup>

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

---

<sup>95</sup> G. Stanton, “Stephen in Lucan Perspective,” in *Studia Biblica III Paper on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies. Oxford, 3-7 April 1978* (JSNTSup 3; ed., E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 352-354, draws a similar conclusion and adopts the variant reading οἱ πατέρες ὑμῶν in Acts 7:39 (found in Irenaeus, Ψ, 81) rather than οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν; cf. Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 104; Jeffery S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 126. A. F. J. Klijn, “Stephen’s Speech – Acts VII.2-53,” *NTS* 4 (1957-1958): 25-31, also takes this position and further argues that the speech draws a contrast between ancestors on the mountain with Moses who received the law (Acts 7:38) and ancestors who rejected it and worshipped the golden calf (Acts 7:39). Although manuscript evidence for this conclusion is weak, the sudden shift in the portrayal of ancestry in Acts 7:51-53 supports the thesis that Luke sees a division in ancestry that corresponds to the division between Jews who believe in Jesus and other Jews. Moreover, Luke has Jesus denounce similar opponents by identifying them with Jewish ancestors that killed the prophets: “So you are witnesses and approve of the deeds of *your* ancestors; for they killed them, and you build their tombs” (Luke 11:48). See also the references to “their ancestors” in Luke 6:23, 26.

<sup>96</sup> Barrett, *Acts*, 1:340.

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).<sup>97</sup>

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).<sup>98</sup> 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.<sup>99</sup> 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.<sup>100</sup> 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.<sup>101</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> In Acts 7:59-60, Luke links the execution of Stephen with the execution of Christ by having Stephen commit his spirit to Jesus (Acts 7:59; cf. Luke 23:46; Ps 31:5) and forgive his executioners (Acts 7:60; cf. Luke 23:34). For further discussion of the links between the rejection or martyrdom of Moses, Jesus, and Stephen, see Johnson, *Acts*, 135-144.

<sup>98</sup> See citation and discussion of Acts 28:25-27 on pages 203-204 above.

<sup>99</sup> 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.”

<sup>100</sup> 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.”

<sup>101</sup> As Bock, *Acts*, 755, argues, Luke casts Paul in the role of Isaiah and those who reject him in the role of those who rejected the prophet Isaiah. Acts 28:25-28 thus functions as a warning for Jews rather

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.<sup>102</sup> 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.<sup>103</sup> 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).<sup>104</sup>

---

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.

<sup>102</sup> 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.

<sup>103</sup> 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.

<sup>104</sup> 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,<sup>105</sup> others correctly point out that the speech contains a number of scriptural allusions.<sup>106</sup> Since

---

<sup>105</sup> 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).

<sup>106</sup> Compare, especially, Acts 10:36-38 (τὸν λόγον [ὄν] ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος, ὑμεῖς οἴδατε τὸ γενόμενον ῥῆμα καθ’ ὅλης τῆς Ἰουδαίας, ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς Γαλιλαίας μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ὃ ἐκήρυξεν Ἰωάννης, Ἰησοῦν τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ, ὡς ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει, ὃς διήλθεν εὐεργετῶν καὶ ἰώμενος πάντας τοὺς καταδυναστευομένους ὑπὸ τοῦ διαβόλου, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ’ αὐτοῦ) with Luke 4:18-19 (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἀφ᾽ ἑσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστέλλει τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφ᾽ ἑσιν, κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν; cf. LXX Isa 61:1-2; 58:6). Scholars often note how this parallel has the effect of recalling the early ministry and proclamation of Jesus in the gospel of Luke (especially Luke 4:16-18). See, e.g., Conzelmann, *Acts*, 83; Haenchen, *Acts*, 352-353; Johnson, *Acts*, 192; Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 233-235. As Bock observes, the terminology in Acts 10:36-38 alludes to both Luke 4:16-18 and to LXX Isa 61:1. Note the repetition of ἀποστέλλω, χρίω, κηρύσσω, and εὐαγγελίζω in all three contexts. Graham Stanton, *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching* (SNTSMS 25; Cambridge: CUP, 1974), 67-85, also suggests that Acts 10:36 alludes to Ps 107:21, Acts 10:38a to Isa 61:1, and possibly to Isa 52:4, Acts 10:38b to Gen 39:21, Acts 10:38c to Ps 107:20, and Acts 10:39 to Deut 21:22-23. For further discussion of

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 (τούτω πάντες οἱ προφῆται μαρτυροῦσιν ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα εἰς αὐτόν).”<sup>107</sup> 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.<sup>108</sup> 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.

<sup>107</sup> Notably, this statement recalls Luke 24:46-47 (εἶπεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν . . . κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη. ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλήμ). 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 . . . μάρτυσιν τοῖς προκεχειροτονημένοις 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 ὑμεῖς μάρτυρες τούτων; Acts 1:8 ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες).

<sup>108</sup> 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.<sup>109</sup> Although, in some instances, non-Jews respond more positively than do Jews,<sup>110</sup> 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 τὰ ἔθνη τὸν λόγον) of the good news and become believers (πιστεῦσαι).” 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, *Actes*, 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 (αἱ προσευχαί σου καὶ αἱ ἐλεημοσύναι σου ἀνέβησαν εἰς μνημόσυνον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ; 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.

<sup>109</sup> See, e.g., Acts 13:50; 14:2, 4-5; 18:4; 19:10-20.

<sup>110</sup> 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.<sup>111</sup>

#### 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.<sup>112</sup> In the *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. *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

---

<sup>111</sup> See the similar conclusion of Florian Wilk, "Apg 10,1-11,18 im Licht der lukanischen Erzählung vom Wirken Jesu," in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002), 616-617: "On Menschen zu Jesus und damit zum endzeitlich gesammelten Gottesvolk gehören, entscheidet sich nicht an ihrer Herkunft, sondern am Hören, Bewahren und Tun des Wortes Gottes" (617).

<sup>112</sup> E.g., *1 Apol.* 36.3-37.1; 49.1-5; *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.

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 (μετετέθη)<sup>113</sup> 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 (τοῦ μεταθεῖναι) this people, and I will transplant them (μεταθήσω). And I will take away the wisdom of their wise, and will bring to nought the understanding of their prudent” (Isa 29:13-14).<sup>114</sup> (*Dial.* 78.10-11)

---

<sup>113</sup> Although Thomas B. Falls, *The Writings of Saint Justin Martyr* (The Fathers of the Church; New York: Christian Heritage, 1948), 273, renders μετετέθη as “was given,” the verb μετατίθημι more typically denotes “transfer” or “change”; see H. G. Liddell and R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Reprint of the 9th ed. [1925-1940] with a new supplement edited by E. A. Barber and others; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968), 1117.

<sup>114</sup> 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.<sup>115</sup> Moreover, in this context, Justin plays on the term μετατίθημι 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 (μετετέθη) from Jews to non-Jewish Christ-believers, so he argues that the scriptures foretell the removal (τοῦ μεταθεῖναι, μεταθήσω) 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 there 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)

---

<sup>115</sup> See also the citation of Isa 29:14 and near-parallel explanation in *Dial.* 32.5. In both *Dial.* 32.5 and 78.11, Justin contrasts the withdrawal of wisdom from Jews with the bestowal of “grace” and “wisdom” to understand upon Christ-believers (cf. *Dial.* 123.4).

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.<sup>116</sup> 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 (*Dial.* 27.1-3; cf. 18.2; 44.2; 45.3; 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.<sup>117</sup>

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 *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. *1 Apol.* 36.3-37.9).<sup>118</sup> Similarly, in *1 Apology* 63, Justin explains that

---

<sup>116</sup> Compare *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).

<sup>117</sup> 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, *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law* (SBL 20; Missoula: Scholars, 1975), 62-76; Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 313-324. Compare also Acts 7:48-50 with *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, *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.

<sup>118</sup> For a full citation of *1 Apol.* 49.1-5 and further discussion of this passage, see pages 186-187 above. Note also that in *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 (*1 Apol.* 63:1-3, 12-15), and in this context attributes their consequent persecution of Christ to the inspiration of demons (*1 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]).<sup>119</sup> 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.<sup>120</sup>

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:<sup>121</sup> “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.

<sup>119</sup> 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).

<sup>120</sup> Compare Luke 6:23, 26; 11:48; 13:31-35; Acts 7:51-53; Acts 28:25 where Luke likens the rejection of Christ by Jews to the actions of Jewish ancestors and to a long-standing pattern of rejection of the Jewish prophets. See, especially, the Lukan Stephen’s statement “you are forever opposing the Holy Spirit, just as your ancestors used to do,” and the Lukan Paul’s statement in Acts 28:25, “The Holy Spirit was right in saying *to your ancestors* through the prophet Isaiah . . .”

<sup>121</sup> In *1 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 (*Dial.* 114.3).<sup>122</sup> Subsequently, he draws a contrast between the correct interpretation of Christ-believers and the misunderstanding of the scriptures by Jews (*Dial.* 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). (*Dial.* 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.<sup>123</sup> 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:

---

<sup>122</sup> 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.

<sup>123</sup> 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 (*Dial.* 110.1-2; 112.2-4; 114.3; 134.2). For example, in *Dial.* 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 (*Dial.* 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 *Dial.* 43.4-7 that Isa 7:10-16 prophesied the virgin birth of Christ but argues in *Dial.* 43.8 that Trypho and his teachers have insisted that the real words of Isa 7:14 are not “behold a virgin (παρθένος) shall conceive” but “behold a young woman (νεάνις) 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 *Dial.* 83.1 Justin argues that the teachers of Trypho wrongly assume that LXX Ps 109.1-4 refers to Hezekiah. Moreover, in *Dial.* 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 (*Dial.* 68.7; 71.1; 120.5) and, in *I 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.<sup>124</sup> 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.<sup>125</sup>

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.<sup>126</sup> 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.

---

<sup>124</sup> Note the similar use of Isa 29:13 in Matt 15:9 and Mark 7:7.

<sup>125</sup> 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 (τὰ τῶν διδασκάλων ὑμῶν), although he does not cite particular passages that affirm these assertions.

<sup>126</sup> See, e.g., Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 174-178; Polhill, *Acts*, 545; Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 75-83; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 227; Haenchen, *Acts*, 730.

#### 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup> 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**

### **Luke-Acts**

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.<sup>2</sup> 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.”<sup>3</sup> Although Conzelmann does not elaborate on this assertion, he appears to assume that Luke equates the acquisition of a correct

---

<sup>2</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (trans. Geoffrey Buswell; Harper & Brothers: New York, 1960), 149-162. Although Conzelmann was responsible for the concept of the epochs of *Heilsgeschichte*, Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 96-102, follows Conzelmann’s framework for describing salvation history. Like Conzelmann, he argues that Luke presents three distinct periods of history and links the church and Israel in order to show the continuity of the history of salvation rather than to create a bridge between Judaism and Christianity. See also E. Haenchen, “Judentum und Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte,” *ZNW* 58 (1963): 155-187; cf. Stephen G. Wilson, *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* (SNTSMS 23; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 219-227.

<sup>3</sup> Conzelmann, *Luke*, 162. Although Haenchen, *Acts*, 103-105, appears to concur, he does not elaborate upon Luke’s use of scripture to the extent that Conzelmann does.

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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup>

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.<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup> Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982), 183.

<sup>5</sup> David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 77, 143.

<sup>6</sup> J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 41-72. See also B. S. Easton, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts, and Other Papers* (ed. Frederick C. Grant; London: SPCK, 1955), 41-57, who argues that Luke presents the early church as a Jewish sect.

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.”<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup>

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

---

<sup>7</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 51; idem, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 14-15, 61-75; *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 92-104, 170-171.

<sup>8</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 64.

<sup>9</sup> 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 Endzeit. 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).

<sup>10</sup> Like Jervell, John T. Carroll, *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts* (SBL Dissertation Series 92; Atlanta: Scholars, 1988), 158-164, suggests Luke places non-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;<sup>11</sup> imperceptiveness to God’s message and purpose prevents Jews from receiving the scriptural promises intended for them.<sup>12</sup> 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.<sup>13</sup>

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.<sup>14</sup>

## 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.<sup>15</sup> For example, John O’Neill argues that Justin describes a radical break between the Christ-

---

<sup>11</sup> Robert C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986-1990), 1:15-44, 298-301; 2:344-357.

<sup>12</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:348.

<sup>13</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:174-175, 352-353.

<sup>14</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:352; cf. idem, “Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul’s Mission in Acts,” in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed. Joseph B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 83-101.

<sup>15</sup> For discussion regarding this perspective in the writings of Justin, see Philippe Bobichon, *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Edition Critique, Traduction, Commentaire* (Paradosis 47/1; Fribourg: Academic Press, 2005), 73-104. Bobichon expresses the scholarly consensus in this way: “L’image des juifs est liée à celle des chrétiens par un rapport d’antithèse univoque et définitif. Justin oppose constamment les uns et les autres sur le plan intellectuel, moral et religieux, sans prendre en compte aucune particularité susceptible d’atténuer son propos” (90).

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.<sup>16</sup> Within this discussion, O’Neill asserts that “Acts represents a theology in which the church has abandoned the People and appropriated the Book,”<sup>17</sup> 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.”<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup>

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.<sup>20</sup> 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

---

<sup>16</sup> J. C. O’Neill, *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting* (London: SPCK, 1961), 12-13, 82-93.

<sup>17</sup> O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 90.

<sup>18</sup> O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 92.

<sup>19</sup> Unfortunately, O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 171, 175, does not give specific examples that illustrate this conclusion.

<sup>20</sup> Oskar Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr’s Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NovTSup 106; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 326-352, 428.

proof,<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

More recently, Denise Kimber Buell has also argued that Justin portrays Christ-believers as the replacement for Israel.<sup>23</sup> Yet she maintains that Justin redefines what constitutes the people, or race, that is chosen by God.<sup>24</sup> 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.<sup>25</sup> 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.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 256-259.

<sup>22</sup> 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 *1 Clement*. But even here, this is not his own language. 'Israel' occurs within OT quotations applied to Christians" (329; see *1 Clem.* 29:2 where Deut 32:8-9 is applied to the church).

<sup>23</sup> 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).

<sup>24</sup> Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 102.

<sup>25</sup> 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).

<sup>26</sup> Kimber Buell, *New Race*, 103-108.

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).<sup>27</sup> Nevertheless, because Luke and Justin also need to account for the inclusion of non-Jews within the Christ-believing community,<sup>28</sup> 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.

---

<sup>27</sup> See discussion of these passages in chapter one, pages 50-78.

<sup>28</sup> 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.<sup>29</sup> 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)<sup>30</sup> 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

---

<sup>29</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke* (AB 28, 28A; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981-1985), 1:467, argues that Luke wishes to emphasize that John the Baptist addressed a broad audience. Similarly, Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:70, suggests that Luke emphasizes the group as a whole and argues that their initial acceptance of the message of John the Baptist resembles the circumstances of the first sermon of Jesus in Luke 4. By contrast, Darrell L. Bock, *Luke* (2 vols.; BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994-1996), 1:303, maintains that the Jewish leaders were the primary target for Luke, even though he refers to the crowds more generally. From yet a different perspective, François Bovon, *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* (Hermeneia; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002), 122, argues that Luke here presents the οἱ ὄχλοι as a group that does not bear fruit worthy of repentance because, by Luke’s time, non-Jews outnumbered Jews in the Christ-believing community; cf. Gerhard Schneider, *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk* (Königstein/Ts.-Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1985), 1:85; Alfred Plummer, *The Gospel According to S. Luke* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1896), 88.

<sup>30</sup> John Nolland, *Luke* (WBC 35; 3 vols.; Dallas: Word Books, 1989-1993), 1:147, argues that the reference to raising up stones may be a wordplay on the Aramaic term for “stones” (אבנים) since it resembles the Aramaic word for “sons” (בנים). J. Jeremias, “λίθος,” in *Theological Dictionary of New Testament Words* (10 vols.; trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley; eds. Gerhard Kittel and Gerhard Friedrich; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-1975), 4:268, 269-271, however, suggests that other contexts in the NT do not confirm this. He argues instead that the image of raising up from stones alludes to Isa 51:1-2, a passage that describes Abraham as a rock from which those who seek God are cut. So also Bovon, *Luke*, 123; Bock, *Luke*, 1:305; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1: 468.

statement could appeal to a non-Jewish readership of Luke-Acts.<sup>31</sup> Nevertheless, the description of new stones could simply mean that God was able to change stones into additional physical descendants of Abraham.<sup>32</sup> Furthermore, the subsequent portrayal of the response of the crowds (οἱ ὄχλοι) 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 ὄχλοι in Luke 3:10-14 suggests that these Jews wish to heed John’s warning to produce (ποιέω) fruit worthy of repentance.<sup>33</sup> 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

---

<sup>31</sup> See, e.g., Heinz Schürmann, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKZNT; Freiburg: Herder, 1982-1994), 1:165; I. Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 141; Bock, *Luke*, 1:306.

<sup>32</sup> Although Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:467-468, suggests that Luke 3:8b implies that God can create Israel anew, he argues that Luke nevertheless depicts the reconstitution of Israel of old in his narrative.

<sup>33</sup> Although the use of ποιέω to describe producing, or bearing, fruit typically has a different nuance than the use of ποιέω 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).<sup>34</sup> 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,<sup>35</sup> 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.<sup>36</sup> The absence of a clear description of this group suggests that

---

<sup>34</sup> 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.

<sup>35</sup> Nolland, *Luke*, 2:735, suggests that Matthew applies the text to the gathering of non-Jews but that Luke uses it to describe the re-gathering of Israel. Similarly, Plummer, *Luke*, 347, argues that Matthew presents the admission of non-Jews more clearly than does Luke. Marshall, *Luke*, 563, also concludes that Luke emphasizes a contrast between the faithful patriarchs and unrepentant Jews who lived at the time of Jesus.

<sup>36</sup> Dale C. Allison, “Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8:11-12 – Luke 13:28-29,” *IBS* 11 (1989): 160, argues that Luke adds “north and south” to Matthew’s “east and west” (Matt 8:11) in order to allude to Ps 107:3, a text that portrays the return of Jewish exiles to their land. Accordingly, he suggests that Luke 13:28-39 refers to the inclusion of Diaspora Jews rather than non-Jews; cf. Nolland, *Luke*, 2:735; Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville: Liturgical Press,

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,<sup>37</sup> the present form of the address fits with the literary account of Luke-Acts.<sup>38</sup> As such, the Stephen speech contributes to our understanding of the Lukan representation of Abrahamic promises and their fulfillment.

Luke has Stephen open his speech with the story of the calling of Abraham (Acts 7:2-4).<sup>39</sup> In this account, Stephen emphasizes that Abraham had no child and did not possess the land of Canaan even though God promised to give him these things (Acts

---

1991), 217. By contrast, Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 528-529, reads Luke 13:28-30 against the context of the eschatological banquet scene portrayed in Isa 25:6-9, a passage that depicts the inclusion of non-Jews. Green therefore concludes that Luke portrays the replacement of Jews with non-Jews in this context; cf. Bock, *Luke*, 2:1239; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1023.

<sup>37</sup> See footnote 92, page 201, chapter four.

<sup>38</sup> G. Stanton, “Stephen in Lucan Perspective,” in *Studia Biblica III Paper on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies. Oxford, 3-7 April 1978* (JSNTSup 3; ed., E. A. Livingstone; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981), 345-360.

<sup>39</sup> 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.

7:5). 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.”<sup>40</sup> 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.<sup>41</sup> By arranging the citation in this way, Luke has Stephen present worship in the land as the ultimate realization of Abrahamic promises.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> For further analysis and discussion of the citation and its adaptations, see J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 371-372; C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (ICC; 2 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998), 1:344-345; F. F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, Eerdmans, 1988), 193-194; Jeffrey S. Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy* (Louisville: Westminster/John Knox, 1991), 122-123. Some scholars argue that “this place” in Acts 6:7 refers to the Jerusalem temple since Acts 6:13-14 describes accusations that Stephen allegedly made against “this place” (i.e., the temple). See, e.g., John J. Kilgallen, *The Stephen Speech A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7:2-53* (AB 67; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 33-35; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:345. Others suggest that the phrase refers more generally to the promised land. See, e.g., Nils Dahl, “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts,” in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn; Nashville: Abingdon, 1966), 145; Bruce, *Acts*, 194; Haenchen, *Acts*, 279; Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 122-123. This latter position fits better with the immediate context of Acts 7:6-7 since Stephen reports the words of God to Abraham while he is in Canaan, i.e., in “this place.”

<sup>41</sup> 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 λατρεύω, 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).

<sup>42</sup> Robert L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* (SBL 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 118-132; Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 123-125.

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).<sup>43</sup> 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

---

<sup>43</sup> S. van den Eynde, “Children of the Promise: On the διαθήκη-promise to Abraham in Luke 1,72 and Acts 3:25” in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; Leuven: Uitgeverij Peeters, 1999), 475-476, argues that Luke adapts promises to Abraham and creates a line of promise and fulfillment from Abraham to the time of Moses and the exodus.

inherit the land.<sup>44</sup> 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.<sup>45</sup>

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.<sup>46</sup> 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

---

<sup>44</sup> Although the next section of the speech (Acts 7:44-50) does not explicitly link the worship of God to promises made to Abraham, Dahl, “Story of Abraham,” 74-75, argues that the account of David’s request to build a dwelling place for God (Acts 7:46) should be interpreted as a request for the fulfillment of God’s promise to Abraham; cf. B. W. Bacon, “Stephen’s Speech: Its Argument and Doctrinal Relationship,” in *Biblical and Semitic Studies* (Yale Bicentennial Publications, 1901), 270. Stanton, “Stephen,” 355, suggests that Acts 7:44-50 provides another example of how Israel failed to worship God and therefore failed to become recipients of the promises made to Abraham. A number of scholars conclude that Acts 7:44-50 expresses an anti-temple polemic. See, e.g., Marcel Simon, *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church* (London: Longmans Green, 1958), 53; Haenchen, *Acts*, 289; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 56; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:337-338; D. Sylva, “The Meaning and Function of Acts 7,46-50,” *JBL* 106 (1987): 261-275. Others suggest, however, that this section of the speech addresses the incorrect understanding of the purpose of the temple and temple worship. So F. J. Foakes and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (London: MacMillan, 1920-1933), 4:81. See also, Stanton, “Stephen,” 352-353; John J. Kilgallen, “The Function of Stephen’s Speech (Acts 7,2-53)” *Bib* 70 (1989): 173-193; Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 105-107. Stephen does not denigrate the temple in his speech but challenges the assumption that God dwells in a sanctuary made with human hands. This recognition of the limitations of the temple also appears to be part of the perspective offered in the prayer of Solomon as recorded by the Deuteronomist in 1 Kgs 8:27: “But will God indeed dwell on the earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you, much less this house that I have built” (cf. 2 Chron 6:18).

<sup>45</sup> Graham Stanton, “Stephen,” 351-352; cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:89-90.

<sup>46</sup> 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).<sup>47</sup> The accusation implies that these opponents, like their ancestors, “disinherit themselves from God’s promises to the offspring of Abraham.”<sup>48</sup> 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.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup> For further discussion of this passage, see chapter four, pages 201-203.

<sup>48</sup> Dahl, “Story of Abraham,” 77.

<sup>49</sup> Some commentators regard the speech of Stephen as an attack against Judaism that paves the way for the mission to non-Jews and the separation of Christianity from Judaism. See, e.g., I. Howard Marshall, *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 132; Haenchen, *Acts*, 287-289; A. F. Loisy, *Les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920), 318-320; O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 75-79; Martin Dibelius, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (London, SCM, 1951), 168-169. Earlier, Overbeck argued that the speech of Stephen functions as a justification for the turning to non-Jews. For a summary of the position of Overbeck, see W. Ward Gasque, *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1975), 81-85. J. Gnilka, *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker* (SANT 3; München: Kösel, 1961), 145, also expresses this position succinctly: “Die Rede des Stephanus ist für Lukas nicht nur die Stellungnahme eines einzelnen zu den gegen ihn erhobenen Anklagen, sie ist im Gesamtgefüge der Apostelgeschichte die geschichtstheologische Begründung dafür, daß das Wort Gottes sich nunmehr von Jerusalem abwendet und den Heiden zuwendet, und daß es die Schuld der Juden ist, wenn die große Masse ihres Volkes nicht zu dem neuen Gottesvolk dazugehört.” These interpreters typically regard the speech as a reflection of the sentiments of the non-Jewish Christ-believing community that identified with Stephen and saw itself as the heirs of the promises made to Abraham, rather than Jews. See, especially, Haenchen, *Acts*, 289; Loisy, *Actes*, 318-320; Gnilka, *Verstockung Israels*, 144, who distinguish between the historical and redactional forms of the speech. The difficulty with this interpretation, however, lies in the way that the speech itself distinguishes between differing types of physical descendants of Abraham, rather than between Jews and non-Jews. This leads others to conclude that the speech of Stephen articulates an inner-Jewish debate regarding what represents authentic community identity. See, e.g., Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992), 115-121; A. F. J. Klijn, “Stephen’s Speech – Acts VII.2-53,” *NTS* 4 (1957-1958): 26; Stanton, “Stephen,” 356; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:340. Although it may have been redacted or composed much later, the passage nevertheless recounts an inner-Jewish struggle and presents Jewish Christ-believers as the segment of Judaism that receives the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises. From this latter perspective, as I have argued, the speech of Stephen indicates that a portion of the physical descendants of Abraham become ineligible to receive the promises made regarding his

## 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 υἱοί) 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 [ἐν]ευλογηθήσονται πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς)” (Gen 12:3; 22:18). When God raised up his servant, he sent him first to you, to bless you (εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς) 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.<sup>50</sup> What remains less than certain, however, is the referent of τῷ σπέρματί 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 (εὐλογοῦντα) the Jewish people, Luke creates a link between this action of Jesus and the promise to Abraham that all peoples would be blessed ([ἐν]ευλογηθήσονται) “in your descendants” (ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου).<sup>51</sup> 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).

<sup>50</sup> Although scholars provide differing interpretations of Luke’s understanding of the role of Jews in the fulfillment of Abrahamic promises in Acts 3:25-26, there is wider agreement that Acts 3:25b foreshadows the inclusion of non-Jews. See, e.g., U. Wilckens, *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen* (Neukirchener: Verlag, 1974), 43; Nils A. Dahl, “‘A People for His Name’,” *NTS* 4 (1957-58): 327; Jacques Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays in the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. J. R. Keating; New York: Paulist, 1979), 129-159; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 58-61; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 219-222; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 291; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:213; Johnson, *Acts*, 70-71. Note, however, that Haenchen, *Acts*, 209, infers that the use of αἱ πατριαὶ rather than τὰ ἔθνη in Acts 3:25b may mean that Luke does not here wish to refer to a mission to non-Jews.

<sup>51</sup> The source of the citation in Acts 3:25b is not entirely clear. The reference to the seed of Abraham (τῷ σπέρματί σου) occurs in Gen 22:18 (ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς) whereas Gen 12:3 refers to Abraham but not his seed (ἐνευλογηθήσονται ἐν σοὶ πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ

Jesus as the chosen seed (σπέρμα) through whom the Abrahamic promises would be fulfilled for both Jews and non-Jews.<sup>52</sup> 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 τῷ 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.”<sup>53</sup>

---

τῆς γῆς). The word order of the citation, however, seems to follow Gen 12:3 more closely. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:212, regards the citation in Acts 3:25b as a conflation of Gen 12:3 and 22:18; cf. Bruce, *Acts*, 146. Johnson, *Acts*, 70, suggests that the citation in Acts 3:25b is most similar to Gen 22:18 but notes that it also resembles Gen 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; 26:4. Darrell L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; JSOT Press, 1987), 195-196, suggests that Acts 3:25 relies on Gen 22:18 because of the similarity in wording. The phrase “all the families of the earth” (πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς) in Acts 3:25b differs from the wording of Gen 22:18 (πάντα τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς) and Gen 12:3 (πᾶσαι αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς). Some explain the change from τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς in Gen 22:18 to αἱ πατριαὶ τῆς γῆς in Acts 3:25b by arguing that Luke did not here want to communicate a universalistic perspective. See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 209; Dahl, “Story of Abraham,” 79. The reason for the change in wording, however, is not entirely clear. Martin Rese, *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas* (SNT 1; Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969), 73, suggests that Luke did not use τὰ ἔθνη because he wanted to use a term that would include Jews. As Bock, *Proclamation*, 358, notes, however, Luke could have chosen to use the phrase αἱ φυλαὶ τῆς γῆς from Gen 12:3 if he did not want to use a phrase like τὰ ἔθνη τῆς γῆς. Furthermore, the indication in Acts 3:26 that God sent Jesus to Jews first implies that other peoples will receive blessing in the future.

<sup>52</sup> 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 σπέρματί σου in Acts 3:25b as a reference to Christ.

<sup>53</sup> 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 τῷ 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.<sup>54</sup> 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).<sup>55</sup>

### 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:

---

<sup>54</sup> Siker, *Disinheriting the Jews*, 119-120, also suggests this view.

<sup>55</sup> 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,<sup>56</sup> 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,<sup>57</sup> but he contextualizes his presentation of this material in order to draw attention to the plight of the wicked and

---

<sup>56</sup> 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 ἡ - ἡ 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.

<sup>57</sup> 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.<sup>58</sup> Thus, although Justin relies on Matthean material, he highlights the exclusion of the wrongdoers 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 unrepentant to eternal punishment. Again, this parallels the

---

<sup>58</sup> Compare *1 Apol.* 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;<sup>59</sup> both Jews and non-Jews receive or are excluded from the future blessings associated with Abraham on the basis of their obedience and repentance.<sup>60</sup>

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,<sup>61</sup> 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.

---

<sup>59</sup> 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.

<sup>60</sup> 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.

<sup>61</sup> 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,”<sup>62</sup> and practicing idolatry.<sup>63</sup> 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.<sup>64</sup> This faith, Justin argues, represents a “circumcision of the heart” that enables non-Jewish Christ-believers to

---

<sup>62</sup> 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.

<sup>63</sup> 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.

<sup>64</sup> 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.<sup>65</sup> 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 (*Dial.* 92.4).<sup>66</sup> 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 (*Dial.* 92.2).<sup>67</sup> 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,<sup>68</sup> 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.<sup>69</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> 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 (*Dial.* 113.6-7; 114.3-4; cf. *Dial.* 28.2-3). He also refers to a “spiritual circumcision” that Christ-believers receive through baptism (*Dial.* 43.2).

<sup>66</sup> According to Justin, God instituted circumcision and ritual law because of his foreknowledge of Israel’s unbelief and disobedience (*Dial.* 12.3; 18.2; 21.1; 22.2; 43.1; 44.2; 46.5; 67.8; 92.4).

<sup>67</sup> This represents but one of Justin’s descriptions of the removal of Jews from the land of promise (*1 Apol.* 32.3; 53.3; *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 (*Dial.* 16.2; 25.5).

<sup>68</sup> 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).

<sup>69</sup> See also 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, 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, *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., *Dial.* 16.2;

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,<sup>70</sup> 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. *1 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,” *J ECS* (2004): 155-156.

<sup>70</sup> Although Falls translates the phrase εἰδωλολάτραις ὄντας 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 εἰδωλολάτραις [πάλαι] ὄντας.

*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).<sup>71</sup> 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 Phrygians, but the chosen people of God who appeared to those who did not seek him. . . . 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

---

<sup>71</sup> There are only a few minor variants and one omission in the citation of LXX Deut 32:16-23. Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 53, suggests that Rom 10:19 might have been Justin's guide for citing Deut 32:16-23. See also J. Smith Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr I: The Pentateuch* (Leiden: Brill, 1963), 99, 144-145; Pierre Prigent, *Justin et L'Ancien Testament: L'argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la Première Apologie* (Ebib; Paris: Lecoffre, 1964), 288.

Egyptians or the Idumeans, since Ishmael became the father of a mighty nation and so did Esau.<sup>72</sup>

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.<sup>73</sup> 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.<sup>74</sup> By also arguing that the repentance,

---

<sup>72</sup> Therefore, although Justin recognizes that non-Jews differ from Jews in their physical relationship to Abraham, he ultimately argues that non-Jewish Christ-believers replace Jews as the rightful descendants and heirs of Abraham (*Dial.* 119.5-6).

<sup>73</sup> Note that this assertion assumes Christ’s pre-existence and interaction with Abraham.

<sup>74</sup> Similarly, in *Dial.* 11.5, Justin follows the logic of Paul by asserting that since Abraham was approved and blessed by God while he was still uncircumcised, non-Jews who have faith in Christ become his descendants (cf. Rom 4:13-25). Notably, *Dial.* 11.5 (cf. *Dial.* 119.4) and Rom 4:17 both cite or allude to Gen 17:4. As Werline, “Pauline Arguments,” 84-86, notes, however, Paul indicates that Jews and Gentiles both trace their lineage to Abraham whereas Justin asserts that non-Jewish Christ-believers replace Jews. Although Justin (*Dial.* 119.6) and Paul (Gal 3:8-9) appeal to Gen 15:6 and declare that non-Jewish Christ-believers obtain righteousness in the same manner as Abraham, Werline argues that Paul describes

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).<sup>75</sup> 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).<sup>76</sup>

### 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

---

the justification of Abraham by faith to show that both Jew and Gentile inherit the promises made to Abraham (Gal 3:28-29) whereas Justin uses this argument, together with prophetic texts, to claim that Christ-believers represent true Israel rather than Jews; cf. Craig D. Allert, *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho* (VCSup 64; Leiden: Brill, 2002), 172-174.

<sup>75</sup> 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.

<sup>76</sup> 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.

Luke 2:25-32 serves as an example of how Luke assigns different aspects of the fulfillment of Isaianic promises to Jesus, Israel, and the nations. In this passage, Luke

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,<sup>77</sup> a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to your people Israel.  
(Luke 2:29-32)

The translation above places the term “light” (φῶς) in apposition to the phrase “your salvation” (τὸ σωτήριόν 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.<sup>78</sup> Similarly, in Luke 3:6, Luke presents the “salvation” (τὸ σωτήριον) brought about by Christ as a form of illumination that “all flesh” will see (Isa 40:3-5).<sup>79</sup> Notwithstanding this

---

<sup>77</sup> George D. Kilpatrick, “*Laos* at Luke 2:31 and Acts 4:25, 27,” *JTS* 16 (1965): 127, argues that earlier commentators wrongly interpreted τῶν λαῶν (Luke 2:31) as a reference to the nations. He notes that Luke may have intended to change τῶν ἔθνῶν, from Isa 52:10, to τῶν λαῶν in order to apply this text to Jews. Others such as Bock, *Luke*, 1:243; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:120; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:428, rightly point out that, in light of the subsequent references to Israel and the nations in Luke 2:32, πάντων τῶν λαῶν in Luke 2:31 probably refers to both Jews and non-Jews.

<sup>78</sup> So also Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:428; Bock, *Luke*, 1:244. Alternatively, “light” (φῶς) and “glory” (δόξαν) may both stand in apposition to “salvation” in which case Luke 2:32 anticipates how Jews and non-Jews experience the coming salvation in distinctive ways: light for non-Jews and glory for Israel. So Plummer, *Luke*, 69; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 1:206; Bovon, *Luke*, 103. Although Nolland, *Luke* 1:120 recognizes that δόξαν and ἀποκάλυψιν could be grammatically parallel in this text, he maintains that δόξαν and φῶς are better understood as parallel terms because of the obvious dependence of the passage upon themes from Deutero- and Trito-Isaiah (see, e.g., Isa 49:5-6; 58:8; 60:1-2, 19-20); cf. Green, *Luke*, 149. A. F. Loisy, *L'Évangile selon Luc* (Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924), 122, concludes that both interpretations are possible. John J. Kilgallen, “Jesus, Savior, the Glory of Your People Israel,” *Bib* 75 (1994): 306-307, 314-317, suggests that light is characteristic of salvation for the Gentiles but “glory” is characteristic of salvation for Israel. In either case, Luke 2:32 clearly indicates that both groups would participate in the coming salvation of God but also assumes that they will retain their distinct identity as Jews and non-Jews in this era.

<sup>79</sup> As Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:40, notes, the neuter form τὸ σωτήριον appears only four times in the NT, three of which occur in Luke-Acts (Luke 2:32; 3:6; Acts 28:28; Eph 2:3). Tannehill suggests that Isa 40:5 forms the scriptural basis for these occurrences of τὸ σωτήριον in Luke-Acts; cf. Dupont, *Salvation*, 16; Marshall, *Luke*, 137; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 160; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:428; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:114; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 40. Note, however, that Luke omits the phrase καὶ ὁφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου from Isa 40:5a. Nolland, *Luke*, 1:144, suggests that this is because “glory” did not aptly describe the public

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.”<sup>80</sup>

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).<sup>81</sup> 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.

<sup>80</sup> As Bovon, *Luke*, 103, notes, “the usual separation between Israel and the Gentiles is respected” in Luke 2:32.

<sup>81</sup> For further discussion of Acts 26:16-18, see chapter four, pages 172-173.

Isaianic promises, it is possible that, in some instances, he envisages 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):<sup>82</sup>

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 (κηρύξαι αιχμαλώτοις ἄφειν) and sight to the blind,” “to let the oppressed go free (ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει),” 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 (ἄφεισις) in his ministry. This addition, together with the reference to

---

<sup>82</sup> In this passage, Luke appears to identify Jesus as the same type of servant or messenger described in Isaiah 40-55. Commentators often note the similarities between Isaiah 61 and Isaiah 40-55. See, for example, W. A. M. Beuken, “Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55,” in *The Book of Isaiah = Le livre d’Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures unité et complexité de l’ouvrage* (BETL 81; ed., J. Vermeulen; Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 411-442; C. Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary* (OTL; trans. J. J. Scullion; London: SPCK, 1986), 365-367; R. N. Whybray, *Isaiah 40-66* (NCB; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1975), 240. For further discussion of Luke’s use of Isaiah as a unified whole, see Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: SAP, 1995), 226-249.

“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 (ἄφεσις).<sup>83</sup> 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.<sup>84</sup>

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

---

<sup>83</sup> See also the use of this term in Leviticus 25 and 27. Luke probably connects the two Isaianic passages because of their common reference to ἄφεσις. It appears as if he omitted the phrase ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντρυμιμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ from LXX Isa 61:1 and inserted the phrase ἀποστελεῖται τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει, which is almost identical to ἀπόστειλε τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει from LXX Isa 58:6. For further discussion of this and other adaptations to LXX Isa 61:2, and textual variants, see Bock, *Proclamation*, 105-111; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 72. For further discussion of the use of the Jubilee theme in Luke 4:16-21, the gospel of Luke, and Isa 61:1-2, see Robert B. Sloan, *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubiliary Theology in the Gospel of Luke* (Austin: Schola, 1977); Green, *Luke*, 212-213; Paul Hertig, “The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes,” *Missiology* 26 (1998): 177; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:197; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:72.

<sup>84</sup> Bock, *Proclamation*, 105-111, argues that Luke presents Jesus as the messiah-servant who fulfills messianic and prophetic roles by both proclaiming and effecting salvation; cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 178, who concludes that this passage presents Jesus as the eschatological prophet who should also be identified with the messiah and servant that Isaiah anticipates. Others argue that Luke here focuses on the role of Jesus as eschatological prophet without reference to his messianic status. See, e.g., F. Hahn, *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity* (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1969), 381-382; U. Busse, *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu. Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4.16-30* (SBS 91; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978); Max Turner, “Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective,” *TynBul* 32 (1981): 3-42; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:96. Although E. Earle Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981), 98, argues that Luke 4:16-21 portrays Jesus as the servant of YHWH, Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:529, maintains that since Isaiah 61 does not form part of the Servant Songs, Jesus is better understood as an anointed prophet in this context. Still others maintain that Luke presents Jesus primarily as a Davidic messiah in Luke 4:16-21. See, e.g., Schürmann, *Lukas*, 1:229; R. C. Tannehill, “The Mission of Jesus according to Luke IV 16-30,” in *Jesus in Nazareth* (BZNW 40; ed. E. Grässer; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972), 69; idem, *Narrative Unity*, 1:63; W. C. van Unnik, “Jesus the Christ,” *NTS* 8 (1961-1962): 113-116. Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 226-249, argues convincingly that Luke’s use of Isaiah as a unified source enables him to link the roles of Jesus as servant, messiah, and prophet-herald together. See also chapter two, pages 114-116.

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.<sup>85</sup> 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).<sup>86</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup> See, e.g., Plummer, *Luke*, 129; Loisy, *Luc*, 162; Conzelmann, *Luke*, 34-38, 114, 194; Haenchen, *Acts*, 101, 414, 417-418, 729-730; Schürmann, *Lukas*, 238; Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israel: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (Münich: Kösel, 1975), 44-46; Tannehill, “Mission of Jesus,” 59-63; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 40-41; Jack T. Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987), 164-168; Maddox, *Purpose*, 2-6; Augustin George, “Israel dans l’œuvre de Luc” *RB* 75 (1968): 481-525; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:537; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:200; Joseph B. Tyson, “The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture,” *NTS* 33 (1987): 619-31; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 78-80.

<sup>86</sup> For example, J. A. Sanders, “From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4,” in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA 12; ed. Jacob Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 98-99, has argued that Luke has Jesus refer to the maxim “Physician, heal yourself!” (Luke 4:23) and to the Elijah and Elisha traditions (Luke 4:25-27) in order to challenge the assumption of his audience that the promises of Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 apply exclusively to them. Sanders argues that the “prophetic hermeneutic” of Jesus resembles an early Jewish hermeneutical axiom (found in the Qumran literature) that claimed scriptural blessings for its own group but damnation for outsiders. He maintains that Luke transforms this axiom so that it functions as a polemic against Judaism and an affirmation of the elect status of non-Jews. Following Sanders, Siker, “First to the Gentiles,” 83-89, argues that Luke 4:25-27 serves as the “hermeneutical key” for understanding the Isaiah citation in Luke 4:18-19. He maintains that the fulfillment of the Isaianic promises, cited in Luke 4:18-19, 21b, “is enacted in 4:23-30 and in the ministry of Jesus in Luke 7.” In his view, Luke 4:25-27 and 7:1-17 are patterned after Elijah-Elisha narrative material and should be taken as Luke’s presentation of the fulfillment of the Isaianic promises cited in Luke 4:18-19. Because Luke 7:1-10 describes the ministry of Jesus to a non-Jewish centurion (Luke 7:1-10), moreover, Siker concludes that Luke prioritizes non-Jews as recipients of the scriptural promises announced in Luke 4:18-19. Siker suggests that Luke 7 inverts the order of Luke 4 so as to present non-Jews as the first beneficiaries of God’s promises and the ministry of Jesus. These conclusions do not take into account the narrative material in Luke 4-7 which clearly portrays Jesus’ fulfillment of Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 for the Jewish people.

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.<sup>87</sup> 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.<sup>88</sup> 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

---

<sup>87</sup> 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 Neiryck; 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.

<sup>88</sup> Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews*, 6-27, argues that this rejection of Jesus is limited to the members of the hometown of Nazareth, and is intended by Luke to verify the identity of Jesus as a prophet (Luke 4:23; τῆ πατρίδι σου); cf. Rebecca I. Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 14; Sheffield: SAP, 1997), 138-139, 149. Similarly, B. J. Koet, *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989), 50-52, maintains that Luke appeals to Elijah and Elisha to “stimulate Israel to convert” (50) and receive the restoration that Jesus announced in Luke 4:16-21. See also Larrimore Crockett, “Luke 4:25-27 and Jewish-Gentile Relations in Luke-Acts,” *JBL* 88 (1969): 177-183, who argues that Luke 4:25-27 does not depict a Jewish rejection of Jesus and does not justify the turning to non-Jews. He maintains that Luke 4:25-27 should be read as a prolepsis of Jewish-non-Jewish reconciliation, and of the cleansing of non-Jews that makes it possible for them to live and eat together with Jews in the new age.

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,<sup>89</sup> it echoes terminology and themes from Luke 4:18-19.<sup>90</sup> 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.

Throughout Luke 4-7, Jesus directs his ministry toward Jews by performing exorcisms (Luke 4:31-37, 40-41; 6:18-19), healing the sick (Luke 4:38-40; 5:12-26; 6:18-19), and announcing the good news of the kingdom (Luke 4:44; 6:20-49). In so doing, he fulfills the release for Israel that Isaiah foretells (Isa 61:1-2; 58:6).<sup>91</sup> Luke clearly presents Jews as the beneficiaries of this deliverance by having Jesus begin his ministry in Galilee (Luke 4:14), proceed from Nazareth to another Jewish city, Capernaum, and

<sup>89</sup> Compare Matt 11:4-6.

<sup>90</sup> Siker, “First to the Gentiles,” 89. Compare Luke 4:18-19 (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με, κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, ἀποστεῖλαι τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει, κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτόν) with Luke 7:21-22 (ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ ἑθεράπευσεν πολλοὺς ἀπὸ νόσων καὶ μαστίγων καὶ πνευμάτων πονηρῶν καὶ τυφλοῖς πολλοῖς ἔχαρίσατο βλέπειν. καὶ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πορευθέντες ἀπαγγείλατε Ἰωάννῃ ἃ εἶδετε καὶ ἤκούσατε· τυφλοὶ ἀναβλέπουσιν, χωλοὶ περιπατοῦσιν, λεπροὶ καθαρίζονται καὶ κωφοὶ ἀκούουσιν, νεκροὶ ἐγείρονται, πτωχοὶ εὐαγγελίζονται). Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:667, argues that the answer of Jesus in Luke 7:22 implies that he embodies the fulfillment of Isaianic promises. Similarly, Nolland, *Luke*, 1:330, maintains that Luke 7:22 presents the ministry of Jesus as a release that Isa 61:1-2; 58:6 describes. Ellis, *Luke*, 121, argues that Luke 7:22 clarifies the ministry of Jesus as messiah and servant of YHWH; cf. Schürmann, *Lukas*, 412; Plummer, *Luke*, 203; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:79-81.

<sup>91</sup> 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).<sup>92</sup> 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.<sup>93</sup> Luke in this way presents Jesus as the source of salvation for all people who express faith in him,<sup>94</sup> 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).<sup>95</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:78, notes that the term Ἰουδαία in Luke 4:44 refers to the whole country of the Jews rather than to the more restricted territory of Judea. Luke also uses the term Ἰουδαία to refer more broadly to the land of the Jews in a number of other contexts (Luke 6:17; 7:17; 23:5; Acts 10:37); cf. Schürmann, *Lukas*, 256; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:557-558.

<sup>93</sup> 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.

<sup>94</sup> 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).

<sup>95</sup> 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 [δὲν] ἀπέστειλεν and εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην in Acts 10:36 correspond to the phrases ἀπέσταλκέν με and εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς 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 ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν ὁ θεὸς πνεύματι ἁγίῳ καὶ δυνάμει) recalls the phrase “the Spirit of the Lord is upon me because he has anointed me” (πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμὲ οὐ ἔνεκεν ἔχρισέν με) from Luke 4:18 (cf. Luke 4:14), and the reference to his healing and deliverance ministry in Acts 10:38 corresponds more generally to his activities. For further discussion of these narrative links, see Conzelmann, *Acts*, 83; Rese, *Alltestamentliche 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* (JPTThSup 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

### Descriptions of the inclusion of non-Jews and of the rejection of Jesus by Jews

become more explicit in the book of Acts. As discussed in chapter four, in Acts 13, Jews become jealous of Paul and Barnabas and so resist their preaching (Acts 13:44-45).<sup>96</sup>

---

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).

<sup>96</sup> See full citation of Acts 13:46-47 in chapter four, page 171. The explicit citation and interpretation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:46-47 has generated considerable discussion and scholars often rightly note that this passage plays a pivotal role in Luke's narrative. Some argue that Luke cites Isa 49:6 to justify the rejection of Jews and the inclusion of non-Jews. See, e.g., Conzelmann, *Luke*, 162-163; Haenchen, *Acts*, 101; Sanders, *Jews in Luke-Acts*, 53; cf. O'Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 90; Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 222-224; Joseph Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992), 142-144. These scholars conclude that Acts 13:46-47 forms part of a literary pattern that demonstrates the rejection of the gospel by Jews, even though Paul keeps proclaiming his message to them (Acts 18:6; 19:9; 28:28). Although they recognize that Paul continues to offer the gospel to Jews because of the God-ordained pattern to preach to Jews first (Acts 13:46; cf. 3:26), Conzelmann and Haenchen argue that Jews' repeated rejection of Paul's message renders them unfit for retaining their elect status. From this perspective, Acts 13:46-47, and the interpretation of Isa 49:6 therein, represent a turning point in the narrative that foreshadows the replacement of Jews by non-Jews and the final denunciation of the Jews in Acts 28:26-28. More recently, Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 98-100, has likewise argued that Luke has Paul and Barnabas cite Isa 49:6 at a strategic point in the narrative to signify "the establishment of the identity of the people of God in contradistinction from the ethnic nation of Israel" (100). Others maintain that Luke cites and interprets Isa 49:6 to present the inclusion of non-Jews as the natural consequence of God's restoration of Israel. According to Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41-61, the mission to non-Jews had already been commanded in Luke's narrative (Luke 24:44-49; Acts 1:8). He argues that Luke has Paul and Barnabas turn from Jews to non-Jews because of the command of God for Jews to be a light to the nations (Isa 49:6). Additionally, he contends that the early accounts of mass conversions of Jews demonstrates that a Jewish restoration had already taken place (mass conversions of Jews [2:41, 47; 4:4; 5:14; 6:1, 7; 9:42; 12:24; 13:43; 14:1; 17:10; 19:20; 21:20]). This restoration made it possible for the inclusion of non-Jews, which was to follow the restoration of Israel, according to Isa 49:5-6. See also M. Rese, "Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte," in *Les Actes des apôtres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ed. J. Kremer; BETL 48; Louvain: Leuven University, 1979), 61-79, who suggests that Luke applies Isaianic promises of illumination for the nations to Jesus in Luke 2:32 and to Paul and Barnabas in Acts 13:47; cf. Marshall, *Acts*, 230. Others take positions that stand between those of Jervell, on the one hand, and Conzelmann, Haenchen, and Sanders, on the other. For example, J. Dupont, *Études sur les Actes des apôtres* (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 343-349, 457-511, agrees with Jervell that many Jews respond positively to the gospel in the early chapters of Acts and notes that the same is true of Paul's ministry (13:43; 14:1; 17:4, 12; 18:8; 28:24). This leads him to conclude that the Jewish rejection is not universal and that the summary statement in Acts 13:46-47 does not represent God's absolute rejection of the Jews. Likewise, David Moessner, "Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel," *NTS* 34 (1988): 102-103, suggests that the preaching in Acts contains a warning to Israel, and concludes that Jews who believe in Jesus form the "eschatological remnant" of Israel. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:169-174, argues that Luke sees the inclusion of the nations as part of God's plan (Luke 2:32; 3:6), and portrays the preaching to non-Jews as part of the mandate of the Twelve and Paul (Luke 24:47f; Acts 1:8; 9:15; 22:15; 26:16-18). Furthermore, he concludes that the announcement and citation of Isa 49:6 in Acts 13:46-

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).<sup>97</sup>

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).<sup>98</sup> 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;

---

47 represents an articulation of the prescribed order in which the mission must take place: the election of Israel obligates Paul and Barnabas to preach to Jews first (Acts 13:46; cf. Acts 3:26); cf. Dennis E. Johnson, “Jesus Against the Idols: The Use of Isaianic Servant Songs in the Missiology of Acts” *WTJ* 52 (1990): 343-53, who argues that Paul’s insistence that they must preach to the Jews first corresponds to the two-fold ministry of the servant of the Lord described in Isa 49:5-6.

<sup>97</sup> 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,” *RB* 88 (1981): 368-372; J. Dupont, *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, *Acts*, 414; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 41-61; Conzelmann, *Acts*, 106; Marshall, *Acts*, 230; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 100-101. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 521, suggests that the use of the second person singular pronoun in the citation – “I have made you (σέ) a light for the nations” – does not correspond well to Paul’s use of the second person plural pronoun “us” (ἡμῶν) 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 (ἡμῶν),” however, it is difficult to read the Isaiah passage as anything but a reference to the missionaries themselves.

<sup>98</sup> As Tannehill, *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.”

cf. LXX Ps 2:7; Isa 55:3; Ps 16:10).<sup>99</sup> 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 (ὕμῖν) therefore, my brothers, that through this man forgiveness of sins is proclaimed to you (ὕμῖν)." Fourth, throughout his speech in Acts 13:16-41, Paul repeatedly declares how this fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures applies to Jews:<sup>100</sup>

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,<sup>101</sup> to us<sup>102</sup> the message of this salvation has been sent

---

<sup>99</sup> 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 ὕμῖν to describe the recipients of Davidic promises – "I will give you (ὕμῖν) 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 ὕμῖν 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 (δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά) and LXX Isa 55:3b (διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ 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* 3<sup>rd</sup>. 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 'ΟΣΙΑ 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.

<sup>100</sup> For Tannehill, "Paul's Mission," 88-89, this emphasis corresponds to the declaration of Paul that he must speak to Jews first (Acts 13:46; cf. Acts 3:25-26).

<sup>101</sup> The phrase in Acts 13:26 – "Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (cf. Acts 13:16 – ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν) – may refer to both Jews and non-Jewish sympathizers, in which case Luke would be applying scriptural promises made to Jews to the latter group as well. There are a number of difficulties associated with the interpretation of οἱ φοβούμενοι. Some commentators argue that Luke uses οἱ φοβούμενοι, together with participle forms of σέβωμαι, as a technical or near-technical term that refers to non-Jewish sympathizers to Judaism. See, e.g., Haenchen, *Acts*, 409; J. Andrew Overman, "The God-fearers: Some Neglected Features," *JSNT* 32 (1988): 21; J. M. Lieu, "The Race of the God-fearers," *JTS* 43 (1995): 483-484. Yet, as Kirsopp Lake, "Proselytes and God-fearers," in *Beginnings*, 5:75-88 and Max Wilcox, "The God-Fearers in Acts: A Reconsideration," *JSNT* 13 (1981): 102-22, have argued, Luke uses the phrase οἱ φοβούμενοι to refer to pious Jews (Luke 1:50) and pious non-Jews (Acts 10:1, 22, 35); they argue that Luke did not use the term as a technical designation even though it could, in some contexts, refer to non-Jewish sympathizers to Judaism. In Acts 13:16, οἱ

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,<sup>103</sup> by raising Jesus  
 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.<sup>104</sup> 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.<sup>105</sup> He does not

---

φοβούμενοι may stand in apposition to Ἰσραηλιταί and serve as an adjective of Ἰσραηλιταί, especially since Paul appears to address the whole group as “brothers” (cf. Acts 13:26). Furthermore, the καί in Acts 13:26 does not occur in two important manuscripts (P<sup>45</sup> B). If the reading without the καί is the original, the entire phrase οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν could stand in apposition to υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραάμ and function as a description of the especially pious Jews in Paul’s audience. Despite this possibility, a number of commentators suggest that the presence of the phrase ἐν ὑμῖν in Acts 13:26 suggests that οἱ φοβούμενοι refers to a group different from “the descendants of Abraham.” See, e.g., Lake, “Proselytes,” 5:86-87; Haenchen, *Acts*, 409; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:639; Mikeal C. Parsons and Martin M. Culy, *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* (Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003), 258. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:639, concludes that since Luke has Paul address the entire group in Acts 13:26 as “brothers,” he must intend to portray οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι as full proselytes to Judaism but suggests that if the καί represents a later addition, the phrase probably describes the physical descendants of Abraham. These observations lead me to conclude that Luke here uses οἱ φοβούμενοι to refer to Jews, or full proselytes to Judaism. Furthermore, the reading of οἱ φοβούμενοι in Acts 13:26 (cf. 13:26) as a reference to non-Jewish adherents to Judaism is problematic since Luke has Paul describe this sermon as an instance of speaking to Jews first; Acts 13:46 presents turning to non-Jews as a shift in the ministry of Paul and Barnabas. If the missionaries have been preaching to non-Jews already, announcing that they would proclaim their message to non-Jews would not represent a change.

<sup>102</sup> Note the alternative readings in Acts 13:26b: ἡμῖν (P<sup>74</sup> ⳑ A B D Ψ 33 81 614 2344<sup>vid</sup> it<sup>d</sup>, sin syr<sup>hmg</sup> cop<sup>sa meg</sup>); ὑμῖν (P<sup>45</sup> C E 36 181 397 453 610 945 1175 1409 1678 1739 1881 Byz [L P] Lect it<sup>ar, c, dem</sup>, e, g, ig, p, ph, ro, t, w vg syr<sup>p, h</sup> cop<sup>bo</sup> arm eth geo slav Chrysostom).

<sup>103</sup> Although most scholars take [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν to be the correct reading, there is only late support for [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν (C3 E 33 36 81 181 Byz pm) but stronger and earlier support for ἡμῶν (P<sup>74</sup> ⳑ C\* D pc). In either case, the emphasis rests upon God’s fulfillment of promises for Jews.

<sup>104</sup> Despite the seemingly clear application of Davidic promises to this Jewish audience, some scholars conclude that Luke intends to demonstrate that the scriptural promises announced in Acts 13:16-41 apply to non-Jews. Haenchen, *Acts*, 412-418, argues that Luke’s readership would conclude that the unexpected “work” that God was accomplishing (Acts 13:41) referred to the rejection of Jews and the acceptance of non-Jews. Furthermore, he maintains that the subsequent announcement of Paul and Barnabas (Acts 13:46-47) signals the “moment of divorce between the gospel and Judaism” (417). Likewise, Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 517, suggests that Acts 13:34 and 13:46 together indicate that the covenant benefits assured to David will be rejected by Jews and applied to non-Jews instead.

<sup>105</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:164-175; cf. idem, “Paul’s Mission,” 87-88.

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).<sup>106</sup> 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.<sup>107</sup>

#### **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

---

<sup>106</sup> 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).

<sup>107</sup> Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:352-357.

his interpretation of these promises in a direction that Luke does not.<sup>108</sup> 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.

### ***Dialogue 10-12***

The interpretation of passages from Isaiah in the *Dialogue* is both shaped by and contributes to the wider debate surrounding what proper covenant fidelity entails.<sup>109</sup> In *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

---

<sup>108</sup> Skarsaune, *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., *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., *Dial.* 121.4-123.2). As Skarsaune notes, however, Justin transforms his source material in *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 *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.

<sup>109</sup> Although Justin provides a concentrated discussion of the Mosaic law and presents Christ as the new covenant and law in *Dialogue* 10-47, he frequently returns to this theme throughout the *Dialogue*. 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), 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 *Dialogue* 12-108 and is summarized again at the conclusion of the *Dialogue*.

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.<sup>110</sup> 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:<sup>111</sup>

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

---

<sup>110</sup> 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” (ταύτης . . . τῆς διαθήκης . . . καταφρονήσαντες) 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” (ἠτιμώσατε τὸν νόμον καὶ τὴν καινὴν ἀγίαν αὐτοῦ διαθήκην ἐφαλίσατε) 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.

<sup>111</sup> 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.<sup>112</sup> 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:<sup>113</sup>

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

---

<sup>112</sup> 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.

<sup>113</sup> 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 (πράσσοντες ὧν οἱ 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.”<sup>114</sup> 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).<sup>115</sup> 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 circumcises 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).<sup>116</sup> 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:<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>114</sup> 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.

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

<sup>116</sup> 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).

<sup>117</sup> 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.<sup>118</sup> 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.

<sup>118</sup> 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. *1 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 *1 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 *1 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.

***Dialogue 121-123***

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).<sup>119</sup> 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).<sup>120</sup> He characterizes Christ-believers as those “who obey the precepts of Christ” (*Dial.* 123.9) and argues that this obedience represents proper covenant fidelity.<sup>121</sup> 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).

---

<sup>119</sup> See further discussion of *Dialogue* 121-123 in chapter four, pages 179-182, 188-190.

<sup>120</sup> 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).

<sup>121</sup> 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 εὐσέβεια, θεοσέβεια 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,<sup>122</sup> 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:<sup>123</sup>

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

---

<sup>122</sup> 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 évidemment qu’Israël va se scinder en deux: les chrétiens sont la descendance humaine, les bêtes ce sont les juifs”; cf. Isa 1:2-4 in *1 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.”

<sup>123</sup> 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).<sup>124</sup> 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.<sup>125</sup> 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.<sup>126</sup>

### 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

---

<sup>124</sup> 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.

<sup>125</sup> Skarsaune, *Proof from Prophecy*, 187-188, 349-353, argues that a number of translations overlook the  $\omega\varsigma$  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).

<sup>126</sup> 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.<sup>127</sup> 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

---

<sup>127</sup> For both authors, moreover, the Spirit also enables Christ-believers to understand and proclaim the correct interpretation of the Jewish scriptures. For example, Luke indicates that the disciples would become witnesses to how Christ fulfilled the Jewish scriptures after the Holy Spirit came upon them (Luke 24:48-49; cf. Acts 1:8). Similarly, Justin indicates that no one can understand God apart from the Holy Spirit (*Dial.* 4.1) and that the Jewish prophets spoke by the inspiration of the Spirit (*Dial.* 7.1).

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).<sup>128</sup> 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),<sup>129</sup> 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).<sup>130</sup>

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 (ἕως οὗ ἐνδύσησθε ἐξ ὕψους δύναμιν),” a phrase that recalls LXX Isa 32:15 (ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ’ ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἀφ’ ὑψηλοῦ) and refers to the imminent outpouring of the Spirit (Luke 24:49).<sup>131</sup> Similarly, in Acts 1:4-8, the Lukan Jesus

---

<sup>128</sup> Bock, *Proclamation*, 99-104, notes the numerous scholarly perspectives regarding the possible allusions to passages from the Jewish scriptures in Luke 3:22 (e.g., Ps 2:7, Isa 42, Gen 22, Ex 4:22-23, Isa 41:8, 42:1, and 44:2 together; or Ps 2:7, Isa 41:8, and 42:1 together) but rightly concludes that no single allusion is clearly present. For further discussion of possible scriptural allusions in Luke 3:22, see Johnson, *Luke*, 69-70; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 1:62-63; Nolland, *Luke*, 1:160-165; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1:485-486. Note also that Luke 3:15-18, Mark 1:7-8, and Matt 3:11-12 all indicate that Jesus himself would baptize the people of God with the Holy Spirit. In accordance with the double tradition, Matthew and Luke further report that John the Baptist announces that Jesus will baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire.

<sup>129</sup> 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).

<sup>130</sup> Compare Mark 6:1-6a and Matt. 13:53-58. Luke also reports that 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).

<sup>131</sup> Marshall, *Luke*, 907; idem, *Acts*, 58; Bock, *Luke*, 1942; Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1220; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 2:1585; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 92. Note also that Luke elsewhere frequently links power with the Spirit

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).<sup>132</sup> 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.”<sup>133</sup>

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

---

(Luke 1:17, 35; 4:14; Acts 1:5, 8; 6:8; 10:38). As Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1220-1221, notes, Luke presents the Spirit as the source of “power” for the ministry of Jesus (Luke 4:14; 5:17).

<sup>132</sup> In his discussion of the references to the “promise of the Spirit” (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33), Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 259, argues that Luke probably has a number of texts from the Jewish scriptures in mind when he refers to the Spirit as “the promise of the Father” (LXX Joel 3:1-2 or in Isa 32:15; 44:3; Ezek 11:19; 36:26-37; 37:14); cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 907. Nolland, *Luke*, 3:1220-1221, also suggests that Luke probably echoes infancy material in Luke 24:49 and anticipates the fulfillment of the covenant promises that were earlier mentioned (Luke 1:54-55, 70, 72-73). Johnson, *Luke*, 403, maintains that Luke associates “the promise of the Spirit” with Abraham (Acts 2:39; 3:24-26; 13:32; 26:6). Robert F. O’Toole, “Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 245-258, argues that Luke sees all of the promises of God as one promise that relates to his intervention on behalf of Israel. He argues that “this underlying factor of God’s promise explains why Luke feels perfectly free to apply ἐπαγγελία to the Father’s promise of the Holy Spirit (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4; 2:33, 39), the land (Acts 7:17; cf. 7:1-7), a savior, Jesus (Acts 13:23), and Jesus’ resurrection (Acts 13:32; 26:6-8, 22-23).” Haenchen, *Acts*, 142, however, emphasizes that Luke presents “the promise of the Father” as a promise that the disciples heard from Jesus (Acts 1:4) and does not refer to a passage from the Jewish scriptures until Acts 2:17-21. Similarly, although Barrett, *Acts*, 1:73, suggests that “the promise of the Father” may refer to the prophecy in LXX Joel 3:1-5, he also argues that “the promise of the Father” is the gift of the Holy Spirit that Jesus (Luke 24:49; Acts 1:4-5) and John the Baptist (Luke 3:16) predicted. In view of the links between Acts 2:17-21 and 2:33 and between the descent of the Spirit and the ascension of Jesus as Davidic Lord and Messiah, it seems probable that Luke links the descent of the Spirit with promises from the Jewish scriptures. So Bock, *Proclamation*, 169.

<sup>133</sup> Bock, *Luke*, 1943.

dream dreams; even upon my slaves, both men and women, in those days I will pour out my Spirit; and they shall prophesy.<sup>134</sup> 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.”  
 (Acts 2:14-21; cf. LXX Joel 3:1-4)

By exchanging the phrase μετὰ ταῦτα in LXX Joel 3:1 for ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in Acts 2:17,<sup>135</sup> 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.”<sup>136</sup> Both the Jewish audience of Peter and subsequent generations of Jews were the intended recipients of this gift.

---

<sup>134</sup> The phrase καὶ προφητεύουσιν at the end of Acts 2:18 does not occur in LXX Joel 3:2. Fitzmyer, *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 *Vetus Latina* because of haplography but notes the argument of P. R. Rogers, “Acts 2:18, *kai propheteuousin*” *JTS* 38 (1987): 95-97, that the version with the phrase omitted is more original. Barrett, *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, *Power*, 270-272, 352-356.

<sup>135</sup> Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 158, suggests that the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις alludes to Isa 2:2; cf. Bruce, *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, *Acts*, 252; Marshall, *Acts*, 73; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:136; Johnson, *Acts*, 49; Carroll, *End of History*, 132. Haenchen, *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 Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte,” *ZTK* 51 (1954): 162. Others suggest that the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις corresponds to post-apostolic thought and therefore should not be considered as Lukan. See, e.g., Rese, *Alttestamentlich Motive*, 51-52; cf. Traugott Holtz, *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas* (TU 104; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968), 7-8. Nevertheless, the textual evidence more strongly supports ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (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, *Alttestamentlich Motive*, 46-55; Bock, *Proclamation*, 157-168; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:136-139.

<sup>136</sup> 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, *Acts*, 144. As Barrett, *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, *Acts*, 130. Fitzmyer, *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, *Christ the Lord*, 98-99, understands Acts 2:39 as a text that addresses the renewal of Israel that

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.<sup>137</sup> 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)<sup>138</sup> and identifies Jesus as “the Lord” about whom LXX Ps 109:1 speaks (Acts 2:34-35).<sup>139</sup> 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.

<sup>137</sup> The repetition of the verb ἐκχέω in Acts 2:21 and 2:33 also has the effect of linking the Joel 3 citation with this latter description of the role of Jesus; by sending the Spirit, he is the agent who causes the fulfillment of LXX Joel 3:1-5. Bock, *Acts*, 113, 131; G. D. Kilgallen, “A Rhetorical and Source-traditions Study of Acts 2,33,” *Bib 77* (1996): 195-196; Johnson, *Acts*, 52, 55; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:150. Moreover, by presenting Jesus as κύριος in Acts 2:34-36, the Lukan Peter identifies the risen and exalted Christ as the “Lord” upon whom people should call for salvation (Acts 2:21; cf. LXX Joel 3:5a). As Kilgallen, “Acts 2,33,” 189, concludes, Acts 2:21 shows that calling on the name of the Lord leads to salvation and Acts 2:36 shows who this Lord is upon whom everyone should call; cf. Bock, *Acts*, 135. Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 33, also asserts that Peter’s speech links the citation from Joel 3 with Psalm 110 and therefore links the gift of the Spirit directly with the ascension of Jesus; cf. Bock, *Proclamation*, 184-185; Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 134.

<sup>138</sup> 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.

<sup>139</sup> Note the reference to the position of Jesus at the right hand of God in both Acts 2:33 and in the citation of LXX Ps 109:1 in Acts 2:34. Turner, *Power*, 273-275, suggests that Acts 2:25-32 establishes that Jesus is the Davidic heir because of his resurrection (on the basis of LXX Psalm 15) and Acts 2:33-35 establishes that Jesus is David’s Lord because of his exaltation to the right hand of God; cf. Kilgallen, “Acts 2,33,” 186-187; Bock, *Proclamation*, 181-186. Similarly, O’Toole, “Davidic Covenant,” 256,

God exalted Jesus as the Davidic Lord and Christ (cf. Acts 2:36).<sup>140</sup> From his position as king of the “whole house of Israel” (Acts 2:36), Jesus fulfills the promises of scripture by pouring out “the promise of the Spirit” (Acts 2:33; cf. Luke 3:16; 24:49; Acts 1:4-5) upon the Jewish people.<sup>141</sup>

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;

---

indicates that the identity of Jesus as “Lord” emerges from LXX Ps 109:1 (vv. 34-35; cf. vs. 21) whereas his identity as “Christ” from the promise to David in LXX Ps 131; cf. 2 Sam 7:12-13 (vv. 30-31).

<sup>140</sup> Wilckens, *Die Missionreden*, 171-175, interprets the declaration that God made Jesus both Lord and Christ as an adoptionist affirmation; cf. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:152. Other scholars rightly argue, however, that in the context of Acts 2:14-42, the statement in Acts 2:36 functions as a description of how the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus establishes him in the roles of Lord and Messiah in fulfillment of the Jewish scriptures. So Bock, *Proclamation*, 185-186; cf. Conzelmann, *Acts*, 21; J. Dupont, “Assis à la Droite de Dieu,” in *Nouvelles Études sur les Actes des Apôtres*, 249.

<sup>141</sup> Franklin, *Christ the Lord*, 39, asserts that Acts 2:36 indicates that Jesus has been enthroned as Lord and Messiah for Israel, to fulfill all the promises made to it. Similarly, Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:40, concludes that Luke portrays the messianic reign of Jesus as the promised era of salvation for Israel in which Jesus, as Davidic messiah and king, mediates the blessings of God’s reign: “the Spirit, repentance and release of sins, and salvation through Jesus’ name are all part of these benefits (Acts 2:21, 38-40)” (40). Some further argue that Acts 2:33 alludes to LXX Ps 67:19 and evokes the image of a covenant renewal ceremony on the day of Pentecost within Jewish tradition and therefore portrays Jesus as a type of second Moses. See, e.g., J. Dupont, “Ascension du Christ et don de l’Esprit d’après Actes 2:33,” in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule* (ed. B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley; Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 224-226; H. J. Cadbury, “The Speeches in Acts,” in *Beginnings*, 4:402-427; W. L. Knox, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: CUP, 1948), 85-86; G. Kretschmar, “Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten,” *ZKG* 66 (1954-1955): 209-253; B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (London: SCM, 1961), 38-59. Barrett, *Acts*, 1:149-150, suggests that ὑψωθείς in Acts 2:33 may point to LXX Ps 67:19 (ἀνέβης εἰς ὕψος). He also suggests that ἔλαβες δόματα in LXX Ps 67:19 corresponds to τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου λαβών in Acts 2:33 and further notes another possible point of contact in vs. 34 (οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς). Barrett ultimately concludes, however, that the allusion to LXX Ps 67:19 in Acts 2:33 is not certain. The lack of straightforward evidence also leads others to deem the allusion improbable. For example, Bock, *Proclamation*, 182 argues that the parallel terminology in Acts 2:33 (ὑψωθείς, λαβών τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν) and LXX Ps 67:19 (ἀνέβης εἰς ὕψος, ἔλαβες δόματα) is too limited to provide sufficient evidence to warrant an allusion to LXX Ps 67:19 in Acts 2:33, especially since Luke does not use a key distinctive term that appears in LXX Ps 67:19 (δόματος). Furthermore, as O’Toole, “Davidic Covenant,” 247-249, rightly notes, the verb λαμβάνω is too common to make the link between Acts 2:33 and LXX Ps 67:19 certain and the participle ὑψωθείς is better understood as a reference to David than to Moses; cf. Bock, *Acts*, 132, who argues that David imagery dominates in Acts 2. So also Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 145-147.

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).<sup>142</sup> 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 μακράν), in order to affirm the inclusion of all peoples.<sup>143</sup> 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

---

<sup>142</sup> Compare Acts 2:39b (πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν) with LXX Joel 3:5b (οὗς κύριος προσέκληται).

<sup>143</sup> See, e.g., Carroll, *End of History*, 131; cf. Rese, *Alttestamentlich Motive*, 50; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:155-156; Johnson, *Acts*, 58; Dupont, *Salvation*, 22-23; Pao, *Isaianic Exodus*, 231; Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 58. The phrase πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν, however, may refer to non-Jews, Diaspora Jews, or future generations of Jews; i.e., it could have an ethnic, spatial, or temporal connotation. Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 266-267, suggests that Diaspora Jews may be in view in this context but, in the context of the wider narrative, a reference to non-Jews is probable. Haenchen, *Acts*, 184, asserts that μακράν in this context is spatial (Diaspora Jews) and that the audience of Peter would not have understood this as a reference to non-Jews. Similarly, Ben Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 156, suggests that πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν refers to Jews who are being summoned from distant lands; cf. Wilson, *Gentile Mission*, 219; Denova, *Things Accomplished*, 167-175. Bruce, *Acts*, 130, suggests that μακράν in Acts 2:39 refers to three different types of groups: distant generations, Diaspora Jews, and non-Jews.

Spirit upon Jewish disciples.<sup>144</sup> 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.”<sup>145</sup> He describes the effects of the outpouring of the Spirit as inspired speech in a manner that recalls the Pentecost experience (Acts 10:46),<sup>146</sup> 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).<sup>147</sup> 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),<sup>148</sup> “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).<sup>149</sup> Within Luke’s story, these descriptions

---

<sup>144</sup> 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).

<sup>145</sup> E.g., Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 360; John B. Polhill, *Acts* (NTC 26; Nashville: Broadman, 1992), 264; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 460, 472; Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2:142-143; Barrett, *Acts*, 1:535.

<sup>146</sup> Compare λαλούντων γλώσσαις καὶ μεγαλυνόντων τὸν θεόν in Acts 10:46 with ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἐτέραις γλώσσαις in Acts 2:4 and λαλούντων αὐτῶν ταῖς ἡμετέραις γλώσσαις τὰ μεγαλεῖα τοῦ θεοῦ in Acts 2:11. Note also the repetition of the term ἐκχέω in Acts 2:17, 18, 33, and Acts 10:45. Elsewhere in Acts, the term occurs only once in reference to the shedding of the blood of Stephen (Acts 22:20).

<sup>147</sup> Compare ἡ δωρεὰ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 10:45 and δωρεάν in Acts 11:17 with τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in Acts 2:38. Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 364, maintains that these references to “the gift” equate the descent of the Spirit upon the first non-Jewish Christ-believers with the experience of the apostles in Acts 2:1-4.

<sup>148</sup> Johnson, *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, *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, *Acts* 1:116, also maintains that the inspired speech may have had different forms.

<sup>149</sup> The phrase θεὸς ἐμαρτύρησεν αὐτοῖς δοὺς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον 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, *Acts*, 288-289; cf. *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.<sup>150</sup>

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:

Simeon<sup>151</sup> has related how God first looked favorably on the Gentiles, to take from among them a people for his name (ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). 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 σκηνὴν Δαβίδ), which has fallen; from its ruins I will rebuild it, and I will set it up (ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν),<sup>152</sup> 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."<sup>153</sup> (Acts 15:14-18)

---

use of μαρτυρέω elsewhere in Luke-Acts, see Luke 4:22; Acts 10:22; 13:22; 14:3; 16:2; 22:12. This connotation, however, is more common when the passive form of μαρτυρέω is used (Acts 10:22; 13:22; 16:2; 22:12).

<sup>150</sup> 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).

<sup>151</sup> "Simeon" is the name that James uses for Peter in this account.

<sup>152</sup> The phrase ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν in Amos 9:11b is here changed to ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν.

<sup>153</sup> 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 Δαυίδ) and the resulting inclusion of non-Jews.<sup>154</sup>

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 λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ. Since Luke elsewhere uses λαός to refer to Jews as the people of God,<sup>155</sup> some conclude that λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ in this context extends the identity, or covenant status, of Israel to non-Jews.<sup>156</sup> Others

---

scriptural passages and to the theological concerns of Luke. For example, some suggest that the initial phrases μετὰ ταῦτα and ἀναστρέψω were added to the citation of LXX Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:16 in order to allude to Hos 3:5 and Jer 12:15. Similarly, scholars frequently conclude that the final phrase of the citation in Acts 15:18 (γνωστὰ ἀπ’ αἰῶνος) functions as an allusion to Isa 45:21. For further discussion of these and other adaptations to the LXX Amos 9:11-12 citation, and their significance, see Jostein Ådna, “James’ Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and Elders,” in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles* (WUNT 127; eds. Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 2000), 133-136; Richard Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)” in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington, III; Cambridge: CUP, 1996), 157; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 459; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:725; Marshall, *Acts*, 252; Bruce, *Acts*, 340; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 555.

<sup>154</sup> Compare the MT of Amos 9:12 which depicts the subjugation, rather than the inclusion, of non-Jews (וְיִרְשׁוּ אֶת-שְׂאֵרֵי אֲדָוִם וְכָל-הַגּוֹיִם אֲשֶׁר-נִקְרָא שְׁמִי עַל־יהוָה נְאֻם-יְהוָה עֲשֵׂה זֹאת) with the LXX (ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ 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.

<sup>155</sup> Luke 1:17, 68, 77; 2:32; 7:16, 29; 20:1; 22:66; 24:19; Acts 2:47; 3:23; 4:10; 5:12; 7:17, 34; 13:17.

<sup>156</sup> 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 ἔθνων λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ derives from the phrase πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ’ οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ’ αὐτοῦ (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. Ådna, “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 *ὁ θεὸς ἐπεσκέψατο λαβεῖν ἐξ ἐθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ* would not designate Cornelius and his household as a distinct cultural unit that replaces Israel.<sup>157</sup>

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*.<sup>158</sup> 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

---

Hermann Strathmann, “*λαός*,” in *TDNT*, 4:54, expresses a similar view when he states that the concept of non-Jews as *λαός* in Acts 15:14 and 18:10 displaces the historical and biological meaning of the term.

<sup>157</sup> Since Luke can use *λαός* to refer to Israel as the people of God in its totality (Luke 1:17, 68, 77; 2:32; 7:16, 29; 20:1; 22:66; 24:19; Acts 2:47; 3:23; 4:10; 5:12; 7:17, 34; 13:17) or to refer to a group of Israelites in a more generic sense (e.g., Luke 1:21; 3:15, 18; 7:1; 8:47; 20:1, 9, 45; Acts 2:47; 3:9, 11, 12; 4:1, 2, 17, 21; 5:13; 12:4; 21:30), the meaning that Luke intends in Acts 15:14 is not entirely clear. Dahl, “People for His Name,” 326, argues that *λαός* in Acts 15:14 refers to a group of people out of the nations who belongs to God in the same way as Israel does but maintains that this identity does not call the status of Israel as the people of God into question. J. Dupont, “Un peuple d’entre les nations (Actes 15.14),” *NTS* 31 (1985): 326-330, notes that Luke uses *λαός* to refer to non-Jews in Acts 18:10 and 15:14, and stresses the ownership of God in both of these passages. In Dupont’s view, this emphasis upon God’s ownership has the effect of portraying non-Jews as an elect people since the Jewish scriptures refer to Israel as God’s special possession on several occasions (e.g., Exod 19:5; Deut 7:6; 14:2). Although Dupont holds that Israel remains the people of God in a distinctive way, he argues that “cette élection n’est pas nécessairement exclusive. Le Seigneur rest libre s’attacher des personnes qui ne font pas ethniquement partie de la race d’Abraham” (328). Similarly, B. D. Chilton and J. Neusner, *Judaism in the New Testament: Practice and Beliefs* (London: Routledge, 1995), 106, argue that Luke does not present non-Jews as re-defined Israel in this context; cf. Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 458. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 66-67, also emphasizes that Luke does not present non-Jews as Israel but as an associate people.

<sup>158</sup> Bock, *Acts*, 502.

hardly seems logical for Luke to argue that they have become Israel, or the replacement for Jews.<sup>159</sup>

A second and closely related interpretive issue surrounds the meaning of “the tent of David” (τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυίδ) in Acts 15:16 (cf. LXX Amos 9:11). The phrase may serve as a metaphor for the Christ-believing community,<sup>160</sup> the restoration of Israel,<sup>161</sup> or the resurrection and exaltation of Christ.<sup>162</sup> A number of scholars reject the latter interpretation because Acts 15:16-18 twice substitutes ἀνοικοδομήσω for the term

---

<sup>159</sup> Regardless of the precise origins of the decree, it outlines guidelines for non-Jews who join the Christ-believing community without converting to Judaism. For further discussion of the background of the decree and its purpose, see Barrett, *Acts*, 2:733-735; Justin Taylor, “The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25 and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-14),” *NTS* 46 (2001): 372-380; Terrence Callan, “The Background of the Apostolic Decree,” *CBQ* 55 (1993): 295-296; Marcel Simon, “The Apostolic Decree and its Setting in the Ancient Church,” *BJRL* 52 (1969-70): 437-460; Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 172-178; Bruce, *Acts*, 342; Johnson, *Acts*, 267; Bock, *Acts*, 506; S. G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (Cambridge: CUP, 1983), 84-192.

<sup>160</sup> Marshall, *Acts*, 252; cf. Otto Bauernfeind, *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte* (WUNT 22; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1980), 192. Richard Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 154-178; idem, “James and the Jerusalem Church,” in Richard Bauckham, ed., *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*; ed. Bruce W. Winter; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 452-462, in particular, has attempted to argue that the exegete responsible for the interpretation of LXX Amos 9:11-12 regarded “the tent of David” as the Christ-believing community which represented the eschatological temple of the messianic age. He maintains that the adaptations to the citation of LXX Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18 and its allusions to other scriptural passages confirm this interpretation. He also suggests that the widespread interpretation of the eschatological temple as the people of God in other early Christian literature strengthens the likelihood of this meaning in Acts 15:16-18 (see, e.g., 1 Cor 3:16-17; 2 Cor 6:16; Eph 2:20-22; Heb 13:15-16; 1 Pet 2:5; 4:17; Rev 3:12; 11:1-2; Did. 10:2; Barn. 4:11; 6:15; 16:1-10; Hermas, *Vis.* 3; *Sim.* 9; Ignatius, *Eph.* 9:1). Others note that Amos 9:11 is used in 4QFlor 1:12 and CD 7:16. For example, George J. Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context* (JSTOTSup 29; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985), 114, 210, 234, notes the similarity of the text tradition for Amos 9:11 in 4QFlor 1:12 and Acts 15:16; cf. J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965), 25; Bruce, *Acts*, 340. Nevertheless, as J. A. Fitzmyer, *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971), 51, observes, there is very little similarity between the interpretation of Amos 9:11 in CD, 4QFlor and Acts 15:16-17; cf. idem, *Acts*, 556; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:726. In CD 7:16, the Mosaic law is associated with “the tent of David” and 4QFlor 1:12 links the “the tent of David” with the one “who will arise to save Israel” together with the “interpreter of the Law” (4QFlor 1:11).

<sup>161</sup> Jervell, *Luke and the People of God*, 51-69; idem, *Apostelgeschichte*, 395-396; cf. J. Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959), 235. Jervell stresses that Luke does not present Jewish Christ-believers as new Israel but as restored Israel of old to whom the nations are added as an associate people.

<sup>162</sup> Haenchen, *Acts* 448; O’Neill, *Theology of Acts*, 14.

ἀναστήσω from LXX Amos 9:11-12;<sup>163</sup> since Luke elsewhere uses ἀνίστημι 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 ἀνοικοδομήσω rather than ἀναστήσω may suggest that Luke did not here wish to refer to Christ or his resurrection. Still, the subsequent replacement of ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν (LXX Amos 9:11b) with ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν (Acts 15:16b) may evoke the image of the establishment of David's throne.<sup>164</sup> 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.<sup>165</sup> 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.<sup>166</sup>

---

<sup>163</sup> See, e.g., Ádna, “James' Position,” 133-136, 145-146; Bauckham, “James and the Gentiles,” 157-160; Witherington, *Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*, 459; Barrett, *Acts*, 2:725-728; Marshall, *Acts*, 252; Bruce, *Acts*, 340; Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 555. The Greek verb ἀνίστημι would also be the most natural translation of  $\text{קָם}$ , the corresponding Hebrew verb from the MT of Amos 9:11. For further discussion, see Earl Richard, “The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts,” *NovT* 24 (1982): 47; J. Dupont, “‘Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombée’ (Ac 15,16=Am 9,11),” in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80ten Geburtstag* (eds. Erich Grässer and Otto Merk; Tübingen : J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 26.

<sup>164</sup> See the use of ἀνορθώσω in LXX Sam 7:13, 16, 26; 1 Chron 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10.

<sup>165</sup> 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 τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν 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 ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν in the latter phrase of LXX Amos 9:11 to ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν 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.

<sup>166</sup> 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.<sup>167</sup> 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.<sup>168</sup> 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.

---

<sup>167</sup> The use of ὅπως 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.

<sup>168</sup> J. Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1988), 37-39, correctly concludes, “the thrust of Acts 15:16-17 differentiates between the tabernacle of David and ‘the rest of men’, with the later being understood as ‘all the Gentiles’” (38).

### 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 (εἶδει) of a dove immediately after his water-baptism (Luke 3:22; *Dial.* 88.3, 8)<sup>169</sup> and a voice from heaven pronounced the words ‘you are my son’ (Luke 3:22; *Dial.* 88.8).<sup>170</sup> 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,<sup>171</sup> 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,<sup>172</sup> he tells

---

<sup>169</sup> 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.

<sup>170</sup> Cf. *Dial.* 103.6; 122.5. In the course of describing the baptism of Jesus in *Dial.* 88.8 and 103.6, Justin cites a phrase from LXX Ps 2:7 (υἱός μου εἶ σύ ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε). In the latter context, he further indicates that this statement was recorded in the “memoirs of the apostles.” Notably, the Western text of Luke 3:22 (e.g., codex D) also cites this phrase from LXX Ps 2:7. Other manuscript traditions of Luke 3:22 make the link to Ps 2:7 less certain (σὺ εἶ ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός, ἐν σοὶ εὐδόκησα; cf. Mark 1:11; Matt 3:17). Although Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament, Second Edition* (Stuttgart, UBS, 1998), 112-113, regards the citation of Ps 2:7 as secondary, Andrew Gregory, *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 269, suggests that it may be original to Luke; cf. B. D. Ehrman, *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament* (New York: OUP, 1993), 62-67.

<sup>171</sup> 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).

<sup>172</sup> 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). He

the same basic story as Luke, and even emphasizes some elements that are unique, among the Gospel accounts, to the Lukan narrative.<sup>173</sup>

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:<sup>174</sup>

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.

<sup>173</sup> Perhaps it is also significant that neither Luke nor Justin explicitly report that John baptized Jesus. Compare Matt 3:13-17 and Mark 1:9-11.

<sup>174</sup> 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, “Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs,” *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. (ed., James H. 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.<sup>175</sup> To suggest that he did could lead to the conclusion that Christ did not exist as God prior to his birth as a human.<sup>176</sup> 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 μηκέτι ἐν τῷ γένει ὑμῶν κατὰ τὸ παλαιὸν ἔθος προφήτας γενήσεσθαι)<sup>177</sup> (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.<sup>178</sup> Therefore, although Justin affirms that the

---

<sup>175</sup> 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 δύναμις, see Demetrius C. Trakatellis, *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr* (HDR 6; Missoula: Scholars, 1976), 27-37.

<sup>176</sup> 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 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.

<sup>177</sup> If we interpret τοῦ γενήσεσθαι 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.

<sup>178</sup> 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.<sup>179</sup> 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

---

<sup>179</sup> 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).<sup>180</sup> 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).<sup>181</sup>  
(*Dial.* 87.6)

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.<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>180</sup> 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.

<sup>181</sup> Stanton, “Spirit,” 332, notes that Justin’s use of μετὰ ταῦτα rather than ἐν ταῖς ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις (Acts 2:17) which makes this part of the citation closer to LXX Joel 3:1. He observes, however, that the phrase ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους 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 τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας).

<sup>182</sup> 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 προφητεύσουσιν) 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.<sup>183</sup> 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

---

<sup>183</sup> 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,<sup>184</sup> 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.<sup>185</sup>

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

---

<sup>184</sup> 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 προφητεύσουσιν) in Acts 2:18. Prigent, *l’Ancien Testament*, 114, suggests direct dependence upon Acts 2:17-21.

<sup>185</sup> 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 πάσας 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).<sup>186</sup> 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.<sup>187</sup> 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.<sup>188</sup>

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

---

<sup>186</sup> 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).

<sup>187</sup> 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.”

<sup>188</sup> 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,<sup>189</sup> 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 (τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς πλάνης) to become disciples in the name of Christ, and this same name of Christ enlightens 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.<sup>190</sup> . . . 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

---

<sup>189</sup> See also Paul’s description of a remnant of Jews who were chosen by God’s grace (Rom 11:1-4).

<sup>190</sup> 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.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, Peter R. “תָּ.” Pages 393-426 in vol. 5 of *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. Johannes Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 14 vols to date. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1974-.
- Albl, Martin C. “*And the Scripture Cannot Be Broken*”: *The Form and Function of Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 96. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Alexander, Loveday. “Fact, Fiction and the Genre of Acts.” *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 380-399.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Acts of the Apostles as an Apologetic Text.” Pages 15-44 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland, New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Ådna, Jostein. “James’ Position at the Summit Meeting of the Apostles and Elders.” Pages 125-161 in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 127. Edited by Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 2000.
- Allert, Craig D. *Revelation, Truth, Canon and Interpretation: Studies in Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho*. Vigiliae Christianae Supplements 64. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Allison, Dale C. “Who Will Come from East and West? Observations on Matt. 8:11-12 - Luke 13:28-29.” *Irish Biblical Studies* 11 (1989): 158-170.
- Andresen, Carl. “Justin und der mittlere Platonismus.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 44 (1952-1953): 157-195.
- Argall, Randal A. *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation, and Judgment*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 8. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.
- Armstrong, A. H. “The Shaping of Christianity in the Second and Third Centuries.” Pages 74-99 in *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition: The Self-Definition of Christianity in Relation to Later Platonism*. Edited by E. P. Sanders. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Pagan and Christian Traditionalism in the First Three Centuries.” *Studia Patristica* 25 (1984): 414-431.

Attridge, H. W. *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Harvard dissertations in religion. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1976.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Historiography." Pages 157-184 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. vol. 2. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum 2.2*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Josephus and His Works." Pages 185-232 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period*. vol. 2. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum 2.2*. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.

Aune, David E. "Justin Martyr's Use of the Old Testament." *Bulletin of the Evangelical Theological Society* 9 (1966): 179-197.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Charismatic Exegesis in Early Judaism and Early Christianity." Pages 126-150 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Edited by J. H. Charlesworth and C. A. Evans. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

Bacon, B. W. "Stephen's Speech: Its Argument and Doctrinal Relationship." Pages 213-229 in *Biblical and Semitic Studies*. Edited by the Semitic and Biblical Faculty of Yale University. New York: Yale Bicentennial Publications, 1901.

Balch, David L. "The Areopagus Speech: An Appeal to the Stoic Historian Posidonius against Later Stoics and the Epicureans." Pages 52-79 in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians, Festschrift for Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.

Baldus, Aloys. *Das Verhältnis Justins des Märtyrers zu unsern synoptischen Evangelien*. Munster, 1895.

Barclay, John M. G. *Against Apion*. vol. 10 of *Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary*. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Barnard, Leslie W. "The Old Testament and Judaism in the Writings of Justin Martyr." *Vetus Testamentum* 14 (1964): 394-406.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Athenagoras: A Study in Second Century Christian Apologetic*. Théologie Historique 18. Paris: Beauchesne, 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Justin Martyr: His Life and Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.

Barnes, T. D. "The Embassy of Athenagoras." *Journal of Theological Studies* 26 (1975): 111-114.

Barrett, C. K. *Luke the Historian in Recent Study*. London: Epworth Press, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. ICC. 2 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Luke-Acts." Pages 231-244 in *It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture: Essays in Honor of Barnabas Lindars*. Edited by Donald A. Carson and Hugh G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Barton, John. *Oracles of God: Perception of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1986.

Bassler, Jouette M. "Luke and Paul on Impartiality." *Biblica* 66 (1985): 546-552.

Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Jerusalem Church." Pages 415-480 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. vol. 4 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)." Pages 154-184 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Throne of God and the Worship of Jesus." Pages 43-69 in *The Jewish Roots of Christological Monotheism: Papers from the St. Andrews Conference on the Historical Origins of the Worship of Jesus*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 63. Edited by Carey C. Newman, James R. Davila, and Gladys S. Lewis. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." Pages 435-487 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 72. Edited by James Scott. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Bauer, Walter. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Revised and edited by Frederick William Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000.

Bauernfeind, Otto. *Kommentar und Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 22. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1980.

Baumgarten, Albert I. "The Name of the Pharisees." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 417-422.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Perception of the Past in the Damascus Document." Pages 1-15 in *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*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 34. Edited by Joseph M. Baumgarten, Esther G. Chazon, and Avital Pinnick. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

Baumgarten, Joseph M. *Studies in Qumran Law*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 24. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1977.

Bayer, Hans F. "The Preaching of Peter in Acts." Pages 257-274 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Beard, Mary. "Writing and Religion: *Ancient Literacy* and the Function of the Written Word in Roman religion." Pages 35-58 in *Literacy in the Roman World*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series III. Edited by M. Beard et al. Ann Arbor: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1991.

Becker, J. *Das Heil Gottes: Heils – und Sündenbegriffe in den Qumrantexten und in Neuen Testament*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1964.

Bedenbender, Andreas. "The Place of the Torah in the Early Enoch Literature." Pages 65-94 in *The Early Enoch Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 121. Edited by Gabriele Boccaccini and John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

Beentjes, Pancratius C. "Prophets in the Book of Chronicles." Pages 45-53 in *The Elusive Prophet: The Prophet as a Historical Person, Literary Character and Anonymous Artist*. Edited by Johannes C. de Moor. Old Testament Studies 45. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Prophets and Prophecy in the Book of Ben Sira." Pages 135-150 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. Edited by Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

- Bellinzoni, A. J. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Writings of Justin Martyr*. Novum Testament Supplements 17. Netherlands: Brill, 1967.
- Benz, E. "Christus und Socrates in der alten Kirche." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 43 (1950-1951): 195-224.
- Bernstein, Moshe J. "Peshar Habakkuk." Pages 647-650 in vol. 2 of the *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. 2 vols. Edited by Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Berrin, Shani L. *The Peshar Nahum Scroll from Qumran: An Exegetical Study of 4Q169*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 53. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Qumran Pesharim." Pages 110-133 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.
- Betz, O. *Offerbarung und Schriftforschung in der Qumransekte*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Past Events and Last Events in the Qumran Interpretation of History." *Proceedings of the World Congress of Jewish Studies* 6 (1977): 27-34.
- Beuken, W. A. M. "Servant and Herald of Good Tidings: Isaiah 61 as an Interpretation of Isaiah 40-55." Pages 411-442 in *The Book of Isaiah = Le livre d'Isaïe: Les oracles et leurs relectures unité et complexité de l'ouvrage*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 81. Edited by J. Vermeulen. Leuven: Peeters, 1989.
- Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, His Works, and Their Importance*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement 2. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1988.
- Bihler, J. "Der Stephanusbericht (Apg 6,8-15 un 7,54-8,2)." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 3 (1959): 252-270.
- Bingham, D. Jeffrey. "Justin and Isaiah 53." *Vigiliae Christianae* 54 (2000): 248-261.
- Black, Matthew. *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica 7. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Prophecy and Canon: A Contribution to the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Notre Dame Center for the Study of Judaism and Christianity in Antiquity 3. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1977.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ezra-Nehemiah: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1988.

Blomberg, Craig. "The Law in Luke-Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22 (1984): 53-80.

Bobichon, Philippe. *Justin Martyr: Dialogue avec Tryphon: Édition critique, traduction, commentaire*. 2 vols. Paradosis 47. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg, 2003.

Boccaccini, Gabriele. *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Partings of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Bock, Darrell L. *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Journal for the Study of New Testament: Supplement Series 12. JSOT Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke*. 2 vols. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994-1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Scripture and the Realisation of God's Promises." Pages 41-62 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Acts*. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2.36. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Natural Law in Second Temple Judaism." *Vetus Testamentum* 45 (1995): 17-44.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Noachide Commandments and New Testament Ethics." *Revue biblique* 102 (1995): 72-101.

Boda, Mark J. "Form Criticism in Transition: Penitential Prayer and Lament, *Sitz im Leben* and Form." Pages 181-192 in *Seeking the Favor of God Vol. 1, The Origins of Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*. Society of Biblical Literature

Early Judaism and its Literature 21. Edited by Mark J. Boda, Daniel K. Falk, and Rodney A. Werline. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.

Bokser, Ben Zion. "Justin Martyr and the Jews." *Jewish Quarterly Review* 64 (1973): 97-122.

Borgen, Peder. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 233-282 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Writings, Philo, Josephus*. vol. 2. *Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum* 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Philo of Alexandria: An Exegete for His Time*. Supplements to *Novum Testamentum* 86. Brill: Leiden, 1997.

Bousset, Wilhelm. *Die Evangeliencitate Justins des Märtyrers in ihrem Wert für die Evangelienkritik*. Göttingen, 1891.

Bovon, François. "The Role of the Scriptures in the Composition of the Gospel Accounts: The Temptations of Jesus (Lk 4.1-13 par.) and the Multiplication of the Loaves (Lk 9.10-17 par.)." Pages 26-31 in *Luke and Acts*. Edited by Gerald O'Collins and Gilberto Marconi. New York: Paulist Press, 1991.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Hermeneia. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke the Theologian: Fifty Years of Research (1950-2005)*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006.

Bowker, J. "Speeches in Acts: A study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967-1968): 96-111.

Brawley, Robert L. *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 33. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Text to Text Pours forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1995.

Broadie, Sarah. "Rational Theology." Pages 205-224 in *The Cambridge Companion to Early Greek Philosophy*. Edited by A. A. Long. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Brodie, Thomas L. "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Sources in Acts: 2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8, 9-40." *Biblica* 67 (1986): 41-67.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative.” Pages 78-85 in *New Views on Luke and Acts*. Edited by Earl Richard. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Crucial Bridge: Elijah-Elisha Narrative as an Interpretive Synthesis of Genesis-Kings and a Literary Model for the Gospels*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Brooke, George J. *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in Its Jewish Context*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 29. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Justifying Deviance: The Place of Scripture in Converting to a Qumran Self-Understanding.” Pages 73-87 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Edited by Kristin De Troyer and Armin Lange with the assistance of Katie M. Goetz and Susan Bond. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Prophecy and Prophets in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Looking Backwards and Forwards.” Pages 151-165 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Brown, Raymond E. “Jesus and Elijah.” *Perspective* 12 (1971): 85-104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Not Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity but Two Types of Jewish/Gentile Christianity.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 45 (1983): 74-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1996.
- Brownlee, William H. *The Text of Habakkuk in the Ancient Commentary from Qumran*. Journal of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 11. Philadelphia: SBL, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk*. Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 24. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1979.
- Bruce, F. F. *Biblical Exegesis in the Qumran Texts*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text With Introduction and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988.

- Buck, P. Lorraine. "Justin Martyr's *Apologies*: Their Number, Destination, and Form." *Journal of Theological Studies* 54 (2003): 45-59.
- Bultmann, R. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. Translated by K. Grobel. London: SCM Press, 1955.
- Burkitt, F. Crawford. *The Gospel History and Its Transmission*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1911.
- Busse, U. *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu. Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4.16-30*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 91. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus. Die Rezeption, Komposition und Interpretation der Wundertradition im Evangelium des Lukas*. Forschung zur Bibel 24. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1979.
- Cadbury, Henry J. *The Making of Luke-Acts*. New York: MacMillan, 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Subsidiary Points." Pages 349-359 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. vol. 2. Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920-1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Speeches in Acts." Pages 402-427 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. vol. 4. Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920-1933.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Acts in History*. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955.
- Callan, Terrence. "The Background of the Apostolic Decree." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 284-297.
- Campbell, Jonathan G. *The Use of Scripture in the Damascus Document 1-8, 19-20*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 228. New York: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.
- Campenhausen, Hans Freiherr von. *Formation of the Christian Bible*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977.
- Carroll, John T. *Response to the End of History: Eschatology and Situation in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 92. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Cassidy, Richard J. *Society and Politics in Acts of the Apostles*. Maryknoll, New York: Orbis Books, 1988.

- Cerfaux, L. "Citations scripturaires et traditions textuelles dans le livre des Actes." Pages 43-51 in *Aux sources de la tradition chrétienne: Mélanges offerts à M. Maurice Goguel à l'occasion de son soixante-dixième anniversaire*. Edited by P. Menoud and O. Cullmann. Neuchatel: Delachaux & Niestle, 1950.
- Chadwick, Henry. "Justin Martyr's Defense of Christianity." *Bulletin of John Ryland's University Library of Manchester* 47 (1964-1965): 275-297.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Philo and the Beginnings of Christian Thought." Pages 137-157 in *The Cambridge History of Later Greek and Early Medieval Philosophy*. Edited by A. H. Armstrong. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.
- Chance, J. Bradley. *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Charles, R. H. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1929.
- Charlesworth, James H. ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1985.
- Chilton, B. D. and J. Neusner. *Judaism in the New Testament: Practice and Beliefs*. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Christensen, T. "Justin og *Testimonia* Traditionen." *Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift* 84 (1983): 39-62.
- Chung, Yun Lak. "The Word of God" in Luke-Acts: A Study of Lukan Theology." PhD diss., Emory University, 1995.
- Cohen, N. G., "The Greek Virtues and the Mosaic Laws in Philo: an Elucidation of *De Specialibus Legibus* IV 133-135." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 9-23.
- Collins, A. Yarbro. "Aristobulus: A New Translation and Introduction." Pages 831-836 in vol. 2 of *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1985.
- Collins, John J. "Jewish Apocalypticism against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 220 (1975): 27-36.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “Before the Canon: Scriptures in Second Temple Judaism.” Pages 225-241 in *Old Testament Interpretation: Past, Present and Future*. Edited by J. L. Mays, D. L. Petersen, and K. H. Richards. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Prophecy and Fulfillment in the Qumran Scrolls.” Pages 301-314 in *Seers, Sybils and Sages in Hellenistic-Roman Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 54. Edited by John J. Collins. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Cult and Culture: The Limits of Hellenization in Judea.” Pages 38-61 in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 13. Edited by John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Construction of Israel in the Sectarian Rule Books.” Pages 25-42 in *Judaism in Late Antiquity Part 5 Volume 1: The Judaism of Qumran: A Systematic Reading of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Theory of Israel*. Handbook of Oriental Studies: Section One: The Middle East 56. Edited by Alan J. Avery-Peck, Jacob Neusner, and Bruce Chilton. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *The Theology of St Luke*. Translated by Geoffrey Buswell. Harper & Brothers: New York, 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by James A. Limburg, Thomas Kraabel and Donald H. Juel. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Cooke, G. A. *A Critical and Exegetical commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1936.
- Cosgrove, C. H. “Justin Martyr and the Emerging Christian Canon: Observations on the Purpose and Destination of the Dialogue with Trypho.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 36 (1982): 209-232.

- Coxe, A. Cleveland, 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: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1989.
- Credner, Carl August. *Beiträge zur Einleitung in die biblischen Schriften*. Halle, 1832.
- Croatto, J. Severino. “Jesus, Prophet like Elijah, and Prophet-Teacher like Moses in Luke-Acts.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 451-65.
- Cross, F. M. *The Ancient Library of Qumran Modern Biblical Studies*. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1961.
- Dahl, Nils A. “‘A People for His Name’.” *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957-58): 319-327.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts.” Pages 139-158 in *Studies in Luke-Acts*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus in the Memory of the Early Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1976.
- Danielou, Jean. *Gospel Message and Hellenistic Culture*. Translated by John Austin Baker. vol. 2 of *A History of Early Christian Doctrine Before the Council of Nicaea*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox Press, 1973.
- Danker, Frederick W. *Luke*. Proclamation Commentary. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.
- Darr, John A. *Herod the Fox: Audience Criticism and Lukan Characterization*. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series* 163. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Davies, Philip R. *The Damascus Document: An Interpretation of the Damascus Document*. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 25. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Old’ and ‘New’ Israel in the Bible and the Qumran Scrolls: Identity and Difference.” Pages 33-41 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. *Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah* 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Dawson, David. *Allegorical Readers and Cultural Revision in Ancient Alexandria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1992.

- Denova, Rebecca I. *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- De Jonge, M. *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*. Studia in Veterus Testamenti pseudepigraphica 18. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- de Waard, J. *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament Text in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the New Testament*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 4. Leiden: Brill, 1965.
- Dillon, John M. *The Middle Platonists. A Study of Platonism 80 B.C. to A.D. 200*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1977.
- Dillon, Richard J. *From Eye-Witnesses to Ministers of the Word: Tradition and Composition in Luke 24*. Analecta Biblica 82. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 43 (1981): 205-227.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Prophecy of Christ and His Witnesses according to the Discourses of Acts." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 544-556.
- Dimant, Devorah. "Qumran Sectarian Literature." Pages 483-550 in *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Writings, Philo, Josephus*. vol. 2. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum 2.2. Edited by Michael E. Stone. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress, 1984.
- Di Lella, Alexander A. and Patrick W. Skehan. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: A New Translation with Notes*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 39. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1987.
- Dibelius, Martin. *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by Mary Ling. London, SCM Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Acts: Form, Style, and Theology*. Translated by Mary Ling. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Doeve, door Jan Willem. *Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1954.

Doran, Robert. *Birth of a Worldview: Early Christianity in its Jewish and Pagan Context*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, 1995.

Douglas, Michael C. "Power and Praise in the Hodayot: A Literary Critical Study of 1QH 9:1-18:4." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1998.

Droge, Arthur J. *Homer or Moses? Early Christian Interpretations of the History of Culture*. Hermeneutische Untersuchungen zur Theologie 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Apologetics in the NT." Pages 302-307 in *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. Edited by David Noel Freedman. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Josephus between Greeks and Barbarians." Pages 115-142 in *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R Levison. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Drury, John. *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel: A Study in Early Christian Historiography*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1976.

Dupont, Jacques. "ΤΑ 'ΟΣΙΑ ΔΑΥΙΔ ΠΙΣΤΑ (Ac XIII 34 = Is LV3)." *Revue Biblique* 68 (1961): 91-114.

\_\_\_\_\_. "La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc." Pages 97-108 in *Aphophoreta: Festschrift für E. Haenchen*. Edited by W. Eltester et F. H. Kettler. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche 30. Berlin, A. Töpelmann, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Études sur les Actes des apôtres*. Lectio Divina 45. Paris: Cerf, 1967.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Les discours de Pierre dans les Actes et le chapitre 24 de l'évangile de Luc." Pages 328-374 in *Évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques. Memorial L. Cerfaux*. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium 32. Belgium: Peeters, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2:33." Pages 219-228 in *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament: In Honour of Charles Francis Digby Moule*. Edited by B. Lindars and S. S. Smalley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. "La portée christologique de l'évangélisation des nations d'après Luc 24, 47." Pages 125-143 in *Neues Testament und Kirche für Rudolf Schnackenburg* [z.

60. *Geburtsag am 5. Jan. 1974 von Freunden u. Kollegen gewidmet*. Edited by Rudolf Schnackenburg and Joachim Gnilka. Freiburg: Herder, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*. Translated by John R. Keating. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Nouvelles études sur les Actes des apôtres*. Lectio divina 118. Paris: Cerf, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Un peuple d’entre les nations (Actes 15.14).” *New Testament Studies* 31 (1985): 321-335.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombée’ (Ac 15,16=Am 9,11).” Pages 19-32 in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80ten Geburtstag*. Edited by Erich Grässer and Otto Merk. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Easton, Burton Scott. *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts, and Other Papers*. London: SPCK, 1955.
- Eddy, Samuel K. *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Edwards, M. J. “On the Platonic Schooling of Justin Martyr.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 42 (1991): 17-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Justin’s Logos and the Word of God.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 3 (1995): 261-280.
- Edwards, Mark, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, and Christopher Rowland. “Introduction: Apologetics in the Roman World.” Pages 1-13 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Ehrhardt, Arnold “Justin Martyr’s Two Apologies.” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 4 (1953): 1-12.
- Ehrman, B. D. *The Orthodox Corruption of Scripture: The Effect of Early Christological Controversies on the Text of the New Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Elliger, K. *Studien zum Habakuk-Kommentar vom Toten Meer*. Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 15. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1953.

- Elliot, J. K. ed., *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993.
- Ellis, Earle. E. *The Gospel of Luke*. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The End of the Earth (Acts 1:8).” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 1 (1991): 123-132.
- Emerton, J. A. “A Review of *The Semitisms of Acts*.” *Journal of Semitic Studies* 13 (1968): 284-290.
- Engelhardt, M. *Das Christentum Justins des Märtyrers. Eine Untersuchung über die Anfänge der katholischen Glaubenslehre*. Erlangen: Andreas Deichert 1878.
- Epp, Eldon Jay. *The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- Esler, Phillip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: the Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for the Study of New Testament Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Craig E. “On the Isaianic Background of the Sower Parable.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 464-468.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6:9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 64. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Old Testament in the Gospels.” Pages 579-590 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1992.
- Evans, Craig A. and James A. Sanders, eds. *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Falls, Thomas B. *The Writings of Saint Justin Martyr*. The Fathers of the Church. New York: Christian Heritage, 1948.
- Feldman, Louis H. *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937-1980)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Judean Antiquities Books 1-4*. vol. 3. Flavius Josephus Translation and Commentary. Edited by Steve Mason. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Prophets and Prophecy in Josephus.” Pages 210-239 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Edited by Michael Floyd and Robert D. Haak. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.

Finkel, A. “The Peshet of Dreams and Scriptures.” *Revue de Qumran* 4 (1963): 357-370.

Fishbane, Michael. *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Use, Authority and Interpretation of Mikra at Qumran.” Pages 339-377 in *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading, and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 2,1. Edited by Martin Jan Mulder. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Inner-Biblical Exegesis: Types and Strategies of Interpretation in Ancient Israel.” Pages 3-18 in *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. “From Scribalism to Rabbinism: Perspectives on the Emergence of Classical Judaism.” Pages 439-456 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. London: Chapman, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 28-28A. Garden City: Doubleday & Company, 1981-1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts.” Pages 524-538 in *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers, 1992*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 31. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1998.

- Foakes, F. J. and Kirsopp Lake, eds., *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920-1933.
- Fraade, Steven D. "Interpretive Authority in the Studying Community at Qumran." *Journal of Jewish Studies* 44 (1993): 51-63.
- Franklin, Cecil L. "Justin's Concept of Deliberate Concealment in the Old Testament." PhD diss., Harvard University, 1961.
- Franklin, E. *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts*. London: SPCK, 1975.
- Fraser, P. M. *Ptolemaic Alexandria*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972.
- Frend, William H. C. "The O. T. in the Age of the Greek Apologists A. D. 130-180." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 129-150.
- Freudenthal, J. *Alexander Polyhistor und die von ihm erhaltenen Reste jüdischer und samaritanischer Geschichtswerke*. Hellenistische Studien I-II. Breslau: Skutsch, 1875.
- Gamble, Harry. *The New Testament Canon: Its Making and Meaning*. Guides to Biblical Scholarship New Testament Series. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- Gammie, John G. "The Sage in Sirach." Pages 355-372 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo Perdue. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Gärtner, Bertil. *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*. Acta seminarii neotestamentici upsaliensis 21. Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1955.
- Gasque, W. Ward. *A History of the Criticism of the Acts of the Apostles*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Fruitful Field: Recent Study of the Acts of the Apostles." *Interpretation* 42 (1988): 117-131.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *The Preexistent Son: Recovering the Christologies of Matthew, Mark, and Luke*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2006.
- Geffcken, Johannes. *Zwei griechische Apologeten*. Leipzig und Berlin: Teubner, 1907.
- George, Augustin. "Israel dans l'œuvre de Luc." *Revue biblique* 75 (1968): 481-525.

Gerber, Christine. “Die Heiligen Schriften des Judentums nach Flavius Josephus.” Pages 91-115 in *Schriftauslegung im antiken Judentum und im Urchristentum* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 73. Edited by Martin Hengel und Hermut Löhr. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1994.

Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory & Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity*. Acta Seminarii Neotestamentici Upsaliensis 22. Livonia: Dove, 1961.

Ginzberg, L. H. *Studies in Daniel*. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1948.

Gnilka, J. *Die Verstockung Israels. Isaias 6,9-10 in der Theologie der Synoptiker*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 3. München: Kösel, 1961.

Goldingay, John E. *Daniel*. Word Biblical Commentary 30. Dallas: Word Books, 1989.

Goodenough, Erwin R. *The Theology of Justin Martyr*. Jena: Verlag Frommannsche Buchhandlung, 1923.

Goodman, Martin. “Josephus’ Treatise Against Apion.” Pages 48-56 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Goodspeed, Edgar J. *Die ältesten Apologeten*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1914.

Goppelt, L. *Typos: Die typologische Deutung des Alten Testaments im Neuen*. Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie 43. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1939.

Goulder, M. D. *Type and History in Acts*. London: SPCK, 1964.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Evangelists’ Calendar: a Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture*. London: SPCK, 1978.

Grabbe, Lester L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian vol. 2: The Roman Period*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992.

Grant, Robert M. “The Heresy of Tatian.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 4-6 (1954): 62-68.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Letter and the Spirit*. London: SPCK, 1957.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theophilus of Antioch Ad Autolycum: Text and Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Greek Apologists of the Second Century*. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.

Grassi, Joseph A. “Emmaus Revisited: Luke 24, 13-35 and Acts 8, 26-40.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 26 (1964): 463-467.

Green, Joel B. “The Problem of a Beginning: Israel’s Scriptures in Luke 1-2.” *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 4 (1994): 61-86.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.

Green, Joel B., and Michael C. McKeever. *Luke-Acts and New Testament Historiography*. Institute for Biblical Research Bibliographies 8. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.

Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1-20: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 22. Garden City, Doubleday Publishing, 1983.

Gregory, Andrew. *The Reception of Luke and Acts in the Period before Irenaeus: Looking for Luke in the Second Century*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 169. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Grelot, Pierre. “Soixante-dix semaines d’années.” *Biblica* 50 (1969): 169-186.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Note sur Actes, XIII, 47.” *Revue biblique* 88 (1981): 368-372.

Grether, O. *Name und Wort Gottes im Alten Testament*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 64. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1934.

Grossman, Maxine L. *Reading for History in the Damascus Document: A Methodological Study*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 45. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Cultivating Identity: Textual Virtuosity and ‘Insider’ Status.” Pages 1-11 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Grübe, K. L. “Die hermeneutischen Grundsätzen Justins des Märtyrers.” *Der Katholik* 60 (1880): 139-159.

Haenchen, Ernst. “Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 51 (1954): 153-167.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Judentum and Christentum in der Apostelgeschichte.” *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 54 (1963): 155-187.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary*. Translated by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.

Hahn, F. *The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity*. New York: The World Publishing Co., 1969.

Hall, Robert G. *Revealed Histories: Techniques for Ancient Jewish and Christian Historiography*. *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series* 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1991.

Hall, Stuart G. *Doctrine and Practice in the Early Church*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.

Hamm, Dennis. “Acts 3:12-26: Peter’s Speech and the Healing of the Man Born Lame.” *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 11 (1984): 199-217.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Paul’s Blindness and Healing: Clues to Symbolic Intent.” *Biblica* 70 (1990): 63-72.

Hammer, Raymond. *The Book of Daniel*. Cambridge Bible Commentary of the Old Testament. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Hammer, R. A. “Elijah and Jesus: A Quest for Identity.” *Judaism* 19 (1970): 207-218.

Hardwick, Michael E. *Josephus as an Historical Source in Patristic Literature Through Eusebius*. Brown Judaic Studies 128. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1989.

\_\_\_\_\_. “*Contra Apionem* and Christian Apologetics.” Pages 369-400 in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*. *Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums* 34. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

Harnack Adolf. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte. Dritte verbesserte und vermehrte auflage.* 3 vols. Freiburg, Leipzig & Tübingen: Mohr, 1894-1897.

\_\_\_\_\_. *History of Dogma.* 7 vols. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1896-1905.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles.* New Testament Studies 3. Translated by Rev. J. R. Wilkinson. Williams & Norgate, 1909.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries.* 2 vols. Translated by James Moffat. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Marcion. Das Evangelium von fremden Gott.* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Texte und Untersuchungen 46. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1924. repr., Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1996.

Hartman, Louis F. and Alexander Di Lella, *The Book of Daniel.* Anchor Bible Commentary Series 23. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1978.

Hastings, A. *Prophet and Witness in Jerusalem: A Study of the Teaching of Saint Luke.* Baltimore: Helicon, 1958.

Hausman, R. A. "The Function of Elijah as a Model in Luke-Acts." PhD diss., University of Chicago, 1975.

Hay, David M. "Philo's View of Himself as an Exegete: Inspired, but not Authoritative." *Studia Philonica Annual* 3 (1991): 40-52.

Hawthorne, Gerald F. "Tatian and His Discourse to the Greeks." *Harvard Theological Review* 57 (1964): 161-188.

Heinisch, P. *Der Einfluss Philos auf die älteste christliche Exegese: Barnabas, Justin und Clemens von Alexandria.* Münster i. W., Aschendorffschen Buchdruckerei, 1908.

Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period.* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Translated by John Bowden. 2 vols. London: SCM Press, 1974.

Hertig, Paul. "The Jubilee Mission of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke: Reversals of Fortunes." *Missiology* 26 (1998): 167-179.

Heumann, C. A. "Dissertatio de Theophilo cui Lucas Historiam Sacram Inscriptis." Pages 483-505 in *Bibliotheca Historico-Philologico-Theologica.* Classis 4. Bremen: 1720.

Hilgenfeld, Adolf. *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Evangelien Justins, der Clementinischen Homilien und Marcion's*. Halle, 1850.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Die alttestamentlichen Citate Justin’s in ihrer Bedeutung für die Untersuchung über seine Evangelien.” *Theologische Jahrbücher* 9 (1850): 385-439.

Hill, Charles E. “Justin and the New Testament Writings.” *Studia Patristica* 30 (1997): 42-48.

Hirshman, M. “Polemical Literary Units in the Classical Midrashim and Justin Martyr’s *Dialogue with Trypho*.” *Jewish Quarterly Review* 83 (1993): 369-384.

\_\_\_\_\_. *A Rivalry of Genius: Jewish and Christian Biblical Interpretation in Late Antiquity*. Translated by Batya Stein. New York: State University of New York Press, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Rabbinic Universalism in the Second and Third Centuries.” *Harvard Theological Review* 93 (2000): 101-115.

Hofer, A. “The Old Man as Christ in Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho*.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 57 (2003): 1-21.

Holladay, Carl R. *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: Volume 1: Historians*. Texts and Translations Pseudepigrapha Series 20. Chico: Scholars Press, 1983.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Theios Aner in Hellenistic Judaism: A Critique of the Use of This Category in New Testament Christology*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 40. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1977.

Hollander, H. W. and M. De Jonge. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Commentary*. *Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica* 8. Leiden: Brill, 1985.

Holm-Nielson, Svend. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. *Acta theologica danica* 2. Aarhus: Universitetsforlaget, 1960.

Holte, R. “Logos Spermatikos: Christianity and Ancient Philosophy according to St. Justin’s Apologies.” *Studia Theologica* 12 (1958): 109-168.

Holtz, Traugott. *Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas*. Texte und Untersuchungen 104. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1968.

- Horgan, Maurya P. *Pesharim: Qumran Interpretations of Biblical Books*. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1979.
- Horner, Timothy J. “Listening to Trypho”: *Justin Martyr’s Dialogue Reconsidered*. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 28. Leuven and Paris: Peeters, 2001.
- Horsley, Richard A. “The Law of Nature in Philo and Cicero.” *Harvard Theological Review* 71 (1978): 35-59.
- Hughes, Julie A. *Scriptural Allusions and Exegesis in the Hodayot*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 59. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- Hunt, Emily J. *Christianity in the Second Century: The Case of Tatian*. Routledge Early Church Monographs. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Hull, J. H. E. *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles*. London: Lutterworth, 1967.
- Hurtado, L. W. *Lord Jesus Christ: Devotion to Jesus in Earliest Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2003.
- Hyldahl, Niels. “Tryphon and Tarphon.” *Studia theologica* (1956): 77-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Philosophie und Christendom: Eine Interpretation der Einleitung zum Dialog Justins*. Acta theologica danica 9. Kopenhagen: Prostant Apud Munksgaard, 1966.
- Japhat, Sara. *I-II Chronicles: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1993.
- Jassen, Alex P. *Mediating the Divine: Prophecy and Revelation in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Second Temple Judaism*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 68. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- Jaubert, A. “Le calendrier des Jubilés et de la secte de Qumran. Ses origines bibliques,” *Vetus Testamentum* (1953): 250-264.
- Jeremias, G. *Der Lehrer der Gerechtigkeit*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1963.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament (Meyer-Kommentar) 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 39. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina 3. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Sacra Pagina 5. Collegeville, Liturgical Press, 1992.
- Joly, Robert. *Christianisme et philosophie: Études sur Justin et les apologistes grecs du deuxième siècle*. Belgique: L' Université de Bruxelles, 1973.
- Jones, Bruce William. "The Prayer in Daniel IX." *Vetus Testamentum* 18 (1968): 488-493.
- Karris, Robert. *What Are They Saying about Luke and Acts?*. New York: Paulist Press, 1979.
- Katz, P. "Justin's Old Testament Quotations and the Greek Dodekapropheton Scroll." *Studia Patristica* 1 (1957): 343-353.
- Kemp Lowther Clarke, William. "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," Pages 66-105 in *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles*. vol. 2. Edited by Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. 5 vols. London: MacMillan, 1920-1933.
- Keresztes, P. "The Literary Genre of Justin's First Apology." *Vigiliae Christianae* 19 (1965): 99-110.
- Kidd, B. J. *History of the Church*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1922.
- Kilgallen, John J. *The Stephen Speech A Literary and Redactional Study of Acts 7:2-53*. Analecta Biblica 67. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Function of Stephen's Speech (Acts 7,2-53)." *Biblica* 70 (1989): 173-193.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus, Savior, the Glory of Your People Israel." *Biblica* 75 (1994): 305-327.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Rhetorical and Source-traditions Study of Acts 2,33." *Biblica* 77 (1996): 178-196.
- Kilpatrick, George D. "Laos at Luke 2:31 and Acts 4:25, 27." *Journal of Theological Studies* 16 (1965): 127.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 94. Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.
- Kimber Buell, Denise. *Why This New Race: Ethnic Reasoning in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005.
- Kingsbury, Jack Dean. "Jesus as the 'Prophetic Messiah' in Luke's Gospel." Pages 29-42 in *The Future of Christology: Essays in Honor of Leander E. Keck*. Edited by A. J. Malherbe and W. A. Meeks. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1993.
- Kister, M. "Concerning the History of the Essenes." *Tarbiz* 56 (1986): 1-15.
- Kittel, Bonnie. "The Problems of Biblical Language." Pages 48-55 in *The Hymns of Qumran: Translation and Commentary*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 50. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1981.
- Kittel, G. and G. Friedrich. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1964-1975.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "Stephen's Speech – Acts VII.2-53." *New Testament Studies* 4 (1957-1958): 25-31.
- Knibb, Michael A. *The Qumran Community*. Cambridge Commentaries on Writings of the Jewish and Christian World 200 BC to AD 200 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Knox, W. L. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1948.
- Kodell, Jerome. "'The Word of God Grew': The Ecclesial Tendency of the Λόγος in Acts 6:7; 12:24; 19:20." *Biblica* 55 (1974): 505-519.
- Koester, Helmut. *Synoptische Überlieferung bei den apostolischen Vätern*. Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literature 65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "ΝΟΜΟΣ ΦΥΣΕΩΣ: The Concept of Natural Law in Greek Thought." Pages 521-541 in *Religions in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell*

- Goodenough*. *Studies in the History of Religions. Supplement to Numen* 14. Leiden: Brill, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Early Christian Literature.” Pages 551-556 in *Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible: Supplementary Volume*. Edited by Keith Crim. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Text of the Synoptic Gospels in the Second Century.” Pages 28-33 in *Gospel Traditions in the Second Century*. Edited by W. L. Petersen. Notre Dame: London, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ancient Christian Gospels: Their History and Development*. London: SCM Press, 1990.
- Koet, B. J. *Five Studies on Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts*. Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia 14. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Kraft, Robert A. “The Multiform Jewish Heritage of Early Christianity.” Pages 174-199 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Krenkel, M. *Josephus und Lukas: Der schrifstellerische Einfluss des jüdischen Geschichtschreibers auf den christlichen nachgewiesen*. Leipzig: Haessel, 1894.
- Kretschmar, G. “Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten.” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 66 (1954-1955): 209-253.
- Kuhn, Karl A. “Beginning the Witness: The αὐτόπται καὶ ὑπηρέται of Luke’s Infancy Narrative.” *New Testament Studies* 49 (2003): 237-255.
- Kugel, James L. “The Messiness of History.” Pages 40-51 in *Early Biblical Interpretation*. Library of Early Christianity. Edited by James L. Kugel and Rowan A. Greer. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Bible As It Was*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Kuhn, Heinz-Wolfgang. *Enderwartung und gegenwärtiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu den Gemeindeliedern von Qumran*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 4. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Kümmel, W. G. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*. Translated by S. Mclean and Howard C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1972.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Introduction to the New Testament*. Translated by Howard Clark Kee. Nashville, Abingdon, 1975.
- Kurz, William S. “The Function of Christological Proof from Prophecy for Luke and Justin.” PhD diss., Yale University, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Promise and Fulfillment in Hellenistic Jewish Narratives and in Luke and Acts.” Pages 147-170 in *Jesus and the Heritage of Israel: Luke’s Narrative Claim upon Israel’s Legacy*. Edited by David P. Moessner. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1999.
- Laato, Antti. “The Seventy Yearweeks in the Book of Daniel.” *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 102 (1990): 212-223.
- Lacocque, André. “The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9.” *Hebrew Union College Annual* 47 (1976): 119-142.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Daniel in His Time*. Studies on Personalities of the Old Testament. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1988.
- Lamberton, Robert. *Homer the Theologian: Neoplatonist Allegorical Reading and the Growth of the Epic Tradition*. The Transformation of the Classical Heritage 9. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989.
- Lange, Armin. “Reading the Decline of Prophecy...and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 195-201 in *Reading the Present in the Qumran Library: The Perception of the Contemporary by Means of Scriptural Interpretations*. Society of Biblical Literature Symposium Series 30. Edited by K. de Troyer and A. Lange. Atlanta: SBL, 2005.
- Larkin, William J. Jr. “Luke’s Use of the Old Testament in Luke 2-23.” PhD diss., University of Durham, 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Acts*. Intervarsity Press New Testament Commentary Series. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1995.
- Laurentin, René. *Structure et théologie de Luc I-II*. Paris: J. Gabalda, 1957.
- Levison, John R. “Philo’s Personal Experience and the Persistence of Prophecy.” Pages 194-209 in *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 427. Edited by Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak. New York: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Licht, Jacob. *Megillat ha-Hodayot: me-megillot midbar Yehudah*. Jerusalem: Bialik Institute, 1956.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Doctrine of the Thanksgiving Scroll." *Israel Exploration Journal* 6 (1956): 1-13, 89-101.
- Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Reprint of the 9th ed. (1925-1940) with a new supplement. Edited by E. A. Barber and others. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Lieu, Judith M. "The Race of God-fearers." *Journal of Theological Studies* 46 (1995): 483-501.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Image and Reality: The Jews in the World of the Christians in the Second Century*. London, T&T Clark, 1996.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christian Identity in the Jewish and Graeco-Roman World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Lindars, B. *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations*. London: SCM Press, 1961.
- Lippelt, Ernst. *Quae Fuerint Justini Martyris ΑΠΟΜΝΗΜΟΝΕΥΜΑΤΑ Quaeque Ratione Cum Forma Syro-Latina Cohaeserint*. Halle, 1901.
- Litke, Wayne Douglas. "Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of Citations in Luke-Acts." PhD diss., McMaster University, 1993.
- Litwak, Kenneth Duncan. *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 282. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. *Paulus vor Damaskus: Arbeitsweisen der neueren Bibelwissenschaft dargestellt an den Texten Apg 9, 1-19; 22, 3-21; 26, 9-18*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 4. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie*. Studien zum Alten und Neuen Testaments 39. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1975.
- Lohse, E. "Lukas als Theologe der Heilsgeschichte." *Evangelische Theologie* 14 (1954): 256-275.
- Loisy, A. F. *Les Actes des apôtres*. Paris: Emile Nourry, 1920.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *L'Évangile selon Luc*. Paris: Emile Nourry, 1924.

Lyman, Rebecca. "Hellenism and Heresy." *Journal of Early Christian Studies* 11 (2003): 209-222.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Justin and Hellenism: Some Postcolonial Perspectives." Pages 160-168 in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Maddox, Robert. *The Purpose of Luke-Acts*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.

Mack, Burton L. *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Structure of Athenagoras, *Supplicatio pro Christianis*." *Vigiliae Christianae* 23 (1969): 1-20.

Manns, F. "L'Exegese de Justin dans le *Dialogue avec Tryphon*." *Analecta* 12 (1977): 130-152.

Mansoor, Menahem. *The Thanksgiving Hymns*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 3. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1961.

Marcovich, Miraslov ed., *Athenagoras Legatio Pro Christianis*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Iustini Martyris Apologiae pro Christianis*. Patristische Texte und Studien 38. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1994.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Iustini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone*. Patristische Texte und Studien 47. New York: Walter De Gruyter, 1997.

Marguerat, Daniel. *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 121. Translated by Ken McKinney, Gregory J. Laughery and Richard Bauckham. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

Marshall, I. Howard. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Resurrection of Jesus in Luke." *Tyndale Bulletin* 24 (1973): 55-98.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1980.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “Luke and his ‘Gospel’.” Pages 289-308 in *Evangelium und die Evangelien: Vorträge vom Tübinger Symposium 1982 / hrsg. von Peter Stuhlmacher*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 28. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Commentary. repr., Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Luke’s Portrait of the Pauline Mission.” Pages 99-113 in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission*. Edited by Peter Bolt and Mark Thompson. Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 2000.
- Marshall, J. L. “Some Observations on Justin Martyr’s Use of Testimonies.” *Studia Patristica* 16 (1985): 197-200.
- Martens, John. “Philo and the ‘Higher’ Law.” Pages 310-322 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*. Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers 30. Edited by Eugene H. Lovering, Jr.. Atlanta: Scholars, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *One God: One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. Ancient Mediterranean and Medieval Texts and Contexts 5. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Martin, François. *Le livre d’Hénoch: Documents pour l’étude de la Bible, traduit sur le texte éthiopien*. Paris: Letouzey et Ane, 1906.
- Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill, 1997-1998.
- März, Claus-Peter. *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas: Die lukanische Worttheologie als Frage an die neuere Lukasforschung*. Erfurter theologische Schriften 11. Leipzig: St. Benno-Verlag, 1974.
- Mason, Rex. *Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics after the Exile based on the “Addresses” in Chronicles, the Speeches in Ezra and Nehemiah and the Post-Exilic Books*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Mason, Steve. *Josephus and the New Testament*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The *Contra Apionem* in Social and Literary Context: An Invitation to Judean Philosophy.” Pages 187-228 in *Josephus’ Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in*

*Greek*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 34. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R Levison. Leiden: Brill, 1996.

McGehee, Michael. “Why Tatian Never ‘Apologized’ To The Greeks.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* (1993): 143-158.

McKirahan, Richard D. Jr. “Chapter 19: The NOMOS-PHYSIS Debate.” Pages 390-413 in *Philosophy Before Socrates: An Introduction with Texts and Commentary*. Indianapolis: Hackett, 1994.

McKnight, Scot. *A New Vision for Israel: The Teachings of Jesus in National Context*. Studying the Historical Jesus 4. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1999.

Meier, John P. “Is There *Halaka* (the Noun) at Qumran.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956): 150-155.

Mendels, D. “Creative History in the Hellenistic Near East in the Third and Second Centuries BCE: The Jewish Case.” *Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha* 2 (1988): 13-20.

Menoud, Philippe H. “Le Plan des Actes des Apotres.” *New Testament Studies* 1 (1954): 44-51.

Menzies, R. P. *Empowered for Witness: The Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 6. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994.

Metzger Bruce M. and Roland E. Murphy, eds. *The New Annotated Apocrypha: The Apocryphal/ Deuterocanonical Books of the Old Testament*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.

Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Society, 1998.

Micheel, Rosemarie. *Die Seher- und Prophetenüberlieferungen in der Chronik*. Beiträge zur biblischen Exegese und Theologie 18. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1983.

Milik, J. T. *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea*. Studies in Biblical Theology 26. Translated by J. Strugnell. Naperville: Alec Allenson, 1959.

Milik, J. T. ed. and trans., *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976.

- Miller, David. "Luke's Conception of Prophets Considered in the Context of Second Temple Literature." PhD diss., McMaster University, 2004.
- Minear, P. S. *To Heal and to Reveal: The Prophetic Vocation according to Luke*. New York: Seabury, 1976.
- Mínguez, Dionisio. "Hechos 8:25-40: análisis estructural del relato." *Biblica* 57 (1976): 168-191.
- Moessner, David P. "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus – Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 220-256.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Paul in Acts: Preacher of Eschatological Repentance to Israel." *New Testament Studies* 34 (1988): 96-104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory." Pages 35-50 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Script of the Scriptures in Acts: Suffering as God's 'Plan' (βουλή) for the World for the 'release of sins'." Pages 218-250 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Moll, Sebastian. "Justin and the Pontic Wolf." Pages 145-151 in *Justin Martyr and His Worlds*. Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.
- Montague, George T. *Understanding the Bible: A Basic Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. New York: Paulist Press, 1997.
- Montgomery, James A. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1927.
- Moore, Thomas. "The Lucan Great Commission and the Isaianic Servant." *Bibliotheca Sacra* (1997): 47-60.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'To the End of the Earth': The Geographical and Ethnic Universalism of Acts 1:8 in Light of Isaianic Influence on Luke." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 40 (1997): 389-399.

Morgan-Wynne, J. E. “The Holy Spirit and Christian Experience in Justin Martyr.” *Vigiliae Christianae* 2 (1984): 172-177.

Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. London: SCM Press, 1959.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 31. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1967.

Mueller, Christopher. “Leserorientierte Fragen im Erzählwerk des Lukas.” *Theologie und Glaube* 93 (2003): 28-47.

Munier, Charles. *Saint Justin Apologie pour les chrétiens: Édition et traduction*. Paradosis 39. Fribourg: L’University de Fribourg, 1995.

Murray, Oswyn. “Hecateus of Adbera and Pharaonic Kingship.” *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology* 56 (1970): 141-171.

Myers, Jacob Martin. *1-2 Chronicles*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 12-13. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1963.

Nahm, Charles. “The Debate on the ‘Platonism’ of Justin Martyr.” *Second Century* 9 (1992): 129-151.

Najman, Hindy. *Seconding Sinai: The Development of Mosaic Discourse in Second Temple Judaism*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 77. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Interpretation as Primordial Writing: Jubilees and Its Authority Conferring Strategies.” *Journal for the Study of Judaism* 30 (1999): 379-410.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Law of Nature and the Authority of Mosaic Law.” *The Studia Philonica Annual* 11 (1999): 55-73.

Nasarella, Laura. “Mapping the World: Justin, Tatian, Lucian, and the Second Sophistic.” *Harvard Theological Review* 98 (2005): 283-314.

Nauck, Wolfgang. “Die Tradition und Komposition der Areopagrede.” *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 53 (1956): 11-52.

Neudorfer, Heinz-Werner. “The Speech of Stephen.” Pages 275-294 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Newsom, Carol A. *Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Constructing ‘We, You, and the Others’ through Non-Polemical Discourse.” Pages 13-21 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70. Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Neusner, Jacob. *Studying Classical Judaism: A Primer*. Louiseville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.

Nickelsburg, George W. E. “The Epistle of Enoch and the Qumran Literature.” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 33 (1982): 334-340.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Revealed Wisdom as a Criterion for Inclusion and Exclusion: From Jewish Sectarianism to Early Christianity.” Pages 73-91 in *To See Ourselves as Others See Us: Christians, Jews, and “Others” in Late Antiquity*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Ernest S. Frerichs. Chico: Scholars Press, 1985.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Scripture in 1 Enoch and 1 Enoch as Scripture.” Pages 333-354 in *Texts and Contexts: Biblical Texts in their Textual Situational Contexts*. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Nature and Function of Revelation in 1 Enoch, Jubilees, and Some Qumranic Documents.” Pages 91-120 in *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, 12-14 January 1997*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 31. Edited by Esther G. Chazon and Michael E. Stone. Leiden: Brill, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. *1 Enoch: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. Harvard Theological Studies 56. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Polarized Self-Identification in the Qumran Texts.” Pages 23-31 in *Defining Identities: We, You, and the Other in the Dead Sea Scrolls, Proceedings*

- of the Fifth Meeting of the IOQS. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 70.* Edited by Florentino García Martínez and Mladen Popović. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. and James C. VanderKam. *1 Enoch: A New Translation Based on the Hermeneia Commentary.* Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 1-9:20.* Word Biblical Commentary 35a. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 9:21-18:34.* Word Biblical Commentary 35b. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke 18:35-24:53.* Word Biblical Commentary 35c. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Press, 1989.
- Norden, E. *Agnostos theos: untersuchungen zur formengeschichte religiöser Rede.* Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1913.
- Norris, Richard A. Jr. "The Apologists." Pages 36-44 in *The Cambridge History of Early Christian Literature.* Edited by Frances Young, Lewis Ayres, and Andrew Louth. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Oden, R. A. "Philo of Byblos and Hellenistic Historiography." *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 110 (1978): 115-126.
- O'Neill, J. C. *The Theology of Acts in its Historical Setting.* London: SPCK, 1961.
- O'Reilly, Leo. *Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles: A Study in Lucan Theology.* Analecta Gregoriana 243. Rome: Editrice Pontifica Universita Gregoriana, 1987.
- Osborn, Eric Francis. *Justin Martyr.* Beiträge zur historischen Theologie 47. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1973.
- O'Toole, R. F. *The Christological Climax of Paul's Defense (Ac 22:1-26:32).* Analecta biblica 78. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Activity of the Risen Jesus in Luke-Acts." *Biblica* 62 (1981): 471-498.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Philip and the Ethiopian Eunuch (Acts VIII 25-40)." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 17 (1983): 25-34.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 102 (1983): 245-258.

Overbeck, F. *Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte von W. M. L. de Wette, Vierte Auflage bearbeitet und stark erweitert von Franz Overbeck.* Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum Neuen Testament Leipzig, 1870.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Ueber das Verhältniss Justins des Martyrers zur Apg.” *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie* 15 (1872): 305-349.

Overman, J. Andrew. “The God-fearers: Some Neglected Features.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 32 (1988): 17-26.

Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus.* Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 130. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.

Parsons, Mikael C. “Isaiah 53 in Acts 8: A Reply to Professor Morna Hooker.” Pages 104-119 in *Jesus and the Suffering Servant: Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins.* Edited by William H. Bellinger, Jr. and William R. Farmer. Harrisburg: Trinity Press, 1998.

Parsons, Mikeal C. and Martin M. Culy. *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text.* Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003.

Parvis, Sarah. “Justin Martyr and the Apologetic Tradition.” Pages 115-127 in *Justin Martyr and his Worlds.* Edited by Sara Parvis and Paul Foster. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

Pattison, S. E. “A Study of the Apologetic Function of the Summaries of Acts.” PhD diss., Emory University, 1990.

Penner, Todd C. *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography.* Emory Studies in Early Christianity. New York: T&T Clark, 2004.

Perdue, Leo G. “Ben Sira and the Prophets.” Pages 132-154 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella, O.F.M.* Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 38. Edited by Jeremy Corley and Vincent T. M. Skemp. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 2005.

Pervo, Richard I. *Acts.* Hermeneia. Minneapolis. Fortress Press, 2009.

Petersen, David L. *Late Israelite Prophecy: Studies in Deutero-Prophetic Literature and in Chronicles.* Society of Biblical Literature Monograph Series 23. Missoula: Scholars, 1977.

- Phillips, Thomas E. "The Genre of Acts: Moving toward a Consensus?" *Currents in Biblical Research* 4 (2006): 365-396.
- Plümacher, Eckhard. *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller: Studien zur Apostelgeschichte*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 9. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to St. Luke*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1922.
- Polhill, John B. *Acts*. New American Commentary 26. Nashville: Broadman Publishers, 1992.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E. "A Scripture Profile of the Book of the Watchers." Pages 263-284 in *The Quest for Context and Meaning: Studies in Biblical Intertextuality in Honor of James A. Sanders*. Biblical Interpretation 28. Edited by Craig A. Evans and Shemaryahu Talmon. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Porteous, Norman W. *Daniel: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1965.
- Price, R. M. "'Hellenization' and Logos doctrine in Justin Martyr." *Vigiliae Christianae* 42 (1988): 18-23.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Are there 'Holy Pagans' in Justin Martyr?" *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 167-171.
- Prigent, Pierre. *Justin et L'Ancien Testament: L'Argumentation scripturaire du traité de Justin contre toutes les hérésies comme source principale du Dialogue avec Tryphon et de la Première Apologie*. Paris: Lecoffre, 1964.
- Puech, Aimé. *Les apologistes grecs du IIe siècle de notre ère*. Paris : Librairie Hachette et Cie., 1912.
- Puech, Émile. "Messianism, Resurrection, and Eschatology at Qumran and in the New Testament." Pages 235-256 in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant. The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 10. Edited by Eugene Ulrich and James VanderKam. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994.
- Pycke, N. "Connaissance rationnelle et connaissance de grace chez saint Justin." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 37 (1961): 52-85.
- Rabin, Chaim. *The Zadokite Documents*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

Isaac Rabinowitz, “The Second and Third Columns of the Habakkuk Interpretation Scroll.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 69 (1950): 31-49.

Rajak, Tessa. “Talking at Trypho: Christian Apologetic as Anti-Judaism in Justin’s *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*.” Pages 59-80 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, and Simon Price in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Josephus.” Pages 585-595 in *The Cambridge History of Political Thought vol. 1: The Cambridge History of Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Reagan, Joseph Nicholas. *The Preaching of Peter: The Beginning of Christian Apologetic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923.

Reed, Annette Yoshiko and Adam H. Becker. “Introduction: Traditional Models and Directions.” Pages 1-34 in *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*. Texts & Studies in Ancient Judaism 95. Edited by Annette Yoshiko Reed and Adam H. Becker Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Reed, Annette. “The Trickery of the Fallen Angels and the Demonic Mimesis of the Divine: Aetiology, Demonology, and Polemics in the Writings of Justin Martyr.” *Journal of Early Christian Studies* (2004): 141-171.

\_\_\_\_\_. “‘Revealed Literature’ in the Second Century BCE: Jubilees, 1 Enoch, Qumran, and the (Pre)History of the Biblical Canon.” Pages 94-98 in *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*. Edited by G. Boccaccini with J. H. Ellens and J. Waddell. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Fallen Angels and the History of Judaism and Christianity: The Reception of Enochic Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Reese, Günter. “Die Geschichte Israels in der Auffassung des frühen Judentums: Eine Untersuchung der Tiervision und der Zehnwochenapokalypse des äthiopischen Henochbuches, der Geschichtsdarstellung der Assumptio Mosis und der des 4 Esrabuches.” PhD diss., Ruprecht-Karl-Universität zu Heidelberg, 1967.

Rese, Martin. *Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas*. Studien zum Neuen Testament 1. Gerd Mohn: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1969.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Die Funktion der alttestamentlichen Zitate und Anspielungen in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte.” Pages 61-79 in in *Les Actes des Apotres: Traditions, rédaction, théologie*. Edited by J Kremer. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 48. Louvain: Leuven University, 1979.

Richard, Earl. *Acts 6.1-8.4: The Author’s Method of Composition*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 41. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts.” *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 37-53.

Ritschl, Albrecht. *Das Evangelium Marcions und das kanonische Evangelium des Lukas*. Tübingen, 1846.

Rius-Camps, Josep and Jenny Read-Heimerdinger. *The Message of Acts in Codex Bezae: A Comparison with the Alexandrian Tradition*, 1. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 257. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Roberts, J. J. M. “The Hand of Yahweh.” *Vetus Testamentum* 21 (1971): 244-251.

Roberts Gaventa, Beverly. “The Eschatology of Luke-Acts Revisited.” *Encounter* 43 (1982): 27-42.

\_\_\_\_\_. *From Darkness to Light: Aspects of Conversion in the New Testament*. Overtures to Biblical Theology. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2003.

Robinson, William C. Jr. “On Preaching the Word of God.” Pages 131-138 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. New York: Abingdon Press, 1966.

Rodway Johnson, Aubrey. *The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1962.

Rogers, P. R. “Acts 2:18, *kai propheteusousin*.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 38 (1987): 95-97.

Rogers, Rick. *Theophilus of Antioch: The Life and Thought of a Second-Century Bishop*. New York: Lexington Books, 2000.

- Rokeah, David. *Justin Martyr and the Jews*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 5. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Roloff, Jürgen. *Apostolat-Verkündigung-Kirche. Ursprung, Inhalt und Funktion des kirchlichen Apostelamtes nach Paulus, Lukas und den Pastoralbriefen*. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1965.
- Rosner, Brian S. “Acts and Biblical History.” Pages 65-82 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce. W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.
- Rudolph, Anette. ‘Denn wir sind jenes Volk...’. *Die neue Gottesverehrung in Justins Dialog mit dem Juden Tryphon in historisch-theologischer Sicht*. Studien zu Alten Kirchengeschichte 15. Bonn: Borengrässer, 1999.
- Runesson, Anders. *The Origins of the Synagogue: A Socio-Historical Study*. Coniectanea biblica New Testament Series 37. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2001.
- Runesson, Anders, Donald D. Binder, and Birger Olsson. *The Ancient Synagogue from its Origins to 200 C.E.: A Sourcebook*. Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 72. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Runia, David T. *Philo of Alexandria and the Timaeus of Plato*. Philosophia Antiqua 2. Leiden: Brill, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Exegesis and Philosophy: Studies on Philo of Alexandria*. Hampshire: Variorum, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Philo in Early Christian Literature: A Survey*. Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum 3.3. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Philo a Middle Platonist? A Difficult Question Revisited.” *The Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 112-140.
- Sanday, William. *The Gospels in the Second Century*. London, 1876.
- Sanders, J. A. “From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4.” Pages 75-106 in *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 12. Edited by J. Neusner. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Isaiah in Luke.” *Interpretation* 36 (1982): 144-155.

Sanders, Jack T. *The Jews in Luke-Acts*. London: SCM Press, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Jewish People.” Pages 58-73 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.

Satterthwaite, Phillip E. “Acts Against the Background of Classical Rhetoric.” Pages 337-379 in *The Book of Acts in Its Ancient Literary Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter and Andrew D. Clarke. vol. 1 of *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by Bruce W. Winter. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1993.

Scharlemann, M. H. *Stephen: A Singular Saint*. Analecta Biblica 34. Rome: Pontifical Institute, 1968.

Schechter, Solomon. *Fragments of a Zadokite Work: Documents of Jewish Sectaries* vol. 1. Cambridge, 1910. Reprinted with prolegomenon by J. A. Fitzmyer. New York: Ktav, 1970.

Schiffman, Lawrence H. *The Halakhah at Qumran*. Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity 16. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls: The History of Judaism, the Background of Christianity, the Lost Library of Qumran*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. Garden City: Doubleday Publishing, 1995.

\_\_\_\_\_. “The Pharisees and Their Legal Traditions according to the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *Dead Sea Discoveries* 8 (2001): 262-277.

Schmidt, Daryl. “The Historiography of Acts: Deuteronomistic or Hellenistic?” Pages 47-427 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1985 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Kent Harold Richards. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985.

Scheckenburger, M. *Über den Zweck der Apostelgeschichte: Zugleich eine Ergaenzung der neueren Commentare*. Bern: C. Fischer, 1841.

Schneider, Gerhard. *Lukas, Theologe der Heilsgeschichte: Aufsätze zum lukanischen Doppelwerk*. Bonner biblische Beiträge 59. Königstein/Ts.-Bonn: P. Hanstein, 1985.

Schnider, F. *Jesus der Prophet*. Orbis biblicus et orientalis 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1973.

- Schniedewind, William H. *The Word of God in Transition: From Prophet to Exegete in the Second Temple Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 197. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1995.
- Schoeps, H. J. *Theologie und Geschichte des Judenchristentums*. Tübingen: 1949.
- Schreck, C. J. “The Nazareth Pericope, Luke 4, 16-30 in Recent Study.” Pages 399-471 in *L’Evangile de Luc-The Gospel of Luke*. Edited by Frans Neirynck. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 32. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1989.
- Schubert, P. “The Structure and Significance of Luke 24.” Pages 165-186 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft 21. Edited by W. Eltester. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1954.
- Schürer, E. *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*. 3 vols. Leipzig, 1901-1909.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. 3 vols. Edited and revised by Geza Vermes, Fergus Miller and Martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1971-1987.
- Schürmann, Heinz *Das Lukasevangelium*. 2 vols. Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 1982-1994.
- Scott, James M. “Acts 2:9-11 as an Anticipation of the Mission to the Nations.” Pages 87-123 in *The Mission of the Early Church to Jews and Gentiles*. Edited by Jostein Ådna and Hans Kvalbein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Seeligmann, I. L. “Die Auffassung von der Prophetie in der deuteronomistischen und chronistischen Geschichtsschreibung.” Pages 254-284 in *Congress Volume Göttingen 1977*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 29. Leiden: Brill, 1978.
- Seifrid, M. A. “Jesus and the Law in Acts.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 39-57.
- Semisch, Karl. *Die apostolischen Denkwürdigkeiten des Märtyrers Justinus*. Hamburg, 1848.
- Shelton, J. B. *Mighty in Word and Deed: The Role of the Holy Spirit in Luke-Acts*. Peabody, MA: Hendrikson, 1988.

- Shemesh, Aharon and Cana Werman. "Hidden Things and Their Revelation." *Revue de Qumran* 18 (1998): 409-427.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Halakah at Qumran: Genre and Authority." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 10 (2003): 106-112.
- Shotwell, Willis A. *The Biblical Exegesis of Justin Martyr*. London: SPCK, 1965.
- Sibinga, J. Smith. *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr*. vol. 1: *The Pentateuch*. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Siker, Jeffrey S. *Disinheriting the Jews: Abraham in Early Christian Controversy*. Westminster John Knox Press, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "'First to the Gentiles': A Literary Analysis of Luke 4:16-30." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 111 (1992): 73-90.
- Silberman, L. "Unriddling the Riddle." *Revue de Qumran* 3 (1961): 323-364.
- Simon, Marcel. "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History* 2 (1951): 127-142.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church*. London : Longmans, Green, 1958.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Apostolic Decree and Its Setting in the Ancient Church." *Bulletin of John Ryland's University Library of Manchester* 52 (1969-70): 437-460.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Verus Israel: A Study of the Relations between Christians and Jews in the Roman Empire, 135-425*. Translated by H. McKeating. New York: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Sjöberg, Erik. "The Restoration of Column II of the Habakkuk Commentary of the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Studia theologica* 4 (1952): 120-128.
- Skarsaune, Oskar. "The Conversion of Justin Martyr." *Studia Theologica* 30 (1976): 53-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Proof from Prophecy: A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 106. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "From Books to Testimonies: Remarks on the Transmission of the Old Testament in the Early Church." *Immanuel* 24-25 (1990): 207-219.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “Judaism and Hellenism in Justin Martyr, Elucidated from His Portrait of Socrates.” Pages 585-611 in *Geschichte--Tradition--Reflexion: Festschriften für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*, vol. 3: Frühes Christentum. Edited by Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1996.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. Anchor Bible Commentary Series 39. New York: Doubleday Publishing, 1987.
- Sloan, Robert B. *The Favorable Year of the Lord: A Study of Jubilarly Theology in the Gospel of Luke*. Austin: Schola, 1977.
- Smend, R. *Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach, hebräisch und deutsch*. Berlin: Reimer, 1906.
- Smith, R. M. “The Eschatology of Acts and Contemporary Exegesis.” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 29 (1958): 641-663.
- Soards, Marion L. *The Speeches in Acts: Their Content, Context, and Concerns*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 1994.
- Sparks, H. F. D. “The Semitisms in St. Luke’s Gospel.” *Journal of Theological Studies* 1 (1950): 16-28.
- Spencer, F. Scott. *The Portrait of Philip in Acts: A Study of Roles and Relations*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 67. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Acts. Readings: A New Biblical Commentary*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Squires, John T. Squires, John T. “The Plan of God.” Pages 19-40 in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts*. Edited by I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Stadelmann, Helge. *Ben Sira als Schriftgelehrter: Eine Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vor-makkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitlehrertum*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 2. Tübingen: J.C.B Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1980.
- Stanley, Christopher D. “The Rhetoric of Quotations: An Essay on Method.” Pages 44-58 in *Early Christian Interpretation of the Scriptures of Israel: Investigations and Proposals*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 148.

Edited by C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Stanton, Graham N. *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 25. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Stephen in Lucan Perspective." Pages 345-360 in *Studia Biblica III Paper on Paul and Other New Testament Authors. Sixth International Congress on Biblical Studies. Oxford, 3-7 April 1978*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 3. Edited by E. A. Livingstone. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Justin Martyr's Dialogue with Trypho: Group Boundaries, 'Proselytes' and 'God-fearers'." Pages 263-278 in *Tolerance and Intolerance in Judaism and Christianity*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton and Guy G. Stroumsa. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Spirit in the Writings of Justin Martyr." Pages 321-334 in *The Holy Spirit and Christian Origins: Essays in Honor of James D. G. Dunn*. Edited by Graham N. Stanton, Bruce W. Longenecker, and Stephen C. Barton. Cambridge: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and Gospel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.

Steck, Odil Hannes. *Israel und das gewaltsame Geschick der Propheten: Untersuchungen zur Überlieferung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtsbildes im Alten Testament, Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 23. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1967.

Stegemann, Hartmut. *Die Entstehung der Qumrangemeinde*. Bonn, 1971.

\_\_\_\_\_. *On the Essenes, Qumran, John the Baptist, and Jesus*. The Library of Qumran. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.

Sterling, Gregory E. *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*. Novum Testamentum Supplements 64. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Platonizing Moses: Philo and Middle Platonism." *The Studia Philonica Annual* 5 (1993): 96-11.

- \_\_\_\_\_. “‘Athletes of Virtue’: An Analysis of the Summaries in Acts (2:41-47; 4:32-35; 5:12-16).” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 113/4 (1994): 679-696.
- Stuedel, Annette. “אֶהְרִית הַיָּמִים in Texts from Qumran.” *Revue de Qumran* 16 (1993-94): 225-246.
- Steyn, Gert J. *Septuagint Quotations in the Context of the Petrine and Pauline Speeches of the Act Apostolorum*. Kampen: Kok Pharos, 1995.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. “Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul’s Preaching Activity.” *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 59-82.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Journal for the Study of New Testament Supplements 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- Strelan, Rick. “The Running Prophet (Acts 8:30).” *Novum Testamentum* 43 (2001): 31-38.
- Striker, Gisela. “Origins of the Concept of Natural Law.” Pages 209-220 in *Essays on Hellenistic Epistemology and Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Stronstad, R. *The Charismatic Theology of Saint Luke*. Peabody, MA: Hendrikson Publishers, 1984.
- Struck, Peter T. *Birth of the Symbol: Ancient Readers at the Limits of their Texts*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. “Temporal Shifts from Text to Interpretation: Concerning the Use of the Perfect and Imperfect in the *Habakkuk Peshet* (1QpHab).” Pages 124-149 in *Qumran Studies: New Approaches New Questions*. Edited by Michael Thomas Davis & Brent A. Strawn. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2007.
- Stylianopoulos, Theodore. *Justin Martyr and the Mosaic Law*. Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 20. SBL and Scholars Press, 1975.
- Sukenik, E. L. *The Dead Sea Scrolls of the Hebrew University*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1955.
- Sylva, D. “The Meaning and Function of Acts 7,46-50.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* 106 (1987): 261-275.

Talbert, Charles H. *Luke and the Gnostics: An Examination of the Lucan Purpose*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Promise and Fulfillment in Lucan Theology." Pages 91-103 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles Talbert. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Reading Acts: A Literary and Theological Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1997.

Tannehill, Robert C. "The Mission of Jesus according to Luke 4:16-30." Pages 76-147 in *Jesus in Nazareth*. Edited by Erich Grässer. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." Pages 83-101 in *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives*. Edited by Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986-1990.

Taylor, Justin. "The Jerusalem Decrees (Acts 15.20, 29 and 21.25) and the Incident at Antioch (Gal 2.11-14)." *New Testament Studies* 46 (2001): 372-380.

Thackeray, H. St. J. *The Life, Against Apion*. London: William Heinemann, 1926.

Tiede, David L. *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Exaltation of Jesus and the Restoration of Israel in Acts 1." *Harvard Theological Review* 79 (1986): 278-286.

Tiller, Patrick A. *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*. Society of Biblical Literature Early Judaism and its Literature 4. Atlanta: Scholars, 1993.

Torrey, C. C. *The Composition and Date of Acts*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1916.

Townsend, John T. "Date of Acts." Pages 47-62 in *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar*. Edited by Charles Talbert. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company, 1984.

Trakatellis, Demetrius C. *The Pre-Existence of Christ in Justin Martyr*. Harvard Dissertations in Religion 6. Missoula: Scholars, 1976.

- Trocme, Étienne. *Le "Livre des Actes" et l'histoire*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France, 1957.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. "The Christology of Luke-Acts." Pages 133-164 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Turner, Max. "The Sabbath, Sunday, and the Law in Luke-Acts." Pages 99-158 in *From Sabbath to Lord's Day: A Biblical, Historical, and Theological Investigation*. Edited by D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1982.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus and the Spirit in Lucan Perspective." *Tyndale Bulletin* 32 (1981): 3-42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness*. Journal of Pentecostal Theological Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Turner, N. "The Quality of the Greek in Luke-Acts." Pages 387-400 in *Studies in New Testament Language and Text*. Edited by J. K. Elliot. Leiden: Brill, 1976.
- Tyson, Joseph B. "The Gentile Mission and the Authority of Scripture." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 619-631.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006.
- van den Eynde, S. "Children of the Promise: on the διαθήκη-promise to Abraham in Luke 1,72 and Acts 3:25." Pages 470-482 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Van Rooy, Harry V. "Prophet and Society in the Persian Period according to Chronicles." Pages 163-179 in *Second Temple Studies 2: Temple Community in the Persian Period*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 175. Edited by Tamara C. Eskenazi and Kent H. Richards. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- van Unnik, W. C. "Jesus the Christ." *New Testament Studies* 8 (1961-1962): 101-116.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Der Ausdruck 'ΕΩΣ 'ΕΞΑΤΟΥ ΤΗΣ ΓΗΣ (Apostelgeschichte 1:8) und sein alttestamentliche Hintergrund." Pages 386-401 in vol. 1 of *Sparsa*

*Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 29. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Background and Significance of Acts X 4 and 35.” Pages 213-258 of vol. 1 of *Sparsa Collecta: The Collected Essays of W. C. van Unnik*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 29. Leiden: Brill, 1973.

Van Winden, J. C. M. *An Early Christian Philosopher: Justin Martyr’s Dialogue with Trypho Chapters One to Nine*. Philosophia Patrum 1. Leiden: Brill, 1971.

VanderKam, James C. *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*. Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1984.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Biblical Interpretation in *1 Enoch* and Jubilees.” Pages 96-125 in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha: Supplement Series 14. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.

\_\_\_\_\_. *From Revelation to Canon: Studies in the Hebrew Bible and Second Temple Literature*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 62. Leiden: Brill, 2000.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Open and Closed Eyes in the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 85-90).” Pages 279-292 in *The Idea of Biblical Interpretation: Essays in Honor of James L. Kugel*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 83. Edited by Hindy Najman and Judith H. Newman. Leiden: Brill, 2004.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Sinai Revisited.” Pages 44-60 in *Biblical Interpretation at Qumran*. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Edited by Matthias Henze. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2005.

\_\_\_\_\_. “To What End? Functions of Scriptural Interpretation in Qumran Texts.” Pages 302-320 in *Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Qumran, and the Septuagint Presented to Eugene Ulrich*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 101. Edited by Peter W. Flint, Emanuel Tov, and James C. VanderKam. Leiden: Brill, 2006.

\_\_\_\_\_. “Those Who Look for Smooth Things, Pharisees, and Oral Law.” Pages 465-477 in *Emanuel: Studies in the Hebrew Bible, Septuagint and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 94. Edited by S. M. Paul, R. A. Kraft, and L. H. Schiffman. Leiden: Brill, 2003.

Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. Rev. ed. England: Clays Ltd., 2004.

- Vielhauer, Phillip. "On the 'Paulism' of Acts." Pages 33-50 in *Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays Presented in Honor of Paul Schubert*. Edited by Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966.
- Volkmar, G. *Über Justin den Märtyrer und sein Verhältniss zu unsern Evangelien*. Zurich, 1853.
- Von Rad, Gerhard. "The Levitical Sermon in I and II Chronicles." Pages 267-280 in *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London: SCM Press, 1966).
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Old Testament Theology*. 2 vols. Translated by David Muir Gibson Stalker. New York: Harper & Row, 1962-1965.
- Wacholder, B. Z. *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*. Monographs of the Hebrew Union College 3. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College, 1974.
- Wanke, J. "Wie sie in beim Brotbrechen erkannten: zur Auslegung der Emmauserzählung Lk 24:13-35." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 18 (1974): 180-192.
- Waszink, J. H. "Some Observations on the Appreciation of the 'Philosophy of the Barbarians' in Early Christian Literature." Pages 41-56 in *Mélanges Offerts à Mademoiselle Christine Mohrmann*. Utrecht: Spectrum, 1963.
- Watson, Frances. *Text and Truth: Re-defining Biblical Theology*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "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.
- Weiss, J. *Über die Absicht und den literarischen Charakter der Apostelgeschichte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897.
- Wendt, H. H. *Die Apostelgeschichte*. Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar, Part 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1913.
- Weren, W. J. C. "Psalm 2 in Luke-Acts: An Intertextual Study." Pages 189-203 in *Intertextuality in Biblical Writings: Essays in Honour of Bas Van Iersel*. Edited by S. Draisma. Kampen: J. H. Kok.
- Werline, Rodney. "The Transformation of Pauline Arguments in Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho'." *Harvard Theological Review* 92 (1999): 79-93.

- Wernberg-Moller, P. *The Manual of Discipline: Translated and Annotated with an Introduction*. Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 1. Leiden: Brill, 1957.
- Westermann, C. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Translated by J. J. Scullion. London: SPCK, 1966.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire: The Politics of Imitation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ancient Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004.
- Whittaker, Molly ed., *Tatian: Oratio ad Graecos and Fragments*. Oxford Early Christian Texts. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
- Whybray, R. N. *Isaiah 40-66*. New Century Bible. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1975.
- Widdicombe, Peter. “Justin Martyr, Allegorical Interpretation, and the Greek Myths.” *Studia Patristica* 31 (1997): 234-239.
- Wilckens, U. *Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte: Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 5. Neukirchener Verlag, 1974.
- Wilcox, Max E. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The God-Fearers in Acts: A Reconsideration.” *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 13 (1981): 102-122.
- Wilk, Florian. “Apg 10,1-11,18 im Licht der lukanischen Erzählung vom Wirken Jesu.” Pages 605-617 in *The Unity of Luke-Acts*. Edited by J. Verheyden. Louvain: Leuven University Press, 2002.
- Willi, Thomas. *Die Chronik als Auslegung*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 106. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1972.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Word Biblical Commentary 16. Waco: Word Books, 1985.
- Wilson, Gerald H. “The Prayer of Daniel 9: Reflection on Jeremiah 29.” *Journal for the Study of Old Testament* 48 (1990): 91-99.
- Wilson, Stephen G. “Lukan Eschatology.” *New Testament Studies* 15 (1969-1970): 330-347.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Society for the New Testament Studies Monograph Series 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke and the Law*. Society for the Study of the New Testament Monograph Series 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Winter, B. W. "On Introducing Gods to Athens: An Alternative Reading of Acts 17:18-20." *Tyndale Bulletin* (1996): 71-90.
- Witherington, Ben Jr. III. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1998.
- Wolfson, H. A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1947.
- Wrede, William. *The Messianic Secret*. Translated by J. C. G. Greig. Cambridge: James Clarke & Co., 1971.
- Wright, N. T. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress Press, 1996.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Greek Apologists of the Second Century." Pages 81-104 in *Apologetics in the Roman Empire: Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Edited by Mark Edwards, Martin Goodman, Simon Price, in association with Christopher Rowland. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Zahn, Theodor. *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Band 1. Das Neue Testament Vor Origenes*. 2 vols. Erlangen, 1888-1892.
- Zeller, E. *Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihrem Inhalt und Ursprung kritisch untersucht*. Stuttgart: C. Macken, 1854.
- Zöckler, O. *Geschichte der Apologie des Christentums. Nebst einem Verzeichnis der literarischen Veroeffentlichungen des heimgegangenen Verfassers*. Gütersloh, 1907.