

Durham E-Theses

Luke, Scripture and the Partings of the Ways: A Comparative Approach

GYE, ADAM,GEORGE

How to cite:

GYE, ADAM,GEORGE (2024) *Luke, Scripture and the Partings of the Ways: A Comparative Approach*, Durham theses, Durham University. Available at Durham E-Theses Online:
<http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/15448/>

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in Durham E-Theses
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full Durham E-Theses policy](#) for further details.

Abstract

Adam Gye

Luke, Scripture and the Partings of the Ways: A Comparative Approach

This thesis examines how Luke uses scripture ecclesiologically to demonstrate the church is the 'faithful' portion of Israel, and how he attempts to present the 'Way' as a school within Judaism. This goes against a tendency to argue that Luke advocates a departure from Judaism to Christianity. To make this point I compare Luke-Acts with Romans 9-11, Revelation 12 and 4QFlorilegium (4Q174) to situate him within his early Jewish environment.

Chapter one compares Luke's ecclesiological use of scripture with Paul's in Romans 9-11. Paul as a committed Jew uses scripture here to present the Christian community as the faithful remnant of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Luke uses scripture in a very similar way. His more pessimistic ending does not indicate that he writes the Jews off at the close of his work; rather it suggests a division within Israel.

Chapter two compares Luke-Acts with Revelation 12. John also shows himself to be a Jewish author involved in an *intra muros* Jewish debate. He uses the metaphor of a woman in conflict with a dragon to represent the church as true Israel engaged in cosmic conflict with the devil. I compare his use of Old Testament traditions about the devil with Luke's in order to argue that Luke also presents the church as engaged in an *intra muros* Jewish debate as the faithful Israel engaged in an apocalyptic struggle.

Chapter three compares Luke-Acts with 4QFlorilegium. This exposition from the Dead Sea Scrolls uses the themes of temple and messiah from 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2 in order to present itself as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce Jewish rivals as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Like the Qumran material this shows Luke remains

highly Jewish in his portrayal of the messiah, despite his critique of the temple, and his fierce critique of Jewish rivals.

**Luke, Scripture and the Partings of the Ways:
A Comparative Approach**

Adam George Gye

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

to the Department of Theology and Religion at Durham University

2023

Contents

Introduction	13
1.1. The Partings of the Ways	16
1.2. Antisemitism in Luke-Acts?	19
1.3. Further Arguments for the Partings of the Ways in Luke-Acts?	23
1.4. Was Luke Pro-Jewish?	26
2. Luke-Acts as Jewish? Altering the Terms of Debate	30
2.1. An <i>Intra Muros</i> Debate	33
3. Scripture and the Partings of the Ways - an Important Link	38
3.1. Luke's Ecclesiological Hermeneutic	40
3.2. Scripture and the Partings of the Ways in Luke-Acts	43
4. Thesis Structure	48
Chapter One: Luke-Acts and Romans 9-11: Situating the Church within Judaism	53
1. Jewishness and Scripture Use in Paul and Luke	56
1.1. Paul within Judaism	56
1.2. Luke within Judaism	62
1.3. Ecclesiological Hermeneutics in Paul and Luke	63
2. Romans 9-11 within Judaism	65
2.1. Date and Purpose of Romans	65
2.2. Structure and Argument of Romans 9-11	66
2.2.1. Precedent for a Divided Israel in Israel's History (9:6-29)	66
2.2.2. The True Israel Lives by Faith; Unbelieving Israel Rejects the Gospel (9:30-10:21)	68
2.2.3. A Faithful Remnant has been Restored; Unbelieving Israel Will be Saved (11:1-36)	69

2.3. Scripture in Romans 9-11	72
3. A 'Jewish' Gentile Mission?	73
3.1. Context of Amos 9:11-12 in Luke-Acts	74
3.2. OT Context of Amos 9:11-12	76
3.3. Textual Variations	77
3.4. Luke's Use of Amos 9:11-12 LXX	79
3.5. Summary: Lukan Gentiles as God's λαός	85
3.6. Context of Hosea 2:25, 2:1; Isaiah 10:22, 1:9 in Rom 9:25-9	85
3.6.1. OT Context of Hosea 2:25, 2:1 LXX	86
3.6.2. Textual Variants	87
3.6.3. Paul's Use of Hosea 2:25, 2:1 LXX	88
3.6.4. Summary: Pauline Gentiles as God's Beloved	90
3.7. OT Context of Isa 10:22, Isa 1:9	91
3.7.1. Textual Variants	93
3.7.2. Paul's Use of Isaiah 10:22-23, 1:9	95
3.8. Evaluation: Gentiles Described in Jewish Terms	98
4. Joel 3: Gentiles Included in the Restored Israel	100
4.1. OT Context of Joel 3:1-5 LXX	100
4.2. Context of Joel 3:1-5 LXX in Acts	102
4.3. Textual Variants	102
4.4. Luke's Use of Joel 3:1-5 LXX	105
4.5. Summary: Luke's Inclusive πᾶς	109
4.6. Context of Joel 3:5 in Romans 10	111
4.7. Paul's Use of Joel 3:5	112
4.8. Summary: Paul's Inclusive πᾶς	115
4.9. Evaluation: An Inclusive Salvific Community	115
5. A Future for Unbelieving Jews?	117
5.1. Context of Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27	118
5.2. OT Context of Isaiah 6:9-10	120

5.3. Textual Variations	121
5.4. Luke's Use of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27	122
5.5. Context of Isa 59:20, 27 in Romans 11:25-27	124
5.6. OT Context of Isaiah 59, 27	125
5.7. Textual Variations	127
5.8. Paul's Use of Isa 59:20, 27:9 in Rom 11:25-27	128
5.9.1. Summary: Paul's Hope for Unbelieving Jews	131
5.9.2. Evaluation: Luke's Pessimistic Ending	131
6. Conclusions	134
Chapter Two: Luke-Acts and Revelation 12: Christian Community as Apocalyptic Israel	137
1.1. Revelation within Judaism	140
1.2. Structure and Argument of Revelation 12	145
2. 'The great dragon... that ancient serpent...' (Rev 12:9)	151
2.1. Primordial Serpent vs Israel (Rev 12:9, 17)	152
2.2. Snake Trampling and Jewish Mission (Lk 10:18-19)	154
2.3. Evaluation: Luke's Serpent in Intramural Jewish Conflict	157
3. 'The Devil and Satan' (Rev 12:9)	158
3.1. Satan in OT Context: Israel's Antagonist	158
3.2. Satan in Rev 12: Church in Ancient Struggle	160
3.3. Satan in Luke-Acts: The Divided Israel	162
3.4. Evaluation: Luke's Satan Reveals True Israel	167
4. Satan's Fall	168
4.1. Devil's Defeat (Rev 12)	169
4.2. Exorcism and Jewish Unbelief (Lk 10:15)	172
4.3. Evaluation: Satan's Fall and Jewish Rejection	176
5. Conclusion	178
Chapter Three: Luke-Acts and 4QFlorilegium: Jewish Temple	181

Polemic and Messiah

1.1. Scripture Legitimizes the True Israel at Qumran	182
1.2. Structure and Argument of 4Q174	186
2. 2 Samuel 7 in 4Q174: Dwelling and Dynasty	192
2.1. 2 Sa 7:10-14 in OT Context	192
2.2. Temple Critique in 4Q174	194
2.3. Davidic Messiah and True Israel in 4Q174	197
3. 2 Samuel 7 in Luke-Acts: Dynasty and Dwelling	203
3.1. Davidic Messiah and True Israel in Lk 1:32-3	204
3.2. Davidic Messiah and True Israel in Acts 2:30	209
3.3. Temple Critique in Acts 7:44-7	215
4. Psalm 2: A Divided Israel	221
4.1. Ps 2 in OT Context: Kingly Enthronement	222
4.2. Ps 2 in 4Q174: Messianic Community vs Jewish Rivals	223
4.3. Ps 2 in Luke-Acts: Anointed Believers vs Jewish Opponents	226
5. Conclusion	231
Main Conclusion	234
Bibliography	245

Abbreviations

Abbreviations of sources match the SBL Handbook of Style (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014).

Abbreviations not included in the handbook are as follows.

BBR *Bulletin for Biblical Research*

BO Berit Olam commentary series

ContC Continental Commentaries

CBR *Currents in Biblical Research*

CNS *Cristianesimo Nella Storia*

EpC Epworth Commentary

ESV English Standard Version

JPT *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*

Statement of Copyright

“The copyright of this thesis rests with the author. No quotation from it should be published without the author's prior written consent and information derived from it should be acknowledged.”

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the Arts and Humanities Research Council for the generous funding that made this thesis possible. Thanks must also go to Professor John Barclay for his significant comments on a draft of this material and for his additional generosity and insight in other conversations we have had over the years. Above all I must make special thanks to my outstanding supervisor Professor Francis Watson for his ongoing guidance, support and enthusiasm for this project, and also for his patience and understanding when health issues occasionally slowed its completion. You have been a remarkable model to me of creative, confident and deeply considered scholarship.

Dedication

This thesis is dedicated to Nana and Bubba, for all your care and support and love.

Introduction

As a vital founding document for early Christianity, Luke-Acts holds crucial material for the reconstruction of the early Christian movement, the interaction between nascent Christianity and early Judaism, and the intriguing way one particular author reshaped Israel's scripture traditions to construct an ideal community. With this in mind, this thesis is focused on the intersection between Luke's use of scripture, Luke's ecclesiology, and the so-called partings of the ways. My argument is threefold: (1) Luke-Acts is a Jewish text; (2) Luke uses scripture to commend Christians as the faithful portion of Israel and denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel; (3) Because he writes from within the Jewish tradition Luke does not advocate an early parting of the ways.

In (1) describing Luke-Acts as a 'Jewish text' I seek to counter a trend that downplays its Jewish features. The 'Jewishness' of Luke-Acts is a multifaceted affair touching on genre, authorship, and audience. Concerning *genre*, most studies tend to compare Luke-Acts with Greco-Roman texts in order to establish its genre.¹ This has obscured many of its Jewish features. Concerning *authorship*, Luke has traditionally been

¹ The most popular options are that Luke-Acts is a work of ancient biography [e.g. Charles Talbert, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974); Richard Burridge, 'The Genre of Acts -- Revisited' in Loveday Alexander, Steve Walton (eds.), *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C.A. Alexander* (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 28; Sean Adams, *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013)] or ancient historiography (e.g. Gregory Sterling, *Shaping the Past to Define the Present: Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2023); Andrew Pitts, *History, Biography, and the Genre of Luke-Acts: An Exploration of Literary Divergence in Greek Narrative Discourse* (Leiden: Brill, 2019); Craig Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*, vol. 1 (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012-15), 300; David Aune, *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Cambridge: James Clark, 1987), 78-115]. I agree with Burridge that the similarities in the prefaces of Luke and Acts suggest both works were intended to occupy the same genre [Richard Burridge, 'The Genre of Acts -- Revisited' in Steve Walton, Thomas Philips, Lloyd Peterson, F. Scott Spencer (eds.), *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday Alexander* (London: T&T Clark, 2011), 4]. I also favour the genre of historiography for Luke-Acts, whose focus is surely more about the spread of the word of God (Acts 4:4, 6:7, 12:24, 13:48, 19:20), the expansion of the gospel, rather than characters within it, who are merely vehicles for its expansion. This is also evidenced by its summary statements, which narrate the growth of the church more than the plight of individual characters (Acts 2:47, 6:7, 9:31, 12:24, 16:5, 19:20, 28:30-31). That said, these two genres often overlapped in antiquity [Daniel Smith and Zachary Kostopoulos, 'Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts', *NTS* 63 (2017), 400], genre designations were more fluid then than they are today, and ancient biography is an apt secondary genre description for Luke's two-volume work [cf. Pitts, *Genre of Luke-Acts*, 359].

considered a Gentile. I want to suggest there is much value in considering him if not a Jew, then at least more 'Jew-ish' than usually recognised. Concerning *audience*, I want to suggest that the original recipients of the work contained a sizeable or at least influential Jewish population.

For my second point (2) I am primarily using *Luke's use of scripture* to argue that Luke-Acts is a Jewish text. Though Luke's use of scripture is often leveraged in favour of his Jewishness, this is rarely done in any depth. Moreover, most studies of his use of scripture lack detailed comparison of how other texts contemporary to Luke-Acts exegete Old Testament (OT) texts. I seek to remedy this deficiency, in particular, by showing how Luke uses scripture to testify of a division within Israel. This is part of a programme in which he seeks to identify the true Israel. To make this point I will compare Luke's work with other early Jewish texts which ask the question of 'who are the people of God?' This use of scripture to establish ecclesial identity I will term 'ecclesiological hermeneutics'. This is the lens through which I will consider his use of the OT.

My final point (3), that Luke does not advocate an early 'parting of the ways', goes against scholarship which commonly sees him describing or advocating an early separation between Judaism and Christianity (the 'partings of the ways', as I will outline below, has become a popular shorthand to describe this process). This has often been allied with a popular strand of scholarship which sees him as antisemitic. In this thesis I will counter both of these trends by suggesting he occupies a perspective from within Judaism, or at least that he portrays Christianity as a Jewish movement. If Luke writes as a Jewish insider, he can hardly be seen to move outside the Jewish tradition, as so many have said. It should be stressed here that I am only concerned with clarifying Luke's portrayal of the Christian community. I am not concerned with addressing how outsiders may have read Luke-Acts in relation to Judaism or whether despite Luke's intentions his work may have inadvertently caused a parting of the ways.

In order to combine these points this thesis is a comparative one. I will specifically compare Luke-Acts with three other texts: Romans (9-11), Revelation (chapter 12) and 4QFlorilegium (4Q174). Each of these can be located within the spectrum of early Jewish authors also using scripture to commend their community as the faithful portion of Israel. This will shed much light on Luke's use of scripture to the same end. I will consider select citations in Luke-Acts, and I will also consider echoes and allusions (see below). This close focus on how Luke uses scripture will demonstrate how he presents the Christian movement as a Jewish school of thought. This range of texts is necessarily selective. It might be pointed out that the first two of the three, being in the New Testament canon, should be considered Christian rather than Jewish. However, this is to re-establish an early dichotomy between 'Jewish' and 'Christian' that recent research on the partings of the ways has proven erroneous. As I will show, these texts all demonstrate very Jewish themes and emphases. It might also be said the coverage is too limited. However, for heuristic purposes, I think these are sufficient to demonstrate the value of comparing Luke's use of scripture with those of other texts – an approach strikingly lacking in other studies of his use of the OT – and of the importance of combining these often disconnected disciplines of the New Testament use of the Old Testament and the partings of the ways in Luke's work.

In this introduction I will outline the trajectory of Lukan scholarship along the following lines. I will highlight some of the problem areas in Lukan studies and where further contribution is needed. I will also point out the problem that few previous studies have related the above themes in any sustained manner. In section 1 I will consider recent scholarly perspectives on the 'partings of the ways'. I will consider ongoing debates about antisemitism in Luke-Acts, and whether Luke's work might be labelled pro or anti-Jewish. In section 2 I will consider the important idea that has the potential to alter the terms of this debate, namely that Luke is a Jewish insider engaged in an inter-Jewish discussion. I will consider the problem that this growing trend in scholarship requires more detailed comparison with texts also sharing a similar perspective. In section 3 I will consider the neglected area of Luke's use of scripture to shed fresh light on the partings of the ways in his work. Then I will present my own case in more detail, and how my thesis combines these elements to present

a novel case about Luke's use of scripture and what it reveals about his relation to Judaism.

1.1. The Partings of the Ways

The 'Partings of the Ways' (POTW) has become a shorthand to describe the alleged process by which Christianity departed from its Jewish roots. Though the phrase was not coined by Dunn, he popularised it in his *The Parting of the Ways* (1970). The first edition of this book made the case for an early separation between the two based on divisions over monotheism, election, Torah, covenant, land and temple. Here Dunn argued that the decisive shift between both took place by the end of the 2nd century CE. In his preface to the second edition of this book he refined this view, arguing that 'if the beginning of the process of the partings of the ways was much less clear-cut, then the outcome of the process was even less clear cut and the final parting a lot longer than I had allowed.'² The rift, now, may have extended up to the 4th century.³ He further refined his case in later publications. In *Neither Jew Nor Greek*, for example, he concedes that 'we are not dealing with two already defined categories relating to each other'⁴ – echoing later critique that 'Judaism' and 'Christianity' are anachronistic labels. Second, he later suggests the 'image of the 'partings of the ways' is more misleading than helpful' and should be replaced.⁵

These changes reflect trends which have increasingly come to the forefront in subsequent scholarship. Developments have taken place along the following lines. First, the parting was *late* – commonly pushed back into the fourth century⁶ with

² James Dunn, *Parting of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and Their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM, 2006), xix

³ *Ibid.*, xxi

⁴ James Dunn, *Neither Jew nor Greek: A Contested Identity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016), 599

⁵ *Ibid.*, 602

⁶ E.g. Daniel Boyarin, *Borderlines* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006); Annette Yoshiko Reed, Adam Becker (eds.), 'Introduction', in *The Ways that Never Parted* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 1-34

some even arguing for overlap between Jews and Christians into the middle-ages.⁷ Second, the parting was *local* – i.e. the transition from Judaism to Christianity was a staggered one with different results in different places.⁸ The archaeological record shows considerable overlap between Jews and Christians into late antiquity, such as in Asia Minor, where Jews and Christians are buried in the same cemetery with the same religious inscription.⁹ We have anomalies (if the POTW model is accepted) like Christians continuing to attend the synagogue in late antiquity.¹⁰ Methodologically Judith Lieu has shown the dangers of conflating orthodoxy (theology) with orthopraxis (practice), suggesting that the rhetorically-charged texts from both sides do not necessarily equate to an early historical distinction between Jews and Christians on the ground.¹¹ Terminologically the very labels ‘Judaism’ and ‘Christianity’ have also been problematised – it is now recognised that there were multiple forms of each in antiquity, and blurred boundaries between both early on makes any discrete division between the two rather anachronistic. (For the purposes of this thesis I will retain the labels ‘Jewish’ and ‘Christian’ while acknowledging that they were intertwined from early on). All this suggests the older paradigm needs revising.

Is the label of the ‘partings of the ways’ apt? Scholars have flirted with other metaphors: the ‘criss-crossing of muddy tracks’;¹² sibling rivalries; a complex dance.¹³ A ‘parting’ from Judaism to Christianity implies a clean, total divide, when there was, rather, ongoing convergence and deviance between the two. That there was some sort of parting between both must be conceded given that we can today talk of two separate faiths. (For this thesis I will therefore continue to use the phrase ‘partings

⁷ Paula Fredriksen, ‘What “Parting of the Ways”? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City’ in *Ways that Never Parted*, 63

⁸ Reed, Becker, ‘Introduction’

⁹ Andrew S. Jacobs, ‘The Lion and the Lamb: Reconsidering Jewish-Christian Relations in Antiquity’ in *Ways that Never Parted*, 193

¹⁰ Annette Yoshiko Reed, “Jewish Christianity” After the “Parting of the Ways” in *Ways that Never Parted*, 193

¹¹ Judith Lieu, *Neither Jew nor Greek* (London: T&T Clark, 2015), 39, 147-8

¹² Dunn, *Partings of the Ways*, 15-16

¹³ Timothy Gabrielson, ‘Parting Ways or Rival Siblings? A Review and Analysis of Metaphors for the Separation of Jews and Christians in Antiquity’, *CBR* 19 (2021), 179-196

of the ways', though with emphasis on the plural *partings* to match the consensus that now sees the division between the two on a localised, contextual basis rather than a single sweeping 'parting').¹⁴

How does this relate to New Testament studies? A related development here is the recovery of the 'Jewishness' of much of the NT. This was catalysed by the discovery of the DSS and additional research into early Jewish literature from the mid 20th century onwards. Its repercussions have been especially significant in Jesus studies and Pauline studies. Following a detachment of Jesus from his historical context, the Jewishness of Jesus has been increasingly emphasised with a swathe of publications devoted to situating his life and ministry in the context of his first century environment.¹⁵ Likewise, with Paul, a paradigm shift began with Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* throwing into question the idea that he opposed a legalistic Judaism priding itself on 'works righteousness'. The effect was to spawn a new interpretation of Paul – the 'New Perspective' – which situates Paul much closer to the Jewish thought world than previous interpretations of the apostle. This mode of interpretation has also succeeded in emphasising Paul's Jewishness, which is now taken as a given by his interpreters. A more recent school of thought – the 'Radical New Perspective' – has taken Paul's Jewishness even further,¹⁶ with ramifications for Luke-Acts which I will show below.

Besides Jesus and Paul the 'Jewishness' of other NT documents is also increasingly being affirmed. Matthew, for example, is now seen as representing a Jewish school.¹⁷

¹⁴ See Jens Schröter, 'Introduction' in Matthias Konradt, Judith Lieu, Laura Nasrallah, Jens Schröter, and Gregory E. Sterling (eds.) *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 5

¹⁵ See, e.g., Ed Sanders, *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); Geza Vermes, *Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM, 2001); Daniel Boyarin, *Jewish Gospels* (New York: New Press, 2012)

¹⁶ Notable advocates of this position include Paula Fredriksen, *Paul: the Pagan's Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017); Mark Nanos and Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005); Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul was not a Christian: The Original Message of a Misunderstood Apostle* (New York, NY: HarperOne, 2009); Matthew Thiessen, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016)

¹⁷ Anders Runesson, 'Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intergroup Conflict' in *JBL* 127 (2008), 95-113; Matthias Konradt (ed.), *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew*

So too is the book of Revelation.¹⁸ This is additional evidence that any ‘parting’ between Judaism and Christianity was late and serves as a helpful reminder that with the aforementioned NT documents we are not dealing with ‘Christian’ texts as opposed to ‘Jewish’, but rather there was homogeneity between both early on. In wake of recent research on the ‘parting of the ways’ this latter point might seem obvious. And one might imagine that Lukan studies have caught up with this trend. However, Luke-Acts has largely been excluded from these developments. In particular Lukan studies have been heavily embroiled in debates over whether Luke is antisemitic or not, and the idea persists that he advocates an early parting of the ways. I will counter this idea. As groundwork, below I will outline arguments that he is antisemitic. If he is antisemitic then he would presumably advocate a ‘POTW’. Then I will consider further evidence that he advocates a parting of the ways.

1.2. Antisemitism in Luke-Acts?

One way of relating Luke-Acts to the POTW is through considering the alleged antisemitism of Luke-Acts.¹⁹ If Luke-Acts is antisemitic, it presumably testifies to an early separation between Judaism and Christianity. Comprising roughly 25% of the NT, if Luke-Acts is antisemitic, then it smears the Christian tradition as opposed to Judaism from the very outset. The most outspoken advocate of antisemitism in Luke-

(Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014); John Kampen, *Matthew within Sectarian Judaism* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2019); Anders Runesson, *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2020)

¹⁸ See Udo Schnelle, *The First One Hundred Years of Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2020), 376. For recent attempts to reclaim the Jewish nature of the NT, and summary of an older tendency to read the NT as making a departure from Judaism, see, e.g. Donald Hagner, *How New is the NT? First-Century Judaism and the Emergence of Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018); Paula Fredriksen, *When Christians were Jews: The First Generation* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2018)

¹⁹ The literature often separates the labels anti-Judaism, which is taken to be religious bigotry, from anti-Semitism, which is often racial; see e.g. Hakola, ‘Anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism in the NT and its Interpretation’ in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Biblical Interpretation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 27-35 for discussion. This distinction is not necessary when one considers recent research highlighting that there was no easy separation between religion and ethnicity in the ancient world, e.g. David Horrell, *Ethnicity and Inclusion: Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020), 23.

Acts came from James Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts*.²⁰ Focusing especially on the interaction between the speeches and the narrative and also considering the problem of Jewish violence in the text, he argued that for Luke 'the world will be much better off when 'the Jews' get what they deserve and the world is rid of them... the modern reader of Luke-Acts is forced to ask whether Luke's polemic against 'Jews' has not become the leaven within Christianity... against which we must all and eternally be on guard'.²¹ Though heavily critiqued, Sanders has found many followers since. He is rightly attuned to the negative portrayal of many of the Jews in Luke-Acts. Of this there is no escaping. Many have picked up on it.

Developing the theme of Jewish violence, Shelly Matthews has argued recently that Acts shows a 'swift, linear and violent break' with Judaism. The watershed moment for a clear early parting, here, is Stephen's death. This sets up a binary contrast whereby 'to be a nonbelieving Jew is to inflict violence upon Christians; to be a Christian is to be subject to violence'.²² Following his martyrdom, the use of οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι increases dramatically, becoming Acts' preferred term of vilification for those who persecute and/or desire the persecution of Jesus' followers (e.g., 9:23, 12:3, 12:11, 13:50, 14:5, 14:19, 18:12, 20:3, 20:19, 23:12, 25:24, 26:21). Following Stephen's death the Jews also lose their status as the people of God.²³ Matthews places Acts in the second-century as a document seeking to commend Christianity to the Roman world by distancing it from Judaism. Luke portrays the Jews as propagators of στάσις to exonerate Romans of violence. Luke's work is 'part of a developing supersessionist rhetoric'.²⁴

Against Matthews, Luke-Acts is possibly less pro-Roman than she suggests.²⁵ Jews are not the sole instigators of violence in Luke-Acts; she too quickly glosses over

²⁰ Jack Sanders, *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987)

²¹ *Ibid.*, 317

²² Shelly Matthews, *Perfect Martyr: The Stoning of Stephen and the Construction of Christian Identity* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 13

²³ *Ibid.*, 68

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 32

²⁵ See e.g. Lk 4:5-8 where Satan is shown to be the force behind the Roman empire.

accounts where this is attributed to pagans.²⁶ Most crucially, the occurrence of violence is not itself a sufficient indicator of parting between Judaism and Christianity: members of Israel are frequently violent towards the prophets in the OT (e.g. Jer 51:35), but this hardly indicates they are thereby separated from the people of Israel.²⁷ Nonetheless, she is right to point out the thorny problem of Jewish violence in the text. This certainly needs accounting for.

Mitzi Smith, 'Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles' also draws attention to Jewish violence. She argues that 'many ethnic or cultural groups identify an other within their collective who is marginalized and rendered as categorically other. This happens when one segment of the group desires to distance or disassociate itself from another segment that it disdains and does not want to be identified with.'²⁸ She applies this to Luke's othering of the Jews (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) in contradistinction to the Christian movement. These are repetitively 'hostile and fiercely opposed to Paul's gospel'. Moreover, Luke has a 'one-dimensional view of *the Jews* as ringleaders of baseless and violent opposition against the *ekklesia*'.²⁹ Also informative are the tense changes each time Paul announces he will go the Gentiles. In the first instance (Acts 13:46) the tense is present; in the second future (18:6); in the third past (28:28). These three statements have often been taken as evidence that Luke advocates a narrative shift in salvation from Jew to Gentile, and consequently a parting of the ways in his work. Smith argues that in each of these passages Paul's statement becomes more definitive, leading to increased emphasis on the Gentile mission. Luke does not 'write the Jews off' at the close of his work. The future tense 'I will heal them' in Acts 28 suggests there may possibly be hope for the Jewish people. Nonetheless Luke remains antisemitic and advocates a parting of the ways in his work.

²⁶ See e.g. Acts 16:16-40; 19:23-41. In this first instance she exonerates the Romans by emphasising it is Roman soldiers who rescue Paul from his persecutors (42); cf. p. 163 n.6. This does happen, but it seems arbitrary to single out Jews especially as instigators of violence in the text.

²⁷ Carl Holladay, *Acts*, NTL (Minneapolis: Westminster John Knox, 2016), 52.

²⁸ Mitzi Smith, *The Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles: Charismatics, the Jews, and Women* (Cambridge: James Clarke, 2012), 62

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 65

Levine argues that Luke is antisemitic and pushes for a parting of the ways on different terms. She focuses on the gospel of Luke. She points out the diminished role of Jerusalem and the temple;³⁰ the shift from circumcision to baptism as an initiation rite³¹; and Christian appropriation of scripture³² as well as the portrayal of the synagogue as a place of violence to suggest that 'Luke sees nothing left of, or for, the Jewish religion'.³³ The basic issue is this: 'whatever practice, ritual, salvation history, or hermeneutic is available must, for Luke, culminate in Jesus. If it does not, it is incomplete or illegitimate'.³⁴ Again we have an early separation between Judaism and Christianity.

Levine considers the gospel apart from Acts, citing recent scepticism on the narrative unity of Luke-Acts.³⁵ However, it is not necessary to take this position. Although early manuscripts of the gospel and Acts were circulated independently and the reception history of reading Luke-Acts together is no evidence of authorial intention, the cumulative evidence of the prefaces, parallel themes in both texts, the overall narrative arc, and examples of themes in Luke foreshadowed in Acts strongly argue in favour that they were designed to be read together. (I will continue to read them together in this thesis). Considering Acts makes it harder to sustain the idea that Jerusalem is diminished in Luke's narrative.³⁶ In Acts 15 he does not necessarily remove the rite of circumcision for believing Jews. Moreover, against the denigration of the synagogue, Paul consistently makes the synagogue his first port of call when he reaches a new city.³⁷ However, Levine is an important voice arguing for an early parting of the ways in Luke-Acts. Not a few scholars, then, continue to read Luke-Acts

³⁰ Amy Levine, 'Luke and the Jewish Religion', *Interpretation* 68 (2014), 395

³¹ *Ibid.*, 91-2

³² *Ibid.*, 399

³³ *Ibid.*, 401

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 399

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 389. For challenges to the unity of Luke-Acts see, for example, Patricia Walters, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, *SNTSMS 145* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009); Mikeal C. Parsons and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993); Andrew Gregory and C. Kavin Rowe, eds., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010)

³⁶ Jerusalem retains a prominent position throughout Acts.

³⁷ Acts 9:20, 13:5, 13:14, 14:1, 17:1, 10, 17, 18:4, 19, 19:5

as antisemitic. Below I will consider other voices arguing Luke commends a separation between Judaism and Christianity.

1.3. Further Arguments for the Partings of the Ways in Luke-Acts?

One does not have to label Luke as antisemitic in order to suggest that Luke-Acts may speak of an early POTW. Like Matthews, Dunn argues that Stephen's speech marks 'the beginning of a clear parting of the ways between Christian and Jew'³⁸ -- 'the first parting of the ways'.³⁹ However, he makes this point on the basis of Luke's stance on the temple rather than on Jewish violence (Acts 7:44-50 is often taken as a critique of the Jerusalem temple).⁴⁰ The idea that Luke's temple views may have originated a POTW appears in the work of Richard Bauckham, who argues here that the church's 'view of itself as the new temple, its eschatological consciousness of access to God independently of the Jerusalem temple... contained the dynamic of the process which increasingly differentiated Christianity from common Judaism'.⁴¹ Hedlun develops this view based on Luke's portrayal of the temple. Using the social phenomenon of 'legitimation,' he draws on the work of Francis Watson who in his *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles* suggests a sect can legitimate itself over against a parent group by (1) denouncing opponents; (2) antithesis; and (3) reinterpretation of the religious traditions of the parent community so that they apply exclusively to the sect.⁴² Hedlun also sees Luke's view of the temple as demonstrating 'the validity, even superiority, of this emerging symbolic [Christian] universe over and against that

³⁸ Dunn, *Parting*, 94

³⁹ *Ibid.*, 301

⁴⁰ As further evidence of an early POTW he also cites Paul's Gentile mission with its relativisation of Torah, p. 301. However, there seems to be some confusion regarding Luke's position on the temple: [this was] 'a parting of the ways at a very early stage. Yet even so, its significance should not be exaggerated. For... the same process could be described as more a broadening of the spectrum of Second Temple Judaism', 126.⁴⁰ Elsewhere in the same book he states 'Matthew, John and even Luke, as well as Paul, still saw themselves within the older walls of the Judaism of Jesus' time', 212. This seems to suggest less of a move outside Judaism here than a division within it.

⁴¹ Richard Bauckham, 'The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why', *ST* 47 (1993), 147

⁴² Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 40.

of Israelite religion'.⁴³ In this view Luke seeks to define a new community outside Judaism through its dissociation with the temple and the events of Pentecost. This takes place through a gradual departure from endorsing the temple (Luke 1-2), to conflict in the temple (Lk 19:45-9), to the torn veil (Lk 23:45) marking the end of its cosmic significance, to Pentecost which marks the Christian community as the locus of God's presence (Acts 2:14-36), to Stephen's speech about the limits of the Jerusalem temple cult.⁴⁴ Again, Luke's interpretation of the temple in Luke-Acts may be taken as leading to a departure from Judaism.

Finally, Tyson gives another reason to suggest Luke advocates an early parting of the ways. This is Luke's use of the term *χριστιανός* (Acts 11:26, 26:28) to label the early Christians. He notes that this title only else occurs in 2nd century literature (except 1 Peter, depending on when it is dated) in contrast to *Ἰουδαϊσμός* (especially Ignatius, *To the Magnesians* 10:3). This shows that in Acts 'at least some Jesus believers were by then becoming recognized as forming a distinct movement and they so recognized themselves'.⁴⁵ Tyson elsewhere dates Acts to the 2nd century.⁴⁶ This is not uncommon among commentators who stress a parting in Luke's work, although recent research on the POTW negates the idea that a later date of Acts increases the likelihood of an early parting.⁴⁷ Tyson is one of several contemporary scholars who still see Luke as advocating a POTW.⁴⁸

⁴³ R.J. Hedlun, 'Rethinking Luke's Purpose: The Effect of First-Century Social Conflict', *JPT* 22 (2013), 256

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 241-255

⁴⁵ Joseph Tyson, 'Acts, the "Parting of the Ways" and the Use of the Term "Christians"', in Kalimi, Isaac (ed.), *Bridging between Sister Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 140

⁴⁶ Joseph Tyson, *Acts and Marcion: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006)

⁴⁷ Dennis Smith, Joseph Tyson (eds.), *Acts and Christian Beginnings: The Acts Seminar Report* (Salem, OR: Polebridge Press, 2013) places Acts in the second century to suggest that 'as a whole, Israel has not accepted the gospel and that there has been a "parting of the ways" between Judaism and Christianity' in Luke's work (107). From the same text: 'the rhetorical effect of Acts is to persuade readers that Jews are the mortal enemies of Christians and that they are to be vigorously opposed, despised, and treated with contempt' (234).

⁴⁸ See also suggestions in Bock, *Luke*, IVPNT (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2010), 3; Michael Wolter, *Luke* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2021), 11. The main problem with Tyson's thesis regarding the use of *χριστιανός* is the issue of attribution. Just because the term does not occur in our existent sources until the second century does not suggest that it was therefore lacking in the first century in sources unknown to us, or that its meaning changed over time. If Luke wrote in an earlier time period, there is no particular reason to suggest he means it in contrast to Jew in his work.

A chorus of voices, then, argue that (Luke-)Acts is an early advocate of the POTW. The reasons for this concern Luke's alleged antisemitism, Jewish violence, the alleged narrative shift from Jews to Gentiles (Acts 13:46, 18:6, 28:28), disputes over temple and Paul's Gentile mission, and the use of *χριστιανός*. Again, this is no new phenomenon, with later scholars echoing the earlier works of (e.g.) Ferdinand Baur, Franz Overbeck, Adolf von Harnack, Hans Conzelmann and Ernst Haenchen.⁴⁹ Luke has long been seen as a Gentile spokesperson for a Christianity moving away from its Jewish roots.

However, the pendulum is now slowly beginning to swing in Lukan scholarship. In particular scholars are increasingly beginning to emphasise Luke's Jewishness. This point can be made in several ways. In contrast to the claims that Luke-Acts is antisemitic many have begun to suggest he is more 'pro-Jewish' in his work. This may tell against an early parting of the ways in his work although with caveats I will address below. Others have recently gone even further than this and begun to suggest that Luke is neither pro nor anti-Jewish, both of which suggest that he operates outside Judaism, but rather that he writes as a Jewish insider. This I will argue is the most profitable venture for further research, though it is currently hampered by various problems which my thesis will seek to remedy. In this next section I will outline the strengths and weaknesses of the view that Luke is 'pro-Jewish' in his work and its implications for the POTW, and then outline the emerging view that he writes from within the Jewish tradition, along with how I will develop this position.

⁴⁹ For a summary of earlier scholarship on the matter see Joseph Tyson, *Luke, Judaism and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999)

1.4. Was Luke Pro-Jewish?

Many works counterbalance the charge that Luke is antisemitic. Jervell's work was seminal in reversing the older consensus that Luke 'writes off'⁵⁰ the Jewish people in his work. Rather than suggesting that the Gentile mission issued from the rejection of Jews as the people of God, he argued for its antithesis: that Jewish *acceptance* of the gospel was the precondition for expansion to the Gentiles. To make this point he argued that the Jerusalem church formed the origins of the restored Israel (represented by the twelve apostles). He emphasised mass conversions of Jews in the narrative.⁵¹ These form the 'true Israel' for Luke,⁵² the true recipients of Israel's promises.⁵³ Israel is not rejected but *divided* into those who accept the gospel and those who do not. Luke himself is a Jewish Christian. His audience is composed primarily of Jewish Christians.⁵⁴ He has a conservative attitude to the law, which is the identifying mark of Israel.⁵⁵ Paul he portrays as an exemplar Jew ('the Pharisee par excellence'⁵⁶). His apologetic speeches are addressed to Jews. Acts is a Jewish document through and through.

This marked a tide turn in which Luke was then seen as more sympathetic to the Jewish people than formerly suggested. Subsequent scholars have drawn heavily on his view that *Luke sees the restoration of Israel as at least partially complete*. This develops a school of thought which might suggest Luke is 'pro-Jewish'. This view takes several forms but its key features are that there was a common expectation in early Judaism that Israel would be restored which Luke plays to. For example, the twelve apostles are typically seen as leaders of the restored Israel⁵⁷; converted Jews

⁵⁰ Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966), 278

⁵¹ Jacob Jervell, *Theology of Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008), 13. Acts 2:41, 4:4, 5:14, 6:1, 7, 9:42, 12:24, 13:43, 14:1, 17:10, 19:20, 21:20

⁵² *Ibid.*, 43

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 41

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 124

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 43, 59; Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2002), 134-46

⁵⁶ Jervell, *Theology*, 14

⁵⁷ Richard Bauckham, 'The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts' in Scott, James M. (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 473

at Pentecost as the twelve tribes regathered.⁵⁸ The outpouring of the Spirit is seen as a trope in Israel's end-time restoration.⁵⁹ Some suggest that Luke preserves the land of Israel as a significant place in Israel's restoration.⁶⁰ Some see evidence of a restored temple in Luke-Acts.⁶¹ Following Jervell, the restoration of Israel thus leads to the Gentile mission (Acts 15:16-17). A popular way of tying these themes together is to invoke a 'New Exodus' framework whereby Luke draws especially on Isaiah 40-55 and its themes of Israel's release from captivity as a model for his own portrayal of salvation.⁶² Particularly important is the refrain that Israel is not rejected but divided into faithful and unfaithful portions of Israel.⁶³ This divided Israel will be an important part of my thesis.

There is debate here about how to view Israel's restoration. Is it fulfilled literally, or is it significantly transformed in his work? Scholars also have different views on the place of Gentiles within Israel – are they inside⁶⁴ or outside it⁶⁵? However these are understood these studies seem to share the view that Israel's restoration is nonetheless underway, and in this sense suggest Luke has a more positive portrayal of Judaism. This is a helpful counterbalance to the popular charge that Luke is antisemitic. However, there are also problems with labelling Luke as 'pro-Jewish'. This still seems to place him outside the world of Judaism as if he were an onlooker rather than a participant in it. Moreover, though a Luke more sympathetic to Judaism

⁵⁸ Ibid., 473

⁵⁹ Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015)

⁶⁰ Michael Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 267-8

⁶¹ Either literally – Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, Temple and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Mercer University Press, 1988) – or reconfigured in the people of God – Bauckham, 'Restoration', 483

⁶² Mark Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 1995); Max Turner, *Power from on High* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 314. David Pao sees this as a 'controlling hermeneutic' behind Luke-Acts in *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000); but see critique in Peter Mallen, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2007).

⁶³ Robert Brawley, 'Ethical Borderlines Between Rejection and Hope: Interpreting the Jews in Luke-Acts', *CurTM* 6 (2000), 415-23; David Seccombe, 'The New People of God' in *Witness to the Gospel*, (ed). I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 352

⁶⁴ Gerhard Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur Lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (München: Kösel, 1975), 59

⁶⁵ Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1972), 143 argues that Gentiles are an 'associate people' alongside Israel rather than included inside it.

might be more reluctant to speak of a POTW, this is by no means clear. It would in theory be possible for him to be in favour of the Jewish cause and still, albeit unwittingly, speak of a necessary parting.⁶⁶ One might ask, then, whether there is a way beyond this debate about Luke's pro or anti Jewish stance. As it turns out, more recent scholarship is beginning to address this issue. Two studies in particular go even further than the above in emphasising Luke's Jewishness, and paving the way towards seeing Luke as a Jewish insider, my own approach. These studies shift away from considering Israel's restoration as underway in Luke-Acts, and towards a greater expectation that Luke anticipates a fuller restoration for Israel in the future.⁶⁷

First, Isaac Oliver's *Luke's Jewish Eschatology* argues Luke has a strong hope for the future (literal) restoration of the Jewish people, land, Davidic monarchy, Jerusalem and the temple. For example, Lk 19:42 reads 'now peace is hidden from your eyes', implying Jerusalem shall in the future have peace.⁶⁸ Lk 21:24 reads 'Jerusalem will be trampled on by the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles are fulfilled'.⁶⁹ This may also suggest Jerusalem has a future. One of Oliver's more intriguing claims is that the fate of Jesus and the fate of Jerusalem are intertwined: Jesus dies in solidarity with Jerusalem, so his resurrection also presumably implies Jerusalem's restoration as well.⁷⁰ If Luke is so in line with traditional Jewish traditions of restoration, this surely places him inside Judaism. Provocatively, and significantly, Oliver states that Luke is 'Jewish till proven Gentile'.⁷¹

⁶⁶ As we have, e.g., with Tannehill, who argues that Luke's work has a 'tragic' tone, i.e. he *wants* there to be a future for the Jews but this is not certain: Robert Tannehill, 'Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story', *JBL* 104 (1985), 69-85

⁶⁷ For earlier suggestions of a future restoration of Israel see Chance, *Temple*; Vittorio Fusco, 'Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel', *Novum Testamentum* (1996), 1-17

⁶⁸ Isaac Oliver, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 92

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 99

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 130, 138

⁷¹ He clarifies this, claiming this is not as a definitive statement about Luke's ethnic background, but rather a heuristic point to expose the effect on scholarship of a long history of 'the "gentilization" of Luke the author'. 25

Kinzer also echoes Oliver's hope for the redemption of Jerusalem based on its' supposed connection to Jesus' death and resurrection.⁷² For him Acts is a second-century response to Marcionite criticisms that Paul is anti-Jewish or opposed to the law. He emphasises Luke's covenantal theology to argue, perceptively, that 'judgment actually confirms rather than annuls the enduring covenantal bond between God and the Jewish people'.⁷³ Like Oliver he also suggests Luke conceives of a rebuilt temple.⁷⁴ For Kinzer the 'we' speeches link him closely to Paul, who is portrayed as very Jewish (Acts 23:6; 24:14–21; 25:8; 26:5–7; 28:17).⁷⁵ And, echoing Jervell, he also suggests that while we cannot be certain if Luke was a Jew or Gentile he nonetheless 'thinks as a Christian Jew and... he is using the categories typical of Jewish Christianity'.⁷⁶ Like Kinzer he also considers the possibility that Luke was a Jew.

Oliver and Kinzer rightly point out the possibility that Luke has a future hope for Israel in the narrative, and the neglect of eschatological features in Lukan studies.⁷⁷ They probably downplay realised eschatology in Luke's narrative.⁷⁸ One can also question their shared idea that Jesus' death is in solidarity with Israel's plight rather than judgment on Israel – in which case there is no basis to link Jesus' resurrection to the restoration of Israel as well. However, their suggestion that Luke may have been Jewish, or at least thinks as a Jew, is a significant counterbalance to the longstanding idea that Luke is a Gentile distanced from the Jewish cause.

⁷² Mark Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2018), 62

⁷³ Quite rightly, it might be suggested: in the OT prophetic judgment is not a denunciation of Israel but rather a stimulus to its further fidelity.

⁷⁴ Stephen's polemic against a temple 'made with human hands' apparently requires the erection of a future temple not made with human hands (Acts 7); Kinzer, *Crucified*, 108

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 17

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 226–7. The latter two chapters of his book are an appraisal of Zionism. I will not address this political issue in my thesis.

⁷⁷ Or, at least, future hopes that go beyond his already *realised* eschatology.

⁷⁸ Kinzer, for example, makes very little of the Holy Spirit.

2. Luke-Acts as Jewish? Altering the Terms of Debate

There are further reasons we might speak of the 'Jewishness' of Luke-Acts. First (following Jervell), Luke is increasingly seen to take a more conservative view of the law. Again Isaac Oliver contributes much here with his *Torah Praxis*. In this monograph he argues that Luke's gospel is rather like Matthew's in its orientation to the law – and the latter is often seen as a Jewish text. He argues that, like Matthew, Luke's take on Torah is very Jewish. Food laws are not abrogated but preserved in the apostolic decree (Acts 15). Peter's vision about eating unclean animals is symbolic for Gentile inclusion and does not refute the ongoing need for food restrictions.⁷⁹ Second, Luke upholds the need for sabbath observance (e.g. Jesus' statements on the sabbath, Lk 6:1-5, do not abrogate it but simply define its appropriate usage).⁸⁰ Third, Luke upholds circumcision for Jews (it is only annulled for Gentiles, Acts 15).⁸¹ Again Oliver uses this to suggest Luke is 'Jewish till proven Gentile.'⁸² His study is important because it demonstrates the importance of comparing Luke-Acts with other texts evincing a 'Jewish' perspective, as I will do in the following chapters. His comparison with Matthew is compelling, raising the question that if Matthew is considered to be part of a Jewish school of thought, why not also Luke?

Also in favour of Luke's Jewishness is his portrayal of Paul. Luke portrays 'Paul as a law-abiding Jew (not a former but 'the eternal Pharisee'.)⁸³ Loveday Alexander points out that Luke portrays Paul as upholding vows; and his final defense speeches strongly portray him as a loyal Jew remaining solely within the traditions of his Jewish people.⁸⁴ Joshua Jipp has also argued that 'Luke's view of Paul is that he is a faithful,

⁷⁹ Isaac Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 344-5

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 145-6

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 436

⁸² *Ibid.*, 25

⁸³ Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012)

⁸⁴ 'It is for the sake of the hope of Israel that I am bound with this chain' (Acts 28:20). Acts 14:15-17, 17:22-31, 3:12-26, 7:2-53, 13:16-41. So Loveday Alexander, *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007), 204. Daniel Marguerat makes the same point in *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002), 28.

Torah-observant Jew, faithful to his ancestral heritage in every way.⁸⁵ He also points out the role of the defense speeches in portraying Paul as a faithful Jew;⁸⁶ that Luke portrays Jews in the Jesus movement as continuing to observe Torah;⁸⁷ and that Jewish believers for Luke continue to circumcise their children.⁸⁸

We might also consider the issue of Luke's audience. If this was composed of large numbers of Jews then there is further reason to reconsider Luke's 'Jewishness'. To be sure, there is no easy way of reconstructing any precise social situation from the internal evidence of the text.⁸⁹ However, recent research on the POTW has shown that Jews and Christians were living in considerably closer proximity to each other than in previous models of early Christianity.⁹⁰ This raises the possibility that Luke's audience also had a larger number of Jews than is often considered. Again, Jervell is provocative here with his suggestion that Jews form the majority audience of Luke-Acts.⁹¹ So too with Esler, whose lengthy study on the social background of Luke-Acts also sees a large number of Jews in Luke's audience with the presupposition that Luke writes to reassure Jewish members of his community under pressure from fellow Jews to avoid table fellowship with Gentiles.⁹² Loveday Alexander also questions why Luke would spend so much apologetic energy locating Paul within Jewish tradition if this were not some sort of pressing issue for his audience (and presumably posed by Jews).⁹³

⁸⁵ Joshua Jipp, 'The Paul of Acts: Proclaimer of the Hope of Israel or Teacher of Apostasy from Moses?', *Nov Test* 62 (2020), 72

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 63

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 64

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 64

⁸⁹ See Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), which critiques the idea of a single community attached to each gospel.

⁹⁰ Jacobs, 'Lion and the Lamb', 193

⁹¹ Jacob Jervell, 'The Mighty Minority' in Jacob Jervell, *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984), 26-51

⁹² *Ibid.*, 31, 42, 57. Many consider godfearers to make up a large part of Luke's audience. See Nikolas Fox, *The Hermeneutics of Social Identity in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2021); Joseph Tyson, 'Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer', *NTS* 41 (1995)

⁹³ Alexander, *Literary Context*, 135

Finally, in addition to Kinzer and Oliver, others have suggested the author was a Jew. Luke's popular⁹⁴ status as a Gentile has been largely based on his traditional association with 2 Tim 4:11, Col 4:14 as well as other factors such as his supposedly more universalistic outlook; his avoidance of semitic words; and his removal of Pharisaic stipulations about what is clean or unclean.⁹⁵ However, Wolter tentatively suggests Luke might be Jewish on the basis of his detailed knowledge of the LXX, his precise awareness of the difference between Pharisees and Sadducees, his traditional Jewish framework of Lk 1-2, and the prominence of the Israel question.⁹⁶ A few suggest that Luke may have been a godfearer.⁹⁷ It is probably impossible to determine completely whether Luke was a Jew or a Gentile with Jewish sympathies. However, along with the above, these proposals do raise the possibility that Luke was 'more Jewish' than often supposed.

With this in mind, it might be asked, how should one categorise Luke-Acts? This brings us to issues of genre. If Luke's Jewishness is thus emphasised, maybe it is appropriate to start considering Luke-Acts as more of a 'Jewish' text, akin to Matthew, or to Revelation, for example, rather than an emblem of Gentile Christianity divorced from its Jewish roots. Or as Böttrich argues, on the basis that Luke's work is modelled heavily on Deuteronomistic history, a Jewish scheme;⁹⁸ that Luke's concern for traditional piety is heavily based on the Torah;⁹⁹ given the late POTW in recent research; and with the suggestion that the first-century evangelists are engaged in inner-Jewish debate – Luke-Acts is a Jewish text and 'Lukas schreibt als ein Insider'.¹⁰⁰ The important point is this: if Luke is a Jewish insider, he probably does not propose an early separation between Judaism and Christianity.

⁹⁴ The overwhelming majority seem to suggest Luke is a Gentile – so Isaac Oliver, *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), citing B.J. Koet, *Five Studies on the Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Peeters, 1989), 22; cf. Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah* (London: Chapman, 1993), 235-39

⁹⁵ For fuller arguments see Joseph Fitzmyer, *Luke* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2007), 41-2

⁹⁶ Michael Wolter, *The Gospel According to Luke Vol. 1* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2016)

⁹⁷ Joseph Tyson, 'Jews and Judaism in Luke-Acts: Reading as a Godfearer', *NTS* 41 (1995); Fox, *Hermeneutics*, 15

⁹⁸ Christfried Böttrich, 'Das lukanische Doppelwerk im Kontext frühjüdischer Literatur', *ZNW* 106 (2015), 84

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 174-5

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 169

2.1 An *Intra Muros* Debate

Coming back to the POTW, as I suggested above, this is surely the issue which must reframe the older issues of pro/anti Judaism in Lukan scholarship, and whether Luke-Acts commends an earlier or a later POTW: whether Luke writes from within or outside the Jewish tradition. There is a growing trend towards emphasising this in Lukan scholarship. This has the potential to radically alter the field of Lukan studies and is the approach I will take. In this section I will outline scholars who have explicitly argued that Luke writes from inside Judaism -- that his apologetic concerns reflect an *intra muros* debate within the Jewish community. I will also point out some of the areas omitted in their work which my thesis will remedy.

Marilyn Salmon first suggested that this idea alters the playing field of the old pro/anti-Jewish question in Luke-Acts. If Luke writes as a Jewish insider, he is not antisemitic. In other words, Luke's position as a Jewish insider (an emic perspective) or outsider (etic) is what most determines whether he is pro-Jewish or not. If an insider, his critique from within is no different to those in Israel's prophetic tradition who speak challenging words to produce change.¹⁰¹ Tiede's work is also very important here. In *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (1980)¹⁰² he argued that 'the polemics, scriptural arguments, and 'proofs' which are rehearsed in Luke-Acts are part of an intra-family struggle that, in the wake of the destruction of the temple, is deteriorating into a fight over who is really the faithful 'Israel' '.¹⁰³ He suggests that the fall of the temple in 70CE catalysed major debates about the identity of Israel in Jewish literature, and Luke's writing reflects this concern. Tiede also contends that an excessive preoccupation with Luke-Acts as a 'Gentile' document has obscured its Jewish features. Luke describes the Christian movement as a ἀἵρεσις (Acts 24:5, 14) ('sect') – a term used also to describe the Sadducees (Acts 5:17) and the Pharisees (Acts 15:5, 26:5). Many debates in Luke-Acts also take place between Jews (Lk 11:54,

¹⁰¹ Marilyn Salmon, 'Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism' in Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 76-82

¹⁰² David Tiede, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980)

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, 7

14:1-3, 20:1-7, 19, 21:27-40). For example, in Lk 11:54 Jewish opponents are chastised for ‘taking away the key of knowledge’. At stake here, he points out, is *a Jewish interpretative issue on scripture*. This is a very important point that shows Luke’s use of scripture is a major means of understanding his relation to Judaism. Like other Jewish texts seeking to identify their group as the faithful Israel, Luke therefore writes to show that his sect has the definitive interpretation of Jewish law.¹⁰⁴

However, there is a problem here. Tiede’s work interacts only minimally with other primary texts that would shed light on his important thesis that Luke-Acts operates within the matrix of Jewish texts seeking to define their community as the true Israel. Though Tiede emphasises scripture exegesis as an interpretative clue to the provenance of Luke-Acts, he makes no extended discussion of what exactly Luke’s hermeneutical position is, evidenced by close examination of how he exegetes particular texts. Moreover, despite Tiede’s work, this problem persists in Lukan studies. Here ‘the continued dominance of genre studies has generally confirmed the prominence of non-Jewish Greco-Roman texts in Lukan studies.’¹⁰⁵ *Essential then is a close study of how Luke relates to these Jewish texts, particularly on the topic of how he uses scripture to place himself inside Jewish debates, in order to see more clearly where to place him on the spectrum of the POTW.*

Other scholars advocate a ‘Luke-as-insider’ approach by re-examining the concept of identity in antiquity. Stroup draws on recent research showing the link between ethnicity and religion to argue that Luke portrays Christians as ethnically Jewish.¹⁰⁶ Identity, he argues using comparative archaeological evidence from Roman cities, was a shifting category, constantly renegotiated by insiders and outsiders.¹⁰⁷ This

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 50

¹⁰⁵ Kylie Crabbe, *Luke-Acts and the End of History* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019), 17. Cf. Todd Penner, ‘Madness in the Method? The Acts of the Apostles in Current Study’, *CBR* 2 (2004), 223-93

¹⁰⁶ Christopher Stroup, *The Christians who Became Jews* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2020). One could quibble with the recent ‘ethnic turn’ in New Testament studies on the basis that this just as anachronistic a label as ‘religion’ – see e.g. David Horrell, *Ethnicity and Inclusion : Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020), 23. There are instances (e.g. Gal 3:28) where Christianity seems to transcend ethnic categories.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 4-5

suggests there can be no monolithic reading of the ‘Jews’ in Luke’s work. Moreover, he argues, it was also possible for persons to possess multiple ethnic identities at the same time (like Paul, who was Roman and Jewish)¹⁰⁸. Stroup’s work helpfully reflects the recent research on the POTW that demonstrates the early blurred boundaries between Judaism and Christianity. It is further evidence that there can be no hasty separation between Jews and Christians in Luke’s work. However, his restricted focus on the archaeological record also means that more *inter-textual comparison* is still needed in order to bolster Tiede’s claim that Luke writes within a school of Jewish thought.

Kylie Crabbe has also drawn on the theme of hybrid identities in her recent work on the POTW in Luke-Acts. She likewise argues that Acts testifies to ‘hybrid identities’ and that his characters can have both Jewish and other ethnicities. In Acts 2, for example, Peter’s audience is Jewish but also retains other geographical identities. So too with Moses (who is Egyptian and Jewish, Acts 7) and again Paul. ‘Luke presents Jewish identity as something of a melting pot’.¹⁰⁹ There is no single Jewish type, then – presumably Christians can also be Jews too. Crabbe’s work also reflects the idea that the POTW was a local phenomenon. While there may have been piecemeal, local, partings in Luke-Acts [e.g. Paul shaking the dust off his feet in Acts 13:51; his conflict with synagogues in Corinth (18:5-6) and Ephesus (19:9)], Luke as a whole does not testify to a total parting. Crabbe also nuances discussions about Jewish violence in her work by arguing, again, that this is restricted especially to ‘the Jews from Asia’ (21:27; 24:19). Her work cautions against any hasty portrait of a single Jewish type opposed to Christians and relates Luke-Acts to recent debates on the POTW to further suggest Luke makes no hasty divide between Jews and Christians. While she does not make the case explicitly, this would also suggest Luke is more of a Jewish insider. Her work is the most up-to-date treatment of the POTW in Luke-Acts. I will use these insights in my own work. Still more inter-textual comparison is needed.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 131

¹⁰⁹ Kylie Crabbe, ‘Character and Conflict: Who Parts Company in Acts?’ in Jens Schröter (ed.), *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 161

Finally, David Smith's recent article¹¹⁰ also makes the suggestion that Luke could be Jewish, Luke's audience could have been composed of many Jews and that Luke-Acts occupies a very Jewish perspective. In favour of Lukan authorship he points to Luke's use of scripture and his stylistic use of the LXX: 'allusions and echoes of the scriptures are woven throughout Luke's writing in a manner that, for the attuned reader, suggests an author whose theological vision was shaped by a lifetime of reading Israel's scriptures.'¹¹¹ In favour of Jewish readership, he points out that Jewish Christianity persisted after the middle of the first century and that Luke's lengthy discussion of Jewish acceptance / rejection of the gospel only makes sense if there were continued interaction between Jews and Christians in Luke's community¹¹², or if there were some sort of ongoing mission to the Jews. In favour of the latter point, he notes for example that Luke portrays his Gentile converts as especially godfearers¹¹³ and required to keep at least some of the law (Acts 15). His work admirably fuses recent research on the POTW with Lukan scholarship to help update the paradigm that Luke is a Gentile, separate from Judaism, writing for a predominantly Gentile audience. However, though he uses Luke's use of scripture as evidence that he should be situated inside the Jewish tradition, he also makes no comparison of early Jewish literature and exegesis that would help support the case.

Clearly, there is a growing trend towards considering Luke portraying Christians as a sort of Jew, or at least operating inside the boundaries of Judaism.¹¹⁴ Proposals to this end range broadly along issues of identity-construction, characterisation, and a re-appraisal of the role Jewish violence plays in Luke's narrative. All this matches the recent research on the POTW to suggest Luke advocates no total parting between Jews and Christians in his work. This is a promising way forward beyond the pro / anti

¹¹⁰ David Smith, 'The Jewishness of Luke-Acts: Locating Lukan Christianity Amidst the Parting of The Ways', *JTS* 72 (2021), 738-768

¹¹¹ *Ibid.*, 744-54

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 759

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 764

¹¹⁴ This 'intramural' trend is also finding its way into recent commentaries. See e.g. Michael Parsons: Luke 'situates the Christian community within the larger debate about self-identity... [Luke] clearly understands 'The Way' to be a movement within first-century Judaism' (Acts, 6).

Semitism debate. However, there is greater need for a study which uses scripture interpretation as a means of situating Luke's work within Judaism.

The importance of this cannot be overstated. Luke's use of scripture is frequently used to link him to Judaism. Scripture usage, interestingly, is one of the main arguments in favour of Matthew's Jewishness, the latter of which is much more established than Luke's (so, e.g., Kondradt: 'the scriptural references in Matthew are... so dense that, in my opinion, one must assume that the final form of the Gospel is the result of a longer process of reflection by a Christ-believing Jewish group').¹¹⁵ I think the same might be said of Luke.

Other scholars arguing that Luke's use of scripture evinces his Jewishness are as follows. Koet concludes his study of five OT texts in Luke-Acts by suggesting the Jews were likely a prominent part of the Christian community and Luke's use of scripture 'is especially to be expected within Jewish circles, because it is only among Jews and people who were attached to the synagogue that such direct and specific appeals to the scriptures would be appropriate.'¹¹⁶ He also says this points to an internal Jewish debate about how to admit Gentiles into the people of God.¹¹⁷ Evans counters Sanders' charges of antisemitism, after considering Luke's use of scripture, by arguing 'he failed to distinguish *intramural* polemic from racial hatred' (that is Luke's use of scripture engages in inter-Jewish debates).¹¹⁸ Brawley in *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech*, which considers echoes of scripture in Luke's work, argues Luke's 'Jesus movement never breaks away from Judaism. It always remains a sect within Judaism...'¹¹⁹ However, there have to date been very few studies of Luke's use of scripture which relate it more conclusively to the POTW. Moreover, few studies of

¹¹⁵ Matthias Kondradt, 'Matthew Within or Outside of Judaism? From the 'Parting of the Ways' Model to a

Multifaceted Approach' in Schröter, *Jews and Christians*, 126

¹¹⁶ Koet, *Five Studies*, 157

¹¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 149

¹¹⁸ Craig Evans, 'Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke's Scriptural Apologetic' in Craig Evans, James Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001), 211

¹¹⁹ Robert Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke Acts* (Bloomington: Indiana University, 1995), 31-2

Luke's scripture also consider his use of the OT in consideration with other contemporary texts occupying a Jewish perspective, which is necessary to establish more fully how Luke-Acts may be situated within the framework of inner-Jewish polemic as Tiede has suggested. In my thesis I will address this deficiency. The following section, then, will briefly outline the state of the question on Luke's use of scripture. This will pave the way for my own argument that Luke's use of scripture commends his work as participating in an *intra muros* debate.

3. Scripture and the Partings of the Ways – an Important Link

The importance of scripture for Luke is well-established. Right from the opening words of the prologue he states his work is an account of 'the things that have been fulfilled among us [τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων]', Lk 1:1. This language of 'fulfillment' then recurs throughout Luke-Acts as a key motif in which the events of Israel's past are repeated in the life of Jesus and the church: the word πληρῶω is found nine times in the gospel and 16 times in Acts. It is also critical that the gospel ends with Jesus' saying that 'the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms must be fulfilled [δεῖ πληρωθῆναι]' concerning his resurrection, repentance, mission, and the outpouring of the Spirit (Lk 24:44-8). Luke closes his διήγησις with a detailed discussion (in Jesus' mouth) of the importance of scripture in understanding the events described in his text. From first to last his narrative is about the appropriate interpretation of scripture. Luke's use of scripture is a key piece of evidence that he presents Christianity as a version of Judaism. I will give some brief technical observations here before relating this to the POTW.

Early studies of Luke's use of scripture considered the text form of Luke's quotations. Most scholars today consider him to work especially with text(s) approximating our reconstructed LXX.¹²⁰ Sometimes Luke seems to differ from the phrasing of the LXX.

¹²⁰ Kenneth Litwak, 'The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts: Luke's Scriptural Story of the "Things Accomplished among Us' in Sean A. Adams and Michael Pahl (eds.), *Issues in Luke-Acts* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2010), 150

It is debated whether this reflects stylistic emendation of the LXX, usage of a different Greek *Vorlage*, or adoption of a Hebrew or Aramaic text (I will consider all options in my thesis).¹²¹ More recently debates have proliferated around whether Luke takes the wider context of his scriptures into account, the terminology used to describe his hermeneutic, and whether his use of scripture is primarily theocentric, Christological, or ecclesiological.

Terminologically Luke's use of scripture was seen via a 'proof from prophecy' framework in which certain OT passages were used to legitimate Jesus' messiahship. Typically this sees Luke treating scripture in an atomistic fashion. Meeks applied this approach in considering citations where Luke uses scripture to vindicate the Gentile mission.¹²² It is still common to see the fulfilment of prophecy as a key means of understanding Luke's hermeneutic.¹²³ A key shift came with Bock, whose 'proclamation from prophecy to pattern' recognises that Luke incorporates not only smaller textual units but also larger narrative patterns in the scriptures used in his account.¹²⁴ Thereafter it has become commonplace to consider Luke to be drawing on the wider context of OT texts in his work.¹²⁵ Here Richard Hays' work on scriptural 'echoes', initially in Paul, has been influential, whereby an 'echo' evokes a broad narrative unit¹²⁶. Hays turned to the gospels in *Reading Backwards* (2014) and *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (2016), arguing that Luke... emphasises promise and fulfilment. Israel's scriptures are read by Luke principally as a treasury of God's

¹²¹ Howard Marshall, 'Acts' in D.A. Carson, G.K. Beale (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 516-7

¹²² James Meek, *The Gentile Mission in Old Testament Citations in Acts* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2009), 134

¹²³ Litwak, 'The Use of the Old', 154; David Pao, Eckhard Schnabel, 'Luke' in Beale, Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament*, 252

¹²⁴ Bock, *Proclamation*, 274-77

¹²⁵ See e.g. Koet, *Five Studies*; Brawley, *Text*; Rebecca Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (London: Bloomsbury, 1997); Kenneth Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2005); David Moessner, *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's 'Christ': A New Reading of the 'Gospel Acts' of Luke* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2016), 205-237, who sees the Lukan travel discourse as a parallel to Deuteronomy where Moses teaches the people of Israel on entry to the promised land.

¹²⁶ Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1993), 20

promises to the covenant people...¹²⁷ through ‘subtle echoing of OT narrative patterns, creating a ‘scriptural’ symbolic world for the story of Jesus Christ.’¹²⁸ In my work I will draw on both echoes, allusions and citations to consider how Luke uses scripture.

3.1. Luke’s Ecclesiological Hermeneutic

Luke’s hermeneutical strategy has also been labelled variably as Christocentric, theocentric and ecclesiological. Earlier studies tended to focus on its Christological aspects.¹²⁹ Brawley argued for a theocentric framework: ‘the spring out of which the eschatological, ecclesiastical, and Christological currents flow is God’.¹³⁰ However, to say that ‘God’ is the controlling hermeneutic is arguably too broad to be of much explanatory use. Later studies have begun to highlight Luke’s ecclesiological use of scripture. This has much capacity to shed light on the POTW, as we will see. The importance of an ecclesiological hermeneutic for Luke can be well-illustrated in Lk 24. This shows the fallacy of separating Christology from ecclesiology.

Here, Jesus says, ‘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 [τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ] in all the scriptures’ (Lk 24:26-7). Likewise in v44: ‘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’. This sets Jesus up as a major referent of OT texts. However, it will not do to consider only Christology here. Rather, the scriptures are also tied to the creation of a new Spirit-empowered community: in light of the

¹²⁷ Richard Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014), 99; Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2018)

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 100

¹²⁹ See summary in François Bovon, *Luke the Theologian Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)* (Waco TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 95

¹³⁰ Brawley, *Text*, 86

scriptures ('thus it is written', v46), 'repentance and forgiveness of sins is to be proclaimed in his name to *all nations*, beginning from Jerusalem. You are *witnesses* of these things' (vv46-8). Here 'nations' and 'witnesses' address the creation of an inclusive community drawn from all tribes and composed of a number of witnesses. Christology leads to ecclesiology here. Luke's ecclesiological use of scripture is also suggested in his prologue. Here he speaks of 'the things that have been fulfilled among us [τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων]. He does not speak here of Jesus as the figure anticipated in scripture. Rather, it is πραγμάτων: 'things, events, deeds,' that are fulfilled. These are mentioned 'so that you may know the truth [τὴν ἀσφάλειαν]' One might ask what these πραγμάτων, then, are. It is telling that Lk 1-2, which seems to set up a paradigm for the rest of Luke's work, immediately after tells not only of the coming messiah but also the restoration of God's people. This suggests that the 'assurance' [τὴν ἀσφάλειαν] Luke seeks to engender in his hearers must at least partially address the question of 'who are the people of God?'¹³¹ Christology must be linked to ecclesiology: scripture anticipates both.

A key feature of Luke's ecclesiological hermeneutic is his use of scripture to legitimate believers as the true people of God. As Hays says, 'the more characteristic function of scripture is to shape the community of Jesus' followers as 'a people prepared for the Lord' (Lk 1:16).¹³² Luke's ecclesiological hermeneutic is important for the POTW given that both issues are about how Luke defines the Christian community. In the following chapters I will explore how Luke uses scripture ecclesologically. The main scholars addressing Luke's use of scripture from an ecclesiological perspective are Litwak, Pao and Wendel.

Litwak considers echoes of the OT as well as more explicit citations. He especially considers how scripture is used by Luke to legitimate community identity:¹³³ 'this

¹³¹ For the importance of this question see John T. Carroll, 'The Uses of Scripture in Luke-Acts' in *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 513-54; also Jacques Dupont, 'The Apologetic Use of the OT in the Speeches of Acts' in *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating: New York, Paulist, 1979), 156

¹³² Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco TX: Baylor University Press, 2016), 275. He also concurs that Christology and ecclesiology cannot be too readily separated, 107.

¹³³ Kenneth Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomsbury: T&T Clark, 2005), 204

[scriptural] continuity legitimates not only Jesus and the first Christians as part of the true Israel and therefore those who offer the correct interpretation of scripture, but also Luke's audience as properly interpreting the scriptures of Israel, over against other groups (cf. Lk 24:44-50).¹³⁴ I will also explore how Luke uses scripture to this end. As an example of this sort of approach see, for example, his comments on Joel and Acts 2. Here Joel 3:1-5 is used to demarcate the Spirit-empowered people of God. Thus 'all who call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved' (Acts 2:21) is a promise used to define the true Israel. Litwak moves beyond 'proof-from-prophecy' and 'promise-fulfillment', citing these as vague, to 'framing in discourse'. That is, Luke models large narrative units on the OT for the purpose of showing continuity between Jesus and his disciples with Israel. I will also consider the wider context of Israel's scriptures in my thesis. Litwak also invokes the 'New Exodus' paradigm in Luke, as Pao does in more detail below. He does not relate Luke's use of scripture to the POTW.

David Pao rightly points out that 'no discussion concerning the purpose of the Lukan writings can avoid the question of the Lukan use of scripture.'¹³⁵ His excellent study *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* examines Luke's use of Isa 40-55. Here he locates a 'new exodus' (NE) theme which recurs throughout the text and argues that 'Luke-Acts should primarily be read within the framework of the Isaianic New Exodus [INE]'.¹³⁶ Like Litwak, he states Luke's aim to establish 'the identity of the early Christian community as the true people of God over against those who offer competitive claims seems to be the issue that controls the development of the narrative'.¹³⁷ This INE programme entails the restoration of Israel as Pao outlines how Luke uses Isaiah to include the classic tropes associated with Israel's restoration (the restored twelve tribes; the rebuilt Davidic kingdom, etc.) Pao's study powerfully explicates how Luke used scripture to articulate the identity of the Christian movement. However, there are several caveats to Pao's work.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 173

¹³⁵ Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 252

¹³⁶ Ibid., 10

¹³⁷ Ibid., p. 14

First, to suggest the INE is the main hermeneutical paradigm behind Luke-Acts is to overlook the importance of the other texts used by Luke to inform his theology.¹³⁸ It might be better to see the Isaianic narrative as one among several other equally valid narratives in Luke's work, then – as he intimates when he links his narrative with 'the law of Moses, the prophets and the Psalms' (Lk 24:44) – not just Isaiah.¹³⁹ Second, while Pao claims Luke defines believers as the true people of God against 'those who offer competitive claims [to be God's people]', he makes no mention of what these claims might be nor how additional communities might have used the same scriptures to develop their own identity. His interaction with how other early readers used scripture to articulate identity is brief. Finally, Pao does not relate Luke's use of scripture to the POTW.

3.2. Scripture and the Partings of the Ways in Luke-Acts

The most detailed study that relates Lukan scripture use, identity and the POTW comes from Susan Wendel. Her work, *Scriptural Interpretation and the Writings of Justin Martyr* (2011) is the most pertinent to my own research. This compares Luke's use of scripture with that of Justin Martyr [JM]'s *Dialogue with Trypho the Jew*. Much of her work paves the way for my own project. Luke-Acts she dates to the 1st century; the latter to the 2nd.

Concerning the POTW her comments pre-empt the discussions which have emerged in subsequent scholarship. It 'is no longer tenable to conclude that they [Luke-Acts and Justin Martyr] were part of a monolithic "Gentile Christianity" that stood over against Torah-observant Judaism'.¹⁴⁰ Likewise an 'early and clearly defined

¹³⁸ Many of these also occur at 'strategic places' in Luke's narrative (e.g. Joel 3). Pao also states 'the wider program of the INE is not systematically integrated into any second-temple non-Christian material' (31). If the INE were as comprehensive and obvious a program as Pao suggests, might not other early Jewish readers have picked up on it?

¹³⁹ Mollen's work, *Transformation*, offers a helpful corrective to Pao. While he acknowledges that Luke uses Isaiah at key points in his narrative (60-63) and that themes from Isa 40-55 explain part of Luke's narrative, he rightly critiques the idea that this is the sole controlling hermeneutic for Luke.

¹⁴⁰ Susan Wendel, *Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-Definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 49

separation between “Jewish” and “Gentile” Christians can no longer be assumed.¹⁴¹ Luke does not participate in a Christianity that saw itself as separate to Judaism.¹⁴² Her thesis is that Justin Martyr presents the church as the true Israel replacing Jews as God’s people, as true heirs to the scriptures. Luke holds out a *future for Jews*, and only believing Jews are true heirs of Israel’s scripture promises.

The first part of her work outlines how early Jewish groups came to see scripture interpretation as a means of demarcating the true people of God. Scriptural exegesis came to be seen as a mode of divinely inspired revelation. This led to rival claims to expertise used to distinguish Jews from Jews and to delineate the true Israel.¹⁴³ Both Luke and Justin Martyr, she suggests, portray themselves as offering divinely inspired interpretation of scripture.¹⁴⁴ Justin Martyr uses scripture to assert the supremacy of Christians over competing Greco-Roman philosophies. For Luke (and this is very important), competition between Christians and other Jews mirrors the ‘self-defining strategies of the early Jewish apocalyptic groups who laid claims to the Jewish scriptures as part of a struggle for recognition within an inner-Jewish context.’¹⁴⁵ This is the milieu into which I will place Luke-Acts. While Justin Martyr separates all Jews from non-Jews, denouncing the former entirely, Luke presents a division *among* Jews along the lines of the Deuteronomistic history, in which faithful Jews are blessed and unfaithful ones inherit judgment.¹⁴⁶ I will also argue that Luke presents an Israel divided into faithful / unfaithful Jews in the following chapters.

A key part of Wendel’s work consists in working out who the different authors portray as heirs of scripture promises. Luke only portrays believing Jews inheriting the blessing given to Abraham (Acts 3:26). Believing Gentiles do not receive these directly; rather they instead ‘receive the blessing that Christ and Christ-believing Jews

¹⁴¹ Ibid., 50

¹⁴² Ibid., 53

¹⁴³ Ibid., 67. To make this point she cites 1-2 Chron, 2 Ezra, Ben Sira, Dan 9, 1 Enoch, 1QpHab, 1QH, CD, 1QS.

¹⁴⁴ See, e.g., Lk 24:45, where Jesus opens their minds to understand the scriptures – as with Lydia in Acts 16:14. Cf. also Justin encountering the old man, and the suggestion that Christians have grace to understand the scriptures in Dial. 30:1, 58:1, 78:10-11, 92:1, 100:2, 119:1

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 357

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 357, 359

mediate to all peoples in their role as the offspring of Abraham' (Gen 12:3, 22:18). Justin Martyr is inclined to consider all Jews as disobedient in 92:1-5; a 'useless, disobedient, and faithless race' (130:3-5). Again with Isaianic promises, Wendel argues that 'Jews and non-Jews become recipients of different aspects of Isaianic promises – those that relate to Israel and to the nations especially'. For example, Lk 2:32, alluding to Isa 49:6, refers to 'a light for revelation to the Gentiles and for glory to your people Israel.' Apparently this implies a different set of promises for believing Jews and Gentiles. Finally, Wendel upholds the distinction between Jews and Gentiles also in relation to the Spirit. Though Gentiles receive the Holy Spirit she does not see this as evidence of a change of status or their replacement of Israel as with Justin Martyr, who sees the Spirit transferred from Jews to Gentiles (Dial. 87:5-6, 82:1, alluding to Isa 11:2-3). In summary, 'Luke portrays Jews and non-Jewish Christ believers as recipients of different types of scripture promises: the former receive these promises made to Israel and the latter become beneficiaries of the promises that predict the inclusion of the nations'.¹⁴⁷ And Luke differs from Justin Martyr in portraying a division between Jews, while the latter places the division between Jews and Gentiles.

Wendel's is an important study relating scripture use to ecclesiology. Hers is one of few studies of Luke's use of scripture offering sustained engagement with another text addressing the issue of who constitutes the people of God. She gives good evidence that Luke-Acts is situated within the context of inter-Jewish debate and is in tune with recent research on the POTW to challenge ideas that Luke advocates an early parting of the ways. However, her attempt to argue that Luke sees Jews and Gentiles as inheriting different promises is misguided. Many of her examples to make this point make artificial distinctions which seem alien to the text. For example, Lk 2:25 does read that Gentiles inherit 'light' but Jews 'glory' – but might this not simply be an example of poetic parallelism, where different words express the same concept? Moreover, Justin Martyr's *Trypho* is notably later than Luke-Acts and by making supersessionist claims situates itself firmly outside Judaism. There is

¹⁴⁷ Ibid., 530

consequently room to compare Luke's work with 'Jewish' texts also asking 'who are the people of God?' to shed more light on the important issue of how other early Jewish groups used scripture to identify the early Christian movement within Israel, and Luke's similarity with these. This is where my study comes in. I will attempt to balance Wendel's detailed study of the use of the OT in Luke-Acts and a non-Jewish text, by presenting the other side which shows Luke is closer in outlook affinities with early Jewish literature. Thus scripture use in itself is not evidence of one's Jewishness (as with Trypho's work) -- but if an author's use of the OT is remarkably similar to that of his Jewish contemporaries, as I will argue, it can be taken in favour of this suggestion.

I will draw on two other studies for their methodological input. Fox, *The Hermeneutics of Social Identity in Luke-Acts* (2021) helpfully draws on the idea of 'legitimation' and social-scientific method to articulate how Luke creates group identity. Fox applies 'Social Identity Theory', which is a 'social science that studies group membership, attributing value and worth to individuals through their participation in an ingroup over and against other outgroups'.¹⁴⁸ Within this model 'early Christianity looks like a reform movement, which starts to break with the parent movement of Judaism and become its own sect, creating differentiation in various ways.'¹⁴⁹ He draws on the work of Francis Watson, who as I pointed out earlier has similarly argued that Paul defines the early Christian communities through a process of denunciation, antithesis, and reinterpretation of traditions.¹⁵⁰ These studies suggest identity is established through a process of differentiation from others, in binary fashion. My own study will reflect this approach. In similar fashion I will argue Luke uses scripture to *denounce* unbelieving Jews and to *vindicate* believers as the faithful portion of Israel. Fox minimally focuses on scripture use. The study can be critiqued for focusing too narrowly on godfearers – it is difficult to determine whether this is Luke's ideal reader given the overlap between godfearers and Jews in Luke-Acts. In my thesis I am arguing that Luke does *not* break away from

¹⁴⁸ Fox, *Hermeneutics*, 30

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 48

¹⁵⁰ Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015)

Judaism. But his use of social-scientific categories to explain the dynamics of identity-formation in Luke-Acts is helpful and something I will try and emulate in my own work.

A final study I will build on is White, *All the Prophets Agree* (2020). He correctly notes the lack of comparison with other early Jewish literature as it relates to scripture interpretation. To remedy this, his study of Luke's use of minor prophets also introduces a third interlocutor into his scripture comparisons to initiate a 'three-way conversation'¹⁵¹ White only considers the minor prophets in Luke's work.¹⁵² White's work is particularly valuable (and rare) in exemplifying the importance of comparing Luke's use of scripture with other early Jewish texts, and also in correcting an overemphasis on Luke's use of Isaiah to the detriment of other OT texts.¹⁵³ Like him I will introduce additional 'interlocutors' to consider how Luke's use of scripture relates to other interpreters.

This is the state of the question concerning Luke's use of scripture today. There has been lively debate about Luke's hermeneutical strategy. Few studies relate Luke's use of scripture to the parting of the ways in any sustained manner. The approaches with the most ability to alter perspectives on this topic are the 'ecclesiological' ones. However, there is a lack of sustained comparison between Luke's use of scripture and other Jewish texts also engaged in scripture interpretation. Required is a study that considers how Luke uses scripture to define his community as a school within Judaism, through detailed comparison with other contemporary texts making the same claim. I will do this as follows.

¹⁵¹ Aaron White, *All the Prophets Agree* (Leiden: Brill, 2020), 35.

¹⁵² His conclusions: 'Luke discerns the pattern of the Day of the Lord in the Twelve Prophets' (52). He sees the 'inauguration of the last days as the organising framework of Luke-Acts' (223).

¹⁵³ Studies of Luke's use of scripture overwhelmingly focus on Isaiah: B.J. Koet, *Five Studies on the Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Peeters, 1989); Rebecca Denova, *Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997); David Pao, *New Exodus*; Mallen, *Transformation*; Holly Beers, *The Followers of Jesus as the 'Servant': Luke's Model from Isaiah for the Disciples in Luke-Acts* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015). Beyond White an exception to this rule is Peter Doble, 'The Psalms in Luke-Acts' in Moyise and Menken (eds.), *The Psalms in the New Testament* (London; New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 83-118

4. Thesis Structure

This thesis seeks to reconcile disparate research on the New Testament use of the Old Testament and the POTW in Luke-Acts. I will suggest that Luke seeks to answer the question, ‘who are the people of God?’ ‘Legitimation’, as others have pointed out, is a significant part of the genre of ancient historiography.¹⁵⁴ In the narrative we are seeing history recounted for the purpose of identity formation. I will argue that Luke uses scripture to *commend* Christians as the faithful portion of Israel and to *denounce* unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. This situates him inside Judaism. He does not advocate a parting of the ways in his work.

A crucial part of identity creation comes from separation and differentiation from others. The division within Israel becomes a controlling theme throughout the narrative in which Christians are consistently portrayed as the right interpreters of Israel’s scriptures over and against rival Jewish interpreters. This, I suggest, accounts for Luke’s emphasis on prophecy and fulfilment throughout his narrative. This is the purpose for which he puts scripture to use. This is why most of his citations of scripture occur in speeches to Jews, why the bulk of Paul’s apologetic speeches are directed to Jews, why he makes such great efforts to portray Jesus and his followers as engaged in scripture debates with rival Jewish interpreters and winning. This is why the Christian movement is portrayed as a *ἀίρεσις* within Israel and why the hope of the ‘Way’ is none other than the ‘hope of Israel’: Luke uses scripture to *vindicate* the Christian movement as the faithful portion of Israel.

Luke also uses scripture to *denounce* Jewish opponents as the unfaithful portion of Israel. This twofold approach of affirming and rejecting corresponds to the ‘falling and rising’ of many in Israel, as Simeon predicts (Lk 2:34). Each of Luke’s echoes, allusions and citations of scripture can be considered with this ecclesiological agenda in mind. Doing so sheds much light on who he considers the Christian community to

¹⁵⁴ Gregory Sterling, *Shaping the Past to Define the Present: Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Chicago: Eerdmans, 2023), 123; Fox, 43

be and how he considers it the exemplar among rival Jewish sects. The thesis will proceed as follows.

First, in chapter one, I will compare Luke's ecclesiological use of scripture with Paul's in Romans 9-11. These are appropriate dialogue partners for several reasons. Paul is a Jew. He seeks to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel and these chapters are ripe with many scripture citations used to make this point. My chapter one will point out the close affinities between Luke's Paul and the Pauline epistles in such a manner as to argue that Luke, like Paul, is engaged in an inter-Jewish debate. I will focus here on citations of scripture.

In chapter two I will compare Luke's use of scripture with that of John's in Revelation 12. This apocalyptic text is one of the 'most Jewish' documents in the NT and also shows the attempt to demarcate Christians as the faithful Israel over and against rival Jewish claims to the same. Revelation 12 particularly exemplifies this, with its image of cosmic conflict between the woman Israel and Satan illustrating well how this apocalyptic interpreter used scripture to commend believers as the faithful Israel through OT conflict traditions defining who the faithful of God are. In this chapter I will focus on echoes of scripture.

Finally, chapter three will compare Luke's use of scripture with that of 4QFlorilegium (4Q174). The Qumran writers are especially striking for their claims to be the faithful Israel and for their strong polemic directed towards other Jewish groups. This text reflects this approach with its reshaping of OT texts about temple and messiah to commend the Qumran covenanters as the faithful portion of Israel. Again, I am primarily focused on citation of scripture here.

It could be argued that the use of scripture in itself does not require Luke to be Jewish, nor Luke-Acts to be a Jewish text. Later Christian texts such as the *Epistle of Barnabas* and Justin Martyr's *Dialogue with Trypho* also use scripture to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel, and yet move the Christian movement outside Judaism. Likewise, Luke could well have been a Gentile who learned the

scriptures after conversion. However, I believe the close affinities Luke's use of scripture has with the Jewish texts in my thesis argues against the idea that he moves outside Judaism. Moreover, I am not trying to prove that Luke is a Jew, only that he is more Jewish than previously suggested. For the majority of the thesis I will compare the same OT texts used by Luke and the other authors. At times I will compare how each author uses a different text. The use of these different OT texts still yields fruitful insight on Luke-Acts when both authors use these OT passages strategically to make a similar theological point. As a case in point I will consider Luke's use of Isa 6:9-10 (Acts 28:26-7) with Paul's use of Isa 59:20, 27:9 (Rom 11:25-7). Though the OT texts are not the same, (a) they both occur at the end of Acts and the conclusion of Romans 11, (b) both authors relate them to the Gentile mission, (c) both authors explicitly use them to address the future of Israel, and (d) the OT texts are drawn from narrative sections addressing the hope of Israel's restoration. These similarities, then, are still sufficient to warrant comparison. Detailed rationale for other comparisons are given in each chapter respectively.

It will be apparent that I have chosen texts from a range of genres for comparison. This is not only interesting but it is also heuristic. For some reason most comparative studies of Luke-Acts have favoured Greco-Roman texts over Jewish ones. This may be due to the consensus that considers the former a type of Hellenistic historiography more along the lines of, say, Plutarch or Thucydides than of a Jewish text like 1 Maccabees.¹⁵⁵ The assumption here seems to be that texts of similar genres elicit better comparisons. Fortunately, the recent work of Kylie Crabbe has shown this is not necessarily the case, and I refer the reader to her own comparative work on Luke-Acts here for the suggestion that there is great value in comparing Luke-Acts with texts outside its own genre.¹⁵⁶ I hope my own thesis will gently push against some of

¹⁵⁵ For notable exceptions see Sean Adams, *Greek Genres and Jewish Authors: Negotiating Literary Culture in the Greco-Roman Era?* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020); Brian Rosner, 'Acts and Biblical History' in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 65-82

¹⁵⁶ In her work *Luke-Acts and the End of History* she suggests, for example, that many textual themes transcend genre; moreover, that genre categories often overlap, and indeed genres change over time (21-31). Her own work shows in exemplary fashion how Luke's work can profitably be compared with texts of different genres, and I will use hers as a model for my own approach here.

the limits produced by labelling it tightly as a *historiography* or some form of *bios*: as the subsequent chapters show, it also has epistolary features; parts of it are quite like the Qumran *pesharim*; and (surprisingly overlooked in discussions of Lukan genre) it is also very apocalyptic.

Concerning date and authorship: with the majority I consider Luke-Acts to be a document produced at the end of the first century, although precise issues of dating are less important to the topic of the parting of the ways now that recent research has shown the shift from Judaism to Christianity to take place much later than was formerly supposed.¹⁵⁷ I am inclined to think Luke was a godfearer or one steeped in Judaism from birth, though we cannot know this for sure. The audience I imagine might have been composed of a large number of Jews, although I will reserve judgment on this until my conclusion.

Some brief words on terminology should also be made here. Ἰουδαῖος I will translate as Jew. I appreciate the work of (e.g.) Mason here in emphasising the ethnic translation of this term ('Judean')¹⁵⁸, but Luke typically uses this as a trans-ethnic category not limited to Judeans (e.g. Lk 7:3, Acts 2:5, 11:19). It is widely recognised that there was no single 'Judaism', which has led some to problematise the term. However, while recognising there were different schools of thought within it, I retain the term 'Judaism' as a helpful umbrella term with several unifying features. I will use it to denote a set of practices and beliefs whose adherents stress unity with the Jewish people, loyalty to Israel's God, concern with temple worship,¹⁵⁹ and commitment to Torah.¹⁶⁰ Any means of upholding the above is 'Jewish'. Any attempt to uphold the above places one 'inside' or 'within' Judaism. This is difficult to measure at times given the variety of ways in which Torah and temple obligations may be

¹⁵⁷ i.e. A second-century dating would not now suggest Luke advocates a parting of the ways in the manner that it would have done in previous years.

¹⁵⁸ Steve Mason, 'Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History', *JSJ* 38 (2007), 457-512

¹⁵⁹ Even if manifested in critique.

¹⁶⁰ For similar attempts to define 'Judaism', see especially E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief* (London: SCM, 1992); Seth Schwartz, *Imperialism and Jewish Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009), 49-99

interpreted. In this case, whatever form it may take, it is above all the conviction that one or one's community is concerned with Torah and temple worship which for this project fulfills the definition of 'inside Judaism'. I have already noted Luke's use of *χριστιανός* to describe the believing community in Acts 11:26, 26:28. Here he does not use the term in a strictly religious sense, or in contrast to Judaism as it has often been taken to mean. However, with these caveats in mind, with the majority of literature on Luke-Acts I will continue to use the term 'Christian' to describe Christ-followers, and 'Christianity' as a helpful designation for the Christ-following movement. Despite the popularity of referring to the Old Testament as the 'Hebrew Bible' I will use the former designation for these texts: the latter is supposedly more 'neutral', free from an undue Christian appropriation of the scriptures, but I am looking at the New Testament use of the Old anyway, which presupposes a Christian orientation to them in the first place; and not all of it is written in Hebrew. By 'Septuagint' / LXX I am referring to the Rahlfs' edition, but I will also note key textual variations in the Göttingen edition. Unless otherwise stated, English translations of OT and NT texts are taken from the NRSV. Finally, some might quibble with my designation 'true / faithful Israel' as anachronistic, or at least absent from the terminology of Luke-Acts. Indeed Luke does omit to use this language himself, but this does not mean the category of a 'true Israel' was not part of his conceptual framework, not least because the concern to distinguish loyal from disloyal Israelites is as old as the remnant language in (e.g.) Isa 37:31-2 and Mic 4:7, 7:18.

My thesis therefore makes the following contributions to New Testament scholarship: it fills a much-needed gap in introducing a 'third interlocutor' into comparisons of Luke's use of scripture; it presents the value of cross-genre comparisons; it urges a re-evaluation of Luke's 'Jewishness'; it bridges the gap between Luke's use of scripture and the partings of the ways; it adds further weight to the idea that Luke is arguing in an *intra muros* debate; and it suggests it is high-time for Luke's relation to the partings of the ways be re-evaluated.

Chapter One: Luke-Acts and Romans 9-11: Situating the Church within Judaism

Luke uses scripture to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel, in a manner that seems to place him inside the Jewish tradition. On this basis his work commends no separation between Judaism and Christianity. This chapter will make the case for this by comparing Luke's work with Paul's use of scripture in Romans 9-11. In these chapters Paul writes in a similar timeframe to Luke,¹ in the wake of the Gentile mission. Like Luke he has had to come to terms with Jewish rejection of the gospel even though some Jews have received it well. As with Luke's work, this seems to prompt a certain theological crisis: who then are the people of God, and is God faithful to his covenant promises to Israel? Like Luke, Paul uses scripture heavily to make his point here – Romans 9-11 has the fullest collection of OT citations in the entire Pauline corpus.

The texts are not without differences. While Luke and Acts are typically understood as works of biography or historiography with theology couched in narrative, Paul's takes an epistolary form with more abstract discussions about law, righteousness and faith. Moreover, there is a long history in scholarship of separating the 'Paul of Acts' from the 'Paul of the epistles' either on theological² or on historical grounds.³ Because of this, many scholars have concluded that Luke neither knew Paul nor his letters, and deny any close proximity between them.

However, these differences are not insurmountable. In terms of *genre*, Paul sometimes uses history in a manner comparable to Luke (compare, e.g., Stephen's summary of Israel's history in Acts 7:1-50 with Paul's in Romans 9:6-18). Luke's work also takes on epistolary features at times (letters are recorded at pivotal points in

¹ See below for issues of dating.

² See e.g. Philip Vielhauer, 'On the "Paulinism" of Acts' in L. Keck and J.L. Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1966), 33-50

³ For example, Acts records Paul makes five trips to Jerusalem; Galatians implies he only goes twice. This could be because Paul seeks to highlight his independence from Jerusalem.

Acts 15:23-9, 23:26-30). *Theologically*, many now argue for closer theological similarities between both of them than was once suggested.⁴ *Historically* there is also much to commend Acts as reliable, and more in tune with the epistles than formerly suggested.⁵ This increases the possibility that Luke knew Paul personally, as the 'we' speeches may imply.⁶ It has also been suggested recently that Luke used Paul's letters.⁷ Though these latter two points cannot be determined absolutely they are still important in demonstrating how scholars now are increasingly seeing similarities between Luke and Acts, and that the two are therefore suitable for comparison.

Most importantly for this chapter, in Romans 9-11 Paul's Jewishness seems to come to the forefront. Rather than advocating a parting of the ways here, he likely anticipates a future for unbelieving Jews and remains deeply sympathetic to his fellow Jews. Here, I suggest, he uses scripture to vindicate believers as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. This offers particularly helpful comparison with Luke-Acts, which also portrays Paul as a faithful Jew and shares similar points of argument with Romans 9-11 that also highlight the Jewishness of Luke's outlook. I will focus on three groups of scripture citations below that suggest Luke uses the OT ecclesiologically in a similar manner to Paul.

⁴ Vielhauer's work has been heavily critiqued for its outdated assumptions on Pauline theology. See, e.g. Stanley Porter, *Paul in Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001), 189-206

⁵ See e.g. Howard Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970)

⁶ That Luke knew Paul, see, e.g.: Craig Keener, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary, Vol 1* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2015), 407; James Dunn, *Acts* (Peterborough: Epworth, 1996), x; Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), 50; Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 53; David Peterson, *Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 1-4. The first person 'we' in Acts has been alternatively understood as (a) a rhetorical device used for added narrative intensity, or (b) Luke's use of a travel diary not his own. However, why would he add this at only mundane points in his narrative? And (b) if from a travel diary, this creates the problem of explaining why Luke would omit to remove the 'we', which seems a clumsy, un-Lukan use of his source material when compared to (e.g.) his use of Mark. It is not necessary in my chapter to argue conclusively that Luke knew Paul personally or his directly used his letters, though I reserve tentative judgment on this till the end.

⁷ See especially Richard Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2006), 51-148. I will at times consider in this chapter whether Luke used Romans. This is a possibility, although it is impossible to tell for certainty.

The chapter is structured as follows. In section 1 I will outline recent contributions to the idea that Paul may be situated within Judaism. I will then compare this with Luke's portrait of Paul to suggest both commend a highly 'Jewish' perspective. Here I will compare Luke and Paul's use of scripture generally to argue that both share similar exegetical assumptions and both adopt an 'ecclesiological' hermeneutic whereby scripture is used to demarcate the people of God. In section 2 I will point out how in Romans 9-11 Paul seems to be arguing from 'within Judaism', using scripture to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelievers as the unfaithful portion of Israel. The rest of the chapter will compare specific citations of scripture by both authors. Section 3 will compare Acts 15:16-19 / Amos 9:11 and Romans 9:25-29 / Hos 2:25, 2:1 / Isa 1:9. Section 4 will compare Joel 3 in Acts 2:17-21, Rom 10:13. Section 5 will compare Romans 11:26-27 / Isa 59:20, 27:9 and Acts 28:26-28 / Isa 6:9. This will reveal the following: (1) Both Luke and Paul seem to portray the Christian community as the faithful remnant of Israel. (2) Both Luke and Paul apply language usually reserved for Israel to the Gentiles in such a manner that implies their inclusion into the faithful portion of Israel. (3) Both Luke and Paul denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel, although Luke is more negative on their future than Paul. Though his ending is more negative than Paul's, this does not move him outside Judaism - rather he is engaging in prophetic critique of Israel here. These features suggest that Luke like Paul seeks to present the Christian movement as the faithful expression of Judaism. This mitigates against the idea that he advocates a parting of the ways in his work.

1. Jewishness and Scripture Use in Paul and Luke

1.1. 'Paul within Judaism'

Paul can be firmly situated within the Jewish thought world. As I noted in my introduction, the New Perspective has steered away from the simplistic contrast between Paul's message and legalistic Judaism. This began with the work of Krister Stendahl, who suggested that Paul suffered from no modern guilt complex in relation to the law, and that he was called rather than converted, hence remained within Jewish tradition.⁸ Then followed Ed Sanders, who suggested that the study of Paul had been tainted by a caricature of early Judaism as marked by 'works righteousness'. His landmark study⁹ made the case that early Judaism, rather, was characterised by 'covenantal nomism', a system where God elects by grace but one remains in the covenant community by works. On this grounds Paul was apparently not too dissimilar from his Jewish contemporaries. Subsequent contributions primarily by Dunn and Wright consolidated this perspective, which came to be recognised by the suggestion that Paul critiques ethnocentrism rather than 'salvation by works' in early Judaism;¹⁰ that many Jews had abused 'boundary markers' such as circumcision by wrongly using them to exclude non-Jews;¹¹ and that justification for Paul meant rectifying this social problem by broadening the contours of the covenant community.¹² This view is not without critique.¹³ Most significant is its distinction between an exclusive Judaism and an inclusive Christianity. This is a dichotomy which calls for more nuance. The claim that early Judaism was marked by ethnocentrism

⁸ Krister Stendahl, 'The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West', *HTR* 56 (1963), 199-215

⁹ Ed Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977)

¹⁰ E.g. James Dunn, *The Parting of the Ways* (London: SCM, 1991), 135-36; N.T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said* (Oxford: Lion, 1997), 32

¹¹ E.g. James Dunn, *Jesus, Paul and the Law* (), 216-19

¹² N.T. Wright, 'The Letter to the Romans', *New Interpreter's Bible Commentary* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 440

¹³ See, e.g., Stephen Westerholm, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2004); Donald Carson, Peter O'Brien and Mark Seifrid (eds.), *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol 1*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001); Carson, O'Brien and Seifrid, *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol 2* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2004)

is a value-judgment which seems little better than to say it was marred by 'works righteousness'. Most recently Barclay has refined the portrayal of 'grace' in early Judaism in such a way as to demonstrate that Paul was unlike his Jewish contemporaries in some respects.¹⁴ The social dimensions of the New Perspective should be weighed carefully. Nonetheless it has succeeded in emphasising the Jewishness of much of Paul's thought in a way that continues to define present scholarship. This Jewishness can further be understood as follows.

In Paul's own words, he is in an Israelite (Rom 9:3, 11:1, Phil 3:5, 2 Cor 11:22); 'circumcised on the eighth day, of the people of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; in regard to the law, a Pharisee' (Phil 3:5). He speaks with fondness of the Jewish 'adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises' (Rom 9:4), referring to Jews as 'my own people' (Rom 9:3). This shows him to be very entrenched within Jewish tradition.

This does not mean he is entirely uncritical of his Jewish heritage. At times, for example, he speaks negatively of the law (e.g. 'if it had not been for the law, I would not have known sin, Rom 7:7), and seems to describe his life in Judaism as a thing of the past (he speaks of 'my earlier life in Judaism', Gal 1:13, and refers to his eighth-day circumcision, Hebrew heritage, membership of Israel as 'rubbish', σκύβαλα, Phil 3:4-8). This might suggest Paul does promote something of a departure from Judaism in his work. However, the so-called 'Paul within Judaism' school has recently challenged some of these ideas, showing that Paul may well have been more pro-Torah than previously suggested, and that he does not diminish his Jewish heritage.

That Paul did not entirely dispense with Torah is seen, for example, in the fact that he never rules out Jewish observance of the law explicitly.¹⁵ As he states, 'was anyone at the time of his call already circumcised? Let him not seek to remove the marks of circumcision' (1 Cor 7:18). Rather 'let each 'remain in the condition in which you were

¹⁴ John Barclay, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017)

¹⁵ Pamela Eisenbaum, *Paul was not a Christian* (New York: Harper One, 2010), 224.

called' (v20). This may suggest he saw no need for Jews to cease observing Jewish practices, and that the importance of demonstrating Jewish ethnic identity persists for him.¹⁶ A similar sentiment might also be seen when he claims 'what advantage has the Jew? Or what value is circumcision? Much in every way' (Rom 3:1).¹⁷ Circumcision is not abrogated altogether for Jews, then. Moreover, though he could have prohibited all law-observance in Rom 14:1-15:13 here he seems to adopt a more flexible ethic where different community members could adopt varying practices so long as they respect one another in doing so ('hold the conviction that you have as your own before God', 14:22; cf. also 1 Cor 8:1-13).¹⁸ Finally, ethical admonitions derived from Torah seem to be the basis for Paul's moral instructions for the Gentiles. In traditional Jewish fashion, for example, they are to abstain from idol worship (1 Cor 10:6-14, Gal 5:20), and πορνεία (1 Cor 5:1, 6:13, 18, 7:2 10:6-14).¹⁹ Moses' instruction forms the basis for financial commands (1 Cor 9:8-11) and Paul speaks of love 'which is the fulfilling of the law' - not its abrogation.²⁰ For these reasons it is not adequate to suggest Paul was entirely opposed to the law.

Another reason to emphasise Paul's ongoing place 'within Judaism' concern his statements about Jewish tradition. Novenson, for example, suggests that Paul's former life ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ, (Gal 1:13, 14) does not refer so much to his previous attachment to Jewish tradition as it does to his former role in persecuting the church. This matches the previous verse in Gal 1:13 (where in his earlier life, Paul writes, 'I was violently persecuting the church of God...'). In this case, we might not see a confessed departure from Judaism here, but rather a detachment from a mode of

¹⁶ Matthew Thiessen, *A Jewish Paul - The Messiah's Herald to the Gentiles* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2023), 30

¹⁷ Thiessen, *Jewish Paul*, 42

¹⁸ Jens Schröter, 'Was Paul a Jew Within Judaism? The Apostle to the Gentiles and His Communities in Their Historical Context' in Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall and Joseph Verheyden, *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 95

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 102.

²⁰ According to Paula Fredriksen this is an appeal to Lev 19:8 which was a commentary on the ten commandments (Paula Fredriksen, 'What Does It Mean to See Paul "within Judaism"?' *JBL* 141 (2022), 370; cf. Gal 5:14).

Jewish life that is characterised by violence.²¹ Fredriksen also points out that though Paul considers much of his Jewish past σκύβαλα (Phil 3:4-8), these things are only 'rubbish' in relation to knowing Christ (vv8-9), they are not in themselves wrong.²² In other words, one need not necessarily see Jewish ethnic identity as removed here so much as it is proven inferior to the 'surpassing value of knowing Christ' (v8). This is not the same thing as commending a removal of his Jewish heritage: rather it is putting it in its relative place. In favour of this Paul remains, for example, of the tribe of Benjamin and also a Pharisee (v5). Even if these 'markers' of identity are refused compared to knowing Christ, that does not mean they cease to exist for him. With this in mind these more negative comments on Paul's Jewish identity should also be balanced by those where he is more avowedly proud of his Jewish heritage (e.g. Rom 3:1-2, 9:1-5).

Finally, in favour of the 'Radical New Perspective on Paul', there was simply no norm or standard mode of Torah observance in the first century. Rather, proponents of the 'Paul within Judaism' school point out, there were a plurality of expressions of Torah-observance. This means that it is methodologically difficult to track what would represent a departure from Judaism in relation to law-observance, as opposed merely to a difference in interpretation from within Judaism, as seems to be the case with Paul.²³ That he was considered by many of his contemporaries to be inside the fold of Judaism, and indeed thought of himself as offering one interpretation of Torah within Judaism, is seen in his description of the 'the forty lashes minus one' received five times (2 Cor 11:24). This is a Jewish punishment (cf. Deut 25:2-3) dispensed by his Jewish contemporaries. In order for this to take place he would have had to submit himself to this punishment, remaining in Jewish circles and judicial practice,

²¹ Matthew Novenson, 'Did Paul Abandon either Judaism or Monotheism?' in Bruce Longenecker (ed.), *The New Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 242, comparing this with the same usage of the term in 2 Macc 2:1, 8:1, 14:38, 4 Macc 4:26.

²² Fredriksen, 'Paul "within Judaism"', 377

²³ Kathy Ehrensperger, 'Die Paul within Judaism Perspektive', *EvT 80* (2020), 456-7, Karin Hedner Zetterholm, 'The Question of Assumptions: Torah Observance in the First Century' in Mark Nanos, Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *Paul within Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 91, Fredriksen, 'Paul "within Judaism"', 368.

such that even if chastised by Jews for his views, his interpretation still does not represent a departure from Judaism.²⁴

Of course, the 'Radical New Perspective on Paul' is not without its weaknesses. It is not entirely reasonable to label this the 'Paul within Judaism' perspective as this label seems to suggest that prior interpretations of Paul do not take into account aspects of his Jewishness, which is not entirely the case. Few, for example, would dispute that Paul refers to himself at times as a Jew or Israelite (Gal 2:15, Rom 11:1). Methodologically scholars would do well here to define exactly *from whose perspective* Paul might be considered to be 'within Judaism': Paul's? His contemporary Jews'? His contemporary non-Jews'? Our 21st century context? (For this chapter, as with Luke-Acts throughout this thesis, I will restrict observations to Paul's self-presentation of the Christian movement as being within Judaism).

Another criticism of this trend is the way it retains an ethnic distinction between Jew and Gentile which Paul seems in many cases to collapse. Scholars in the 'Paul within Judaism' perspective frequently argue that Paul typically upholds Torah observance for Jews but not for Gentiles in a manner that places the two in separate camps. Or ambiguity characterises the precise status of non-Jews, who are described in terms such as 'ex-pagan pagans'²⁵ or as those in a 'no-man's land'²⁶ which is neither Jewish nor pagan. This division between the two, however, seems to be contradicted by statements such as 'there is no longer Jew or Greek... for all of you are one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:28) and 'we were all baptized into one body—Jews or Greeks, slaves or free' (1 Cor 12:13).²⁷ In Romans, moreover, Paul writes 'all [παῖς], both Jews and Greeks, are under the power of sin' (Rom 3:9). This inclusive 'all', contra to popular claims in the 'Radical New Perspective' on Paul, suggests there is a deep anthropological reason to consider Jews and Gentiles on the same terms.²⁸ 'No

²⁴ Thiessen, *Jewish Paul*, 42

²⁵ Paula Fredriksen, *Paul: The Pagan's Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 91

²⁶ Ehrensperger, 'Paul within Judaism', 462

²⁷ Paul Foster, 'An Apostle Too Radical for the Radical Perspective on Paul', *ExpTim* 133 (2021), 5

²⁸ Michael Bird, 'An Introduction to the Paul within Judaism Debate' in Michael Bird, Ruben A. Bühner, Jörg Frey, and Brian Rosner (eds.), *Paul within Judaism: Perspectives on Paul and Jewish Identity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023), 18

human [ἄνθρωπος] will be justified before him [God] (Rom 3:20)': thus this is not just a Gentile problem, as many spokespersons for the Radical New Perspective claim.²⁹ Romans 5 makes this clearer with its binary identity markers as being those in Christ (Rom 5:17) vs those in Adam (v14), not (as those in this more recent interpretation might suggest) Jews vs Gentiles. Finally, as I will make much of in this chapter, we might also consider that 'there is no distinction [οὐ ... διαστολή] between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all [πᾶς] in Rom 10:12. In this latter verse we have a return to the inclusive πᾶς which was emphatic in Rom 3:20. In his citation of Joel 3:5 in Rom 10:12 Paul further uses this πᾶς as a catchword to suggest that the universal human problem is given a solution, against the original context of the Joel text, which *creates an eschatological community* in which there is no difference between Jew or Gentile. Again, οὐ ... διαστολή is telling here. I will consider this citation of Joel 3 and more OT citations in more detail below to argue, against the Radical New Perspective on Paul, as I do throughout the rest of this chapter, that Paul merges Jews and Gentiles as one in the people of God, without making a separate eschatological identity for each.

Finally, we might also suggest the 'Radical New Perspective' on Paul goes slightly too far in emphasising the positive statements Paul makes on the law. To be sure, as noted above, he does advocate a limited Torah-observance for Gentiles (e.g. concerning πορνεία, 1 Cor 5:1, and idol worship, 1 Cor 10:6-14). He does leave space for Jews to observe the law (e.g. Rom 14:1-15:13). At the same time, 'cursed is everyone who does not observe and obey all the things written in the book of the law' (Gal 3:10) -- note, 'everyone [πᾶς]', not only Gentiles.³⁰ And 'apart from the law, sin lies dead' (Rom 7:8). A full appraisal of Paul's view on the law must take into account also these negative views. Space does not permit me here to make a full nuanced analysis of Paul's view on the law, as my predominant focus is on Luke-Acts. I will only suggest that Paul upholds the ceremonial function of the law as a Jewish identity marker, even applied in a limited way to Gentiles, while negating its salvific

²⁹ E.g. Matthew Novenson, *Paul, Then and Now* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2022), 83; Fredriksen, *Pagan's Apostle*, 130

³⁰ Foster, *Too Radical*, 4

value. Important for my thesis is recognise that the 'Paul within Judaism' perspective commendably stresses Paul's Jewishness, and the positive attitude Paul has in relation to much of Jewish life,³¹ in a way that has not been so clear in other interpretations. And, most critically, *this portrayal of Paul matches very closely with Luke's own portrayal of Paul as it emerges in Luke-Acts*. Here especially he is portrayed as an observant Jew faithful to Torah, as I will highlight below.

1.2. 'Luke within Judaism?'

Scholars have long-noted the considerable lengths Luke goes to portray Paul as a faithful Jew. Jervell comments, for example, that he is not the ex- but rather 'the eternal Pharisee', retaining his Jewish identity.³² Luke seems conscious of the charge, placed in James' words, that Paul was abandoning his Jewish heritage (Jewish believers in Jerusalem, he states, 'have been told about you that you teach all the Jews living among the Gentiles to forsake Moses...', Acts 21:21) and clearly shows this to be otherwise³³ given Paul's eagerness to show his fidelity to tradition by undertaking a public vow of purification (vv23-6). His defense speeches are primarily addressed to Jews and here especially Luke shows his place in Judaism, addressing them for example as 'brothers' in the Hebrew language (22:1-2). Here Paul's self-description is like that of the epistles: 'I am a Jew... brought up... at the feet of Gamaliel, educated strictly according to our ancestral law, being zealous for God [ζηλωτής... τοῦ θεοῦ, Acts 22:3; cf. Phil 3]'. Moreover, Paul keeps Torah: he circumcises Timothy (16:1-5); commemorates Jewish festivals (21:2-7; 24:17; 24:11-14), observes other Jewish temple rituals (24:11, 17). Finally, he also paints Christian belief as nothing other than 'the hope of Israel' (Acts 28:20) – Jewish through and through.

³¹ For example his opposition to Judaism as a legalistic religion in the so-called Lutheran perspective on Paul; or the way he problematises Judaism as marked by ethnocentrism and exclusivism as with the 'New Perspective'.

³² Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), 14

³³ Joshua Jipp, 'The Paul of Acts: Proclaimer of the Hope of Israel or Teacher of Apostasy from Moses?' *NovT* 62 (2020), 61; Mark Kinzer, *Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018), 196

Various reasons have been made for why Luke stresses Paul's Jewishness. Was he seeking to directly persuade Jewish critics?³⁴ Or respond to a Marcionite distancing of Pauline Christianity from Judaism?³⁵ Or bolster confidence in Gentile converts that they were the true heirs of Israel's heritage? Whatever the case one thing is clear: it would take a rather Jewish author to promote a conservatively Jewish Paul. Moreover, an author so concerned to commend the hero of his narrative as a law-abiding Jew could hardly be advocating a parting of the ways. The 'Lukan' Paul and the 'Paul of the epistles' thus seem very similar at this junction, and there is much to suggest that a comparison between both will be fruitful for understanding Luke's own viewpoint. However, the similarities do not stop there. Both share a very similar use of scripture to commend believers as the faithful Israel, and it is to this which I now turn.

1.3. Ecclesiological Hermeneutics in Paul and Luke

Luke and Paul's shared assumptions about scripture are as follows. First, both employ a hermeneutic which reads current events as the eschatological fulfilment of long-awaited promises in the last days.³⁶ Paul sees events from Israel's desert wanderings as 'written down to instruct us, on whom the end of the ages [τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων] has come (1 Cor 10:17). Luke's phrase ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις beginning his citation of Joel (Acts 2:17) indicates how the Pentecost outpouring locates his community in an eschatological time period. Second, both also appeal to the Holy Spirit as the source and guarantor of true scriptural interpretation: Paul suggests that those who fail to comprehend his preaching are as Moses with a veil over their faces (referencing Ex 34:33, 35) and only 'when one turns to the Lord the veil is removed... [Now] the Lord is the Spirit' (2 Cor 3:15-17). Likewise for Luke the same God who

³⁴ Arco den Heijer, *Portraits of Paul's Performance in the Book of Acts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021), 199

³⁵ Joseph B. Tyson, *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006)

³⁶ See my chapter 3 for this in more detail.

‘spoke by the Holy Spirit through our ancestor David’ (Acts 4:25) is the same God inspiring the early church in its interpretation of scripture: Peter’s revelation of Gentile inclusion into the people of God is given as a Spirit-inspired vision (Acts 10:9-16) while James’ recognition of the same truth ‘seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us’ (Acts 15:27). Finally, and most importantly for this chapter, both use scripture *for the purpose of explicating who the people of God are*. Paul’s ecclesiological hermeneutic has already been identified in scholarship.³⁷

In Romans Paul’s ecclesiological use of scripture might be illustrated by the *inclusio* that marks the beginning and end of the letter. This concerns ‘the gospel of God, which he promised beforehand through his prophets in the holy scriptures’ (Rom 1:2). This ‘gospel’ is no mere Christological description but is also ‘the mystery that was kept secret for long ages but is now disclosed and through the prophetic writings is made known to all the Gentiles... to bring about the obedience of faith’ (16:25-6). This is very ecclesiological: the only other reference to ‘μυστήριον’ (16:25) is the ‘mystery’ in 11:25 that Jew and Gentile alike are destined for salvation, albeit in a different order to that expected. Likewise, Paul’s stress that this mystery is now being made known to the Gentiles to produce among them the obedience of faith [εἰς ὑπακοὴν πίστεως, 16:26] further highlights the ecclesiological dimensions of scripture in establishing a community drawn not only from Jews but also from Gentiles (cf. Rom 1:5). This matches chapter 15, which explicates how God used Christ ‘in order that he might *confirm the promises* given to the ancestors and that the Gentiles might glorify God for his mercy’ (15:8-9), after which Paul uses further citations from Isaiah to outline his vision of a priestly community of Jews and Gentiles worshipping God (vv7-13). For Paul, as for Luke, scripture and community-creation go hand in hand – and this is especially clear in Romans 9-11. The following section will situate Romans 9-11 in the context of the rest of the letter; and then I will commence with more specific comparisons of scripture between Luke and Paul to inform the topic of Luke and the POTW

³⁷ See Richard Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1993), 86, 123, 162, 168, 177, 184, though it cannot be separated from Paul’s christology: Francis Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: T&T Clark, 2016), 82-84

2. Romans 9-11 within Judaism

2.1. Date and Purpose of Romans

Most scholars date the composition of Romans in the late 50s CE.³⁸ A variety of reasons are given for its composition and likely no single one prevails. Paul has not previously visited the Roman church, so the epistle may be a summary of his teaching; he might be writing to commend himself to them to prepare them for his arrival there so he can use it as a base on his way to Spain (15:25-8). It may also be a plea for support of his financial collection.³⁹ The audience is mixed between Jew and Gentile. Though it is not possible to determine with ease the precise proportion of each,⁴⁰ it is clear that there are disputes in the community. These concern the place of Jewish privilege (3:1-2, 9:4-5), law observance (2:17-20) and the validity of abstention from idol food and feast days in the wake of Gentile conversions (14:1-6)⁴¹. One other reason Paul seems to write, then, is to promote unity between Jews and Gentiles (15:7-13) by discussing how the law is an insufficient means of salvation to Jew or Gentile (3:9-20) and how salvation is now mediated apart from the law through Christ (10:1-17). A key issue at stake in the letter is God's righteousness: if the Jews have largely rejected the gospel, how can he be faithful to Israel's promises (3:3-4, 9:6, 14, 11:1)? The removal of the law also poses an identity problem: if Israel

³⁸ E.g. Aaron Sherwood, *Romans: A Structural, Thematic, and Exegetical Commentary* (Bellingham: Lexham, 2020), 12; Richard Longenecker, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016); 6. Douglas Moo, *The Letter to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018), 57; Tom Schreiner, *Romans*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018), 3; Robert Jewett, *Romans*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 72

³⁹ See Michael Bird, 'The Letter to the Romans' in Mark Harding, Alanna Nobbs (eds.), *All Things to all Cultures* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 177-204

⁴⁰ Frequently Claudius' expulsion of the Jews from Rome (49 CE) is given as a reason to see Jews forming the minority of the audience given their only recent return from expulsion. It is difficult to see the precise impact of this on the Roman church. Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 336.

⁴¹ Some, e.g. Alexander Wedderburn, downplay the presence of a 'judaizing' component of the Roman church at Paul's time of writing, given Claudius' recent disciplinary measures against the Jews: *The Reasons for Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988), 64-5. However, Paul mentions various Jewish names in Romans 16 (Andronicus, Aquila, Junia, Herodion, Rufus, Rufus's mother) which would speak for a prominent position of Jews among his audience.

was formerly defined by Torah observance, what has become of her now (2:28-9, 3:1, 9:6)?

Romans 9-11 outworks the tension emerging from Paul's theology of justification apart from the Jewish law. As Paul states in 9:14, 'is there injustice [ἀδικία] on God's part?' This has strong affinity with the disciples' question to Jesus in Acts 1:6: 'Will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?' Both are concerned with the issue of Israel's identity and future in the wake of the Christ event, and how Israel's promises to Israel (cf. Lk 1-2) will now be fulfilled.⁴² As with Luke-Acts, scripture is used extensively to uphold a remnant theology which identifies his believing community as the faithful portion of Israel and denounces unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. The argument of Romans 9-11 proceeds as follows. This will clarify Paul's position within Judaism and how he speaks of a division within Israel between faithful and unfaithful Jews.

2.2. Structure and Argument of Romans 9-11

2.2.1. Precedent for a Divided Israel in Israel's History (9:6-29)

Romans 9-11 begins sympathetically towards ethnic Israel by affirming her privileged position before God: 'to them belong the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship and the promises' (9:5). The argument from 9:6 onwards can be divided into three sections: 9:6-29; 9:30-10:21; 11:1-36. In 9:6-29, Paul shows God remains faithful to Israel because *he is acting in a manner consistent with his dealings with her in the past*. This section is fronted with the statement οὐ

⁴² Paul's question may suggest a stronger element of theodicy than Luke's. Luke is concerned with God's faithfulness – without it his whole scheme of promise and fulfilment would unravel. He is perhaps more sharply attuned to the consequences of Jewish rejections for God's character than Luke is, though God's faithfulness would still be a concern for Luke given his scheme of promise and fulfilment – if God is not faithful, this would fall apart.

γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ ('not all who are of Israel are Israel', 9:6). The first Israel presumably refers to ethnic Jews. The second 'Israel' here may refer to elect Jews,⁴³ or it may refer to spiritual Israel composed of Jews and Gentiles alike.⁴⁴ Probably ethnic Jews are in mind here. 9:1-5 seems to restrict the Ἰσραηλιῖται mentioned here to ethnic Jews, and terminologically Paul seems to maintain a distinction between Jews and Gentiles throughout chapters 9-11 when he refers to Israel (see, e.g. 9:24, 30-31, 11:25).

Vv 6-18 then explain how this is no new innovation but part of an old pattern in which God elects some and not others,⁴⁵ using a range of characters from Israel's history as examples. Thus, for example, God favours Isaac over Ishmael (v7); Jacob over Esau (v12). This shows that it is not by human exertion but God's mercy that one gains membership into the elect community (v16). Vv 19-29 then confirm the workings of this process of election and explain their implications. First Paul deals with a criticism addressing the negative side of election: surely this renders God unjust to find fault with unbelievers (v19)? The response: God can do what he likes; we have no right to question him ('will the molded say to the potter, why have you made me like this?', v20). Vv22-29 then highlight the positive side of election: God's mercy in delivering some from wrath (vv22-23). In vv23-29 this pattern of mercy to the elect is then extended to believing Gentiles and believing Jews, who form a remnant, using texts from Hosea and Isaiah. I will compare these below with Luke's use of Amos 9:11-12 (Acts 15:15-17). This will demonstrate how both authors use language originally

⁴³ Francis Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 311; Susan Eastman, 'Israel and the Mercy of God', *NTS* 56 (2010), 381-383; Barclay, *Paul and the Gift*, 386

⁴⁴ N.T. Wright, *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (London: SPCK, 2013), 2.1241-42; Jewett, *Romans*, 574; Schreiner, *Romans*, 482. Moo suggests it may refer to an Israel which Paul has not yet been defined, in which case there may be ambiguity here. Moo, *Romans*, 593

⁴⁵ John Barclay argues against the tendency to see these verses as the justification for a divided Israel, on the basis that (1) it is difficult to argue that God's word has not failed (9:6) if only a remnant is presently saved and (2) nowhere else in Romans is any indication given that Gentile figures here (Esau, v13; Pharaoh, v17) are types of unbelieving Jews: *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017), 527-529. Against (1) note that Paul is adamant that salvation will extend beyond the remnant of Israel (11:26) -- this surely does not diminish the power of God's word. (2) While Esau and Pharaoh are not mentioned elsewhere in the epistle, this argument from silence could be taken both ways: the context of vv6-18 must decide how the figures are to be understood.

applied to Israel to believing Gentiles in a manner that seems to portray the Gentile mission in Jewish terms. This argues against the Gentile mission as a reason to see a parting of the ways in Luke-Acts.

2.2.2. The True Israel Lives by Faith; Unbelieving Israel Rejects the Gospel (9:30 - 10:21)

In the next section Paul provides the second reason why God remains faithful to Israel: *those whom God chooses (9:6-29), he saves apart from any human criteria of worth*. 9:30-9:33 comment in more detail on the surprising role reversal by which the Gentiles have come to inherit salvation in place of unbelieving Jews. This introduces two binary modes of salvation which will be explained more fully in 10:1-13, righteousness through faith (9:30) which the Gentiles have received, and righteousness that is based on the law (9:31), which the majority of Israel pursued but failed to obtain. 10:1-13 then clarify this in more detail. Paul explains the difference between these two modes of salvation with texts from Leviticus, Deuteronomy, Isaiah and Joel. Thus 'the one who does these things shall live by them' (Lev 18:5) speaks of righteousness by the law (v5), while the 'righteousness that comes from faith' is more optimistic about God's word being kept (Deut 30:12-14, Rom 10:6-8).⁴⁶ Vv 11-13 outline the implications of this righteousness by faith: it removes the distinction between Jew and Gentile. This point is confirmed with Isa 28:16 ('all who believe in him will not be put to shame', along with Joel 3:5 LXX. Joel 3:5 LXX is also cited by Luke, as I will compare below.

⁴⁶ There has been much debate about the meaning of the terms δικαιοσύνη and νόμος. The so-called 'Old Perspective' on Paul generally sees righteousness by 'law' as a religious disposition of seeking to acquire merit by one's own performance (See e.g. Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 277; the 'New Perspective' generally reads it as ethnic Israel's attempt to secure right-standing with God based on ethnicity (James Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1998), 603; N.T. Wright, *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001), 242. John Barclay has recently made some way beyond this dichotomy by emphasising that the Christ event removes all forms of worth, whether religious or ethnic, as a means of attaining God's righteousness (Barclay, *Gift*, 541)

Next 10:14-21 give another reason why God remains faithful to Israel despite the surprising reversal between Jews and Gentiles: Israel is without excuse because she has had ample opportunity to hear the gospel and still rejected it.⁴⁷ She has heard the gospel (v18; Ps 18:5 LXX) she should have understood it (v19, Dt 32:21 LXX); so the Gentiles instead received it (v20; Isa 65:1 LXX); unbelieving Israel is 'disobedient and contrary' (v21; Isa 65:2 LXX). Striking here is the manner in which both Luke and Paul ascribe salvation as applicable to Jew and Gentile alike. I will consider this in more detail below when I compare their use of Joel 3. This will also highlight how Luke portrays believers as part of the restored Israel, which tells further against the idea that he advocates a parting of the ways.

2.2.3. A Faithful Remnant has been Restored; Unbelieving Israel Will be Saved (11:1-36)

'Has God, then, rejected [ἀπωθέομαι] his people?' By no means [μὴ γένοιτο]!' (11:1) In this final section Paul gives two more reasons why God remains faithful to Israel. The first of these, which he has already hinted at, is *that not all of Israel at present is disobedient* to the gospel. This is evidenced by Paul's own salvation as a representative Israelite (11:1). He takes himself as a type of Elijah: a solitary pious Israelite who is informed that a small portion of Israel remains immune to the wider nation's apostasy (11:3-4). Critically, 'at the present time there is a remnant [τό λείμμα] chosen by grace' (v5). Vv 5-10 then further divide between a faithful and an unfaithful Israel – the 'elect' (v7) and 'the hardened' (vv7-10).

Finally, Paul asks if Israel has stumbled as to permanently fall (11:11). The answer: 'not at all!' [μὴ γένοιτο]: 'because of their transgression, salvation has come to the Gentiles in order to [εἰς] make Israel jealous.' The second reason in this section why God remains faithful to Israel is therefore because *Israel's hardening is temporary*.

⁴⁷ So, e.g., C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC, Vol 2 (London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2004), 533; Käsemann, *Romans*, 294; Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 578.

Israel's disobedience has now placed her in the perfect place to receive grace – just as the Gentiles were brought from disobedience to obedience.⁴⁸ Surprisingly, the Gentile mission is actually to be the means by which unbelieving Israel is to be saved. Thus the 'full inclusion' [τὸ πλήρωμα, 11:12] of disobedient Israel will eventually be brought into the believing community: an event that will metaphorically be 'life from the dead' (v15). Moreover, though the present majority of Israel are like natural branches of an olive tree, replaced by obedient Gentiles (vv 17-24), 'God has the power to graft them back in again' (v23). 'A partial hardening has come upon Israel until the full number of Gentiles has come in [ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ v25].' In this way πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται (v26). God is to be glorified for his mercy towards all (vv26-36).

Debates on this final section (vv25-36) abound. Some consider Paul to be inconsistent on the fate of Israel -- on the one hand excluding national heritage on the basis of faith (9:30-10:21), but on the other hand reverting back at the end to patriarchal promises for the hope of their salvation (11:29).⁴⁹ And οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται (v26) is also contentious: (1) What does οὕτως mean? (2) Who is 'Israel?'; (3) What does πᾶς refer to? (4) How will Israel be saved? (1) It could be argued that οὕτως does not mean 'and so' in a temporal sense (as with the NRSV), but rather 'by this means'. In other words it describes the *manner* by which 'Israel' shall be saved. In conjunction with the previous verse this would mean that 'Israel' will be saved through a hardening coming upon part of Israel and the simultaneous acceptance of the gospel by Gentiles.⁵⁰ In this case (2) 'Israel' in v26 refers to an Israel which includes Jews and Gentiles. In favour of this definition Wright (who particularly clearly endorses this reading) argues that a future restoration of some unbelieving Jews would hardly seem an adequate response to the charge that God has been

⁴⁸ Barclay, *Gift*, 549

⁴⁹ The so-called *Sonderweg* hypothesis proposes that Paul offers two alternate paths to salvation in Romans 9-11. See Hvalvik, R., 'A 'Sonderweg' for Israel: A Critical Examination of a Current Interpretation of Romans 11.25-27', *JSNT* 38 (1990), 87-107 for detailed explanation. For critique see John Barclay, *Gift*, 521, on the basis that Paul's apparent agony over Israel's future (9:1-5) surely presupposes that salvation is not automatically bestowed through ethnic privilege; cf. Watson, *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles*, 329.

⁵⁰ Notably N.T. Wright, 'Romans' in *The New Interpreter's Bible Vol 10* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2002), 699; see also Sherwood, *Romans*, 594

unfaithful to his Jewish people.⁵¹ Moreover, it presupposes a certain equality between Jew and Gentile which Paul seems to suggest in (e.g.) Rom 10:12-13. Against this view, such a reading is awkward because it requires a shift in the meaning of 'Israel' from ethnic Israel in contrast to Gentiles as described in 11:25.⁵² To be sure, Paul might be said to re-define 'Israel' in 9:6,⁵³ but there is no indication he does so here in v26, where he does not warn the reader that he is now using a different meaning of the term to that in the previous verse. Moreover, vv28-31 also distinguish between Jews and Gentiles in a manner that also makes this more inclusive meaning of Israel in v26 contentious. 'Israel' here likely refers to ethnic Israel, then.⁵⁴ (3) Πᾶς probably refers to the majority of Israel but not necessarily every single Jew. This is probably the equivalent to the πλήρωμα of Israel to be saved in 11:12, itself analogous to τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν in v25, which certainly does not suggest every member of the Gentile world. In this way 'all Israel' balances the 'part of [ethnic] Israel'⁵⁵ (μέρους τῷ Ἰσραήλ) in the previous verse. To make this point Paul cites two texts from Isaiah (59, 27). Luke also cites Isaiah at the close of his work to address the future of unbelieving Jews. I will compare both authors' endings below. This will highlight Luke's take on their future to be more negative than Paul's, though he may reflect Paul's hope earlier in his narrative. Nonetheless, this does not show him to advocate a parting of the ways: his use of scripture suggests he occupies a school within Judaism, as I will argue below.

The strongest reason in favour of Paul describing a 'parting of the ways' in Romans 9-11 is the fact that he mentions the failure of many Jews to receive the gospel. Israel, 'who did strive for the law of righteousness, did not attain that law' (Rom 9:31). They have 'stumbled' (v32). They are a 'disobedient and contrary people' (10:21) and 'Israel has not achieved what it was pursuing' (11:7). It could be argued that the success of the Gentile mission and the poor gospel reception among the Jews is a

⁵¹ Wright, *Romans*, 689

⁵² Moo, *Romans*, 737

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 690

⁵⁴ This remains the consensus position. See, e.g., Zoccali, 'All Israel', 292; Moo, *Romans*, 728; Longenecker, *Romans*, 898; Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 623; Matera, *Romans*, 273; Jewett, *Romans*, 701;

⁵⁵ Zoccali, 'All Israel', 292.

major reason for the separate emergence of Christianity. So too with his relativisation of the importance of Torah.

However, this position can hardly be sustained. Perhaps more clearly than anywhere else in Paul's letters Romans 9-11 shows Paul's Jewishness and desire to keep within Judaism. First, he shows himself proud of Jewish identity markers: 'to them [Jews] belong the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the giving of the law, the worship, and the promises...' (9:4). Proudly he states 'I myself am an Israelite' (11:1). He is anguished over their rejection of the gospel (9:2, 10:1). Emphatically, 'has God rejected his people? By no means!' (11:1). Most telling is his expectation of the 'full inclusion' of Israel (11:12) and his hope that eventually 'all Israel will be saved' (11:26). This expectation that the pendulum will swing and that unbelieving Jews will receive the gospel makes it difficult to consider him to advocate a departure from Judaism here. Indeed, part of his reason for writing these chapters is to undercut Gentile boasting about the removal of Jews from God's purposes (11:13, 18, 25). Romans 9-11 seems to make the strong case against a POTW.

2.3. Scripture in Romans 9-11

How, then, does Paul use scripture to argue for God's faithfulness and to clarify who the people of God are (9:6)? I suggest that he uses the OT in two primary ways here: (a) to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel, and (b) to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel. Accordingly (a), unbelieving Jews have stumbled over the stone that will make them fall (9:33 / Isa 28:16, 8:14). They are a 'disobedient and contrary people' (10:21 / Isa 65:2). They have a 'sluggish spirit, eyes that would not see and ears that would not hear...' (11:8 / Dt 29:3, Isa 29:10). Of them, as David says, 'let their eyes be darkened so that they cannot see' (11:10 / Ps 68:23 LXX) – a passage, tellingly, ascribed to *David's enemies*, which is a particularly strong denunciation of unbelieving Jews. Believers (b), however, are aligned with the Isaianic remnant ('though the number of the children of Israel were

like the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will be saved, 9:27 / Isa 10:22, Hos 2:1 LXX). Though others stumble, of these, 'whoever trusts in him [God] will not be put to shame' (9:33 / Isa 28:16). Paul also seems to commend believing Gentiles as being part of this faithful remnant, given the manner he applies to them Hos 2:1 LXX ('those who were not my people I will call "my people" '), which in its original context is strictly a promise of restoration for the restored Israel. For the rest of this chapter I will compare in detail important citations of scripture⁵⁶ by both authors that demonstrate how Luke, like Paul, seems to use scripture to locate the Christian movement as a perspective within rather than outside Judaism.

For each of these I will first consider the context of the OT text in the NT text. Then I will consider the citation in its OT context. Then I will consider textual variants using a table. This will place the MT alongside the LXX text and the NA28 for easier comparison and help to highlight key differences between them. There was no single Hebrew or Greek text of the OT when Luke and Paul wrote, but this is a helpful starting point for considering their possible sources and how they may have used the material. These comparisons will demonstrate how Luke like Paul uses scripture in a manner that seems to locate him inside Judaism.

3. A 'Jewish' Gentile Mission?

One key text often related to the POTW in Luke-Acts is Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18. This occurs at a hinge in Luke's narrative just as mission towards the Gentiles begins to take off. In particular it provides justification (as James interprets it) for expanding the mission to non-Jews. This text in Acts refers to a 'booth of David' which

⁵⁶ A further study might also consider each respective author's use of echoes or allusions to legitimate the believing community / denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. See, e.g. Robert Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995), Kenneth Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup, 282; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005) for examples of this comparative methodology, though not focused on the theme of ecclesial legitimation.

God will restore, after which Gentiles will 'seek the Lord'. Thereafter Luke portrays increasing hostility from the Jews (e.g. Acts 17:1-15, 18:12-16, 21:17-26), Paul states three times he will go from Jews to the Gentiles (13:46, 18:6, 28:28) and the Christian movement begins to shift away from the synagogue to the οἶκος (10:2, 22, 16:16, 20:20, 21:8). This shift in focus from Jew to Gentile, and the emergence of the Gentile mission, has been taken to suggest Luke indicates a departure from Judaism here.⁵⁷ In this case Amos 9 is used to provide justification for an early POTW. My comparison will demonstrate the opposite: that Luke actually applies Amos 9 to Gentiles in a manner that suggests they are to be located within the faithful portion of Israel, and hence there is no departure from Judaism here. This, I suggest, is what Paul seems to do in his catena of citations in Rom 9:25-9 (Hosea 2:25, 2:1; Isaiah 10:22, 1:9). In this unit Paul also justifies the Gentile mission. Here he also provides grounds for the inclusion of Gentiles into the people of God. Both *Luke and Paul apply these scriptures to believing Jews and Gentiles in such a manner that aligns them with the faithful remnant of Israel*, this is the means by which ongoing mission to the Gentiles must be understood, and for this reason despite the Gentile mission both authors firmly portray the Christian movement inside Judaism. First I will consider Luke's use of Amos.

3.1. Context of Amos 9:11-12 in Luke-Acts

Acts 15 describes a debate over whether or not Gentiles should be circumcised to be saved. This issue was posed by certain persons 'from Judea' (15:1) and was continued in Jerusalem by believers 'from the sect of the Pharisees' (15:5). On one side of this debate were Peter, who describes how 'God made no distinction between them and us' (15:9) by pouring out the Holy Spirit on the Gentiles too, suggesting that Jews and Gentiles alike are only 'saved by the grace of the Lord Jesus' (v11), and Paul and Barnabas, who recount signs and wonders seen among the Gentiles to make the

⁵⁷ Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 471

same point (15:12). James then finds a precedent for the conversion of the Gentiles in Amos 9:11. Given that God intends to save Gentiles as well as Jews, he argues, no hindering demands should be placed upon them except abstinence from idol pollution, fornication, 'whatever has been strangled', and blood (15:19-20). This decree is sent by letter to believers in Antioch, Syria and Cilicia (15:22-29).

That Luke speaks of a POTW here might be suggested by the omission of circumcision for Gentile converts. This surely marks them outside Judaism. Moreover, Peter seems to denigrate the importance of Gentiles observing Torah in his apparent contrast between the Torah ('a yoke that neither we nor our ancestors have been able to bear', v10) and faith [πίστις v9] and 'the grace of our Lord Jesus [διὰ τῆς χάριτος, v11].⁵⁸ However, as has often been pointed out, this is not strict evidence that Torah observance is entirely removed for Gentiles, as the prohibitions in the Apostolic Decree are similar to those stipulated in Lev 17-18 for Gentile converts.⁵⁹ Moreover, 'yoke' is not necessarily negative, in which case, again the Torah is not necessarily denigrated.⁶⁰ Moreover, and particularly telling, James seems to read the Amos passage as suggesting Gentiles are on the same footing as believing Jews by incorporation into the same people of God. This is seen by his reference to God's taking 'from the Gentiles a people for his name [λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ., v14]. Λαός here for Luke is an important term used to describe Israel.⁶¹ Applying it to Gentiles here strongly suggests they are caught up into Israel's heritage. Moreover, that these Gentiles are also to be a people 'for his [God's] name' also takes a common descriptor for Israel and applies it to Gentiles to further suggest their equality with Israel. This

⁵⁸ This antithesis between law and faith is very Pauline (see e.g. Rom 3:21-26). Luke's point that there is no difference between Jews and Gentiles where salvation is concerned (οὐθὲν διέκρινεν μεταξύ ἡμῶν τε καὶ αὐτῶν, 15:9 is also rather like Rom 10:21, οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν διαστολή Ἰουδαίου τε καὶ Ἑλλήνου), also suggesting close proximity with Pauline thought.

⁵⁹ The other alternative is that the decree refers to the so-called 'Noahide' food laws (cf. Gen 9:4-5), but the only mention made in Acts 15 is to Moses (15:5). See Pieter Hartog, 'Noah and Moses in Acts 15: Group Models and the Novelty of the Way', *NTS* 67 (2021), 498 for summary of positions.

⁶⁰ Beverly Gaventa, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2003), 141; Isaac Oliver, 'The "Historical Paul" and the Paul of Acts' in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Paul the Jew* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2016), 59, citing 2 Bar 41:34. Nor is this necessarily a critique of the law in itself - more of the idea that the law is necessary for salvation and of the ability to keep the law in its entirety.

⁶¹ Lk 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

reference to God's name recurs in the citation from Amos below ['Gentiles over whom my name has been called, v17], which is further evidence that Luke reads the Amos citation below as evidence of the Gentiles' sharing in Israel's heritage. If Luke uses Amos to link Gentiles so closely to Israel, the Gentile mission can scarce be taken as evidence of a POTW. Below I will consider the OT context of Amos, and consider Luke's use of it in more detail, in order to further develop this point.

3.2. OT Context of Amos 9:11-12

This text comes at the close of Amos as a final promise of blessing for Israel (11-15) after national destruction. This blessing is described as the rebuilding of the 'booth of David' (11-12), a time of agricultural blessing (13), the rebuilding of ruined cities, and permanent lodging in the promised land. The 'booth of David' (את סכת דויד, τήν σκηνήν Δαυιδ) is a cryptic expression. Most likely it refers to the restored kingdom of David,⁶² although it has been taken to refer to the city of Jerusalem.⁶³ סַכָּת is elsewhere used to describe the 'tabernacle' erected yearly to celebrate the feast of booths.

The next phrase provides the reason for God's rebuilding of this 'tent'. Here there is an important difference between the MT and LXX texts. The MT reads that God will restore it 'in order that (למען) they might possess (יירשו) the remnant of Edom and all

⁶² Jorg Jeremias, *The Book of Amos: A Commentary* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1998), 127, Göran Eidevall, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017), 57, Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 24a (London: Doubleday, 1989), 240; Stuart, Douglas K., *Hosea-Jonah*, WBC 31 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987), 398, Marvin A. Sweeney, David W. Cotter (eds.), *The Twelve Prophets*, BO 1 (Collegeville, MPLS: Liturgical Press, 2000), 273

⁶³ Especially Hans Walter Wolff, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977), 353. In favour of this, note the architectural language of 'walling up' / גָּדַר and 'establishing' / קוּם in v11 (Harry Mowvley, *The Books of Amos and Hosea*, EpC (London: Epworth, 1991), 95 – as well as the rebuilding and reinhabiting of ancient cities in v14. Cf. also Isa 1:8, where 'Daughter Zion' is portrayed as a סַכָּת. However, the 'building' language is probably likely to be metaphorical. The Davidic dynasty is usually described in the OT as a house (בֵּית־דָּוִד; see, e.g., 2 Sam 3:1, 7:5, 11, 1 Kgs 12:20, 2 Kgs 17:21). The shift from house to 'tent' probably reflects the lapsed state of Davidic reign: Eidevall, *Amos*, 240. Compare Isa 16:5 for a similar use of 'tent of David' in reference to Davidic rule, albeit with the more conventional אֹהֶל for 'tent'.

the nations who are called by my name'. Here 'house of Israel' (v9) is the subject of ירש. The idea is that Israel will subjugate the nations. However, the LXX instead reads that the booth shall be rebuilt 'in order that the remainder of humankind [τῶν ἀνθρώπων] and all the nations might seek (ἐκζητήσωσιν)... the Lord.' Here the verb ירש (to possess) has been read as שרש (to seek out), אדום while (Edom) has been replaced by אדם (humankind). On this striking reading ἄνθρωπος becomes the subject of ירש to suggest now that non-Jews (not just Edom) will seek the Lord just as the restored Israel will. This substitution of the initial י for τ may be due to scribal error. It may also be the deliberate attempt to shift the focus from the subjugation of Gentile nations by Israel to the Gentiles' willing conversion to serve Yahweh. Importantly, Luke uses this LXX text to justify the Gentiles' share in Israel's salvation. The following table shows key variations between the MT, LXX and NA28 sources of Amos 9:11-12. As with the other following tables, the differences between the MT / Greek text are marked in bold. Differences between the LXX and the NT text will be italicised.

3.3. Textual Variations

Amos 9:11-12 MT	Amos 9:11-12 LXX	Acts 15:16-18
11 ביום ההוא אקום	ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἀναστήσω	16 <u>μετὰ ταῦτα</u> ἀναστρέψω
		καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω
את סכת דויד הנפלת	τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυιδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν	τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυιδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν
וגדרתי את פרציהן	καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς	καὶ τὰ

		κατεσκαμμένα αύτης άνοικοδομήσω
הרסתיו אקים	καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αύτης <i>ἀναστήσω</i>	καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν,
ובניתיה כימי עולם	καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος,	
למען יירשו את שארית 12 אדם	12 ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων	17 ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων <u>τὸν</u> <u>κύριον</u>
וכל הגוים	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη,	καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη
אשר נקרא שמי עלהם	ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς,	ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς,
נאם יהוה עשה זאת	λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα.	λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα
		18γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος.

3.4. Luke's Use of Amos 9:11-12 LXX

The meaning of the 'booth of David' (σκηνήν Δαυίδ) in Acts 15:16 has been much debated. Glenny maps out five interpretations here. I mention these below, with my own evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses.

1. The 'tent' refers to the *restored Israel comprised of believing Jews*, and a distance is maintained in the passage between Jews and Gentiles. Believing Gentiles remain distinct from the community of believing Jews and are saved as an 'associate people' following the restoration of Israel. This view has traditionally been associated with Jacob Jervell.⁶⁴ In its favour, the passage does seem to imply a distinction between Jews and Gentiles, as evidenced by the fact that the σκηνήν Δαυίδ is rebuilt 'in order that [ὅπως ἂν] the rest of humankind may seek [ἐκζητήσωσιν] the Lord.' This purpose clause would surely be redundant if the tent was already comprised of Jews and Gentiles (i.e.: 'I will restore Jews and Gentiles in order that Gentiles may seek the Lord.')⁶⁵ Not only this, but the phrase 'the rest of mankind' [οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων] also suggests that the rebuilt tent is in a different class to believing Jews. Against this view, the context of Acts 15 seems to eradicate the distinction between Jew and Gentile (so Peter: 'in cleansing their [Gentile] hearts by faith he has made no distinction between them and us', 15:9, which Luke is emphatic about (cf. the same usage in 11:12)).
2. The 'tent' refers to the *restored Israel comprised of Jews and Gentiles alike*. So the majority of interpreters.⁶⁶ In favour of this view, James states just prior to the citation that God has taken from the Gentiles 'a people for his name'

⁶⁴ Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 51-54.

⁶⁵ Edward Glenny, 'The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Acts 15' in *BBR* 22 (2012), 17. Susan Wendel, *Scriptural Interpretation and Community Self-definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Boston: Brill, 2011), 265.

⁶⁶ See summary in Mark Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 189-90.

(λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, 15:14). Λαον is elsewhere used by Luke exclusively for Israel (Lk 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).⁶⁷ Applying it to Gentiles here suggests that they too are now considered to be part of the renewed people of God.⁶⁸ A variation of this view sees the 'tent' as the rebuilt temple which is a metaphor for the whole people of God. Bauckham argues for this on the basis that Luke appeals to Hos 3:5, Jer 12:15-16 and Isa 45:21 as well as the Amos text to speak of a rebuilt temple – though surprisingly it is not clear that a rebuilt temple is envisaged in these other passages.⁶⁹

3. It may refer to *Jesus' resurrection* (so Haenchen).⁷⁰ If this were the case Luke may more likely have used the verb ἀνίστημι, which the LXX uses and which is his favourite verb for resurrection (Lk 7:22, 8:54, 9:7, 22, 24:6, 24:34, Acts 3:15, 4:10, 5:30, 10:40, 13:30, 37, 26:8).⁷¹ In John's gospel Jesus refers to his body as a temple (Jn 2:19). But nowhere explicitly in Luke-Acts is Jesus' resurrection portrayed as a rebuilt temple, or in architectural terms.

4. It may refer to the *whole plan of God* which includes Jesus' death, resurrection, exaltation, and the establishment of the church (so Bruce).⁷² This is subject to the same criticism as (3).⁷³ It is probably too broad to be useful - in his speeches Luke differentiates between these different elements. Moreover, if the 'booth' includes the establishment of the church then this fails to explain the causative link between the booth and the 'rest of humankind seeking the Lord', as they would seem to have the same referent.

⁶⁷ Marshall, *Acts*, 251.

⁶⁸ L.T. Johnson, *Acts* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992), 264.

⁶⁹ The main parallels given are Hos 3:5, Jer 12:15-16, Isa 45:21. Richard Bauckham, 'James and the Jerusalem Church' in *Acts in its Palestinian Setting Vol 4* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 453-455. See also Mikeal Parsons, *Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic 2008), 213.

⁷⁰ Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 188

⁷¹ Glenny, 'The Septuagint', 18.

⁷² F.F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1954), 310.

⁷³ Glenny, 'The Septuagint', 18.

5. It may refer to *Jesus' Davidic reign* which commences through his exaltation.⁷⁴ In favour of this view, as already noted, the original context of Amos 9:11-12 seems to imply that the 'tent' refers to the restored Davidic kingdom. Moreover, this reading matches the targum of Amos 9:12: 'at that time, I will set up again the kingdom of the house of David that has fallen.' 4QFlorilegium (4Q174) may also support this reading. This text identifies the 'booth' with the 'branch of David', a messianic figure of whom, as 2 Sa 7:12 reads, 'I will establish the throne of his kingdom' (4Q174 1.12-13). This text reads Amos 9:11 messianically, then, but it also links it to the restored kingdom of David. This is an important text which I will return to in chapter three. The theme of Jesus' Davidic reign inaugurated through his ascension is a recurrent theme in Luke-Acts (most notably Acts 2, in fulfilment of Ps 132:11, 16:10, 110:1).⁷⁵

Given this, it is likely that Luke primarily means the restored 'booth' to refer to the Davidic reign inaugurated through Jesus' resurrection and ascension. However, one should not separate this too hastily from a restored Israel, as the restoration of one in conventional Jewish expectation also required the other.⁷⁶ For this reason Luke also uses the passage to make an ecclesiological point⁷⁷, that Israel has been restored. This 'Israel' certainly includes the 'mass conversions' of believing Jews.⁷⁸ Also telling for the topic of the POTW, is that *Luke also seems to include believing Gentiles into this faithful portion of Israel* too. Below I will consider this point in more detail with particular reference to how Luke's citation of Amos varies from other witnesses of the LXX text. Key variations are as follows:

⁷⁴ Darrell Bock, *Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 132; G.K. Beale, D.A. Carson (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 589; Peterson, *Acts*, 432

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 18

⁷⁶ Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 313-4

⁷⁷ Contra Aaron White, *All the Prophets Agree* (Boston: Brill, 2020), 100, who argues that the focus here is not ecclesiology but rather eschatology.

⁷⁸ Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 13

- He replaces ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ with μετὰ ταῦτα.⁷⁹ Luke's version points back to signs, wonders, and Gentile reception of the gospel as the eschatological events recorded in Amos' oracle.
- Luke's version reads 'I will return [ἀναστρέψω] and I will rebuild [ἀνοικοδομήσω] the tent...'⁸⁰ rather than the LXX 'I will raise up [ἀναστήσω] the tent of David. If for stylistic reasons rather than his possession of a different *vorlage*, he may be echoing a popular theme of God's eschatological visitation to Israel here.⁸¹ This theme is evident in Lk 1:68: 'Blessed be the Lord the God of Israel, for he has visited and redeemed his people [ἐπεσκέψατο καὶ ἐποίησεν λύτρωσιν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ]. This refers to Jesus' visitation in his earthly ministry (cf. also Lk 1:78). The theme of God's eschatological return in Jesus' ministry also recurs in Lk 7:16 (again with ἐπισκέπτομαι). 'I will return' in Acts 15:16 very likely reflects this same eschatological hope in speaking of the restored Davidic kingdom. Particularly significant, however, is that a similar statement occurs *concerning the Gentiles* in v14, as James says: 'Simeon has related how God first visited [ἐπεσκέψατο] to take from the Gentiles a people...' This may reflect a broadening of God's eschatological visitation for Israel to include Gentiles too. This seems to place Gentiles in league with the restored Israel and suggests they are inside Jewish tradition, not outside it.
- The LXX uses four verbs of 'building' for the booth: ἀνίστημι, ἀνοικοδομεω, ἀνίστημι, ἀνοικοδομεω. Luke uses ἀναστρέψω, ἀνοικοδομεω, ἀνοικοδομεω, ἀνορθώω. There may be significance in his choice of verbs here. That he twice

⁷⁹ Glenny has suggested the influence of Hosea 3:5 here, where μετὰ ταῦτα introduces a promise of Israel returning to 'their God, and David their king' following a period of destruction: Glenny, 'The Septuagint', 12. But there is no reason to posit the influence of Hosea here, given how Luke also replaces the LXX μετὰ ταῦτα of Joel 2:1 with ἐν ταῖς εσχαταῖς ἡμεραῖς in his citation in Acts 2:17, suggesting that the terms are broadly interchangeable.

⁸⁰ D reads ἐπιστρέψω in place of ἀναστρέψω.

⁸¹ cf., for example, Zechariah 8:3 and Jeremiah 12:15, albeit using ἐπιστρέψω. Glenny, 'The Septuagint', 12-13. See N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 612-53 for the ubiquity of this theme.

uses ἀνοικοδομεω may suggest, as Bauckham has argued, that Luke implies the community of restored Israel may be likened to a temple. In favour of this, see Acts 9:31, 20:32 where the same verb is used to refer to the church being 'built up'.⁸² If this is the case it would further locate the believing community within Judaism as the true fulfillment of Israel's worship. However, if this is the case then Luke only makes it implicitly: the temple in Luke-Acts is only ever described literally as the Jerusalem temple; other NT texts identifying it with the Christian community do so far more explicitly.⁸³ With this in mind, Glenny has also pointed out that οἰκοδομέω is used often in conjunction with the Davidic dynasty – especially when coupled with ἀνορθόω.⁸⁴ If Luke seeks to emulate this it would strengthen the case that he sees the 'booth' principally as David's kingdom restored through Jesus. Linking the believing community with the Davidic kingdom is further strong evidence that for him it should be located within Jewish tradition.

- LXX Amos 9:12 reads 'and I will rebuild it [the booth] as in the days of old.' Luke omits this. This, again, may either reflect his use of a different *Vorlage*, or be deliberate stylistic variation. If deliberate it suggests he seeks to distance the believing community slightly from the 'days of old'. To be sure, God has acted to revivify Israel, but in a manner slightly unanticipated, slightly different from how things were done. But this does not mean he advocates separation from Judaism here; rather, the Christian movement is simply a fresh expression of an old tradition.
- In Acts 15:17 Luke adds the indefinite particle ἄν to LXX ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν. He also adds the object 'the Lord' (τὸν κύριον) to the verb ἐκζητέω.⁸⁵ This

⁸² Bauckham, 'James and the Gentiles', 157.

⁸³ 1 Cor 6:19, 2 Cor 6:16, 1 Pet 2:5

⁸⁴ Οἰκοδομέω is used in 2 Sa 7:11, 13, 27, 1 Chr 17:4, 6, 10, 12, Ps 88:5); ἀνορθόω in 2 Sa 7:13, 16; 1 Chr 17:12, 14, 24; 22:10. The same view is also held by Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 188

⁸⁵ This is also added by Alexandrinus, minuscules 49 (11th century), 198, 407, 534, 86 (9th century), 456 (16th) and the Syriac and Arabic witnesses.

clarifies the striking prediction (omitted in the Hebrew text, above) that Gentiles will also seek YHWH as the Davidic kingdom is restored. This statement that 'humankind will seek the Lord' (15:17) parallels 'all the nations over whom my name has been called...' (15:18). In the OT this latter phrase (being called by God's name) is a crucial identity marker for Israel.⁸⁶ This would suggest that Gentiles too are now being incorporated into the faithful portion of Israel.⁸⁷ In v14 James further suggests this point by mentioning how God has taken from the Gentiles 'a people [λαός] for his name'. Λαός is Luke's special term to refer to Israel throughout Luke-Acts. This further suggests these believing Gentiles are part of the faithful Israel.⁸⁸ Again the Gentile mission marks no departure from Judaism but remains within it.

- LXX Amos 9:12 ends λέγει κύριος ὁ ποιῶν ταῦτα. Luke omits the reference to ὁ θεός here, which is added by the LXX 3rd century Washington papyrus, Alexandrinus, and other later witnesses. This may simply be due to a variation in his Vorlage. Against the LXX, the Western text of Acts here reads ποιησει in place of the more broadly attested participle ποιων – stressing the ongoing nature of the Gentiles' seeking of the Lord.
- Luke adds to the Amos citation the phrase γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος ('says the Lord, *who has been making these things known from long ago*'). It has been suggested that this reflects Isa 45:21⁸⁹ ('let them draw near, so that they may know together who made these things known from the beginning': ἐγγισάτωσαν, ἵνα γνῶσιν ἅμα τίς ἀκουστὰ ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς...). This Isaianic passage emphasises God's foresight in contrast to other claimants to divine authority (45:20-25). In this case Luke may be drawing from this Isaianic passage to suggest God knew from long ago that he would rebuild the

⁸⁶ See e.g. Dt 26:18-19; 32:8-9; Ps 134:12 LXX; Zech 2:11 uses it to refer to 'Gentiles as a part of renewed Israel'. Bock, *Acts*, 152

⁸⁷ Keener, *Acts Vol 3*, 2252; Dunn, *Acts*, 246

⁸⁸ Dunn, *Acts*, 245

⁸⁹ Richard Bauckham, 'James and the Gentiles (Acts 15:13-21)' in Ben Witherington (ed.), *History, Literature and Society in the Book of Acts* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 164

Davidic kingdom to facilitate Gentiles seeking the Lord. However, this addition may also be a Lukan transposition of αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος, which was omitted from his citation of LXX 9:11 earlier ('...I will rebuild it as in *the days of old*'). In either case, emphasising God's foresight here stresses that the Gentile mission is entirely consistent with God's purpose and far from a surprising departure away from Judaism.

3.5. Summary: Lukan Gentiles as God's λαός

On the surface Luke's use of Amos 9:11-12 LXX may be taken to justify a departure away from Jewish tradition, in the sense that it establishes a warrant for the Gentile mission and less of a focus after Acts 16 on the salvation of Jews. However, a close look at his use of the text shows the opposite to be the case. Rather than marking a departure from Judaism, Luke applies this text in a manner that suggests Gentiles are included into the restored Israel which is implied by the rebuilt booth. Accordingly, they are described as God's λαός; those over whom God's name has been called; and God has 'visited' them much like he promised to visit Israel for eschatological deliverance. This shows a remarkable flexibility on Luke's part to label believing Gentiles with descriptors typically reserved for Israel. Moreover, by using the Amos text, he strongly identifies the Christian movement with the rebuilt Davidic kingdom so long hoped for by Israel. If the Gentile mission is the product and extension of the Davidic kingdom it can pose no occasion for a parting of the ways in Luke's work. The following comparison will show he is rather like Paul here and clarify how this might place his Christian movement inside Judaism.

3.6. Context of Hosea 2:25, 2:1; Isaiah 10:22, 1:9 in Rom 9:25-9

Paul's Gentile mission has often been taken as evidence for a POTW. However, the catena of citations in Rom 9:25-9, like Luke's use of Amos 9, may challenge this point.

In the previous verses (Rom 9:6-23) Paul has just pointed out God's sovereign choice in election and emphasised his patience and mercy in choosing some for salvation. What he seeks to demonstrate in 9:25-9 is first that this election now includes Gentiles (Hosea 2:25, 2:1 / vv25-6), and second that it applies to a remnant within Israel (Isa 10:22, 1:9 / vv27-9). Striking here is *that with his Hosea text he also applies Israel-focused language to Gentiles*. This seems rather like Luke's use of Amos. If this is the case then both *authors may have seen the Gentile mission as simply an extension of Israel's boundaries*. Close consideration of Hosea in its OT context illuminates this. Then I will look at Paul's Isaiah citations in their OT context before considering how he re-applies them to suggest the Christian movement is the faithful portion of Israel.

3.6.1. OT Context of Hosea 2:25, 2:1

And I will sow him for myself in the land, and I shall show mercy to the Not-Mercied; and I shall say to the Not-My-People, you are my People, and he shall say 'you are the Lord my God' (Hos 2:25 LXX)

'And it shall be in that place, where it was said to them, 'You are not My People', there they shall be called sons of the living God.' (Hos 2:1 LXX)

Paul cites both of these verses. Originally both refer to the restored Israel. Here Hosea chronicles the fate of the northern kingdom through the symbolism of his wife and children. In 1:1-3 God tells Hosea to take a whore for a wife. In 1:4-9 he is told to name their three offspring יזרעאל ('for the blood of Jezreel', 1:4), לא רחמה ('Not Pitied', just as Israel will not be pitied) and לא עמי ('Not my People', as a means of disowning Israel). 2:1-2 then detail the first glimpse of restoration beyond Israel's punishment: multiplication of the people, the promise (used by Paul) that 'where it was said to them, "Not my People," it shall be said to them, "Children of the Living God," ' and repossession of the land. 2:3-15 point out in further detail Israel's coming punishment (on the basis that Israel is like an unfaithful wife whoring after other

lovers, v12). Vv 16-25 conclude the chapter with the promise of Israel's return to God again, using the language of returning to her first husband (vv16-17, 18, 21-22), and ending with the renaming of Hosea's sons to denote the coming blessing on Israel (vv23-25). Paul merges Hos 2:1, 25 here into a composite citation.

3.6.2. Textual Variants

Hosea 2:25 MT	Hosea 2:25 LXX	Rom 9:25
		ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ Ἰσηὲ λέγει·
זרעתיה לי בארץ	καὶ σπερῶ αὐτήν ἐμαυτῷ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	
ורחמתי את לא רחמה	καὶ ἐλεήσω τὴν Οὐκ- ἠλεημένην	καλέσω τὸν οὐ λαόν μου λαόν μου καὶ τὴν οὐκ ἠγαπημένην ἠγαπημένην·
ואמרתי ללא עמי עמי אתה	καὶ ἐρῶ τῷ Οὐ-λαῶ-μου Λαός μου εἶ σύ,	
והוא יאמר אלהי	καὶ αὐτὸς ἐρεῖ Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἶ σύ	

Hosea 2:1 MT	Hosea 2:1 LXX	Rom 9:26
והיה במקום אשר יאמר להם לא עמי אתם יאמר להם בני אל חי	...καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς Οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.	καὶ ἔσται ἐν τῷ τόπῳ οὗ ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς · οὐ λαός μου ὑμεῖς, ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος.

3.6.3. Paul's Use of Hosea 2:25, 2:1 LXX

Paul applies the Hosea texts to believing Gentiles as follows.

- He omits the reference to land, 'I will sow him [Jezreel] for myself in the land' (Hos 2:25). Land-acquisition is redundant for Paul's argument: in Rom 9:25-26 he is more focussed on who the people of God are than where they live.⁹⁰ But he does cite the other promises in Hosea 2:25 which reverse the judgment oracles of 1:6-8 ('I will have mercy on the Not-Mercied' and 'I will say to the Not-My-People, You are My People'). Unlike the LXX, Paul inverts their order of mention here. This enables him to begin his citation with the catchword καλέσω ('I will call', which replaces the LXX ἐρῶ, 'I will say').⁹¹ This forms an inclusio with the end of his composite citation, which also uses the catchword καλέω: Gentiles will 'there be called...sons' [ἐκεῖ κληθήσονται υἱοί', v26]. Paul's use of καλέω is important because it makes a strong point about election. Earlier he has stated that God 'has called us [ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς] not only from Jews but also from Gentiles' (9:24). It also points back to the election narrative where it is a key term for God's sovereign initiative in choosing the elect within Israel for himself (9:7, where God's election manifests οὐκ ἐξ ἔργων ἀλλ' ἐκ τοῦ **καλοῦντος** in 9:12). What is striking is that this calling language applies to Gentiles as well as Jews. This application of language reserved for Israel to Gentiles mirrors Luke's description of the latter in Acts 15:17 as 'those over whom my name has been called'. It is interesting that both associate Gentiles with the word καλέω. Even if this does not indicate Luke's use of Romans it shows the remarkable similarity of their thought here. It strongly suggests Paul includes believing Gentiles here into the faithful portion of Israel.

⁹⁰ Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 274. (Cf. Luke's interest in Jerusalem as the locus of God's restoration for Israel initially, before extending salvation beyond the borders of the city later - Acts 1:8.)

⁹¹ Kata Kujanpää, *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans* (Boston: Brill, 2019), 111

- The LXX reads the divine address to the restored Israelites in Hos 2:25 as Λαός μου εἶ σύ (matching the MT הַיְהוָה אֱלֹהֵינוּ), and Israel's response (in all witnesses): 'You are [εἶ σύ] the Lord my God'. Paul's citation omits the first εἶ σύ. He also removes the final phrase ('and he will say you are the Lord my God'). His shorter version simply emphasises the role reversal of the Not-My-People to My-People. Again, Hosea applies this to the restored Israel but Paul to believing Gentiles. This also suggests Paul includes Gentiles into the faithful Israel he mentions in vv27-9.
- Paul describes believing Gentiles as 'beloved' [ἠγαπημένην]. Most LXX witnesses here read ἐλεήσω τὴν Οὐκ-ἠλημένην. Paul has replaced ἐλεέω with ἀγαπάω here. This may either be due to reliance on an alternative Greek Vorlage⁹² to the extant LXX or a conscious attempt to link the Gentiles with 9:13. This earlier verse also uses ἀγαπάω to emphasise God's initiative in election: 'Jacob I loved, but Esau I hated [τὸν Ἰακώβ ἠγάπησα, τὸν δὲ Ἡσαῦ ἐμίσησα]'. This would reinforce the idea that believing Gentiles are the elect in the same manner as believing Jews, and part of the faithful portion of Israel.
- LXX 2:1 ends 'and it shall be in the place where it was said to them, 'You are not My People', it shall be said to them, 'Sons of the living God'. This Paul cites almost verbatim (9:26)⁹³ although he omits the first part of the verse ('and the number of the sons of Israel was as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured or numbered...'). υἱοὶ θεοῦ ζῶντος is likely Hosea's own construction. It parallels 11:1 ('out of Egypt I called my children'), a section which details Israel's earlier calling and election.⁹⁴ 'Sons of the living God' also

⁹² Vaticanus, Venetus, 9th century minuscule 407, Cyril of Alexandria and Hilary make the same adjustment.

⁹³ Paul adds ἐκεῖ along with LXX witnesses Venetus, Cyril of Alexandria and other church fathers, which have likely been influenced by the Pauline text.

⁹⁴ The LXX replaces υἱοὶ with τὰ τέκνα here.

contrasts with the 'children of whoredom' characterising disobedient Israel in 1:2 (cf. also 5:7, 9:10ff).⁹⁵ In Hosea this further stresses how 2:1 refers to the faithful remnant of Israel. Again, by applying this text to believing Gentiles, Paul suggests these are part of the faithful portion of Israel.

3.6.4. Summary: Pauline Gentiles as God's Beloved

Counter to the idea that the Gentile mission for Paul marks a departure away from Judaism, Paul applies Hosea's language of the restored northern tribes of Israel to believing Gentiles. This firmly locates it within Jewish tradition. Moreover, though his use of 'Israel' in Romans 9-11 seems to refer primarily to ethnic Jews, this use of scripture suggests that on another level, Paul still considers Gentiles to be part of the restored portion of Israel.⁹⁶ Of course, it is difficult to see why Paul is reluctant to explicitly refer to Gentiles as 'Israel' in Romans 9-11 if this were the case - especially if he may do so otherwise in his writing.⁹⁷ One can only conjecture here. A key part of his argument in Romans 9-11 is to correct different misunderstandings and misappropriations of the gospel by Jews (9:6) and Gentiles (Rom 11:13, 25) respectively. Perhaps if he were to label the Christian movement too hastily as one homogenous 'Israel' this would reduce the clarity of appeal to each of these groups independently. This could suggest 'Israel' was something of a slippery term for the apostle, or one which could be used variably depending on his rhetorical aims. Moreover, though it was not unprecedented in early Judaism to include non-Jews into 'Israel', it seems rather rare that this was the case,⁹⁸ even if at the conceptual level Paul considers Jews and Gentiles to be part of a single people of God (cf. his

⁹⁵ Hans Walter Wolff, *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974), 27

⁹⁶ As Denys McDonald, 'Ex-Pagan Pagans?' Paul, Philo, and Gentile Ethnic Reconfiguration', *JSNT* 45 (2022), states: 'This extensive attribution of Israelite identity criteria to Gentiles-in-Christ makes it difficult to see how Paul can contribute to regard them as strictly Gentiles... and not as members of Israel in some sense' (p. 45; cf p. 37). For a similar view see also Dunn, *Romans*, 2.572; Moo, *Romans*, 613; Longenecker, *Romans*, 821.

⁹⁷ Most scholars suggest that Paul claims Gentiles are part of Israel in Gal 6:16 ('as for those who will follow this rule—peace be upon them, and mercy, and upon the Israel of God'): Eastman, 'Israel', 369.

⁹⁸ See Jason Staples, *The Idea of Israel in Second Temple Judaism: A New Theory of People, Exile and Israelite Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 340

metaphor that believing Gentiles have now been 'grafted in' to the olive tree of 11:17-19).⁹⁹ This might further explain Paul's reluctance to use this language. In any case the application of OT scripture describing Israel applied to Gentiles, in a section addressing who the people of God are,¹⁰⁰ is striking and needs accounting for. It is also very much like Luke's application of Israel-focused language (λαός, those over whom my name has been called) in Acts 15. This is evidence these authors saw the Gentile mission as an extension within Israel, not a move outside it. Of course the Hosea texts only applied to the Gentile mission. The Isaiah texts in 9:27-9 apply to Jews. I will now consider these and how they shed light on Luke's ecclesiology. They are particularly important here because of the manner they talk of the faithful remnant of Israel.

3.7. OT Context of Isa 10:22, Isa 1:9

'And if the people of Israel become like the sand of the sea, the remnant will be saved, for he is completing and cutting short a reckoning with righteousness, because God will perform a shortened reckoning in the whole world.' (Isa 10:22-3 LXX, NETS)

And if the Lord Sabaoth had not left us offspring, we would have become like Sodom and been made similar to Gomorra (Isa 1:9 LXX, NETS)

Unlike the Hosea texts, Paul applies these Isaiah texts to Jews. In their original context they address Northern Israel in the wake of Assyrian invasion. Both speak of a small remnant of Israel spared from destruction. Paul cites Isaiah 10:20-23 first. These describe hope in the wake of Israel's national destruction. Though linked to the

⁹⁹ Troels Engberg-Pedersen, *Paul on Identity: Theology as Politics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2021), also argues that this represents Gentiles being grafted into the true 'Judaism' (82).

¹⁰⁰ It could be argued that Paul simply cites the Hosea text here (Rom 9:25-6) to stress *how* God saves the Gentiles, not *who* the people of God are. However, his citation is fronted by the claim that God has called 'us... not from the Jews only but also from the Gentiles' (v24). This would suggest that Paul is addressing the composition of the people of God here, and the place of Jews and Gentiles in it. Note also the strong use of the 'identity' language of 'my people, beloved, and sons of the living God' in v25 in favour of this interpretation.

Assyrian threat it may be taken to refer to some more abstract eschatological event too (note the eschatological, 'on that day' and cosmic references to the destruction of the whole earth, v23).¹⁰¹ Vv20-23, like Luke's Amos 9:11, likely predicts a restored Davidic monarchy.¹⁰² Importantly for Paul, it also speaks of a preserved 'remnant' (שאר). This is a key motif in the passage. It is repeated throughout (once in v20, twice in v 21, once in v22), and the promise that 'a remnant shall return' (שאר ישוב) has already recurred as the name of Isaiah's son (7:3).¹⁰³ שאר is a key term in Isaiah and may refer either to survivors in a war or be a technical term for an authentic core group within Israel. Both are probably envisaged here.¹⁰⁴ That the remnant will 'return' in 10:22 (ישוב) may denote physical return from exile or repentance, or, possibly, both.

There are differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions of 10:22-3. The MT reads, 'For though your people [עמך] Israel were like the sand of the sea, only a remnant of them will return.' First, the LXX witnesses omit the second person suffix from עמך (thus: 'the people Israel'...). Second, they read 'the remnant will be saved (σωθησεται)' rather than 'a remnant shall return (ישוב). Third, the Greek witnesses lengthen the description of judgment: the MT reads only ליון חרוץ 'destruction has been decreed', while the Greek witnesses read, 'for he is completing [συντελῶν] and cutting short [καὶ συντέμνω] a reckoning with righteousness'. Fourth, the LXX replaces 'destruction...overflowing [שופט] with righteousness' with a simple preposition ('a reckoning... in [ἐν] righteousness'). Fifth, while the MT (v23) reads, '...YHWH the Lord of hosts [אדני יהיה צבאות] has determined complete destruction to be made in the midst of the earth', most Greek witnesses omit the divine title and replace בארץ כל הארץ with ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη.

¹⁰¹ Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB (London: Doubleday, 2000), 258.

¹⁰² The reference to God as אֱלֹהֵי גִבּוֹר (God, the Heroic Warrior') repeats the title of 9:6 which is associated with the establishment of the Davidic throne. John Watts, *Isaiah 1-33* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 154.

¹⁰³ Cf. Isa 10:10 where שאר is also used, but applied to Assyria.

¹⁰⁴ Watts, *Isaiah*, 154.

Isaiah 1:9 also capitalises on the theme of judgment and the salvation of a remnant in Israel. 1:2-20 is a legal dispute between YHWH and Judah. Heaven and earth are evoked as witnesses in vv2-3. YHWH makes his complaint: the nation has gone astray and ‘forsaken the Lord’ (1:4). This leads to a picture of national devastation (‘your country lies desolate, your cities are burned with fire, v7). Only Jerusalem remains (‘Daughter Zion is left’, 1:8) from this catastrophe. Moreover, the destruction would have rendered the city like Sodom and Gomorrah had ‘the Lord of hosts... not left us a few survivors [הותיר לנו שריד], v9. These verses contain the first reference in Isaiah to the doctrine of the remnant (note the repetition of the verb יתר, ‘to remain’, in vv8-9). Vv10-17 then detail further complaints about the deficiency of cultic worship to remedy the situation. The section concludes with YHWH’s invitation to resolve the issue with Judah (18-20). The historical cause of devastation has frequently been taken to be Sennacherib’s attack against Hezekiah in 701BCE, in which Jerusalem was the only significant city in Judah left standing.¹⁰⁵ There are minimal differences between the Greek and Hebrew versions of Isa 1:9.¹⁰⁶ Both texts, then, speak of judgment on broader Israel and the salvation of a minority inside it.

3.7.1. Textual Variants

Hos 2:1a LXX	Isa 10:22-23 MT	Isa 10:22-23 LXX	Rom 9:27-28
			(27) Ἡσαΐας δὲ κρᾶζει ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰσραήλ.
Καὶ ἦν ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ	כי אם יהיה אִנְךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל	καὶ ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραηλ	ἐὰν ἦ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραηλ
ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης....	כחול הים	ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης	ὡς ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης,

¹⁰⁵ Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39*, 183.

¹⁰⁶ While the MT reads, ‘we would have become a little bit [בְּהֶבֶט] like Sodom...’, the LXX omits בְּהֶבֶט.

	שאר ישוב בו	τὸ κατάλειμμα αὐτῶν σωθήσεται·	τὸ ὑπόλειμμα σωθήσεται·
	כליון חרוץ	λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων	(28) λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων
	שׁוֹשׁ צדקה	ἐν δικαιοσύνη,	
	כי כלה ונחרצה (23)	(23) ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον	
	אדני יהוה צבאות עשה בקרב כל הארץ	ποιήσει ὁ θεὸς ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλη.	ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς.

Isa 1:9 MT	Isa 1:9 LXX	Rom 9:29
		καὶ καθὼς προείρηκεν Ἡσαΐας·
לולי יהיה צבאות הותיר לנו שריד	καὶ εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαωθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα,	εἰ μὴ κύριος σαβαὼθ ἐγκατέλιπεν ἡμῖν σπέρμα,
מעט כסדם היינו	ὡς Σοδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν	ὡς Σόδομα ἂν ἐγενήθημεν
לעמרה דמינו	καὶ ὡς Γομορρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν.	καὶ ὡς Γόμορρα ἂν ὠμοιώθημεν.

3.7.2. Paul's Use of Isaiah 10:22-23, 1:9

Paul uses his LXX Isaiah texts to vindicate believers as true Israel and denounce unbelievers as false Israel, as follows:

- Paul merges Hos 2:1 LXX with Isa 10:22 in 9:27 through their shared use of ἡ ἄμμος τῆς θαλάσσης, which likens Israel to the 'sand of the sea'. In Hosea this refers to the restored Israel, while in Isaiah it refers to the broad majority of unfaithful Israel. Though the first part of the catena in 9:27-9 sounds more like Hos 2:1 LXX,¹⁰⁷ the remainder of it quotes Isa 10:22-3 to suggest Paul primarily has the latter sense of unfaithful Israel in mind here. In this way he aligns unbelieving Jews with those destined for judgment in Isaiah's text. This denounces Jewish opponents of the gospel. However, the use of Hos 2:1a may provide a tantalising glimpse that there may be a future restoration for unbelieving Jews.¹⁰⁸
- He uses Isa 10:22 to speak not only of judgment on unbelieving Jews but also the survival of a remnant (τὸ ὑπόλειμμα)¹⁰⁹ within Israel. This identification of believing Jews as τὸ ὑπόλειμμα therefore equates believing Jews in Paul's day with the faithful portion of Israel. If Paul has the wider context of Isa 10 in mind here then they are also to be identified with the restored Israelites (LXX: οἱ σωθέντες τοῦ Ιακωβ¹¹⁰) who turn to God from disloyalty in Isa 10:20. If Paul sees them as the σωθέντες of Isa 10:22 this would link the Isaianic remnant with those who are saved (σωθέω) by confessing 'Jesus is Lord' and 'calling on the name of the Lord' in 10:9, 13 - a group which includes Gentiles (see below). The inclusion of 'remnant' language into his argument is a

¹⁰⁷ Rom 9:27 (ἐὰν ᾗ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ) is more like ᾗ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ (Hos 2:1a) than ἐὰν γένηται ὁ λαὸς Ἰσραὴλ (Isa 10:22). This part of Hos 2:1 was not cited in 9:26, where only Hos 2:1b was quoted.

¹⁰⁸ Mark Seifrid, 'Romans' in G.K. Beale and D.A. Carson (eds.) *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 649

¹⁰⁹ The most reliable NT witnesses here read τὸ ὑπόλειμμα rather than the LXX τὸ κατάλειμμα in 9:2. Others including P46, Sinaiticus, and D have probably been altered to match the LXX here. Dunn, *Romans 9-16*, 568.]

¹¹⁰ cf. MT 'the survivors of Israel' (ופלית בית יעקב)

significant means of vindicating believing Jews as the faithful portion of Israel. This may be informative for Luke-Acts. Luke lacks the technical language of the 'remnant' in his work. However, it is likely that he also had this popular theme in mind, particularly given his use of Amos 9:11 which addresses the remnant of Israel even though it lacks the specific language of τό λείμμα. Further evidence of it may be seen in, e.g., Lk 2:34, where Simeon predicts the 'falling and rising of many in Israel', and Jesus' selection of the twelve who likely represent the remnant of the twelve tribes of Israel (Lk 6:13). If the Christian movement is linked to the restored remnant of Israel, this places it inside Jewish tradition rather than outside it.

- Paul also applies to unbelieving Jews the oracle, 'the Lord will make a total and finalising work on the earth' [λόγον γὰρ συντελῶν καὶ συντέμνων ποιήσει κύριος ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, v28].¹¹¹ This draws more attention to the motif of judgment on unbelieving Jews.
- Paul refers to God as κύριος in 9:28 rather than ὁ θεός as LXX Isa 10:23 reads.¹¹² This binds the citation closer to Isa 1:9 in the next verse (...κύριος σαβαωθ...). It may also point forward to 10:9, where κύριος applies to *Jesus* ('if you confess that Jesus is Lord [κύριον Ἰησοῦν] and believe in your heart that God raised him from the dead, you will be saved). This would imply that the same Lord Jesus who bestows salvation (Rom 10:9) will also 'execute his judgment on the earth quickly and decisively' on unbelieving Jews. This makes one's response to Jesus a key criterion to assess who is in the faithful portion of Israel, and further vindicates believing Jews as part of the same.

¹¹¹ All witnesses to the LXX insert between 'total and finalising work' and 'God shall make on the whole earth', the phrase ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὅτι λόγον συντετμημένον, which corresponds to the words in italics here: 'he is completing and finalising a reckoning with righteousness, for God shall perform a finalising work on the whole earth). There are some variations to the Romans text here: several MSS. including κ2 D F G K P Ψ 33. 104. 365. 630. 1175. 1241. 1505. 2464. Lat sy^h match the longer LXX form verbatim. These are likely to be secondary additions: the citation from Hosea 2:25 shows Paul's tendency to abbreviate his citations here, which would explain his omission of the second συντεμνω, as well as the confusing addition 'in righteousness'.

¹¹² As with Marchalianus, the Palestinian Syriac source, Eusebius, Basil.

- Paul replaces ἐν τῇ οἰκουμένῃ ὅλῃ with ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. This may reflect additional dependence on Isaiah 28:22¹¹³ which references 'deeds finished and cut short, which he will perform upon the whole land' [συντελεσμένα καὶ συντετμημένα πράγματα ἤκουσα παρὰ κυρίου σαβαωθ, ἃ ποιήσει ἐπὶ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν]: note the shared use here of the striking words συντελεω and συντεμνω in relation to judgment. Isaiah 28:22 is also part of a section describing judgment, here on Israel's leaders (28:14), which Paul may also be referring to. Isa 1:9 continues this theme by likening unbelieving Jews to Isaiah's Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa 1:9, Rom 9:29). Denouncing Jewish unbelievers as the unfaithful portion of Israel is the other side of vindicating believers as the faithful remnant. Both seem to locate the Christian movement inside Judaism. Luke similarly uses scripture to denounce unbelieving Jews; I will consider this in more detail in my third comparison below.
- Finally, Paul uses Isa 1:9 to refer to the believing remnant as a σπέρμα. Importantly, σπέρμα hearkens back to 9:7 -- 'not all Abraham's children are his true descendants [σπέρμα], but it is through Isaac that descendants [σπέρμα] shall be named for you.' This recalls Paul's argument that 'not all who are of Israel are Israel' and suggests again that the Christ event has initiated a division in Israel. The use of the word 'seed' to describe the remnant of Israel may also anticipate the positive end to Romans 11, that 'all Israel will be saved' (11:26): in both Isaiah and other second temple literature it acts as a key catchword for the restored remnant of Israel from which originates the restoration of all Israel at a later date (e.g. Isa 41:8-10, 43:5, 44:2-3, 45:25, 65:9, 66:22, Wis 14:6, CD-A 2:11-12, 4Q504 frgs. 1-2 5:6-14).¹¹⁴ In this case Paul is arguing that the believing community is the vanguard of the eventual restored Israel just as he suggests in Rom 11:11-12, 23-24, 25. This seems conversant with Luke's view (below).

¹¹³ Wagner, *Heralds*, 96

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 113-115.

3.8. Evaluation: Gentiles Described in Jewish Terms

Frequently the Jerusalem council has been understood as a definitive occasion whereby the 'Gentile church is declared free from the law'.¹¹⁵ On this basis it is strong evidence for a parting of the ways in Luke-Acts.¹¹⁶ In Romans Paul's salvation of Gentiles apart from the Torah may also indicate a POTW.¹¹⁷ However, a close look at both authors' use of scripture here has shown the opposite to be the case. *Both use these citations to vindicate believers, including Gentiles, as the faithful portion of Israel, and in this way imply the Gentile mission is not a departure from Jewish tradition but rather the extension of it.*

Against the older consensus which read the Gentile mission as the product of Israel's rejection, Amos 9:11 in Acts (15:15-17) seems to portray it as the consequence rather of Israel's restoration.¹¹⁸ The 'booth of David' Luke understands as the freshly inaugurated Davidic kingdom which itself also entails the restoration of God's people. On this basis the Gentile mission proceeds, presumably, as the extension of Davidic rule. That Luke saw the 'Way' as a manifestation of the Davidic kingdom is obvious through his many references to the restored throne of David (Lk 1:27, 32, 69, 2:4, 11:3, 31, Acts 2:25-34, 13:34-6).¹¹⁹ By couching the Gentile mission in these terms he suggests that it is thoroughly Jewish. Moreover, Luke also seems eager to portray believing Gentiles here with language typically reserved for the faithful Israel. They are, accordingly, those 'over whom my name has been called' (15:17), and ὁ λαός (v14). Rather than a departure away from it, this suggests the believing community for Luke remains ostensibly Jewish.¹²⁰

¹¹⁵ Hans Conzelmann, *The Theology of St Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982), 212

¹¹⁶ Randy Hedlun, 'Rethinking Luke's Purpose: The Effect of First-Century Social Conflict' in *JPT* 22 (2013), 232

¹¹⁷ James Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., (London: SCM, 2006) 301

¹¹⁸ Jacob Jervell, *Theology*, 97

¹¹⁹ This is a particularly Lukan emphasis; Paul lacks much discussion of Davidic kingship - for exceptions see 1 Cor 6:9-10, 15:50, Gal 5:21; Rom 1:3.

¹²⁰ cf. Christopher Stroup, *The Christians who became Jews: Acts of the Apostles and Ethnicity in the Roman City* (London: Yale University Press, 2020), 93-44, with the suggestion that Luke portrays Gentile believers here as Jewish προσήλυτοι (cf. Lev 17-18) without circumcision.

In case this may be seen as a Lukan quirk, Paul's catena of citations in Rom 9:25-9 seems to make a similar ecclesiological point. Here his language of the Isaianic remnant [τὸ ὑπόλειμμα, σπέρμα], applied to Jewish believers is informative. In this manner he also portrays them as the restored portion of Israel which has been selected out of a broader majority of unfaithful Israelites in line for judgment ('the Lord will execute his sentence... quickly', Isa 10:22/ Rom 9:28) and likened to Sodom and Gomorrah (Isa 1:9 / Rom 9:29). Luke lacks the technical language of the Isaianic remnant in his own work. But his heavy use of Isa 40-55,¹²¹ and similar idea of a smaller faithful portion of Israel restored out of a broader unfaithful majority in his work¹²² suggests that like Paul he operates with this framework in mind.

Most intriguingly, Paul also applies hopes of the restored Northern tribes in Hosea to believing Gentiles. This suggests that for him Gentiles are now to be included within this faithful remnant.¹²³ This shows Luke's application of Israel-focused language in Amos to Gentile believers is not unprecedented. It also suggests that for Luke too Gentiles may be incorporated into the people of Israel.¹²⁴ Again this tells against the Gentile mission as a parting of the ways. These scriptural themes, then, locate Luke's movement inside Judaism: the Davidic kingdom; the remnant; and Israel's titles applied to Gentiles. Though both authors apply Israel's titles to Gentiles, so do other NT texts (e.g. 1 Pet 2:5, Col 1:12). Though both authors suggest Gentiles are incorporated into Israel, so do other NT texts (e.g. 1 Pet 1:1, Jas 1:1, Eph 2:12). It is therefore inconclusive at this point whether Luke used the Pauline epistles, although they both agree on the incorporation of Gentiles into the restored Israel at this point. The next section on Joel in both authors will provide further evidence that Luke-Acts is engaged in an *intra muros* Jewish debate.

¹²¹ David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002)

¹²² See Jacob Jervell, 'The Twelve on Israel's Thrones: Luke's Understanding of the Apostolate' in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 75–112 for the argument that the twelve disciples are presented as leaders of the restored Israel.

¹²³ McDonald, 'Ex-Pagan Pagans', 45.

¹²⁴ See Robert Wall, 'Israel and the Gentile Mission in Acts and Paul: A Canonical Approach' in Marshall, Peterson (eds.), *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 453-4, also comparing Rom 9:25-9 / Acts 15.

4. Joel 3: Gentiles Included in the Restored Israel

Joel 3 is a text cited by both Luke and Paul. As with the above texts, *this is also used by both authors to side the believing community with the faithful remnant of Israel and to imply the inclusion of Gentiles into this elect community*. This, again, argues against a parting of the ways in both texts and for the continuance of the Christian community as a movement within Judaism. In its original context Joel 3:1-5 describes the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit upon the faithful portion of Israel, cosmic signs and the salvation of ‘all who call upon the name of the Lord’. Luke cites all of these verses; Paul only Joel 3:5 (Rom 10:13). Below I will consider the OT context of Joel 3:1-5 before considering how it is taken up by Paul and Luke to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel.

4.1. OT Context of Joel 3:1-5 LXX

Joel 3:5 LXX occupies a section on Israel’s blessing after a period of lament (2:1-11) and repentance (12-17). This coming blessing involves the removal of northern invaders (2:20). It is agricultural (2:21-27). It includes the promise that οὐ μὴ καταισχυθῶσιν οὐκέτι πᾶς ὁ λαός μου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα (2:27). It also foresees the outpouring of God’s Spirit on ‘all [πᾶσαν] flesh’ (3:1) and concludes with a lengthy judgment on the surrounding nations [πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, 4:2] in 4:2-21.

Several features stand out here. The first of these, demonstrated by the repetition of $\eta\omicron\iota\eta / \kappa\alpha\iota \xi\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\dots$ (3:5), is the strong parallel between the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and the ‘calling on the Lord’ envisaged in 3:1-5. Here Joel echoes the anticipation of other prophetic texts regarding the outpouring of the Spirit. This was evidently a key marker of eschatological Israel.¹²⁵ According to Joel this will not apply

¹²⁵ See, e.g., Isaiah 44:3, Ezek 36:26-27, Zech 12:10.

to a privileged few but will emphatically occur amongst all ages, positions and genders within Israel: 'sons and daughters..., elderly..., young men..., male and female servants' (3:1-2).

Also striking is the repetition in Joel of the word 'all' (πᾶς). This occurs in 2:27 to describe the wide-reaching eschatological blessing upon Israel (οὐ μὴ κατασχυθῶσιν οὐκέτι πᾶς ὁ λαός μου), the coming outpouring of the Spirit for all groups within Israel (ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα) in 3:1, and the proximity of YHWH's salvation for all who repent and call upon the name of the Lord (πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται...) in 3:5. It is also used to refer to the totality of Gentiles under judgment in 4:2-21, referred to as πάντα τὰ ἔθνη who will be judged in the valley of Jehoshaphat in 4:2, 4:11, 12, and as πάντες ἄνδρες who will be summoned to the losing side of eschatological battle in 4:9. This further contrasts the fate of the faithful remnant of Israel with their Gentile antagonists.

The recipients of salvation in Israel (3:5) are clearly restricted to those who 'call upon the name of the Lord'. 'Calling on the Lord' was a common expression used to demarcate the community of Israel (e.g. Deut 4:7, Isa 55:6).¹²⁶ This is presumably the same group of people who repent in 2:12-17 (note the threefold repetition of ἐπιστρέψω in 2:12-14). That this group clearly represents the remnant of Israel, compare the Masoretic Text of Obadiah 17, which parallels the first part of Joel 3:5 verbatim (ובהר ציון תהיה פליטה) and is more explicitly aligned with the regathered 'exiles of the Israelites... and the exiles of Jerusalem' (Obadiah 20).

Salvation is described differently in both versions of Joel 3:5. While the MT reads 'all who call upon the name of the Lord will survive [ימלט]¹²⁷', the LXX reads 'all who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved [σωθήσεται].' While the MT reads, for on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be *a chance to escape* [פליטה],¹²⁸ as the Lord has

¹²⁶ Moo, *Romans*, 660.

¹²⁷ ימלט in the niphal carries the sense of 'fleeing, surviving' (3:5), cf. Steyn, Gert J., 'Observations on the Text Form of the Minor Prophet Quotations in Romans 9-11' *JSNT* 38 (2015), 60.

¹²⁸ For פליטה as 'escaping' see *HALOT*, 3:1356.

said, and survivors [ובשרידים]...', the LXX reads, 'on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be one who escapes [ἀνασωζόμενος] ... and *those who hear the good news preached* [εὐαγγελιζόμενοι].' The LXX use of the participle of εὐαγγελίζομαι here strengthens the connection between the restored Israel and salvation as oral proclamation. Luke uses this text as follows.

4.2. Context of Joel 3:1-5 LXX in Acts

Luke places Joel 3:1-5 LXX on Peter's lips on the day of Pentecost, when the disciples gathered in Jerusalem were filled with the Spirit and began to speak in other languages (2:1-13). The Joel passage provides an explanation for the strange occurrences and occasions a message about the death and resurrection of Jesus. This prompts a large mass of Jewish hearers to repent (2:14-42). The length of the citation highlights its significance for Luke. It is foreshadowed several times in the narrative (it is predicted by John the Baptist in Luke 3:17 and by Jesus in Lk 24:49, Acts 1:5). The event it describes is also alluded to later in the narrative: Ananias is sent to Paul to pray for his infilling with the Spirit, which is described in similar language to Acts 2:4 (ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου, Acts 2:4; ὅπως... πλησθῆς πνεύματος ἁγίου, Acts 9:17). The episode about Cornelius and his Gentile household dramatically receiving the Spirit is also described in similar terms in 10:44-48, 11:15-18, 15:8. Luke clearly considers this scripture as paradigmatic in his work.¹²⁹ Again, in the table below differences between the LXX and NT are underlined.

4.3. Textual Variants

Joel 3:1-5 MT	Joel 3:1-5 LXX	Acts 2:17-21	Rom 10:13
---------------	----------------	--------------	-----------

¹²⁹ Craig Evans, *Luke and Scripture: the Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2001); cf. Robert Wall, 'Israel and the Gentile Mission in Acts and Paul: A Canonical Approach' in I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson, *Witness to the Gospel: the Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 443, who sees 'Acts 2:22-15:12 as a narrative commentary on Joel 3:1-5'.

והיה אחרי כן 1	1 Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ	17 καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός,	
אשפוך את רוחי על כל בשר ובא בניכם ובנותיכם	ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν,	ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν	
זקניכם	καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν	καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν	
חלמות יחלמו	ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται,	ὀράσεις ὄψονται	
בבחוריכם חזינות יראו	καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται·	καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίους ἐνυπνιασθήσονται·	
וגם על העבדים	2 καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους	18 καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου	
ועל השפחות	καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας	καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου	

ההמה בימים אשפוך את רוחי	ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου	ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν	
מופתים ונתתי בשמים	3 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ	19 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω	
ובאר	καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς,	καὶ σημεία ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω,	
דש ותימרות עשן	αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ·	αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ.	
4יהפך השמש לחשך והירח לדם לפני בוא יום יהיה הגדול והנורא	4ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.	20 ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.	
והיה כל אשר יקרא בשם יהיה ימלט	5 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ	21 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ	πᾶς γὰρ ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται

	ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται·	ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.	
כִּי בְהַר צִיּוֹן וּבִירוּשָׁלַם תְּהִיָּה פְּלִיטָה	ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιών καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ἔσται ἀνασωζόμενος,		
כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר יְהוָה וּבִשְׂרִידִים אֲשֶׁר יְהִיָּה קְרָא	καθὼς εἶπεν κύριος, καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται.		

4.4. Luke's Use of Joel 3:1-5 LXX

Luke cites Joel 3:1-5 to equate his believing community with the faithful portion of Israel as follows:

- He replaces Joel's 'after these things' (also attested by the MT, 3:1) with 'in the last days' (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, v17).¹³⁰ This exaggerates the eschatological nature of the Pentecost outpouring. Locating themselves in the 'last days' was a common interpretative move for those seeking to

¹³⁰ The majority of manuscripts attest to this, with the exception of B,C, 076, sa^{m5}, which preserve μετὰ ταῦτα to make the citation conform more closely to the LXX but in doing so miss the emphatic reference to this 'last act of history'. C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles Vol 1* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994), 136.

demonstrate that their community represented the ultimate fulfilment of Israel's scriptures.¹³¹ The phrase is only else seen in LXX Isa 2:2.¹³² This passage is evidently informative for Luke's portrayal of Pentecost. This text reads that the mountain of the Lord shall be established high and 'all the nations shall stream to it' (v2). In similar fashion Luke records that 'there were devout Jews from every nation under heaven' in Jerusalem (Acts 2:5), suggesting that the believers filled with the Spirit in Pentecost are the regathered tribes of Israel. Likewise Isa 2 reads 'out of Zion shall go forth instruction and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem' (v3). Acts 2 of course highlights the centrality of Jerusalem as the immediate locus of God's pneumatological operation. In this way Luke likely supplements the Joel citation with the Isaiah text in a manner that suggests the Spirit-filled community in Jerusalem is the faithful portion of Israel.

- Luke adds to the above phrase, λέγει ὁ θεός ('says the Lord'). Absent in the original Joel text, this reinforces Joel's prophecy as being God's word, inspired by the Holy Spirit. Luke is fond of adding similar clauses to give extra weight to prophetic announcements (e.g. '...as he spoke through his holy prophets of long ago', Lk 1:70; God also uttered Psalm 2 'by the Holy Spirit through our ancestor David', Acts 4:24). This emphasises that the Pentecost events are the fulfilment of God's word, vindicating Luke's believing community as the faithful portion of Israel by portraying this foundational event as the direct fulfilment of Israel's God-given hopes.
- Luke adds the possessive pronoun μου to the male and female servants mentioned in v18. This matches the OT terminology of 'my servants' as

¹³¹ Lawrence H. Schiffman, 'Pesharim' in *New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol 4* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2006), 459-461.

¹³² David Allen, *Lukan Authorship of Hebrews* (Nashville: B&H, 2010), 220

referring to anointed prophetic characters.¹³³ Luke models many figures in the early church on the pattern of OT prophets. Stephen receives a vision in Acts 7:55-56; like Elijah (2 Kings 2:16) ‘the Spirit of the Lord snatched Philip away’ (8:39); Paul’s commissioning has features of prophetic calling narratives (Acts 26:15-18)¹³⁴, Agabus is described as τις... προφήτης (21:10). By portraying them in the pattern of OT prophets Luke suggests strong continuity between Israel’s inspired leaders of the past and these characters in the early Christian community. The prophetic nature of his community is also emphasised by the Lukan addition of ‘they shall prophesy’ [καὶ προφητεύσουσιν] in v18.¹³⁵ This also confirms that he portrays his community as the faithful portion within Israel.

- Luke adds σημεῖα to the LXX τέρατα in v19 to produce the couplet ‘signs and wonders.’ This broadens the eschatological wonders beyond the elemental realm of Joel 3:3-4 LXX (blood, fire, columns of smoke and signs in the sun and moon) to include other references to τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα in Acts. The first of these is applied by Peter to Jesus, ‘a man attested to you [Jews] with deeds of power καὶ τέρασιν καὶ σημείοις’ (2:22). This is paralleled shortly after by the τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα performed by the apostles (2:43, also 5:12). Shortly after this the healing of the cripple at the Beautiful Gate (3:1-10) is described as a σημεῖον (4:16, 22); the community likewise prays for ‘signs and wonders’ to be performed among them (4:30). Other individuals producing ‘signs and wonders’ include Stephen (6:8), Philip (here used to convert the inhabitants of Samaria, 8:6, 13), and Paul and Barnabas (as a testimony accompanying their preaching, 14:3, and accompanying the Gentile mission, 15:12). Crucially, this same terminology is also used by Luke to describe the deeds performed by Moses ‘in Egypt, at the Red Sea, and in the wilderness for forty years’ (7:36). This shows recognition of τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα as a key stock

¹³³ E.g. 2 Kgs 9:7, 17:13, Jer 7:25, 26:5, 35:15, 44:4, Ezek 38:17, Zech 1:6. C.M. Blumhofer, ‘Luke’s Alteration of Joel 3.1–5 in Acts 2.17–21’, *NTS* 62 (2016), 504

¹³⁴ The language of his commission echoes Isaiah 42:7 (‘[I have given you...] to open the eyes that are blind, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeon, from the prison those who sit in darkness.’)

¹³⁵ Omitted by D, g¹, r, vg^{mss}, presumably to avoid the repetition of προφητεύσουσιν in v17.

phrase in the LXX, especially associated with God's saving power delivering Israel from Egypt (e.g. Ex 7:3, Dt 4:34, 7:19, 26:8, Ps 77:43, 105:5, 27, Jer 32:20; see also Bar 2:11).¹³⁶ This suggests further continuity between Luke's congregation and Israel by situating the believing community as the present locus of God's saving activity on the earth.

- Like Paul, Luke also makes extensive use of the πᾶς in Joel 3:5. This he cites from 3:1 and 3:5 in vv17-21 to form an inclusio around his whole quotation. The first πᾶς here refers to the pneumatological events of Acts 2:1-16 (the outpouring of the Holy Spirit on πᾶσαν σάρκα) and the second (πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται) is elaborated in more detail in 2:22-42 as Peter proclaims Jesus' death and resurrection and the call for salvation (his concluding words, 'the promise... is for ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν echoes the close of Joel 3:5 -- οὐκ κύριος προσκέκληται -- which Luke omits from the close of his citation in vv17-21, suggesting that vv20-40 are an elaboration on the Joel citation). Like Paul, Luke also intersperses the term heavily throughout his passage. Πᾶς recurs in Acts 2:1 in reference to the disciples ('they were all together in one place'), v4 ('all of them were filled with the Holy Spirit). It is also used to represent the broad totality of Jews who witnessed the disciples being filled with the Spirit (coming from every [παντός] nation under heaven, v5), who also exclaim, 'are not all these who are speaking [in tongues] Galileans?' (v7), the same 'all [who] were amazed' at the events (v12). Peter also addresses the 'men of Judea and all who dwell in Jerusalem' in v14; likewise the concluding statement, 'let all the house of Israel know... that God has made him [Jesus] Lord and Messiah' in v36 leads to the promise of salvation 'to you, your children, and... all who are far away' (v39). The final cluster of πᾶς phrases occurs in the next section, 2:42-47, in relation to the Jerusalem church. Clearly then, Luke primarily takes Joel's πᾶς to include Jews in the Pentecost passage. However, this does not mean that Luke entirely restricts the Joel promise to

¹³⁶ Johnson, *Acts*, 50.

Jews. Rather, the broader context of Luke-Acts clearly extends this to include Gentiles. The repetition of $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$ in the Pentecost passage vividly recalls Luke's citation of Isa 40:3-5 in Lk 3:4-6,¹³⁷ which states that $\acute{\omicron}\psi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\sigma\alpha\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\ \tau\omicron\ \sigma\omega\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}$. That this promise of salvation is extended to Gentiles as well as Jews is made even clearer here given John's announcement in the following verses, 'Do not begin to say to yourselves, 'We have Abraham as our ancestor...God is able from these stones to raise up children to Abraham' (Lk 3:8) -- the joint references to the Spirit and fire in Lk 3:16 and Acts 2:3-4 further tie these two sections together. More evidence that the Joel prophecy may be applied to the Gentiles is found in the fact that Acts 10:1-48, 11:1-18 and 15:6-11 also describe on three separate occasions how Cornelius and his Gentile household receive the Holy Spirit in the same way as the Jewish believers in 2:1-13. This further identifies believing Gentiles with the faithful portion of Israel due to inherit salvation and the Spirit in Joel 3:1-5.

- Luke differs from Paul in his description of what it means to 'call on the name of the Lord' (Joel 3:5). Paul (above) related this to the confessional formula $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\nu\ \iota\eta\sigma\omicron\tilde{\upsilon}\nu$ (10:9), couching it in terms of 'submitting to the righteousness of God' (10:3), by faith and not by works of the law (9:30-32). Luke, however, identifies calling on the Lord here primarily with repentance and baptism (2:38).

4.5. Summary: Luke's Inclusive $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$

Luke draws heavily on the pneumatological features of Joel 3:1-5 to portray believers as the restored portion of Israel. This is evidenced particularly through his emphasis on prophetic phenomena in the community and God's description of believers as 'my servants' and the occurrence of signs and wonders. Most significantly for Luke's ecclesiology, he seems to apply the $\pi\alpha\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$ of Joel 3:5 ('all who call upon the name of the Lord will be saved') to include Gentiles too. This goes against the original context

¹³⁷ Johnson, *Acts*, 49. Witherington, *Acts*, 140-142.

of the Joel text where the remnant of Israel to be saved is clearly distinguished from Gentile nations who are to inherit judgment (4:2-21). In favour of this point, Luke omits this later reference to judgment on Gentiles. As Pao has pointed out, he also omits at the close of his citation the qualifier that those who call on the name of the Lord 'in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem... shall...escape' (Joel 3:5).¹³⁸ This may imply the beginnings of a more universal sweep of salvation. To further make this point, Peter also states later in his speech, echoing Joel 3:5 again, that repentant hearers 'will receive the gift of the Holy Spirit. For the promise is for you, for your children, and for all [παῖς] who are far away, everyone [πᾶς] whom the Lord our God calls to him' (Acts 2:38-9).

Some commentators have argued that this promise of salvation to 'those who are far away' only anticipates the sweep of salvation to Jews. Witherington, for example, makes this point on the basis of 'Luke's geographical approach to history writing and the telling of the story of the early church'.¹³⁹ On this basis the promise should be restricted to early Jews as salvation does not reach Gentiles until Acts 10.¹⁴⁰ Susan Wendel also argues that the promise of the Spirit only applies to Jews here on the basis that Luke applies a different rationale to Jew and Gentile outpourings of the Spirit respectively. Jews receive the Spirit in Acts 2 '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... Acts 15, he depicts the descent of the Spirit upon Cornelius and his household as the realization of God's promises to enable non-Jews to seek him [Amos 9:11-12]'.¹⁴¹ For her non-Jews therefore remain separate from Israel even though they also receive the Spirit, as different scriptural reasons are given for each group receiving it.

However, there is no reason not to see Joel 3 as also applied to Gentiles in Acts 2:38-9. First, against Witherington, Peter could have prophetically addressed a wider

¹³⁸ Pao, *New Exodus*, 231-232

¹³⁹ Witherington, *Acts*, 155-156

¹⁴⁰ So too Bock, *Acts*, 145; Peterson, *Acts*, 155.

¹⁴¹ Wendel, *Scriptural Interpretation*, 260-261

reception of salvation to Gentiles though they are not given the Spirit until Acts 10, *even if he were not fully aware of their full inclusion until later*. Even if Peter did not know it, 'the student of Acts knows with certainty that the Gentiles later receive this promise.'¹⁴² As Keener helpfully points out, prophetic spokespersons in antiquity could often be seen to speak truthfully of the future even if while speaking they were not fully aware of what they were saying (e.g. Jn 11:49-50).¹⁴³ Supporting this point Luke echoes this sentiment in Acts 1:16 where 'the Holy Spirit through the mouth of David spoke' about Judas -- even though David of course was unaware of it. Not only this, but the only other two uses of 'far off' [μακράν] in Acts apply to the context of the Gentile mission (Acts 22:21; Acts 17:27).¹⁴⁴ Finally, Susan Wendel's attempt to separate Jews from Gentiles on pneumatological grounds is highly suspect. Though Luke does only explicitly use Amos 9:11-12 as rationale for Gentiles receiving the Spirit later, she neglects to mention that the outpouring of the Spirit in the OT is only ever a promise made to Israel. That Luke so stresses Gentile reception of the Spirit would surely suggest, then, that he does see them as recipients of Israel's promises in Joel 3 (I will argue against Wendel that Amos 9:11-12 also suggests Gentiles are incorporated into Israel, as I will also argue below). Joel 3 is therefore a key text that seems to align both Jews and Gentiles with the restored Israel in Joel. This is further evidence against the view that Luke advocates a POTW between Judaism and Christianity. Paul also uses Joel to place Jews and Gentiles on equal footing in God's people, as shown below.

4.6. Context of Joel 3:5 in Romans 10

Romans 10:4 reads, τέλος γὰρ νόμου Χριστὸς εἰς δικαιοσύνην παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι. 10:5-11 then address the mechanics of salvation outlined above (righteousness through faith rather than through works). 11-13 detail their implications, namely that righteousness given apart from human worth means that Gentiles as well as Jews can now be saved. The point in vv11-13, accordingly, is the universality of salvation

¹⁴² White, *Prophets Agree*, 85

¹⁴³ Keener, *Acts*, Vol 2, 987; cf. also Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 267

¹⁴⁴ Keener, *Acts*, Vol 2, 987, though he does not mention Acts 17:27 here.

available through faith. To reinforce this Paul first cites Isa 28:16 in v11: [πᾶς] ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνηθήσεται (also cited in 9:33 to emphasise the way in which faith undercuts national or religious privileges). The implication of this (v12) is that there is no difference between Jew and Gentile because God ‘enriches all who call upon [ἐπικαλέω] him. Paul further makes use of the language of ‘calling on the Lord’ (ἐπικαλέω) in Joel 3:5 LXX cited in v13 (above).

4.7. Paul’s Use of Joel 3:5

Paul omits the outpouring of the Spirit and the eschatological signs of Joel 3:1-4. LXX 3:5 is cited verbatim here (with an additional γὰρ). He uses it as follows to argue that the believing community is the faithful portion of Israel:

- He makes emphatic use of the πᾶς in Joel 3:5. This is achieved by omitting the καὶ ἔσται... from the start of his quotation so that ‘all’ is fronted for impact. This matches his frequent use of πᾶς throughout 10:4-13 more generally: ‘Christ is the end of the law’ for **παντὶ** τῷ πιστεύοντι (10:4); **πᾶς** ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ’ αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυνηθήσεται (10:11; πᾶς is added here to the original Isaianic quotation, which I have italicised); God is κύριος **πάντων** (10:12). This itself mirrors the paradigmatic statement in 1:16 that ‘I am not ashamed of the gospel, for it is the power of God for salvation to all who believe [**παντὶ** τῷ πιστεύοντι], to the Jew first and then to the Gentile’. Likewise, 3:19-26 reads, ἐξ ἔργων νόμου οὐ δικαιωθήσεται **πᾶσα** σὰρξ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ (3:20). This is followed by the promise that the ‘righteousness of God [is] through faith in / [the] faith of Jesus εἰς **πάντας** τοὺς πιστεύοντας. οὐ γὰρ ἐστιν διαστολή, **πάντες** γὰρ ἥμαρτον... (3:22-23). Theologically, then, the πᾶς of Joel 3:5 clarifies how the gospel is the power of God for salvation (1:16). It also balances the negative point of 3:22-23 that all alike are under sin with the positive theme of God’s righteousness bestowed as gift.¹⁴⁵ However,

¹⁴⁵ While 3:22-23 reads, ‘there is no difference [οὐ... διαστολή], for all have sinned...’, 10:12 reads, ‘there is no difference [οὐ... διαστολή] between Jew and Gentile... for the same Lord is Lord of all, enriching all who call upon him.’

while Paul and Joel both use πᾶς for emphasis, they do so for different reasons: while Joel used it to emphasise the distinction between the remnant of Israel and the Gentiles as heirs of judgment, Paul uses it to collapse the distinction between Jew and Gentile, even though the original Joel text clearly restricts the recipients of salvation to those ‘on Mount Zion and in Jerusalem’ (3:5). This incorporates his believing community very clearly with the faithful portion of Israel in Joel.¹⁴⁶ Luke’s rationale for applying Joel’s πᾶς to Jews and Gentiles seems especially to come from his use of Isaiah and its themes of restored Israel blessing the Gentiles (e.g. Isa 42:6, 49:6 alluded to in Lk 2:32; Isa 40:3-5 / Lk 3:4-6), and the subsequent Gentile reception of the Spirit. Paul’s especially comes from his view of the law as completely deficient for salvation and fulfilled in Christ. Though they do this on different grounds, the way both apply this πᾶς to include Gentiles too is striking and further tells against a POTW for both authors.

- Paul retains Joel’s identification in 3:5 LXX of salvation with oral proclamation: ἐπικαλέω is found in both Rom 10:13 / Joel 3:5 (‘calling on the name of the Lord¹⁴⁷ and 10:12 (God enriches ‘all who call upon him’). This repetition in vv12-13 parallels the emphasis on the spoken word as confirming salvation in 10:6-10 (the righteousness of faith ‘speaks’ [λέγω] in vv6, 8; the ‘word [of faith] is in your mouth’ (v8); this is the same word that is being preached [κέρυσσω] by the apostle (v8); ‘if you confess (ὁμολογέω) in your mouth that Jesus is Lord... you will be saved’ (v9); likewise ‘one confesses (ὁμολογέω) with the mouth and is saved’ (v10). Not only this, but Paul also ties Joel 3:5 closely to the previous verses by aligning Joel’s reference to τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου with Jesus in 10:9 (κύριον Ἰησοῦν). In this way Paul makes salvation dependent on the correct confession about Jesus’ mission and identity. ‘Jesus

¹⁴⁶ Paul’s equivalence between Jew and Gentile is evidently so persuasive that even Fitzmyer overlooks the original context of the Joel text here, when he argues that πᾶς in Joel 3:5 LXX refers ‘to all human beings’, Jew and Gentile alike (*Romans*, 592). Steyn, further, points out how believing Jews and Gentiles are linked with the faithful ὑπόλειμμα of Israel in 9:27 / Isa 10:22 via the Stichwort σώθω: Steyn, ‘Observations’, 61.

¹⁴⁷ ‘Calling on the Lord’ could refer to the act of prayer (Moo, *Romans*, 660); it may also be a technical term to describe the people of God, as with 1 Cor 1:2 (Käsemann, *Romans*, 178).

is Lord' is elsewhere used in Paul as an expression used to identify Christians ('No-one can say, "Jesus is Lord" except by the Holy Spirit', 1 Cor 12:3).¹⁴⁸ This also identifies the faithful remnant of Joel 3:5 with the Christian community. It is not entirely clear who κύριος in Acts 2:39 refers to. In v25 it refers to God the Father in distinction to Jesus; in 2:34 it refers to both figures together; in v36 Jesus, and in 2:39 (also alluding to Joel 3:5) it is κύριος ὁ θεός. However, 'Lord' is a very common title for Luke (occurring about 70-75 times in his work), so the Christian identification of Jesus as κύριος may further locate them within the faithful portion of Israel calling on the name of the Lord in the Joel text.¹⁴⁹

- Further identification of Paul's believing community with the remnant of Israel in Joel is suggested by his citation of Isa 28:16 in 10:11 (πᾶς ὁ πιστεύων ἐπ' αὐτῷ οὐ κατασχυθήσεται). This has already occurred in 9:32-33 to refer to Christ as the 'stumbling stone' that has tripped Israel up. This double reference to the promise that 'whoever believes in him will not be put to shame' parallels the repetition of οὐ μὴ κατασχυθῶσιν οὐκέτι... ὁ λαός μου twice earlier in Joel 2:26-27 – suggesting that Paul took the wider context of the Joel passage into account here. Joel emphatically restricts this promise each time to ὁ λαός μου. In its original context this was clearly limited to the repentant portion of Israel.¹⁵⁰ Taking the broader context of Joel into account further suggests how Paul saw continuity between the faithful of Israel and the believing community. There is no evidence in Acts 2 that Luke considered the wider context of the Joel passage.

¹⁴⁸ See Dunn, *Romans*, 616, for the argument that this was a stock confession of Christian saving faith; also Käsemann, *Romans*, 292.

¹⁴⁹ Larry Hurtado, 'Christology in Acts' in Sean A. Adams, Michael Pahl (eds.), *Issues in Luke-Acts* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 221

¹⁵⁰ Joel 2:16, 4:2-3 (here, against the grain of Rom 10:11-12, it is explicitly contrasted with the Gentiles).

4.8. Summary: Paul's Inclusive πᾶς

Like Luke, Paul also understands the 'all' of Joel 3:5 to include both Jews and Gentiles. Rather than highlighting its pneumatological dimensions, however, he primarily argues for this through the idea of justification by faith. The 'Lord' in Joel 3:5 he takes to refer to Jesus, which further aligns Christians who confess that Jesus is Lord (Rom 10:9) with the faithful remnant in the Joel passage. He also links Joel 3:5 with Isa 28:16 ("No one who believes in him will be put to shame.") This evokes the wider Joel narrative (Joel 2:27, 'and my people shall never again be put to shame') to further align those who believe with the restored Israel in Joel.

4.9. Evaluation: An Inclusive Salvific Community

In the original context, the πᾶς in Joel 3:5 refers strictly to the faithful remnant within Israel (2:12-14), in contrast to πάντα τὰ ἔθνη (4:9, 11, 12) who are to be punished. Paul and Luke, strikingly, make extensive use of the πᾶς in Joel to argue that the promise of salvation is for Jew and Gentile alike, while simultaneously omitting the reference in 3:5 to 'Mount Zion and Jerusalem' which restricts the promise to Jews, as well as the subsequent references in Joel to judgment on the nations. Both use this scripture to make the case for an inclusive community in which Jew and Gentile alike are part of Joel's faithful portion of Israel.

There are differences between both uses of Joel, however. Paul's Christological use of 'calling on the Lord' (κύριον Ἰησοῦν, Rom 10:9) primarily identifies Joel's eschatological community with those who subscribe to righteousness by 'faith' and not by 'works' (9:31-10:11). Luke, by including the previous verses, is far more pneumatological here in the way he identifies his present community with the faithful portion of Israel: first, by aligning recipients of the Spirit with Israel's prophetic vessels of the past; second, using the phrase 'signs and wonders' to identify

miraculous activity in his Christian community with the eschatological signs of salvation in Joel 3:3 LXX.

Beyond Joel, Luke's connection between the Spirit and the restored Israel also occurs in Luke 4:18, where he makes much emphasis of the Spirit anointing Jesus to restore Israel in Luke 4:18 (citing Isa 61:1). John the Baptist also suggests that the baptism of the Spirit is an indicator of the true portion of Israel, in a passage addressing how Jesus' ministry will divide Israel (Lk 3:16-17). The expectation that the disciples' baptism of the Spirit will empower them to be Jesus' witnesses 'in Jerusalem, in all Judea and Samaria, and to the ends of the earth (Acts 1:5, 8) strongly echoes the language of Isa 49:6, in which the restored Israel is commissioned to preach salvation to the rest of Israel, and Gentiles as well. The language of the church 'living in the comfort of the Holy Spirit [τῆ παρακλήσει τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος]' (Acts 9:31) also suggests the Christian community fulfils the 'consolation of Israel [παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ]' in Lk 2:25. Conversely, disobedience to the Spirit is a key identifier of unbelieving Israel (Acts 7:51). Along with Joel 3:5, the 'promise of the Spirit' Luke refers to in Lk 24:49, Acts 1:4, 2:33 likely alludes to such OT passages as Isa 32:15, 44:3, Ezek 11:19, 36:26-37, 37:14.¹⁵¹ These promises are only ever applied to Israel. This seems to counter Wendel's assertion that Luke distinguishes Gentiles from the faithful portion of Israel in their reception of the Spirit.¹⁵² In this regard Luke is not unlike his Jewish contemporaries who also saw the outpouring of the Spirit as evidence of the restored portion of Israel.¹⁵³ This portrayal of Jews and Gentiles alike as part of the restored Israel is further evidence that Luke does not envisage a parting of the ways in his work.

Is this evidence that Luke used Paul's epistle to the Romans? While both authors quote Joel 3:5 LXX verbatim, Joel is nowhere else cited in the NT. Luke's expansion of the quotation to include vv1-4, and the way he makes the Joel text paradigmatic for his own narrative, may not be surprising for an author who was struck by an earlier

¹⁵¹ Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 256

¹⁵² Wendel, *Scriptural Interpretation*, 260-1

¹⁵³ E.g. 1QH 5:19-26; 1QS 4:20-5; Jub. 1:15-25; Deut. Rab 6:14.

author's use of scripture and sought to elaborate it in more detail in his own work. In this case Luke has removed the Joel text from its Pauline framework of 'justification through faith' and chooses to align Joel's salvation here (3:5) more with repentance and baptism (2:38) than the Pauline confession of saving faith (10:9) – though preserving the inclusive nature of the 'all who call upon the name of the Lord [who] shall be saved'. Emphasising the universalising motifs of Joel 3:5 may provide some evidence that Luke used Paul here: the cosmic signs of Joel 3:3-4 are alluded to in Mk 13:24, Mt 24:29, Lk 21:26 and the outpouring of the Spirit (3:1) in Titus 3:5-6, indicating that the Joel passage was rather well known by early Christians,¹⁵⁴ but this exegetical labour around the word πᾶς is elsewhere unique to the texts compared above (there is little comparative evidence for the use of Joel 3 in early Judaism).¹⁵⁵

5. A Future for Unbelieving Jews?

Thus far this chapter has shown Luke and Paul to use scripture in a very similar way. They identify believers with the restored remnant of Israel. They apply language for Israel to believing Gentiles. This 'faithful Israel' seems to include Gentile believers. They speak of a divided Israel and use OT texts to denounce unbelieving Jews as unfaithful Israel (a critique from within, not outside, Judaism). This shows Luke like Paul to be very Jewish and argues against the idea that he advocates a parting of the ways. One more comparison remains to be made between both authors, however, and that is their views on the future of unbelieving Jews. A negative view of their future has often been taken to indicate a parting of the ways. This is particularly the case with Acts 28, where Luke cites Isa 6 in apparently damning fashion towards Jews who reject the gospel. In the words of Haenchen, Luke has 'written off' the Jews

¹⁵⁴ C.H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952), 47-8

¹⁵⁵ Only MUR88 contains a reference to Joel 3 in the Dead Sea Scrolls, with minor deviation from the MT; Targum Jonathan on the Latter Prophets likewise contains only a minor change to the MT, while providing no further comment on the text; potential references to Joel 3 in *T. Jud.* 24:3, *T. Levi* 18:11 are also likely Christian interpolations; explicit citations of Joel 3 only exist in late rabbinic sources.

here.¹⁵⁶ Does Luke indeed have a negative view of the future for unbelieving Jews? And if so, does this suggest he advocates a decisive POTW in his conclusion? Below I will compare his use of Isa 6 in Acts 28 to Paul's use of Isa 59, 27, in Romans 11. This last section of this chapter indicates Paul's concluding take on the future of unbelieving Jews. This will shed much light on Luke's own position. There may be evidence from this that he is more optimistic on their future in other parts of his narrative, though this comparison shows that his ending is more negative than Paul's. As I will argue, this still does not imply a POTW in Acts 28.

5.1. Context of Isa 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27

The final citation in Acts occurs at Paul's visit to Rome (28:16-31). Upon his arrival here he summons the local leaders of the Jews to a meeting. When they convene he testifies to them about the kingdom of God and tries to convince them about Jesus from the law and the prophets. The reception to this is mixed, with some believing and others doubting. As they leave Paul then cites the Isaiah text: 'The Holy Spirit was right in saying to your ancestors through the prophet Isaiah...'(v25). Isaiah is then cited before Paul announces that 'this salvation of God has been sent to the Gentiles; they will listen' (v28). Acts ends with Paul living in Rome for two additional years, during which he welcomes all who come to him and continues to teach about Jesus and the kingdom of God (vv30-31). This passage has been much debated. Supporting the view that Luke has 'written the Jews off' here,¹⁵⁷ is Paul's statement, 'to the

¹⁵⁶ Ernst Haenchen, 'The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity', in L.E. Keck, J.L. Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 1966), pp. 258-278.

¹⁵⁷ That the Jews are rejected as a corporate group here, see Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971), 128; H. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles, Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1987), 227; So also Jack T. Sanders, 'The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts' in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 104-28; M.J. Cook, 'The Mission to the Jews in Luke-Acts: Unravelling Luke's "Myth of the Myriads"' in Joseph Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish people: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 102-23; Robert Maddox, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982), 86; Richard Pervo, *Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), 685; Robert Tannehill argues that Jewish rejection dominates the close of Acts: 'Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story', *JBL* 104: 69-85, though he concedes that there may be a weak glimmer of hope for the Jews: *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Vol 2* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990), 357.

Gentiles this salvation has been sent'.¹⁵⁸ That this is the final remark in the text in relation to Israel may suggest that they have no further place in Luke's plan of salvation. Second, the citation of Isaiah 6:9-10 LXX seems wholly negative: Luke only references the denunciation of Israel from the original oracle, which despite depicting the hardening of Israel still ends with the promise of a remnant preserved (6:11). Luke generally inserts scripture citations at paradigmatic points in his narrative: including this particularly long citation here would make a strong case for the end of salvation to Israel.¹⁵⁹ In this case we would have a clear case for a parting of the ways here.

However, Luke may not have 'written the Jews off' entirely here. First, it should be noted that just before the citation Paul firmly situates himself inside Judaism: 'it is because of the hope of Israel that I am wearing this chain' (Acts 28:20). Moreover, the Roman Jews also place believers inside the Jewish community by referring to it as a *αἵρεσις* (28:22), which is elsewhere used to differentiate between Jewish groups.¹⁶⁰ It is unlikely that just after making this point Luke would then move the Christian movement outside Judaism. Second, it should be noted that Paul has previously threatened to bring salvation to the Gentiles instead twice before in the narrative: first to the Jews at Antioch (13:46) and then to the Jews in Corinth (18:6). Both of these times he has continued to preach to Jews – in which case this statement may be one of frustration more than of actual intent.¹⁶¹ Third, Paul's preaching has not been rejected by all leaders of the Jews. Rather, there is clearly a divided response (v24).¹⁶² This suggests that there is still hope for individual Jews, even if many of them are condemned.¹⁶³ Indeed, to stress that there is ongoing hope for

¹⁵⁸ 'Gentiles', τοῖς ἔθνεσιν, is fronted for emphasis, v28.

¹⁵⁹ Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 68-9 argues that the Jewish mission has ended, but because it was a success.

¹⁶⁰ cf. Lk 24:5. cf. JW 2.119-166. Kylie Crabbe, 'Character and Conflict: Who Parts Company in Acts' in Jens Schröter (ed.), *Jews and Christians*, 174.

¹⁶¹ Marshall, Acts, 217; W.J. Jennings, *Acts* (Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2017), 245.

¹⁶² T.M. Troftgruben, *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts within Its Literary Environment* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2010), 27.

¹⁶³ Joseph Tyson, 'The Problem of Jewish Rejection in Acts' in Joseph Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish people: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 124-137; R.F. O'Toole, 'The Christian Mission and the Jews at the End of Acts of the Apostles' in J.L. Ska and J.N. Aletti (eds.),

individual Jews, Luke stresses that Paul continues to welcome ‘all who came to him’ πάντας τοὺς εἰσπορευομένους πρὸς αὐτόν (v30) – this presumably includes Jews.¹⁶⁴ The ending of Acts, then, certainly does not ‘write off the Jews’ or seem to indicate a decisive POTW. What it does indicate, again, is a divided Israel.¹⁶⁵ This is seen even more clearly through Luke’s use of Isa 6.

5.2. OT Context of Isaiah 6:9-10

Isaiah 6 details the prophet’s commission. This occurs as a vision. First Isaiah sees seraphim (1:3-4) which praise God’s holiness. Then he laments his own sinfulness and inadequacy before God (v5). This leads to a seraph purging his sin by touching his mouth with a live coal (v7). The Lord asks, ‘... who will go to this people?’ and Isaiah responds (‘Here am I; send me!’) Vv 9-13 then detail the divine commission. Isaiah is to go and address a hardened people (9-11). He asks, ‘How long, Lord?’ (‘Ἔως πότε, κύριε;’) This could refer to the duration of Isaiah’s ministry but is more likely a question about how long Israel’s hardening and punishment will last.¹⁶⁶ The divine response: until the land suffers destruction and all the people are sent away (‘vast is the emptiness in the midst of the land’, vv11-12). The LXX reads instead here, ‘those who have been left will be multiplied on the land’ – reading the adjective רבה, vast, as the verb, ‘to multiply’ and replacing הַמְצַדֵּה (‘destruction’) with καταλειφθεντες (‘the remainers’) to speak instead of a remnant blessed and increasing. V13 is difficult to interpret. The first part seems to suggest that even if a tenth of Israel survives the destruction of vv11-12 it will still be burned (‘But even if a tenth remains in it, again

Biblical Exegesis in Progress: Old and New Testament Essays (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico), 379.

¹⁶⁴ 614, 2147, vg^{mss} sy^h add Ιουδαιους τε και Ελληνας / ‘to Jews and Gentiles’ to stress this point.

¹⁶⁵ Craig Evans, ‘Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke’s Scriptural Apologetic’ in Craig Evans (ed.), *Luke and Scripture* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1993), 209

¹⁶⁶ Watts, *Isaiah*, 108. The question ‘how long’ is frequently asked in in lament Psalms in which the psalmist seeks to know how long God will let the enemy triumph or how long punishment will last (Ps 6:4, 74:10, 80:5, 90:13, 94:3). J.M. Roberts, *First Isaiah: A Commentary, Hermeneia* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 100; Joseph Blenkinsopp, *Isaiah 1-39: A Commentary* (London: Doubleday, 2000), 226

it shall be burned' (וד בה עשריה ושבה והיתה לבער).¹⁶⁷ The next part seems more positive: 'like a terebinth or an oak which when felled its stump remains in it, the holy seed is its stump.' 'Stump' here (מִצְבֵּת) presumably denotes the 'root-stock' which remains in the plant when cut down;¹⁶⁸ the 'holy seed' (שֵׂרֵץ קֹדֶשׁ) the source of implied renewal for the nation. All LXX witnesses except Eusebius, Jerome, Symmachus, Theodotion, Marchalianus and the Syriac witness Sy^h omit any reference to this holy seed. Broadly speaking, then, the oracle is a denunciation of Jews unresponsive to Isaiah's ministry, ending on a note of hope for the nation (the preservation of a remnant). As will be seen below, Luke uses this passage to denounce unbelieving Jews and omits the reference to a remnant preserved. He also uses it as with the OT context to preserve the idea of a division within Israel.

5.3. Textual Variations

Isa 6:9-10 MT	Isa 6:9-10 LXX	Acts 28:26-27
ויאמר לק ואמרת לעם 9 האזה	καὶ εἶπεν Πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπὸν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ	Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπὸν·
שמעו שמוע ואל תבינו	Ἄκοῦ ἄκούσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε	ἄκοῦ ἄκούσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε
וראו ראו ואל תדעו	καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε·	καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε·
השמן לב העם הזה 10	10 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου,	27 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου

¹⁶⁷ The LXX reads, καὶ παλιν εἶσται εἰς προνομήν, 'it will be plundered again'.

¹⁶⁸ Roberts, *First Isaiah*, 101, by analogy with Job 14:8; the LXX of Isa 6:13 reads in place of this η προνομη: 'plunder, booty, store, provision'.

ואזניו הכבד	καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν	καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν
ועיניו השע	καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν,	καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν·
פן יראה בעיניו	μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς	μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
ובאזניו ישמע	καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν	καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν
ולבבו יבין ושב ורפא לו	καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ιάσομαι αὐτούς.	καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ιάσομαι αὐτούς.

5.4. Luke's Use of Isaiah 6:9-10 in Acts 28:26-27

- Luke's use of Isa 6 denounces Jews who reject Paul's preaching as unfaithful Israel. To them is applied the oracle of judgment addressed to the unfaithful Israel that rejected Isaiah's ministry: having dull hearts, ears 'hard of hearing', closed eyes so that they refuse to repent (μήποτε... ἐπιστρέψωσιν). This does not advocate for a POTW here any more than Isaiah's work favours a departure away from Judaism. Luke's Paul, a faithful prophet of Israel like Isaiah, is engaged here in a critique of unfaithful Israel from within Israel.
- At the same time as Isa 6 denounces unbelieving Jews in Rome, it also has the effect of commending believers as the faithful Israel. The former fail to repent (ἐπιστρέφω). But believers are portrayed as those who have repented (ἐπέστρεψεν, Acts 11:21). They are those whose eyes have been opened and

ears have been unstopped. This can only mean they are on the right side of Isaiah's oracle, the faithful Israel. Thus, again, the Christian movement alone is the correct interpreter of Israel's traditions.

- Luke has already used Isa 6 to speak of a divided Israel in Jesus' teaching about the parables (Luke 8:9-10). These parables are evidently significant because they produce a mixed response among their hearers. Specifically, they occur in order that (ὅνα) 'they [those who reject Jesus] may look, but not perceive...' (Lk 8:10). This is in contrast to the disciples, to whom 'it has been given to know the secrets of the kingdom of God' (8:10). Unbelieving Jews are those who receive the word of God poorly in the corresponding parable of the sower (Lk 8:11-15). Believers are those who receive the word in good soil and 'bear fruit' (Lk 8:15). In Luke 8, Isaiah 6 is therefore used to divide between an unbelieving Jewish majority and to legitimate Jesus' true disciples. Luke's use of Isaiah 6 in Acts 28 presumably points back to his earlier treatment of the passage with its attempt to demarcate between those who reject the gospel and those who respond rightly. With this backdrop the citation in Acts 28 might be seen as the backdrop before which Jesus' true disciples (the believing community) are further vindicated.
- It has been suggested Luke has hopes of the restoration of unbelieving Jews here. The Isaianic oracle was often used in the second temple period with this sense in mind.¹⁶⁹ While the MT reads 'they will be healed', the LXX reads *ιάσομαι αὐτούς*, thus changing the mood of the verb away from the subjunctive to the indicative, and from the third to first person singular unlike the previous verbs (see, hear, turn). This may suggest the LXX more strongly holds out the hope of restoration for unfaithful Israelites - and Luke draws on the LXX here.¹⁷⁰ Moreover, if we are inclined to see close proximity between

¹⁶⁹ C.A. Evans, *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6. 9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009), 163-164

¹⁷⁰ Isaac Oliver, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 136

Luke and Paul here (as the previous citations have suggested) then there is the chance that Luke too may reflect Paul's more explicit expectation that unbelieving Jews shall eventually be saved (Rom 11:26, below). However, Luke omits the reference in LXX 6:11 to the multiplication of a remnant on the land after judgment: οἱ καταλειφθέντες πληθυνθήσονται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. Surely he would have included this if he were seeking to emphasise the expectation of unbelieving Jews repenting. Its omission suggests that the emphasis of his concluding citation is therefore on the disobedience of unfaithful Israel.¹⁷¹ Again, this does not equate to a POTW. Rather, as with the Isaianic oracle, it is a critique from within Judaism.

To summarise: Luke uses Isa 6 to stress that a division has taken place within Israel. This is the original context of the text and he seems to share this view. Moreover, by placing it in the mouth of Paul who is elsewhere portrayed as a loyal Jew, and labelling the 'Way' a αἵρεσις just before the citation, he seems to be critiquing Israel from within Jewish tradition rather than advocating a move outside it. Isa 6 was already used to separate believers as faithful Israel, and unbelieving Jews as unfaithful Israel, in Lk 8. This use is consistent in Acts 28. To be sure, Luke's emphasis falls on denouncing unbelieving Jews with muted hopes of their repentance. However, there is little reason to speak of a parting of the ways here.

5.5. Context of Isa 59:20, 27 in Romans 11:25-27

Did Paul have a more positive or a more negative position than Luke on the future of unbelieving Jews? He seems to hold out a positive hope for their eventual restoration. In Rom 11:25 he poses a mystery [τὸ μυστήριον] to Gentile believers in the community: unbelieving Israel has presently been 'hardened' until the 'full number of the Gentiles has come in'. This presumably parallels his statements in 11:11 ('salvation has come to the Gentiles, so as to make Israel jealous') and v15 ('for

¹⁷¹ This omission also speaks against Litwak's suggestion that Acts 28:28 is suggestive of the future restoration of these unbelieving Jews via an echo of Isa 40:5. This link is tenuous and if Luke's emphasis in 28:26-8 was on the restoration of the unfaithful portion of Israel he would surely rather have made this through an explicit reference to Isaiah 6 than an obscure link to Isa 40:5.

if their rejection is the reconciliation of the world, what will their acceptance be but life from the dead'). 'In this manner all Israel will be saved' (v26). Most scholars here agree that Paul envisages a future eschatological redemption of the majority of unbelieving Jews (see above). Isa 59:20 and 27:9 are cited here to argue for a coming visitation of God to unbelieving Jews, in which their sins are removed and they are recipients of an implied new covenant. Then comes a conclusion describing the pattern of the disobedient receiving mercy which underpinned God's dealings with Gentiles and will eventually extend to unbelieving Jews (vv28-32) – and a doxology celebrating God's workings (33-36). The OT contexts of Isa 59:20, 27:9 are as follows.

5.6. OT Context of Isaiah 59, 27

'And the one who delivers will come for Zion's sake, and he will turn impiety away from Jacob. and this is the covenant to them from me, said the Lord, my spirit that is upon you and my words that I have put in your mouth shall not fail out of your mouth....' (Isa 59:20-21 LXX, NETS)

Because of this the lawlessness of Jacob will be removed. And this is his blessing, when I remove his sin... (Isa 27:9)

Isaiah 59 shares the movement of Rom 9-11 from Israel's iniquities to her restoration. 'The hand of the Lord is not too short to save'; rather, it is because of her own iniquities that a barrier exists between her and God (v1). Vv1-8 portray the social injustice rampant in Israel ('their feet run to evil, and they rush to shed innocent blood,' v7). Vv 9-15 detail a confession made for the people by the prophet ('for our transgressions before you are many, and our sins testify against us', v12). Vv15-20 portray Yahweh as a divine warrior girding himself to restore justice (v15) and to enact vengeance upon his enemies¹⁷² ('according to their deeds, so will he repay',

¹⁷² There is no mention of Assyria, Babylon, Persia, or any of Israel's neighbours here; the enemy instead seems to be sin. John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 527.

v18). Then, in the verse cited by Paul (v20), ‘he will come to Zion as Redeemer’ and make a new covenant with Israel. There is minor difference between the LXX and MT versions here. The Hebrew reads *וּבֵא לְצִיּוֹן גּוֹאֵל*.¹⁷³ The LXX preserves the meaning of *גּוֹאֵל* (‘redeemer, deliverer’) with *ὁ ρυόμενος* but replaces the preposition *ל* with *ἕνεκεν*. Thus the LXX reads, ‘the deliverer will come on *account of* Zion’ rather than ‘*to* Zion’. After this there is further salvation for Jerusalem: people are gathered to her, her state of poverty is turned to riches, foreigners will rebuild her walls (60:1-10).

Isaiah 27 states God will punish Leviathan (primordial chaos, v1). Vv2-5 describe God’s attitude towards Israel in exile using the imagery of a vineyard (‘let it cling to me for protection’, v5). V6 promises that Jacob shall again be rooted in the land. God’s punishment of Israel is outlined in vv7-9. Vv10-11 then describe the state of the ruined city. Paul cites v9 here (Rom 11:27). The MT reads, ‘therefore by this (בְּזָאת) the sin of Jacob shall be atoned, and this shall be all the fruit [כל פרי] of the removal of his sin...’¹⁷⁴. What is this ‘fruit’? The removal of places of idolatrous worship and the return of dispersed Israelites (v9). Vv 10-11 outline in more detail the destruction of the city (representative of Israel’s destruction generally in the absence of repentance).¹⁷⁵ The passage concludes in vv12-13 with a promise that Israel will eventually be gathered together from Assyria and Egypt to worship Yahweh in Jerusalem.

In Isa 59, then, restoration for Israel looks like a divine theophany to renew a covenant with Israel. In Isa 27 it mainly looks like the blotting out of Israel’s sins, the removal of idolatrous places of worship and the return of the dispersed tribes. Paul

Watts suggests that God’s agent envisaged here is Artaxerxes. John Watts, *Isaiah 34-66* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2005), 287.

¹⁷³ The Isaiah Targum also uses the preposition *ל*; 1QIsa reads *אל*

¹⁷⁴ There is some difference here between the LXX and the MT versions of 27:9. While the MT reads, ‘this shall be all the fruit [כל פרי] of the removal of his sin...’, most LXX manuscripts replace *כל פרי* (all the fruit) with the more generic *ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ* (thus: ‘this shall be his blessing’). In the Hebrew this reference to ‘fruit’ further connects this verse with v6: ‘Israel shall blossom and sprout’ to emphasise *יִצְיַץ וּפְרַח יִשְׂרָאֵל* the motif of Israel’s expansion in the land.

¹⁷⁵ Roberts, *First Isaiah*, 340.

uses the LXX texts nearly verbatim to anticipate a future restoration of unbelieving Jews.

5.7. Textual Variations

Isa 59:20 MT	Isa 59:20-21 LXX	Romans 11:26-27
		καὶ οὕτως πᾶς Ἰσραὴλ σωθήσεται, καθὼς γέγραπται·
ובא לציון גיאול	αὐτὸς ἦξει ἕνεκεν Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος	ἦξει ἐκ Σιών ὁ ῥυόμενος,
ולשבי פשע ביעקב נעם יהיה	καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακωβ.	ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ἰακώβ.
ואני זאת בריתי אותם 21 אמר יהוה	21καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἢ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, εἶπεν κύριος·	27 καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἢ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη,
רוחי אשר עליך ודברי אשר שמתי בפיך	τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἐμὸν, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπὶ σοί, καὶ τὰ ῥήματα, ἃ ἔδωκα εἰς τὸ στόμα σου,	ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν
לא ימוש מפיו ומפי זרעך ומפי יהיה מעתה ועד עולם	οὐ μὴ ἐκλίπη ἐκ τοῦ στόματός σου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ σπέρματός σου, εἶπεν γὰρ κύριος, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν καὶ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.	

Isa 27:9 MT	Isa 27:9 LXX	Rom 11:27
כן בזאת יכפר עון יעקב	διὰ τοῦτο ἀφαιρεθήσεται ἡ ἀνομία Ιακωβ,	
זזי כל פרי	καὶ τοῦτό ἐστιν ἡ εὐλογία αὐτοῦ,	καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη,
הסר חטאתו	ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι αὐτοῦ <i>τὴν</i> <i>ἀμαρτίαν,</i>	ὅταν ἀφέλωμαι <i>τάς</i> <i>ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν</i>
בשומו כל אבני מזבח כאבני גר מנפצות לא יקמו אשרים וחמני	ὅταν θῶσιν πάντας τοὺς λίθους τῶν βωμῶν κατακεκομμένους ὡς κονίαν λεπτὴν· καὶ οὐ μὴ μείνη τὰ δένδρα αὐτῶν, καὶ τὰ εἴδωλα αὐτῶν ἐκκεκομμένα ὥσπερ δρυμὸς μακράν.	

5.8. Paul's Use of Isa 59:20, 27:9 in Rom 11:25-27

- Paul omits the initial καί from LXX Isaiah 59:20.

- He replaces ἔνεκεν in LXX 59:20 (thus: 'the deliverer will come *for Zion's sake*') with ἐκ (thus: 'the deliverer will come *from Zion*'). This may reflect the influence of texts such as Pss 13:7 LXX, 109:2 LXX, and Isa 52:7 LXX which speak of God's salvation coming from Zion (ἐκ Σιων).¹⁷⁶ Arguably the LXX reading 'the deliverer will come for Zion's sake' is more exclusive- limiting salvation to Israel. This reads against the grain of Paul's argument in Romans 9-11, while ἐκ Σιων is more inclusive and may imply Gentile inclusion into God's people.¹⁷⁷ It has also been suggested that Zion here refers to the heavenly sanctuary from which he will arrive to help Israel.¹⁷⁸ In favour of this latter point, cf. Gal 4:26, which refers to 'the Jerusalem above' (this tradition is in line with Hebrews 12:22, which also refers to Zion as the 'heavenly Jerusalem'). Further in support of God's descent from the heavenly sanctuary, 1 Thess 1:10 is the only other time Paul uses ῥύομαι (to save, deliver) in the participle form. Here it refers to Jesus' eschatological salvation as the coming of the 'Son from heaven' (ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν). This might suggest that Christ is also the eschatological Deliverer of Rom 11:26. Luke also envisages the return of Jesus from heaven (Acts 1:11). Interestingly 'he must remain in heaven until the time of universal restoration that God announced long ago' (3:21). This latter verse may well imply Luke anticipated a future restoration for Israel (if Israel repents, 'times of refreshing may come from the presence of the Lord and... he may send the Messiah appointed for you', 3:20).¹⁷⁹ If this is the case¹⁸⁰ we have a strong parallel between Paul's messianic deliverance for Israel and Luke's. However, Luke's is far more conditional on Israel's repentance, reflecting the Deuteronomic idea of repentance preceding

¹⁷⁶ Cranfield, *Romans*, ix-xvi, 577; Moo, *Romans*, 724.

¹⁷⁷ Kujanpää, *Rhetorical Functions*, 247

¹⁷⁸ Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980), 314; Dunn, *Romans*, 692. Moo, *Romans*, 727. The only other time Paul uses 'Zion' is in Romans 9:33, but ambiguously here.

¹⁷⁹ Jervell, *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998), 167; Isaac Oliver, *Restoration Eschatology*, 68

¹⁸⁰ 'Restoration of all things [ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων]' Acts 3:21 may imply more than the restoration of Israel is in view here: potentially Luke signals a cosmic deliverance.

national restoration.¹⁸¹ Paul's seems entirely premised on the act of God and his character of showing mercy to even the undeserving (Rom 11:28-36).¹⁸²

- 59:20 LXX reads of the Redeemer, καὶ ἀποστρέψει ἀσεβείας ἀπὸ Ιακωβ ('and he will banish ungodliness from Jacob'). The MT only records one verb here for God's visitation (בוא). Here the *initiative is on Israel* to remove its iniquity [ב[עקב] פשע ביעקב] 'and [he will come] to those in Jacob who repent of transgression'). The LXX addition of ἀποστρέψει ('he will banish...') emphasises *God's initiative* in saving and cleansing Israel, and this is the view Paul seems to adopt in Rom 11:28-32. Again, there is some evidence that Luke also holds out a similar hope for Israel. Coming back to Acts 3 he also mentions the wiping out [ἐξαλείφω] of Israel's sins (Acts 3:19). Again, though, this is not as certain a hope as Paul holds out.
- 59:21 reads 'and this shall be the covenant that I will make with them, says the Lord [καὶ αὕτη αὐτοῖς ἡ παρ' ἐμοῦ διαθήκη, εἶπεν κύριος:]. Paul repeats this verbatim.¹⁸³ Then he inserts Isaiah 27:9b ('when I will take away their sins'). The effect is a twofold witness of the new covenant that God will make with unbelieving Israel. This eschatological promise is an entirely conventional Jewish expectation - grounding Paul inside Judaism rather than a parting of the ways here.¹⁸⁴ Cf., for example, the wording of Jer 38:33-34 LXX, which also references the covenant (ἡ διαθήκη) by which Israel's sin will be removed. Luke also acknowledges the importance of God's covenant made with Israel (Acts 3:25). He also makes reference to a new covenant to the disciples (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη, Lk 22:30), but this is grounded in the crucifixion rather than an eschatological event for Israel in the future (Rom 11).

¹⁸¹ Christoph Schaefer, *Die Zukunft Israels bei Lukas* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 429

¹⁸² Barclay, *The Gift*, 404

¹⁸³ With the exception of P46, which places the article after ἐμου.

¹⁸⁴ Käsemann, *Romans*, 312

5.9.1. Summary: Paul's Hope for Unbelieving Jews

To summarise: Paul seems to apply Isa 59:20, 27:9 to unbelieving Jews to anticipate a heavenly return of Jesus from the heavenly sanctuary for their deliverance. This is premised entirely on God's mercy. At this visitation he will institute a new covenant with them and remove their sins. There are some parallels here with Acts 3:17-21 which might suggest Luke is more optimistic on the future of unbelieving Jews, but if this text does refer to Israel's restoration (over and against a broader cosmic restoration) it is more contingent on Israel's future repentance and much less certain than Paul's expectation. On the whole Luke is reticent to speak in certain terms of their future and his ending is more pessimistic than Paul's on the same topic.

5.9.2. Evaluation: Luke's Pessimistic Ending

This comparison highlights that Paul is more positive than Luke about the restoration of unbelieving Jews. Rom 11:25-32 sees him apply two texts about Israel's future restoration to them in a manner that shows him clearly remain within Jewish eschatological tradition: though much of Israel has stumbled at present, at some time the majority of them will repent and there will be an eschatological national deliverance for them. Luke may hint at such an idea (Acts 3:17-26).¹⁸⁵ It has also been suggested that Lk 21:24 parallels Paul's argument in Rom 9-11: 'Jerusalem will be trampled on by the nations, until the times of the nations are fulfilled [ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν...]'¹⁸⁶. This prediction by Jesus, like Rom 9-11, seems to

¹⁸⁵ There is another possibility that Lk 21:24 parallels Paul's thought in Rom 9-11: 'Jerusalem will be trampled on by the nations, until the times of the nations are fulfilled [ἄχρι οὗ πληρωθῶσιν καιροὶ ἐθνῶν...]' . This prediction by Jesus, like Rom 9-11, seems to envisage a time of Gentile hegemony, after which there may be national deliverance for Israel. It has been suggested this is very much like Paul's temporal clause ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ (Rom 11:25), placing Israel's restoration after the 'fulness of the Gentiles': Peder Borgen, 'From Paul to Luke', *CBQ* 31 (1969), 173 . However, it is more likely that the 'times of the Gentiles' for Luke refers not to Gentile salvation but to Gentile military oppression (vv20-4), in which case this is not addressing the Gentile mission as with Paul. That Luke does hold out hope for Jerusalem's liberation here see Isaac Oliver, *Jewish Restoration Eschatology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2021), 45; cf. If this is so Luke makes no explicit mention of it.

¹⁸⁶ Isaac Oliver, 'The "Historical Paul" and the Paul of Acts' in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Paul the Jew* (Fortress Press, 2016), 63

envisage a time of Gentile hegemony, after which there may be national deliverance for Israel. Luke's 'times of the Gentiles' being fulfilled here might match ἄχρι οὗ τὸ πλήρωμα τῶν ἐθνῶν εἰσέλθῃ (Rom 11:25), which also places Israel's restoration after the 'fulness of the Gentiles.' However, it is more likely that the 'times of the Gentiles' for Luke refers not to Gentile salvation but to Gentile military oppression (vv20-4), in which case this is not addressing the Gentile mission as with Paul. If Luke does hold out any hope for Jerusalem's liberation here¹⁸⁷ he makes no explicit mention of it. Again the restoration of unbelieving Jews may be hinted at in his narrative, but not as clearly as with Paul.

In this sense, it seems, Luke's narrative seems to end round about halfway through Romans 11. In 11:8 Paul also cites Isa 6 in describing Israel's 'eyes that would not see and ears that would not hear'. He moves on to describe the reversal of this state. But for Luke the eyes of unbelieving Jews remain closed even to the end of his work, with no clear evidence of their reversal. Luke downplays any mention in LXX 6:13 of the blessing of those who remain (οἱ καταλειφθέντες) after judgment. In exasperation Paul threatens to bring the gospel to the Gentiles instead (28:28). Luke clearly majors on the judgment side of this oracle.

However, despite his more negative ending, this is no indicator that Luke advocates a parting of the ways at the close of his work. Against the view which sees him rejecting the Jewish people here, his use of Isa 6 shows a division within Israel rather than its removal.¹⁸⁸ This accords with his use of Isa 6 earlier in his narrative (Lk 8) and is simply further evidence that he sees unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel and believers as the faithful portion of Israel. This use of Isaiah certainly does not imply the Christian movement moves beyond Judaism in his work; rather his Paul

¹⁸⁷ Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer, 1988), 116. It is hard to argue why he would expect a glorified Jerusalem given the narrative move beyond Jerusalem, Acts 1:8.

¹⁸⁸ Craig Evans, 'Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke's Scriptural Apologetic' in Evans, *Luke and Scripture*, 208-9

in good prophetic fashion seems engaged in a critique from within¹⁸⁹ - and that to a limited local context of Jews in Rome, not to all Jews entirely (Acts 28:30).

There is a possibility that Luke knew Paul's view on this topic, either through direct letter usage, personal acquaintance with him, or indirect knowledge of Pauline tradition. At times their thoughts do converge here: both address the 'problem' of Gentile inclusion, Jewish rejection of the gospel, whether God remains faithful to his people; both use the language of 'hardening' and 'contrary' [αντιλέγων] to describe the plights of unbelieving Jews.¹⁹⁰ The previous scripture comparisons in this chapter have also shown great similarity between both authors. If this was the case we might ask why Luke ends on a more negative note, given Paul's manifestly more optimistic hope for unbelieving Jews. Maybe this could be accredited to a different audience: Luke's Paul addresses first-time Jewish hearers of the gospel while Paul's latter statements in Rom 11 are directed to Gentiles tempted to become arrogant about their own reception of Jewish rejection of the gospel. This might account for a difference in emphasis between each.¹⁹¹ Or maybe Luke is more reticent than Paul to talk about eschatological redemption for Israel (Acts 1:6-8) given the obvious fact that much of Israel remained unrepentant, at the time of his writing, while Paul's earlier composition of Romans may not have allowed time for such hopes to be dimmed.¹⁹² Even though the two authors apply two very different texts to their Jewish rivals (one a restoration oracle, the other a judgment oracle), the fact that Luke applies a more negative text to Jewish rivals as a critique from within does not mean he advocates a parting of the ways here.

¹⁸⁹ William Jennings, *Acts*, BTC (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2017), 180

¹⁹⁰ Marianne Palmer Bonz, 'Luke's Revision of Paul's Reflections in Romans 9-11' in David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, David Pao (eds.), *Early Christian Voices* (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), 147-9

¹⁹¹ Kenneth Litwak, 'One or Two Views of Judaism: Paul in Acts 28 and Romans 11 on Jewish Unbelief', *Tyndale Bulletin*, 57 (2006), 242

¹⁹² Michael Wolter, 'Israel's Future', 319; Marianne Palmer Bonz, 'Luke's Revision of Paul's Reflections in Romans 9-11' in David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, David Pao (eds.), *Early Christian Voices* (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), 151

6. Conclusions

This chapter has compared Romans 9-11 with Luke-Acts in such a manner as to demonstrate that Luke and Paul both present the Christian movement as part of the faithful portion of Israel. Paul argues from 'within Judaism'. The portrait of Paul in Acts accords broadly with Paul's self-presentation in his epistles, suggesting close proximity of thought there. It is possible that Luke knew Paul or his letters, and he agrees on many fundamental points of his theology. Most importantly, Luke uses scripture ecclesiologically to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel in a manner very similar to Paul's. These compelling similarities suggest that we might see Luke, too, as arguing from 'within Judaism' - even if they do not necessarily argue in identical ways for the continuity of the Christian movement with Judaism. This chapter has compared three groups of citations where parallels could be seen between Paul and Luke.

Amos 9:11 (Acts 15) and Hosea 2:25, 2:1, Isa 10:22, 1:9 (Rom 9:25-9) address the rationale for including Gentiles in the people of God. The Gentile mission has often been seen as occasion to see a parting of the ways in Paul and in Luke, but this comparison rather showed the opposite to be the case. Here Paul applied the Hosea texts, originally addressing the restoration of the northern tribes, to believing Gentiles to indicate their change in status ('those who were not my people I will call my people...'). He applied the Isaiah texts to believing Jews to suggest they are part of the faithful remnant [τὸ ὑπόλειμμα] of Israel. *Rather than imply a departure from Judaism to Christianity, believers are portrayed in terms used to describe the faithful portion of Israel.* This, intriguingly, was also shown to be the case with Luke's use of Amos. Here the 'booth of David' was shown to be the restored Davidic kingdom which also implied the restoration of a remnant in Israel. This describes Jewish believers as the faithful Israel. But James also applies this oracle to describe Gentiles as 'those over whom my name has been called' (15:17) and ὁ λαός (v14). This is important terminology to describe Israel and suggests Luke like Paul is suggesting Gentile

believers are now incorporated into the faithful portion of Israel here. In both cases, then, each author describes the Gentile mission in very Jewish terms: the not-beloved becoming beloved for example (Rom 9) and for Luke, the extension of the Davidic kingdom. Granted: neither Luke nor Paul explicitly refer to the Christian movement of Jews and Gentiles as '(faithful / true) Israel'. But the way both insert the Gentiles into Israel's restoration story here, making Gentiles the recipients of promises to the restored Israel, argues strongly for a single people of God into which they have been included. Applying these Jewish descriptors to Gentiles in the context of the Gentile mission here suggests that for Luke, the Gentile mission cannot be conceived of as a parting of the ways; as with Paul's work, being part of the restored Israel it is portrayed as very Jewish from the outset.

Both authors cite Joel 3 ('all who call on the name of the Lord will be saved'). Paul only uses v5 and Luke includes its pneumatological features (3:1-4). In its original context Joel's 'all [πᾶς]' was restricted to the remnant of Israel, even in opposition to the Gentiles. Luke and Paul seem to extend this 'all' to include Gentiles as well as Jews. Paul claims 'there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all [πᾶς] and is generous to all who call on him'. Luke immediately uses it to refer to believers in Jerusalem (Acts 2:1,4, 5, 7, 14). But his programmatic citation of Isaiah earlier claims 'all flesh [πᾶσα σὰρξ] shall see the salvation of God' (Lk 3:4-6), and this text refers to the Gentiles. Moreover, by citing Joel 3:1-5, Peter links the remnant of Israel with the reception of the Spirit. Later in the narrative he emphatically links this to the Gentiles (10:1-48, 11:1-18 and 15:6-11). This implies that he also understands them as part of the remnant of Israel referred to by Joel. *Again - if believers are part of the restored Israel then the Christian movement is hardly a departure from Judaism for Luke; rather than the church replacing Judaism it remains inside it.*

Finally this chapter considered the ending of Acts. This has been a major reason to see a parting in Luke's work. Paul seems to envisage a future eschatological deliverance for unbelieving Jews with his citation of Isa 59:20, Isa 27:9 (Rom 11:25-27). In this sense their hardening is temporary; at some point they will be 'grafted in'

again (11:23); this will be 'life from the dead' (11:23). This comparison suggested Luke may possibly have a future hope for unbelieving Jews. This may be especially hinted at in Acts 3: Peter says to the Jews, 'Repent, therefore, and turn to God so that your sins may be wiped out' (Acts 3:19), and this national renewal seems to take place at the return of Jesus (v20). However, this hope is not as certain as with Paul, and hinges uncertainly on the repentance of unbelieving Jews rather than on God's unconditional mercy (Rom 11:28-36). Luke's ending is more negative than Paul's. Here he cites Isa 6 to declare judgment on unbelieving Jews in Rome. It has often been said that Luke has 'written off the Jews here'. I have suggested above that rather than separating the Christian movement from Judaism here, Luke only uses Isa 6 to speak of a division within Israel, aligning believers again with the faithful remnant of Israel and unbelieving Jews with the unfaithful Israel. This, then, is a prophetic critique from within Israel's ranks and again speaks against a parting of the ways.

This chapter has shown Luke and Paul to very alike theologically, contra to a previous strand of scholarship which strikes a wedge between them. It is possible but by no means certain that Luke used Paul's letters. In my following chapters I will compare Luke's use of scripture with that of Revelation and 4Q174. This chapter has focused on citations of scripture. These chapters will focus also on echoes and allusions to provide a more comprehensive look at how Luke uses scripture like his Jewish contemporaries to vindicate believers as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. They will also show how he uses the OT to suggest the Christian movement is a branch of Judaism, further challenging the idea of a parting of the ways in his work.

Chapter Two: Luke-Acts and Revelation 12: Christian Community as Apocalyptic Israel

The previous chapter compared the use of scripture in Romans 9-11 and Luke-Acts to clarify how Luke uses the Old Testament to portray believers as the faithful portion of Israel. This argued against the idea that Luke advocates a parting of the ways and for the view that he is engaged in an *intra muros* Jewish debate. In this chapter I will compare Luke-Acts with Revelation in order to provide another perspective on Luke's ecclesiological use of scripture. This is a suitable comparison for several reasons. First, Revelation is among the most Jewish texts in the NT and also situates the Christian community within inter-Jewish debate. Second, it is replete with hundreds of allusions to the OT many of which are shared with Luke-Acts, and recent scholarship has also shown Luke's use of scripture to incorporate broader echoes and allusions to the OT too.¹ Third, John like Luke also seems to vindicate believers as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. This likely takes place in a setting before a substantial parting of the ways has taken place. With this in mind, this comparison will shed further light on Luke's ecclesiological use of scripture and the Jewishness of Luke-Acts.

The number of allusions to the OT in Revelation makes a thorough comparison between both texts impossible here. For this reason I will focus below on Revelation 12, and what this reveals about Luke's own use of allusion to commend believers as the faithful portion of Israel. Revelation 12 is apt here for several reasons. First, it contains the lengthiest metaphor for Israel in the Apocalypse. This reveals much about John's ecclesiology. Second, it provides several instances where John seems to allude to the same OT text as Luke. Third, a defining feature of Revelation's

¹ See e.g. Robert Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995); Rebecca Denova, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, c1997); Kenneth Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup, 282; New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005)

ecclesiology is the notion of a *community in cosmic conflict*, and arguably this is seen nowhere more clearly than in this chapter.

It might be suggested that Luke-Acts is too removed from the genre of Revelation to produce a fruitful comparison here. I have already pointed out in my introduction the problems of limiting comparisons of Luke-Acts to texts of the same genre. However, while Luke-Acts is not itself an apocalypse, it does have many apocalyptic features.² With this in mind, Collins' definition of 'apocalypse' remains helpful here, according to which apocalyptic literature is 'a genre of revelatory literature with a narrative framework, in which a revelation is mediated by an otherworldly being to a human recipient, disclosing a transcendent reality which is both temporal insofar as it envisages eschatological salvation, and spatial, insofar as it involves another, supernatural world.'³

Luke-Acts has many components of this definition. Knowledge is frequently mediated through angels: to Zechariah in Lk 1:8-20; Mary in 1:26-38; to numerous women following the resurrection (24:4-7); to the disciples following the ascension (Acts 1:10-11) and to Peter in 12:6-17, to give a few examples. Heavenly visions are

² For rare attempts to link Luke-Acts with apocalyptic literature, see Kavin Rowe, who refers to Luke-Acts as an 'Apocalypse' in his *World Upside Down: Reading Luke-Acts in the Graeco Roman Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 137. However, he makes little effort to define this term or to highlight the apocalyptic features of Luke-Acts by comparing it with other apocalyptic texts. Kylie Crabbe compares Luke-Acts with the Qumran War Scroll, 4 Ezra, 2 Bar. in *Luke-Acts and the End of History* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019) but on the issue of Luke's eschatology, not his ecclesiology. This lack of comparison between Luke-Acts and apocalyptic literature is surprising given that the latter also frequently wrestles with questions about who forms the faithful Israel (e.g. Dan 11:33-5; 4 Ezra 2:10-13, 39-48, 7:60, 16:74-8; 2 Bar 41-2; 44:3, 13-15, 78:7).

³ John J. Collins, (ed.), *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1979), 9. This is the most commonly used definition of 'apocalypse'. However, it has not been without criticism, the main objection being that it omits mention of the functional aspect of apocalyptic literature; see discussion in (e.g.) Lorenzo DiTommaso, 'Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity' *CBR* 5 (2007), 238-243. For this reason the definition above has been supplemented with the later addition: the apocalypse 'was intended to interpret present, earthly circumstances in light of the supernatural world and of the future, and to influence both the understanding and the behaviour of the audience by means of divine authority.' Adela Yarbro Collins, 'Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism' in *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 7. This may clarify the use of apocalyptic motifs in Luke-Acts and Revelation as a source of effecting the present-day conduct of their readers, but many other non-apocalyptic texts also sought to influence the 'understanding and the behaviour' of their audience by appealing to divine authority and the future, in which case this does not necessarily add much to the previous definition.

commonplace (heaven opens in 3:21-22; Jesus is transfigured in Lk 9:28-36; Jesus is carried into heaven in Lk 24:50-53; tongues of fire appear in Acts 2:2-4).⁴ In terms of 'transcendent reality', cosmic dualism is seen in the portrayal of Jesus as the ascended Lord enthroned in heavenly places (Acts 1:9, 2, 13, glimpsed by Stephen in Acts 7:5-6, cf. Rev 1:12-18) and the portrayal of the devil as the force behind the kingdoms of the world (Lk 4:5-6; cf. Rev 13). Glimpses of 'eschatological salvation' may be seen in Lk 2:25 (referencing the 'consolation of Israel'), Acts 1:6 (when the disciples ask Jesus, 'is this not the time when you will restore the kingdom to Israel?'), 3:20 (hinting at future 'times of refreshing' for Israel), Acts 24:21 and 26:6-7 (mentioning the resurrection of the dead) and especially Lk 21, whose apocalyptic crises (war, conflict, persecution, famine, signs in the heavens) are strikingly similar to that of Revelation's visions of the seal judgments in Rev 6. This confirms that while Revelation is not an apocalypse per se, it is strongly apocalyptic, such that a comparison with Revelation remains helpful here.

In section 1 I will outline how Revelation might be understood as a Jewish text, situating believers as the faithful portion, and denouncing unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion, of Israel. Rather than advocating a parting of the ways, I will show how this suggests John writes from within a Jewish perspective. Here I will also outline the argument of Revelation 12 and how it portrays Israel as opposed by Satan and his demons. Section 2 will examine the OT traditions behind John's description of the 'great dragon... that ancient serpent' opposing the true Israel in Rev 12:9 and how these also inform Luke's own portrayal of demonic power and its opposition to the true Israel, with particular emphasis on Lk 10:18. Section 3 will consider the OT texts (1 Chr 21:1, Job 1-2, Zech 3) alluded to in John's depiction of 'the Devil and Satan' (Rev 12:9) and Luke's probable use of these same texts, especially in Lk 4:1-13, and Lk 8:1-21, 22:31-4 where Satan opposes Israel. Finally, section 4 will consider the OT texts alluded to in John's description of Satan's fall (Rev 12:4-13) and Luke's striking allusion to them in Lk 10:15, where in both cases again Satan is said to stand

⁴ See Kindalee Pfremmer De Longe, 'Angels and Visions in Luke-Acts' in Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought* (Fortress Press, 2017), 79-107 for a fuller list of apocalyptic revelatory phenomena in Luke-Acts.

opposed to Israel. *This will shed the following light on Luke-Acts: (1) Luke-Acts is highly apocalyptic in outlook and (2) Luke like John portrays believers as the faithful Israel engaged in cosmic conflict.*

1.1. Revelation within Judaism

Revelation is generally thought to have been written in 80-100 CE⁵, by an early Christian prophet with an active ministry in Asia Minor. He was likely of Jewish background.⁶ This can be seen through his use of scripture, his frequent use of semitisms and his deep familiarity with Hebrew.⁷ The text is addressed to a broad audience with a range of socio-economic backgrounds, many of Gentile origin, as indicated by the letters to the seven churches. These believers faced a range of issues. At one end of the spectrum some have undergone persecution – recently Antipas, a ‘witness’ to Jesus in Pergamum was put to death, (2:13) while John himself has been exiled to Patmos on account of the ‘testimony of Jesus’ (1:9). This persecution was likely local and sporadic – and John anticipates a fresh wave of persecution for some believers (2:10). This suffering seems to have raised a moral issue: if God is just, how would he let believers undergo such hardship, and what is the value of suffering for Jesus’ name? Revelation therefore encourages those under threat of persecution to hold fast to their testimony for the sake of heavenly reward: God is in control, and the faithful will be vindicated. At the other end of the spectrum, John portrays other believers as facing the problem of spiritual complacency and excessive assimilation to Graeco-Roman culture. Those in Ephesus had ‘abandoned

⁵ Craig Koester, *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 71; Brian Blount, *Revelation: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing Corporation, 2013), 8; Robert Mounce, *The Book of Revelation*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 19; Wilfrid Harrington, *Revelation*, SP (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1993), 8; G.R. Beasley-Murray, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1974), 38; Leonard Thompson, *The Book of Revelation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 15; Judith Kovacs and Christopher Rowland (eds.), *Revelation*, EpC (Malden: Blackwell, 2004), 3

⁶ So most commentators concur, e.g. Koester, *Revelation*, 68; Blount, *Revelation*, 8; Boxhall, *Revelation*, 7; Beasley-Murray, *Revelation*, 33-34; Harrington, *Revelation*, 9; Mounce, *Revelation*, 15; Louis Brighton, *Revelation* (St. Louis: Concordia, 1999), 15; David Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, WBC 52A (Nashville: Nelson, 1998), lvi.

⁷ Ralph Korner, David Aune (eds.), *Reading Revelation After Supersessionism: An Apocalyptic Journey of Socially Identifying John's Multi-Ethnic Ekklēsiai with the Ekklēsia of Israel* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2020), 145

the love' they had at first (2:4); those in Pergamum and Thyatira were eating food sacrificed to idols (2:14, 2:20); those in Laodicea were 'lukewarm' in faith (3:15-16). So John also writes to these believers to motivate them out of spiritual complacency.

The Jewishness of Revelation is seen in John's concern about matters of purity. Concerning sexual ethics, in a vision of the 144,000 believers he celebrates the fact that they 'have not defiled themselves with women, for they are virgins' (14:4), mirroring Jewish prohibitions on sex in relation to holy war.⁸ Nothing κοινὸν, unclean, shall enter the new Jerusalem (21:27). John also chides prophetic rivals in Pergamum and Thyatira for teaching believers to commit sexual immorality [πορνεῦσαι] and to eat εἰδωλόθυτα (food sacrificed to idols, 2:14, 20). This concern for halakhic observance seems to associate him with a particular brand of Jewish Christianity⁹ rather similar, it seems, to that promoted in James' apostolic decree in Acts 15:20 which also prohibits Gentile converts from 'things polluted by idols [τῶν εἰδώλων] and from sexual immorality [τῆς πορνείας]'.¹⁰

Most significant for John's Jewish identity, however, is his complaint about 'the slander on the part of those who say that they are Jews and are not but are a synagogue of Satan' in the letter to Smyrna (Rev 2:9). Likewise, to the church in Philadelphia, he refers to 'those of the synagogue of Satan who say that they are Jews and are not but are lying' (3:9). 'Slander' [τὴν βλασφημίαν] in the first instance seems to refer to the act of being slandered to the authorities.¹¹ The identity of the so-called Ἰουδαῖοι has been debated. They could refer to Jewish Christians, on the basis that συναγωγή might apparently refer generally to a non-Jewish assembly, and that to read Ἰουδαίους as 'Jews' as opposed to 'Christians' is anachronistic.¹² They could also be Gentile Christian judaizers on the basis that this is the most literal means of

⁸ Richard Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000), 230-232

⁹ David Frankfurter, 'Beyond "Jewish Christianity": Continuing Religious Sub-Cultures of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents' in Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 137

¹⁰ cf. also *Did.* 6:3. David Frankfurter, 'Jews or Not? Reconstructing the 'Other' in Rev 2:9 and 3:9', *HTR* 94:4 (2001), 415

¹¹ Koester, *Revelation*, 274; G.K. Beale, *Revelation*, 236; Mounce, *Revelation*, 75

¹² Frankfurter, 'Jews or Not?', 407-8

reading 'those who say that they are Jews and are not'. These may have claimed Jewish ethnic identity to gain Jewish rights and avoid persecution.¹³ However, against the first, it seems more likely that συναγωγή would refer to a Jewish institution.¹⁴ Against the second, it is difficult to explain why fellow believers might blaspheme other Christians to the authorities¹⁵. Most commentators take them therefore to be unbelieving ethnic Jews.¹⁶ There is also a strong tradition of Jews denouncing Christians to the authorities in Jn 9:22, Acts 13:50, 14:2, 17:5, 18:12-13; 25:7; 1 Thess 2:14-16.¹⁷ What this seems to suggest, then, are rival Jewish communities competing against Christian ones.

This has been taken to indicate that John advocates a parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity.¹⁸ However, this can only be taken as evidence for a local parting and not a widespread parting throughout Asia Minor.¹⁹ Moreover, John's phrasing actually argues against a parting when he chides those λεγόντων ἑαυτοὺς Ἰουδαίους εἶναι, καὶ οὐκ εἰσὶν ἀλλὰ ψεύδοντα (3:9). Rather than separating from Judaism, what he seems to be doing is claiming Jewish heritage for Christian believers, itself a very Jewish move. Jesus' words, 'I will make them come and bow down before your feet', (3:9) are also telling. These allude to OT promises where *Gentiles* will bow down at the feet of the restored *Israel* (Isa 45:14, 49:23, 60:14, Ps 86:9). John has used these allusions in such a way as to suggest that these so-called

¹³ Magnus Zetterholm, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003), 206

¹⁴ Koester, *Revelation*, 275; Boxhall, *Revelation*, 54.

¹⁵ Koester, *Revelation*, 275

¹⁶ E.g. Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 162-3; Beale, *Revelation*, 240-1; Koester, *Revelation*, 275-6; Paul Trebilco, 'The Jewish Community in Ephesus and Its Interaction with Christ-Believers in the First Century CE and Beyond' in James Harrison (ed.), *The First Urban Churches 3: Ephesus* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2018), 112-113; Osborne, *Revelation*, 119-120; Mounce, *Revelation*, 75; Beasley-Murray, *Revelation*, 81

¹⁷ Mikael Tellbe, 'Relationships among Christ-Believers and Jewish Communities in 1st century Asia Minor' in Craig Koester (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Book of Revelation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 160-162

¹⁸ Bruce Malina and John Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000), 54; Leonard Thompson, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990), 125-7

¹⁹ Paul Trebilco, 'Beyond the 'Parting of the Ways' between Jews and Christians in Asia Minor to a Model of Variegated Interaction' in Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall, Joseph Verheyden (eds.), *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 286-7

Jews are now in league with these Gentiles while the church is the restored Israel.²⁰ The polemic against unbelieving Jews is damning, but both his concern for Jewish *halakhah* and his readiness to imply the 'real Jews' are believers (2:9, 3:9) seems to suggest that he is not engaged in anything other than an inter-Jewish debate²¹ about who the faithful portion of Israel is here.²²

John portrays believers as the faithful portion of Israel in other ways. Revelation is addressed to the 'seven churches that are in Asia' (1:4, also v 11). This marks an *inclusio* with 22:16 (this is a 'testimony for the churches'), indicating that the prime subject matter is the church and its relation with the wider world. From the outset the church is described using language originally applied to Israel: Jesus 'made us to be a kingdom, priests serving his God and Father' (1:6), echoing Ex 19:6, 23:22 LXX, Isa 61:6. Then commences the first vision of Jesus where he stands among the seven lampstands [ἑπτὰ λυχνιάς] which are the seven churches (1:12, 20, 2:1). This echoes Zech 4:1-14, with some variation (in the latter there is one lampstand [ἡ λυχνία] with seven lamps [ἑπτὰ λύχνοι]). In the Zechariah text these lamps represent the seven eyes of the Lord (4:10) and evoke the image of the temple. There is also parallel here with the menorah 'burning before the Lord' in Ex 27:21 and Lev 24:2-4.²³ In this case the church fulfils the cultic function of the OT temple or tabernacle as the dwelling place of God, which was itself understood to be a microcosm of Israel.²⁴ From the earliest point in Revelation, then, John portrays the believing community as the faithful part of Israel.²⁵ Further evidence for this may be found in John's vision of the

²⁰ Greg Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2015), 122

²¹ Blount, *Revelation*, 54; Richard Bauckham, 'The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why?' in idem., *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 175-192; Adela Yarbro Collins, 'Vindication and Self-Definition in The Book of Revelation', *HTR* 79 (1986), 308-20.

²² See also John Marshall, *Parables of War: Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse* (Ontario: Wilfried Laurier, 2001), 16; Daniel Frankfurter, 'The Legacy of the Jewish Apocalypse in Early Christian Communities: Two Regional Trajectories' in James VanderKam and William Adler (eds.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 131; he reads Revelation as a 'document of continuing Jewish propheticism': idem., 'Beyond "Jewish Christianity": Continuing Religious Sub-cultures of the Second and Third Centuries and their Documents' in Becker, *The Ways*, 139

²³ Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 89; Mounce, *Revelation*, 57

²⁴ Beale, *John's Use of the Old*, 105.

²⁵ Or 'communities of worship within the tradition of Israel.' Koester, *Revelation*, 255.

hundred and forty four thousand from every tribe of Israel (7:4-8, 14:1-5) which seems to correspond to ‘a great multitude... from every nation, from all tribes and peoples and languages...’ (7:9), the former emphasising the church’s roots in Israel, the latter emphasising its inclusive nature,²⁶ and Rev 21:12-14, which likewise merges the inscription of the names of Israel’s tribes on the gates of the New Jerusalem with the twelve names of the apostles also inscribed on the city’s foundations.²⁷ This vision of the church as faithful Israel emerges particularly clearly in Revelation 12 which I will consider below.

Like Luke, John draws heavily on scripture to provide continuity between God’s purposes in the present and future, and his past dealings with Israel. He uses it thematically (developing major OT themes such as the ‘Day of the Lord’), suggests that certain scriptures are being directly fulfilled in the new community, he uses it typologically, and at times (as with, e.g., Luke 1-2) he also uses it stylistically by reproducing semitisms and septuagintisms in his own writing.²⁸ Unlike Luke-Acts, scripture is never cited directly. Rather, he only makes allusions to the OT,²⁹ and many phrases may evoke several OT passages at once. This makes it difficult to assess precisely which texts are being referred to, for which reason Fekke’s criteria for

²⁶ So the majority of interpreters from the early 20th century onwards (Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 442). Other readings suggest the 144,000 are (a) Jewish Christians (J.A. Draper, ‘The Heavenly Feast of Tabernacles: Revelation 7:1-17, *JSNT 6* (1983), 136; John Walvoord, *Revelation of Jesus Christ* (Chicago: Moody Publishers, 1966), 143 or (b) Christian martyrs (George Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine* (London: Black, 1966); Christopher Rowland, *Revelation*, EpC (London: Epworth, 1993), 91 Robert Thomas, *Revelation 1-7: An Exegetical Commentary* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1995), 474; Mitchell Reddish, *Revelation* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2001), 146). Against (a) note that the ‘great multitude’ are portrayed as equal heirs of Israel’s promises in 7:14-17, which makes their distinction from the 144,000 unlikely, as well as their depiction as ‘a kingdom and priests’ (which is a definitive description for Israel) in 5:9-10 (Koester, *Revelation*, 427). Interpretation (b) often links the 144,000 to the martyrs in 6:9-10, which anticipates a fuller number of martyrs to be added to a former group, but there is no clear reference to martyrdom in any of the passages about the 144,000.

²⁷ Thus tribes and apostles as Israel are part of the one people of God: Osborne, *Revelation*, 591; Koester, *Revelation*, 816; Boxall, *Revelation*, 302; Blount, *Revelation*, 386). Cf. Lk 22:30 for a similar fusion of the twelve apostles with the twelve tribes, suggesting further that Luke aligns the church with the faithful portion of Israel. Much more could be said about Rev 7:1-17 and Rev 21:12-14 (the only time other than 2:14 where ‘Israel’ is mentioned), along with 14:1-5, but I lack space: the idea that John portrays the church as the faithful portion of Israel will be outworked in particular detail below in my discussion of Rev 12.

²⁸ Beale, *John’s Use of the Old*, 75-125

²⁹ Koester, *Revelation*, 123, puts the number of these allusions to around 300, although it is hard to quantify exactly how many allusions are made.

assessing allusions is probably helpful: allusions are certain / virtually certain, probable / possible or unlikely / doubtful.³⁰ It may also be helpful to distinguish 'allusions' from 'echoes' here, the former as intentional references to the OT and the latter as an adoption of OT language and themes even though 'no intentional reference to any particular text is made'.³¹ Finally, there has also been extensive debate about whether or not John takes the original context of his allusions into account. The strongest argument that he does not take the original context into account is probably that John's audience was predominantly from a pagan background and would have been unfamiliar with the OT. Against this it can be argued that the communities in Smyrna and Philadelphia had links with Jewish synagogues, in which case *some* of the believers would have knowledge of the scriptures, and that pagan converts would likely have been taught some of the scriptures so that they might be able to appreciate some of the allusions too.³² I will therefore consider the wider context of the OT passages below as I do consistently with Luke-Acts. With this in mind, this next section will outline the argument of Revelation 12, and how John uses scripture here to identify believers as faithful Israel, before I compare his ecclesiological use of scripture with Luke's.

1.2. Structure and Argument of Revelation 12

John has already suggested in Rev 2:9, 3:9 that only the believing community has the right to be called Ἰουδαῖοι. He has also shown this identity is contested, not only by his Jewish opponents, but also by Satan. For John, then, the faithful Israel is opposed not only by rival Jews but also by a demonic entourage. This takes the struggle for Jewish identity to a cosmic level. This is the point I will highlight in this chapter. Luke, I will argue below, adopts a very similar view: *the faithful Israel is engaged in cosmic conflict. For both authors this aligns the nascent Christian community with Israel*

³⁰ Jan Fekkes, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and their Development* (JSNTSup, 93; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 279-81

³¹ Jon Paulien, 'Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation' in Steve Moyise (ed.) *Studies in the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001), 119

³² Beale, *John's Use of the Old Testament*, 68-71. That John does not take the original context into account see Jan Fekkes, *Isaiah*, 286-87. That he does see Bauckham, *Climax of Prophecy*, xi

opposed by Satan in the OT. Revelation 12 particularly expands on the image of Satanic conflict in its presentation of the church as the faithful portion of Israel. It alludes extensively to OT conflict traditions also found in Luke's work. It proceeds as follows.

Revelation 12 begins with 'a great sign appeared in heaven.' There are three sections in ch 12. In the first (12:1-6) this sign constitutes a woman 'clothed with the sun, with the moon under her feet, and on her head a crown of twelve stars' (v1). She is pregnant. Another sign appears in heaven – a red dragon [δράκων, v3] with seven heads, ten horns and seven diadems on its heads. Its tail sweeps a third of the stars of heaven to earth; the dragon seeks to devour her child; she gives birth to a child who will rule with an iron rod (v5). Then the child is snatched away to God's throne while the woman escapes into the wilderness to be nourished for 1260 days (v6).

On the one hand this passage may imply a parting of the ways. This happens if we take the identity of the woman to be the church replacing Israel. In favour of this the twelve stars could represent the twelve apostles, and her children keep the testimony of Jesus (12:17).³³ However, if she is exclusively the church it is difficult to explain how she gives birth to the Messiah (12:2).³⁴ It is likely, then, that the woman represents Israel, which also includes the church.³⁵ This accounts for the fact, as Jan Dochhorn suggests, that John seems to mix several metaphors in portraying the woman.³⁶ First, the crown of twelve stars on her head (v1) probably alludes to the twelve tribes of Israel,³⁷ as with the twelve gates of Rev 21:12. Second, her link with the sun, moon and stars may harken back to Joseph's dream about Israel (Gen 37:9-11) where they also refer to Jacob's sons.³⁸ Third, her crying out in birth pangs repeats

³³ Keener, *Revelation*, 541

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 543.

³⁵ So the majority of commentators, e.g. Marshall, *Parables*, 134; Beale, *Revelation*, 626; Boxall, *Revelation*, 178; Mounce, *Revelation*, 231; Harrington, *Revelation*, 130; Koester, *Revelation*, Osborne, *Revelation*, 365; Brighton, *Revelation*, 327; Stefan Schreiber, 'Die Sternenfrau und ihre Kinder (Offb 12): Zur Wiederentdeckung eines Mythos', *NTS* 53 (2007), 442

³⁶ Jan Dochhorn, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie: Der eschatologische Teufelsfall in Apc Joh 12 und seine Bedeutung für das Verständnis der Johannesoffenbarung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010), 140

³⁷ Reddish, *Revelation*, 233; Beale, *Revelation*, 627

³⁸ Beale, *Revelation*, 627

a common metaphor for Israel's tribulation in (e.g.) Isa 26:17-18, Jer 4:31, Mic 4:10.³⁹ That Israel could also be identified with the church, there is a notable parallel here with Rev 21:11-14. In this later passage John links the twelve gates of the New Jerusalem as the twelve tribes of Israel, with its twelve foundations as representing the 'twelve apostles of the Lamb' (Rev 12:11-14).⁴⁰ This other important use of the number twelve would indicate that there is no clear distinction between church and Israel.⁴¹ Rather than replacing Jewish tradition, John equates the Christian movement with it here.⁴²

The scene continues. Her child is the Messiah (v5), as indicated by the rod of iron with which he will rule the nations (v5, cf. Rev 19:15).⁴³ The dragon is identified as the 'Devil and Satan' in v9. Its seven heads likely utilise the symbolic number seven to represent the magnitude of the threat. The diadems on each of its heads (worn by kings and rulers) represents power and authority.⁴⁴ Its ten horns echo the ten horns of Dan 7:7 which refer in that context to the Seleucid dynasty. The point seems to be that Satan has power in the political realm - in John's context the Roman empire. Next a third of the stars fall from heaven to earth (Rev 12:4). The referent of the stars is debated. It has been suggested that they refer to the saints. Osbourne suggests, for example, that there is parallel here with Dan 8:10, where Antiochus 'threw down to the earth some of the host and some of the stars, and trampled on them'. This refers in context to certain Jews who erred.⁴⁵ Beale also makes this point with reference to Dan 12:3 where 'those who lead the many to righteousness [are] like

³⁹ Reddish, *Revelation*, 233

⁴⁰ Brian Blount, *Revelation: A Commentary* (Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing, 2013), 228

⁴¹ Ian Boxall, *The Revelation of Saint John* (London: Continuum, 2006), 179

⁴² Not Mary, a reading absent in the church fathers and only emergent in the late Middle Ages. Mounce, *Revelation*, 231. Harrington, *Revelation*, 128 states the woman is the bride, the heavenly Jerusalem. Yarbro Collins, *Combat Myth*, 149 suggests she represents the Jewish people of God who suffered before yielding the Messiah (also Beasley-Murray, *Revelation*, 195, and implied by George Caird, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine*, BNTC (London: Black, 1966), 149) – though it seems unlikely that John would devote so much time to describing the tribulation of Jews given the ongoing persecution of Jews and Gentiles alike in the present church situation.

⁴³ Jürgen U. Kalms, *Der Sturz des Gottesfeindes: Traditionsgeschichtliche Studien zu Apokalypse 12* (WMANT 93; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001), 48-9.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 545

⁴⁵ Osbourne, *Revelation*, 585

the stars forever'.⁴⁶ This would suggest the dragon has led some believers astray. More likely, however, the stars here refer to the fall of certain angels.⁴⁷ This is suggested by the following verse which explicitly references war between 'Michael and his angels... [and] the dragon'. It also parallels the second scene in vv9, 10, 13 where the dragon was 'thrown down' (ἐβλήθη) along with 'his angels', v9). It could be argued that the 'fall' of these angels refers to a primordial event, before the ascension, and not describing their defeat but rather their rebellion against heaven.⁴⁸ This is unlikely given the context of the narrative. Their fall in v9 rather seems to coincide with Jesus' enthronement (v5) and his casting up to God (ἠρπάσθη, v5), which presumably refers to his ascension.⁴⁹ This suggests demonic defeat has taken place not in the distant past but rather through his ascension. Following this, the woman Israel is then nourished in the wilderness for 1260 days (v6). This number is important. It draws on Daniel's 42 months (Dan 11:2, 13:5) and equivalent timeframe in 7:25,⁵⁰ 12:7, 8:14⁵¹, 12:11,⁵² 9:27⁵³ to refer to a period of tribulation for Israel at the hands of Gentile oppressors. John therefore applies this period of tribulation, in the wake of Jesus' ascension, to the suffering of the church. Moreover, the church's sojourn in the 'wilderness' (v6) also recalls Israel's desert wanderings.⁵⁴ In both instances, again, John portrays believers as the faithful portion of Israel.

Now we come to the second section of Revelation 12 (vv7-12). This repeats the same scene from a different angle. War breaks out in heaven. Michael and his angels fight against the dragon. He loses and is thrown to earth. This prompts a cry of victory: 'now have come the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God, and the authority of his Messiah' (v10). All seems well, but this victory announcement is mingled with the suggestion that the devil remains active. Specifically, v11 implies ongoing challenge to believers' witness about Jesus and the threat of martyrdom:

⁴⁶ Beale, *Revelation*, 640.

⁴⁷ David Aune, *Revelation 6-16* (Nashville, Nelson, 1998), 686.

⁴⁸ Osborne, *Revelation*, 469.

⁴⁹ Koester, *Revelation*, 547; Aune, *Rev 6-16*, 670

⁵⁰ 'Time, times and half a time', also 12:7.

⁵¹ 'Two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings'.

⁵² '1290 days'

⁵³ A week and a half in Theodotion's translation of the Hebrew Bible.

⁵⁴ Caird, *Revelation*, 152.

‘they did not cling to life even in the face of death’.⁵⁵ Likewise in v12 the heavens rejoice, but those on the earth face ‘woe’ and the devil’s ‘great wrath’.

Again there is some debate about the timings of this event. Some suggest that a war at the end of the age (v7) is envisaged. Fanning, for example, suggests that this occurs in a manner that parallels the future opening of the seventh trumpet in Rev 10:6-7.⁵⁶ In other words, this marks the culmination of the devil’s overthrow at the end of the space-time universe. In favour of this, he notes that the statement, ‘woe to the earth and the sea’ (Rev 12:12) may entail cosmic eschatological signs on land and sea commencing in Rev 10:5-7.⁵⁷ Moreover, the appearance of Michael may be significant here. He has several roles in Jewish tradition. Among these he is Israel’s eschatological guardian, ‘the protector of your people’, in Dan 12:1. He was also expected to deliver Israel at the end of the present age (Dan 10:13-21, 12:1).⁵⁸ However, there are reasons (as above) to ground this war more explicitly to Jesus’ ascension. The cry, ‘now have come the salvation and the power and the kingdom of our God... and the authority of his Messiah’ (Rev 12:10) seems to match the snatching up of Jesus to the kingly throne, where he receives power to rule (12:5). This suggests the scene is ‘the heavenly counterpart to the victory of Christ in his death and resurrection’.⁵⁹ Moreover, there seems little reason to limit the threat of martyrdom and the need for believers to continue witnessing despite persecution (12:11) into the future. Martyrdom is already portrayed as having taken place (see the death of Antipas, 2:13) and the church already faces the challenge of faithful witness despite opposition in some areas (e.g. Rev 3:4, 8). The message here seems to be, then, that Jesus’ ascension marks the initial defeat of the devil, but believers should continue

⁵⁵ The aorist of ‘they have conquered’ (ἐνίκησαν, v11) may suggest that believers have already secured victory over the devil. In one sense this is true, given the decisiveness of Jesus’ victorious enthronement: Caird, *Revelation*, 156. But that their conquering is also contingent on their ongoing witness, note the ongoing demonic threat in v12, and the letters to the churches, where the idea of conquering is conditioned on obedience (Rev 2:7, 11, 17, 26, 3:5, 12, 21, 21:7).

⁵⁶ Buist Fanning, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2020), 356

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 356. See also Dochhorn, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, pp., 395-6, who also suggests this eschatological war culminates with the blowing of the seventh trumpet, with comparison to the eschatological war in the Qumran War Scroll (1QM).

⁵⁸ Dochhorn, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie*, pp., 395-6

⁵⁹ Mounce, *Revelation*, 235. So also Thomas Schreiner, *Revelation* (Ada, MI: Baker, 2023), 126; Blount, *Revelation*, 233; Beale, *Revelation*, 647

holding fast to their witness about him even in the face of persecution which he continues to incite against them.⁶⁰ By referencing this battle with Satan in apocalyptic terms applied to Israel's struggle John further suggests believers are the eschatological Israel. This further locates him within a branch of Judaism.

Finally, in the third scene (Rev 12:13-17) John depicts one more time the conflict facing Israel. This time the dragon on earth pursues the woman. She escapes into the wilderness for protection (v14). The serpent tries to destroy her with water. She is saved by the earth which swallows up the flood (vv14-15). This angers the dragon who goes off to attack the woman's other children (v17). Again, like 12:1-6 / 7-13, through Jesus' enthronement victory over Satan has been partially secured (symbolised by the woman escaping the waters of chaos in v16). At the same time, the devil continues to wage war on the 'rest [τῶν λοιπῶν]' of... [the woman's] children' in v17. These are identified as believers who '...hold the testimony of Jesus' (v17).⁶¹ The identity of her offspring is uncertain here. If it refers to the church emerging out of Israel⁶² it suggests a difference between the woman Israel and the church - in which case we might also see a parting of the ways here. But this would suggest the tribulation in Rev 12 is primarily directed towards ethnic Jews, which goes against John's emphasis that it is the entire church under threat. More likely the testimony of her offspring parallels that of 12:11, where it is linked to those who have been martyred. In this case 'the rest' of the woman's children are a subset of existing believers, likely those who have already suffered at the hands of the authorities.⁶³

⁶⁰ Beale, *Revelation*, 648

⁶¹ Koester, *Revelation*, 567. The identity of these 'children' is difficult to determine given that the woman already seems to represent believers as the true Israel in conflict with the devil in 12:6, 14.

⁶² Gerhard Krodel, *Revelation*, ACNT (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 246; Blount, *Revelation*, 241

⁶³ This would parallel the mention of martyrs in 12:11, who are a subset of believers. Caird, *Revelation* 159; Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 709 argues that the 'children' here are individual Christians singled out for state persecution. This makes sense given that their holding 'fast to the testimony of Jesus' in 12:17 links them with the martyrs of 12:11 who are also said to overcome 'by the word of their testimony', while John also singles out the martyrs as a select group in 6:9-11. It has also been suggested that they represent the *same* group of people as the woman, with vv14-15 stressing her protection and v16 representing the threat of persecution against her (G.K. Beale, *Revelation*, 677). Against this, the distinction between the woman and her other child the Messiah in 12:4-5 may suggest there is also a distinction between the woman and the children of 12:17.

In this chapter, then, John uses several OT allusions to align believers with the faithful portion of Israel. This argues against the idea that he advocates a parting of the ways in his work: believers are the true ἰουδαῖοι (Rev 2:9, 2:9). He also addresses head on the problem of persecution. This took place at the hands of Jewish rivals whom Satan motivates in 2:9, 3:9. It is particularly linked to Roman authority which Satan manipulates in Rev 12. This suggests John is trying to bolster the Jewish identity of his own group while also separating it from the Roman empire. Here especially the cosmic nature of this conflict is seen. This highlights how *for John, believers are defined as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in heavenly conflict*, opposed by the same demonic host who opposed the Israel of old. I will now consider this apocalyptic conflict tradition in more detail to clarify how Luke uses many of the same OT texts to also commend his own community as the faithful portion of Israel, engaged in heavenly conflict. In each section below I will first consider these OT passages in their original context; then how they have been used by John and Luke respectively. This will shed light on the figure 'Satan' already mentioned as a key challenger of Jewish identity (Rev 2:9, 2:9) and how Luke shares this theme. These parallels will provide further evidence not only of Luke-Acts taking a position within Judaism but also its homeliness in the world of apocalyptic Jewish literature.

2. 'The great dragon... that ancient serpent...' (Rev 12:9)

The first way John describes Israel's antagonist is as ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις. These terms recall a wealth of OT tradition associating reptilian figures with chaos, rebellion and opposition to Israel. I will examine these texts below but pay special attention to a likely allusion to Gen 3:15 here (and also in Rev 12:17), where God states he will grant enmity between Eve's offspring and the primordial serpent. Luke, strikingly, seems to allude to this very same tradition in Lk 10:19. This is a very important passage showing the cosmic backdrop behind his ecclesiology. This comparison will particularly highlight the apocalyptic contours behind Luke's portrayal of Israel.

2.1. Primordial Serpent vs Israel (Rev 12:9, 17)

There are numerous references to serpents in the pagan cults contemporary to John's time of writing.⁶⁴ This might suggest that John sees the woman's antagonist as being pagan religion. However, he especially here seems to draw on OT parallels to John's description of ὁ δράκων ὁ μέγας, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος⁶⁵ to depict the enemy as in league with the ancient forces opposing Israel. The description of the creature as ὁ δράκων probably recalls the mythical sea monster Leviathan (לִוְיָתָן) in the OT. The LXX translates לִוְיָתָן as 'dragon' (ὁ δράκων) as with Rev 12:9. This figure occurs in Job 3:8, 41:1 as an unruly force which YHWH subdues by his power. It is linked to God's sovereign power over creation (Ps 104:26, 74:14). It is associated with the sea in the above references as a symbol for the watery chaos that God subdues in the primordial story of creation (Gen 1:1-2). This helps explain the fact that water proceeds from its mouth in Rev 12:15-16 as it tries to drown the woman. ὁ δράκων also translates the Hebrew תַּן, תַּנִּין (also 'dragon'), which likewise refers to a sea monster in Job 7:12, Ps 74:13, Ps 148:7. In Ezek 29:3, 32:2 it refers to Egypt which threatens Israel. Less frequently it translates נָחַשׁ ('serpent') which is likewise a sea monster in Job 26:13. However, the ecclesiological significance of these terms emerge most clearly where they are associated with Israel. In Ps 74:13 ὁ δράκων recurs in the context of Israel's military defeat; in the context of exile (Amos 9:3); and in the context of Israel's restoration in Isa 27:1. These texts particularly show its role in opposing Israel. This is the theme John draws out in Rev 12. Isa 27:1, which chronicles Israel's restoration, is especially informative here.

Isa 27:9 was cited by Paul at the close of Rom 11:26-27. Like Rev 12:9 it also uses ὁ δράκων and ὁ ὄφις to refer to the same figure. This strengthens the chance John

⁶⁴ Blount, for example, points to the cults of Asclepius, Dionysus, Cybele and Zeus as evidence of this. Blount, *Revelation*, 235

⁶⁵ Revelation 12 also parallels Greco-Roman combat myths where a malevolent figure opposes a woman. These are not my focus for this chapter: for a fuller list of parallels see Koester, *Revelation*, 550, Kalms, *Sturz*, 113-205; Caird, *Revelation*, 148.

alludes to it here.⁶⁶ Like Rev 12:7-9, this text refers to this reptilian figure with several different aliases in close succession: לוייתן, נחש, and התנין, although the LXX only describes it as ὁ δράκων and ὁ ὄφις. Most importantly, it also uses the language of God's victory over the dragon (Isa 27:1) to describe God's restoration of Israel. This is evidenced by the restoration of God's vineyard (vv2-6), the removal of guilt and idolatry from Israel (v9), and the regathering of the dispersed tribes (vv12-13). In both these texts the primordial Leviathan myth has been projected into an eschatological context. John, however, sees the overthrow of the serpent figure to take place especially at Jesus' enthronement (Rev 12:5). If the wider context of Isa 27 is taken into account then this would imply that Jesus' enthronement has also commenced the restoration of Israel. If this is the case it would be further evidence that believers for John are also the faithful portion of Israel in this text.

However, the strongest OT allusion in Revelation 12 to 'the ancient serpent [ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος]'⁶⁷ is most likely the primordial tradition in Genesis 3:1 which also refers to the 'serpent' [שׁוֹחֵחַ, ὁ ὄφις] that tempts Eve.⁶⁸ This figure is portrayed in Genesis (3:1) as more 'crafty' than all the other beasts of the field. This may explain the origin behind the deception motif in Rev 12:9, where the devil is said to deceive 'the whole world' [τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην] just as he deceived Eve in his primordial role. That the dragon 'went off to wage war on the rest of her offspring' [τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς] also recalls the portrayal of conflict in Genesis 3:15. The OT text reads here that God will put enmity [הָאִי־בָא, ἔχθραν] between the serpent and the woman, and between the serpent's 'offspring [μετ', το σπέρμα]' and the woman's 'offspring [μετ', το σπέρμα]'. In this case John seems to apply the 'offspring' of the woman in Gen 3:15 to martyrs in the church. Again, these are portrayed as an

⁶⁶ See Aune, *Revelation 1-5*, 698, with reference to the 'reptilian trinity' depicted in MT Isa 27:1 (of course the LXX only describes the figure with two titles). It is not clear here whether John used the Greek or Hebrew text here (or both): while he never uses the Hebrew 'Leviathan', matching the LXX with its use of ὁ δράκων, he still uses both the Greek (ὁ Διάβολος) and Hebrew (ὁ Σατανᾶς) names for this figure (Rev 12:9) – the LXX never describes the devil using his Hebrew title ἰσση.

⁶⁷ p⁴⁷ omits the adjective ο αρχαῖος here.

⁶⁸ Kalms, *Sturz*, 138. The Greek *Apoc. Mos.* also describes the way ὁ Σατᾶν tempts Eve and appears as an angel of light (17:2). Like Rev 12, this author also links Satan with the primordial events of Gen 2-3. However, unlike Rev 12, this text poses a distinction between Satan (also described as ὁ διάβολος in 15:3, 16:1, 7) and the serpent (ὁ ὄφις): Satan speaks to the serpent (16:1).

exemplar type of believer given the parallel in Rev 12:11: 'they have overcome him... for they did not cling to life even in the face of death'. These are identified with the true Israel (a) by the fact that they are said to be exemplary children [σπέρματος] of the woman Israel. In this passage John therefore applies the Genesis 3 passage to state persecution. Grounding believers' struggle with the Roman empire within this struggle in Genesis adds dignity and significance to their present difficulties. Finally, Gen 3:15 also reads 'he will bruise your head, and you will bruise his heel' (NRSV).⁶⁹ This suggests both serpent and woman harm each other in some way. This may add a note of encouragement to believers that while the serpent may oppose them (12:17), they should also envisage that if they are the woman's offspring, they might also harm the devil too (as Rev 12:11 suggests - 'they have conquered him by the blood of the Lamb...'). This especially shows the cosmic apocalyptic conflict facing Israel.

2.2. Snake Trampling and Jewish Mission (Lk 10:18-19)

It is possible that Luke drew upon similar serpentine traditions to the above. Jesus demonstrates control over the chaotic waters (Lk 8:22-5) when he calms the storm. This may reflect the influence of texts about primordial waters above (cf. water coming from the dragon's mouth in Rev 12:15). At times he also refers to snakes in the context of mission. Acts 16:16 describes a slave-girl with a spirit of python [πνεῦμα πύθωνα] convoluting the expansion of the gospel (vv16-18). On the island of Malta Paul is also bitten by a serpent (ἡ ἔχιδνα, Acts 28:4-6) after the storm at sea (27:13-44) yet survives. This may imply awareness of the above traditions about Leviathan and dragon-like opposition to the people of God. However, these allusions are fainter. The strongest parallel to the above comes in Lk 10:18-19 where Luke also alludes to Gen 3:15. This passage also suggests believers are the faithful portion of Israel and unbelieving Jews are the unfaithful portion of Israel.

⁶⁹ The LXX renders the MT 'bruise' (רָשַׁע) here with τηρέω. This is less violent than the MT, which John's allusion to Gen 3:15 in Rev 12:17 is closer to.

Lk 10:1-24 is a crucial text for understanding Luke's demonology and how it relates to Israel. I will return to it in section 4 with emphasis on how Jesus' statement 'I saw Satan fall... from heaven' mirrors Satan falling from heaven in John's work. This passage shows the return of Jesus' seventy-two disciples⁷⁰ from proclaiming the kingdom of God (10:1-12). Jesus pronounces woe on unrepentant towns in Galilee (vv13-16). This is contrasted with the joy of the disciples because the demons submit to them (Lk 10:17). Jesus says, 'I watched Satan fall from heaven like a flash of lightning. See, I have given you authority to tread on snakes [ἐπάνω ὄφεων] and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy; and nothing will hurt you...' (vv18-19). Then he urges them to rejoice not at their newfound powers over demons but that their names are written in heaven, that they are envoys of heaven, and that they are blessed that the Father has shown them the kingdom when even prophets and kings could not see it in the past (vv21-24).

Vv 17-20 are significant here because, like Revelation 12, they also link the serpent [ὁ ὄφις] both with demons (τὰ δαιμόνια, v17; τὰ πνεύματα, v20) and with Satan (v18). Unlike Rev 12 though, Luke identifies demonic power not only with serpents but also with 'scorpions' [οἱ σκορπίοι, v19]. There may be other texts alluded to here. Serpents and scorpions are paired as early as Deut 8:15 here and scorpions are a symbol for punishment in 3 Kgdms 12:11, 14; 2 Chr 10:11, 14, Sir. 39:30, which Luke may also have drawn from.⁷¹ There has also been suggested allusion here to Ps 90:13 LXX, which like Lk 10:19 also refers to snakes being trampled on [ἐπιβαίνω, καταπατέω in the language of the LXX; Luke reads πατέω]. However, Psalm 90:13 LXX

⁷⁰ A well-attested variant reads 'seventy' here. The external evidence for both readings seems to be balanced on both sides (agreeing with the verdict of the UBS committee). The comparative paucity of references to 72 in the early literature (Num 31:38; Gen 10 LXX; 72 elders translated the LXX in *Let. Aris.* 46-50) may suggest that later scribes changed the 72 to 70 to align it closer to (e.g.) the 70 elders of Israel in Ex 24:1, Nu 11:16, or the groups of 70 in Ex 1:5, 15:27, Judg 9:2, 2 Kgs 10:1, Bel 10) – so Howard Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1978), 415; Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX*, AB28(London: Yale University Press, 2006), 845. Attempts to identify the numbers 70 / 72 symbolically with OT passages are difficult to assess as Luke only lists the number without explanation (the common idea that the 70 / 72 are sent out to each nation of the earth, of which there were 70 / 72 in the MT / LXX translations of Gen 10, cannot be sustained given that the disciples are sent out in pairs in Lk 10:1 – Marshall, *Luke*, 415). Scribes may also have rounded 72 down to 70 for greater rhetorical elegance, in which case again one should read too much symbolic value into the number.

⁷¹ Fitzmyer, *Luke X-XXIV*, 863.

never refers to snakes as οἱ ὄφεις, and the animals mentioned in it were nowhere else understood as demons.⁷² That Luke likely draws on Gen 3:1, 15 can be seen for several reasons. First is the shared language of the ὄφις in Gen 3:1 and Lk 10:19. Second, only in Gen 3:1 is a serpent [ὁ ὄφις] portrayed with personality and powers of speech. This lends itself to an association with demonic personalities (Lk 10:17, 20) and Satan (v18) more than any of the other texts above. Third, Jesus' promise that believers will 'trample' [πατέω] on snakes and scorpions also strongly resembles Gen 3:15 with its promise that 'he [the serpent] will strike your head, and you will strike his heel' (NRSV).⁷³ Fourth, Gen 3:15 LXX also states that God will put 'enmity' [ἐχθρός] between Eve and the serpent's offspring. This may explain Luke's description of Satan as 'the Enemy' [ὁ ἐχθρός] in Lk 10:19.⁷⁴

The wider context of Lk 10 clearly shows believers trampling on serpents, and thus applies Gen 3:15, in the context of exorcism. Specifically, this is exorcism among unbelieving Jews. This suggests that believers are the offspring of the woman and that the promise of them bruising the serpent is fulfilled in the context of mission. This fits Luke's general emphasis on gospel expansion. At the same time, the fact that the Jews in Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum (Lk 10:13-15) reject the gospel suggests they are on the wrong side of this conflict and are consequently in league with the serpent. In section 4 I will outline further how this passage makes the case for a divided Israel.

⁷² Ibid., 863

⁷³ Luke in describing how believers may 'trample' [πατέω] on serpents shows closer resemblance to the Hebrew (דָּבַעַ), as does Rev 12:17.

⁷⁴ Green points out that ἐχθρός has already occurred in Lk 1:68-71, where Zechariah prophesies about 'salvation from our [Israel's] enemies [σωτηρίαν ἐξ ἐχθρῶν ἡμῶν, v71].' These 'enemies' would be understood in Jewish tradition to refer to Israel's Roman captors. Conjoined with 'the power of the enemy' in Lk 10:19, the author may be making the point that the true force behind the Roman empire is diabolic in nature, which would further stress the apocalyptic backdrop behind Israel's struggle in Luke-Acts. Joel Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997), 417.

2.3. Evaluation: Luke's Serpent and Intramural Jewish Conflict

This comparison reveals the following. Luke and John both likely contain awareness in their texts of OT traditions about serpents and primordial chaos. John especially seizes on these traditions in his description of ὁ δράκων... ὁ ὄφις opposing believers in a manner that evokes these other texts about dragons and serpents opposing Israel. This would suggest believers are the faithful portion of Israel. Most significantly, both John and Luke seem to allude to Gen 3:15 and its promise that Eve's offspring shall harm the primordial serpent. John applied this primarily to believers' conflict with the Roman empire. He sees victory over Satan and his offspring secured through Jesus' being caught up to God (Rev 12:6). However, the serpent can still harm believers through state persecution, and continued victory is contingent on their continued witness unto death (Rev 12:10-11). This ongoing conflict is how the struggle between the woman's offspring and the serpent is to be understood. Luke's placing of this tradition into mission to the Jews, on the other hand, places it more in the context of an *intramural* Jewish conflict. His suggestion that the 72 are the woman's offspring, rather than state martyrs as with John, highlights that through mission victory over the serpent is achieved. Moreover, the fact that many of these Jews reject the gospel places them on the same side as the serpent. This strongly denounces the opponents of the Christian community and highlights the *intramural* Jewish nature of Luke's work. What this does reveal in both instances is the extent to which both authors projected on to their community struggles the idea of an apocalyptic struggle. Seeing the plight of believers as a fulfillment of this primordial myth strongly highlights the apocalyptic features of Luke-Acts. This is the first strand of tradition that seems to portray *believers as the faithful Israel engaged in cosmic conflict*. In the next section I will consider further OT allusions to Satan in both texts which make the same point.

3. 'The Devil and Satan' (Rev 12:9)

The next strand of OT tradition concerning the devil and his antagonism towards Israel in Revelation 12 is suggested by John's use of the title 'Satan' (12:9). Satan is a major figure opposing Israel in the OT. Unlike Leviathan this figure is more personalised. This develops John's earlier mention of the synagogue of Satan (Rev 2:9, 3:9), which was clearly applied in the context of an *intra muros* Jewish debate. In this section I will focus especially on his portrayal in Job 1-2, 1 Chr 21:1-17 and Zech 3 here. These texts link him to themes of the divine council, they highlight his role as an accuser, and they show how he is a figure who often stands opposed to Israel. After considering these OT texts I will then consider how John and Luke take up themes in these texts. I will argue below that presenting this figure as the source of conflict in their own communities is further evidence that Luke and John both portray believers as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in conflict, and therefore within Judaism.

3.1. Satan in OT Context: Israel's Antagonist

In the MT 'Satan' comes from the Hebrew שָׂטָן, which is commonly given the article to refer to 'The Accuser' or 'The Adversary'. The LXX texts translate this as ὁ Διάβολος; 'slanderer'. 1 Chr 21:1, Job 1:6-9, 12, 2:1-7 and Zech 3:1, 2 are particularly important references here. Both John and Luke allude to these following texts in their work. The first of these, 1 Chr 21, is especially important as it shows how Satan is linked to the divine council, and also *how he is a figure opposing Israel*. The text begins, 'Satan stood up against Israel' (v1).⁷⁵ He then incites David to make a national census, which is abhorrent to YHWH (vv3, 7), who punishes Israel with plague (vv7, 14). This is

⁷⁵ Sara Japhet, *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary* (Westminster: John Knox Press, 1997), 145-8 argues that the supernatural figure Satan is not the subject of the verb in this sentence – rather it simply refers to a human 'adversary'. There is some evidence for this – the article is omitted, unlike other references to Satan where it more clearly has a titular function. However, 1 Chronicles 21:1 edits 2 Sam 24:1, where it is the 'anger of the Lord' instead that is kindled against Israel, and where YHWH incites David to count the population. This substitution matches the portrayal of the character Satan in Job as a figure operating loosely inside of God's will but carrying out evil deeds that the biblical writers would not readily attribute to the deity.

averted by David making a sacrifice (v26). Here Satan has a role in tempting an individual to de-rail the whole nation of Israel. Though the sin is David's, all Israel inherits guilt (vv3, 7-8). This theme of Satan attacking Israel will be taken up by both authors, below.

Job 1:6-9, 12 is the next important OT text. This especially shows how Satan is linked to the divine council. It also further shows his role as accuser. It also shows how God invests him with authority to test his people, but not too much authority. In Job 1:6-9, 12 Satan [שטן / ὁ διάβολος] joins the members of the divine council [בני האלהים, οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ, v6] having been wandering to and fro on the earth (v7). God boasts of Job's piety; Satan questions Job's unwavering commitment to God; God gives him permission to test him (1:12). Then Satan goes out 'from the presence of the Lord' (v12) and attacks Job's family (1:13-21). Satan's interaction with YHWH is repeated nearly verbatim in 2:1-7; again YHWH gives him authority to harm Job (v7), but here Job's health is now attacked (vv7-13). The limitations of Satan's authority are made clear here by the fact that he must request permission from YHWH for Job's testing ('stretch out *your hand*, ידך... and touch his... flesh', v5). But in Job 1-2 his power is still considerable given, first, that he can access the divine council in the first place, and, second, that God allows this testing of Job: 'I have placed him into *your hand* [בידך], v6.⁷⁶ The implications of Satan's testing *for Israel* is more muted here but recurs, along with the motif of Satan's authority in the divine council, in the Zechariah text – the final time Satan is depicted in the MT.

Zech 3:1 further develops the themes of the divine council, shows how the devil takes on an *accusatory* role, and further establishes that he is a figure opposing Israel. In 3:1 the prophet sees a vision of Satan (LXX: ὁ διάβολος) standing at the right hand of the High Priest Joshua to oppose him [יגשיל, τοῦ ἀντικείμεθα αὐτῷ].⁷⁷ This accusation presumably has to do with his ceremonial impurity, as suggested by

⁷⁶ The LXX removes the pun about Job's fate transferred from God's 'hand' [representing jurisdiction, power] to Satan's 'hand', by replacing the second reference to [Satan's] 'hand' with the more abstract 'I give him [παραδίδωμι] to you' (Job 2:6 LXX).

⁷⁷ The LXX ἀντίκειμαι means simply 'to oppose', with less forensic force than the Hebrew: 'to accuse'.

Joshua's filthy clothes (v3). YHWH then condemns Satan: 'The Lord who has *chosen Jerusalem* rebuke you!' (v2, emphasis mine) – demonstrating that Satan's attack of Joshua is linked as with 1 Chr 21:1 to the fate of Israel corporately. Joshua's clothes are replaced with clean garments (vv4-5) to symbolise the removal of his guilt [ἰὼ, ἡ ανομία, v4). He is then given several blessings including charge of God's house, access to the divine council, the promise that God will send the Davidic 'Branch' to deliver Israel,⁷⁸ and the reconsecration of the priestly head garment symbolising the priestly ability to remove the 'guilt [ἰὼ-תא, תִּהְיֶה אֲדִיקָא] of this land in a single day' (vv6-10). This vision indicates the restoration of the temple and cultic powers within Israel; Joshua's removal of guilt parallels the vindication of Jerusalem more generally through God's intervention. In this case again, then, Satan is a figure who opposes individuals but also one who stands against Israel⁷⁹ and (here) its future restoration. John and Luke, below, both develop these themes of the divine council, Satan's role as an accuser, and his opposition to Israel in order to portray believers as the faithful Israel engaged in cosmic conflict.

3.2. Satan in Rev 12: Church in Ancient Struggle

John has adapted several features of this διάβολος tradition and its implications for faithful Israel in Revelation 12. First, as with the Job and Zechariah texts this opposition particularly manifests itself as *accusation*. Thus John writes the devil is the 'accuser [ὁ κατήγορ]⁸⁰ of our comrades... who accuses them [ὁ κατηγορῶν] day and night before our God' (12:10). This accusation is linked to the fact 'they did not cling to life even in the face of death' (v11), i.e. the threat of state persecution. In this way the devil's accusation of believers mirrors his testing of Job and Joshua to cast

⁷⁸ Probably symbolising the governor Zerubbabel who will help restore Jerusalem, but potentially with messianic undertones.

⁷⁹ An interesting parallel text where Satan interacts with a single individual to derail the whole nation of Israel is in the Greek version of the *Mart. Isa*. Here he leads King Manassesh astray (1:9, 11, 2:8) to worship Satan and idols (2:2, 8, 3:4, 3:8) with the result that 'many in Jerusalem and Judea shall turn away from... God and worship idols' (1:9). But I am focused on OT allusions in this chapter.

⁸⁰ A well-attested variant reads κατηγορος here: whichever reading was the original, the motif of accusation is the same in both.

aspersions on their faithfulness to God. This accusation takes place on two fronts: Greco-Roman, as is the main context of Rev 12 (he is 'deceiver of the whole world', ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, Rev 12:9⁸¹), as well as Jewish (Rev 2:9, 3:9). This also finds parallel in the accusation (or blasphemy, ἡ βλασφημία, Rev 2:9⁸²) of unbelieving Jews in Smyrna, identified with 'Satan's synagogue' who slander Christians to the authorities leading to their coming imprisonment (2:9-10).

The second feature John adapts from the above traditions is the motif of Satan's access to the divine council. The Job and Zechariah texts imply that he can freely access God's judicial assembly, though Job suggests he prefers to move about 'on the earth' (Job 1:7, 2:2). It is here that his accusation takes place, and here that God also places limits on his ability to harm Job (1:11, 2:6). In Revelation his place in the divine assembly is implied by the war in heaven between the dragon and Michael and his angels (12:7).⁸³ However, John varies this theme by suggesting he has been 'thrown down' from heaven after conflict (12:10, 12). The timing of this event is debated. Again, this may reflect a primordial event given this interpretation of the passage in early Jewish literature (see section 4 below). However, it is more likely that this takes place after Jesus' ascension as his casting up to God [ἠρπάσθη, v5] presumably parallels the devil's casting down [ἐβλήθη, v9]. Satan's fall I will consider in more detail in the following section (where there is marked parallel with Luke-Acts). Here John seems to suggest he has lost his place in the divine assembly. Finally, John further builds on traditions about the divine council by suggesting, as with Job, that even though he has considerable authority to harm the people of God, this authority is limited. Hence he has license to deceive the whole world [τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην,

⁸¹ In an interesting parallel *the T. Dan 5:6* links him to spirits of deceit, which mirrors his description as the 'deceiver of the whole world' in Rev 12:9, along with the reference to the 'angels of Satan' (*T. Ash 6:4*) which may parallel 'his angels' in Rev 12:7, 9. However, in *T.12.Patr.* Satan is aligned with individual moral temptation rather than cosmic rebellion or attack against Israel at large as with Rev 12.

⁸² In the Greek fragments of *The Assumption of Moses* the devil also takes on an accusatory role as with Rev 12:11 when he 'blasphemes' Moses for being a murderer (frags. h, i, using ἡ βλασφημία /βλασφημέω.

⁸³ Michael is elsewhere mentioned in the Greek fragments of *The Assumption of Moses*, which detail a dispute between Michael and the devil over the body of Moses. If he drew on this tradition John has obviously omitted any mention of the devil hindering the burial of Moses' body (frag. j).

v9]. But his casting down seems to represent a loss of authority, and believers can have victory over him if they hold fast to 'the word of their testimony' (12:11). This parallels his being thrown into the bottomless pit to be bound for a thousand years and only released to deceive the nations with God's permission (Rev 20:1-3). This would encourage John's readers that while evil and persecution is rampant and the devil does pose a threat to their welfare, Jesus' victory has limited his dominion and he is now on a very short leash.

The final feature of OT tradition that John develops in Rev 12 is the devil's opposition to Israel. Again, this was seen where he incites David to number a census of Israelites (1 Chr 21) and his accusation of Israel's high priest (Zech 3:1-2). In Revelation he tries to devour the woman's child (12:4). He pursues (or persecutes, δῶκω) the woman (12:13). Then he wars [ποιῆσαι πόλεμον] with 'the rest of her children' (v17). This suggests the Διάβολος is opposing believers as the faithful portion of Israel much as he opposed the Israel of old. The conflict tradition therefore creates powerful continuity between the plight of believers in the Roman empire and the OT people of God. This also shows how John portrays believers as the faithful portion of Israel vindicated through cosmic conflict.

3.3. Satan in Luke-Acts: The Divided Israel

Below I will consider three texts in Luke-Acts that show how he also portrays believers as opposed by the devil. Luke's references to the devil [ὁ διάβολος], Satan [ὁ Σατανᾶς] and demons are numerous. The devil's role in Luke-Acts is diverse.⁸⁴ I have selected these three texts as they also show reliance on the same OT traditions above, sharing the same themes of the divine council, Satan as accuser, and his role in opposing Israel. And while like Revelation Luke portrays the devil as having power over the Roman empire, these texts especially highlight his role in leading unbelieving

⁸⁴ He opposes Jesus in his ministry (Lk 4:2-13, 22:3; cf. Rev 12:4), rules through demons (Lk 4:33, 35, 7:33, 8:29, 9:42, 11:14, 18; cf. Rev 12:9), causes sickness (Lk 13:16, Acts 10:38), leads individuals astray (Lk 22:3, Acts 5:3, 13:10), hinders Gentiles (Acts 13:10, 26:18, cf. Rev 12:3) and Jews (Lk 8:12; cf. Rev 2:9-10, 3:9) alike from receiving the gospel.

Jews astray. This further highlights the *intra mural* Jewish nature of his work and his portrayal of believers as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in apocalyptic conflict.

The first major parallel between Revelation 12 and Luke-Acts concerns diabolic testing in the wilderness. In Rev 12 the woman is tested (12:6). In Luke 4, Jesus is tested. Both of these recall the desert traditions of Israel's wanderings. Like Revelation, Lk 4:1-12 shows Satan's power over the Greco-Roman world and over the Jewish religious establishment. It also particularly demonstrates the *intra mural* Jewish nature of Luke's work. This episode shows the devil's three temptations of Jesus in the wilderness. In the first he is commanded to turn a stone into bread. The second and third temptations are the most informative about the scope of his authority. In the second the devil shows him 'in an instant all the kingdoms of the world [πάσας τὰς βασιλείας τῆς οἰκουμένης, v5]', claiming that all their 'glory and authority has been given to me [τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην ἄπασαν καὶ τὴν δόξαν αὐτῶν... ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται, v6]' and that he will give them to Jesus if he bows down and worships him. There may be some evidence to suggest that the devil is lying here,⁸⁵ given his reputation for deception, but the temptations listed would not have been a test for Jesus if they were untrue. In this case this second test suggests that Luke sees the devil as having considerable power over the pagan world, just as indicated in Rev 12:3 (the seven diadems) and v9 (where he also deceives τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην).⁸⁶ However, the devil's power over the Jewish world is particularly seen in the third test.

Here he leads Jesus to the 'pinnacle of the temple' (v9) and urges him, with the aid of Ps 91:11-12, to throw himself down on the premise that God 'will command his angels concerning you, to protect you...' (vv10-11). Jesus replies by quoting Deut 6:16 ('do not put the Lord your God to the test'), which in its original context refers to the Israelites' testing of God at Massah. Here (Ex 17:1-7) their specific fault is doubting whether God will provide water for them in the wilderness; this implies that Satan in

⁸⁵ See discussion in Green, *Luke*, 195

⁸⁶ Further evidence of this may also be seen in Acts 26:17-18, in which Paul is commissioned to preach to the Gentiles, to turn them 'from the power of Satan to God...'

Lk 4 is tempting Jesus to doubt God's faithfulness in protecting him.⁸⁷ But the placement of this temptation in Jerusalem and on the temple is also significant. There are hints that by throwing himself from the temple Jesus will be making a public spectacle – the 'pinnacle [τὸ πτερύγιον]' of the temple is very specific and probably refers to a 'highly prominent part of the temple'.⁸⁸ This may suggest that the devil is also encouraging Jesus to make a public scene to gain the attention of his Jewish contemporaries. Most importantly, this location is the centre of power in the Jewish religious world and, taken together with the devil's claim that he owns the kingdoms of the world (Lk 4:5-6), shows that the devil is also showing to Jesus his power over the Jewish religious establishment. This strongly denounces unbelieving Jews as diabolically motivated.

The devil's authority over the Jewish religious domain, for Luke, is further strengthened when one compares his temptation narrative with Matthew's. While the latter places this temptation second (Mt 4:5-7), Luke renders it Jesus' last. This augments Luke's general interest in Jerusalem (as the last test it is the most emphatic) but also links this account with the uniquely Lukan material that follows it (Lk 4:16-30). Here Jesus inaugurates his ministry in Nazareth only to be rejected by his Jewish hearers, who lead him 'to the brow of the hill... *so that they might hurl him off the cliff*' (Lk 4:29). There is strong parallel here with the devil's urge for Jesus to throw himself from the temple. This may suggest that his rejection of the devil's offer is linked with the Jewish rejection in Lk 4:28-30. A final indicator that the devil motivates Jewish opposition in Luke-Acts is seen in the quoting of scripture by Jesus and Satan in Lk 4:1-13 to validate their positions. This suggests that the struggle against the devil is also a struggle for the true interpretation of scripture. Jesus and his followers correctly interpret the OT (Lk 4:4, 8, 12; cf. also Acts 7:1-53 and 8:26-35, for example, where Stephen and Philip are seen as exemplary expositors). And not only the devil, but also unbelieving Jews, misread the scriptures (see, e.g., the debates over scripture interpretation in Lk 6:1-5 14:1-6, 18:18-25, 20:1-8, 17-18, 41-

⁸⁷ Marshall, *Luke*, 173; also implied in Green, *Luke*, 195

⁸⁸ Fitzmyer, *Luke I-IX*, 517

3, where they are confounded at each point by Jesus' wisdom). In this case the temptation narrative may also be an implied critique against those Jews who falsely wield scripture. This may confirm Luke is engaged in an *intra muros* Jewish debate.

There are strong allusions in Luke's temptation narrative to Job 1-2, where the devil tests Job in order to see if he really serves God disinterestedly (Job 1:9). His authority over earthly affairs also echoes Job 1:6-12, 2:1-7, where his place in the divine council also indicates considerable authority. But the devil's hold over the Jewish religious world in Luke-Acts and Revelation is closest related to Zechariah 3:1-10 (above), where Satan is shown as having much power over the temple cult and its priesthood, and whose power here is a major source of opposition to Israel's restoration more generally (note the connection between Joshua's filthy clothes, v4, and the guilt of the land, v9). By placing unbelieving Jews in league with Satan Luke makes a similar point to Rev 2:9, 3:9 where they are linked to the 'synagogue of Satan'. He continues this theme with the next passage: Lk 8:1-21. This passage shows even more clearly the role of the Διάβολος to further identify believers as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in cosmic conflict.

I have already considered this text in chapter one. It includes Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom through various villages (vv1-4), the Parable of the Sower and its explanation (vv4-18), and a saying about Jesus' true followers (vv19-21). In this parable Jesus explains why some are receptive to his message but some cannot comprehend it. The devil especially opposes Israel in Lk 8:12: here 'the devil comes and takes away the word' from the hearts of those who hear Jesus' teaching 'in order that they may not believe and be saved'. The immediate context of this passage also shows a division within Israel. It also shows Satan's influence over unbelieving Jews. This is evidenced (a) by the citation of Isa 6:9 LXX in v9: 'looking they may not perceive, and listening they may not understand.' In its OT context this refers to an Israel divided in its response to the prophet's ministry, which is set in distinction to a faithful remnant within Israel in v13 MT, v12 LXX. Luke repeats the oracle in Acts 28:26-7, which also speaks of an Israel divided in its response to the gospel (Acts 28:24). This suggests that Luke seeks to apply this oracle to suggest a similar division

within Israel in Lk 8 too.⁸⁹ This division in Israel is also seen (b) by the saying about the true kindred of Jesus (Lk 8:19-21) immediately after the parable and its explanation shows that Jesus' true family are not those traditionally expected (his 'mother and his brothers', who were seeking him, v19) but rather, as Jesus says, 'my mother and my brothers are those who hear the word of God and do it' (v21). Linked with Isaiah's oracle earlier and the lengthy discussion on the 'word of God' in v11ff. this makes the point that the true Israel is not to be found in those who reject his message but only among those who hear God's word and obey it (v15). In this case, the devil's 'snatching away' [αἰρέω] of God's word from people's hearts in v12 should not be understood only as an attack against individual commitment to God but rather an attempt to oppose Israel more broadly. Perhaps the closest OT parallel to this deed is 1 Chr 21:1, where Satan tempts David to count Israel, because this also sets a precedent for him affecting an individual's thoughts to lead the nation astray.⁹⁰ And again, as with Rev 2:9-10, 3:9, there may also be further echo of Zechariah 3:1-10 here given the devil's further influence over the world of unbelieving Jews.

As with Rev 12, Lk 22:31-34 is the final passage where Satan is linked to accusation, the divine council and opposition to Israel. This text addresses his activity among the twelve disciples, who presumably represent the twelve tribes of Israel.⁹¹ This also shows Luke's reworking of the same OT traditions that seemed to influence John. Here Jesus predicts Satan's testing of the twelve disciples and Peter's role in supporting the twelve, saying, 'Simon, Simon... Satan has demanded to sift you all like wheat, but I have prayed for you that your own faith may not fail; and you, when

⁸⁹ Analogy between Lk 8:9-10, 12 and ongoing Jewish unbelief in Acts 28:26-7 also suggests that the latter is equally inspired by the devil; Luke gives no indicator that Satan ceases to lead individuals astray in his work.

⁹⁰ There is some variation here: 1 Chr 21:1 does not explicitly mention the heart [καρδία] as Lk 8:12 does. The former also describes him putting a thought into David's heart while Lk 8 technically describes him taking a thought out of it. Still, both texts are significant in showing the ability of the devil to alter one's thinking. The Greek fragment of *Mart. Isa. 7:9* also uses the language of Satan effecting the heart: Satan is said to dwell (κατοικέω) in Manasseh's 'heart', which like Lk 8:12 also refers to ἡ καρδία and may be derived from 1 Chr 21:1. There may be some parallels between Lk 8:12 and Jub. 11:11, where 'Prince Mastema' sends birds to eat the seed sown into the earth 'to rob mankind of their labors' and produce a famine. It is not likely that Luke used it as the former treats this agricultural event literally while the latter reads it as a parable.

⁹¹ Jacob Jervell, 'The Twelve on Israel's Thrones: Luke's Understanding of the Apostolate' in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 75-112

you have turned back, strengthen your brothers' (Lk 22:31-32). The image of being 'sifted' by Satan, as one separates wheat from chaff, is similar to his testing of Job and implies that his role here is to distinguish true from false commitments to Jesus.⁹² Jesus then predicts Peter's threefold denial during his passion (vv33-34). That Satan also opposes Israel here is evidenced by the Lukan placement of the disciples' testing (vv31-34) immediately after Jesus' promise that the disciples will receive the Father's kingdom and sit 'on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Lk 22:20). Matthew repeats the phrase that the disciples will judge the twelve tribes of Israel (with minor variation) in Mt 19:28; Mark lacks it. This statement about the twelve thrones in both suggests that the twelve disciples are the leaders of the restored Israel. But Jesus does not predict the disciples' testing and Peter's denial of Jesus in Matthew until 26:30-5. By combining these sections Luke suggests that although the ultimate destiny of the twelve is to represent Israel (Lk 22:28-30), Satan's role is to disrupt this role of the twelve (Lk 22:31-4) by motivating them to fall away from Jesus. This further shows Luke shows believers as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in cosmic conflict, just as with Revelation 12.

3.4. Evaluation: Luke's Satan Reveals True Israel

Both Luke and John develop the following themes from the above OT texts. Both retain the idea of the Διάβολος involved in the *divine assembly*, just as was seen in Zech 3 and Job 1-2, where he must request permission to test Job. This establishes both the limits of his authority (he operates within divine jurisdiction) and also its considerable scope. John suggests he has been evicted from the council after Jesus' ascension (12:9). Luke suggests he retains a place there (Lk 22:31). Both authors also retain the idea of Satan as *accuser* as seen in Zech 3 (against Joshua) and Job 1-2. John linked this accusation to state persecution (Rev 12:11) and potentially blasphemy (Rev 2:9, 3:9). Luke understands it in a similar sense to Job 1-2, where the devil tests Job in order to determine his faithfulness to God. It carries this sense in

⁹² Green, *Luke*, 772. Fitzmyer suggests there may be resemblance here to Amos 9:9 LXX and its shaking of the 'house of Israel... as one shakes with a sieve'. Luke, X-XXIV, 1424.

the temptation narrative (Lk 4, where Jesus seems to represent Israel) and in Lk 22:31-2, where he tests the believers who also represent the twelve tribes of Israel. Finally, and most importantly for ecclesiological purposes, both authors also retain the idea of Satan *opposing Israel*. This was seen in Zech 3 where his attack of Joshua is linked to an attack on the whole nation (3:9) and also in 1 Chr 21 where the census of Israel threatens the nation. John repeats this theme by portraying his attack against the woman who represents Israel (12:13, 17). Luke retains it in speaking of his opposition to the twelve as leaders of the restored Israel (Lk 22:31-2), his role in dividing Israel by snatching the word from unbelieving Jews (Lk 8:12), and his role in leading the temple establishment astray (Lk 4:9). John also mentions Satan's role in the context of an *intra muros* Jewish dispute (Rev 2:9, 3:9). However, Luke's Διάβολος references make much more of this theme and highlight how for him especially Satan has a role in dividing between faithful and unfaithful portions of Israel. Again, this highlights how both authors see believers as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in cosmic conflict. In this final section I will explore in more detail a final tradition used by both authors to further make this point: Satan's fall from heaven.

4. Satan's Fall

Rev 12:4, 9, 13 refer three times to Satan's fall from heaven. This represents his loss of judicial authority after Jesus' enthronement. Here John alludes to Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:1-19. These texts address the 'fall' of the King of Babylon and of Tyre, *Israel's enemies*. This further suggests John sees believers as the true Israel engaged in cosmic conflict. Jesus also speaks of Satan's fall as the 72 disciples return from a mission to the Jews. Here his 'fall' is linked to exorcism. This passage also denounces unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel, as it parallels Capernaum's casting down to the ground (Lk 10:15) in such a manner that suggests its inhabitants who reject the gospel are in league with Satan (cf. Rev 2:9, 2:9). These are contrasted with the disciples who seem to represent the faithful Israel. Luke also likely alludes to Isaiah 14:12-15 and Ezek 28:1-19 here. This shared use of material in both texts

further shows the apocalyptic conflict both authors see as they seek to define their community identity. Below I will consider John's use of these OT texts. Then I will consider how Luke uses them ecclesialogically.

4.1. Devil's Defeat (Rev 12)

The 'casting down' of the devil is mentioned in Rev 12:9, 10, 12, 13. This language specifically recalls that of Isaiah 14:12-15. This oracle originally addressed the Babylonian king after Israel's eschatological restoration (14:1-2), when they will 'rule over those who oppressed them' (v2). Thus, again, *it refers to Israel's enemy*. Vv4-12 here take up a taunt against the king of Babylon in the wake of his destruction. Vv12-20 then describe his 'fall' and humiliation before the nations. This 'fall' has several features. First, in an ironic twist, it reverses the king's ambition in vv13-14 that he will ascend [ἀναβήσομαι] to heaven... above the clouds' (ἀναβήσομαι is twice repeated in these verses, contrasted with 'but now you are *brought down* [καταβήση] to Sheol, v15). This is tantamount to setting his 'throne on high' and setting up a rival authority to God himself. Second, it is from heaven to earth - 'how you are fallen from heaven, O Day Star, son of Dawn!' [πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων; v12].

On the one hand this text is unlike the portrayal of the devil in Revelation 12: the Isaiah text situates the oracle amidst other judgment passages on Assyria, Philistia (ch 14) and Moab (ch 15), implying it literally refers to the ruler of Babylon, who is also described as a 'man' (ἄνθρωπος) in v16. There is no mention of this figure as an 'accuser' as with Rev 12:10 and there is no description of a heavenly war preceding his fall (as with Rev 12:7-8).

However, the parallels are striking. In Revelation the figure is 'the deceiver of the whole world' (ὁ πλανῶν τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην, 12:9) whose widespread dominion is symbolised by his seven diadems, v3. In Isaiah he is portrayed as having power over the nations (14:6) while the kings of the earth under his former control are astonished at his fall (v16); he had power over the whole earth [τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην,

v17]. Second, his fall from heaven is emphatic in both texts – ἐβλήθη being repeated in Rev 12:9 (twice here), 10, 13, and κατέβη in v12, while Isa 14 also describes it variably as being brought down [καταβαίνω] to the foundations of the earth (v15), to Hades (v19), and falling [ἐκπίπτω] from heaven (v12). The description of the king of Babylon as the ‘Day Star’ (Isa 14:12) and his attempt to ascend ‘above the stars of heaven [τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]’ (v13) also parallels the reference to ‘stars of heaven [τῶν ἄστρων τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]’ in Rev 12:4 with its likely angelic overtones (cf. Rev 12:7, 9) – ‘Day Star, Son of the Dawn’ recalls divine names in Canaanite myth.⁹³ Finally, it is not hard to see how the conflict elements of the King’s attempt to set up his rival throne to God (Isa 14:13-14) may have been extended to the idea of heavenly war in John’s own narrative (Rev 12:7); see also the reference to the Messiah being snatched up to God’s throne [τὸν θρόνον] in Rev 12:5, which may parallel the reference to God’s throne in Isa 14:13. This is strong evidence that John used the Isaiah text and saw in it a heavenly figure opposing the rule of God as Satan does in the Apocalypse.⁹⁴

There is also likely allusion to Ezekiel 28:1-19 in the events of Revelation 12. Like Isaiah 14 this too is focused on a single figure, here the Prince of Tyre (v1), who seems to be a synecdoche for the people of Tyre at large. *This also speaks of the overthrow of Israel's enemies.* This figure is condemned for his corrupt patterns of trade (vv5, 16). His other sin, as with the Isaiah text, is his claim ‘I am a god’ (v2) and the boast that he has the mind of a god (vv2, 6, 9). The charge is that he will nonetheless die (vv8, 10) like a mortal (vv 9, 11). At this the nations will ‘cast you down’ [καὶ

⁹³ John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah: 1-39* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1986), 321

⁹⁴ Other texts show the popularity of this tradition in early Jewish literature. 2 En. 29:3-4 also suggests that Satan ‘thought... that he might place his throne higher than the clouds which are above the earth’ and was hurled to earth, while *LAE* 12-16 also details Satan’s casting down to the earth (12:2, 13:2, 16:1), including his struggle with Michael (ch 14; cf. Rev 12:7). Aune, *Revelation 6-16*, 686 suggests there may be parallel between Revelation 12 and the myth of the Watchers in 1 Enoch 6-11, which also describes the descent of angels to earth to corrupt humankind -- although the angels in 1 Enoch choose to descend (6:5) rather than being cast down, the lead figure of the rebellion is Semyaz/ Semyaza (6:3) rather than Satan, and there is mention of a power conflict with the divine here. John may have been aware of an old tradition about Satan's fall. However, this chapter is focused on OT allusions, and the linguistic parallels with Isa 14 strongly suggest the OT is the main source of this idea for him.

καταβιβάσουσίν σε, v8).⁹⁵ Vv11-19 then repeat this story as another ‘lamentation over the King of Tyre’ (v12) but one in which judgment on his corrupt commerce [ἡ ἐμπορία, vv16, 18) is interspersed with another primordial myth about the fall of a heavenly figure. Tyre here is associated with a cherub in the garden of Eden (v14)⁹⁶ on the divine ‘mountain of God’ (v14) before he is displaced from the mountain (v16) and cast down to the ground [ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν ἔρριψά σε] for his pride (v17).

Ezekiel 28:19 may draw on Isaiah 14:12-15. Like the Isaiah text the corrupt Prince in Ezekiel is a supernatural figure in angelic company (Ezek 28:14, 16 as with Isa 14:13), on God’s mountain, Ezek 28:14, cf. Isa 14:13), claiming to sit in the ‘seat of God’ [κατοικίαν θεοῦ, v2; cf. Isa 14:13 – ‘I will make my throne [τὸν θρόνον μου] above the stars...]. As with the Isaiah text this figure is emphatically cast downwards (Ezek 28:8, 16, 17; cf. Isa 14:12 15,19). As with Isa 14:5-6, 10-11, 16-17, Ezek 28:17 presents this figure as ruler of nations now humiliated before those he once subjugated. As with Isaiah 14, while the figure oversteps their authority, there is no mention of a heavenly war (Rev 12:7) or of other angels joining ‘Tyre’ in his rebellion (Rev 12:7). But Ezek 28 probably joins with Isaiah 14 in explaining the backdrop behind Satan’s dominion over the nations (Rev 12:3, 9), his cosmic fall, and the statement that after heavenly conflict there was ‘no longer any place for them [Satan and his angels] in heaven’ (Rev 12:8). That John may have been drawn to this Ezekiel text is made even more likely given the strong indictment of Tyre’s trade [ἡ ἐμπορία] in Ezek 28:4-5, 16. Ezekiel’s taunt of Tyre also has strong parallels with the dirge over Babylon in Revelation 18. As with Tyre, the latter figure (= Rome) is also personified as a human character; she too had great influence over the rulers of the earth (the wealthy in Roman society) who traded with her (e.g. Rev 18:3, 9, 11-13, 15-19); most

⁹⁵ The Hebrew reads ‘cast you down *to the pit*’, לַשַּׁחַת, which is closer to the בּוֹר, in Isa 14:15.

⁹⁶ The text is not immediately clear here whether Tyre is one of the ‘cherubim’, heavenly figures attending God’s presence, or simply in the company of cherubim. In the LXX of v14 God states that ‘I placed you on the holy mountain of God with a cherub...’ [μετὰ τοῦ χερουβ]; the MT of the same verse reads ‘you were a cherub’ [אַתְּ־כְרוּב]. The former reading is more likely the original given the separation between Tyre and the cherub in v16 (both MT and LXX read in v16 that the guardian cherub forced the King out from God’s presence / the ‘stones of fire’) – in which case MT v14 should probably be read that Tyre was ‘with a cherub’ [אַתְּ־כְרוּב].

significantly her chief hubris is also singled out here as her corrupt trade activity (ἡ ἐμπορία, Rev 18:3, 11, 15, 23).

John, then, has applied the primordial myth from Isaiah and Ezekiel to address the situation of the church in the world. He has applied this tradition about the King of Babylon and Tyre to Satan in such a way as to suggest the persecution facing believers is diabolical. There is a difference in the timing of the texts. John shifts the myth away from its primordial origins to the time immediately following the Messiah's ascension (Rev 12:5).⁹⁷ This allows him to suggest that victory over the devil has been partially secured, even though he is still able to oppose believers at present (12:11). Most importantly, *by alluding to these texts about Israel's enemies, he seems to suggest that believers too are the faithful portion of Israel tied up in the same conflict as the Israel of the past.* Below I will consider how Luke also uses these same texts to suggest his community is the faithful portion of Israel.

4.2. Exorcism and Jewish Unbelief (Lk 10:15)

I have already considered above Jesus' allusion to Gen 3:15 that the disciples will trample on serpents and scorpions (Lk 10:19). This discourse about the return of the 72 from mission details how Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum have rejected the gospel (Lk 10:13-15). This may imply something of a parting between the Christian movement and fellow Jews. However, Luke's use of these OT traditions rather shows a division within Israel in which believers are vindicated as the faithful, and unbelievers as the unfaithful, portion of Israel. As with John these OT traditions further demonstrates an Israel in cosmic conflict.

To reiterate the context of Lk 10:1-24: Jesus commissions the seventy disciples to preach the kingdom of God to the towns he intended to visit (Lk 10:1-12). Then he proclaims woe on the Galilean villages that fail to repent, comparing Chorazin, Bethsaida and Capernaum to Tyre and Sidon (vv13-16). Of Capernaum he states, 'will

⁹⁷ Koester, *Revelation*, 550; Caird, *Revelation*, 154

you be exalted to heaven? No, you will be brought down to Hades' (v15). This is followed by a statement that whoever listens to the disciples listens to Jesus and whoever rejects them rejects Jesus (v17). Luke narrates the return of the seventy, who are full of joy because the demons submit to them. Then Jesus says, 'I watched Satan fall like lightning from heaven' (v18) before urging them to rejoice not that demons submit to them but that their 'names are written in heaven' (v20) and that they are the heirs of what kings and prophets only glimpsed at long ago (vv21-4).

This passage shows believers are the faithful Israel by making a critical distinction between believing and unbelieving Jews. This can be seen, first, in the symmetry between the 'fall' of Capernaum (v15) and the 'fall' of Satan (v18). Here Luke contrasts the fate of the disciples' names '*written in heaven*' (10:20) and revelation of the Father's will (vv21-4), with the rejection of the gospel in these villages, who will *not be 'exalted to heaven'* but '*cast down to Hades*' (v15).⁹⁸ This distinction between believing and unbelieving Jews is seen, second, by the juxtaposition of the 'woe' pronounced on the villages' inhabitants (v13) with the 'joy' that the disciples should inherit in vv17, 20. It is made even more apparent, third, when the passage is compared to its Matthean equivalent. Matthew includes the woe on unrepentant villages (Lk 10:13-15) with almost identical wording (Mt 11:20-24) including the reference to Capernaum being cast down from heaven. But while Matthew inserts this material following Jewish rejection of John the Baptist and Jesus (Mt 11:16-19), Luke places it after the disciples' return from mission. This draws attention to Luke's interest in mission and the rejection of the gospel by unbelieving Jews. The manner Luke's section (Lk 10:13-24) is structured into disciples vs unbelieving Galileans in this way reinforces his idea of a divided Israel. This symmetry between Capernaum's fall and Satan's fall especially suggests that the unbelief of the Jews in Lk 10:13-15 is linked to demonic activity. This further denounces unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. I will now consider in more detail the OT allusions behind the motif of 'falling' applied to Capernaum in Lk 10:15 and Satan in Lk 10:18. It is very likely

⁹⁸ Capernaum is singled out to receive this oracle, but the context of 10:13-15 suggests that the other villages will also be subject to a similar fate.

here that Luke also alludes to the ‘heavenly fall’ texts used in Rev 12, with further implications for his ecclesiology.

First, Luke also alludes to Isa 14:13-15 LXX in Lk 10:15. The table shows the parallels between these texts.

Isa 14:13-15 LXX	Lk 10:15
<p>σὺ δὲ εἶπας ἐν τῇ διανοίᾳ σου εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀναβήσομαι, ἐπάνω τῶν ἀστρῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ θήσω τὸν θρόνον μου, καθιῶ ἐν ὄρει ὑψηλῷ ἐπὶ τὰ ὄρη τὰ ὑψηλὰ τὰ πρὸς βορρᾶν, 14 ἀναβήσομαι ἐπάνω τῶν νεφελῶν, ἔσομαι ὅμοιος τῷ ὑψίστῳ.</p>	<p>καὶ σὺ, Καφαρναούμ, μὴ ἕως οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθήσῃ;⁹⁹</p>
<p>15 νῦν δὲ εἰς ἄδου καταβήσῃ καὶ εἰς τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς.</p>	<p>ἕως τοῦ ἄδου καταβήσῃ¹⁰⁰.</p>

That Luke alludes to this text is highly likely given its shared themes of a city under judgment, the casting down [καταβαίνω] of this city from heaven [ὁ οὐρανός] after its prideful attempt to exalt itself [ὑψώω], the denial of any claim to status this city might have¹⁰¹, and its intriguing link to the fall of a heavenly figure (Isa 14:12 LXX; cf. Lk 10:18). Again, in its original context this Isaiah text was applied to Babylon (Isa 14:4 LXX). While John drew especially on Isaiah’s language of the fall of this heavenly figure from heaven in Rev 12, Luke modifies its judgment on Israel’s enemies by

⁹⁹ This (‘will you be exalted to heaven?’) is how the NA28 renders the text. Other witnesses read ἕως τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὑψωθείσα (‘exalted to heaven’). Potentially the second is a later revision, reflecting the omission of the original μ by haplography, leading to a consequent change in grammar Marshall, Luke, 425.

¹⁰⁰ This reading, from καταβαινω (thus: ‘you will be brought down’), is supported by P75 B D 579 sy; many other manuscripts including x P45 A C K read καταβιβασθησῃ, from καταβιβαζω (thus: ‘you will be driven down’). The former reading here (‘cast down’) may be preferred as it reflects a wider geographical demographic of texts: Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV*, AB28 (London: Yale University Press, 2007), 853. It is also verbatim the form used in Is 14:15 LXX.

¹⁰¹ Jesus’ question ‘will you ascend to heaven?’ (NA28 Lk 10:15) never actually claims that Capernaum has any legitimate status in heaven. This seems more in keeping with the rhetoric of the Isaiah text than the alternative ‘Capernaum, exalted to heaven’, although the difference is subtle.

applying the oracle to unbelieving Galilean villages. This further suggests they are in league with Satan.

This verse may also allude to Ezek 28. In this case Luke also uses this OT text to imply a division within Israel. This allusion is evidenced in Lk 10:13-14 by Jesus' comparison between Chorazin and Bethsaida and Tyre and Sidon. These last two pagan neighbours were paired together for judgment in Ezek 28:1, 20. Although they were also linked together in (e.g.) Zech 9:2, Jer 25:22, 47:4, reliance on Ezek 28 is more likely here given its thematic links with the fall of the heavenly figure in Isaiah 14:12-19, which Luke alludes to in Lk 10:18 (below). By linking unbelieving Jews with Tyre and Sidon, Luke goes even further than John here (who omits mention of the cities in chapter twelve). This further denounces them as in league with Israel's enemies. Isa 14 and Ezek 28 are also referred in Lk 10:18. This verse even further shows the apocalyptic cosmic backdrop behind Luke's portrayal of Israel, as with Revelation.

Isa 14:12 LXX	Lk 10:18
<p>πῶς ἐξέπεσεν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὁ ἑωσφόρος ὁ πρωὶ ἀνατέλλων; συνετρίβη εἰς τὴν γῆν ὁ ἀποστέλλων πρὸς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη</p>	<p>εἶπεν δὲ αὐτοῖς· ἐθεώρουν τὸν σατανᾶν ὡς ἀστραπὴν ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ πεσόντα.</p>

In this verse, Jesus says 'I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven'. Again, the context of Lk 10:18 locates it in the event of the disciples' return from mission and their rejoicing over the demons' submission to them (Lk 10:17-20). Specific points of contact between Isa 14:12 LXX and Lk 10:18 are as follows. First, Isa 14:12 LXX refers to Babylon's 'fall' with the aorist indicative of ἐκπίπτω; Luke 10:18 describes it with the aorist participle of πίπτω. Second, both Isa 14:12 LXX and Lk 10:18 explicitly refer to this figure falling 'from heaven' [ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ]. Third, there may also be some resemblance between the LXX description of the King of Babylon as the 'Morning Star, Son of the Dawn' (14:12) and Luke's own description of Satan 'as lightning [ὡς ἀστραπὴν]': though lightning may simply be a metaphor for rapid descent (above), it is notable that both texts use cosmic language and the motif of *bright light* to

describe this supernatural figure.¹⁰² Dependence on Ezek 28:11-19 LXX (and its casting down of the heavenly figure from God's mountain (v14, 16) is less clear in Lk 10:18 than v15 on a linguistic level. But its usage in v15 and the thematic parallel between Lk 10:15 and 18 suggests that this was also the backdrop behind the latter too.

Jesus' statement is full of apocalyptic imagery. This is evident on several levels. Jesus' statement 'I saw...' [θεωρέω]¹⁰³ may imply that he saw a vision:¹⁰⁴ though θεωρέω may mean 'seeing' in the ordinary sense, often for Luke it also implies a heightened form of seeing associated with visions or supernatural phenomena (Lk 24:37, 39, Acts 7:56, 8:13, 9:7, 10:11). This is in line with its use in Daniel 7 where it introduces an apocalyptic vision.¹⁰⁵ 'Satan' already recalls the figure mentioned in 1 Chr, Job and Zechariah above, along with all its heavenly paraphernalia concerning the divine council and access to God's throne. Satan's fall 'like lightning' [ὡς ἀστραπήν] also recalls apocalyptic language: while lightning may simply suggest Satan fell quickly down,¹⁰⁶ it is also a popular image in the prophetic / apocalyptic world where it is applied to the divine presence (e.g. Hab 3:11, Zech 9:14, Ezek 1:14, Dan 10:6 LXX, 1 En 14:10, 17, 17:2), (divine judgment (Sir 43:13 LXX), and associated with angelic beings in Jub. 2:4. This apocalyptic language further highlights the cosmic nature of the struggle facing Israel.

4.3. Evaluation: Satan's Fall and Jewish Rejection

Luke's use of Isa 14 and Ezek 28 compares with Revelation 12 as follows, then. First, both authors preserve from these texts the idea of a heavenly figure being cast down in judgment from heaven. Second, both apply this fall to Satan himself. Third, both associate the fulfilment of this event not in primordial times but with the lifetime of

¹⁰² For light as a supernatural phenomenon in Luke-Acts see also Lk 9:29, Acts 1:10, 9:3, 12:7, 22:9.

¹⁰³ Or 'I was watching', which better suits the sense of the imperfect here than the NRSV.

¹⁰⁴ E.E. Ellis, *Gospel of Luke*, 157

¹⁰⁵ Green, *Luke*, 419. Heavenly visions are a common trope in apocalyptic literature – also ubiquitous in Revelation (e.g. Rev 1:17, 1:20, 4:1, 4, 5:1-11, 6:1-12, 7:1-14, 8:2, 13), though here they are more commonly associated with the verb ὁράω.

¹⁰⁶ *BDAG*, 146; Marshall, *Luke*, 428.

Jesus. These similarities are striking. Both authors, it seems, use the OT texts to vindicate believers as the faithful Israel engaged in cosmic conflict, but both do so in different ways.

For John, Satan's fall especially seems to represent his eviction from the heavenly court which he has access to in Job 1-2, Zech 3:1 – after he and his angels were defeated 'there was no longer any space for them in heaven' (Rev 12:8). This presumably equates to his loss of judicial authority to accuse (Rev 12:10), which was his dominant function in the divine council. This event took place after Jesus' enthronement (Rev 12:5). It does not mark a total end to Satan's ability to oppose Israel (Rev 12:12, 17). This will only be concluded when he is thrown into the lake of fire in Rev 20:10. These OT texts referred to judgment on *Israel's enemies*. By applying them to believers undergoing state persecution John also seems to suggest that they are the faithful portion of Israel opposed by similar antagonists that challenged Israel in the past.

For Luke, Satan's fall is primarily linked with the 72 disciples sent on mission to the Jews. Here it seems to refer to exorcism (Lk 10:17, 20) rather than Satan's loss of judicial authority in the divine council as with Revelation. He still seems to access the divine council after this event in Lk 22:31. Unlike Revelation 12, Luke preserves from Isaiah 14 and Ezek 28 the fall of Tyre and Sidon. These judgment oracles are applied to villages of unbelieving Jews rejecting the gospel (Lk 10:13-16). Of these Capernaum is singled out as a representative: 'you will be brought down to Hades' (Lk 10:15). This marks both a parallel with Satan's own descent, implying the unbelieving Jews are diabolically motivated, and a contrast with the disciples whose names are written in heaven (Lk 10:20), which implies that they *are* the faithful portion of Israel. Luke has carefully structured and placed this heavenly fall narrative into Luke 10. This shows that he has contemplated this tradition at considerable length and highlights how compelling he found the idea of apocalyptic conflict (as with Revelation 12) in his own work.

5. Conclusion

In this chapter I have situated Revelation within Judaism. I have demonstrated that John sees the church as engaged in an *intra muros* Jewish dispute. This was shown through his critique of Jewish rivals as those 'who say that they are Jews but are not but are a synagogue of Satan' (Rev 2:9, cf. 3:9). This shows a concern to demonstrate that Christians alone are true Israelites, which John sustains throughout his apocalypse. A key part of this programme for John is to *portray the church as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in cosmic conflict*. Here there are compelling parallels with Luke-Acts, which also presents Christians in the same manner. This was particularly well exemplified with Rev 12, where the church's antagonist Satan is most fully unmasked. Rev 12 is full of scripture allusions. I focused on three units of tradition above which are also shared by Luke in his portrayal of the church as portrayed in cosmic conflict. There are many similarities in the way both authors exegete these scriptures. However, while John makes much of Satan's role in motivating state persecution, Luke uses him far more to demonstrate how the church is involved in a division within Israel and therefore an *intra mural* Jewish debate. Put differently, he uses the devil to extend the sentiment of Rev 2:9, 3:9 far more through his own work. This suggests he is even more concerned than John to demonstrate believers' legitimate place in Israel amidst Jewish rivals. I compared the three sets of OT traditions as follows to make this point.

The first of these traditions concern John's description of the 'great dragon... that ancient serpent' (Rev 12:9). This recalls many OT texts portraying reptilian figures as creatures of chaos and opposing Israel. Above all, John's description of the serpent opposing the woman and her seed (τῶν λοιπῶν τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς, Rev 12:17, cf. v13), and deceiving the 'whole world' (v9) recalls the prediction in Gen 3:15 that the seed [σπέρμα] of Eve will bruise the deceptive serpent and he will bruise her heel. John applies this struggle to believers undergoing state persecution. Luke likely alludes to the same tradition when Jesus claims disciples will trample on snakes and scorpions, demons (Lk 10:18). Here, however, the struggle is applied to exorcisms by

the 72 believers on mission to the Jews. In this mission the Jews have largely rejected the gospel. Thus Luke implicitly suggests the unbelieving Jews are in league with Satan and maps this cosmic struggle on to the division within Israel.

The second set of traditions concern John's description of Διάβολος καὶ ὁ Σατανᾶς (Rev 12:9). This especially recalls Job 1-2, 1 Chr 21:1-13, and Zech 3 where he is linked to the divine council, presented as an accuser, and as one who opposes Israel. John preserves these traditions by presenting his fall from the divine council (12:7-9) to earth to accuse believers (12:10). By pitting this figure against believers he locates them in the same place as the Israel of old also opposed by the same character. Luke also alludes to these same texts and themes throughout his narrative. Satan appears in the temptation narrative where Jesus represents Israel. This shows the devil's power over the Roman world but also (emphatically for Luke) the Jewish religious establishment. This highlights his power in leading unbelieving Jews astray. In Lk 8:12 the devil is said to take away the word of God from hearers' hearts. This occurs in the context of Jesus' preaching to Jews and of a divided Israel (8:10). This further suggests Satan is involved in an *intra muros* Jewish debate. Finally, I also examined Lk 22:31-24. This text also presents Satan's work in opposing Israel where he asks for permission to test the twelve disciples, who represent Israel. These three passages highlight how for Luke too the devil opposes believers as he opposed Israel in the past, and the first two of these imply that unbelieving Jews are diabolically motivated, which further shows believers by contrast to be the true portion of Israel.

Finally I considered traditions about Satan's fall in both texts where each author seems to allude to Isa 14:12-15, Ezek 28:1-19. These OT texts place judgment on Israel's enemies by linking them to the myth of a fallen cosmic figure. John shares these themes in his fall of Satan from heaven, which seems to indicate his loss of authority after Jesus' enthronement (12:5). By pitting this figure against believers he also seems to suggest they are the faithful Israel opposed by the one motivating Israel's enemies in the past. Here I returned to Luke 10 and the return of the 72 from mission. Here Jesus' statement 'I saw Satan fall like lightning from heaven' (Lk 10:18) alludes to these same texts. Jesus applies it to exorcism. The same texts are alluded

to in Lk 10:15 which also talks about Capernaum's casting down because it is has rejected the gospel. These parallels suggest, again, that unbelieving Jews are linked to Satan. Lk 10 pits them against the 72 whose names are written in heaven (Lk 10:20). Thus, again, Luke links unbelieving Jews to Satan.

There is much in common, then, between Luke and John here. Both seem to draw on the same OT texts in their portrayal of Satan opposing believers. In both cases this commends them as the faithful portion of Israel by virtue of the fact that Satan especially opposes Israel in the OT. In this case the antagonist can be seen as something of an identity marker for faithful Jews. Moreover, these striking parallels also highlight an apocalyptic conflict theme running throughout Luke-Acts. *This shows there are more apocalyptic features than are often emphasised in genre studies of Luke's work. This adds another nuance to Luke's portrayal of believers: not only are they the faithful portion of Israel, but they are also made so through the motif of cosmic conflict.* Luke leverages Satan even more than John to denounce Jewish rivals as unbelieving Israel and vindicate believers as faithful Israelites. This comparison further highlights the Jewishness of Luke-Acts and how Luke presents the Christian movement is on the winning side of a cosmic *intra muros* Jewish dispute. This further tells against the parting of the ways in his work. In the next chapter I will compare Luke-Acts with a text from the Dead Sea Scrolls to further highlight its place in the thought world of inter-Jewish debate.

Chapter Three: Luke-Acts and 4QFlorilegium: Jewish Temple Polemic and Messiah

My previous chapters have shown Luke to be operating within a Jewish framework of polemic. This thesis has been supported by comparing the use of scripture in Luke-Acts with an epistle and an apocalyptic text, both taken from the NT. However, although Paul and John were both Jewish, it is also necessary to look beyond the confines of the NT in order to establish more fully the case that Luke is operating within a Jewish thought-world by using scripture to commend believers as the true Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Here I will look at the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) to bolster my claim.

The Qumran corpus illuminates Luke's scriptural claims to Jewish identity as follows. Like the Christian community portrayed by Luke, it shows the struggle of a sect trying to assert itself as the legitimate heir of Israel's traditions in the wake of competing claims for 'true' Jewish identity. Like the early Christian community portrayed by Luke, it also uses scripture to vindicate its members as the faithful portion of Israel in contrast to the broader majority of 'unfaithful' Jews.

In this chapter I will focus my comparison on 4Q174, otherwise titled 'Florilegium'. This fragmentary text is mainly an exposition of 2 Sam 7:10-14, Amos 9:11 and Psalms 1-2, along with supporting texts. These texts are used to comment in particular on the themes of temple (2 Sam 7), Messiah(s) (2 Sam 7, Amos 9:11) and eschatological conflict and division in Israel (Pss 1-2). All of these themes are used to commend the sectarians as the faithful portion of Israel. 4Q174 provides an apt comparison with Luke-Acts here because Luke uses these very same OT texts in his work. Moreover, Luke-Acts also draws heavily on the themes of temple, Messiah and a divided Israel. This chapter will therefore show, with the help of this Qumran text, how Luke has likewise reshaped these fundamentally Jewish categories to portray his own community as the faithful portion of Israel. This will further suggest he is arguing not from outside but from within Judaism.

The chapter will proceed as follows. In section 1 I will show how the Qumran sectarians saw themselves as the faithful remnant of Israel in contrast to their Jewish opponents and made this case using scripture. Here I will look more broadly at the Qumran corpus to make this point. Particularly informative here is their use of a 'pesher' (פֶּשֶׁר) interpretative method, which supposedly relies on divinely inspired exegesis to unveil the hidden meaning of a biblical text in the contemporary life of the sectarians. I will then show how this operates in 4Q174. In section 2 I will examine how the author of 4Q174 uses 2 Sam 7 to address the themes of *temple* and *Messiah* to legitimate the sect as the true Israel. In section 3 I will compare this with Luke's use of 2 Sam 7 to address the same themes in Lk 1:32-3, Acts 2:30, 7:45-7. In section 4 I will consider the use of Ps 2 in, first, 4Q174 and then, Acts 4, to legitimate their communities as the faithful portion of Israel, and to denounce Jewish opponents as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Amos 9:11 I have already discussed in chapter 1, so I will not consider it in depth in this chapter.

This will shed the following light on Luke-Acts. First, like 4Q174, his christology is strongly Davidic, which aligns him with Judaism. Second, Luke is often supposed to have a negative take on the temple which is frequently taken to suggest a parting of the ways in his work. However, 4Q174 also denounces the Jewish temple cult for worshipping incorrectly and yet remains within Judaism. Finally, like 4Q174, Luke also uses Ps 2 in a strikingly similar manner to speak of a divided Israel and a reconstitution of the people of God, in which Jewish opponents are read as YHWH's enemies and the Christian community by implication is the true Israel as the anointed of God. These themes suggest that Luke-Acts, like 4Q174, occupies a position within early Judaism.

1.1. Scripture Legitimizes the True Israel at Qumran

Where, then, is the evidence that the Qumran sectarians saw themselves as the faithful remnant of Israel? Here I will look more broadly at the DSS to make this point. Once this is established I will then turn to 4Q174 to see how it repeats this theme.

First, then, it is necessary to look briefly beyond 4Q174 to the Damascus Document.¹ This is a narrative account of the sect's origins. The precise historical circumstances are difficult to reconstruct from this, but the theology is nonetheless clear. Apparently, after 390 years of Babylonian exile God 'saved a remnant (שרית) for Israel²' (CD 1:4-5) and God 'caused to sprout from Israel and from Aaron a shoot of the planting in order to possess his land.' (CD 1:5b-7). After 20 years God raised up for them a 'Teacher of Righteousness' to teach them about Israel's sin and future, and the covenant requirements for Israel. Meanwhile, the rest of Israel remains in exile to await judgment (CD 8:9-17). This new community is the recipient of a 'new covenant' which evidently consists of renewed Torah legislation.³

This account in the Damascus Document is striking for its language of the faithful remnant and a division within Israel, both of which are an attempt to reframe Israel's identity.⁴ Significantly, a key component of what it means to be the true Israel is its correct interpretation of Torah. Right from the outset the dispute with early opponents of the sect was evidently a difference of Torah interpretation (led by the Scoffer who 'poured out over Israel waters of lies', CD 1:15); these opponents "sought easy interpretations, chose illusions, scrutinised loopholes..." (CD-A 1:18-19).

¹ Probably dated in its earliest form to around 100 BCE, mainly due to the fact that the text does not refer to the Romans (or 'Kittim'). Geza Vermes, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999), 137-8.

² The precise relationship between the Qumran community and the broader majority of Israel has been debated. The scrolls themselves lack the language of old/ new or true/ false Israel, preferring instead to use the language of remnant (שאר). That the sectarians saw themselves replacing an old Israel, note their language of a 'new covenant', which may suggest discontinuity with the former. Philip Davies argues that the word for God 'remembering (זכר) the covenant of the[ir] forefathers' (CD 1:5) implies only a weak connection between the new and old covenants. However, it is unlikely that the sentiment is that this new covenant is like that in Hebrews 8:13, where the διαθήκη καινήν (8:8) 'makes the first one obsolete'. Rather, the image of the shoot springing from Israel (CD 1:8-9) implies continuity with the Israel of the past, i.e. both plant and root remain intact (cf. Rom 11:11-24). This also seems to line up more closely with the new covenant mentioned in Jer 31:31, which the Qumran ideology is likely based on. Thus we should probably speak of the sectarians here as a 'renewed' rather than an entirely new Israel, or alternatively the redeemed, faithful portion of Israel: see Alex Deasley, *The Shape of Qumran Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000), 91; Talmon, Shemeryan, 'The Identity of the Community' in Ulrich, Eugene and Vanderkam, James (eds.) *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 12; John Bergsma, "Qumran Self-Identity" in *DSD 15* (2008), 182.

³ E.g. CD 6:19, 9:28, 11:14, 15:5-8.

⁴ For other references to שאר and its cognate שרית as 'remnant' cf. 1QM I:6; 2:10, 11; 4:1, 2; 13:8; 14:5, 8, 9; 4Q386 1.2.5, 6; 4Q491 8-10.1.3; CD I:4, 5; 2:4-7; 1QS 4:14; 5:12, 13; 1QHa 14:32; 4Q427 7.2.7, 8.

Yet to the remnant alone God 'established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing [לגלות] to them hidden things in which all Israel had gone astray' (CD 3:13-14). 'Revealed' here implies divine inspiration. This itself is fundamental to the 'pesher' hermeneutic operative in the community: the idea that the full meaning of the biblical texts is latent until a divinely inspired interpreter unveils its meaning for the present.

This assumption is exemplified in the commentary on Habakkuk (1QpHab). Apparently God told Habakkuk to write down the events of the final generation. He was not fully aware of their meaning, which was hidden until God made known (הודיע) its mystery to the Teacher of Righteousness, who unveiled it to the community.⁵ This pesher hermeneutic is typically identified in the scrolls by a citation, then an introductory formula typically containing the word פשר, then the text's application to the present context⁶. Here 'pesher' refers to the interpretative method. It can also specify the genre of texts which have a high frequency of these occurrences.

A few passages exemplify how this *pesher* mode of interpretation legitimates the community as the faithful portion of Israel. Again, concerning the founding of the community in the Damascus Document, God evidently 'established his covenant with Israel forever, revealing to them [לגלות] hidden matters [נסתרות] in which all Israel had gone astray...' (3:13-14). This first instance is noteworthy for the description of both the Qumran community and other unfaithful Jews as Israel, one faithful and the other not, on the basis of their response to the new teaching. In the Community Rule (1QS) a similar point is made: to the initiate of the community is to be revealed 'every matter hidden [הנסתר] from Israel but which has been found out [ונמצא] by the Interpreter' (6:5-6). Finally, in the Thanksgiving Hymns (1QH), the hymnist states 'you [God] have lightened my face for your covenant... but...[there are] mediators of fraud and seers of deceit, they have plotted... to change your law, which you have engraved

⁵ 1QpHab 7.1-5

⁶ Timothy Lim, 'Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls' in Timothy Lim, John J. Collins, *The Oxford Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 305

in my heart' (1QH 12:5-11). In all these examples⁷ the true interpretation of the law, received by revelation, is the boundary marker to determine which Jews are faithful worshippers among Israel and which are not.

I have already argued at length for Luke's division within Israel. His similarity to this *peshet* mode of interpretation is also striking. Jesus' inaugural statement, 'today [σήμερον] this scripture [Isaiah 61:1, 58:6, Lev 25:10] has been fulfilled in your hearing' (Lk 24:21) already suggests that Luke operates with a similar hermeneutic of *time*, i.e. that the scriptures only reach complete fulfilment in the events of the community; likewise note his emendation of the Joel citation, where he replaces the original 'after these things [μετὰ ταῦτα]' (Joel 3:1 LXX) with 'in the last days [ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, Acts 2:17]' to suggest again that this prophetic text reaches its definitive interpretation with the events of Pentecost. Like the Teacher of Righteousness, Jesus is also portrayed as a divinely inspired exegete. The Gospel likewise ends with his instruction to two remaining disciples: 'beginning with Moses and all the prophets, he interpreted to them the things about himself in all the scriptures' (Lk 24:27), and he constantly betters his Jewish opponents in debate. Not only this, but Jesus' followers are also portrayed as exemplar exegetes: the outpouring of the Spirit renders them all accessible to divinely inspired interpretation (Acts 2:14-21) and Peter in the same passage shows himself capable of the same sort of charismatic exegesis as Jesus, as do Stephen (Acts 7:1-53), Philip (Acts 8:30-33) and Paul (e.g. Acts 13:16-41). The following discussion will demonstrate how this also commends his community as the faithful portion of Israel.

Now I will outline the structure and contents of 4Q174 before commencing with more detailed scripture comparisons. 4Q174 also illustrates this *peshet* mode of interpretation. Here the word *peshet* (פֶּשֶׁט) is principally applied to Psalms 1 (4Q174 1:14) and 2 (1:19). The word 'midrash' ('interpretation') is also applied to Ps 1 in 1.14.

⁷ See Susan Wendel, *Scriptural interpretation and Community Self-definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Boston: Brill, 2011), 35-76 for a fuller treatment.

This has led to considerable debate about the precise genre of the text.⁸ However, its use of the technical term פֶּשֶׁר and its assumption that the full meanings of the OT texts cited are only fulfilled in the events of the community indicate that it is probably best categorised as a 'pesher' similar to that found in (e.g. 1QpHab), as most commentators suggest.⁹

1.2. Structure and Argument of 4Q174

4Q174 is difficult to reconstruct in its entirety. It consists of 26 fragments. The first column, consisting of frgs. 1-2, 21 can be reproduced easily, and also a third of the next column (frgs. 1,3). The remaining fragments are so small that no substantive reconstruction can be made of them. They are likely a pesher on Deut 33 with supporting citations (Dan 11:32 and Isa 65:22-3).¹⁰ The text is typically dated from the 1st century CE.¹¹

⁸ The text is commonly titled 'Florilegium', which refers to an anthology of texts, but this title is slightly misleading as the text is also a commentary on these biblical citations. More recently it has been titled 'A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1-2' ('midrash pesher': William Brownlee, 'Midrash Pesher of Habbakuk' (1979), 25 and 'eschatological midrash': John M. Allegro, 'Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim', *JBL* (1958), 350-4). This reflects the technical term in 4Q174 1.14. However, recent doubt has been shed on the suitability of 'midrash' as a technical label: in the DSS corpus 'midrash' is used variably, applying equally to communal study (1QS 8:14-16, 8:26), judicial enquiry (1QS 6:24), communal regulation (CD 20:6, 4Q266 frg. 18.5:18-20), and to authoritative interpretation of scripture (4Q258 frg. 1.1.11). See Timothy Lim, *Pesharim* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2022), 49. Timothy Lim, *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997), 127

⁹ See Timothy Lim, *Pesharim*, 48-5. Jonathan Campbell, *The Exegetical Texts* (London: T & T Clark, 2004), 13. Even here there are caveats: unlike the other Qumran Pesharim (commentaries on Nahum, Habakkuk, Psalms and so on) it is not concerned as these are with a single biblical book but with different texts from different writings. See Michael Knibb, 'Florilegium' in Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 257. In the interests of brevity this will have to do.

¹⁰ Steudel suggests that the text was originally part of a longer work including 4Q177, which also includes the psalms and shares with the former similar patterns of citation: Annette Steudel, '4QMidrEschat: A Midrash on Eschatology' (4Q174 + 4Q177) in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings*, vol 2 (1992), 533-6. However, the first similarity could be coincidental, while the latter may simply be the product of a standardised system of citation. See James Vanderkam, 'Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des Durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden' in *CBQ* 57 (1995), 577 and Lim, *Pesharim*, 15, for critique.

¹¹ Jacob Milgrom, 'Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1-2 (4Q174 = 4QFlor)' in James Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*.

4Q174 is mainly a commentary on 2 Sam 7:10-14 and Pss 1-2, along with secondary proof texts supporting the main passages. The primary scriptural texts divide it into two sections. There is no formal introduction to the first. The former part of 2 Sam 7:10 – the promise that God will ‘appoint a place for my people Israel...’ may have been mentioned here¹², given that the reconstructed text early mentions ‘...this is the house which [he will build] for him...’ (4Q174 1:2) without mentioning its antecedent. As it stands the text begins abruptly with a citation from Ps 89:23. In its original context this referred to the vanquishing of David’s enemies. Here it applies to a future scenario when Israel will be given rest from its enemies, as clarified by the next citation from 2 Sam 7:10-11, which also refers to a future time when Israel will be oppressed no more. The context for this is evidently God’s construction of (a) the eschatological temple: ‘this is the house [הבית] which [he will build] for [him] in the latter days [באחרית הימים]’ (1:2).¹³ This is the first of three temples which elucidate the theme of Israel and God’s dwelling in 2 Sam 7:10-14.

The first temple is introduced by a citation about the ‘sanctuary’ [מקדש] in Exod 15:17-18.¹⁴ Evidently no ‘Ammonite... Moabite... bastard... foreigner... or... proselyte’ will be allowed here (1:4). YHWH will reign here forever [עולם, 3], God’s glory will dwell there perpetually, and ‘strangers will lay it waste [ולא ישמוהו] no more, as they formerly laid waste the ‘sanctua[ry of I]srael [ישראל] [מקד[ש] י[ש]ראל] because of their sin’ (6). This latter ‘sanctuary of Israel’ is (b) the second temple mentioned in the text. Presumably this one refers to the first temple that was desecrated.

Volume 6b: Pesharim and Related Documents (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 248, though George Brooke argues for a date in the second half of the first century: George Brooke, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4Q Florilegium in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 83-4. For the English I am using Milgrom’s translation; other English translations I take from Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study Edition* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1997-8).

¹² Knibb, ‘Florilegium’, 257

¹³ ‘Latter days’ recurs in 1:2, 12, 15, 19, highlighting the eschatological concern of the text.

¹⁴ This could either be translated as ‘The sanctuary,] O Yahweh’ (4Q174 1:3) or ‘The sanctuary of] Yahweh’.

The third temple (c) refers to the 'sanctuary of man' [מקדש אדם, 16]¹⁵. This God has commanded to be built, apparently as compensation for the second temple. This presumably refers to the present Qumran community,¹⁶ whose cultic worship is described both as 'incense' and as keeping 'works of Torah [מעשי תורה, 1:7]'.¹⁷ Then 2 Sam 7 is cited again, with further commentary: 'I [shall obtain] for you [rest] from all your enemies' (v11). This forms an *inclusio* with the former part of the text detailing the promise of rest from Israel's enemies (1:1-2). Here the victory is further elaborated on as 'rest' from the 'Sons of Belial' [בני בליעל] who supposedly 'cause them to stumble in order to destroy [th]em... just as they came with a plan of [Be]lial to cause to stumble the S[ons of] Light (1:7-9)'.¹⁸ The Sons of Light here likely refer to Israel (4Q174 1:2, 13), the 'Sons of Belial' the enemies of the sect. The precise historical referent is difficult to determine here. Possibly it refers to some internal schism in the sect.¹⁹ This also links to the end of Florilegium, where Belial's overthrow is completed after a time of eschatological conflict (2:1-2).²⁰

¹⁵ The curious phrase could also be translated variably as 'sanctuary of humanity' or 'consisting of men': G.K. Beale, *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Leicester: Apollos, 2004), 104.

¹⁶ Milgrom, 'Florilegium', 248; Michael Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 259-60; Beale, *Temple*, 88. Daniel R. Schwartz, 'Three Temples in 4Q Florilegium' in *RevQ 10* (1979-81), 85, reads it as 'a sanctuary amongst men', dispelling the idea the community is a temple here; on this basis it is material and the same as the eschatological temple of 1.2-5. However, there is surely a separation between the future eschatological temple and the מקדש אדם as 4Q174 claims that God himself will build the future temple (1.2-3), in its elaboration of 2 Sam 7, while the מקדש אדם he has 'commanded to be built for him' instead (1.6) - contra also Bertil Gärtner, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1965), 31-32, who reads the 'sanctuary of man' as the eschatological temple. cf. 1QS 8.5; 1QH 8.20; 4Q418 frg. 81 for other instances where the community is portrayed as a dwelling for God.

¹⁷ Brooke, *Exegesis*, 108, argues that this phrase should be read 'works of thanksgiving'. Against this see Milgrom, 'Florilegium', 248, on the basis of analogy with מעשי התורה in 4Q398 [MMT] frgs. 14-17.2.3, where it refers to matters of cultic ritual.

¹⁸ This is likely an allusion to some historical event in the past, although the precise referent cannot be recovered. Knibb, 'Florilegium', 260. The figure 'Belial' (בליעל) in the DSS is the angel of darkness leading the evil spirits who lead Israel astray (1QM 13:10-15). He is also responsible for the defilement of the sanctuary (CD 4.12-18). His influence can be avoided by reverting to the Torah of Moses (CD 16:4-5, cf. CD 7:2, 19:14, 1QS 11-12) and he will be defeated in the war at the end of days (1QM 17:5-8, 4Q504).

¹⁹ As with CD 8:16, which refers to the 'converts of Israel who turned aside from the path of the people'; cf. also CD 19:20.

²⁰ Cf. 1QM 1:9-15; 18:1-3 for the defeat of the forces of Belial.

1.1-9 is therefore a commentary on the first meaning of בית mentioned in 2 Sam 7:11 ('house' as 'temple'). The remainder of section 1 in 4Q174 then elaborates on the second meaning of בית in 2 Sam 7:12-16, that of 'house' as a 'dynasty'. Parts of 2 Sam 7:12-14 are then cited here, namely that God will raise up a house for David, through his offspring 'establish his royal throne forever', and that 'ו' [YHWH] will be a father to him, and he shall be a son to me' (line 11). David's offspring here is then understood to be one of two Messiahs, the 'shoot of David' [צֶמַח דָּוִד] who will arise with the 'Interpreter of the Law' [דּוֹרֵשׁ הַתּוֹרָה, line 11]. The 'Shoot...' is also the 'booth of David' in Amos 9:11, cited in line 12; this figure shall 'save Israel' (13).²¹

The second section of 4Q174 is an exposition of Psalms 1-2. This commences abruptly as 'Midrash [מִדְרָשׁ] of Happy is [the] man who has not followed the counsel of the wicked' (line 14). This is a citation of Ps 1:1. The interpretation [פֶּשֶׁר] of this saying is then given, with reference to the 'two ways' doctrine (the righteous vs the wicked) enshrined in the psalm. This is outlined in the language of walking in the 'way' [בְּדַרְקָ] mentioned, but not cited here, in the latter part of Ps 1:1. Apparently this psalm concerns those members of the sect who 'turn aside from the way' (14). This is evidenced by a supporting citation from Isa 8:11, also linked by the catchword דָּרַךְ, and also vindicating those who have turned aside from this inferior path (15-16). Then a citation from Ezek 37:23: these 'shall never defile themselves with all their idols' (16-17). At this point the referent of those who turned aside from this wicked way is made explicit: they are the 'Sons of Zadok and the men of their Council' (17). These probably do not refer to all members of the sect, but rather those priests whom the rest of the sect congregated around.²²

Next, Ps 2:1 is cited ('[Why ar]e the nations [in turmoil] and hatch the peoples [idle plots? The kings of the earth t]ake up [their posts and the ru]lers conspire together

²¹ For the view that this Messiah is not himself the 'booth of David' but rather the *builder* of the booth, see Ruzer, 'Who is Unhappy with the Davidic Messiah?', 237, on the basis of comparison with CD-A 7.14-19 [4Q266 frg. 3.3.18], where 'booth' refers to the books of the Torah. Against this argument note that in the Damascus Document this event occurs in the past. In 4Q174, however, the emerging booth of David will occur in 'the latter days' (1.12).

²² Brooke, *Exegesis*, 157

against YHWH and against [his anointed one', lines 18-19). The corresponding פֶּשֶׁר it predicts a future time of trial coming to purify Israel and to leave a remnant [שָׂרָא 2:2]. This is confirmed with a citation from Daniel 12:10, 11:32 about a coming period of refining (lines 3-11), connected to further activity of Belial (frg. 4.1-7).

The terse fragments we have concluding 4Q174 indicate citations from Deuteronomy 33:8-21 in which various blessings are distributed among the tribes of Israel. Some of these seem to have brief *peshet* interpretations. These are not included in most recent editions of 4Q174. As the content is so piecemeal I will not discuss it further.

How, then, does 4Q174 use scripture to legitimate the Qumran sectarians as the faithful portion of Israel? One way of assessing this is to consider the various titles given to those inside vs those outside the sect. Those outside it are the 'Sons of Belial' (1:8) who deceive(d) the sectarians (1:9). They are Israel's enemies (1:1) and denounced in derogatory fashion as 'this people', drawing here on Isa 8:11 (1:15-16). Not only this, but they are also linked to idol worship (using Ezek 37:23 in 1:16-17). Those linked to the sect, on the other hand, are 'Sons of Light' (1:8-9), Sons of Zadok (line 17), and those who have *not* walked in the wicked 'way' of Ps 1, Isa 8:11 and Ezek 37:23. Finally, they are also the 'sanctuary of human(s)' (1:6) -- the temple built by God anticipating the future temple to come, who alone interpret the Torah rightly (1:7). And this division in Israel is exemplified in the two ways doctrine of Ps 1.

There are differences with Luke-Acts here. There is little in the latter comparable to the 'time of refining' and future conflict seen in 4Q174 2:1-4.²³ Moreover, Luke lacks any idea of a rebuilt temple,²⁴ and as I have argued in chapter one he probably does

²³ A possible exception is John the Baptist's prophecy about God baptising with the Spirit and with fire in Lk 3:16. Jesus is also predicted to judge the world in Acts 17:31, with no further elaboration.

²⁴ Luke narrates its destruction in Lk 21:24 ('...Jerusalem will be trampled on by the nations, until the times of the nations are fulfilled'). Chance points out that its destruction may not be final on the basis that its demise is a common trope in biblical and early Jewish literature, but so is its rebuilding (Zech 12:4; Ps 79:8-13; 2 Macc 10:1-5; Isa 65:17-25; 2 Bar 67:6-8; Dan 8:13-14; 1 Macc 4:36-60; Ps Sol 17:23-27): Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988), 135. However, Luke makes no explicit reference here to its rebuilding, unlike these other texts. Isaac Oliver, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration*

not portray the Christian community as a temple either. Finally, Luke is more inclusive than the Qumran covenanters, whose exclusion of foreigners is an important part of true temple worship (1:4).

However, this preliminary comparison has already shown some important similarities which may shed light on Luke's work. First, Luke also makes extensive use of 'The Way' to describe members of the Christian community.²⁵ Typically this is attributed to his use of Isaiah.²⁶ However, he may possibly have had the two ways doctrine of Ps 1 in mind here. Second, like Luke-Acts, the Qumran community clearly considers itself to have the true interpretation of Torah, as evidenced by the community-as-temple which presently offers 'works of Torah' as incense to YHWH (1:7). Luke also presents the Christian community as the sole correct interpreter of Israel's traditions. Third, like 4Q174, Luke's Messiah is also strongly portrayed as Davidic (especially in Lk 1-2 and the speeches of Acts),²⁷ although there is only one Messiah in Luke-Acts. Most strikingly, the way both 4Q174 and Luke-Acts use scripture to explain a division within Israel and to vindicate the sectarians as being on the right side of that schism,

of Israel in Luke-Acts (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021), 84, also suggests Luke may hope for a rebuilt temple on the basis that Jesus' fate is bound up with Jerusalem and its temple. For example, his death mirrors its demise. This might suggest his resurrection will entail its restoration too (Lk 13:35, p. 85). However, this point is not made explicit by Luke either.

²⁵ See, e.g., Acts 9:2; 16:17; 18:25, 26; 19:9, 23; 22:4; 24:14, 22.

²⁶ With justification, given that Lk 3:4-6 cites from Isa 40:3-5. However, Luke also cites Mal 3:1 ('I am sending my messenger to prepare the way before me' in Lk 7:27, which may suggest 'The Way' may also have several referents (cf. Mk 1:2-3 where the Isaiah and Malachi texts are cited in conjunction to refer to the coming way of the Lord).

²⁷ Acts 2:14-40, 13:16-41, 47, 15. Luke also portrays Jesus as a prophetic Messiah: see, e.g., Stanley Porter, 'The Messiah in Luke and Acts: Forgiveness for the Captives' in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 164, E. Franklin, *Christ the Lord* (London: SPCK, 1975), P.F. Feiler, 'Jesus the Prophet: The Lukan Portrayal of Jesus as the Prophet Like Moses' (PhD dissertation, Princeton Theological Seminary, 1986). He is also a priestly Messiah: W.H. Brownlee, 'Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament', *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 205-206 and a suffering servant: e.g. E. Ellis, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Nelson, 1996), 97. Howard Marshall, *Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 1978), 178, Darrell Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987), 105-11. And significantly, he is also 'Lord' (κύριος): Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012). Scholars are divided as to which of these portrayals dominates. It is probably not necessary to think of one as being primary: Larry Hurtado, 'Christology in Acts: Jesus in early Christian Belief and Practice' in Sean Adams, Michael Pahl (eds.), *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 226. A detailed overview of these christologies is impossible for this chapter, which will have to focus on Jesus' Davidic Messiahship and how it is used to legitimate believers as the faithful portion of Israel.

strongly commends Luke-Acts too as Jewish literature. I will now proceed below with more detailed study of how the author of 4Q174 uses 2 Sam 7 and Ps 2, beginning first with the OT context of each and then considering how it has been applied to the sectarians.

2. 2 Samuel 7 in 4Q174: Dwelling and Dynasty

In this section I will consider in more detail how the author of 4Q174 uses 2 Sam 7:10-14 to portray the Qumran community as the faithful portion of Israel. The first citation from 2 Sam 7:10-11 in the Qumran text begins in 1:1-2. This is followed by explanation of its meaning (1:2-7). The next citation, 2 Sa 7:11, occurs in 4Q174 1:7. The final citations from 2 Sam 7 (vv 11-14) occur in 4Q174 1:10-11. I will divide these citations into two groups: those that address the theme of temple (2.2) and those that address the theme of Messiah (2.3) in 4Q174. These themes derive from two different ways of reading the Hebrew for 'house' [בית] in 2 Samuel 7 -- *dwelling* and *dynasty* – a pun that the author of 4Q174 is also sensitive to.

To easier compare 4Q174 with the OT versions of 2 Sa 7 I have placed each of them into tables. The tables list for each citation the MT text, the NRSV translation, the LXX and the reconstructed text we have from 4Q174. Key variations are in bold. These tables will show in close detail what the author of 4Q174 chooses to emphasise from 2 Sam 7. This will pave the way for more specific discussion on how 4Q174 uses this OT text to legitimate the sectarians as faithful Israel. It will also aid with the comparison with Luke-Acts later on. But first, of course, it is necessary to consider the OT context of 2 Samuel 7.

2.1. 2 Sam 7:10-14 in OT Context

2 Samuel 7 commences with King David telling the prophet Nathan that he would like to build a temple for the Lord (v1). Nathan initially tells him to do what is in his mind for the Lord is with him (vv2-3). But then Nathan receives an oracle from the Lord

(v4) in which the Lord now claims that he does not need David to build him a house [בית, v5] and that he has been quite sufficient formerly with a tent and tabernacle (vv6-7). Then follows a catalogue of promises from God to David.

First, God promises to make for David a great name (v9). God will 'appoint a place [מקום]²⁸ for my people Israel and will plant them [נטע]... in their own place' (v10). They will have rest from their enemies (v11) and in a surprising turn of affairs it is apparently not for David to build a temple, but rather 'the Lord will make you [David] a house [בית, v11]. After David's death God, says, 'I will raise up your offspring [-אתך זרעך] (v12). Of this offspring God also says 'I will establish your kingdom' [-וחקמתי אתך זרעך v12]. This offspring 'shall build a house [בית] for my name' and God will establish the throne of his kingdom forever (v13). God will be a father to David's offspring and the latter shall be a son to the Lord (v14); God will not remove his steadfast love for him (v15). The remainder of the chapter chronicles David's response, a prayer (vv18-29).

Several features are significant here. First is the word play associated with בית (vv1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13). This can mean 'house, palace, dwelling-place, temple' or family, dynasty.' Thus the promise that God will build a בית for David (v12) refers both to a perpetual kingdom [ממלכת, v12], and also the temple which David's offspring (likely Solomon) will build for the Lord (v13). The phrase 'forever' [עד-עולם] also occurs three times in the passage (vv13, 16), suggesting that the passage may have been used as some form of propaganda to legitimate the Davidic line.²⁹ How the author of 4Q174 has reshaped this OT text for his own purposes I will show below.

²⁸ This may be an exilic gloss anticipating the return of Israel to the land -- Peter Ackroyd, *The Second Book of Samuel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 77 -- or it might refer to the erection of a place of worship, maybe the Deuteronomistic central sanctuary (P. Kyle McCarter, *2 Samuel*, AB (London: Yale University Press, 1984), 202-4

²⁹ E.g. Walter Bruegemann, *First and Second Samuel* (Louisville: John Knox Press, 1990), 256. It has also been read as a text to legitimate Solomon's temple (especially v13): 257.

2.2. Temple Critique in 4Q174

First, the Qumran text uses 2 Sam 7 to demonstrate that Jerusalem temple worship is deficient and that the Qumran covenanters alone are the true worshippers in Israel. This twofold scheme of denouncing existing temple worship and legitimating Qumran worship is an important way of vindicating the sectarians as the faithful Israel. 2 Sam 7 is used in several ways in order to make this point. Most importantly, 4Q174 suggests that true temple worship is linked to the eradication of the sectarians' enemies. These opponents seem to have infiltrated the community with their ideology and their mention suggests an internal division in the sect along the theme of true worship. This can be seen in more detail as follows.

The first citation from 2 Sam 7 about the temple occurs in 4Q174 1:1-2. This comes from 2 Sam 7:10b-11a and concerns God defeating Israel's enemies. It is likely that the original Qumran text also included the first part of 2 Sam 7:10. This reads 'I will appoint a place [מקום] for my people Israel'. This inclusion is suggested by the way 4Q174 also cites Ex 15:17b-18 ('the sanctuary, O Lord, that your hands have established. The Lord will reign forever and ever', 4Q174 1:3). This uses the similar term מקון ('place, site') to refer to YHWH's place of dwelling.³⁰ If this was the case the Exodus text has been used to shed light on the ambiguity of the מקום mentioned in 2 Sam 7, which God will appoint for Israel. This term can mean a 'place' more generically, in which case it may be a promise of *land*, or it can take on a more technical meaning of 'sacred site'. By linking this text with the Exodus one about God's dwelling place the author of 4Q174 clearly prefers the latter option: מקום is the eschatological *temple* which God will build (the 'sanctuary of YHWH [מקדש יהיה], 4Q174 1:3). The following table shows key variations between these different versions of 2 Sam 7:10-11a here. Variations between the different text versions of 2 Sam 7 are shown in bold in the table below.

³⁰ 4Q174 does not use the word מקון directly in its citation of Ex 15:17-18, but its similarity of wording with מקום still provides evidence of the *gezera shewa* technique which would cause a Jewish author to link two texts.

NRSV, 2 Sa 7:10-11	MT, 2 Sam 7:10b-11a	4Q174, 1:1-2	LXX, 2 Sam 7:10b-11a
And I will appoint a place for my people Israel and will plant them, so that they may live in their own place,			
and be disturbed no more;	לא ירגז עוד	ול'רגז עוד או'ב reb	καὶ οὐ μεριμνήσει οὐκέτι
and evildoers shall afflict them no more,	לא יסיפו בני עולה לענות	ולוא'וט'ף בן-עולה לענותו	καὶ οὐ προσθήσει υἱὸς ἀδικίας τοῦ ταπεινώσαι αὐτὸν καθὼς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς
as formerly,	כאשר בראשונה	כאשר בראשונה	
11 from the time that I appointed judges over my people Israel;	11 ולמן היום אשר צויתי שפטים על עמי ישראל	11 ולמן-היום אשר צויתי שפטים על-עמי ישראל	

The main differences between the MT and Qumran text versions here are as follows:

- 4Q174 inserts the subject או'ב ('enemy') into v11b, which then renders ἰγ ('oppress') in the active ('no enemy will oppress him [Israel] again') rather than passive tense ('[Israel] will be oppressed no more', MT).
- A ' is removed from the MT בְּנֵי-עוֹלָה ('sons of deceit'). This renders 'son' in the singular, matching the LXX. Like the LXX and against the MT 4Q174 also reads the verb יסף ('to repeat, do again') in the singular to match this singular 'son of deceit'.

It is hard to tell whether these changes were stylistic or simply the result of a different *Vorlage* of 2 Sam 7. What the wording in 4Q174 does tell us is the vital emphasis the author places on the enemies of Israel being overthrown as the temple is established. True worship and purging of the sect go hand in hand. This is also suggested by the next citation from 2 Sam 7. This (2 Sam 7:11b, 4Q174 1:7) resumes exactly from where the last one from 2 Sam 7 ended. Again, key variants in the text forms of 2 Sam 7 here are shown in the table below.

NRSV, 2 Sa 7:11	MT, 2 Sa 7:11b	4Q174 1:7	LXX, 2 Sa 7:11b
...and I will give you rest from all your enemies...	והניחתי לך מכל איבילך	והניחתי לכה מכול איביכה	καὶ ἀναπαύσω σε ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου

Despite these small variations, in all instances God promises to give Israel rest from all her enemies as the new temple is built. In the original context of 2 Sam 7 these enemies referred to David's opponents. But in an important interpretative move, the author of 4Q174 now understands the 'son of deceit' (4Q174 1:1, cf. 2 Sam 7:10b) to be linked to the 'sons of Belial who cause them [the sectarians] to stumble' and who came with a plan to 'cause to stumble the Sons of Light' (4Q174 1:8-9). This clearly refers to internal conflict in the sect. It is striking, as with the previous citation, that this mention of enemies overthrown is conjoined with YHWH's establishment of true temple worship. Moreover, there seems to be a contrast between the enemies mentioned and the 'sanctuary of human(s)', 4Q174 1:6, which represents the present sectarians offering correct sacrifices. From other Qumran material it may be inferred that the enemies mentioned here are in some way linked to the Jerusalem temple cult.³¹ If not, the deficiency of the Jerusalem temple is still implied in 4Q174 given

³¹ The Jerusalem temple is critiqued in CD 3.6 for its incorrect practices (CD 3.18, 4Q394 8.3:5, 4Q496 1.1:1, 1.2:1, 6, 8, 10). It is said to be contaminated in 4Q266 frg. 9.3.4; 4Q394 frg. 3.1.4, 8, frg. 8.4.4, 4Q397 1-2.3. For this reason the Qumran covenanters did not participate in sacrificial service (CD 6.12-13).

that the community alone is portrayed as offering true sacrifices. There would be no need for a 'sanctuary of man' or a future replacement if the Jerusalem temple were functioning correctly.

What we seem to have in 4Q174, then, is a proposed division in Israel on the basis of temple worship. The sectarians are the faithful Israel, the sanctuary of YHWH, who uphold correct forms of worship (4Q174 1:6-7) even while a future temple awaits building. Those worshipping at the Jerusalem temple do so incorrectly and may be the enemies of Israel described in the text. This enables the sectarians to legitimate themselves as the true Israel even while distancing themselves from the Jerusalem temple cult. Importantly for the partings of the ways in Luke-Acts, this shows how a group can criticise temple worship yet still remain inside Judaism.

Below I will consider the next citations from 2 Sam 7 (vv12-14) in the Qumran text (4Q174 1:10-11). Together they address the second meaning of בית addressed in Nathan's oracle: the promise to David of a *dynasty*. This has been taken to refer specifically to a Messiah. Again this is used to commend the community as the faithful portion of Israel.

2.3. Davidic Messiah and True Israel in 4Q174

In its original context, 2 Sam 7:11-14 refers to God raising up Solomon as David's offspring, with the expectation that he will perpetuate the 'house' of David. The author of 4Q174, however, takes this text to refer to a future Davidic Messiah. This figure will emerge with the second Messiah, the Interpreter of the Law, to save Israel. In this way 2 Sam 7 is also read messianically in order to commend the sectarians as the true Israel. The author of 4Q174 has been quite selective about which parts of 2 Sam 7:11-14 to cite to make this point. As the following citations show, he uses the text very creatively in order to speak of this coming leader who will vindicate the sectarians.

The first citation in 4Q174 addressing the Davidic dynasty comes from 2 Sam 7:11c.

Here we have God's promise to David that he will build him a house:

NRSV, 2 Sam 7:11c	MT, 2 Sam 7:11c	4Q174, 1:10	LXX, 2 Sam 7:11c
...Moreover the Lord declares to you	והגיד לך יהיה	והגיד לך לכה יהוה	καὶ ἀπαγγελεῖ σοι κύριος
that the Lord will make you a house.	כי בית יעשה לך יהיה	כי בית יבנה לכה	ὅτι οἶκον οἰκοδομήσεις αὐτῷ.

Key textual variations are as follows:

- 4Q174, like the LXX, omits the יהיה at the end of the MT sentence.
- 4Q174 replaces the MT verb עשה ('to make') with בנה ('to build'). This latter verb matches the account in 1 Chr 17:12. However, 1 Chr 17 reads 'he [David's offspring] shall build me a house' (as does the LXX). This is different to 'the Lord will make you a house' as we have here in 4Q174 and in 2 Sa 7:11. This suggests reliance on 2 Sam 7 rather than on 1 Chr 17.

In all cases, the author of 4Q174 has here adopted the original wordplay around the בית of David to extend the referent of 'house' beyond temple to address the Davidic kingdom. In the MT / LXX passages of 2 Sam 7, the text carries on now with the mention of David's death (v12a). However, 4Q174 makes no mention of this. If deliberate (rather than due to a different *Vorlage*) this shifts attention away from David to his successor. The citation continues in 4Q174 with 2 Sam 7:12b onwards.

NRSV, 2 Sam 7:12	MT, 2 Sam 7:12	4Q174, 1:10	LXX, 2 Sam 7:12
When your days are fulfilled and	כי ימלאו ימך ושכבת את אבתילך		καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι σου καὶ

you lie down with your ancestors,			κοιμηθήσῃ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων σου,
I will raise up your offspring after you,	והקימתי את זרעך אחרך	והקימתי את־זרעכה אחריכה	καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ,
who shall come forth from your body,	אשר יצא ממעיך		ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου,
and I will establish his kingdom.	והכינתי את ממלצתו	והניחתי את כטא ממלכטו	καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ·

This citation clarifies what this second meaning of ‘house’ in 2 Sam 7 refers to: David’s ‘seed’ (זרע).³² Here 4Q174 omits the reference in v12 to the phrase ‘who shall come forth from your body’ (2 Sam 7:12c). If for stylistic reasons this also distances David’s offspring from Solomon. This enables the author of the text to suggest the true heir of this oracle is not David’s direct descendant but the future Messiah to come. The specific identity of this successor is further disclosed as the citation continues from 2 Sam 7:13b-14 (4Q174 1:11). 4Q174 omits in between these citations the concluding part of 2 Sam 7:12 (את ממלכתו), and 2 Sam 7:13a (‘he shall build a house for my name’). The omission of Solomon building God a house here also suggests this oracle is fulfilled in a future figure rather than in Solomon. And 4Q174 has already made emphatic that it is *God* who builds the eschatological temple (4Q174 1:2). However, 4Q174 preserves the idea of David’s kingdom being perpetuated by the coming ruler, and his position as God’s son:

³² 4Q174 also has a different form of the 2.sg. suffix here: זרך (‘your seed’) becomes זרכה. Likewise אחרך (‘after you’) becomes אחריכה.

NRSV, 2 Sam 7:13-14	MT, 2 Sam 7:13-14	4Q174, 1:11	LXX, 2 Sam 7:13b-14a
He shall build a house for my name,	(13) הוא יבנה בית לשמי		αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον τῷ ὀνόματί μου,
and I will establish the throne of his kingdom	וכננתי את כסא ממלכתו	וְהִכִּינֹתִי אֶת־כִּסֵּא מַמְלַכְתּוֹ	καὶ ἀνορθώσω τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ
forever.	עד עולם	לעולם	ἕως εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
(14) I will be a father to him,	(14) אני אהיה לו לאב	(14) אני אהיה־לו לאב	(14) ἐγὼ ἔσομαι αὐτῷ εἰς πατέρα,
and he shall be a son to me.	והוא יהיה לי לבן	והוא יהיה־לי לבן	καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μοι εἰς υἱόν·
When he commits iniquity, I will punish him with a rod such as mortals use, with blows inflicted by human beings.	אשר בהעותו והכחתיו בשבט אנשים ובנגעי בני אדם		καὶ ἐὰν ἔλθῃ ἡ ἀδικία αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐλέγξω αὐτὸν ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἀνδρῶν καὶ ἐν ἀφαῖς υἱῶν ἀνθρώπων·

Differences in the versions are rather minimal here. Most importantly, 4Q174 omits the idea that God will discipline David's successor. The reason for this is clear given the author's interpretation of this text as referring to the Messiah. If the Messiah

were to commit iniquity (2 Sam 7:14), this would limit his authority as eschatological deliverer (4Q174 1:13).

Given the extensive use of 2 Sam 7 in 4Q174 here, the question must now be asked how the latter text uses the theme of David's successor to legitimate the sectarians as the faithful portion of Israel. The answer lies in the remaining lines. The author of 4Q174 refers to the Messiah in several ways.

First, he is known as the 'shoot [צמח] of David' (1:11). This language is likely taken from Jer 23:5, which also refers to a 'shoot of righteousness' [צמח צדיק]³³ appointed for David. In 4Q174 1:11 this figure will arise with the 'Interpreter of the Law [דורש הרתורה]' in the latter days (1:11). Second, this Davidic figure is also described through a citation from Amos 9:11 -- 'I will raise up the booth [סוכת] of David which is fallen' (4Q174 1:12). I have already discussed Amos 9:11 in my first chapter. Again, in its original context its 'booth' [סוכת] referred to the restored Davidic kingdom. Here it has been personalised to refer to a Messiah.³⁴ Third, concerning timings, this figure will arise 'in the latter days' [באחרית הימים, 4Q174 1:12] to 'save Israel' (1:13).

Several features are worthy of note here. Significantly, there are *two* Messiahs.³⁵ The prominence of the Davidic one here ('David' is mentioned three times in 4Q174 1:11-13) is unsurprising given that this was the dominant form of Messiah expected in the

³³ This title is probably taken from Jer 23:5, where God will raise up for David a 'righteous branch' (צמח צדיק); cf. also Jer 33:15; Zech 6:12, 3:8 (for similar uses of the צמח related to anointed figures), and Isa 11:1 (albeit with חטר). For other references to the צמח דוד at Qumran see also 4Q161 frags 8-10, 18, 4Q252 5.3-4, 4Q285 frg. 5.3, 4Q285 frg. 5.3.

³⁴ Ruzer argues that the 'Booth of David' refers not to the Davidic Messiah, the 'Shoot of David' (1.11), but rather to an entity that the Interpreter erects. He makes this on the basis of analogy with CD-A 7:14-19, which also cites Amos 9:11 and reads the 'booth' here as the books of the law interpreted by the Interpreter of the Law: Serge Ruzer, 'Who is Unhappy with the Davidic Messiah? Notes on Biblical Exegesis in 4Q161, 4Q174, and the Book of Acts' in *CNS* 24 (2003), 237-8. However, given the flexibility of Qumran exegesis, there is no particular reason to assume that the same citation has to have the same interpretation in both instances. That there is considerable distance between Amos 9:11 as used in the Damascus Document and the same text in 4Q174 may also be seen by the fact that the former applies it to the past but the second the future. Ruzer also argues that the Davidic Messiah is subservient to the Interpreter of the Law in 4Q174 (p.238). Again, while this may be the case in other texts (e.g. 4QIsa frags. 8-10, 11-18), it is no by means clear from the context of 4Q174 that this is the case.

³⁵ This dual messianism seems to have been the norm at Qumran, though there was no single messianic expectation in the scrolls: John Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010), 83

early Jewish period.³⁶ The identity of the second (the 'Interpreter of the Law') is also interesting. Here the figure is ambiguous but the 'Interpreter of the Law' [דורש התורה, 4Q174 1:11] elsewhere appears in the scrolls along with the kingly Messiah as an eschatological priestly figure.³⁷ The phrase 'the latter days' [באחרית הימים, 4Q174 1:12] immediately grounds the coming of these Messiahs as an eschatological event: this fits the tenor of the scrolls generally, whereby the Messiah is anticipated to arrive during a time of eschatological conflict.³⁸

This interpretation of 2 Sam 7 vindicates the sectarians as the faithful portion of Israel as follows. First, the Messiah will arise 'to save Israel' [להושיע את ישראל, 4Q174 1:13]. This clearly implies that there is something deficient about the majority of Israel in the first place – otherwise they would not need deliverance. This is strongly contrasted with the Qumran community which is portrayed as the faithful Israel by virtue of its portrayal as the temple which prefigures the eschatological temple to come, and their sacrificial 'works of Torah [מעשה תורה]' in 1:11. Second, these 'sacrifices of Torah' may refer to the community's interpretation of Torah as the single true one over against rival interpretations. This would strongly link the community's own 'interpretation' [מדרש] of Israel's scripture tradition in 1:14 with the Interpreter [דורש] of the Torah (1:11). This further suggests, again, that they are on the right side of this eschatological Messiah to come. Third, the militant aspect of the Davidic Messiah's coming also argues in favour of the sectarians as the faithful

³⁶ Ibid., 78; also Deasley, *Shape*, 288. Of course, one cannot generalise too much here: there was great diversity of early messianic expectation.

³⁷ Cf. CD 7:18 for the same title applied to a figure linked especially to the books of the law and the prophets. This may imply a teaching role. It recurs in 4Q177 frag 1.5 with no description. The theme of multiple Messiahs is clearest seen in 1 QS 9:10-11 (which mentions the 'prophet and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel' to emerge; cf. also CD 14:18-19, 4Q266 fr.10, 1.11-13 for a similar phrase). Here the link to Aaron strongly implies a priestly role for this Messiah, who also has a teaching role here. 4Q175 (Testimonia), a collection of prooftexts which matches the threefold division of prophet, Messiah of Israel and Messiah of Aaron, also seems to suggest the second Messiah has a priestly role: attached to the prophet is Deut 18:18-19; to the kingly Messiah Nu 24:15-17, to the third Messiah Deut 33:8-11. This latter text is a blessing on Levi by Moses. This is the very same passage mentioned in the final fragments we have of 4Q174, which may further suggest some association between the Interpreter in 4Q174 and a priestly figure. For an eschatological priestly figure cf. also 4Q541 fr. 9 1, 4Q491 fr.11, 12, 1. Michael Knibb's discussion, 'Apocalypticism and Messianism' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 403-433 is helpful here.

³⁸ Annette Steudel, 'אחרית הימים' in the Texts from Qumran' *RevQ* 16 (1994), 225-247

portion of Israel. His role as warrior is well established in other Qumran texts.³⁹ This strongly implies that he is the one who will help establish rest from Israel's enemies, the 'sons of Belial' who lead the covenanters astray (1:7-9). Again, then, he vindicates the present community as the single true representative of Israel's worship and faithful subjects of the Davidic kingdom.

To summarise this section, then. The author of 4Q174 has taken the two meanings of 'house' in 2 Sa 7 and used this to structure his own *peshet* interpretation of the text. The first meaning of 'house' (*dwelling*) he has applied to the temple. Though his temple theology is complex, and he lists three temples, one point seems clear: the Qumran covenanters alone worship rightly, in contrast to the Jewish majority associated with the Jerusalem temple cult. The second meaning of 'house' (*dynasty*) he applies messianically to the Davidic ruler to come, and the Interpreter of the Law who accompanies him. Well-established Jewish categories, then, are applied to the contemporary community in such a way as to suggest that they are the faithful portion of Israel. Luke, I suggest, argues in a similar manner below.

3. 2 Samuel 7 in Luke-Acts: Dynasty and Dwelling

Luke's portrayal of Jesus the Messiah and the Jerusalem temple are critical indicators of how Luke views Israel. The first is obvious given that the Christian community is shaped around himself. The latter has interesting implications for the identity of Israel given that Luke marks a progressive shift away from temple worship as Acts proceeds. Does this removal from Jerusalem worship mean that he sees the church as replacing Israel? This section will show that like 4Q174, Luke also reshapes these traditional Jewish themes using scripture to argue that believers form the faithful portion of Israel. There are several allusions to 2 Sa 7 in the text. Of these the clearest are found in Lk 1:32-3, Acts 2:30, and Acts 7:45-7. These form three subsections below. The first two address the theme of the Messiah; the final one the temple.

³⁹ E.g. CD 19:10-11, 4Q285 5.4

Each of these I will compare with 4Q174 below in order to clarify how Luke uses scripture to situate believers within Israel.

3.1 Davidic Messiah and True Israel in Lk 1:32-3

On the one hand Luke's portrayal of the Messiah could suggest a parting of the ways, particularly if one considers him to have a higher christology than was common for early Judaism.⁴⁰ However, as I will argue below, he also has a very Davidic christology ('one wonders... whether any extent piece of early Christian literature... heralds Jesus as the messiah son of David so emphatically as Luke-Acts does').⁴¹ This aligns him with early Jewish tradition in which expectation for a Davidic Messiah dominates.⁴² Of course, merely describing Jesus as a Davidic Messiah does not in itself make a text or author Jewish. But the *degree* to which Jesus is emphasised as Davidic is nonetheless significant and suggests Luke's closer affinity to Jewish tradition than many other NT texts on this theme. This may be taken as further evidence of his concern to address inter-Jewish debates and a heightened concern on his part to demonstrate the legitimacy of Jesus within the Jewish world.⁴³ However, as I will argue below, he also has a very Davidic christology. This also draws on 2 Sam 7 and fits in extensively with the portrayal of the Messiah in 4Q174. In fact, Luke may well have the most Davidic of NT christologies.⁴⁴ This would firmly situate him within Judaism, in which expectation for a Davidic Messiah dominates.⁴⁵ The first clear allusion to 2 Sam 7 in Luke's narrative occurs in Lk 1:32-3. Chapters 1 and 2 of Luke

⁴⁰ See below, though Daniel Boyarin, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006), 113-127 has made the interesting case that higher christology should not be seen as an occasion for a parting of the ways based on the existence of binitarian theology in some early Jewish thought.

⁴¹ Oliver, *Jewish Eschatology*, 69

⁴² John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 78

⁴³ Strauss also sees Luke's Davidic christology as evidence of inter-Jewish debate: 'it seems likely [from this] that an ongoing debate with unbelieving Jews - focusing... on the validity of Jesus' messianic identity - is threatening to undermine the faith of this community.' See Mark Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 348

⁴⁴ Oliver, *Jewish Eschatology*, 69, suggests Luke's portrayal of Jesus is the most Davidic in the NT, with the possible exception of Matthew's.

⁴⁵ John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: Messianism in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010), 78

are particularly important for Luke-Acts in setting up the expectation of eschatological deliverance. They set up a critical portrait of Jesus the Messiah which has major parallels with the Qumran text above. I will first briefly place Lk 1:32-3 into its Lukan context before considering how Luke has used 2 Sam 7 here.

Lk 1:32-3 come as the angel Gabriel's word to Mary concerning Jesus. This figure visits her in Nazareth while she is engaged to Joseph 'of the house of David' (1:26). The angel tells her that she will conceive a son, to be called Jesus (v31), that he will be 'Son of the Most High' and heir to David's kingdom (vv31-2). After she questions him he tells her that this will take place through the Holy Spirit and, again, that the child will be called 'Son of God' (vv34-5).

This is the second visitation to a human by Gabriel. Formerly the angel appeared to Zechariah to inform him of the birth of John the Baptist (Lk 1:8-20). There are several prophetic oracles concerning John and Jesus' respective destinies in chapters one to two (from Mary, 1:46-55, Zechariah, 1:67-79, Simeon, 2:28-32, and Anna, 2:36-8). These supernatural occurrences undergird Jesus and John with authority and establish several facets of their mission and identity which will recur later in the narrative. In addition to Lk 1:27, 32-3 the name David occurs with particular concentration in Lk 1-2,⁴⁶ indicating its early importance to Luke in setting up the expectation of a Davidic deliverer.⁴⁷ Lk 1:32-3 contains the clearest allusion to 2 Sam 7 in these opening chapters.

The table below shows how Luke alludes to 2 Sam 7 here. Luke seems closer to the LXX than the MT form of the text at this point, for which reason I will only show the

⁴⁶ Note the 'house of David' (1:27, 69, 2:4) and 'city of David' (2:4,11)

⁴⁷ The expectation of a Davidic ruler who will remove Roman rule (1:71, 73) seems to dominate these chapters. See Mark Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 123-5. Though one should probably not go as far as Bock who argues that the whole narrative shifts from an emphasis on Davidic messianism to Jesus as 'lord' (κύριος) as it progresses (Bock, *Proclamation*, 8). Jesus is also portrayed as κύριος as early as Lk 1:43, 2:11, each time with considerable theological importance (the first referring to his birth; the second time it is linked with Χρίστος, which invests it with major titular significance).

LXX text in comparison with the NT one. The key similarities are in bold. This strongly shows Jesus to be a Davidic Messiah.

NRSV Lk 1:32-33	NA28 Lk 1:32-33	LXX 2 Sam 7:12	LXX 2 Sam 7:14	LXX 2 Sam 7:16
32 He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High,	32 οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται	12καὶ ἔσται ἐὰν πληρωθῶσιν αἱ ἡμέραι σου καὶ κοιμηθῆσῃ μετὰ τῶν πατέρων σου, καὶ ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου μετὰ σέ, ὃς ἔσται ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας σου,		
and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his ancestor David.	καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ,	καὶ ἐτοιμάσω τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ·		καὶ πιστωθήσεται ὁ οἶκος αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ
33 He will reign over the house of Jacob forever,	33 καὶ βασιλεύσει ἐπὶ τὸν οἶκον Ἰακώβ εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας			ἕως αἰῶνος ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ,

and of his kingdom there will be no end.”	καὶ τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔσται τέλος.			καὶ ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ ἔσται ἀνωρθωμένος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.
--	---	--	--	--

The parallels with 2 Sam 7 are extensive. First, Jesus is referred to in Luke 1 as ‘Son of the Most High’ (v32). Though there is no direct precedent in 2 Sam 7 for ὑψίστος (‘Most High’), the theme of the coming Davidic ruler as God’s υἱός is nonetheless mentioned in 2 Sam 7:12, 14. This is the very same language the author of 4Q174 applies to his Messiah in 4Q174 1:10. However, Luke extends this language to apply to Jesus also in Lk 9:26, 10:21-2, 22:29, 23:34, 36, 24:49, where he refers to God as being his Father.

The second parallel with 2 Sam 7 here is the statement that Jesus (Lk 1:32) is said to receive the ‘throne of David’ [θρόνον Δαυίδ]. This is mentioned in 2 Sam 7:16, where God says of Solomon, ‘his throne [ὁ θρόνος αὐτοῦ] shall be built forever [ἀνωρθωμένος εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα].’ This θρόνος is evidently important to Luke as it recurs in Acts 2:30. It was also used in 4Q174 1:10 to refer to the Messiah’s reign. However, while Lk 1-2 seems to portray the rulership of the Messiah in terms of traditional Jewish expectation here like 4Q174⁴⁸ (i.e. the subjugation of Israel’s enemies),⁴⁹ the throne motif is significantly transformed in Acts 2. I will examine this more in the following subsection.

The third parallel to 2 Sam 7 in Lk 1 is the ascription of the kingdom [ἡ βασιλεία] to David’s offspring Jesus – just as Solomon is said to receive this in 2 Sam 7:12, 16. This is also true of the Messiah in 4Q174 1:10. Again, Luke has significantly extended this motif as a key part of Jesus’ preaching throughout his gospel. Finally, like 2 Sam 7,

⁴⁸ 4Q174 1.1-2, 7

⁴⁹ Note the expectation of salvation ‘from our enemies and from the hand of all who hate us’ (Lk 1:76, cf. v 74). On the nationalistic themes here see Richard Bauckham, ‘The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts’ in James Scott (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 435-489. Cf. Green, *The Gospel of Luke*, 88. Of course, there was no single messianic expectation at the time.

Luke also emphasises the *perpetuity* of this kingdom. This is repeated with two different formulae for effect: it is ‘forever [εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας]’ *and* of this kingdom ‘there shall be no end [οὐκ ἔσται τέλος]’ (Lk 1:33). The first of these descriptors closely matches the LXX εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα repeated in 2 Sam 7:13, 16, and εἰς αἰῶνος, also in v16 (the MT also mentions דלג־דג three times in the same verses).⁵⁰

In applying to his Messiah the themes from 2 Sam 7 about sonship, kingship and the Davidic throne, Luke is very much like 4Q174 – even going further than the latter in extending these themes throughout his gospel (e.g. God as Jesus’ father and his preaching about the kingdom). There are further links with 4Q174 in Lk 1. 4Q174 refers to the Davidic Messiah as the ‘Branch [נחצ] of David’ (1:11). This draws from Jer 23:5 which also refers to God raising up for David a ‘righteous branch’ [נחצ]. Luke draws from the LXX of Jer 23:5 (God will raise up for David an ἀνατολήν δικαίαν, ‘a righteous shoot’) in describing Jesus as ‘the dawn [ἀνατολή] from on high’ (Lk 1:78). Moreover, 4Q174 reads that this Branch will arise ‘in Zion’ (1:12). Luke also acknowledges the centrality of Jerusalem in ratifying Jesus’ Messiahship: both Simeon (Lk 2:25-35) and Anna (2:36-8) prophesy here about his identity, and his arrival is linked to the ‘redemption of Jerusalem’ (2:38). Both the Qumran Messiah and Jesus are also predicted to ‘save Israel’ (4Q174 1:13, cf. Lk 1:54 – God has ‘helped his servant Israel’). In both texts the Messiah’s advent is linked to Israel’s enemies being overthrown (4Q174 1:1, 7; cf. Lk 1:71 – he arose ‘that we [Israel] would be saved from our enemies’).

There are differences between both texts. Lk 1-2 lacks any mention of the Messiah’s advent in the ‘latter days’, while this is a recurrent phrase in 4Q174. And, again, there is no parallel to the ‘Interpreter of the Law’ here, the second Messiah in 4Q174 (1:11 – though see below for more reflection on this). But in the first two chapters of the gospel, Luke’s use of 2 Sam 7 to portray Jesus as a conquering Davidic Messiah is

⁵⁰ There may also be an allusion in this verse to Isa 9:6, which also emphasises the reign and everlasting dominion of the coming ruler: there will be everlasting peace ‘for the throne of David and his kingdom shall be established... forever [ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον Δαυιδ καὶ τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῦ κατορθῶσαι... εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα]’.

remarkably like that of 4Q174. How, then, like 4Q174, does Luke use 2 Sam 7 to commend the believing community as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel? Like the former, he portrays Jesus as a Davidic Messiah and Israel's saviour. This presupposes there is something wrong with the majority of Israel, or else they would not need saving. Like 4Q174, the Messiah's overthrow of Israel's enemies shows he fights for Israel. This suggests those opposed to the Messiah are thereby opposed to Israel's flourishing. In portraying Jesus as the legitimate ruler of Israel Luke further suggests that (like 4Q174) his followers alone are the only ones on the right side of God's rule. Finally, like 4Q174, Luke is emphatic that the Messiah's coming will initiate a division within Israel. This is just what Jesus is predicted to do in Lk 2:34 (cause the 'falling and the rising of many in Israel'), and proceeds to do through the remainder of Luke-Acts. This echoes the 'time of trial' coming upon Israel in 4Q174 2:1, which evidently involves the purification of a faithful remnant within Israel (4Q174 2.1-3). In this way both texts suggest their communities are the faithful Israel correctly aligned with the Messiah. This portrayal of the Davidic Messiah in Luke's work, like 4Q174, seems to locate Luke-Acts inside Judaism.⁵¹ The next major allusion to 2 Sam 7 by Luke I will consider below. This time Luke varies significantly from 4Q174. However, he still portrays Jesus as very Davidic here, and therefore remains within Jewish expectation.

3.2 Davidic Messiah and True Israel in Acts 2:30

The next allusion to 2 Sam 7 I will consider is found in Acts 2:30. Here Luke suggests Jesus is a more exalted Messiah, greater than David, following his ascension. This shows a development of traditional Davidic messianism. A turning point in Luke's portrayal of the Messiah has already occurred in Lk 20:42-44. Prior to this, references to David are few⁵² and there is little here to suggest that anything other than traditional Davidic messianism is portrayed. Lk 20:42-44 is the final reference to David in the gospel and the first clue in the narrative that for Luke Jesus transcends

⁵¹ See also Oliver, *Restoration Eschatology*, 41-70

⁵² Lk 1:27; 1:32; 1:69; 2:4; 2:11; 3:31; 6:3; 18:38

this traditional portrayal of the Davidic Messiah. Here Jesus challenges scribes and chief priests with a problem posed by the attribution of Ps 110 to David. In this Psalm David states, 'The Lord said to my Lord, sit at my right hand' ('Lord' in both cases translating κύριος, vv42-3). The suggestion Luke makes here is that David's successor must be his superior if he is to address him as κύριος. However, for Luke this more exalted portrayal of Jesus as Messiah emerges even more clearly after his resurrection, in Acts, as we have in Peter's speech in 2:14-36.

In this speech Peter explains to the Jews in Jerusalem the events of Pentecost using Joel 3:1-5 (Acts 2:16-21). Then he points out how they were responsible for putting Jesus to death (Acts 2:22-3). Then he explains to them Jesus' resurrection with a supporting text (Ps 15:8-11 LXX, vv24-32). Finally he moves on to describe Jesus' ascension (vv32-6). Concerning the ascension, Ps 109:1 LXX is again cited: 'The Lord said to my Lord, "Sit at my right hand..." ' , vv34-5). Peter concludes '...God has made him [Jesus] both Lord [κυριός] and Messiah' (v36).⁵³

Like Lk 20:42-44, Acts 2 also explains how Jesus as κυριός is greater than David.⁵⁴ First, David 'both died and was buried' (v29) – whereas Jesus was resurrected. Second, 'David did not ascend into the heavens' (v34), but Jesus did. It is this latter exaltation to God's right hand, as exalted lord, that enables him to pour out the Holy Spirit and makes him greater than David. He is clearly a Messiah, then (vv31, 6) – but also more than a Messiah.⁵⁵ This is where Luke's use of 2 Sam 7 differs somewhat

⁵³ Some have taken ποιέω in this verse as evidence for a theory of adoptionism, i.e. that Luke only considers Jesus to have been adopted as God's co-regent at this point: see e.g., C.K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles Vol 1* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994-8), 151; cf. Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 21. However, it is more likely that ποιέω in Acts 2:36 is simply making the point that even death and human opposition cannot annul God's plans, especially given that Jesus has already been announced as χριστός and κύριος as early as Lk 2:11. See Rowe, Kavin, *Early Narrative Christology: the Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (2006), 8

⁵⁴ Darrell Bock, *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 118, David Peterson, *The Acts of the Apostles*, PNTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009), 142

⁵⁵ This is not to say, as Bock does, that Luke-Acts shows a narrative shift in emphasis from Jesus as Messiah/Servant to Jesus as κύριος (Bock, *Proclamation*, 262-5). Jesus is already described in a paradigmatic sense as ὁ κύριος right from Lk 2:11 and also throughout the gospel. On this see Kavin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006), 8. It does suggest, however, that the fullest implications of Jesus as κύριος are not made clear until after his resurrection / ascension.

from 4Q174. However, he still remains for Luke a Davidic Messiah, and in this sense Luke remains within Jewish expectation.

2 Sam 7 is particularly alluded to in Acts 2:30, which talks about Jesus' resurrection. Admittedly the language is probably more reminiscent of Ps 131:11 LXX in this verse. There are also parallels here to Ps 88:5 LXX. But both psalms in these verses are commenting on 2 Sam 7. Again, I have tabulated Acts 2:30 here to clarify which allusions are being made. Clear points of contact are in bold. Again, Luke uses this to show that Jesus is not only a Davidic Messiah but also an exalted one.

NRSV Acts 2:30	NA28 Acts 2:30	Ps 131:11 LXX	Ps 88:4-5 LXX
Since he was a prophet, he knew that God had sworn with an oath to him	προφήτης οὖν υὑάρχων καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι ὄρκω ὤμωσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς	ὤμωσεν κύριος τῷ Δαυιδ ἀλήθειαν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσει αὐτήν	Διεθέμην διαθήκην τοῖς ἐκλεκτοῖς μου, ὤμωσα Δαυιδ τῷ δούλῳ μου ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος ἐτοιμάσω
that he would put one of his descendants	ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι	ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας σου θήσομαι	τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ οἰκοδομήσω εἰς γενεὰν καὶ γενεὰν
on his throne.	ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ,	ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον σου	τὸν θρόνον σου διάψαλμα

Ps 88:4-5 LXX has much in common with Acts 2:30. Both mention God's *oath* to David with the verb ὀμνύω. Both mention God's promise to bless *David's* offspring. Both mention the ascension of David's offspring to the throne (ὁ θρόνος). There are differences, however. Acts 2:30 renders ὀμνύω in the third person (*God 'swore'*)

while the psalm renders it in the first person (God says: ‘I swore’). Moreover, while Acts 2:30 describes David’s descendant as ‘the fruit of his loins [ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ]⁵⁶’; Ps 88:5 LXX describes him as ‘your seed’ [τὸ σπέρμα σου]. Ps 131:11 LXX contains the above similarities with Acts 2:30 but is more closely aligned to the latter where it too renders ὁμνύω in the 3rd person (thus God swore, ὤμοσεν). Ps 131:11 LXX is also closer to the Acts text in describing David’s descendant as ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας..., and using the preposition ἐπί before θρόνος. This suggests Luke is mainly drawing on the latter psalm to recall the promise of 2 Sam 7. I will therefore focus on this psalm in my comparison with 4Q174 below. I will now set this Psalm in its original OT context in order to assess more in more detail how Luke applies it to Jesus in Peter’s speech, and how this compares to the use of 2 Sam 7 in 4Q174.

Ps 132 draws on the two meanings of ‘house’ in 2 Sam 7: dwelling and progeny. First, Ps 132:1-5 summarise David’s intent to build God a dwelling. Vv 6-9 evidently indicate a procession of pilgrims to Jerusalem.⁵⁷ Vv 10-12 then return to 2 Sam 7 again, referencing the promise of an offspring (described as Χρίστος, Ps 131:11 LXX) for David who will sit on his throne. Vv13-16 outline God’s choice of Zion as his habitation, and vv17-18 make additional reference to the ‘horn for David’ anticipated in 2 Sa 7, the Messiah ([Χρίστος], Ps 131:11 LXX). The phrase ‘YHWH has sworn [נשבע- יהיה], v11, uses common Ancient Near Eastern enthronement language, which may link it to the same phrase in Ps 110:4, also an enthronement psalm.⁵⁸

Luke has especially taken this psalm to refer to Jesus as the exalted Davidic Messiah. Here he applies the key elements of 2 Sam 7 rather differently to 4Q174. Most significantly, he redefines the nature of the Davidic Χρίστος following his resurrection and ascension. These are the events through which his kingship must now be understood. Thus ‘foreseeing this [προϊδών]’ – God’s promise of *a Davidic successor*,

⁵⁶ Irenaeus, some Latin mss., and the Peshitta read κοιλια instead of οσφυς here, which more closely aligns it with Ps 131:11 LXX (below).

⁵⁷ Nancy L. deClaisse-Walford, Rolf A. Jacobson, Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 934

⁵⁸ *Ibid.*, 935

v31 – David is said to address the *resurrection* (v31). For Luke, Jesus' ascent to heaven therefore marks the enthronement suggested at in Ps 131:11-12 LXX. The privileged position of the king at God's right hand (Ps 110:1, Acts 2:34) is now taken literally. Jesus' throne (2 Sam 7, Ps 132, Ps 88) is now in heaven. And it is from here that he pours out the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:33) as exalted κύριος.

Interestingly, as with Lk 1:32-3, Luke makes no mention here of the first meaning of 'house' mentioned in 2 Sam 7 – *dwelling*. This, again, is a major theme in Ps 132, where Jerusalem is the resting place of God ('the Lord has chosen Zion...', v13). Jerusalem is important as a central hub early on in the gospel mission. It is linked to Jesus' Messiahship early in the gospel ('to you is born... in the City of David... the Messiah, Lk 2:11). However, Luke clearly seeks to transcend Jerusalem as the word spreads (Acts 1:6-8). Moreover, if Jesus is the King promised in Ps 132:11-12 who will be enthroned in Zion (v17), it no longer makes sense for Zion to refer to the physical city in light of his ascension: the heavenly location of Jesus now undercuts the central importance of Jerusalem as the primary locus of God's rule.

This contrasts with the use of 2 Sam 7 in 4Q174 as follows. First, it shows Luke's portrayal of Jesus to be greater than the 'Branch of David' in 4Q174 1:12, who is portrayed in David's line but never greater than David. As exalted κύριος by virtue of his ascension Jesus is now able to pour out [ἐκχέω] the Spirit (Acts 2:17) – an act directly ascribed to God, who himself pours out the Spirit (ἐκχέω) in the citation from Joel in Acts 2:17. Through Jesus' resurrection he is also able to forgive sins (Acts 13:38-9). This further marks him as greater than David. The ascription of κύριος both to YHWH and to Jesus in Acts 2 (see vv 20, 21, 25, 34-5, 36) also offers further evidence of the exalted position Luke ascribes to him here. In this way, like 4Q174, Luke retains the traditional category of Davidic kingship. But he elevates it.

Second, Luke detaches this Davidic descendant from Jerusalem at the point of his inauguration, whereas David's offspring in 4Q174 will arise 'in Zion' from where he will 'save Israel' (1:12). This emphasises the heavenly reign of Luke's Messiah, of which the outpouring of the Spirit is the most visible sign of his rule at present. This

suggests that the faithful portion of Israel for Luke is therefore the community in receipt of the Spirit as seen throughout Acts.

Third, in Acts, Jesus' rule is not vindicated through violent overthrow of his enemies. This is also unlike 4Q174, which links the Messiah's advent to the eschatological 'time of trial' which reveals the true Israel in 2:1-4 (cf. also the expectation that the Davidic king will clothe his enemies with disgrace in Ps 132:18). Luke makes no mention of Jesus removing any enemies when he is exalted to God's throne here. The true portion of Israel for Luke is to be dissociated from violence.⁵⁹

In summary, then, like 4Q174, Luke uses the themes of kingship, the Davidic throne and divine sonship from 2 Sa 7 in order to argue for a particular view of a Davidic Messiah. Both texts suggest that this Messiah will emerge in the last days to prompt a major division within Israel; that this will determine who is the faithful Israel or not, and in doing so he will save Israel. At the beginning of Luke's gospel (Lk 1:32-3) his portrayal of the Messiah is very much like that in 4Q174. However, after Jesus' resurrection / ascension he departs from this view of the Messiah in making him greater than David, giving him a heavenly rather than earthly throne, removing any conquest of enemies, and equating him with YHWH in many aspects. At this point, then, it might be asked what Luke's use of 2 Sam 7 suggests about the partings of the ways in his work. Like 4Q174, he takes great lengths to portray Jesus as a *Davidic* Messiah. Exegetically this has shown him to be very much in line with this Jewish interpretative school of thought. Ideologically this aligns him with the dominant form of messianic expectation in the period.⁶⁰ His attempt to align the believing community with this Davidic line, then, strongly seems to locate him inside Judaism.⁶¹

⁵⁹ Like 4Q174, Zechariah does suggest that through Jesus 'we [Israel] would be saved from our enemies' (Lk 1:71). This makes it more surprising when at Jesus' enthronement he does nothing to eradicate his opponents. This seems to suggest that the enemies of Lk 1 should not be read as Roman oppressors but perhaps instead demonic powers (e.g. Lk 4:1-13).

⁶⁰ Mark Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 337

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 338, contrasts Luke's christology with Paul and Mark's. Their more muted Davidic elements 'probably resulted from a widening rift with the synagogue'. Though I situate Paul more within Judaism (chapter one), Strauss' use of Lukan christology to argue against a parting of the ways in Luke-Acts is helpful; cf. also David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 252, who sees Luke's messianic perspective as a more 'Jewish-Christian' one.

In the following section I will focus on the theme of temple in 2 Sam 7, and how Luke's reading of 2 Sam 7 alongside 4Q174 here also suggests he argues from inside Judaism.

3.3 Temple Critique in Acts 7:44-7

Luke's supposedly more negative take on the temple has often been taken to indicate a parting of the ways in his work. Dunn, for example, suggests that Stephen's speech (Acts 7) indicates a more pessimistic view of the temple - 'the beginning of a clear parting of the ways between Christians and Jews.'⁶² This view has also been taken up recently by various commentators.⁶³ If the temple was of pivotal importance to early Jewish belief,⁶⁴ even after its demise,⁶⁵ it could be suggested that a departure from it moved one outside the walls of Judaism. However, as I have demonstrated, 4Q174 uses 2 Sam 7 to advocate a departure from the Jerusalem cult and remains within Judaism. Luke, I suggest, does the same. In order to establish this I will first set Acts 7:45-7 in its narrative context. Then I will consider in more detail Luke's transformation of 2 Sam 7 here. Then I will compare Luke's use of the OT text with 4Q174's, and how Luke's view of the temple implies he writes from within an *intra muros* Jewish perspective.

Initially Luke seems rather pro-temple in his work. This is suggested, for example, by the fact that Jesus is presented in the temple after his birth (Lk 22:22-4), that the gospel ends with the early Christians being 'continually in the temple blessing God' after his ascension (24:53), and that the early Christian movement began around existing temple worship (e.g. Acts 3:1). Moreover, Luke stresses Paul's undertaking

⁶² James Dunn, *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM, 2006), 94. Note, however, p.126 where he qualifies Luke's position on the temple: [this was] 'a parting of the ways at a very early stage. Yet even so, its significance should not be exaggerated. For... the same process could be described as more a broadening of the spectrum of Second Temple Judaism'.

⁶³ Randy Hedlun, 'Rethinking Luke's Purpose: The Effect of First-Century Social Conflict' in *JPT* 22 (2013), 232, 256; Richard Bauckham, 'The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why' in *ST* 47 (1993), 147-8; Amy Jill-Levine, 'Luke and the Jewish Religion' in *Int.* 68 (2014), 390

⁶⁴ E.P. Sanders, *Judaism: Practice and Belief 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992), 256-7

⁶⁵ Bauckham, 'Parting', 145

of a rite of purification before entering the temple. In other words, he seems to endorse the temple cult here.⁶⁶ However, Luke's narrative also shows a progressive shift away from the centrality of temple worship as the Christian movement advances beyond Jerusalem and into other locations. This raises the critical issue, given the importance of the temple for early Jewish identity, of how can the early Christians for Luke be part of Israel while separate from the temple? Acts 7 is the most detailed text on Luke's temple theology, and I will consider it below.

Acts 7:1-53 contains Stephen's speech before his martyrdom (vv54-60). This takes place after Stephen has been accused of blasphemy for speaking 'against this holy place [the temple] and the law' (Acts 6:13). Evidently, the Jewish council claims, he has said that Jesus will destroy the temple 'and change the customs that Moses handed on to us' (v14). This speech traces the themes of land, law and temple⁶⁷ through Israel's history with special reference to Abraham, Joseph, Moses, Joshua and David. It ends with Stephen denouncing his accusers: rather than himself being unfaithful to Moses and God's dwelling place, it is actually *they* who oppose the Holy Spirit (51) and have not kept the law (v53). Thus the charges brought against him are shown as inconsequential and it is his opponents who are in the wrong.⁶⁸ Much of Luke's theological agenda is revealed in the speeches. This is no exception: here the charges brought against Stephen offer Luke an ideal opportunity to explain more fully his position on the law and on the true nature of God's dwelling.⁶⁹ It is concerning this latter theme that 2 Sam 7 is alluded to here in vv45-7.

Apparently, Stephen suggests, the Jerusalem temple culminates God's promise to Abraham of deliverance from Egypt. As God states, Israel is to be liberated here so that it may 'worship me in this place' (v8). This Exodus marks the first phase in Israel's

⁶⁶ Allen, *Lukan Authorship*, 13

⁶⁷ Peterson, *Acts*, 245

⁶⁸ One should probably not look for a single purpose behind the speech. Its theology is broad, addressing Christology, salvation history, ecclesiology, and the continuity between Israel's traditions and the church.

⁶⁹ The speech is often taken to be a defense speech (Carl Holladay, *Acts: A Commentary* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016), 159, although strictly speaking Stephen does not directly respond to all the charges made against him, and nor is it made to avert his martyrdom, which seems to take place rather suddenly after the speech (Bock, *Acts*, 278)

worship. The second phase is evidently the ‘tent of testimony [σκηνή τοῦ μαρτυρίου]’ which roamed about in Moses’ and Joshua’s time (v44). The temple itself is not mentioned until vv45-7. Here Stephen describes the shift from the tabernacle to the third phase of Israel’s worship. Vv45-7 allude to 2 Sam 7. There is also parallel with Ps 131:5 LXX here, as the table below shows:

Acts 7:45-7	NA28 Acts 7:45-7	Ps 131:5 LXX
...And it was there until the time of David, 46 who found favor with God and asked	45ἦν...ἕως τῶν ἡμερῶν Δαυίδ, 46ὸς εὕρεν χάριν ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ ἤτήσατο	ἕως οὗ
that he might find	εὕρεῖν	εὔρω τόπον τῷ κυρίῳ,
a dwelling place for the God of Jacob. ⁷⁰ 47 But it	σκηνωμα τῷ θεῷ Ἰακώβ. 47Σολομῶν δὲ οἰκοδόμησεν αὐτῷ οἶκον.	σκηνωμα τῷ θεῷ Ἰακωβ.

⁷⁰ There is a notable textual variant in v46, indicated in bold in the table. Here I have chosen to go against the reading of the NA28 text. Several alternative witnesses including κ2, A, C, E, Ψ, 33, 614, 945, 1175, 1241, 1505, 1739, lat, sy, co replace ‘house’ with θεω, rendering the phrase instead that David sought to build a place ‘for the *God of Jacob*’. This is the reading I have preferred. The difference between these two options is considerable. The first (‘house of Jacob’) is the more obscure reading (it seems to imply that David sought to build a house for himself and his own dynasty whereas the account in 2 Sam 7 and the context of Acts 7:44-50 makes emphatic that we should surely envisage God’s dwelling here). Normally as the most difficult we should favour this as the original reading (Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1975), 308-9; Bock, *Acts*, 308; Ben Witherington, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 272-3. However, Johnson gives three reasons here for ‘overturning the rules of textual criticism’: (1) The alternative reading (‘house of God’) seems to be an allusion to LXX Ps 131:5 (σκηνωμα τῷ θεῷ Ἰακωβ); (2) the αυτο in the following verse makes more sense if referring to God rather than Jacob; and (3) this reading also makes more sense of the emphatic declaration ‘God does not dwell’ in v48 (L.T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Epistles* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1992), 131-2; also echoed by Peterson, *Acts*, 257). The first of these points is particularly made stronger in light of my previous comparison, which has already shown Luke’s very probable reliance on Ps 132. Here (against the NRSV) I am following the reading adopted by the KJV, NKJV, ESV, TNIV. (An intermediary option between these two readings is Fitzmyer’s suggested dwelling ‘for the house of the God of Jacob’, which has subsequently been abbreviated by homoeoteleuton: though this makes a great deal of sense it is not supported by any witnesses.) Of course, even if ‘house of Jacob’ were the original reading here it would not dull Luke’s allusion to the events of 2 Sam 7 here, which is very clear.

was Solomon who built a house for him.		
--	--	--

As with Acts 2:30, Luke is likely drawing on Ps 131 LXX here. Acts 7:46 is in verbatim agreement with parts of Ps 131:5 LXX. Both of these texts describe David ‘finding [ἐυρίσκω]’ a place for God to dwell (2 Sam 7 only mentions David *building* a house for God). Moreover, they both mention the temple as a σκήνωμα, which is rare in the NT and LXX.⁷¹ Finally, both also describe the temple as a place τῷ θεῷ ἱακώβ. However, there is evidence that like 4Q174 Luke is also drawing on 2 Sam 7 here. First, in v46, Luke writes that David found favour with God before seeking a place for God (v46). This matches the trajectory of 2 Sam 7, which takes as its starting point God’s blessing of David (rest and security, vv1-3).⁷² Ps 132 does not mention God’s prior blessing of David. Second, Luke mentions that Solomon was the one to build a house instead of David (v47). This parallels 2 Sam 7:13 (‘he [David’s offspring] shall build a house for my name’), whereas Ps 132 lacks any mention of Solomon. Third, Luke never describes the temple in Acts 7 as a ἱερόν as he does through the rest of Luke-Acts. His preference for the rarer word οἶκος in vv46-7 further suggests reliance on 2 Sam 7. This uses the word eleven times to repeat the word play of ת’ב I have discussed earlier. Ps 131 LXX only uses it once.

How, then, has Luke used these OT texts in Stephen’s speech, and how does this compare with the use of 2 Sam 7 in 4Q174? First, like 4Q174 he here highlights the second meaning of בית in the passage: ‘house’ as referring to God’s temple. This has been applied to the Jerusalem temple. Second, Luke uses 2 Sam 7 to downplay the legitimacy of the Jerusalem temple. This denunciation of the existing temple cult was suggested in 4Q174, first, by the expectation of a future sanctuary built by God (4Q174 1:3). It was also suggested by the fact that the Qumran community is also portrayed as a temple (the ‘sanctuary of human, מִקְדָּשׁ אָדָם) which anticipates at

⁷¹ The term means ‘dwelling, habitation’. It only re-appears in the NT in 2 Pet 1:13-14. In the LXX it probably refers to the temple in Pss 151:1, 26:8, 43:3, 49:11, 61:4, 84:10 but nowhere else.

⁷² Note Luke’s wordplay: it was because David found [εὔρεν] grace that he sought to find [εὔρεϊν] a dwelling for God. This neatly summarises the relationship between divine favor and David’s zeal to build a place for God in 2 Sam 7.

present the temple to come. This of course implies that there is something deficient about the Jerusalem temple and its sacrifices, or else there would be no need for a future replacement, nor for the Qumran community to offer in its place true 'incense... works of Torah' (4Q174 1:6-7).

Luke makes his case for a more limited view of the Jerusalem temple as follows. Immediately after alluding to 2 Sam 7, he begins with a strong adversative ἄλλ' clause: 'but the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands' (7:48). Then follows a citation from Isa 66:1: 'Heaven is my throne, and the earth is my footstool. What kind of house will you build for me, says the Lord, or what is the place of my rest...?' In other words, as God fills the heavens and the earth, surely there is no house [οἶκος] that can contain him (7:49-50). On this basis Stephen's opponents are wrong to denounce him for speaking against the temple (6:13, 7:51-53). Rather, it is *they* who have a skewed view of it. Luke's precise stance here on the temple has been much debated: is Luke completely anti-temple, or is his position more nuanced than this?

In favour of the view that Luke is anti-temple, it has been pointed out that Solomon's temple is only mentioned briefly before it is quickly dismissed (v47).⁷³ Moreover, 'made with human hands [χειροποίητος]' is often in the LXX used in the context of idolatry.⁷⁴ Idolatry, indeed, is the subject of Acts 7:41-43, which denounces Israel's ancestors for worshipping pagan deities and seems to draw analogy with the present hearers of the speech. This has led some commentators to suggest that Luke is describing the temple cult as idolatrous in some way.⁷⁵ However, in the NT χειροποίητος is generally removed from the meaning of pagan idolatry it has in the LXX, and is now used to indicate an antithesis between human works and the work of God instead.⁷⁶ Stephen is not, then, accusing the Jerusalem temple of idolatry, nor

⁷³ F.F. Bruce, *The Book of Acts*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988), 148

⁷⁴ E.g. Lev 26:1, 30, Isa 2:18, 10:11, 16:12, 19:1, 21:9, 31:7

⁷⁵ E.g. Todd Penner, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004), 310-18; more recently Richard Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008), 191, who notes that Isa 66:1 in its original context was a polemic against paganism.

⁷⁶ Holladay, *Acts*, 262. See e.g. Mk 14:58, Acts 17:24, Eph 2:11, Heb 9:11, 9:24

denouncing it in itself, but rather critiquing his opponents' assumption that the presence of God can be limited to a single place.⁷⁷ This is the same point made in Acts 17:24 - 'The God who made the world and everything in it, he who is Lord of heaven and earth, does not live in shrines made by human hands [χειροποιήτους]'.⁷⁸ The point is nothing new for the Jewish tradition. Solomon himself suggests as much when the first temple is dedicated ('will God indeed dwell on the earth? Even heaven and the highest heaven cannot contain you...', 1 Kgs 8:27-30).⁷⁹ The problem for Luke seems to be that many of the Jews have forgotten it.⁸⁰

By distancing the early Christian movement from the Jerusalem cult, then, Luke is hardly distancing the Christian community from Israel. Rather, in a similar way to 4Q174 he is able to critique the temple cult in a way that affirms that the Christian community is the only group worshipping rightly. Of course, there are differences in both texts. For the Qumran covenanters the basic problem with the Jerusalem cult was its defilement.⁸¹ For Luke it is the attempt to limit God's presence. There is also variation in both cases about what the alternative mode of worship is to be. In the rebuilt temple of 4Q174 neither 'the Ammonite, the Moabite, nor the bastard, nor the foreigner' will enter (4Q174 1:3-4). This is very unlike Luke's vision where the Christian movement is inclusive of foreigners and Gentiles. Moreover, Luke lacks any idea of a rebuilt temple, and unlike 4Q174 his shift away from Jerusalem in the narrative further argues against a restriction of worship to a single place.

⁷⁷ Steve Smith, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017), 191; Bradley Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, Ga: Mercer, 1988), 39; Witherington, *Acts*, 62; Eric Franklin, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975), 105; Bruce, *Acts*, 149; Bock, *Acts*, 303. Luke may possibly offer a glimpse of a heavenly sanctuary here - note the citation of Isa 66:1 (Acts 7:49-50) which refers to God's heavenly dwelling with the language of 'house' and 'dwelling', and Stephen's vision of Jesus standing at the right hand of God (7:55), where 'standing' may imply Jesus' priestly position: Nicholas Moore, 'He Saw Heaven Opened': Heavenly Temple and Universal Mission in Luke-Acts', *NTS* 68 (2022), 43-45. But this heavenly sanctuary is otherwise quite muted in the text.

⁷⁸ Cf. Also Acts 4:24 for the same creation theology.

⁷⁹ Holladay, *Acts*, 262

⁸⁰ That Luke sometimes regards the temple positively, see Acts 2:46, 3:11, 5:20-1, 21:26, 22:17, 24:18 may also be taken as examples of this.

⁸¹ Cf. Here CD 3:6, 18-19, 4:1, 6:12-13, 4Q394 8.3.5, 4Q396.

There may be some overlap here with 4Q174's portrayal of the community as the temple (1:6-7). Isa 66:2, whose previous verse Luke applied to the temple, reads, 'but this is the one to whom I will look, to the humble and contrite in spirit...' Potentially this underscores Luke's temple theology, then: that God dwells in people rather than buildings.⁸² This sentiment is also reflected in Isa 66:22 (when God makes the new heavens and new earth 'all flesh shall come to worship before me': in other words the idealised state is cosmic worship detached from a single locale, realised by all humanity).⁸³ Finally, in Acts 17, after saying again that God cannot be limited to a single place of worship, Paul also suggests a very close intimate relationship between God and humans ('In him we live and move and have our being', v28).⁸⁴

However, it is quite a stretch to go from here to argue that Luke portrays believers themselves as a new temple, as I have argued in ch 1. What this comparison does highlight, again, is how similar Luke-Acts is to this Qumran text in using scripture to commend the believing community as the faithful, and to denounce Jewish opponents, as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Though they separate from the Jerusalem temple, believers for Luke are alone the true heirs of correct Israelite worship, and like the Qumran covenanters can quite happily remain inside Judaism. The final section in this chapter will compare the use of Ps 2 in both texts to legitimate their communities as the faithful Israel.

4. Psalm 2: A Divided Israel

Both authors cite the very same text from Ps 2 in their work. This is not groundbreaking given the considerable use of this psalm in early Jewish literature⁸⁵ and in the NT.⁸⁶ What is significant is the way both authors use this psalm *ecclesiologically* to address the issue of who constitutes the true people of God.

⁸² Bruce, *Acts*, 150

⁸³ Bart Koet, 'Isaiah in Luke-Acts' in Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken, *Isaiah in the New Testament* (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 90

⁸⁴ 'God is not far from each one of us. For 'in him we live and move and have our being...' (Acts 17:27-8)

⁸⁵ See, e.g., Ps Sol 17; Sib. Or. 3:664-8; Test. Levi 4:2; 1 En. 48:20

⁸⁶ It is also cited in Acts 13:33; Heb 1:5; 5:5; Rev 2:26-7; 19:15; NA28 lists twelve allusions to it.

4Q174 and Acts 4 are alike in two striking points of interpretation here. First, they insert their rival *Jewish* opponents into the group of *Gentile* antagonists opposing YHWH and his 'anointed' in the psalm (Ps 2:1-2). Second, they read the 'anointed' of Ps 2 *corporately*, not just *individually* as referring to the Messiah. Both of these interpretations I will explore in more detail below. Together they are further evidence of Luke's Jewishness -- that in portraying his community as the faithful Israel he is no different from this Qumran text in arguing from within Israel's scripture traditions, to portray the Christian community alone as the true worshippers within Israel. I will briefly outline Ps 2 in its OT context before considering how it has been used by 4Q174 and Luke.

4.1 Ps 2 in OT Context: Kingly Enthronement

Ps 2 along with Ps 1 was probably read in antiquity as an introduction to the Psalter. Both lack a Davidic superscription, as do only two other psalms in Book One of the psalter. Moreover, both share several important terms (the rare word הַגָּה, 'to murmur'; 'way', דֶּרֶךְ; the congratulatory formula 'happy are').⁸⁷ The Western text of Acts 13:33 also reads 'as it is written in the first psalm' when citing Ps 2, which also indicates that at least one other reader in antiquity read it in pairing with Ps 1. Ps 2 is typically classified as a royal psalm, probably linked to the enthronement of the Davidic king of Israel,⁸⁸ possibly linked to an annual enthronement festival.⁸⁹ It is comprised of four stanzas. In the first of these (vv1-3) the nations (ἔθνη), peoples, kings and rulers of the earth rebel against the Lord (ὁ κύριος, יהיה) and his anointed the king (τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ, משיחו). These verses are cited in Acts 4:25-6 and 4Q174 1:18. In the second stanza (vv4-6) God laughs at his opponents and tells them that he has instated the king on Zion. An inaugural decree about the king's authority on God's behalf is then made in vv7-9 ('You are my Son; today I have begotten you'). YHWH also promises to give him hegemony over the nations as his vice-regent. Here,

⁸⁷ Nancy DeClaisse-Walford, Rolf Jacobson, Beth Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014), 65

⁸⁸ E.g. Mitchell Dahood, *Psalms 1-50*, AYB (New York: Doubleday, 1965), 7; Peter Craigie, *Psalms 1-50* (Texas: Word Books, 1983), 63

⁸⁹ Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary*, ContC (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 126. Brooke, *Exegesis*, 173-4, suggests it was used along with 2 Sam 7 at the annual feast of tabernacles.

like 2 Sam 7, the psalm draws on traditional Ancient Near Eastern language of the king as God's son. The final stanzas (vv10-12) are a warning to hostile kings to serve the Lord (יהיה) with fear lest he be angry and they perish. Noteworthy in this psalm is the role of the king as carrying the authority to act on God's behalf, and his enthronement as the means by which God secures his victory over foreign nations.

4.2 Ps 2 in 4Q174: Messianic Community vs Jewish Rivals

Now I will consider how 4Q174 reads Ps 2 ecclesiologically. Again, 4Q174 cites Psalms 1:1 and 2:1-2 together as a unit. After each is cited its interpretation is given. Both are taken to refer to a division within Israel. The *peshet* [פֶּשֶׁר] of Ps 1 is given in 4Q174 1:14-17, and then Ps 2 and its *peshet* is given in 1:18 onwards (the end of this interpretation is unclear). Ps 1, then, refers to a division in Israel as follows. The citation reads, 'Happy is [the] man who has not followed the counsel of the wicked.' This 'happy' person apparently applies to those 'who turn aside from the way [דֶּרֶק]...' (4Q174 1:14). Here דֶּרֶק provides a catchword to link this interpretation with Isa 8:11, where God turned the prophet 'aside from walking in the path [דֶּרֶק] of this people' (4Q174 1:15-16). Apparently here the prophet represents the sectarians who shun the evil practices of their contemporary Jews. In support of this Ezek 37:23 is then cited – in which the sectarians are like those who '[shall] never defile themselves with all their idols' (4Q174 1:16-17). In this way the author has taken the 'two-ways' distinction in Ps 1 between the righteous and the wicked and applied it to the sectarians and their Jewish opponents. Ps 2:1-2 is then cited:

NRSV, Ps 2:1-2	MT, Ps 2:1-2	4Q174, 1.18-19
Why do the nations conspire, and the peoples plot in vain?	למה רגשו גוים ולאמים יהגו רוק	למהי רגשו גוים ולאמים יהגו רק
The kings of the earth set themselves,	יְתִיצְבוּ מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ יַחַד	יְתִיצְבוּ מַלְכֵי אֶרֶץ וְרוֹזְנִים נוֹסְדוּ בִיחַד

<p>and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and his anointed</p>	<p>על יהוה ועל משיחו</p>	<p>על יהוה ועל משיחו</p>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------

4Q174 is largely similar to the MT here. Two themes are evident in the former's use of the OT text: (a) 4Q174 uses this text to justify a division within Israel, and (b) 4Q174 understands the 'anointed' one to refer to the community-at-large.

As evidence for (a) a division within Israel, the interpretation (פשר) of Ps 2 is that it concerns the 'chosen... of Israel in the latter days' (1.19). Its ultimate fulfillment here is in the future. Moreover, it also applies to a 'time of refining [עת המצרף], literally 'time of the crucible', 2.1] coming upon the House of Judah 'to perfect...' This same phrase (עת המצרף) occurs also in 4Q174 2:19. Here it refers to a time when the 'wicked of Ephraim and Manasseh... will attempt to lay hands on the priest and members of his council' – again, a future division between the faithful and unfaithful members of Israel. Some text is missing, and then 4Q174 continues with a cryptic mention of Belial (who led dissenters astray in 1:8-9). After this trial and Belial's involvement a remnant [שאר] will remain to observe the entire Torah (2.2). This remnant is, of course, the sectarians who refuse to compromise on their beliefs. This eschatological division in Israel is also confirmed by additional citations from Daniel 11:32, 12:10 -- 'the righteous shall [purify themselves and make] themselves [white] and refine themselves and a people that know God will be strong' (2.4). In its original context this OT text addressed the activity of a faithful remnant resisting Hellenistic reforms. In 4Q174 it is applied to the sectarians' vindication as the faithful Israel after conflict with their Jewish opponents. The remaining text is marked by omissions. Some remaining material may suggest a time of visitation from God ('whose God will come down...in his descent', 2:4). In fragment 4 there is further mention of Belial opposing the house of Judah to 'scatter them'. This, as with the above material, suggests further division in the sect (frg. 4.1-7).

Psalm 2 has been used in several interesting ways here. First is the application of the גוים ('nations') in Ps 2:1 to dissident members of the sect. This considerably alters the original context of the Psalm, in which the גוים are Gentiles, namely the 'kings of the earth' and world 'rulers' (Ps 2:1-2). The reading in 4Q174, then, seems to portray the sectarians' opponents in damning terms as pagans. This shows the sectarians were willing to go to considerable lengths to denounce their opponents as alienated from Israel's heritage. This is important for Luke-Acts below as it shows how one Jewish sect could use this psalm to make strong polemic against Jewish opponents, yet remain within Judaism.

The second major way 4Q174 reads Ps 2 is (b) its curious messianic interpretation of the text. Here, importantly, its author applies 'his Messiah [משיח] in Ps 2:3 not to an individual but to the community as a whole. This also reads against the original context of the psalm, where the Messiah is the king. This reading is surprising given the previous mention in 4Q174 of the 'Branch of David' and messianic rulers to emerge in the latter days. Here, then, we have a striking portrait of the community-at-large as anointed. Nor does 4Q174 draw from Ps 2 the idea of a kingly enthronement, which might also be expected given 4Q174's earlier mention of the Messiahs to arrive in the latter days. This application of the 'anointed' to the community suggests that the author of 4Q174 considers them to be the means by which God secures his rule over hostile powers. This 'corporate anointing' is seen also in 4Q270 frg. 2, 14; 1QS 2:25-3:12; 1QH 7:1-21; 4:17-27; 13:29-34; cf. 4Q521 frag. 8, 9.⁹⁰ Here it suggests the community is to fulfil, at least in part, the vocation of the individual Messiah(s) mentioned earlier in the text. In this case the sectarians are the means by which God's reign is extended, as well as the prime recipients of opposition against YHWH's rule to come. These interpretative moves further emphasise that the sect is the faithful Israel and their Jewish opponents are its enemies. Below I will indicate how Luke shares these two interpretative moves to make a similar point about the community of believers.

⁹⁰ See Ruzer, 'Davidic Messiah', 240.

4.3 Ps 2 in Luke-Acts: Anointed Believers vs Jewish Opponents

Luke in Acts cites this same section of Ps 2. Like 4Q174, he has applied this to a division in Israel. Like 4Q174, he also applies the ‘Gentiles’ of the original passage to rival Jews, and like 4Q174 he also reads the ‘anointed’ of Ps 2 as applying to the community-at-large, in order to align the latter with the faithful portion of Israel – though he also reads the ‘anointed’ individually as applying to Jesus, in contrast with 4Q174. In this manner he reflects the very same scriptural hermeneutic used by this Qumran author to legitimate the community as the true Israel and to denounce Jewish opponents. This is further evidence that Luke is neither anti-semitic nor supersessionist, but is simply engaged in inner-Jewish debate. Below I will set the citation within its context in Acts; then I will compare in more detail how Luke uses the OT text here in comparison with 4Q174.

The following table shows the citation of Ps 2:1-2 in Acts 4:25-6. This citation agrees verbatim with the LXX text. For this reason I have only shown the NA28 text and the NRSV translation of Acts 4:25-6 for clarity.

Acts 4:25-6 NRSV	Acts 4:25-6 NA28
25 it is you who said by the Holy Spirit through our ancestor David, your servant:	25 ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυὶδ παιδός σου εἰπών·
‘Why did the Gentiles rage,	ἵνατί ἐφρύαξαν ἔθνη
and the peoples imagine vain things?	καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά;
26 The kings of the earth took their stand,	26 παρέστησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς τῆς γῆς
and the rulers have gathered together against the Lord and against his Messiah.’	καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου καὶ κατὰ τοῦ χριστοῦ αὐτοῦ.

Ps 2:1-2 occurs in Acts 4:25-6 as part of a believers’ prayer after Peter and John have been detained by the Jewish council (Acts 4:1-22) and commanded not to keep

speaking in Jesus' name (v18). The prayer begins with an appeal to God as Creator (Acts 4:24). Then Ps 2 is introduced by the believers as coming from 'our father David [τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν... Δαυίδ, v25]⁹¹ and cited. Following this a γὰρ ('for') introduces the psalm's interpretation. Verse 27, just after the psalm is cited, is fronted with συνήχθησαν ('were gathered'). This is the same word used in Ps 2 for the rulers being gathered together. In v27 it is applied to Herod⁹² and Pontius Pilate, 'together with the Gentiles and peoples of Israel [σὺν ἔθνεσιν καὶ λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ⁹³']'. The mention of Pilate and the Gentiles here is unsurprising given the application of Ps 2 originally to pagans. What is surprising is Luke's reading of Herod and the 'peoples of Israel' as part of those who 'gathered' together against Jesus, who is the anointed one of Ps 2:1-2 (Luke describes him as 'your holy servant whom you anointed [ὃν ἔχρισας]', v27). In this way Luke reads Jewish opponents of the believing community as being in league with the psalm's pagans - just like 4Q174.

Luke's interpretation goes on. Apparently, the opposition to Jesus was part of God's plan – 'whatever your hand [ἡ χεὶρ σου] had predestined to take place' (v29). However, this opposition is not limited to Jesus. In an important interpretative move Luke extends the persecution he faced to the believing community which is now opposed by unbelieving Jews (Acts 4:1-22). This leads to a prayer for boldness, and appeal for God to 'stretch out your hand [ἡ χεὶρ σου] to perform signs and wonders through 'your holy servant Jesus [τοῦ ἁγίου παιδός σου Ἰησοῦ]', vv28-30. Several features here are noteworthy. First, in sharing Jesus' sufferings, Luke presents the believing community as linked to the anointed one of Psalm 2. Second, they also share the heritage of the anointed one by sharing in his ministry (God performs signs and wonders through them, 'through the name of your holy servant Jesus', v30). In this way, like 4Q174, Luke also suggests believers are like the anointed one of Ps 2. The repetition of 'hand' in both vv28 and 30 is also significant. This suggests that the same hand which destined persecution to take place is also the same hand which will be used to work miraculous healings in Israel pointing to salvation. Luke, then, is

⁹¹ There are a few textual variants here, but the psalm is ascribed to David in all of them.

⁹² Though half-Jewish Herod is identified as a Jew in Lk 23:6-12.

⁹³ E, Ψ 326, sy read λαος in the singular here.

making a point here about how believers should respond to opposition: not with antagonism but with prayerful attempts to win over opponents. God's approval of this policy is seen when he answers the prayer by bestowing on the believers boldness and when the building shakes as they are filled with the Spirit (vv30-31).

There are some differences with 4Q174 here. First, in Acts, the conflict described in Ps 2 is applied to the past – during Jesus' ministry – and to the more contemporary situation of opposition to the church at large. In 4Q174, however, the conflict is said to take place in the 'latter days'. This fits in with Luke's considerably more realized eschatology, in which the Messiah has already appeared. This is significant for Luke's ecclesiology as it shows that contrary to the Dead Sea Scrolls the critical division within Israel has already occurred, and that it is on the basis of one's response to the message about Jesus' resurrection that the true or false Israel is made evident.

A second difference between both uses of Ps 2 concerns the portrayal of the 'anointed' in Ps 2. While 4Q174 broadens the scope of this expression to the community at large, Luke initially applies it to Jesus as the Messiah. This preserves more of the original context of the psalm, which reads the Lord's anointed as the king instated by YHWH (Ps 2:7). This application in Acts 4 also matches Lk 3:27, where Ps 2:7 is applied to Jesus at his baptism ('you are my Son'), and in Acts 13:33, where the same verse is applied to his resurrection. This latter passage emphasises again the idea that it is Jesus' resurrection that is the primary means of his enthronement as king and by which the decisive conquest over YHWH's enemies is enacted (Ps 2:2-4). The application of Ps 2 to Jesus individually in Acts 4, and his suffering at the hands of Pilate, Herod, and the peoples of Israel, is important because it shows a suffering Messiah. This is significant for Luke's ecclesiology because it shows that the founder of the Christian community was a victim of suffering.⁹⁴ If the founder suffered in this way, and this is how the victory of Ps 2 over hostile powers is secured, then this presumably leaves a model for the community that follows too. This is especially the

⁹⁴ Steve Mason, 'Interpretation Of Psalm 2 In 4QFlorilegium And In The New Testament', in Florentino García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (Boston, Brill, 2009), 81

case given Luke's extension of the conflict in Ps 2 to the Christian community. The point made here is that through suffering and persecution is the true Israel to be identified, and the anointed of God to be found. The faithful Israel for Luke is a suffering community. Ps 2 is not used to emphasise a suffering community in 4Q174.

A third point of contrast between both uses of Ps 2 here concerns Luke's missional agenda as a response to conflict. This is seen in the disciples' prayer for boldness, signs and wonders to help them continue preaching about Jesus to their opponents (Acts 4:27-31). There is no parallel to this in the Qumran text: that the sect's opponents are to be prayed for and converted to the right path. This, presumably, is how Luke considers the words of Ps 2:8 to be fulfilled ('ask of me, and I will make the nations your heritage, and the ends of the earth your possession'). Enemies are not to be met with eradication but with conversion. The rule of God is not extended through violence but with forgiveness (so Jesus teaches in Lk 6:37-8). This comes as a surprise given the promise in Lk 1 that through Jesus 'we would be saved from our enemies... rescued from the hands of our enemies' (Lk 1:71, 3). Luke's use of Ps 2 seems to play on this contrast to suggest that forgiveness and seeking the healing of one's opponents is how the believing community should secure victory over hostile opponents to God's reign (Ps 2:9). This is very different from the Qumran expectation that one's enemies should be vanquished, implied by the appearance of the Davidic Messiah in 4Q174 1:11, the promise of rest from Israel's enemies the sons of Belial (1:7-9), and the 'time of trial' coming on Judah (2:1), all of which point elsewhere in the scrolls to eschatological war. The faithful Israel for Luke, then, is also to be understood as a forgiving and missional community.

However, the similarities between Acts and 4Q174 are striking. The application of the Gentile $\text{D}\iota\gamma$ of Ps 2:2 to Jews in both cases is a significant role-reversal. In Luke this echoes the earlier prediction of the 'falling and the rising of many in Israel' (Lk 2:34). It also echoes the words of Acts 3 earlier. Here Peter addresses the people [$\text{\acute{o}} \text{\lambda}\alpha\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$] of Israel following the healing of the cripple, saying that everyone who does not listen to the words of Jesus the prophet will be 'utterly rooted out of the people [$\text{\acute{\epsilon}}\xi\theta\lambda\epsilon\theta\text{\rho}\epsilon\upsilon\theta\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\kappa \text{\tau}\omicron\upsilon \text{\lambda}\alpha\omicron\upsilon$]' (Acts 3:23). This latter phrase suggests the

possibility of unbelieving Jews being removed from God's people.⁹⁵ This seems to be the case in Acts 4. Ο λαός is often used to describe the people of Israel in Luke-Acts.⁹⁶ A similar reconstitution of the people of God is seen in Acts 15:14. Here James describes how God determined to take 'from the Gentiles a people for his name [ἐξ ἔθνῶν λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ]'. Luke reorders the people of God, into which Gentiles may now be included and Jews excluded. A similar flexibility with Jew/Gentile language was also seen in this project in Paul's application of Hosea 2:25 ('those who were not my people I will call my people') to Gentiles rather than Jews, who were its original audience. It was also seen in John's statement concerning 'those who say they are Jews and are not, but are a synagogue of Satan' (Rev 2:9), also relegating Jews to the status of Gentile pagans. This shows the considerable lengths earlier interpreters of Israel's traditions could go to disenfranchise opposing Jews from its promises while claiming these promises for themselves. The fact that 4Q174 as well as Luke inserts Jewish opponents into the Gentile antagonism in Ps 2 especially tells against the idea that Luke advocates supersessionism or anti-semitism here. Like the Qumran text, he is engaged in inter-Jewish debate here, critiquing from *within* rather than from *outside* Jewish tradition.

Finally, the application of the Messiah in Ps 2:2 to the community in both Acts and 4Q174 is striking. This is seen in Luke's extension of the 'anointed' to include the early Christians who were being persecuted. Like 4Q174, by implication, they are now the means by which YHWH enacts his kingly rule (Ps 2:7-10). This further suggests that they are the faithful portion of Israel. Admittedly Luke goes further than 4Q174 in linking the Christian community with the Messiah Jesus. There is almost a quasi-mystical unity between Jesus and the church in the way he works through the latter to continue his ministry of healing, signs and wonders (Acts 4:30). This same unity is seen in the fact that the disciples receive the same Spirit that anointed Jesus for ministry (Lk 4:16-19), which also propels them for mission (Acts 1:8). 4Q174 does not explain *how* the Qumran community might extend God's rule. However, the salient

⁹⁵ The latter is a citation from Lev 23:29.

⁹⁶ E.g. Acts 2:47, 3:23, 4:10, 5:12, 7:17, 34, 13:17.

point here is that both Luke and 4Q174 clearly read their own community as fulfilling God's purposes, intimately connected to YHWH, and due to receive dominion over their enemies, by virtue of their identification with the 'anointed' king of Ps 2. This is another compelling reason to suggest they are both using scripture here to commend their community as the faithful portion of Israel. This, again, commends Luke as arguing from inside Judaism.

5. Conclusion

This chapter has compared Luke-Acts with another Jewish text which commends its community as the faithful, and denounces its Jewish opponents, as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Both texts draw on 2 Sam 7, Amos 9:11 and Ps 2 to make this point. Both use them in very similar ways. In section 1 I showed how the Qumran covenanters generally saw themselves as the remnant of Israel against a broader majority of unfaithful Jews. I also showed their use of a 'pesher' hermeneutical strategy which understood the meaning of scripture to be hidden until its full disclosure in the life of the community. 4Q174 exemplifies these points well. Luke seems to adopt a similar approach in his own work.

In section 2 I considered the use of 2 Sam 7 in 4Q174. In its original context this passage records God's promise to David of a successor who will build him a dwelling place. It employed the double-meaning of בית to make this point ('dwelling' and 'dynasty'). 4Q174 preserves both these senses in its use of the OT text. It uses this passage, first, to predict YHWH's construction of an eschatological temple free of defilement (1.3-4). This temple replaces the past one which was destroyed. It also reads the community-at-present as a 'sanctuary of human' which correctly offers true worship (1.6-7) while the future temple is yet to be built. This implies critique of the existing temple cult. YHWH's erection of the future temple also coincides with the overthrow of the sect's enemies who by implication seem to be connected to temple worship (1.7-10). The author of 4Q174 has used the promised 'house' of 2 Sam 7, then, to suggest that its community alone correctly upholds Israel's worship against

a broader majority who have failed to obtain it. This indicates a departure from the existing temple cult, while the covenanters clearly remain inside Judaism.

The second way 4Q174 reads the בית of 2 Sam 7 is as a prediction of a Davidic Messiah figure. To make this point it omits the direct connection of this promise to Solomon, David's immediate successor. It applies it instead to a future 'Branch of David' (1.11; Jer 23:5). He will arise with a second Messiah, the 'Interpreter of the Law' (= the 'tent of David', 1.13; Amos 9:11). These will both arise in Zion (1.12) to 'save Israel' (1.13). The emergence of the Davidic Messiah (and his priestly ally) will initiate an eschatological division in Israel. This will purify Israel and vindicate the sectarians as the true remnant of Israel (2.2) against the sons of Belial (frg. 4.1-7). Eschatological war is implied. This portrayal of the Davidic Messiah also has the effect of vindicating the Qumran community as the faithful portion of Israel. These will be on the right side of the Davidic Messiah, David's successor, when he comes.

Luke, section 3 has shown, uses 2 Sam 7 in a similar way. First, he also reads it to predict a Davidic Messiah. Lk 1:32-3 especially alludes to Nathan's oracle. Here Jesus is portrayed as inheriting David's throne, a son of an eternal kingdom. He will also save Israel (1:54, 68). Military activity is implied (1:71). Thus far conventional Jewish expectations are upheld. However, Luke moves beyond the portrayal of the Davidic Messiah in his post-ascension narrative. For him Jesus is a more exalted Messiah after this event. This was seen especially in Peter's speech where Acts 2:30 alludes to Ps 131 LXX, which itself alludes to 2 Sam 7. Unlike 4Q174, the ascension marks the Davidic Messiah's *heavenly* enthronement. He is detached from Jerusalem here. Moreover, unlike 4Q174, there is no hint here of him ruling through violence. However, *Luke's christology should not be seen as an occasion for a parting of the ways in his work. He has one of the most Davidic christologies in the NT and like 4Q174 uses 2 Sam 7 to make this point emphatic.*

Second, this section also considered Luke's portrayal of the temple using 2 Sa 7 (via Ps 131:5 LXX) in Acts 7:45-7. His temple theology has often been taken to indicate a parting of the ways. Like 4Q174 Luke critiques temple worship. The rationale for this

critique differs from the Qumran text (the latter sees it as defiled; Luke as wrongly localising God's presence). However, *the fact that 4Q174 can strongly critique the temple cult yet remain inside Judaism is further evidence that Luke may well be doing the same.*

Finally, section 4 considered the use of Ps 2 in both texts. Here the similarities were striking. 4Q174 reads this in a way that portrays Jewish opponents of the sect as in the same league as the pagan nations of Ps 2:2 (1.18). It also reads the community as the 'anointed' of Ps 2:2, against the original OT context (where it applies to the king). Luke reads the 'anointed' (Ps 2:2) as Jesus. He also equates Jewish opposition against Jesus (from Herod and 'the peoples of Israel') with *Gentile* opposition to the anointed one in Ps 2 (Acts 4:27). Moreover, like 4Q174, he also reads the 'anointed' of Ps 2:2 to be the community-at-large. There are differences. 4Q174 applies Ps 2 to a future division which will vindicate the sectarians as the true Israel. Luke applies it to the past (in Jesus' life and the early church). By reading Jesus as the opposed 'anointed' one, Luke also hints at a suffering Messiah, of which there is no precedent in 4Q174. Moreover, he sees this opposition in Israel not as a reason for violence towards, but rather of mission to, unbelieving Jews. However, the way both texts use Ps 2 to reconstitute the people of Israel (relegating Jewish opponents to the status of Gentiles) while showing itself to be the true Israel, is highly significant. Most importantly, *the Qumran material shows how one group could highly denigrate its opponents yet still remain Jewish.* This, I suggest, helps explain the nature of Luke's fierce polemic against rival Jews. While this has often been taken as evidence of his antisemitism or a parting of the ways, this scripture comparison has shown, rather, that it is the hallmark of an *intra mural* Jewish debate. This is my final chapter which uses scripture to emphasise the Jewishness of Luke-Acts. In the following conclusion I will summarise the contributions this project has made.

Main Conclusion

This thesis has attempted to bridge the gap between the use of scripture and the parting of the ways in Luke's work. My argument is threefold. I have argued that (1) Luke-Acts is a Jewish text; (2) Luke uses scripture to commend Christians as the faithful portion of Israel and denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel; (3) Because he writes from within the Jewish tradition Luke does not advocate an early parting of the ways.

Luke writes history for the purpose of creating community identity. He is concerned with history for the purpose of legitimating a certain identity amongst his implied audience. With this in mind, Luke-Acts creates an identity for the Christian community as a sect within Israel. As the faithful portion of Israel this is the true expression of Israelite worship. Luke sets this in contrast to the broader majority of unbelieving Jews who have rejected the gospel. His polemic against them is fierce. At times he even goes so far as to suggest they are in the same league as pagan Gentiles.¹ But this does not mean that he is antisemitic or advocates a parting of the ways in his work between Jews and Christians. Rather, his image is of an Israel divided. Rather than rejecting Judaism, he presents Christians as heirs of Jewish traditions. Any polemic against Jewish opponents is *intra muros*. Luke-Acts we can therefore situate within the milieu of rival Jewish groups claiming for themselves the identity of the faithful Israel.

One helpful way of contextualising this is to observe where Luke uses the language of ἀρρεσεις, or sectarian schools of thought. He uses this terminology to describe both Christian and Jewish movements in a way which is particularly telling. This term for a sect or faction he applies to the Sadducees as they arrest the apostles (Acts 5:17). He applies it to Christian Pharisees who advocate Gentile converts be circumcised and keep the law of Moses (Acts 15:5). He applies it to Paul who, talking to his Jewish accusers, claims 'I have belonged to the strictest sect of our religion [τὴν

¹ Acts 4:25-7, interpreting Ps 2:1-2

ἀκριβεστάτην αἵρεσιν τῆς ἡμετέρας θρησκείας] and lived as a Pharisee' (Acts 26:5). This is the same term used by Josephus in referring to the Pharisees,² Sadducees³ and Essenes.⁴ Josephus presents them as a type of philosophical school, as the term had come to mean at his time of writing.⁵ This matches up with his desire to present Judaism as a credible movement in the Roman empire. Luke applies this to the Christian movement when Tertullus accuses Paul before the governor as 'ringleader of the sect of the Nazareans' (Acts 24:5). Paul in his defense speech refers to the movement as 'the way, which they call a *sect*' (24:14) before stressing his faithfulness to the Jewish tradition (24:14-18). Finally, the Jewish leaders in Rome also describe the Christian movement as a sect 'that everywhere... is spoken against' (28:22).

It is possible that Luke was influenced by Josephus here. Elsewhere in his work there is evidence that this may have been the case. Both refer to the census under Quirinius.⁶ Luke like Josephus singles out the same three figures as representative of resistance from the pre-war period.⁷ Luke also agrees in many specific minor details⁸ with the historian. If this is the case it would bolster the idea that he shares Josephus' model in presenting the Way as a Jewish philosophical school. Indeed, elsewhere in his work there is evidence that Luke presents Christianity in philosophical terms. His gospel preface, with reference to teaching transmitted [παραδίδωμι] from Jesus to his followers, and Luke's concern for 'certainty, assurance' [ἀσφάλεια], reflects concerns in Greco-Roman philosophy. So too for his critique of wealth, luxury and hypocrisy.⁹ However, even if Luke was not influenced by Josephus, the fact he describes the Christian movement with the very same terminology he uses earlier for Jewish sects should not be understated.

² *B.J.* 2.162; *A.J.* 13.288; *Vita* 12, 191

³ *A.J.* 13.293

⁴ *B.J.* 2.122, 137. He also uses the term to refer to all three collectively in *A.J.* 13.17; *Vita* 10.

⁵ Steve Mason, *Flavius Josephus: Volume 9, Life of Josephus: Translation and Commentary* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 15

⁶ Lk 2:1-3; *B.J.* 2:117-118

⁷ Specifically, Judas the Galilean (Acts 5:36-7; *A.J.* 20:102); Theudas (Acts 5:36-7; *A.J.* 20:97); and the Egyptian prophet (Acts 21:38; *A.J.* 20:171).

⁸ E.g. Famine in the reign of Claudius (Acts 11:28-9; *A.J.* 3:320; 20:51-53); and his reference to 'Lysanius, tetrarch of Abilene' (Lk 3:1; *B.J.* 2:215).

⁹ For these observations about Luke's possible use of Josephus I am indebted to Steve Mason, *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1992), 205-222

Of course, it might be pointed out that when Luke presents the Christian movement as a *αἵρεσις* he does so in the words of a non-Christian. There is one exception, when Paul refers to the way 'which *they* call a sect' (Acts 24:14). It might be suggested this implies a slight distancing between the Christian movement as a *αἵρεσις* and Jewish sects as *αἵρεσεις*. One might expect that if Luke really wanted to identify the Way as a Jewish sect, then he would surely make this statement more emphatic by a Christian in his narrative rather than a point made by Paul's opponents and only weakly assented to by Paul ('which they [rather than himself?] call a sect'). However, the opposite point can be made. Rather than weakening this attribution, the fact that Luke has both leading Jewish authorities in Rome (Acts 28:22), and a representative of Paul's opponents (24:5) claim the Christian movement is a *αἵρεσις* actually strengthens the idea that the Christian movement should be considered a sect within Judaism. It is one thing for a Christian to make this claim, but for leading figures of the Jewish world, even those hostile to the gospel, to do so, is to strongly argue for the place of Christianity in the Jewish world. That Paul does not make this claim for himself but points to Tertullus' own statement of the matter further makes this point. He does not need to argue for it: despite hostility the Jews themselves consider it part of early Judaism.

This terminology, then, strongly underlines the importance for Luke that the Christian movement be considered a sect within Judaism. But we can go even further than this. By deploying this *αἵρεσις* language within the very narrative context of an inter-Jewish debate, Luke even more strongly asserts the place of Christianity in the Jewish world. Or to put it differently: Luke most strongly identifies the Christian movement as a Jewish sect precisely where the identity of the Christian movement in Judaism is most contested. That Acts ends with such an apologetic point in Paul's trial speeches further indicates the importance of this point for Luke. On trial before a Jewish audience, here the relation of Christianity to Judaism particularly comes to the forefront. The pace of the narrative slows down; the point is laboured. Luke waits to the end of his work to deploy the language of the Jewish sect. The place of the

Christian movement within Judaism is one of the last things he wants to leave in the audience's mind.¹⁰

All of this is to demonstrate that it was evidently vital for Luke to demonstrate that the Way be understood as a certain form of Judaism. We cannot determine exactly why this was the case. However, it is doubtful that he would expend so much rhetorical energy in making this point if it were not of considerable concern to himself or his audience. This would seem to place Luke-Acts in a framework before a clear parting of the ways has taken place and in a context where the Christian movement continued to be embroiled in inter-Jewish debates. At least, this is the point I have sought to demonstrate throughout this project, and Luke's ἀρεσις neatly encapsulates it. With this *intra muros* image in mind, this thesis has therefore gone against a prevailing tendency to emphasise Luke is a Gentile advocating a departure from Judaism to Christianity, and that he writes for a predominantly Gentile audience. It is part of a growing chorus of voices stressing the 'Jewishness' of Luke-Acts and its homeliness in the thought world of early Judaism. To reach this conclusion I have compared Luke's work with three 'Jewish' texts (Romans 9-11, Revelation 12, 4Q174), two of which are also Christian. Few other studies showing Luke is engaged in *intra mural* Jewish debate include detailed discussion of contemporary Jewish texts. I have aimed to remedy this deficiency. These three texts, all by Jewish authors, each seek to answer the question 'who are the people of God'? All of them portray their respective communities as the faithful portion over against a broader majority of Jews who are the unfaithful portion of Israel. All of them use scripture extensively in order to make this point. In order to focus on the use of scripture to make an ecclesiological statement ('ecclesiological hermeneutics') I have considered a range of echoes, citations, and allusions in Luke's work in conjunction with these other texts.

¹⁰ We might go further and see an *inclusio* marked here with the beginning of the gospel, Lk 1-2, and the trial speeches at the end of Acts. Luke begins and ends his work by stressing the Jewishness of the Christian movement. (See my chapter three for the use of traditional Jewish language used to describe the Christian movement in Lk 1-2). This framework further highlights the Jewishness of the Way for Luke.

In chapter one I compared Luke's work with Romans 9-11. Paul, I suggested alongside the 'Paul within Judaism' school, writes as a committed Jew and also portrays the Christian community as deeply entrenched within Judaism. This matches Luke's portrayal of him in Acts and provides a useful starting point from which to consider his use of scripture in comparison with Luke's. Here the 'Paul of the epistles' and the 'Paul of Acts' show very close affinities with each other. It is possible that Luke used the epistles. Romans 9-11 especially show Paul's ecclesiological use of scripture to commend Christians as the faithful portion of Israel and to denounce unbelieving Jews as the unfaithful portion of Israel. Luke adopts a very similar approach. This comparison focused on citations of scripture in both works. Comparing Luke's use of Amos 9:11 (Acts 15:16-17) with Hosea 2:25, 2:1, Isa 1:9, 10:22 (Rom 9:25-9) showed that Paul uses the language of 'remnant' to refer to the Christian community. Luke lacks this terminology but this framework sheds much light on his own work and it is likely that he operates with this pattern in mind. Strikingly, both authors in these citations apply language originally applied to Jews to Gentiles in the context of the Gentile mission (Paul renders them as 'My People' and 'sons of the living God'; Luke as λαὸν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ). This seems to imply, against a parting of the ways, that they consider the Gentile mission to be an extension of Israel's boundaries. Intriguingly, both authors also cite Joel 3. This passage in its original context referred to the restoration of Israel. Both take the πᾶς here ('all who call on the name of the Lord', Joel 3:5 LXX) to speak of a universal salvation that now includes Gentiles as well. I also considered the ending of Romans 11:26-7 and Acts 28:26-7, where Isa 59:20, 27:9 and Isa 6:9 are cited respectively. This highlighted that Luke is more pessimistic on the future of unbelieving Jews than Paul. However, this does not indicate a parting of the ways in his work either, as Isa 6 he uses to demonstrate again a division within Israel. This is the first textual comparison that shows Luke is concerned with internal Jewish debates.

Chapter 2 compared Luke-Acts with Revelation 12. This is also a Jewish text by a Jewish Christian engaged in an *intra muros* Jewish debate. This was shown especially through John's reference to the 'synagogue of Satan' (Rev 2:9, 3:9) to denounce unbelieving Jews as diabolically motivated while commending believers as the

faithful portion of Israel. He also takes a Jewish-Christian position on the need to abstain from food offered to idols (2:14, 20). Here I focused on OT allusions in both works. Revelation 12 was an apt comparison here because it shows the most extended ecclesiological metaphor in the apocalypse (the woman Israel opposed by Satan and his agents). This especially shows how John portrays the church as the faithful portion of Israel engaged in cosmic conflict against Satan and his demonic entourage. This comparison added another angle to Luke's portrayal of church as true Israel by highlighting the apocalyptic features of his ecclesiology. This especially shows the value of comparing Luke-Acts with texts outside ancient historiography or biography and shows that Luke's work also takes on Jewish apocalyptic features even though it is not strictly an apocalypse, an element commonly overlooked in studies focusing on historiography in Luke-Acts. Luke draws on the same traditions about Satan and cosmic conflict as John. Luke uses these in a very similar manner to portray the church as the faithful portion of Israel opposed by the same figure who opposed Israel in the OT. In a similar manner to Revelation 2:9, 3:9, he especially uses these to show that Jewish opponents of the gospel are demonically inspired. This was seen through the use of the serpent tradition of Gen 3:15. John primarily applied this in his portrayal of Satan (Rev 12:9, 17) to the Roman empire. Luke applies it to unbelieving Jews in the context of Jewish mission (Lk 10:1-24). It was also seen in Luke's application of texts about Satan from Job, Zechariah and 1 Chronicles, which John also alludes to. Luke applies these in Lk 4:1-13 to suggest that the Jerusalem temple cult is under the sway of Satan. He applies it in the parable of the sower (Lk 8:12) to speak of the devil snatching the word from hearer's hearts in the context of an *intra muros* Jewish debate (mission to the Jews). He also applies it in Lk 22:31-4 to speak of the twelve disciples, who represent the true Israel, being opposed by Satan. Finally, both authors also draw on Isaiah 14:3-21 and Ezek 28:1-19 to speak of Satan's overthrow. John applied this to suggest he has been evicted from the divine council following Jesus' enthronement. This implies his loss of authority to accuse believers. Again Luke applies this tradition in the context of an *intra muros* Jewish debate. He applies Satan's fall to exorcisms in the disciples' mission to the Jews (Lk 10:17-20). This parallels the prediction of Capernaum's fall for rejecting the gospel. This link between demonic power and the fall of these Jewish villages also suggests these Jews

who reject the gospel are demonically motivated. This comparison adds another dimension not mentioned often in scholarship on his treatment of the Jews: those who oppose the gospel are in league with Satan. Again this does not indicate a parting of the ways in Luke's work, as John holds the same view yet argues from inside Judaism, and presenting the church as opposed by the same figure who opposes Israel in the OT, further commends it as the faithful Israel opposed by Satan. This is the second textual comparison that shows Luke occupies a perspective within Judaism.

The first two chapters compared Luke-Acts with early Jewish / Christian texts. The final one compared it with a Jewish text, 4Q174 (4QFlorilegium). This exposition of (mainly) 2 Sa 7:10-14, Amos 9:11 and Pss 1-2 also shed much light on Luke's use of scripture to argue from inside Judaism. This illuminated how Luke, like this text from the scrolls, uses a peshar-like hermeneutic of seeing the fulfillment of scripture in the present day. The Qumran community also saw itself as the faithful portion of Israel amidst a broader unfaithful majority, and the following scripture comparisons further suggest that Luke shared this framework. First, Luke and 4Q174 both draw on 2 Sa 7. This oracle promises to David a dynasty and a dwelling place for God (making a pun on the word בית, which evokes both senses). Both authors use this text to critique the idea of the Jerusalem temple cult. This has often been taken to indicate a parting of the ways on Luke's part. But the Qumran text distances itself from the temple and remains within Judaism, so Luke may well be doing the same here. Both authors also draw on 2 Sa 7 to portray a Davidic messiah who will restore Israel. Luke's pains to emphatically present Jesus in traditional Davidic terms also highlight his Jewish sympathies. Finally, both authors share a strikingly similar exegesis of Ps 2. This psalm speaks of the anointed king opposed by pagan rulers. Luke and 4Q174 apply this anointed figure to their community-at-large to suggest they corporately represent the faithful portion of Israel. They also, intriguingly, understand Jewish antagonists to be these pagan opponents to the anointed of Ps 2. This is a strong means of denouncing Jewish rivals. However, it does not indicate a parting of the ways in the Qumran text, so nor should any strong polemic against Jewish opponents indicate a parting in Luke's work either. Luke shares very similar exegetical moves, then, to this

Qumran text, in a manner that further suggests he portrays the Christian movement as a faithful sect within Israel, and against a parting of the ways in his work. This is the third text that shows how Luke presents Christianity as a Jewish school of thought.

The salient conclusions of this project are as follows. First of these concern *Luke's use of scripture*. I have considered citations, echoes and allusions in his work. I have shown that Luke shares the exegetical techniques of his Jewish contemporaries. He uses scripture within an ecclesiological framework to demarcate who the people of God are and to demonstrate that the church is the faithful portion of Israel. Luke, I demonstrated, frequently evokes the wider context of his OT text. This study has also moved beyond the narrow focus on Isaiah in previous studies of Luke's use of scripture to consider also texts from the minor prophets and the psalms. This highlights the diversity of his scripture knowledge and also how his application of these texts fits comfortably within a Jewish framework of interpretation, as exemplified by my comparison with other Jewish texts. This has shown the value of comparing Luke's use of scripture not in isolation but in dialogue with his contemporary interpreters to highlight the distinctives of his own approach.

From Luke's use of scripture we might deduce something, second, of *Luke's own Jewish sympathies*. He is deeply immersed in the world of scripture, imitating and alluding to the LXX at length throughout his work (as with Revelation). It is not possible to tell conclusively whether he was a Jew, a Gentile or a godfearer: he could have acquired this scriptural fluency after conversion. Moreover, scripture use itself is not a definitive marker of an author's position within Judaism, as many subsequent authors used scripture from a supersessionist perspective. However, contrary to a strand of scholarship which emphasises his detachment from Judaism, Luke's similarities to the Jewish texts considered in this project are significant. Like these texts, and against the idea he has a supersessionist perspective, he uses scripture to advocate a division within Israel rather than its replacement. Like these texts he affirms continuity with Israel's traditions rather than its rupture. In many cases he uses the very same OT texts as these Jewish texts in an almost identical way to stress

the Christian movement is the faithful portion of Israel. For example, as was seen, he applies the 'anointed' figure of Ps 2 to the whole community to vindicate it as the true Israel, while interpreting its Jewish opponents as the pagan enemies of Ps 2, just like 4Q174 1.18-19 (cf. Acts 4:23-31). And, again, he also sees in Joel 3:5 LXX the prediction of a restored Israel calling 'on the name of the Lord' which corresponds to the present believing community (Acts 2:21), just like Paul in Rom 10:13. The fact that Luke interprets scripture within such a Jewish framework, sharing so many of the exegetical and ecclesiological assumptions as these Jewish texts, points further in the direction of his 'Jewish-ness' than is often emphasised. From Luke's use of scripture we might also conjecture something about *Luke's audience*. There seems little reason for him to have made such great efforts to allude to and imitate the OT if these subtleties would be lost on his readers. This implies that many of them would also have been deeply conversant with the scriptures in a manner we might also expect of a godfearing or, especially, Jewish audience. Moreover, his use of scripture to show how the church upholds Jewish conventions (the Davidic kingdom; a Davidic Messiah; true temple worship; and the restoration of Israel) also suggests a major concern on his part to speak into Jewish concerns and debates. This, in conjunction with his apologetic portrayal of the Jewish Paul, his conservative portrayal of the law, and his description of the Christian movement as a ἀρεσις suggests a sizeable or at least influential Jewish contingent amongst his hearers.

From this again we might make another point, third, about the *genre of Luke-Acts*. I see no reason to question the view that this is a work of ancient historiography or biography. However, the comparative nature of this project has also highlighted how Luke's work spills out into many secondary genre features not often mentioned in studies of his genre. Accordingly, Luke's work contains exegetical features not unlike the Pauline epistles. It also has many apocalyptic elements. It also has features similar to the *pesher* hermeneutic of 4Q174. This, then, is a call to consider Luke-Acts more in conversation with texts outside its commonly designated genre labels. The above texts have also all been Jewish. The features Luke-Acts has in common with these also suggests that his work should be considered more Jewish than has often been considered in genre studies. We might situate it beyond these in the same league as

texts such as the gospel of Matthew and the Didache, in saying that Luke-Acts is a 'Jewish text'.

Where, then, might we locate Luke-Acts in the development of early Christianity? I have strongly argued that Luke presents the Christian movement inside Judaism. Against a previous majority view, he does not commend or document a parting of the ways between Judaism and Christianity, and is far more Jewish than commonly designated. At the same time, however, his work may also contain seeds of a future *Adversus Ioudaios* tradition which could be later developed in 2nd century texts like the Epistle of Barnabas and Justin Martyr's 'Dialogue with Trypho the Jew'. This can be seen, for example, in Luke's ending compared with Paul's. While Paul holds out explicit hope for the restoration of unbelieving Jews, Luke ends with Isa 6 on a more negative note (Acts 28:25-7). We may not go so far as Tannehill in labelling Luke-Acts as a 'tragic' text where unbelieving Jews are concerned. However, we might certainly label it an 'ambiguous' one on the topic of their future restoration, and while not the same as hostility or negativity, one can see how this could develop eventually into a more negative take on what Luke considers to be the unfaithful portion of Israel. The same could be said for Luke's recurrent portrayal of Jewish persecution and rejection¹¹.

This research might be taken further as follows. More comparison could be made with a wider selection of Jewish texts than I have considered here. This project has made the case that Luke's use of scripture has much in common with that of other Jewish texts addressing Jewish concerns with a Jewish scriptural hermeneutic. This corrects a deficit of comparison between Luke-Acts and Jewish texts where the New Testament use of the Old is concerned, and considering other Jewish texts would further develop this important area. At the same time profitable comparison might also be made with later Christian texts which do use scripture extensively while advocating a parting of the ways, like the letters of Ignatius or the Epistle of Barnabas. There is also more scope for comparison between Luke-Acts and texts outside

¹¹ E.g. Acts 8:1-3, 9:23-5, 12:1-17, 14:19-20, 17:5-9, 18:12-16

ancient historiography or biography, particularly apocalyptic texts. This would all shed more light on Luke's own hermeneutical strategy and would further bridge the gap between the study of Luke's use of scripture and the historical question of his position in the development of early Christianity.

Bibliography

Ackroyd, Peter, *The Second Book of Samuel*, CBC (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977)

Adams, Sean, *The Genre of Acts and Collected Biography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013)

----- *Greek Genres and Jewish Authors: Negotiating Literary Culture in the Greco-Roman Era?* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2020)

----- and Pahl, Michael (eds.), *Issues in Luke-Acts: Selected Essays* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012)

Alexander, Loveday, *Acts in Its Ancient Literary Context: A Classicist Looks at the Acts of the Apostles* (London: Bloomsbury, 2007)

Allegro, John M., 'Fragments of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim', *JBL* (1958), 350-4

Allen, David, *Lukan Authorship of Hebrews* (Nashville: B&H, 2010)

Andersen, Francis I., and Freedman, David Noel, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (London: Doubleday, 1989)

Aune, David, *Revelation 1-5*, WBC 52A (Dallas: Word Books, 1997)

----- *Revelation 6-16*, WBC 52B (Nashville, Nelson, 1998)

----- *The New Testament in its Literary Environment* (Cambridge: James Clark, 1987)

Barclay, John, *Paul and the Gift* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2017)

Barrett, C.K., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, ICC, Vol 1 (Edinburgh : T&T Clark, 1994-8)

Bauckham, Richard, 'The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why?' in Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Jewish World Around the New Testament* (Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 175-192

----- 'The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts' in James Scott (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish and Christian Perspectives* (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 435-489

- *Climax of Prophecy* (London: Bloomsbury, 2000)
- 'The Parting of the Ways: What Happened and Why', *ST 47* (1993), 135-148
- (ed.), *The Gospels for All Christians: Rethinking the Gospel Audiences* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998)
- 'James and the Jerusalem Church' in *Acts in its Palestinian Setting Vol 4* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1995), 453-455
- Beale, G.K. and Carson, D.A., (eds.), *Commentary on the New Testament use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007)
- *John's Use of the Old Testament in Revelation* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2015)
- *The Temple and the Church's Mission: A Biblical Theology of the Dwelling Place of God* (Leicester: Apollos, 2004)
- Beasley-Murray, G.R., *Revelation* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974)
- Beers, Holly, *The Followers of Jesus as the 'Servant': Luke's Model from Isaiah for the Disciples in Luke-Acts* (London: Bloomsbury, 2015)
- Bergsma, John, "Qumran Self-Identity", *DSD 15* (2008), 172-189
- Bird, Michael, 'The Letter to the Romans' in Mark Harding, Alanna Nobbs (eds.), *All Things to All Cultures* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2013), 177-204
- 'An Introduction to the Paul within Judaism Debate' in Michael Bird, Ruben A. Bühner, Jörg Frey, and Brian Rosner (eds.), *Paul within Judaism: Perspectives on Paul and Jewish Identity* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2023), 1-28
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph, *Isaiah 1-39: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB (London: Doubleday, 2000)
- Blount, Brian, *Revelation: A Commentary* (Louisville: Presbyterian Publishing, 2013)
- Bock, Darrell, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern : Lucan Old Testament Christology* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987)
- *Luke* (Leicester: InterVarsity Press, 2010)
- *Acts*, BECNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007)

Bonz, Marianne Palmer, 'Luke's Revision of Paul's Reflections in Romans 9-11' in David H. Warren, Ann Graham Brock, David Pao (eds.), *Early Christian Voices* (Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, 2003), 143-151

Böttrich, Christfried, 'Das lukanische Doppelwerk im Kontext frühjüdischer Literatur', *ZNW* 106 (2015), 151-183

Bovon, Francois, *Luke the Theologian Fifty-Five Years of Research (1950-2005)* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006)

Boxall, Ian, *The Revelation of Saint John* (London: Continuum, 2006)

Boyarin, Daniel, *Border Lines: The Partition of Judaeo-Christianity* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006)

----- *Jewish Gospels* (New York: New Press, 2012)

Brawley, Robert, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 1995)

----- 'Ethical Borderlines Between Rejection and Hope: Interpreting the Jews in Luke-Acts', *CurTM* 6 (2000), 415-23

Brooke, George, *Exegesis at Qumran: 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985)

Brown, Raymond, *The Birth of the Messiah* (London: Chapman, 1993)

Brownlee, William, *Midrash Peshar of Habakkuk* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1979)

----- 'Messianic Motifs of Qumran and the New Testament', *NTS* 3 (1956-57), 195-210

Bruce, F.F., *The Book of Acts*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1988)

Brueggemann, Walter, *First and Second Samuel* (Louisville, KY: John Knox Press, 1990)

Burridge, Richard, 'The Genre of Acts -- Revisited' in Loveday Alexander, Steve Walton (eds.), *Reading Acts Today: Essays in Honour of Loveday C.A. Alexander* (New York: T&T Clark, 2011), 3-28

Caird, George, *A Commentary on the Revelation of St. John the Divine*, BECNT (London: Black, 1966)

Campbell, Jonathan, *The Exegetical Texts* (London: T & T Clark, 2004)

Carroll, John T., 'The Uses of Scripture in Luke-Acts' in *SBL 1990 Seminar Papers* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1990), 513-54

Carson, Donald; O'Brien, Peter and Seifrid, Mark, (eds.), *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol 1*, (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2001)

----- *Justification and Variegated Nomism, Vol 2* (Grand Rapids, Baker Academic, 2004)

Chance, Bradley, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988)

Collins, John, *The Scepter and the Star* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2010)

Collins, Adela Yarbro, 'Introduction: Early Christian Apocalypticism' in Collins, Adela Yarbro, *Early Christian Apocalypticism: Genre and Social Setting* (Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1986), 1-12

----- 'Vindication and Self-Definition in The Book of Revelation', *HTR* 79 (1986), 308-20

Conzelmann, Hans, *The Theology of St Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982)

----- *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987)

Cook, Michael, 'The Mission to the Jews in Luke-Acts: Unravelling Luke's "Myth of the Myriads"' in Joseph Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish people: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 102-23

Crabbe, Kylie, *Luke-Acts and the End of History* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2019)

----- 'Character and Conflict: Who Parts Company in Acts' in Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall, Joseph Verheyden (eds.), *Jews and Christians - Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?: Reflections on the Gains and Losses of a Model* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 151-183

Craigie, Peter, *Psalms 1-50*, WBC 19 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1983)

Cranfield, C.E.B., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, ICC, Vol 2 (London; New York: T&T Clark International, 2004)

Dahood, Mitchell, *Psalms 1-50*, AYB (New York: Doubleday, 1965)

Deasley, Alex, *The Shape of Qumran Theology* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 2000)

DeClaissé-Walford, Nancy L., Rolf A. Jacobson and Beth LaNeel Tanner, *The Book of Psalms*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2014)

De Longe, Kindalee Pfremmer, 'Angels and Visions in Luke-Acts' in Benjamin E. Reynolds and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, *The Jewish Apocalyptic Tradition and the Shaping of New Testament Thought* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2017), 79-107

Denova, Rebecca, *The Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1997)

DiTommaso, Lorenzo, 'Apocalypses and Apocalypticism in Antiquity', *CBR* 5 (2007), 238-243

Doble, Peter, 'The Psalms in Luke-Acts' in Moyise and Menken (eds.), *The Psalms in the New Testament* (London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 83-118

Dochhorn, Jan, *Schriftgelehrte Prophetie: Der eschatologische Teufelsfall in Apc Joh 12 und seine Bedeutung für das Verständnis der Johannesoffenbarung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010)

Dodd, C.H., *According to the Scriptures: The Sub-Structure of New Testament Theology* (London: Nisbet, 1952)

Donaldson, Terence, 'Paul within Judaism: A Critical Evaluation from a "New Perspective" Perspective' in Mark Nanos and Marcus Zetterholm (eds.), *Paul Within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 277-302

Draper, Jonathan, 'The Heavenly Feast of Tabernacles: Revelation 7:1-17', *JSNT* 19 (1983), 133-147

Dunn, James, *Romans 9-16*, WBC 38B (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1998)

----- *The Partings of the Ways*, 2nd ed., (London: SCM, 2006)

----- *The Partings of the Ways: Between Christianity and Judaism and their Significance for the Character of Christianity* (London: SCM, 2006)

----- *Acts* (Peterborough: Epworth, 1996)

Dupont, Jacques, 'The Apologetic Use of the OT in the Speeches of Acts' in *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (trans. John R. Keating: New York: Paulist, 1979), 129-159

Eastman, Susan, 'Israel and the Mercy of God', *NTS* 56 (2010), 367-395

Ehrensperger, Kathy, 'Die Paul within Judaism Perspektive', *EvT* 80 (2020), 456-7

Eidevall, Göran, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017)

Eisenbaum, Pamela, *Paul was not a Christian* (New York: Harper One, 2010)

Ellis, Earl, *The Gospel of Luke* (London: Nelson, 1996)

Engberg-Pedersen, Troels, *Paul on Identity: Theology as Politics* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2021)

Evans, Craig, 'Prophecy and Polemic: Jews in Luke's Scriptural Apologetic' in Craig Evans (ed.), *Luke and Scripture* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1993), 171-211

----- *To See and Not Perceive: Isaiah 6.9-10 in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretation* (London: Bloomsbury, 2009)

Fanning, Buist, *Revelation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2020)

Fekkes, Jan, *Isaiah and Prophetic Traditions in the Book of Revelation: Visionary Antecedents and Their Development* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994)

Fitzmyer, Joseph, *The Gospel according to Luke I-IX*, AYB 28 (London: Doubleday, 2006)

----- *The Gospel According to Luke X-XXIV* AYB 28 (London: Doubleday, 2007)

----- *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998)

Foster, Paul, 'An Apostle Too Radical for the Radical Perspective on Paul', *Expository Times*, 133 (2021), 1-11

Fox, Nikolas, *The Hermeneutics of Social Identity in Luke-Acts* (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2021)

Frankfurter, David, 'The Legacy of the Jewish Apocalypse in Early Christian Communities: Two Regional Trajectories' in James VanderKam and William Adler (eds.), *The Jewish Apocalyptic Heritage in Early Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 129-200

----- 'Jews or Not? Reconstructing the 'Other' in Rev 2:9 and 3:9', *HTR* 94:4 (2001), 403-425

----- ' Beyond "Jewish Christianity": Continuing Religious Sub-Cultures of the Second and Third Centuries and Their Documents ' in Adam Becker and Annette

Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *The Ways That Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007)

Franklin, Eric, *Christ the Lord: A Study in the Purpose and Theology of Luke-Acts* (London: SPCK, 1975)

Fredriksen, Paula, *Paul: The Pagan's Apostle* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017)

----- *When Christians were Jews: The First Generation* (Yale: Yale University Press, 2018)

----- 'What Does It Mean to See Paul "within Judaism"?' *JBL* 141 (2022), 359-380

----- 'What "Parting of the Ways"? Jews, Gentiles, and the Ancient Mediterranean City' in Adam Becker, Annette Yoshiko Reed, *The Ways that Never Parted* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 35-65

Fuller, Michael, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006)

Fusco, Vittorio, 'Luke-Acts and the Future of Israel', *NovT* (1996), 1-17

Gabrielson, Timothy, 'Parting Ways or Rival Siblings? A Review and Analysis of Metaphors for the Separation of Jews and Christians in Antiquity', *CBR* 19 (2021), 179-196

Gärtner, Bertil, *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1965)

Gaventa, Beverly, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2003)

Glenny, Edward, 'The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Acts 15', *BBR* 22 (2012), 1-26

Green, Joel, *The Gospel of Luke*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997)

Gregory, Andrew and C. Kavin Rowe, eds., *Rethinking the Unity and Reception of Luke and Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2010)

Haenchen, Ernst, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1966)

----- 'The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity', in L.E. Keck and J.L. Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 258-278.

Hagner, Donald, *How New is the NT? First-Century Judaism and the Emergence of Christianity* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018)

Hakola, Raimo, 'Anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism in the NT and its Interpretation' in *The Oxford Encyclopedia* (New York: Oxford University Press: 2013), 27-35

Harrington, Wilfrid, *Revelation*, SP (Collegeville, MT: Liturgical Press, 1993)

Hartog, Pieter, 'Noah and Moses in Acts 15: Group Models and the Novelty of the Way', *NTS* 67 (2021), 496-513

Hays, Richard, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (Yale: Yale University Press, 1993)

----- *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014)

----- *Echoes of Scripture in the Gospels* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2018)

Hedlun, Randy, 'Rethinking Luke's Purpose: The Effect of First-Century Social Conflict' in *JPT* 22 (2013), 226-256

Heijer, Arco den, *Portraits of Paul's Performance in the Book of Acts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2021)

Holladay, Carl, *Acts: A Commentary*, NTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 2016)

Horrell, David, *Ethnicity and Inclusion: Religion, Race, and Whiteness in Constructions of Jewish and Christian Identities* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2020)

Hurtado, Larry, 'Christology in Acts' in Sean A. Adams, Michael Pahl (eds.), *Issues in Luke-Acts* (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2012), 217-237

Hvalvik, Reidar, 'A 'Sonderweg' for Israel: A Critical Examination of a Current Interpretation of Romans 11.25-27', *JSNT* 38 (1990), 87-107

Hyuk-Kim, Dong, 'Free Orthography in a Strict Society: Reconsidering Tov's "Qumran Orthography" ', *DSD* (2004), 72-81

Jacobs, Andrew, 'The Lion and the Lamb: Reconsidering Jewish-Christian Relations in Antiquity' in Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 95-119

Japhet, Sara, *I and II Chronicles: A Commentary*, OTL (Westminster, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1997)

Jennings, William, *Acts* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 2017)

Jeremias, Jorg, *The Book of Amos: A Commentary*, OTL (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox, 1998)

Jervell, Jacob, 'The Twelve on Israel's Thrones: Luke's Understanding of the Apostolate' in Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 75–112

----- *The Unknown Paul: Essays on Luke-Acts and Early Christian History* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1984)

----- *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006)

----- *Luke and the People of God* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972)

----- *Die Apostelgeschichte* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1998)

Jewett, Robert, *Romans*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007)

Jipp, Joshua, 'The Paul of Acts: Proclaimer of the Hope of Israel or Teacher of Apostasy from Moses?', *NovT* 62 (2020), 60-78

Johnson, Luke Timothy, *The Acts of the Apostles*, SP (Collegeville, PA: Liturgical Press, 1992)

Kalms, Jürgen, *Der Sturz des Gottesfeindes Traditionsgeschichtliche Studien zu Apokalypse 12* (WMANT 93; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2001)

Kampen, John, *Matthew within Sectarian Judaism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2019)

Käsemann, Ernst, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1980)

Keener, Craig, *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2012-2015)

Kinzer, Mark, *Jerusalem Crucified, Jerusalem Risen* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2018)

Knibb, Michael, *The Qumran Community* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987)

----- 'Apocalypticism and Messianism' in *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 403-433

Koester, Craig, *Revelation: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AYB 38A (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014)

Koet, Bart, *Five Studies on the Interpretation of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Leuven: Peeters, 1989)

----- 'Isaiah in Luke-Acts' in Steve Moyise and Maarten J.J. Menken, *Isaiah in the New Testament* (New York: T & T Clark, 2005), 79-100

Konradt, Matthias (ed.), *Israel, Church, and the Gentiles in the Gospel of Matthew* (Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2014)

Korner, Ralph and Aune, David, (eds.), *Reading Revelation After Supersessionism: An Apocalyptic Journey of Socially Identifying John's Multi-Ethnic Ekklesiāi with the Ekklesiā of Israel* (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2020)

Kovacs, Judith, and Rowland, Christopher (eds.), *Revelation*, EpC (Malden: Blackwell, 2004)

Kraus, Hans-Joachim, *Psalms 1-59: A Commentary*, ContC (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988)

Krodel, Gerhard, *Revelation*, ACNT (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989)

Kujanpää, Kata, *The Rhetorical Functions of Scriptural Quotations in Romans* (Boston: Brill, 2019)

Levine, Amy, 'Luke and the Jewish Religion', *Int* 68 (2014),

Lieu, Judith, *Neither Jew nor Greek* (T&T Clark: Edinburgh, 2015)

Lim, Timothy, 'Authoritative Scriptures and the Dead Sea Scrolls' in Timothy Lim and John Collins, *The Oxford Companion to the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010), 303-322

----- *Pesharim* (Sheffield: Academic Press, 2022)

----- *Holy Scripture in the Qumran Commentaries and Pauline Letters* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1997)

Litwak, Kenneth, 'One or Two Views of Judaism: Paul in Acts 28 and Romans 11 on Jewish Unbelief', *TynBul* 57 (2006), 229-49

----- *Echoes of Scripture in Luke–Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (New York: T. & T. Clark, 2005)

----- 'The Use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts: Luke's Scriptural Story of the "Things Accomplished among Us' in Sean A. Adams and Michael Pahl (eds.), *Issues in Luke-Acts* (Piscataway: Gorgias, 2010), 147-170

Lohfink, Gerhard, *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur Lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (München: Kösel, 1975)

Longenecker, Richard, *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2016)

Maddox, Robert, *The Purpose of Luke-Acts* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1982)

Malina, Bruce and Pilch, John, *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Revelation* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2000)

Mallen, Peter, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2007)

Marguerat, Daniel, *The First Christian Historian: Writing the 'Acts of the Apostles'* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002)

Marshall, John, *Parables of War: Reading John's Jewish Apocalypse* (Ontario: Wilfried Laurier, 2001)

Marshall, Howard, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970)

----- 'Acts' in D.A. Carson (ed.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 513-607

----- *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, 1978)

----- 'Acts' in D.A. Carson (ed.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Baker Academic, 2007), 516-7

Martínez, Florentino García, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A Study Edition* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997-8)

Mason, Steve, 'Interpretation Of Psalm 2 In 4QFlorilegium And In The New Testament', in Florentino García Martínez, *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament* (Boston, Brill, 2009), 83-102

----- *Josephus and the New Testament* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1992)

----- 'Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History', *JSJ* 38 (2007), 457-512

Matthews, Shelly, *Perfect Martyr: The Stoning of Stephen and the Construction of Christian Identity* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010)

McCarthur, Kyle, *2 Samuel*, AYB 27 (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1984)

McDonald, Denys, 'Ex-Pagan Pagans?' Paul, Philo, and Gentile Ethnic Reconfiguration', *JSNT* 45 (2022), 23-50

Meek, James, *The Gentile Mission in Old Testament Citations in Acts* (London: T&T Clark, 2009)

Metzger, Bruce, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (London: United Bible Societies, 1975)

Milgrom, Jacob, 'Florilegium: A Midrash on 2 Samuel and Psalms 1–2 (4Q174 = 4QFlor)' in James Charlesworth, *The Dead Sea Scrolls. Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations. Volume 6b: Pesharim and Related Documents* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 248-263

Moessner, David, *Luke the Historian of Israel's Legacy, Theologian of Israel's Christ* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006)

Moo, Douglas, *The Letter to the Romans*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2018)

Moore, Nicholas, 'He Saw Heaven Opened': Heavenly Temple and Universal Mission in Luke-Acts', *NTS* 68 (2022), 43-45

Mounce, Robert, *The Book of Revelation*, NICNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1997)

Mowvley, Harry, *The Books of Amos and Hosea*, EpC (London: Epworth, 1991)

Nanos, Mark and Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *Paul within Judaism: Restoring the First-Century Context to the Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005)

Novenson, Matthew, 'Did Paul Abandon either Judaism or Monotheism?' in Bruce Longenecker (ed.), *The New Cambridge Companion to St. Paul* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 239-259

----- *Paul, Then and Now* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2022)

Oliver, Isaac, *Luke's Jewish Eschatology: The National Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2021)

----- *Torah Praxis after 70 CE: Reading Matthew and Luke-Acts as Jewish Texts* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013)

----- 'The "Historical Paul" and the Paul of Acts' in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Paul the Jew* (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 2016), 51-80

Oswalt, John, *The Book of Isaiah*, NICOT (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998)

O'Toole, Robert F., 'The Christian Mission and the Jews at the End of Acts of the Apostles' in J.L. Ska and J.N. Aletti (eds.), *Biblical Exegesis in Progress: Old and New Testament Essays* (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico), 371-396

Pao, David, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2002)

----- Eckhard Schnabel, 'Luke' in G.K. Beale, D.A. Carson (ed.), *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 513-607

Parsons, Mikeal, *Acts*, PCNT (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2008)

----- and Richard I. Pervo, *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993)

Paulien, Jon, 'Criteria and the Assessment of Allusions to the Old Testament in the Book of Revelation' in Steve Moyise (ed.) *Studies in the Book of Revelation* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001)

Penner, Todd, *In Praise of Christian Origins: Stephen and the Hellenists in Lukan Apologetic Historiography* (New York: T & T Clark International, 2004)

----- 'Madness in the Method? The Acts of the Apostles in Current Study', *CBR 2* (2004), 223-93

Pervo, Richard, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apologists* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge Press, 2006)

----- *Acts: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2008)

Peterson, David, *Acts* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2009)

Pitts, Andrew, *History, Biography, and the Genre of Luke-Acts: An Exploration of Literary Divergence in Greek Narrative Discourse* (Leiden: Brill, 2019)

Porter, Stanley, 'The Messiah in Luke and Acts: Forgiveness for the Captives' in Stanley E. Porter (ed.), *The Messiah in the Old and New Testaments* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2007), 144-164

- *Paul in Acts* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 2001)
- Ravens, David, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (London: Bloomsbury, 1996)
- Reddish, Mitchell, *Revelation* (Macon GA: Smyth & Helwys, 2001)
- Reed, Annette Yoshiko, Adam Becker (eds.), 'Introduction', in Adam Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed (eds.), *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2007), 1-34
- "Jewish Christianity" After the "Parting of the Ways" in *Ways that Never Parted*, 189-233
- Roberts, J.M., *First Isaiah: A Commentary*, Hermeneia (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015)
- Rosner, Brian, 'Acts and Biblical History' in *The Book of Acts in its Ancient Literary Setting* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1993), 65-82
- Rowe, Kavin, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012).
- *World Upside Down: Reading Luke-Acts in the Graeco Roman Age* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Rowland, Christopher, *Revelation*, EpC (London: Epworth, 1993)
- Runesson, Anders, 'Matthean Community History as Pharisaic Intergroup Conflict' in *JBL* 127:1 (2008), 95-113
- *Matthew within Judaism: Israel and the Nations in the First Gospel* (Atlanta, GA; SBL, 2020)
- Ruzer, Serge, 'Who is Unhappy with the Davidic Messiah? Notes on Biblical Exegesis in 4Q161, 4Q174, and the Book of Acts', *CNS* 24 (2003), 229-255
- Salmon, Marilyn, 'Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism' in Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 76-82
- Sanders, E.P., *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977)
- *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985)
- *Judaism: Practice and Belief, 63 BCE - 66 CE* (London: SCM, 1992)

Sanders, Jack T., 'The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts' in C.H. Talbert (ed.), *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* (New York: Crossroad, 1984), 104-28

----- *The Jews in Luke-Acts* (London: SCM, 1987)

Schaefer, Christoph, *Die Zukunft Israels bei Lukas* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012)

Schiffman, Lawrence H., 'Pesharim' in *New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Vol 4* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006), 459-461

Schnelle, Udo, *The First One Hundred Years of Christianity* (Grand Rapid, MI: Baker Academic, 2020)

Schreiber, Stefan, 'Die Sternenfrau und ihre Kinder (Offb 12): Zur Wiederentdeckung eines Mythos', *NTS* 53 (2007), 436-457

Schreiner, Tom, *Romans, BECNT* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2018)

----- *Revelation* (Ada, MI: Baker, 2023)

Schröter, Jens, 'Was Paul a Jew Within Judaism? The Apostle to the Gentiles and His Communities in Their Historical Context' in Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall and Joseph Verheyden, *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021)

----- 'Introduction' in Matthias Konradt, Judith Lieu, Laura Nasrallah, Jens Schröter, and Gregory E. Sterling (eds.), *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2021), 5

Schwartz, Daniel R., 'Three Temples in 4Q Florilegium', *RevQ* 10 (1979-81), 83-91

Schwartz, Seth, *Imperialism and Jewish Society* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009)

Seccombe, David, 'The New People of God' in *Witness to the Gospel*, (ed). I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998), 349-72

Sherwood, Aaron, *Romans: A Structural, Thematic, and Exegetical Commentary* (Bellingham, WA: Lexham, 2020)

Smith, Daniel and Zachary Kostopoulos, 'Biography, History and the Genre of Luke-Acts', *NTS* 63 (2017), 390-410

Smith, David, 'The Jewishness of Luke–Acts: Locating Lukan Christianity Amidst the Parting of The Ways', *JTS* 72 (2021), 738-768

Smith, Mitzi, *The Literary Construction of the Other in the Acts of the Apostles: Charismatics, the Jews, and Women* (Cambridge: James Clarke & Co, 2012)

Smith, Steve, *The Fate of the Jerusalem Temple in Luke-Acts* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2017)

Stendahl, Krister, 'The Apostle Paul and the Introspective Conscience of the West', *HTR* 56 (1963), 199-215

Sterling, Gregory, *Shaping the Past to Define the Present: Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2023)

Studel, Annette, '4QMidrEschat: 'A Midrash on Eschatology' (4Q174 + 4Q177' in J. Trebelle Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner, *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-22 March 1991* vol 2 (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 531-541

----- 'אחרית הימים' in the Texts from Qumran', *RevQ* 16 (1994), 225-247

Strauss, Mark, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)

----- *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)

Steyn, Gert J., 'Observations on the Text Form of the Minor Prophet Quotations in Romans 9-11', *JSNT* 38 (2015), 49-67

Stroup, Christopher, *The Christians who became Jews: Acts of the Apostles and Ethnicity in the Roman City* (London: Yale University Press, 2020)

Stuart, Douglas, *Hosea-Jonah*, WBC 31 (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1987)

Sweeney, Marvin A., Cotter, David W. (eds.), *The Twelve Prophets vol 1* (Collegeville, MPLS: Liturgical Press, 2000)

Talbert, Charles, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes, and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1974)

Talmon, Shemeryan, 'The Identity of the Community' in Ulrich, Eugene and Vanderkam, James (eds.), *The Community of the Renewed Covenant* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 3-26

Tannehill, Robert, 'Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story', *JBL* 104, 69-85

----- *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation Vol 2* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990)

Tellbe, Mikael, 'Relationships among Christ-Believers and Jewish Communities in 1st century Asia Minor' in Craig Koester (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the Book of Revelation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2020), 154-168

Thiessen, Matthew, *Paul and the Gentile Problem* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2016)

----- *A Jewish Paul: The Messiah's Herald to the Gentiles* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2023)

Thompson, Leonard, *The Book of Revelation: Apocalypse and Empire* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990)

Thomas, Robert, *Revelation 1-7: An Exegetical Commentary*, WEC (Chicago: Moody Press, 1995)

Tiede, David, *Prophecy and History in Luke-Acts* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980)

Trebilco, Paul, 'Beyond the 'Parting of the Ways' between Jews and Christians in Asia Minor to a Model of Variegated Interaction' in Jens Schröter, Benjamin A. Edsall and Joseph Verheyden (eds.), *Jews and Christians – Parting Ways in the First Two Centuries CE?* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2021), 273-306

----- 'The Jewish Community in Ephesus and Its Interaction with Christ-Believers in the First Century CE and Beyond' in James Harrison (ed.), *The First Urban Churches 3: Ephesus* (Atlanta, GA: SBL Press, 2018), 93-126

Troftgruben, T.M., *A Conclusion Unhindered: A Study of the Ending of Acts Within Its Literary Environment* (Tübingen: Mohr-Siebeck, 2010)

Turner, Max, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996)

Tyson, Joseph B., *Marcion and Luke-Acts: A Defining Struggle* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2006)

----- 'The Problem of Jewish Rejection in Acts' in Joseph Tyson (ed.), *Luke-Acts and the Jewish people: Eight Critical Perspectives* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988), 124-137

----- *Luke, Judaism, and the Scholars: Critical Approaches to Luke-Acts* (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1999)

----- 'Jews and Judaism in Luke–Acts: Reading as a Godfearer', *NTS* 41 (1995), 19-38

----- 'Acts, the "Parting of the Ways" and the Use of the Term "Christians"', in Kalimi, Isaac (ed.), *Bridging between Sister Religions* (Leiden: Brill, 2016), 128-140

Van der Sandt, 'The Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts' in Marten J.J. Menken and Steve Moyise (eds.), *The Minor Prophets in the New Testament* (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 57-78

Vanderkam, James, 'Der Midrasch zur Eschatologie aus der Qumrangemeinde (4QMidrEschat): Materielle Rekonstruktion, Textbestand, gattung und traditions-geschichtliche Einordnung des Durch 4Q174 ("Florilegium") und 4Q177 ("Catena A") repräsentierten Werkes aus den Qumranfunden' in *CBQ* 57 (1995), 576-577

Vermes, Geza, *An Introduction to the Complete Dead Sea Scrolls* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1999)

----- *Jesus the Jew* (London: SCM, 2001)

Vielhauer, Philip, 'On the "Paulinism" of Acts' in L. Keck and J.L. Martyn (eds.), *Studies in Luke-Acts* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1966), 33-50

Wagner, Ross, *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans* (Leiden: Brill, 2002)

Wall, Robert, 'Israel and the Gentile Mission in Acts and Paul: A Canonical Approach' in Marshall, Peterson (eds.), *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 437-458

Walters, Patricia, *The Assumed Authorial Unity of Luke and Acts: A Reassessment of the Evidence*, *SNTSMS 145* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Watson, Francis, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith*, 2nd ed. (London: T&T Clark, 2016)

----- *Paul, Judaism and the Gentiles: A Sociological Approach* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009)

Watts, John, *Isaiah 1-33*, WBC 24 (Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, 2005)

Wedderburn, Alexander, *The Reasons for Romans* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1988)

Wendel, Susan, *Scriptural interpretation and Community Self-definition in Luke-Acts and the Writings of Justin Martyr* (Boston: Brill, 2011)

Westerholm, Stephen, *Perspectives Old and New on Paul: The "Lutheran" Paul and His Critics* (Grand Rapids, MI.: Eerdmans, 2004)

White, Aaron, *All the Prophets Agree* (Boston: Brill, 2020)

Witherington, Ben, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1998)

Wolff, Hans Walter, *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977)

----- *Hosea: A Commentary on the Book of the Prophet*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1974)

Wolter, Michael, *Luke* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2021)

Wright, N.T., *Paul and the Faithfulness of God* (London: SPCK, 2013)

----- *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993)

----- 'Romans' in *The New Interpreter's Bible Vol 10* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 2002), 393-770

----- *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 2001)

----- *What Saint Paul Really Said* (Oxford: Lion, 1997)

----- 'The Letter to the Romans', *New Interpreter's Bible Commentary* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 393-770

Zetterholm, Karin, 'The Question of Assumptions: Torah Observance in the First Century' in Mark Nanos, Magnus Zetterholm (eds.), *Paul within Judaism* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015), 79-103

Zetterholm, Magnus, *The Formation of Christianity in Antioch: A Social-Scientific Approach to the Separation between Judaism and Christianity* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2003)

Zoccali, Christopher, 'And so All Israel Will be Saved: Competing Interpretations of Romans 11.26 in Pauline Scholarship', *JSNT* 303 (2008), 289-318