

“I will give you the holy and sure blessings promised to David”

A Comparison of Messianic Elements in the Inauguration  
Speeches of Jesus, Peter and Paul in Luke–Acts

Andreas Abrahamsson

*Termin:* Ht 2016

*Kurs:* RKT235, Examensarbete för magister, 15 hp

*Nivå:* Magister

*Handledare:* David Nyström

## **Abstract**

This study will focus on the inaugurating speeches of Jesus, Peter and Paul and the messianic elements which emerge from them. There are reoccurring similarities with Jesus and his followers throughout Luke's double work (Luke–Acts), but the speech given by Jesus differs from the ones given by Peter and Paul. At first, Jesus speech seems to carry prophetic element, but through the study a progression for the royal Davidic Messiah will be detected. The study primarily investigates the quotes from scripture, which Luke uses to prove and confirm the claims made by Jesus, Peter and Paul. The Messianic era was understood as being present by the coming of the spirit and it was progressively launched in phases through these speeches. For Luke, the signs of this era are demonstrated by the outpouring of the spirit and the gentile inclusion. In the final discussion a hypothesis will be presented regarding an interim Davidic typology for Luke's narrative outline and the understanding of the Messiah. This means that the differences detected in the speeches might be explained by Luke's use of the Davidic narrative in 1 Sam 13–2 Sam 2, which describes the anointing of David long preceding his enthronement. A pattern, which matches the progression of the speeches in Luk 4, where Jesus was anointed, but not enthroned (in heaven) until his post resurrected exaltation in Acts 1. The speeches of Peter and Paul therefore share different premises for the proclamation about the Messiah.

# Content

Abstract.....	2
1 Introduction.....	4
1.1 Purpose.....	5
1.2 Question.....	5
1.3 Limited Scope.....	5
1.4 Theory and Method.....	5
1.5 Recent Work and Views.....	6
1.5.1 Luke–Acts.....	6
1.5.2 Messianism.....	7
2 Luke.....	9
2.1 Authorship and Dating.....	9
2.2 The Unit of Luke–Acts.....	9
2.3 Genre.....	9
2.4 Purpose.....	11
2.5 Audience.....	12
2.6 Luke's Speech.....	12
2.7 Luke's Understanding of the Spirit and Prophecy.....	13
3 Messianic Expectation.....	15
3.1 Scripture.....	15
3.2 Origin of a Davidic Messiah.....	16
4 Analysis.....	19
4.1 Jesus' Speech in Luke 4:16–30.....	19
4.1.1 Literary Context.....	19
4.1.2 Historical Context.....	20
4.1.3 Line of Argument.....	21
4.1.4 Conclusion.....	26
4.2 Peter's Speech in Acts 2:14–40.....	27
4.2.1 Literary Context.....	27
4.2.2 Historical Context.....	28
4.2.3 Line of Argument.....	29
4.2.4 Conclusion.....	33
4.3 Paul's Speech in Acts 13:14–43.....	34
4.3.1 Literary Context.....	34
4.3.2 Historical Context.....	35
4.3.3 Line of Argument.....	35
4.3.4 Conclusion.....	38
5 Final Discussion.....	39
5.1 Comparison of the Messianic Element in the Speeches.....	39
5.2 A Solution Proposal.....	40
6 Conclusions.....	43
7 Bibliography.....	44

# 1 Introduction

The life of Jesus and his disciples fascinates me and has done so for some time. When studying Luke–Acts it became obvious to me that the similarities between Jesus, Peter and Paul are not accidental.<sup>1</sup> The common pattern, emerging from the author's description of these figures, show the importance for him of what they demonstrated in words and deeds. In the ancient genre (see 3.3 Genre), words and deeds were used together when portraying their subject.<sup>2</sup> The author presents Jesus, as the promised Messiah, who demonstrated and spoke of the Kingdom of God throughout the gospel and his followers as called to do the same (Luke 9:2). Peter is portrayed as the chief disciple in Luke–Acts and from Acts 9 and onward Paul becomes the key leader in the expansion of the Church. The author has, throughout his work, edited the material of Peter and Paul to match the model presented by Jesus in the gospel. One of his aim was to portray the key leaders of the church as faithful disciples to the Messiah. All three of them had an experience of the spirit (Luke 3:21–22; Acts 2:1–4; 9:17; 13:9), gave their first speech as a inauguration when they moved into active ministry (Luke 4:16–30; Acts 2:14–40; 13:14–43).<sup>3</sup>, casted out unclean spirits (Luke 4:31–37; Acts 5:16; 16:16–18), healed a lame (Luke 5:17–26; Acts 3:1–10; 14: 8–10), raised a person from the dead (Luke 7:11–17; Acts 9:36–43; 20:7–12) and they all healed in an extraordinary way, either by a touch, a shadow or by a cloth (Luke 8:42–48; Acts 5:15; 19:11–12). This list shows the intentionality of the author to present the key leaders of the early church as faithful followers of Jesus. From these similarities, the fact that their speeches differ from one another stands out even more. The inaugural speeches show similar setting as they inaugurate and launch a new phase in the books and introduce new territory in the theological progression of author's purpose (see 3.4 Purpose). In the ancient genre it seems as if the speeches were not just literary compositions but had a summary function which related to what was the characters' message and carried on in the oral tradition.<sup>4</sup> Since the speeches had characteristics of representative summary (see 3.6 Luke's Speech) they ought to show the author's central understanding of Messiah through the words of the key–figures' speech. The quotations from Old Testament (OT) in Luke–Acts, which the author used to legitimize his interpretation, are all but one included in speeches.<sup>5</sup> Dunn states that it is evident through the literary context that the speeches “carry the most heavy weight of the book's theology.”<sup>6</sup> Since the pattern between these three figures is intentional and their speeches carry the author's

<sup>1</sup> James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* [1996] (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans ed, 2016), original Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1996), p. xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Richard A. Burrege, *Imitation Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Studies* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007), p. 73.

<sup>3</sup> C. Kevin Rowe, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006), p. 78, n. 1.

<sup>4</sup> Craig Keener, *Acts – an Exegetical Commentary, vol 1* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012), p. 101; Ben Witherington III, *Acts of the apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 117; Dunn 1996, p. xi.

<sup>5</sup> Steve Moyise, *The Old Testament in the New: An Introduction*. 2 ed. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark 2015), p. 88.

<sup>6</sup> Dunn 1996, p. xvii.

interpretation of Jesus and, in the author's eyes, the two most important leaders the speeches will be used to investigate the author's understanding of the concept of Messiah.

## **1.1 Purpose**

The purpose of this comparative thesis is to study the author of Luke and Acts' understanding of the Messiah, which emerges in the inaugurating speeches of Jesus, Peter and Paul. I want to investigate the basic elements in messianic interpretation and the arguments of the speeches by looking at how the author used quotes from the OT. By a comparative study I will locate the similarities and differences regarding the understanding of Messiah in the speeches. An attempt will be made to explain what they hold and why they differ.

## **1.2 Question**

How do the inaugurating speeches of Jesus, Peter and Paul compare with each other regarding Messianic elements?

## **1.3 Limited Scope**

I will limit the study to the speeches which inaugurates the key figures respective ministries in Luke 4:16–30, Acts 2:14–40 and 13:14–43. The speeches will be the primary object of study even though the narrative, sometimes in the immediate context, has the function of confirming messianic claims made in the speech. Some material from contemporary Jewish sources will be used for clarification, but this material is too vast to fit this thesis and will thus only be included briefly in the analysis. It is necessary to keep in mind that this kind of eclectic study of elements in the narrative as a whole will become partial and need to be seen in the context of the broader picture.<sup>7</sup> A general chapter on the author's purpose and understanding of specific themes will help to set the frame. It also needs to be said that these speeches have undergone intense studies and there is much more to them than will be pursued or included in this study.

## **1.4 Theory and Method**

Burridge argues that there has been a tendency to either try read what lies behind the text or, as a reaction to that, simply focus on the author's intention loosened from the historical context.<sup>8</sup> He uses the image of a window for the first approach which seeks the historical information that gave rise to

<sup>7</sup> Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 1997), p. 11.

<sup>8</sup> Burridge 2007, p. 23.

the text and the image of a mirror for the second approach, which reflects modern perspective. He argues that the appropriate approach could be described as the image of a stained glass. The object of study is located *within* the glass, which reflects what is behind the glass (historical information) even though it has been colored by the glass (author's intention). This approach, describing the author's work with historical information colored by his purpose, will be appropriate for this study when probing the author's understanding of Messiah. The author used information from sources about Jesus to portray and present a text with the purpose to set an example.<sup>9</sup> A narrative–critical and historical–critical method will therefore be used for the study of the selected speeches. The narrative–critical comparison of the speeches will focus on the speeches' quotations and the composition of argument to conclude the author's view of messianic claims made by Jesus, Peter and Paul. To get a deeper understanding of Messianic expectancy the historical–critical perspective will use some contemporary sources to highlight the author's view and central elements.

## 1.5 Recent Work and Views

Luke–Acts has, as most of the NT writings, undergone massive studies and a brief description of the recent trends will be addressed. Although these texts have caused a vast production of monographs and commentaries they still inspire further study. As with the view of Messianism in the contemporary second temple Judaism the discussion is still ongoing.

### 1.5.1 Luke–Acts

Strauss has provided an important study on the Davidic–Messiah in Luke–Acts which concludes that Luke's view of the Messiah shows (1) Isainic influence for a suffering servant, (2) a Davidic Messiah, and (3) a Mosaic prophetic role.<sup>10</sup> This study has been helpful in locating the understanding of Messiah in Luke–Acts, but does not explain the difference between the speeches in Luke 4:16–30 and Act 2:14–40; 13:14–43. In recent research, the view of Luke–Acts has shifted from a sceptic tendency toward the author's historical reliability to a more appreciative approach to his material. A consensus is now pointing to Luke's work as a reliable source of history.<sup>11</sup> Most scholars would probably join Fitzmyer in saying that “Acts is substantially more trustworthy from a historical point of view than not.”<sup>12</sup> Recent exception from this is Pervo, who argues that the reliability of the Lukan account is poor since Acts is a literary fabrication categorized in the ancient genre of Novel.<sup>13</sup> Keener compares Luke with other ancient historians on which we depend heavily

<sup>9</sup> Burridge 2007, pp. 24–25.

<sup>10</sup> Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts: Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press, 1995), p. 336.

<sup>11</sup> Keener 2012, p. 200, n 291.

<sup>12</sup> Idem., p. 202; Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998), p. 127.

<sup>13</sup> Richard I. Pervo, *Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009), pp. 14–15.

on regarding information of ancient history. He argues that despite their biases they are trustworthy historians, as is Luke.<sup>14</sup> Pao has presented a study about the Isaiah as the bigger narrative which forms the Exodus pattern for Luke's narrative. He confirms the widely recognized view of Luke's use of the Septuagint (LXX) in quotes, but argues that the scriptural use is broader and points to a wider narrative with which Acts interacts. He states that “the scriptural story can best be understood as providing the hermeneutical framework within which the various individual units find their meaning.”<sup>15</sup> This theory of an overarching narrative will be applied in the discussion for a tentative solution to understand the difference of the inauguration speeches, but instead with the books of Samuel. With the so-called *third quest*, the aim is set for a historically driven interest in understanding Jesus and the emergence of what would become Christianity in the proper context.<sup>16</sup> Luke's work is a literary composition formed within his context and understanding. The object of study is not primarily regarding the historicity of Luke's narrative but an attempt to interpret his understanding of Messiah from within his context.

### ***1.5.2 Messianism***

There has been a dramatic shift regarding the perception of Messianism in the second temple Judaism.<sup>17</sup> Earlier scholarship thought of a uniform messianic idea that existed prior to and independently from the relevant texts. This seems to be an anachronistic approach brought forth by the nineteenth-century metaphysical idealism.<sup>18</sup> In studies concerned with Paul, the foremost theologian in the early church, a long discussion has been going on about whether he, in his use of Χριστός (270 times), included a messianic understanding or not.<sup>19</sup> Novenson argues for a historical-linguistic argument for the meaningfulness of מָשִׁיחַ and Χριστός. He states that one should “think of messianic texts as uses of language by competent members of a linguistic community” even though the practice of anointing a person had not been active for centuries.<sup>20</sup> Words change over time even though idioms remain current long after circumstances that gave rise to their coining have fallen out of use. This is the case with Χριστός, which is sparsely attested prior to the LXX translation. It is reserved for מָשִׁיחַ rather than any other word in the third and second centuries BCE and therefore gains currency from the translation of the Hebrew. Novenson concludes that it is plausible that “Jewish readers around the turn of the era would have understood Χριστός to signify an anointed person even if no one had anointed a king or a priest for centuries because they were familiar with the scriptures in Greek. This is a historical-linguistic claim, not a

---

<sup>14</sup> Keener 2012, p. 130.

<sup>15</sup> David Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* [Mohr Siebeck, 2000] (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publisher, 2016), p. 5.

<sup>16</sup> Craig Evans, *Jesus and his Contemporaries – comparative studies*, (Leiden: Brill, 1995), p. 45.

<sup>17</sup> John J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2010), p. 5.

<sup>18</sup> Matthew V. Novenson, *Christ Among the Messiahs* (New York: Oxford university press, 2012), pp. 35–37.

<sup>19</sup> Idem., p. 2.

<sup>20</sup> Idem., p. 47.

theological or metaphysical one.”<sup>21</sup>

Oegema states that almost all of the sources which gave rise to messianic interpretation are among the Jewish Tanach. These Messianic interpretations cluster around relatively few texts and none of them includes the word Messiah.<sup>22</sup> Rather, what is common for these scriptures is that all convey an indigenous ruler for the Jewish people.<sup>23</sup> Collins argues that if the messianic concept had meaning, it was widespread and embraced in different degrees and interpretations, Therefore we cannot talk about uniformity as in earlier scholarship.<sup>24</sup> On the other side he states that “if this [the Pauline use of Χριστός] is not ample testimony that Paul regarded Jesus as Messiah, then words have no meaning” as a critique against the view that Χριστός had no meaning, but became something of a title/surname early in the church.<sup>25</sup> Stanton represents the later view when he suggests that Christians only after some twenty years did not have the Jewish perspective and therefore lacked the understanding of Messiah. Although, he rightly acknowledges that Χριστός was being filled with “Christian” meaning he fails to see the consistency with the Jewish roots of Messianism.<sup>26</sup> Even Irenaeus states the significance of Messiah as the anointed and not just as a title or surname when he quotes Isa 61:1.<sup>27</sup> Therefore we can conclude that the word definitely had a meaning of more than a title, but the interpretations of what was expected of the Messiah varied.

---

<sup>21</sup> Novenson 2012, pp. 49–51.

<sup>22</sup> The most common are Gen 49:10, Num 24:17, 2 Sam 7:12-13, Is 11:1-2, Amos 9:11, Dan 7:13-14.

<sup>23</sup> Novenson 2012, pp. 57–58; Gerbern Oegema, *The Anointed and his People – Messianic Expectation from Maccabees to Bar Kochba* in *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series, no. 27* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 294–299.

<sup>24</sup> Collins 2010, p. 18.

<sup>25</sup> Idem., p. 2.

<sup>26</sup> Stanton 2002, p. 241.

<sup>27</sup> Irenaeus, *Bevis för den apostoliska förkunnelsen*, trans. Olof Andrén, (Skellefteå: Artos, 2007), p. 53.



## 2 Luke

Luke has traditionally been identified as the author of this massive double work that will be the object of study in this thesis. The gospels in general and especially the book of Acts, which is unique in the NT, has provided a lot of inspiration for study of Jesus as well as a model for the Church throughout the centuries.

### 2.1 Authorship and Dating

For the sake of space I will not involve the discussion about authorship or dating of Luke–Acts, but stay with the majority view that the author was, at least short–term, a companion of Paul and the author of both the gospel of Luke and Acts. It is mainly suggested that he wrote between 70–90 CE.<sup>28</sup> The author seems to be, either a God–fearing gentile associated with the diaspora Judaism or a long time member of the Hellenistic Jewish–Christian movement. This is not of absolute value for our understanding, but it might be interesting since he emphasise the gentiles inclusion and builds heavily on the LXX.<sup>29</sup> The author builds upon Mark and has edited and inserted material of his own. He also shares material with Matthew from what is called the Q source. He will be referred to as Luke hereafter.

### 2.2 The Unit of Luke–Acts

The gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles are widely seen as a unity of two volumes telling one story.<sup>30</sup> The division of the volumes could be a pragmatic one by the need to fit into the length of a papyrus roll that measured about 35 feet. Both volumes are about the same length which required a full papyrus roll.<sup>31</sup>

### 2.3 Genre

Already in his initial verse (Luke 1:1), Luke introduces that narrative genre through the word δῆγησις (*narrative*). This was, broadly speaking, appropriate for ancient historiographies, biographies and novels. The first ones dealt with events and the persons involved, but the later one were not necessarily related to an actual event.<sup>32</sup> Even if there has been criticism on Luke's

<sup>28</sup> Keener 2012, p. 402; Dunn 1996, p. 11; Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996), p. 2.

<sup>29</sup> Keener 2012, p. 405; Jervell 1996, p. 5.

<sup>30</sup> Green 1997, pp. 6–7; Dunn 1996, p. 15; Keener 2012, p. 550; Jervell 1996, p. 12.

<sup>31</sup> Green 1997, p. 8.

<sup>32</sup> Idem., p. 2.

historical reliability from scholars this indicates how he perceived himself.<sup>33</sup> Keener states that by using the keyword of this genre Luke was presenting historiography as a narrative of events in accordance to the prototypes laid out by Herodotus and Thucydides.<sup>34</sup> BurrIDGE on the other hand states that the gospels are of the genre of ancient biographies. The marker of this genre was the composition of a narrative, (suitable for one scroll) which placed the subject's birth, public entrance and death in a chronological plot. In between “they contained stories, sayings and anecdotes about the person, with a constant focus on their words and deeds.” He further states that the narrative usually reached a climax in the subject's death where the true character of the subject was revealed. He concludes that the Gospels therefor belong to this genre.<sup>35</sup> For Acts, though, Keener argues that the most fitting definition of the genre would be ancient historiography since it includes other genres in ancient literature, such as novel, epic, travel narrative and biography.<sup>36</sup> In ancient historiography the historical information and the rhetorical presentation were both important. The ancient historians valued sources closer to the event and they knew how to expand and bridge between sources. Luke was not as skilled as elite historians, but could have followed the same sort of rhetorical techniques.<sup>37</sup> Keener concludes that historians undoubtedly used traditions and sources when they were available.<sup>38</sup> Jervell points out that even though Luke made use of material, he rewrote all sources into his own narrative except the quotes from scripture.<sup>39</sup> This would be appropriate for an ancient author.

In the initial lines in both works, Luke seems to make sure that the reader could trust the accuracy of what was being told (Luke 1:1–4; Acts 1:1) even if it was done with a purpose and not in the sense of modern objectivity. By ancient standards of history the authors could achieve historical information and rhetorical presentation without harming one or the other.<sup>40</sup> Ancient historians did not normally feel free to invent events, but only to interpret them. They were not objective in their interpretation, but would not fabricate history. If this was done, there are examples which show that it would create severe criticism.<sup>41</sup> Keener concludes that Luke should have, as other ancient historians, felt free to construct speeches, infer private scenes, fill in dramatic details in the most plausible way from what was known.<sup>42</sup> Luke had his own interest in writing Luke–Acts and was not attempting to chronicle the entire history of the early Christianity. Gregerman argues that by the time Luke wrote the churches were mostly urban, gentile and opposed to Jews. Luke

---

<sup>33</sup> Samuel Byrskog, *Story as History, History as Story – The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (Boston/Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher, 2002), p. 230.

<sup>34</sup> Green 1997, p. 5.

<sup>35</sup> Richard A. BurrIDGE, *Imitation Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Studies* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007), p. 24.

<sup>36</sup> Keener 2012, p. 89.

<sup>37</sup> Idem., p. 116.

<sup>38</sup> Idem., p. 275.

<sup>39</sup> Jervell 1996, p. 6.

<sup>40</sup> Keener 2012, p. 147.

<sup>41</sup> Idem., p. 121.

<sup>42</sup> Idem., p. 219.

thus explained the foundation from a Jewish perspective that the gentiles were included in the plan.<sup>43</sup> This approach limits the work's value for modern historians' broader interest, but is not to be viewed as unhistorical thereby.<sup>44</sup> Ancient historians could have agendas without being accused of falsifying history. They sought to teach moral, apologetic and political value through the reported history.<sup>45</sup> In comparison with ancient historians, Luke was writing closer to the events which he described and had probably some access to oral sources for recent events even though he might have had less than complete information for the earlier events in Acts.<sup>46</sup> From this point, I will not focus further on the discussion regarding genre or determine the definitive genre, but conclude that Luke was intentional in using available historical sources and composing the information to fit his purpose.

## 2.4 Purpose

The purpose of Luke–Acts seems to deal with describing how God is bringing salvation to all people.<sup>47</sup> Evans thinks that Luke saw his writing as the continuation of the scribal story. He would thus see himself in the OT genre.<sup>48</sup> His intention seems to have been something of an ethnically apologetic approach to defend and legitimise the Jesus–movement outside the dominant Greco–Roman mainstream culture.<sup>49</sup> The gentiles inclusion is stated already in the birth narrative and this is the most important key–interpretative element, which he grounded in the story of Israel.<sup>50</sup> Luke used, especially, the OT prophets to legitimize the gentiles inclusion in the Jewish inheritance.<sup>51</sup> In the beginning of both volumes, accounts are given of prophetic revelations which will be fulfilled and set the outline for the following narrative.<sup>52</sup> There is no question that Jesus was regarded as Messiah by Luke, but what kind of Messiah?<sup>53</sup> Strauss states that Jesus as the Davidic messiah is a leading theme, if not *the theme*, in Luke. Starting with the birth narrative, it continues to develop in the gospel together with the key speeches in which he shows strong Davidic Messianic interpretations.<sup>54</sup> Luke's conception exceeds the Jewish expectations and thus serves as an apologetic function for the truth about Messiah. Strauss states that Luke's view is more than

---

<sup>43</sup> Adam Gregerman, 'What does the Scripture Say?' - *Studies in the Function of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, vol 1: the Synoptic Gospels*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias, (New York: T&T Clark, 2013), pp. 215–216.

<sup>44</sup> Keener 2012, p. 27; Jervell 1996, p. 10.

<sup>45</sup> Keener 2012, p. 25.

<sup>46</sup> Idem., p. 107.

<sup>47</sup> Green 1997, p. 9.

<sup>48</sup> Evans 1993, p. 201, n. 73.

<sup>49</sup> Keener 2012, p. 165.

<sup>50</sup> Green 1997, p. 208; Keener 2012, p. 479.

<sup>51</sup> Gregerman 2012, p. 240.

<sup>52</sup> Green 1997, p. 13.

<sup>53</sup> Jocelyn McWhirter, Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (ed). 'What does the Scripture Say?' - *Studies in the Function of Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, vol 1: the Synoptic Gospels – Messianic Exegesis in Mark 1:2–3*, (New York: T&T Clark, 2013), p. 178.

<sup>54</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 198; Jervell 1996, p. 13.

traditional Jewish expectations, but not more than what he could derive from scriptures.<sup>55</sup> Luke is intentional in grounding the Christian interpretation of the Messiah in the Jewish scriptures, as will be seen in the speech material. All this make sense, but Luke had more than just one purpose when writing.<sup>56</sup> The apologetic approach to legitimize Paul might as well be a central theme.<sup>57</sup> Martyrdom would not rhyme well with the agenda of proving Paul innocent if there was the tension of conflict which included Paul and his ministry. By portraying Paul as faithfully following the example set out Jesus and Peter would then serve his defence.

## 2.5 Audience

The question about Luke's audience has increasingly been given lesser weight since scholars recognise that Luke's work probably was addressed to a broader audience than a local church, for a single occasion. Rather the purpose was an enduring literature. It is likely that his ideal audience was similar to himself – one of higher education, knowledge of the Aegean Greek culture and familiarity with the Jewish scripture in the Greek translation of Septuagint (LXX).<sup>58</sup> Luke used *λαός* (*people*) consistently, which usually was reserved for Israel. This point to Luke's theological emphasis that God has only one people, which is the Church. Thus the recipients were to understand themselves in line with the history of Israel.<sup>59</sup>

## 2.6 Luke's Speech

A comparison of Luke's speech with the rhetorical devices used by ancient historians/biographers is of value to understand the genre of such work. The ancient writers exercised more liberty in details than we would grant modern historians.<sup>60</sup> The speech was to keep in line with the character and what that person likely would have said at the occasion.<sup>61</sup> Ancient historians fleshed the speeches out and could even compose them, according to what they saw as appropriately to the occasion.<sup>62</sup> An example for this is Josephus which expands and elaborate.<sup>63</sup> The speeches, even Luke's, are literary creations and not abbreviated versions of a speech even if the contrast show that Luke did not expound the speeches to the same degree as would other ancient historians. This is widely noted and the mere length of the speeches suggest that Luke did not have the ambition of a typical ancient

---

<sup>55</sup> Strauss 1995, pp. 29–30.

<sup>56</sup> Jervell 1996, p. 11.

<sup>57</sup> Keener 2012, p. 223.

<sup>58</sup> Idem., p. 423.

<sup>59</sup> Jervell 1996, pp. 23–25.

<sup>60</sup> Keener 2012, p. 28.

<sup>61</sup> Jervell 1996, p. 8; Keener 2012, pp. 269–271.

<sup>62</sup> Keener 2012, p. 258.

<sup>63</sup> Ben Witherington III, *Acts of the Apostles*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), p. 117; Keener 2012, p. 147.

historian.<sup>64</sup> Luke neither claimed the speeches to be exact quotations nor did he compose them himself out of nowhere. His speeches show weaker rhetorical quality than some other parts of his work, and whereas other ancient historians expanded their speeches to compose full speeches, he rather presents them concisely with a summary of the argument, which is explicitly stated in Acts 2:41.<sup>65</sup> The mere quantity of speech in Luke points to the centrality of preaching in the story that Luke recounts.<sup>66</sup> Moyise concludes that all quotes from OT, except in Acts 8:32, are found in the speeches. He also concludes that it is more likely that the narrative would form the framework for the speeches rather than the other way around.<sup>67</sup> The speeches are thus to be seen as the central carrier of the message.<sup>68</sup>

## 2.7 Luke's Understanding of the Spirit and Prophecy

Luke viewed the gospel tradition as sacred tradition and ὁ λόγος (*the word*) in Luke 4:32 seems to be reminiscent of דְּבַר יְהוָה (*Jahve's word*), which carried prophetic connotations.<sup>69</sup> The very role and position of the Messiah are derived from the anointing of the Spirit. For Luke, the spirit with its activity in the history of Israel made the scriptures come into existence and spoke through them.<sup>70</sup> The vast majority of scholars see Luke associating the spirit with prophetic proclamation, not merely in content but by the way it was done.<sup>71</sup> Luke adopted the Jewish idea of the spirit being connected with prophetic utterance. Even though miracles are important they are never ascribed to the spirit in Luke. The healing power was associated with Jesus himself. This does not mean that he did not see the witness by the spirit as miraculous. There is a strong emphasis on the work of the spirit to reveal the will of God, but προφητεία (*prophecy*) is *the* central work of the spirit for Luke. The deeds were to confirm the presence of the messianic age through the prophetic speeches by which it was inaugurated.<sup>72</sup> Hurtado argues that the early use of Jesus name in for example connection with baptism (Acts 2:38) show us that Jesus was viewed as exalted and seen in a way that is incomparable with other leaders, but instead comparable to God. This is also true for the use of prophecies where Jesus was the speaker of divine inspiration (Luk 4:18) and the mediator of the

<sup>64</sup> Keener 2012, pp. 260–261.

<sup>65</sup> Keener 2012, p. 283; Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1972), p. 44; Dunn 1992, pp. xviii–xix.

<sup>66</sup> Keener 2012, p. 263.

<sup>67</sup> Moyise 2015, p. 88.

<sup>68</sup> Dunn 1996, p. xvii.

<sup>69</sup> Craig Evans, “*Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography*” in *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation – Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 14/ Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield academy press, 1993), p. 177.

<sup>70</sup> Jervell 1996, pp. 44–46.

<sup>71</sup> Keener 2012, p. 523; Jervell 1996, p. 50.

<sup>72</sup> Eduard Schweizer, “πνεῦμα” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament (TDNT)*, vol. 6, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co 1964-1976), pp. 407-408.

spirit so that his followers could speak from his authority (Acts 2:33).<sup>73</sup>

The title of prophet occurs 59 times in Luke–Acts and the spirit of prophecy was a traditional label.<sup>74</sup> Most Jewish people seem to have had a view that the spirit had been quenched and thus used the title only when referring to the OT prophets, although the Qumran community saw themselves as prophets.<sup>75</sup> In this sense, Luke took a big step away from contemporary Judaism in referring to prophets. Even Josephus, when talking about prophets and prophecy, associates the divine spirit with the OT inspiration.<sup>76</sup> Jesus was thus inaugurating the era of the spirit in Acts 2:17. Luke seems to reserve the language for receiving the spirit in connection with empowerment for mission. He thus emphasises the spirit's activity as mission, which is central to the church (even when he allows for the diverse experience of the spirit Acts 8:12–17; 10:44–48; 19:5–6).<sup>77</sup> The messianic era was inaugurated by the spirit and Luke used these sources and information with the purpose of proclaiming the Messianic fulfilment in Jesus' life, death, resurrection and exaltation. With this brief presentation of Luke and his work, we will now turn to a short presentation dealing with Messianism.

---

<sup>73</sup> Larry W. Hurtado, *Lord Jesus Christ – Devotion to Jesus in the Earliest Christianity*, (Grand rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), pp. 150–151.

<sup>74</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 29.

<sup>75</sup> Keener 2012, p. 537.

<sup>76</sup> Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. William Whiston (Ware: Wordsworth edition limited, 2006), 6, §222; 8, §408.

<sup>77</sup> Keener 2012, p. 681.

### 3 Messianic Expectation

The Messianic elements derive from the Jewish tradition so let us start with a brief presentation from where it originates. In the contemporary Judaism Messiah we find a variety of interpretations and some sources that will be included briefly in the analysis for a better understanding, but they are not the primary object of the study. The analysis of all the texts available is not possible within the framework of this study as stated earlier (1.5.2). Since Luke derived his understanding from the Jewish scripture by using quotes and, as will be argued in the discussion, the OT narrative in a wider sense, the object of comparison will be the LXX.

#### 3.1 Scripture

Luke had a view of scripture as flawless and binding. He used the LXX (due to his lack of understanding Hebrew), which he saw with the same authoritative weight as the Hebrew scripture. All scripture were seen as God's word and thus “there is no messianic title, epithet or name from the Scriptures which does not apply to Jesus.”<sup>78</sup> There was a corpus of authoritative scriptures in the wider Judaism and it seems like the canon were somewhat centered around the Torah and the prophets in Luke's day even though it was not a closed orthodox canon.<sup>79</sup> All the quotes in Luke derive from within the authoritative scripture and thus point to Luke's ambition to root the interpretation of Jesus as the Davidic Messiah within the Jewish tradition. Most quotations in Luke are lacking in the wider Christian tradition which points to that Luke's references from scripture came from his own study as he centers on the prophets, which are used immensely and through whom in particular God spoke.<sup>80</sup> The Psalms, which were seen as prophetic literature,<sup>81</sup> were probably a part of the canonic inner circle which helped shape the hope for a future ideal Davidic king with its royal theme when used in the liturgy in Jerusalem.<sup>82</sup> These categories are the most commonly used source in the study of the speeches. Even though the Psalms derive from different times and were designated to different kings, which were not future ones, they were interpreted to portray an ideal king centered on Davidic descent.<sup>83</sup>

When the Hebrew scripture was translated into the LXX, there is a question whether some of the prophecies were inserted into the biblical text in the post-exilic period or not. Some texts are difficult to date and thus we have an uncertain picture of messianic expectation in the Persian and early Hellenistic period. There is little evidence of messianic expectations in the LXX translation of

---

<sup>78</sup> Jervell 1996, p. 30.

<sup>79</sup> Keener 2012, p. 478; Collins 2010, pp. 22–23; Craig Evans, *The Scripture of Jesus and His Earliest Followers in The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald & James A. Sanders (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), p. 185.

<sup>80</sup> Jervell 1996, pp. 61–63.

<sup>81</sup> Evans 2002, p. 186.

<sup>82</sup> Marinus De Jong, “Messiah” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, vol 4 K-N, (New York: Doubleday, 1992), p. 787.

<sup>83</sup> Idem., p. 779.

Torah, but the case is different with the prophets and the psalms which were translated later in the second or first century BCE.<sup>84</sup> The Torah is earlier and thus less developed in this sense.<sup>85</sup> The Jewish people thereby had a common reference point from where they understood and could speak meaningfully of Χριστός in the translation of LXX.<sup>86</sup>

### 3.2 Origin of a Davidic Messiah

Evans state that the definition of משיח/Χριστός (*anointed*) “is a highly complex and difficult question.”<sup>87</sup> Although this is true it seems to be clear that there was a somewhat widespread expectancy for Messiah but with a variety of interpretation. Eschatology was in the air around the first century Palestine which becomes evident in Dead Sea Scrolls and Pseudepigrapha.<sup>88</sup> The understanding of the eschatological atmosphere is sketchy, but eschatology and messianic expectancy do not flourish in a politically and socially secure world.<sup>89</sup> The Messianic expectation differed, but since they all originated from the same political situation they had some central elements in common regarding a liberator.

In the Hebrew bible משה is used 38 times, always in reference to a person, usually in the singular and usually as a substantive. It signifies a person anointed with oil as a symbolic action that distributes the spirit for holy services. It is usually used for kings (1 Sam 9:16; 2 King 9:6; 1 Sam 10:1, 16:13; 1 King 1:39), but also for priests (Exod 28:41; Lev 8:12) and prophets (1 King 19:16). The kingly concept is firmly rooted in narrative, but when it comes to talking about a future Messiah there are relatively few texts which cluster around a few major historical episodes beginning with the Maccabean revolt (160's BCE) and ends with the Bar Kokhba revolt (130's CE).<sup>90</sup> There is little future Davidic claim and no eschatology in the OT narratives as it stands and the accession to a throne was a religious, theological and political event.<sup>91</sup> Although this is true, the king, priest and prophet are all candidates for the later messianic expectations. All expectations derive from the interpretation of biblical and historical precedents in the OT narrative.<sup>92</sup> Thus we have some general understanding, as we will come back to, but not a general consensus of what they expected. There is indeed a distance between the royal ideology of the Hebrew bible and the messianic reflections of some Hellenistic– and Roman–period Jewish literature. But the fact the later ones are interpretations of the first one shows that the people in the later category thought that

---

<sup>84</sup> Collins 2009, p. 61.

<sup>85</sup> Idem., p. 61.

<sup>86</sup> Novenson 2012, p. 48.

<sup>87</sup> Evans 1995, p. 53.

<sup>88</sup> Idem., p. 57.

<sup>89</sup> Geza Vermes, “*Scrolls, Scriptures and Early Christianity*”, in *Library of Second Temple Studies, no. 56*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe, James H. Charlesworth (London/New York: T & T Clark international, 2005), p. 68.

<sup>90</sup> Novenson 2012, p. 10.

<sup>91</sup> Evans 1995, p. 54.

<sup>92</sup> Idem., p. 58.



there was a Messiah in the texts. It was in the second temple period when there no longer was a king on the throne that the term came to refer to a future king that would restore the kingship.<sup>93</sup> The idea of the Messiah probably arose with the exile and the termination of the monarchy in 587 BCE. This provided the climate for the messianic restoration of the promises of David. The King went into exile in 597 BCE and his uncle replaced him. A revolt was encouraged by Egypt with Tyre and Ammon, but Nebuchadnezzar came in 589 BCE and besieged Jerusalem and conquered the city in 587 BCE. Jehoiachin was released but not reinstated as a king and although there was some hope, in for example Zerubbabel by Haggai (2:12-23), the pretended of the Davidic throne ceased to exist after 520 BCE.<sup>94</sup> In the diversity of messianic hope there seem to be a growing influence of Davidic messiah in the first century as a result of Roman oppression and lack of political sovereignty. Hope was placed upon the king, an agent of God, as the liberator from the occupation.<sup>95</sup> Charlesworth states that Jewish messianology exploded in the early first century B.C.E. because of the degeneration in the Hasmonean dynasty and the loss of Israel's inheritance land to the gentile and idolatrous nation Rome.<sup>96</sup>

Strauss argue that although there was a diversity in general, they centered around an absolute messiah, a deliverer as a Davidic figure that would arise around the turning of the era.<sup>97</sup> This common heritage of a Davidic King was dormant and awoke in the Hashmonean period.<sup>98</sup> The sketch of this liberating figure was derived from the gathered corpus of scripture and portrayed the coming of an ideal king that would defeat the nations and restore the dynasty. He was a human figure, empowered with the spirit which would be a "warrior king who would destroy the enemies of Israel and institute an era of unending peace" This was the common core of Jewish Messianism around the turn of the era.<sup>99</sup> No text from the Jewish bible was seen to have the definitive interpretation of the Messiah over another. Rather the texts were given different interpretations and inspired messianic creativity which was formed to the relevant context.<sup>100</sup> It might also be worth remembering that since the Messiah had never appeared before, they had to work out the understanding of him in the meantime. Some foundational elements such as the promise to David, God's faithfulness to the covenant, David's seed, a Davidic heir forever in his throne, domination over pagan nations and father-son relationship with God seem to be somewhat common from most contemporary sources with the author of Luke–Acts.<sup>101</sup> With a presentation of the author's interests

<sup>93</sup> Collins, "Messiah" in *New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible (NIDB)*, vol 4 (Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), p. 59.

<sup>94</sup> Randall Heskett, *Messianism within the Scriptural Scrolls of Isaiah*, (London: T & T Clark, 2007), p. 4.

<sup>95</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 54.

<sup>96</sup> James H. Charlesworth (ed.), *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), p. 35.

<sup>97</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 55.

<sup>98</sup> Collins 2010, p. 52.

<sup>99</sup> Collins 2010, pp. 77–78.

<sup>100</sup> Novenson 2012, pp. 62–63.

<sup>101</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 44.

and some general information regarding the understanding of Messiah we will now turn to the analysis.

## 4 Analysis

After a presentation of useful background information, it is time for the comparative analysis of the inauguration speeches of Jesus, Peter and Paul. These speeches have undergone intense study and it will not be possible to cover all the different perspectives or depths in this thesis. I will therefore focus on the initial question of comparison. The speeches have an important part in Luke's overall progression to legitimise the emerging Church as living in the messianic era. The analysis will deal with one speech at a time and the discussion will be included in the analysis although a final comparative discussion and conclusion will be treated in chapter 5.

### 4.1 Jesus' Speech in Luke 4:16–30

Jesus enters the public stage with a very famous speech, which is seen as a programmatic statement of his coming ministry. There is not a full outline of what will be unravelled in the gospel by Luke, but a short description of his upcoming ministry. The starting point of Jesus' public ministry will be developed in the gospel and carried on by the disciples in Acts. The thematic progression of Luke's Messianic understanding will continue to evolve, as will be seen from this study. The anointed figure has spoken a few words in the temptation narrative, but this is the first public teaching that will be presented.

#### 4.1.1 Literary Context

The inauguration of Jesus' ministry is stated in the birth narrative (1:32–33, 69; 2:11, 26, 30–32, 38), activated in the baptism (3:21–22) and launched public in the first speech. This is the only report of the content in the synagogue context. It has been argued that Luke must have had access to an additional account of Jesus' ministry in Nazareth. The welded result could have been composed into a better unity if it was merely a free composition.<sup>102</sup> Luke seems to have had a different source than Mark 6:1–4. It has been noted that his use *ναζαρά* and *ἀμὴν* are both uncharacteristic for him and could possibly even point to the historical Jesus.<sup>103</sup> This text has often been described as a programmatic text for the gospel and gives the incitement for the gentile mission, empowered by the spirit in Acts.<sup>104</sup> The reference to the spirit is interwoven to the previous text with the anointing (3:21–22) and temptation (4:1), where Jesus acted on the empowerment received in the baptism. Jesus was seen, by Luke, as both the recipient of the spirit by his baptism and was conceived by the very same. Luke has made it clear, from the birth narrative, that he understood Jesus as the Davidic

<sup>102</sup> Nolland 1989, p. 192.

<sup>103</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 225; Nolland 1989, p. 195.

<sup>104</sup> Keener 2012, p. 521; Rowe 2006, p. 78, n. 1.

Messiah, but the speech does not seem to include typical Davidic claims. This raises the question of how Luke understood Jesus from his sources and what kind of Messiah that emerges from Jesus' speech. Since the Davidic Messiah seems to be a prominent element in Luke's understanding (1:27, 32, 69; 2:4), stated from the birth narrative, there probably is a reason for the apparent shift of perspective. An analysis of the speech will help locate elements, which will be developed in the ending discussion in a hypothetical solution to why the speeches differ.

#### **4.1.2 Historical Context**

Nazareth was located in the roman province of Galilee and in Jesus' time it was probably a small agricultural village of 400–500 inhabitants.<sup>105</sup> The name is derived from the Hebrew word for “branch”, “root”, which Matthew used with reference to Isa 11:1 as a messianic connotation. In the NT Nazareth is identified as Jesus' hometown and the absence of references to the village in ancient sources show its unimportance. First time mentioned was in the gospels and Acts and thereafter not until 3<sup>rd</sup> century in an inscription from Caesarea Maritima.<sup>106</sup> Nazareth was located in close proximity to Sepphoris which became a big Hellenistic city after 70 CE with a gentile population.<sup>107</sup> Even in Jesus' days Galilee was far more integrated into the larger roman Empire than was thought before. It was not an isolated, rural village, which would mean that they were very aware of the Roman occupation.<sup>108</sup> Jesus' family seemed to have perceived themselves as Davidic descendants and Jesus was explicitly pointed out as such by the audience. This would have fueled the expectations in the historical context. As will be argued below, this probably explains the audience reaction in Luk 4:28 from excitement to fury.<sup>109</sup> Luke, on the other hand, portrays Jesus' spiritual descent with a theological emphasis in the birth narrative rather than strictly human descent (Luke 1:35).<sup>110</sup>

The speech gives us one of the first accounts of a synagogue service. The major elements of the service probably were the recitation of Shema (Deu 6:4–9, 11:13–21; Num 15:37–41), the Tephillah prayer, read by someone in the congregation, a reading from Torah (probably shared by several persons), a reading from the prophets, a sermon based on the reading followed and finally a priestly blessing (if a priest were present). The tasks in the service were appointed by the ruler of the synagogue. It is possible that a fixed schedule of the reading from the Pentateuch had been established, but there are no evidence that the texts from the prophets had come that far.<sup>111</sup> The text

<sup>105</sup> Devries F., L. “Nazareth” in *The New Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible (NIDB). Vol 4.* (Nashville: Abingdon press, 2009), p. 241.

<sup>106</sup> Idem., p. 240.

<sup>107</sup> Craig Evans, *Jesus and His World – Archaeological Evidence* (London: Society or Promoting Christian Knowledge, 2012), p. 26.

<sup>108</sup> Evans 2012, p. 21.

<sup>109</sup> Ibid.

<sup>110</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 59.

<sup>111</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 1–9:20 in Word Biblical Commentary, vol 35a*, ed. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker (Dallas:

from the prophets probably had some association with the reading of the Torah. Whether Luke thought that Jesus did the choice himself or not is not obvious.<sup>112</sup> Luke and his contemporaries saw the book of Isaiah as a unit and found the description of one Messiah in all scripture. They probably saw Isaiah's description in chapter 61 as a herald /prophet and chapters 40–55 as describing the servant as an expansion of the Davidic messiah introduced in chapter 9 and 11.<sup>113</sup> The school of redactional criticism has tended to forget to read the book of Isaiah as a whole to understand the author's use of it.<sup>114</sup> Therefore, different passages that might carry separate portraits were probably included in the interpretation of Isa 61 by Luke and his contemporaries. The synagogue was at the heart of the broader, pious diaspora Judaism, which will serve Luke's purpose even though it was located in Galilee. The speech starts from a habitual statement to point out Jesus' faithfulness to the Jewish customs. In accordance with a standard procedure, he was given a text which was the basis for the speech's argumentation. He probably read in Hebrew and spoke in Aramaic, as would have been customary. The listeners would initially have understood themselves as the first benefactors of what was proclaimed – the inauguration of the messianic era, but instead they failed to grasp who Jesus claimed to be and thereby the inauguration for the Messianic era. Luke's recipients, though, already got this information from the birth narrative.<sup>115</sup>

### 4.1.3 Line of Argument

The quote from Isaiah is the source from where the Messianic elements emerge. It constitutes the beginning of the speech and it is framed as a whole by the verbs *stood up*, *was handed* and *unrolled* in verse 16–17 and *rolled up*, *handed* and *sat down* in verse 20.<sup>116</sup> The comparison of the quotes used from the Septuagint and the reading in Luke 4:18–19 will show the following (a guide for the markers used in the following analysis will be given in the notes).<sup>117</sup>

<p>(18) Πνεῦμα κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμέ, οὗ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς, ἀπέσταλκέν με κηρῦξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν, <u>ἀποστείλει</u> τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει,</p>	<p>(1) Πνεῦμα Κυρίου ἐπ’ ἐμέ, οὗ εἶνεκεν ἔχρισέν με·εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με, <del>ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τὴν καρδίαν</del>, κηρῦξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεςιν καὶ τυφλοῖς</p>	<p>(6) <del>οὐχὶ τοιαύτην νηστεῖαν ἐγὼ ἐξελεξάμην, λέγει κύριος, ἀλλὰ λῦε πάντα σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας, διάλυε στραγγαλιὰς βιαιῶν συναλλαγμάτων, <u>ἀπόστειλε</u> τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει</del></p>
---	--	--

Word Books Publisher, 1989), p. 194; Green 1997, p. 207 note 17; Bock 2007, p. 451.

<sup>112</sup> R. Alan Culpepper, *The Gospel of Luke – The New Interpreter's Bible (NIB)*, vol IX (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995), p. 105.

<sup>113</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 244.

<sup>114</sup> Idem., pp. 234–235.

<sup>115</sup> Green 1997, p. 215.

<sup>116</sup> Nolland 1989, p. 191.

<sup>117</sup> The marks used has following significance and will be followed throughout the rest of the study.

(1) a line above = insertions,

(2) underline = variant of words,

(3) ~~line through~~ = omission,

(4) if the text has no marking it is identical.

(19) ~~κηρύξαι~~ ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν. ἀνάβλεψιν, (2) ~~καλέσαι~~ ἐνιαυτὸν Κυρίου ~~καὶ πᾶσαν συγγραφὴν ἄδικον διάσπα-~~  
 δεκτὸν ~~καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως,~~  
 (Luke 4:18-19) ~~παρακαλέσαι πάντας τοὺς πενθοῦντας,~~ (Is 58:6)  
 (Jes 61:1-2)

Isa 61:1–2 carried eschatological connotations and was understood as a messianic and prophetic utterance by contemporaries as is seen in the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) (11QMelch 2:4–20, 1QH 17:14).<sup>118</sup> Luke linked with the quote from Isa 61:1–2 with Isa 58:6 through ἄφεσις (*release /forgiveness*) in the LXX, although there are different words in the Hebrew.<sup>119</sup> This was the technique called *gezerah shewa* and was an interpretative tool in contemporary Judaism where two texts were interpreted by communal wording. For Luke, this was the programmatic keyword which characterised Jesus' ministry. In classical Greek ἄφεσις had the meaning of releasing someone from legal debt, but it was never interpreted in a religious sense. It covers a whole series of Hebrew words in the LXX and was used in the sense of removal of sin since God and man were related in legal covenantal terms in Judaism. This was alien to Greek thought. In Luke, when used as a noun, it always means *forgiveness* and has the meaning of that even though in this context it allude to *release* from Isa 61:1 and 58:6.<sup>120</sup> It is a bit strange that ἄφεσις mean release in this context when on the other occasions in Luke it mean forgiveness, but it included both spiritual and social forms of release for him.<sup>121</sup> Even if this concept of forgiveness was a Jewish thought it had a new feature in the ministry of Jesus. Forgiveness was now available as a part of the eschatological message that Jesus inaugurated.<sup>122</sup> Also, it certainly had a connotation to the occupation and exile from which historical Messianism emerged. Luke, though, seems to dismiss this emphasis because of his purpose. We will come back to this.

Jesus portrayed himself as the anointed one, by whom the messianic era was inaugurated. In the quotation ἐμέ/με (*me*) is emphasised which stress the personified interpretation of the passage to Jesus. The fact that the prophet in Isa 61 is speaking in the first person was unusual and suits this speech perfectly.<sup>123</sup> Jesus was anointed by κύριος (*Lord*) even though he called himself κύριος in Luke 6:46; 13:25; and 19:31. This will also be seen in the use of Ps 109:1 (LXX) in Acts 2:34.<sup>124</sup> The anointing was, as stated above, primarily a symbol of divine election for a function. This quote was thus used as a confirmation of Jesus' baptism. We will come back to the understanding of anointing in prophetic and royal terms below. The central action is described with εὐαγγελίζω (*proclaim good news*), which carried the eschatological inauguration of the kingdom of God (cf.

<sup>118</sup> Evans 1995, p. 59.

<sup>119</sup> Nolland 1989, p. 193.

<sup>120</sup> Bultmann, “ἄφιμι” in *TDNT*, vol. 1, pp. 509–511.

<sup>121</sup> See 5:27-32 and the calling of Levi; 7:36-50 the women at Jesus feet; Green 1997, p. 211.

<sup>122</sup> Bultmann 1964, pp. 511–512.

<sup>123</sup> Shalom M Paul, *Isaiah 40-66*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2012), p. 528.

<sup>124</sup> Rowe 2006, p. 81.

Luke 4:43).<sup>125</sup> There are similarities with the Greek use of εὐαγγελίζω and the NT regarding liberation from enemies or deliverance from demonic powers.<sup>126</sup> In Palestinian Judaism, the word was equivalent with the בשר (*to brings the good tidings*) which was a religious term. It could refer to God, the spirit, scripture or angels when proclaiming the joyful message about forgiveness of sin, hearing of prayer or sharing in the world to come. The expectation of the מברש (*The one who brings the good tidings*) was still alive in the time of Jesus and could be connected to the Messiah.<sup>127</sup> This might be similar to the servant of God in Isa 55, which was more of a role rather than a person. This type of reference to a role was probably the same case as with the Davidic descent in the original context.<sup>128</sup> This might explain the expectancy of the audience which Luke describes in the synagogue.

The prophetic texts from Isa 58 and 61 have developed jubilant themes, describing the coming redemption and release from captivity in eschatological language. Luke's text move beyond the literal meaning of the year of jubilee (Lev 25:10) to be given an eschatological approach.<sup>129</sup> The year of jubilee in the context of Isaiah has no claim on legislation, nor was it solemnly a spiritual form. It was about spiritual restoration, moral transformation, rescue from demonic oppression and release from illness and disability. This will be demonstrated by Jesus in the following narrative.<sup>130</sup> Luke's eschatological interpretation of the year of jubilee was not unique, as stated above. In 11QMelchizedek we find also an eschatological interpretation of Isa 61:1–3 with clear reference to the year of jubilee.<sup>131</sup> It has been stated that Isa 61:1–2 contains no reference to a Davidic dynasty or a royal function.<sup>132</sup> Although, this might be the case from the original context it seems odd regarding the strong emphasis made by Luke in the birth narrative. When comparing with Jer 34:8–22 implicit royal claims can be located. The text in Jeremiah speaks about the King being responsible for announcing the release of slaves (which was included in the year of jubilee). The King also had the executive power to bring about social justice and to act as the agent who brings judgment and righteousness.<sup>133</sup> The change from καλέσαι (*call*) in Isaiah, to κηρῦσαι (*proclaim*) in last part of the speech in Luke seems to mark this performative emphasis. When the prophet made the announcement it was up to the ruling leader to follow and execute what God had spoken. Since there are no textual variants of the wording, the interpretation of an intentional change of word gets strong support. Jesus was not only the messenger but also the author who inaugurated the new era, the eschatological year of Jubilee.<sup>134</sup> This might explain the audience's reaction.

<sup>125</sup> Friedrich, “εὐαγγελίζομαι” in *TDNT*, vol 2, p. 718.

<sup>126</sup> Idem., p. 712

<sup>127</sup> Idem., pp. 715–716.

<sup>128</sup> John Goldingay and David Payne, *Isaiah 40–55, vol 1 in The International Critical Commentary*, ed. Christopher M. Tuckett and Graham I. Davies (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2014), p. 291.

<sup>129</sup> Green 1997, p. 212.

<sup>130</sup> Nolland 1989, p. 202.

<sup>131</sup> Evans 1995, p. 119.

<sup>132</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke, I–IX* (New York: Doubleday, 1979), p. 529.

<sup>133</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 231.

<sup>134</sup> Friedrich 1965, “κηρῦσαι” in *TDNT*, vol 3, p. 701.

There are indications of a view which saw the spirit of prophecy as had been taken from Israel and would return with a coming prophet (1 Macc 4:46; 9:27; 14:41; Josephus. *Against Apion* 1.41).<sup>135</sup> If this was a widespread view the audience in Nazareth would have been astonished by the very proclamation itself, referring to the spirit, because they understood it as the inauguration of the Messianic era.<sup>136</sup> Their expectation caused them to react positively initially, but the omission of Isa 61:2b might be explained by their hope of God's revenge upon gentiles.<sup>137</sup> If this goes back to a source from the historical Jesus it might derive from a poetic technique called *Metalepsis*, which expected the listeners to recognise the full literary context from a quote in order to grasp the full force and the intertextual use.<sup>138</sup> There are also common themes regarding this with the Psalms of Solomon, which expected the Davidic Messiah to expel all aliens out of Israel. This would imply that Jesus, as the Davidic descendant, would defeat and expel the Romans.<sup>139</sup> If the omission is from Luke's hand, it fits well with his emphasis on gentile inclusion. Jesus is portrayed by Luke as having different interpretations of what the messianic task meant. Jesus seemed to know what their expectations were and challenged that by relating to the anointed Elia and Elisha, which involved God's grace upon gentiles (1 Kings 17:8, 2 Kings 5:14). After this statement the audience drove him to the edge of a cliff because they probably, as pious Jews, considered to kill him for being a false prophet (Deut 13:5).<sup>140</sup> From the initial reaction of hope they, provoked by Jesus' inclusion of gentiles, wanted to kill him. The gentiles were the very people that occupied and hindered the freedom of the promised land. From the background of Psalms of Solomon, it might not be that strange that the passage in Isa 61:2b (“and the day of vengeance of our God, to comfort all who mourn”) was omitted, either by Jesus or Luke.<sup>141</sup> The gentiles were instead included in the coming era inaugurated by Jesus in Nazareth. The consensus from recent study on proselytism shows the indifference from early Judaism in converting gentiles. There is almost no evidence to support intentional missionary outreach. Even though some gentiles actually converted to Judaism, this was probably a result more of their own personal interest rather than missionary activity. Some Jews thought that gentiles were immoral idolaters and thereby lacked interest in missionary motivation.<sup>142</sup> This shows a sharp contrast to Luke's interpretation and understanding of God's will

<sup>135</sup> Cullpepper 1995, p. 15; Keener 2012, p. 890.

<sup>136</sup> Friedrich 1965, p. 714.

<sup>137</sup> Green 1997, p. 213.

<sup>138</sup> Richard B. Hays, *Reading Backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco: Baylor university press, 2014), p. 42.

<sup>139</sup> Stanton 2002, p. 242; Gerd Theissen – “*The Political Dimension of Jesus' Activities*” in *The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J. Malina, Gerd Theissen (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), p. 232.

<sup>140</sup> Theissen 2002, p. 218.

<sup>141</sup> The Psalms of Solomon should probably be dated between 70–45 BCE to before 70 CE. Chapter 17 preserve one of the most detailed description of Messiah in the pre-Christian era. The Messiah is the Davidic son, called to establish the everlasting kingdom of God. Messiah is distinctly royal and political figure, but not a warrior in ordinary sense since his power (spiritually) comes from God without the Messiah being supernatural. He is without sin, invincible and perfect in judgment. R. B. Wright (trans.), *Psalms of Solomon, in The old testament pseudepigrapha. Vol 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth. (New York: Doubleday, 1985), p. 641, 645.

<sup>142</sup> Gregerman 2012, p. 218.



in reaching the gentiles, which is Luke's main point of Jesus in his post-resurrection appearance in Luke 24:47 and Acts 1:8.<sup>143</sup> The same contrast becomes evident when comparing with 11QMelchizedek. Both texts address the year of jubilee in term of release by the inauguration of a messianic figure, but in the text from Qumran only the sect was included and the gentiles were the damned and excluded. The gentile inclusion is central for Luke.<sup>144</sup>

The speech has prophetic references from the quotes from Isaiah and from Jesus' reference to Elijah and Elisha, but the context up to the speech seems to emphasise Davidic descent. So was Jesus seen as a prophetic or royal Messiah?

The argument for a *prophetic* understanding would be that it is most natural from Isa 61 and that Jesus stated their rejection on the basis of a prophetic role (4:24). Also the attempt to kill him would probably be on the basis of being a false prophet (4:29). Some of the eschatological expectations even centred on Elijah and Moses in contemporary Judaism, whom were seen as prophets.<sup>145</sup> This fits well with Jesus identification with Elijah and Elisha (4:25–27).<sup>146</sup> Elijah and Elisha were exercising God's grace among outsiders. They included women, non-Jew, unclean, gentiles – people with socio-religious low status.

The argument for a *royal* understanding is primarily derived from the context. Jesus was seen as a prophet by the public, but he spoke of the kingdom of God, had a conflict with the temple authorities regarding true leadership and was crucified by the Romans as the King of the Jews.<sup>147</sup> Further, the act of anointing was most commonly connected with kingship in the OT narrative.<sup>148</sup> From the fact that Isa 61 should be seen in the whole context of Isaiah, the interpretation carries both individual and collective (representative) attributes for a king. In the first century, they would have understood both perspectives as royal.<sup>149</sup> Since the acceptable year had not been announced by any king it was given eschatological connotations instead. This way of arguing will become evident in Luke's use of Ps 15 (LXX) and 109 (LXX) in the other speeches.<sup>150</sup> The salvation described in Isa 61:1–2 exceeded the limits of a normal king and thus suggests an eschatological reading which from the context of chapter Isa 60–62 looked beyond the return from Babel to an eschatological fulfilment.

Some think that the text deals with *both* prophetic and royal understandings.<sup>151</sup> With regards to the explicit Davidic connotation to Jesus in the birth narrative (1:32, 69) it seems strange that Luke would perceive Jesus' speech with just prophetic emphasis. Luke had probably, as an ancient author, access to a source that told about Jesus' first speech. From this source, Luke added the Markan

---

<sup>143</sup> Idem., p. 220.

<sup>144</sup> Green 1997, p. 213.

<sup>145</sup> Strauss 1995, pp. 227–228.

<sup>146</sup> Green 1997, p. 216.

<sup>147</sup> Evans 1995, p. 15.

<sup>148</sup> Cullpepper 1995, p. 17.

<sup>149</sup> Strauss, pp. 240–242.

<sup>150</sup> Heskett 2007, p. 262.

<sup>151</sup> Strauss 1995, pp. 227–228; Rowe 2006, p. 79.

material and elaborated the speech. Luke emphasised Jesus as the Davidic descendant, but put Jesus in the beginning of his ministry before the royal association came into play. This echoes the life of David where his anointing long preceded his coronation. For Luke the prophetic and the royal claims from Isa 61 with his elaboration of Isa 58:6 came from Scripture itself. The anointing in the OT was most common for the king. To dismiss the Davidic royal claim is to deny inter-narrative and verbal connection of, for example, ἔχρισέν (4:18) and χριστός (2:11), where Jesus is explicitly called the Messiah.<sup>152</sup> The prophetic dimension of Jesus' ministry is *plainly evident* and the kingly aspect of his execution is, historically, quite probable.<sup>153</sup>

#### **4.1.4 Conclusion**

I find it interesting that there is nothing about the coming death and resurrection of the Messiah in Jesus' inauguration speech (which will be the most explicit Davidic elements in the coming speeches). Luke probably saw the speech as royal with prophetic functions, although royal attributes are less emphasised. There seems to be a well-attested tradition that Jesus spoke of himself as a prophet and was probably crucified as a (pretending) king.<sup>154</sup> In the broader picture, Luke seems to include the prophetic and royal claim of Jesus from the book of Isaiah as a whole. If Luke got hold of a source that spoke of the historical context where they understood Jesus as a prophet he still saw both royal and prophetic elements, although implicit and less emphasised royal ones. Jesus was to be seen as the anointed by the statements made at the birth narrative and the anointing in the baptism, but he had not yet entered the throne. Luke seems to be intentional in letting the Messianic role develop. A hypothesis will be developed in the final discussion below regarding the Davidic narrative for a theological outline of Jesus' ministry.

---

<sup>152</sup> Rowe 2006, p. 79.

<sup>153</sup> Evans 1995, pp. 450–451.

<sup>154</sup> Idem., p. 437.

## 4.2 Peter's Speech in Acts 2:14–40

Peter's speech was given by Peter at the day of Pentecost in Jerusalem. It has traditionally been seen as the birth of the Church and has the same function as Jesus' speech in Luke 4, which state the birth of his ministry. The speech has also been central to the understanding of Jesus as the Messiah as well. Peter is a key-figure already in the gospel, but there is a dramatic shift to his leadership after the Pentecost experience.

### 4.2.1 Literary Context

This speech has similar placement and function as Jesus' speech in Luke 4. Both speeches have an inaugurating function which will be developed by Jesus in the gospel and by the disciples in Acts. Peter enters his ministry after a spiritual experience (the outpouring of the spirit) in the same way as Jesus did (the baptism). Just as Jesus' speech set the outline for the gospel so will this speech also inaugurate and outline the prophetic people (2:18), which will be expanded in Acts through the work of the Messiah (2:36–38). The first part of the speech is an explanation of the outpouring of the spirit proved from the prophecy from Joel 3:1–5 (LXX) (2:14–21). The outpouring of the spirit and the inauguration of a new phase in the messianic era was not legitimised simply by its occurrence, but needed to be confirmed by scripture.<sup>155</sup> The second part deals with Jesus' ministry and resurrection (2:22–28) and the speech progressively moves towards the exaltation in the third part (2:29–36), which was the cause for the outpouring of the spirit.

Jesus is the subject of the speeches in Acts, but not merely the content. He was also, through the spirit, seen as an active actor in the narrative (9:3–6, 16:7, 18:9–10). Luke describes Peter's and Paul's discipleship as following the model set out by Jesus in the gospel. When he describes Peter in this setting he uses biblical images of prophets.<sup>156</sup> In this sense Jesus and Peter carries the same prophetic inaugurating function in the text, but in different phases of the Messianic era. The king was enthroned and his prophetic model was seen as a representative function from the gospel. Jesus launched his own (representative) ministry and Peter launched the Church's ministry. Both were empowered by the spirit and proclaimed progression of the Messianic era.

Luke introduced the theme of gentiles inclusion early on in the gospel (which caused the negative reaction in Nazareth), yet he does not state the full inauguration immediately but build the foundation progressively into Acts. In this speech, it moves one step further. Luke presents Peter's arguments as (1) Explaining the coming of the spirit – it is important to notice that the manifestation was not self-evident. It demanded an explanation and could be interpreted both positively and

---

<sup>155</sup> Jervell 1996, p. 72.

<sup>156</sup> Luke T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles in Sacra Pagina Series, vol 5*, (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1992), p. 12.

negatively as seen by some initial reaction (2:13).<sup>157</sup> (2) The present situation had its origin in God's work through Jesus' ministry and his resurrection from the dead. This argument build upon the quotations from the Davidic psalms as a confirmation of the messianic expectations. (3) From the ascended position, at the right hand of the Father, Jesus distributed the spirit as the messianic king enthroned with God. Luke portray Peter using, in line with contemporary Judaism, a Midrashic application of Joel 2:28–32.<sup>158</sup>

#### **4.2.2 Historical Context**

Even if the speech is from Luke's hand, the content might very well originate from Peter's earliest preaching. Ps 15:8:–11 (LXX) is only used here and in Acts 13:35 while Ps 109:1 (LXX) certainly was used to explain what happened to Jesus in the early Christian interpretation, (Heb 1:13).<sup>159</sup> The early speeches probably made an impact on the audience. Peter's speech at Pentecost would be one of those occasions. Luke might have had access to eyewitnesses whom could give him material to compose the speech. Sources of Peter's speech plausibly remembered that he appealed to Joel and the Davidic Psalter, called Jesus Lord and Messiah and urged the audience to repent.<sup>160</sup> Even if it originates from a historical source, it is clearly a summary which Luke has arranged to fit his narrative purpose.<sup>161</sup> The basic pattern of the early kerygma had four parts in the same order: (1) the Age of fulfilment had arrived. (2), the account of Jesus ministry, death and resurrection. (3), OT quotations were used as evidence of Jesus fulfilment. (4), the call to repentance.<sup>162</sup> Peter's speech fits this pattern. Some argue that Peter's speech was given in Aramaic<sup>163</sup>, but others suggest that Peter spoke in Greek since the reaction of the crowd (pilgrims from outside of Israel) seem to imply that they understood what was said and no reference is made to Peter still speaking in tongues.<sup>164</sup> Most Jews were living outside of Israel at this time and in this setting they represent the movement prophesied in Acts 1:8. Jerusalem at Pentecost was a place where many pilgrims gathered.<sup>165</sup> With this background, let's turn to the use of the quotes from OT to see how the argument is developed and what Messianic elements which emerge from the speech.

---

<sup>157</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 26.

<sup>158</sup> Idem., p. 28; Robert W. Wall, *The Acts of the Apostles* in *NIB* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2002), p. 62.

<sup>159</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 28.

<sup>160</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1997), p. 249.

<sup>161</sup> Keener 2012, p. 299.

<sup>162</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 63.

<sup>163</sup> Darrell L. Bock, *Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), p. 111.

<sup>164</sup> Keener 2012, p. 865.

<sup>165</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 26.

### 4.2.3 Line of Argument

When we take a closer look at the text which Peter made use of from Joel 3:1–5 (LXX) we find some changes being made to give emphasis (see note 117 for an explanation of the markers used).

(17) καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεῦσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνιασθήσονται. (18) καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεῦσουσιν. (19) καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ. (20) ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἶμα, πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. (21) καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

(Acts 2:17–21)

(1) Καὶ ἔσται ~~μετὰ ταῦτα~~ καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεῦσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται. (2) καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου. (3) καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδα καπνοῦ. (4) ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἶμα πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. (5) καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται· ~~ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται ἀνασφόμενος, καθότι εἶπεν κύριος, καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, οὗς κύριος προσκέκληται.~~

(Joel 3:1-5)

From the use of Joel 3:1–5 the following elements are emphasised: (1) the present inauguration of the messianic era, (2) the belonging of the servants (3) and the centrality of prophecy. It could be that Joel 3:1–5 was referring to the fulfilment of Mose's wish in Num 11:29.<sup>166</sup> Peter legitimised the experience of the outpouring of the spirit by bringing the prophecy from Joel into his context. This interpretation was in line with contemporary Jewish interpretation about eschatological salvation. Although the tongues are not mentioned they are a manifestation of the presence of the spirit.<sup>167</sup> The eschatological meaning is sharpened by inserting ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (*last days*) instead of μετὰ ταῦτα (*after this*). The last days in contemporary Judaism had an apocalyptic and eschatological meaning of starting one era into a new one, but it was not seen as the end of the world.<sup>168</sup> The last days were usually referred to as the coming epiphany of God and in the present context it seems to be interpreted partly realized through the coming of the spirit.<sup>169</sup> Even if Luke downplays the cataclysmic eschatological emphasis of the last days they are still already present by the presence of the spirit.<sup>170</sup> The insertion λέγει ὁ θεός (*says God*) proves the origin of the prophecy and thus legitimised what was going on. There is a change of order compared with till LXX. In Acts the young men are mentioned first probably to emphasise the disciples, mostly young men, as the true leaders of Israel in the emerging messianic era. This will be the cause for upcoming conflict in 4:1–

<sup>166</sup> Evans 1995, p. 116.

<sup>167</sup> Edvin Larsson, *Apostlagärningarna, 5a in Kommentar till Nya Testamentet* (Stockholm: Verbum, 1983), p. 48.

<sup>168</sup> Collins 2010, pp. 113–114; Witherington 1998, p. 140.

<sup>169</sup> Kittel, “ἔσχατος” in *TDNT vol 2*, p. 697; Keener 2012, p. 890.

<sup>170</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 28; Jervell 1996, p. 106; Barrett 1994, pp. 135–136.

2. The insertion of μου (*my*) for male and female servants confirm that the disciples were God's servants. The omission of “for on mount Zion and in Jerusalem there will be deliverance, as the Lord has said, even among the survivors whom the Lord calls” (Joel 3:5b NIV) is probably in line with the omission of Isa 61:2b in Luke 4:19 to avoid contemporary political expectancy in nationalistic terms rather than the Lukan overarching inclusion of gentiles. The insertion of the preposition ἄνω (*up*), in heaven, and κάτω (*down*) on the earth is probably an allusion to Jesus being raised to the right hand of the Father from the grave. σημεῖον (*sign*) is added in the prophecy (2:19) probably to connect the ministry of Jesus in 2:22 and the disciples in 2:43.<sup>171</sup> τέρας (*wonder*) has in LXX (and in Luke) the meaning of God's self-attestation to the word, proclaimed by one of his messengers.<sup>172</sup> It was closely connected with the destiny of the people who was chosen by him. τέρας is never used in describing Jesus' deed in the Synoptics, but is frequently used in Acts and could point to Luke's understanding of God's continuously revelation through his anointed people in the messianic era.

After the resurrection and the exaltation of Jesus the followers rapidly came to refer to him as the Lord, which reflects his status at God's right hand. This is further shown by the fact that Jesus was placed in the text from OT where God was the original actor and the distributor of the spirit (Joel 3:1–5 LXX).<sup>173</sup> Another important insertion is the phrase καὶ προφητεύουσιν (*and they will prophesy*) which allude to the bigger Lukan theme about the proclamation of a divinely inspired message, exemplified here by Peter.<sup>174</sup> The cessation of prophecy, as noted above (3.7) give the background of this monumental shift in the world view which is implied by Luke. By the prophetic actions, which was probably expected of a coming prophet (1 Mack 9:27 and 4:45–46; 14:41), the messianic era was inaugurated. The disciples all carried the spirit and spoke (prophesied) regarding God's work of salvation which originated in Jesus. This will be developed further in the following quotes from Ps 15:8–11 (LXX).

(25) προωρώμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός, ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστὶν ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ. (26) διὰ τοῦτο ἠυφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, (27) ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. (28) ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς, πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου.

(Acts 2:25–28)

(8) προωρώμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός, ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστὶν, ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ. (9) διὰ τοῦτο ἠυφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου, καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι, (10) ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν. (11) ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς· περπνότητες ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος.

(Ps 15:8-11)

<sup>171</sup> Rengstorf, “σημεῖον” in *TDNT vol 7*, p. 242.

<sup>172</sup> Idem., “τέρας” in *TDNT vol 8*, p. 119; Barrett 1994, p. 141; Jervell 1996, p. 22.

<sup>173</sup> Hurtado 2003, p. 181; Larsson 1983, p. 49.

<sup>174</sup> Friedrich, “προφήτης” in *TDNT vol 6*, p. 828.

This quote is almost identical. The last verse might be omitted because it would include τέλος (*end*) and could be understood as a coming end for the eternal Messianic exaltation, which would not fit Luke's understanding. It is a bit strange, though, since it includes ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου (*at your right hand*), which would be appropriate. Peter shared a number of common assumption about the Messiah with contemporary Judaism, which he, of course was part of. (1) The Psalms were authored by David, (2) David was God's anointed, (3) God had promised an eternal dynasty to David through his descendants, (4) The things stated in the psalms, therefore, spoke of David or his descendants – the Messiah.<sup>175</sup> The reference to David as a prophet is unique even though there was a rich tradition counting him as a composer of Psalms, which was seen as prophetic texts (Josephus *ant.* 6.8.2 § 166).<sup>176</sup> This quote deals with the resurrection of Jesus. The argument goes like this: Since everybody knew that David had died and the text speaks of a coming person it could not be about David, but had to point to the Messiah.<sup>177</sup> From the LXX the understanding of κύριος (*Lord*) was not of an earthly king but of God. Therefore it was about a heavenly enthronement. Since David was not seen as ascended the text must once again speak of the Messiah, who was from that moment sitting at the right hand of God. The promise to David, made by God through Nathan in 2 Sam 7:12–16 has a messianic interpretation when referred to in Luke 1:32–33.<sup>178</sup> 2 Sam 7:12–16 is used with a similar argument as Ps 16 (15 LXX) and 110 (109 LXX). Since David had died this points to Messiah because Solomon did not follow God faithfully (Sir 47:19–21). The resurrection proved Jesus to be the Messiah.<sup>179</sup> There is more of an apocalyptic view of Messiah here which has common elements with 4 Ezra, which also has close parallels to 2 Baruch, 1 Enoch and even Psalms of Solomon.<sup>180</sup>

(30b) ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ  
τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τὸν  
θρόνον αὐτοῦ,

(31) προιδῶν ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς  
ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅτι οὔτε  
ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ἄδην οὔτε ἡ σὰρξ  
αὐτοῦ-εἶδεν διαφθοράν.

(Acts 2:30-31)

(11) ὤμοσεν κύριος τῷ Δαυὶδ ~~ἀλήθειαν~~  
~~καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσῃ αὐτήν~~ Ἐκ καρποῦ  
τῆς κοιλίας σου θήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον  
σου·

(Ps 131:11)

ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου  
εἰς ἄδην οὔδὲ θώσεις τὸν ὄστέον σου ἰδεῖν  
διαφθοράν.

(Ps 15:10)

<sup>175</sup> Johnson 1992, p. 54.

<sup>176</sup> Bock 2007, p. 127; Barrett 1994, p. 146; Jervell 1996, p. 65.

<sup>177</sup> Jervell 1996, p. 31.

<sup>178</sup> Johnson 1992, p. 52; Also in 4QFlor 1:7–13.

<sup>179</sup> Johnson 1992, p. 55; C. K. Barrett, *The Acts of the Apostles, vol 1 (1–14)* in *The International Critical Commentary*, ed. J.A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994), p. 129, 147.

<sup>180</sup> B. M. Metzger (trans. and intro.), “*Fourth Book of Ezra*” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. vol 1*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), pp. 522–523.

There was probably a common stock of scripture used by the early church to explain Jesus' messianic function and Ps 15 (LXX) was surely one of them.<sup>181</sup> In the Hebrew it is clear in that David was talking about God as the Lord and that he was talking about himself (Ps 16:10). Luke uses the LXX to derive the resurrection from corruption.<sup>182</sup> Jesus was resurrected and thus ruling together with God as a fulfilment of the promise stated in Acts 2:30.<sup>183</sup> There is a shift in tense between the verbs in 2:27 and 2:31. The first in future tense and the second in past tense (aorist) which stress that the promise had been fulfilled.<sup>184</sup> The insertion of ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ (*his flesh*) instead of τὸν ὅσιόν σου (*your holy one*) emphasise the bodily resurrection of Jesus. ἀνίστημι (*rise up*) in 24, 31 and 32 points to the key element by confirming Jesus as the promised descendant, who will not decay. Josephus notes that the Pharisees held the view of a general resurrection before the judgment. This seems to have been embraced somewhat broadly (1 Enoch 51:1, 2 Bar 30:2–5), although some texts state that not all are included in the resurrection (Dan 12:2, 2 Macc 7:14).<sup>185</sup> Jesus resurrection was different because it was a singular event within history different to the general one at the end of the age. Hades was the Greek equivalent to Gehenna or Sheol – a place where the dead were gathered for judgment. The Jews believed that the soul stayed with the dead body for three days before it departed.<sup>186</sup>

(34b) εἶπεν [ὁ] κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου·κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,  
 (35) ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.  
 (Acts 2:34-35)

(1) ~~Τῷ Δαυὶδ ψαλμὸς.~~ Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου  
 ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν  
 ποδῶν σου.  
 (Ps 109:1)

This quote is identical. The use of Psalm 15 (LXX) and 109 (LXX) are in accordance with the Midrash interpretation when two passages are linked with the occurrence of keywords. Here the link is made by ἐκ δεξιῶν μου (*at my right*). Ps 109 (LXX) was seen as Davidic and not referring to him since he never was seated at the right hand of the Father. Luke uses this in reference to ascension rather than resurrection in this quote.<sup>187</sup> Jesus was not only risen *by* God's right hand, but also seated *at* his right hand.<sup>188</sup> The Davidic throne was closely connected to God's throne (a common picture in OT),<sup>189</sup> but by using the title κύριος (*Lord*) it exceeded the traditional Messianic expectation.<sup>190</sup> In 1 Enoch (62:5; 69:27, 29) the heavenly Messiah is called to sit on the throne of

<sup>181</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 261.

<sup>182</sup> Moyise 2015, pp. 75-76.

<sup>183</sup> Larsson 1983, p. 55.

<sup>184</sup> Idem., p. 44; Bock 2007, p. 129.

<sup>185</sup> Josephus *Ant. 18. (1) §14*.

<sup>186</sup> Bock 2007, pp. 123–25; Witherington 1998, p. 145.

<sup>187</sup> Barrett 1994, p. 149.

<sup>188</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 67.

<sup>189</sup> Larsson 1983, p. 53.

<sup>190</sup> Idem., p. 56.



Glory.<sup>191</sup> Jesus was thus a heavenly king ruling with God and Lord became a further qualification of Messiah. By doing this Luke loosened it from the national expectations. Through the resurrection Jesus was vindicated as the heir of David. This was the decisive turning point where God made him both Lord and messiah.<sup>192</sup> Χριστός and κύριος was complementary as expressed in Luke 2:11, Acts 2:36, 10:36.<sup>193</sup> Jesus was also seen as having a divine role in the distribution of the spirit (Acts 2:17).<sup>194</sup> κύριος, usually a divine title, translated the Hebrew word for God and is the only title which is used for both Jesus and God in Acts.<sup>195</sup> In LXX God is often called κύριος (compare Luke 2:11 and Ps Sol 17:36).<sup>196</sup> The context determine the obvious meaning, which was awkward in Jewish eyes, that Jesus was somewhat divine, sitting at the right hand of God.<sup>197</sup> For Luke Jesus was not like the OT figures whom the spirit came upon, rather he was the possessor of, and Lord of the Spirit, which he distributed (2:33).<sup>198</sup> The spirit is even referred to as being his in Acts 16:7.<sup>199</sup> Acts 2:36 is unique in the way that it explicitly link Jesus' exaltation to the right hand of the father with Davidic enthronement.<sup>200</sup>

#### 4.2.4 Conclusion

Peter stepped forward as a response to the people's reaction of the outpouring of the spirit on Pentecost. The speech state Jesus as the Davidic Messiah and derives the combination of two titles from scriptural proof. The *Messiah* from Ps 15 and *Lord* from Ps 109. Luke does, however, use *Lord* both before and after the resurrection.<sup>201</sup> Luke portrays Peter legitimising the event from Joel 3 and by quoting Ps 15 he proved the resurrection just as he proved the ascension from Ps 109, which was the basis for the outpouring of the spirit. Although Peter followed Jesus, the speech and its content seems to be aimed to a more apocalyptic messianic expectation for a king. The Jewish contemporaries had primarily a messianic hope for a Davidic, royal Messiah and it was, therefore, natural that any interpretation of Jesus as the Messiah would look for Davidic words or deeds to make sense of what they experienced.<sup>202</sup> This way of understanding Jesus Davidic Messiahship also make sense for Luke in general. We will come back to this in the discussion.

---

<sup>191</sup> Collins 2010, p. 162.

<sup>192</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 65.

<sup>193</sup> Idem., p. 27.

<sup>194</sup> Keener 2012, p. 502.

<sup>195</sup> Wall 2002, p. 64.

<sup>196</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 68.

<sup>197</sup> Bock 2007, pp. 134–135.

<sup>198</sup> Schweizer, “πνεῦμα” in *TDNT*, vol 6, pp. 404–405.

<sup>199</sup> Keener 2012, p. 502.

<sup>200</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 66.

<sup>201</sup> Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles*, [trans., first ed 1963] (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), p. 21.

<sup>202</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 30.

### 4.3 Paul's Speech in Acts 13:14–43

Paul is mostly known as the great theologian and even though there is a large amount of narrative reported in Acts about his missionary activity, the speeches in this book has not been as central as the speech of Jesus and Peter. As the case with Jesus, Paul is introduced a few chapters before his first reported speech.

#### 4.3.1 Literary Context

There are similar arguments using Ps 15 (LXX) and 109 (LXX) from Peter's speech, but not to the background of the spiritual outpouring as in Acts 2. In Acts 13 there was not a move of the spirit that needed to be explained. The speech is less concise compared with Luke 4 and Acts 2. This might be because of Luke's personal knowledge of how Paul taught. The speech in Acts 13:14–43 is also suggested to be a Homiletic Midrash or from the sources of it. The texts are not cited to the same degree as they are in the other speeches, but more alluded. It has been suggested that the speech builds upon 2 Sam 7 without quoting it.<sup>203</sup> There are five quotes in this passage. The first three have been fulfilled, the fourth isn't when spoken, but the following Sabbath. The fifth became fulfilled by the end of the book.

There is little doubt that it is deliberate that Paul preached (almost) the same sermon as Peter since one of the purposes of Acts probably was some kind of apologetic defense for Paul.<sup>204</sup> 13:27 confirms that Jesus was foretold by the prophet throughout the scriptures and according to the promise, thus legitimizing Paul's claim. The other speeches have an inauguration function in the messianic era, but this has more of an inaugurating function for Paul alone. The key word is ἐγείρω and ἀνίστημι (as in 2:24, 31, 32). The fulfilment of Davidic promises is this the point of the sermon<sup>205</sup> and the connection to David is accomplished by the two Psalms and the quote from Isaiah.<sup>206</sup> The structure is divided into three parts (16b–25, 26–37, 38–41) and framed by Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται or Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί. The first section deals with the historical background from Abraham to John the baptism. The second section address the whole crowd in 13:26 as “brothers” which include the gentiles (God-fearers) and explained Jesus. This confirms what was initiated in Luke's gospel.<sup>207</sup> The kerygma is in the middle section, where the ministry of Jesus was not recognised. Even though the prophecies had been proclaimed among them they killed him, but God raised him and thus confirmed his claims as Messiah.<sup>208</sup> The third part is the invitation which emphasise the forgiveness of sin justification through faith. The invitation is sharpened by a

<sup>203</sup> Strauss 1995, pp. 153–155.

<sup>204</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 177.

<sup>205</sup> Strauss 1995, pp. 156–157.

<sup>206</sup> Dunn 1996, p. 180.

<sup>207</sup> Idem., p. 178.

<sup>208</sup> Fitzmyer 1998, pp. 507–508.

warning not to be receptive.

### 4.3.2 Historical Context

The setting is very similar to Jesus speech, although Paul stood up as a Hellenistic rhetorician different from Jesus, who sat down and taught (as was customary for Jewish teachers) in Nazareth.<sup>209</sup> The speech has an introductory function to Paul's ministry as well. Paul was invited to give a sermon after the reading. It is unclear if the reading alludes in his speech or if Paul made use of other texts since several more texts are involved in the speech, although the use of *gezerah shewa* could explain the inclusion of other texts. Paul is not being portrayed as addressing the pagan context in the same way as in Lystra (Acts 14:15–17) or in Athens (Acts 17:22–31). This makes the setting closer to Peter's and Jesus', although outside of Israel. Antioch was a Roman colony which makes sense in Luke's bigger picture of gentile inclusion, although not as obvious as in 16:12 with Philippi.<sup>210</sup> The gentiles are called both brothers and disciples, which were terms formerly reserved for Jews.<sup>211</sup>

### 4.3.3 Line of Argument

The argument builds upon the historical background and the purpose is to legitimate Jesus from the Jewish history as the Davidic Messiah. God's promises about the Messiah was derived from scripture and was confirmed by Jesus' resurrection. The central section is located in 13:23 by σωτήρ (*saviour*) as a distinctly Lukan title for the resurrected Jesus. He was seen as the saviour for Israel, according to the promise made by God.<sup>212</sup> σωτήρ is derived from LXX and thus rooted in Jewish thinking with the meaning of deliverance from enemies.<sup>213</sup> In contemporary sources, it was used of people in prominent positions, but never so in NT. Only God and Jesus are called saviour (it only occurs in Luke 2:11, Acts 5:31; 13:23 and John 4:42 in NT).<sup>214</sup> The first set of quotes are more of allusion than word by word quotation and serves to set the origin of Jesus in accordance with the promises.

Εὖρον Δαυὶδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰησοῦ,

~~καὶ νῦν ἡ βασιλεία σου οὐ  
στήσεται, καὶ ζητήσῃ κύριος  
ἑαυτῷ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν~~

ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου,

εὖρον Δαυὶδ τὸν δευλόν μου,  
ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ μου ἔχρισά-  
αὐτόν.

(Ps 88:21)

ὁ λέγων Κύριε φρονεῖν, καὶ

<sup>209</sup> Edvin Larson, *Apostlagärningarna, 5b in Kommentar till Nya Testamentet* (Uppsala: Verbum, 1987), p. 291.

<sup>210</sup> Conzelmann 1987, p. 103; Barrett 1994, p. 627.

<sup>211</sup> Gregerman 2013, pp. 213–214.

<sup>212</sup> Fitzmyer 1998, p. 512.

<sup>213</sup> Keener 2012, p. 504; Jervell 1996, pp. 94–95.

<sup>214</sup> Bock 2007, p. 453.

ὁς ποιήσει	καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, καὶ	Πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου
πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.	ἐντελεῖται κύριος αὐτῷ εἰς	ποιήσει· ὁ λέγων Ἱερουσαλημ
(Acts 13:22b)	ἄρχοντα ἐπὶ τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ,	Οἰκοδομηθήσῃ, καὶ τὸν οἶκον
	ὅτι οὐκ ἐφύλαξας ὅσα	τὸν ἅγιόν μου θεμελιώσω.
	ἐνετείλατό σοι κύριος.	(Isa 44:28)
	(1 Sam 13:14)	

The narrative background from 1 Sam lies in the background for much of Luke's work (which will be argued for in the discussion below). In the story where Saul was removed from the throne and David was made king through the word ἐγείρω (*raise up*), which alludes to the resurrected Messiah for Luke.<sup>215</sup> In the sermon, Paul jumps thousand years to the son of David, which is the main point of the speech.<sup>216</sup> And the main focus of the scattered allusions is to state Jesus' Davidic descent. The quote from Isaiah 44:28 is part of the servant song which portrays Israel as the servant of God, which Jesus represented perfectly. The Ps 88 (LXX) were probably written when disaster had struck David's house and the contrast between promise and present failure was expressed in frustration.<sup>217</sup> The omission of (τὸν δοῦλόν μου, ἐν ἐλαίῳ ἁγίῳ μου ἔχρισα αὐτόν) is a bit strange since it could have been well used. Maybe the technique of *Metalepsis* is thought of and the listeners expected to catch the allusion? The explicit address in 13:26 confirms the gentile inclusion that has been initiated in the other speeches by Jesus and Peter (as well as other speeches in the narrative). The audience, whom traditionally had been standing outside the blessing were thus invited.<sup>218</sup>

ὅτι ταύτην ὁ θεὸς ἐκπεπλήρωκεν τοῖς τέκνοις [αὐτῶν] ἡμῖν	διαγγέλλων τὸ πρόσταγμα κυρίου Κύριος εἶπεν πρὸς με
ἀναστήσας Ἰησοῦν ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ	μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε·
δευτέρῳ, Υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε.	(Ps 2:7)
(Acts 13:33)	

Here Paul returns to the central section from 13:23 and use Ps 2:7 as scriptural proof for the claims made in 13:23 and 13:33.<sup>219</sup> It was a royal psalm for the enthronement of an unnamed king of Davidic descendant, which might derive from 2 Sam 7:14.<sup>220</sup> Psalm 2 and 2 Samuel 7 were connected before the Christian era in 4Q Flor from the Qumran community.<sup>221</sup> The Psalm has political terms rather than ontological or metaphysical claim.<sup>222</sup> Since David was dead the quote

<sup>215</sup> Wall 2002, p. 192.

<sup>216</sup> Bock 2007, p. 453.

<sup>217</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 256.

<sup>218</sup> Bock 2007, p. 458.

<sup>219</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 164.

<sup>220</sup> Fitzmyer 1998, p. 517.

<sup>221</sup> Hengel, M. *Christological Titles in Early Christianity in The Messiah – Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), p. 438.

<sup>222</sup> Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament*, (Minneapolis: Fortress press, 1997), p. 606.

must talk about someone else. This is the same way of arguing as in Peter's speech. Psalm 2 already had Messianic connotations in Psalms of Solomon (17:26).<sup>223</sup> And also 4 Ezra 13:33–38 is reminiscent of Ps 2 where the “son”, who is identified from context as Messiah, stands on Zion.<sup>224</sup>

<p>(34) ἔτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς διαφθοράν, οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.</p> <p>(35) διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει οὐ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.</p> <p>(Acts 13:34–35)</p>	<p><del>προσέχετε τοῖς ὁπίοις ὑμῶν καὶ</del> <del>ἐπακούθησατε ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου</del> ἐπακούσατέ μου, καὶ ζήσεται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν καὶ διαθήσεται ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον, τὰ ὅσια Δαυὶδ τὰ πιστά.</p> <p>(Isa 55:3)</p>	<p>ἔτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.</p> <p>(Ps 15:10)</p>
--	--	--

Three link words are use in these verses to connect the quotations (τὰ ὅσια/ τὸν ὄσιόν, διαφθοράν, and δώσεις).<sup>225</sup> The use of τὰ ὅσια/ τὸν ὄσιόν (*holy thing/s*) is translated from **דַּיְדוּק** (*faithful love/mercy*) in the Hebrew text. LXX made it more concrete to holy *things* which implicitly include the promises (and the covenant omitted from Isa 55:3b) given to David in 2 Sam 7 and the holy *one* that will not die.<sup>226</sup> As we have seen, this text was given an eschatological and messianic interpretation in second temple Judaism. The quote from Isa 55:3 was not strong enough, for Luke, to stress the resurrection, therefore, it lends support from Ps 15:10 (LXX). God did not let Jesus go to Sheol, where Jews thought of the soul staying for three days, and he did not leave his body to decay.<sup>227</sup> Ps 2:7 and Ps 15:10 (LXX) were proof texts for the resurrection.<sup>228</sup> In Acts 2 the use of Ps 15 (LXX) was not about the resurrection of David, but to prove Jesus as Davidic Messiah since he did not die, but in Acts 13 Ps 15:10 (LXX) is used to prove that he fulfilled the promise to David of an eternal reign.<sup>229</sup> In 13:38 Paul addresses *all* brothers and by that he is including the gentiles.<sup>230</sup> Here we see the progression in Luke's overall emphasis of gentiles inclusion in the messianic movement. The focus of ἄφεσις (*forgiveness/release*) of sin in 13:38 is closer to the key–theme in Luke 4:18–19 than Acts 2 where the spirit is the focus, although ἄφεσις is included among the blessing that will result from baptism and in Luke 4 it is about release. Forgiveness of sin is mentioned before (2:38; 3:19; 5:31; 10:43), but not justification as addition to it.<sup>231</sup> For Luke, the contrast with the law is that it is utterly inadequate to bring forgiveness.<sup>232</sup> Jesus was the one that

<sup>223</sup> Larsson 1987, pp. 300–302.

<sup>224</sup> Collins 2010, p. 208.

<sup>225</sup> Bock 2007, p. 457.

<sup>226</sup> Ibid; Strauss 1995, p. 170.

<sup>227</sup> Fitzmyer 1998, p. 517.

<sup>228</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 166.

<sup>229</sup> Idem., p. 173.

<sup>230</sup> Fitzmyer 1998, p. 518.

<sup>231</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 262.

<sup>232</sup> Bock 2007, p. 459; Fitzmyer 1998, pp. 518–519.

brought complete righteousness, which the law of Moses' never could.<sup>233</sup> The only other place is in Luke 18:14 where the tax collector went home justified after casting himself completely on divine grace.<sup>234</sup> Jesus crucifixion did not have the atoning emphasis in the Lukas view such as the one we find in Paul (Rom 4:24–25, 1 Cor 15:3). Instead, the necessity of the Messiah's death was more as an apologetic explanation for Jesus crucifixion.<sup>235</sup> Thus comes a warning to not receive what God offers.

Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, ὅτι ἔργον ἐργάζομαι ἐγὼ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, ἔργον δὲ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται ὑμῖν.

(Acts 13:41)

Ἴδετε, οἱ καταφρονηταί, καὶ ἐπιβλέψατε καὶ θαυμάσατε ~~θαυμάσατε~~ καὶ ἀφανίσθητε, διότι ἔργον ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν, δὲ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε ἐάν τις ἐκδιηγῆται.

(Hab 1:5)

*To maintain in the grace of God* is probably a Lukan insertion of an important part of Pauline theology which drives the process of conversion and justification.<sup>236</sup> The last quote is clearly cited and not alluded as the other. This point to Lukan edition. The change of order in Hab 1:5 makes no difference, but could point to Luke having another version of LXX which had that order of words. In verse 42–43 it seems like the two, earlier separated groups (proselytes and God-fearers) are included in one group, thus making less difference and greater inclusion.<sup>237</sup> This is the first of several occasions that Paul turned explicitly to the gentiles.<sup>238</sup> So let us conclude what central element Luke has Paul emphasise.

#### 4.3.4 Conclusion

The central element of Paul's speech is to root Jesus within the Jewish history. The promises of God and the resurrection was the basis of which Jesus was confirmed as the Messiah, according to Luke. From Jesus' resurrection, the righteousness and forgiveness flows to all people. The gentiles' inclusion stated by Jesus in Luke 4 and realised in the ending invitation of Paul. Luke lets Paul linger at the Davidic claim of Messiah, which Jesus fulfils. Luke puts the focus on traditional Davidic understanding of Messiah it in the mouth of Paul, in a representative way.<sup>239</sup>

<sup>233</sup> Bruce 1988, p. 262.

<sup>234</sup> Ibid.

<sup>235</sup> Hurtado 2003, p. 186.

<sup>236</sup> Fitzmyer 1998, p. 520.

<sup>237</sup> Bock 2007, p. 461.

<sup>238</sup> Idem., p. 463.

<sup>239</sup> Johnson 1992, p. 238; Witherington 1998, p. 409.

## 5 Final Discussion

The discussion has been included in the analysis so far and a final discussion will be presented in this chapter. I will summarise and discuss the conclusions and answer the question presented in the introduction. The aim is to show (1) Luke's understanding and development of Messiah in his narrative and (2) a tentative answer for the difference. Since Luke seems to have had a high regard for history, although to serve his purpose, we should expect these results to mirror something of how Luke understood Jesus, Peter and Paul historically. So let us look at the conclusion from the analysis.

### 5.1 Comparison of the Messianic Element in the Speeches

The result from the first speech is that Jesus was seen by Luke with both royal and prophetic elements. The prophetic function of Jesus is explicit through the use of Isa 61:1–2 and the reference to Elijah and Elisha. The royal claim is implicit, although the context clearly points to a Davidic royal association. Even from the use of Isa 61 we did locate some royal elements. If Luke got hold of some source for this speech it seems like the historical context understood Jesus as a prophet, but Luke sees both royal and prophetic elements. The Messianic era was inaugurated by the presence of the spirit and the prophetic proclamation, according to Luke. The Gentiles' inclusion into the messianic kingdom was a major sidestep compared with contemporary Judaism, but of central importance for Luke.

Comparing the speech of Peter's and Jesus' we found that Peter's speech also has an introductory function for a new phase in the messianic era. Luke's account claim that Peter, as Jesus, spoke under the influence of the spirit and launched the next step in the messianic kingdom – the Church (foretold in Acts 1:8 just as Jesus was foretold in Luke 1:69). The speech is focused on royal messianic expectations for an eternal Davidic descendant. There is just a brief summary of Jesus' ministry in Peter's speech (Acts 2:22) compared with Jesus' speech, where this is the central outline of Jesus coming ministry. The function of the speech was to confirm Jesus as the Messiah. Luke states that Jesus, by his resurrection and exaltation, was the source of the outpouring of the spirit. The change of tense is also a common theme with Jesus' speech. The promises from OT are fulfilled in the present tense and not in the future, although it seems to be an interim period between the inauguration and the fully coming of the messianic era. The differences with Jesus' speech is that Peter's speech is focused on explaining the outpouring of the spirit from the resurrection and the ascension. The messianic era, which was connected with the spirit which seemed to be a widely held view, now moved into the next phase through Jesus' exaltation and the anointing of the church.

In the Third speech Luke portrays what Paul says when he was giving his first speech. It seems to be more complex than the former two, which suggest historical information of Paul's teaching. Luke has Paul speak with the purpose to root Jesus, just as Peter did, within Jewish history and promises of OT to a mixed audience. The resurrection was the central argument in confirming Jesus as a Davidic Messiah. The outcome of this is presented with the possibility of forgiveness and righteousness. Forgiveness is also present in Peter's speech. When comparing Paul's speech with Jesus' we find that both were held in a synagogue and were proactive proclamations rather than a response to an extraordinary experience such as in Acts 2. Luke portray that there was a similar reaction to gentile inclusion from Jews in Luke 4:28 and Act 13:45 even though no gentiles were present in Luke 4. There are more of similarities with Peter's speech and contemporary Judaism in the messianic elements deriving from Davidic descendant and royal expectations for the Messiah. The differences with Jesus' speech is that both Paul and Peter used Midrash argumentation to confirm the resurrection of Jesus. His ministry, though, is just briefly mentioned. Further, they state that Jesus rose from the dead as the fulfilment of the prophecies and the central text in both is Ps 15:10 (LXX). The difference between Peter and Paul is that in Paul's speech the resurrection is focused, but not the exaltation, although it is implicit in 13:34b. In Acts 2 the context is the outpouring and exaltation, in Acts 13 divine son-ship and incorruptible status of the Davidic descendant are focused. The major difference with contemporary Judaism was the inclusion of gentiles and the resurrection within history as stated above.

So, why is there a difference between the speeches when the typological pattern of Jesus is followed by his disciples throughout the Lukan narrative? It is important to keep in mind the overarching presentation within the narrative. All the speeches, among other texts, help to build a progression for Luke's emphasis of Jesus as the Davidic descendant and of the gentiles inclusion. The difference noted when comparing the first speech to the other two might be explained by Luke's awareness of the OT and his ambition as an author of sacred history. A tentative hypothesis will be presented as follow:

## **5.2 A Solution Proposal**

Since the Davidic frame for the understanding of Messiah seems to be emphasised from the beginning it is probable that the story of David can give additional clues to the difference noted. I think that the Davidic narrative can locate and outline what would fit the Lukan progression for Jesus as the royal Messiah. The analogy with David, as the anointed King before coronation, has been briefly noted before (1 Sam 16),<sup>240</sup> but not developed with the perspective of the Davidic narrative as a whole for Luke's theological outline for Jesus. Additional support is found in the fact that some texts are alluded rather than quoted in these speeches. Most of the quotes used derive

---

<sup>240</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 145.



from either prophetic literature or the psalms. But there is one other text which seems to allude to, rather than quoted from and that is the case with 1 Sam 13:14 in Acts 13:22. This passage in Acts 13 is a mix of several sources, which imply that Luke probably alluded from memory rather than quoting strictly from a scroll in front of him, as are most of the other OT passages used in the speeches. All the quotes used from LXX are related to prophetic actions or texts (Is 44:28; 55:3; 58:6; 61:1–2; Joel 3:1–5; Ps 2:7; 15:8–11; 88:21, 109:1, 131:11; Hab 1:5) except 1 Sam 13:14, which deal with the ideal attitude which will be fulfilled with the coming of David. This could point to Luke's awareness and use of the Davidic narrative without strictly quoting it. The Lukan usage of the passage supports the view that the Davidic narrative lies at the back of Luke's head. In a brief comparison this is what emerges:

From Luke's perspective, Jesus is seen as an anointed royal figure with prophetic elements such as David (1 Sam 23:2, 11). John the baptism is explicitly called prophet by Luke, but Jesus never is even though there can be a prophetic function connected with the kings. Davidic and prophetic ideas converge in both Hebrew scripture and LXX of 1 Sam 16:13 and even Josephus, when paraphrasing this passage added prophesying to 1 Sam 16.<sup>241</sup> Both David and Jesus were anointed by a prophet – Samuel and John the Baptist (1 Sam 16:13; Luke 3:21–22). The Spirit of the Lord fell upon David and rested upon him from that moment which is similar to Jesus (Luke 3:21–22). Samuel gets a word from God that the Lord has found David, a man of his heart (1 Sam 13:14; 16:7), which is similar to the Father's statement over Jesus at his baptism (Luke 3:22) and explicitly stated in Acts 13:22. A comparison which could be suggest, but which should not be given a heavy weight is from In 1 Sam 16:14–23 when Saul, the leader of Israel, had been abandoned by the spirit of the Lord and was afflicted by an evil spirit. David was called to bring freedom to the oppressed king (1 Sam 16:23), Similarly, Jesus in his speech is stated to bring ἄφεσις (*release*) to the afflicted (Luke 4:18). David is portrayed as a loyal servant to the anointed king even though Saul had been forsaken by God (1 Sam 16–31). Luke does not show negative monarchical approach even though it is explicit from 1 Sam 12:1–25. He's main focus could be a loyal servant.<sup>242</sup> Not even the man that claim to have had mercy and killed Saul gets spared from David's loyalty to the Lord anointed (2 Sam 1:16). David was seen as blamelessly loyal, as is Jesus. In 2 Sam 2:4 the people of Judah came and anointed David (again) and made him king. The human recognition for God's anointed had executive power which might be addressed through repentance and faith in Luke's mind. Another, more vague, comparison could be seen when the enemy's commander confessed the Lord's promise to David when accused (2 Sam 3:9–10) and the demons confesses similarly who Jesus is (Luke 4:34). The interim tension between the anointing and enthronement of David might thus be a

---

<sup>241</sup> Evans 1995, p. 447.

<sup>242</sup> Johnson 1992, p. 231.

typological reference to Jesus way from the baptism, inaugurating speech, loyal ministry, death, resurrection and exaltation.<sup>243</sup>

---

<sup>243</sup> Strauss 1995, p. 145.

## 6 Conclusions

The concluding result from the study of Luke's understanding of Messiah, emerging from the comparison of these key speeches, has presented an Davidic, eschatological, apocalyptic, non-nationalistic Messiah from Jewish rooted with prophetic elements. This show both congruent element with contemporary Judaism, but also divergent elements (gentile inclusion). Luke portray Jesus as inaugurating the first phase of the messianic era by his proclamation and forthcoming ministry. After Jesus' death he was resurrected from the dead and ascended to his heavenly throne, from where he distributed the spirit in the second phase of the messianic era, the birth of the Church in accordance to the fulfilment of Gods promises. The third speech has the same function when Paul is expanding the territory and including the gentiles in his speech. The differences between the speeches are explained by a hypothesis that Luke had, either explicitly or implicitly, the Davidic narrative from 1 Sam 16:13–2 Sam 2:4 as a background for the progressive interim period between Jesus' anointing in Luke 4 and his heavenly enthronement from Acts 2 and forward.

## 7 Bibliography

- Adams, Sean A., *The Tradition of Peter's Literacy: Acts, 1 Peter, and Petrine Literature*, ed. Helen K. Bond & Larry W. Hurtado (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2015)
- Barrett, Charles. K., *The Acts of the Apostles, vol 1 (1–14)* in *The International Critical Commentary*, ed. J.A. Emerton, C. E. B. Cranfield and G. N. Stanton (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994)
- Bock, Darrell, L., *Acts* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007)
- Brueggemann, Walter, *Theology of the Old Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress press, 1997)
- Burridge, Richard A., *Imitation Jesus: An Inclusive Approach to New Testament Studies* (Cambridge/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co., 2007)
- Byrskog, Samuel, *Story as History, History as Story – The Gospel Tradition in the Context of Ancient Oral History* (Boston/Leiden: Brill Academic Publisher, 2002)
- Charlesworth, James H. (ed), *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, vol 2* (New York: Doubleday, 1985)
- Collins, John J., *The Scepter and the Star*. 2 ed. [1995] (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2010)
- . *The Journal of Religion* 76.3 (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996), pp. 464–66.
- .. “Messiah” in NIDB, vol 4 (Nashville: Abingdon, 2009), pp. 59–66.
- Conzelmann, Hans, *Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, (trans.) 1987 [Original 1972])
- Culpepper, R. Alan, *The Gospel of Luke in NIB, vol 9* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1995)
- Jervell, Jacob, *The Theology of Acts of the Apostles*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996)
- de Jong, Marinus, “Messiah” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary, vol 4* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), pp. 777–788.
- DeVries, F., LaMoine., “Nazareth” in *The New Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible, vol 4* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2006–2009), pp. 240–41.
- Dunn, James D. G., *The Acts of the Apostles* [original Peterborough: Epworth Press, 1996] (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Edition, 2016)
- Evans, Craig, *Jesus and his World – the Architectural Evidences* (London: SPCK, 2012)
- . *Jesus and his Contemporaries – Comparative Studies* (Leiden: Brill, 1995)
- . *Luke and the Rewritten Bible: Aspects of Lukan Hagiography* in *The Pseudepigrapha and early Biblical Interpretation – Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series, no. 14/ Studies in Scripture in Early Judaism and Christianity, no. 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth and Craig A. Evans (Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press, 1993), pp. 170–201.

- . *The Scripture of Jesus and his earliest Followers in The Canon Debate*, ed. Lee Martin McDonald & James A. Sanders (Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2002), pp. 185–195.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Gospel according to Luke , I–IX* (New York: Doubleday, 1979)
- . *The Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Doubleday, 1998)
- Flavius Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities*, trans. William Whiston (Ware: Wordsworth Edition Limited, 2006)
- Friedrich, Gerhard, “εὐαγγελίζομαι” in *TDNT*, vol 2, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 707–37.
- . “κηρῦξις” in *TDNT*, vol 3, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 683–718.
- . “προφήτης” in *TDNT*, vol 6, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 828–61.
- Goldingay, John and Payne, David, *Isaiah 40–55 in The International Critical Commentary, vol 1*, ed. G. I. Davies and C. M. Tuckett (London/New York: T & T Clark, 2014)
- Green, Joel B., *The gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1997)
- Gregerman, Adam, “*Biblical Prophecy and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish and Christian Interpretations of Isaiah*,” in ‘*What does the Scripture say?*’ – *Studies in the Function of Scripture in early Judaism and Christianity, vol 1: The Synoptic Gospels*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (London & New York: T&T Clark, 2012), pp. 212–40.
- Hays, Richard B, *Reading backwards: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco: Baylor university press, 2014)
- Hengel, Martin, *Christological Titles in early Christianity in The Messiah – Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), pp. 425–448.
- Heskett, Randall, *Messianism within the Scriptural Scrolls of Isaiah* (London: T & T Clark, 2007)
- Hurtado, Larry W., *Lord Jesus Christ – Devotion to Jesus in the earliest Christianity* (Grand rapids: Eerdmans, 2003)
- Irenaeus, *Bevis för den apostoliska förkunnelsen*, trans. Olof Andrén (Skellefteå: Artos, 2007)
- Keener, Craig, *Acts – an Exegetical Commentary, vol 1* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2012)
- Kittel, Gerhard, “ἔσχατος” in *TDNT*, vol 2, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 697–98.
- Larson, Edvin, *Apostlagärningarna, 5a* (Stockholm: EFS-förlaget, 1983)
- . *Apostlagärningarna, 5b* (Uppsala: Verbum, 1987)
- McWhirter, Jocelyn, *Messianic Exegesis in Mark 1:2–3 in What does the Scripture say? – Studies in the Function of Scripture in early Judaism and Christianity, vol 1, the Synoptic Gospels*, ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias (New York: T&T Clark, 2012), pp.

158–178.

- Metzger, Bruce. M., “*Fourth Book of Ezra*” in *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha. vol 1*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1983), pp. 517–59.
- Moyise, Steve, *The Old Testament in the New: an Introduction*, 2 ed. (London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015)
- Nestle–Aland, *Novum Testamentum Graece 28* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2012)
- Nolland, John, *Luke 1–9:20* in *Word Biblical Commentary, vol 35a*, ed. David A. Hubbard, Glenn W. Barker (Dallas: Word Books Publisher, 1989)
- Novenson, Matthew V., *Christ among the Messiahs* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- Oegema, S., Gerbern, *The Anointed and his People – Messianic Expectation from Maccabees to Bar Kochba* in *Journal for the Study of Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series 27* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998)
- Pao, David, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* [Mohr Siebeck, 2000] (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publisher, 2016)
- Paul, Shalom M., *Isaiah 40–66* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 2012)
- Pervo, Richard I., *Acts* in *Hermeneia*, ed. Harold W. Attridge (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2009)
- Rengstorf, Leonhard, “σημεῖον” in *TDNT vol 7*, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 200–69.
- . “τέρας” in *TDNT vol 8*, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 113–26.
- Rowe, C. Kavin, *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006)
- Schweizer, Eduard, “πνεῦμα” in *TDNT, vol 6*, ed. G. Kittel & G. Friedrich (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Co, 1964–1976), pp. 332–455.
- Skarsaune, Oskar, *In the Shadow of the Temple* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press, 2002)
- Stanton, Graham, *The Gospels and Jesus* (Oxford: Oxford University press, 2002)
- Strauss, Mark L., *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts* in *Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series, no. 110* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academy Press, 1995)
- Theissen Gerd – *The Political Dimension of Jesus' Activities in The Social Setting of Jesus and the Gospels*, ed. Wolfgang Stegemann, Bruce J. Malina, Gerd Theissen (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2002), pp. 225–250.
- Vermes, Geza, *Scrolls, Scriptures and early Christianity*, in *Library of Second Temple Studies, no. 56*, ed. Lester L. Grabbe, James H. Charlesworth (London/New York: T & T Clark International, 2005)
- Wall, Robert W., *The Acts of the Apostles* in *NIB* (Nashville: Abingdon, 2002)
- Witherington, Ben III, *Acts of the Apostles* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998)

Wright, Richard. B., *Psalms of Solomon in The Old testament Pseudepigrapha. vol 2*, ed. James H. Charlesworth (New York: Doubleday, 1985), pp. 639–70.