

**“It is written...”**

**Peter Doble**

***peter.doble@cantab.net***

Luke’s relationship with Israel’s scriptures is *structural*; his retelling of Jesus’ story is embedded within those scriptures and cannot be told without them. That structure comprises a frame enclosing a narrative whose lexical palette is drawn from scriptural models or patterns, and whose purpose is to show how its events are “the things fulfilled among us.”<sup>1</sup>

### ***Interpreter’s<sup>2</sup> Argument***

*Interpreter* addresses one focal problem: was Luke mistaken in twice affirming that “it is written” that the Messiah must suffer and be raised from the dead?<sup>3</sup> Since Luke’s interpretative perspective is from his (Jewish) *Weltansshauung*-transforming event of God’s raising Jesus from the dead, he was demonstrably not mistaken. For Luke, event governs interpretation.<sup>4</sup>

*Luke-Acts’* Jesus-triptych, found in Luke 1:26-38; 2:1-7; 8-20,<sup>5</sup> introduces Jesus, indicating that the subsequent narrative concerned David’s House and God’s promise about David’s seed.<sup>6</sup> That introduction offers readers a roadmap through Luke’s narrative<sup>7</sup> to its conclusion in Rome. There, Paul’s encounter with its principal Jews re-affirmed those “things fulfilled among us,” and their significance for his hearers. Luke’s first-announced messianic descriptors, *Saviour*, *Messiah* and *Lord*,<sup>8</sup> are those of his narrative’s closing scenes,<sup>9</sup> and the commonest throughout Jesus’ story, where Christian proclamation was of Jesus, *Lord* and *Messiah*.

By examining six<sup>10</sup> of Jesus’ witnesses’ exegetical speeches I have shown:

(a) *how* their Jewish *scriptural reasoning* focused on explaining Jesus-*logia*<sup>11</sup> or Lukan base-texts, 2 Sam 7:12-16 and Ezek 34:23-25;<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Luke 1:1-4.

<sup>2</sup> *Abbrev. for Luke the Interpreter: of Jesus’ story and of Israel’s scriptures.*

<sup>3</sup> Luke 24:25-27; 44-49; see Ch1; Doble, P., (1996; 2000; 2004; 2006; *cf.*, 2013; 2014).

<sup>4</sup> Chs3-6.

<sup>5</sup> See Ch2.

<sup>6</sup> I will raise up - ἀναστήσω.

<sup>7</sup> Ch1.

<sup>8</sup> Luke 2:11.

<sup>9</sup> Acts 28:28, 30-31.

<sup>10</sup> For Stephen’s and Paul’s exegetical speeches see *luketheinterpreter.com*.

<sup>11</sup> Jesus’ sayings in Luke 20:15-26; 37-38, 41-44 within their cotexts; see Chs4-7.

(b) where “it is written” that the *Messiah must suffer and be raised from the dead*. Given *Interpreter’s* argument, this chapter crystallises its “how” and “where.”

### **Fulfilment.**

By understanding how Luke “used” Israel’s scriptures, we can grasp what he probably understood by “fulfilment.”<sup>13</sup> His principle of “event controls interpretation” operates throughout *Luke-Acts*. Because his narrative perspective is from the event of God’s having raised Jesus from the dead, Luke read his scriptures through this new, previously inconceivable lens and, as Acts’ final scene makes plain, this use remained disputable.<sup>14</sup> For him, “I will raise up...” (ἀναστήσω)<sup>15</sup> now carried two distinct meanings, both “fulfilled.”<sup>16</sup> Luke’s retrospective reading became visible as his “using” scripture became clearer.

This chapter’s five sections indicate his reading’s shape: (A) A *reference-frame* encloses (B) *Luke-Acts’* continuous narrative, whose *shaping* is significant, and (C) whose *conflict narrative’s* exploiting of Jesus-descriptors (D) forms part of a vigorous *debate about scripture*. Loose ends are tidied by (E) Resonances, objections, evoked wholes, and labelling.

### **A. A Reference-frame.**

I use “reference-frame” analogously.<sup>17</sup> An acknowledged literary artist, Luke encloses his fulfilment-story<sup>18</sup> about a Davidic-Jesus within his Prologue’s Jesus-triptych<sup>19</sup> and his narrative’s final scene in Rome.<sup>20</sup> Alternatively, a music model suggests a home key, and development unfolding through varying movements to its destined ending: his work has reached home.

### **1. Remembering David**

*Interpreter* accents this reference-framing because Luke’s Prologue is *distinctive*. The question implied by our research focus – what is *Luke’s* concept of messiah?<sup>21</sup> – prompted a search from within his narrative. We identified his base-text<sup>22</sup> and its

---

<sup>12</sup> Set within their cotexts; see C3 below; and *luketheinterpreter.com*.

<sup>13</sup> Dodd, C. H., (1952), 27; Hays, R. B., (2015; 2016).

<sup>14</sup> Acts 28:23-31.

<sup>15</sup> As in 2 Sam 7:12; Ezek 34:23; Deut 18:18; Amos 9:11.

<sup>16</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Paul.

<sup>17</sup> See Ch1 n142.

<sup>18</sup> See his Preface, Luke 1:1, ... *περὶ τῶν πεπληροφορημένων ἐν ἡμῖν πραγμάτων...*

<sup>19</sup> Ch2.

<sup>20</sup> Acts 28:17-31.

<sup>21</sup> Ch1.

<sup>22</sup> 2 Sam 7:8b-16.

implications<sup>23</sup> in his Prologue, concluding that Luke's messiah-concept underlay his narrative, and was clarified only by his account of Jesus' resurrection.<sup>24</sup> Luke shared his interest in this base-text with 4Q174, and like its interpreter concluded that Amos 9:11-12 summarised the goal towards which the historically-failed David-promise still hopefully looked.<sup>25</sup>

#### *Amos 9:11-12*

James's summarising of the Jerusalem debate again depends on his deploying the principle that event governs interpretation. His introductory "the words of the prophets agree with [Simeon/Peter's report]"<sup>26</sup> followed by γέγραπται presents his *adaptation* of Amos's oracle, Luke's final version of the David-promise. With both Stephen's speech focused on the bivalence of "He shall build a house for my name..." (Acts 7:47-50) and Paul's unpacking of "I will raise up your seed after you..." (Acts 13:32-36) in mind, Luke could expect readers to recognise in James's evocation (Acts 15:16-17) of Amos's twice affirmed duo -- ἀναστήσω, ἀνοικοδομήσω -- this prophet's echo from Nathan's oracle: ἀναστήσω τὸ σπέρμα σου followed by αὐτὸς οἰκοδομήσει μοι οἶκον and its accompanying assurance of the endurance of David's house.<sup>27</sup>

#### *Ezekiel 34*

Luke's Prologue is further distinguished by its embracing one oracle from Ezekiel's renewal of the David-promise during the Babylonian Exile,<sup>28</sup> an extension that offers Luke's first use of the term *Messiah* and a context for his distinctive understanding of *Saviour* and its related concepts,<sup>29</sup> enriching and extending tradition's Isaianic understanding of John the Baptist's prophetic activity<sup>30</sup> – "all flesh shall see God's *salvation*."

## **2. Luke's Frame's purpose**

*Luke-Acts'* concluding exchanges in Rome encapsulate the kerygmatic ground of "this salvation of God"<sup>31</sup> developed in the narrative to this point. *Jesus* is Paul's focus for scriptural understanding: the *Kingdom of God* and Jesus' relation to it are contained in Luke's

---

<sup>23</sup> Promises respecting David's *seed* (ἀναστήσω, 2 Sam 7:12) and David's *House* (πιστωθήσεται, 7:16).

<sup>24</sup> Ch3.

<sup>25</sup> Acts 15:13b-21.

<sup>26</sup> Acts 15:15; *contra* NRSV *ad loc*.

<sup>27</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen and Paul.

<sup>28</sup> Ezek 34:2-31, *esp.*, 23-24.

<sup>29</sup> Ch2. See B below on Luke's structural *Exodos* thread.

<sup>30</sup> Luke 3:4b-6 (Isa 40:3-5 *adapted*); Mark 1:2b-3 (Mal 3:1; Isa 40:3; *conflated; adapted*); Matt 3:3b (Isa 40:3, *adapted*).

<sup>31</sup> Acts 28:28; see, *e.g.*, Luke 2:11 (*Saviour*); 3:6 (*God's salvation*); 19:10 (*Son of man*); Acts 4:8b (σέσωται) -12 (σωτηρία, σωθῆναι); 13:23 (σωτήρα), 26 (σωτηρίας), 37-39; *usw*.

“things about Jesus,”<sup>32</sup> and Jesus as Israel’s hope of a *Messiah*, the *Lord* raised up beyond mortality, are bound up in this Lukan shorthand.

*Luke-Acts’* Prologue announced these goals through its two Jesus-annunciations. Reference-framing encloses a coherent narrative, shaping its development, and controlling its interpretation of scripture. Luke’s distinctive retelling of Jesus’ story occupies the space within his clearly marked, traditional Davidic frame.<sup>33</sup>

### ***B. Luke’s narrative shaping.***

The balanced proportions of *Luke-Acts* become clear in the accompanying analytical diagram that distributes blocks representing Luke’s text across narrative-proportion and geographical axes.

These proportions resemble a normal distribution where the conflict in Jerusalem – *Speaking Truth to Power* -- is focal, textually-central and volume-bridging. It is focal in that its events are *Luke-Acts’* dynamic, crystallised by *Interpreter’s* target verses. It is textually-central to *Luke-Acts* in that this Jerusalem-unit occupies roughly 25% of the total text, preceded in Luke by about 40%, of which the Prologue comprises 5%, and followed in Acts by around 36%. This narrative shaping goes beyond statistics into scriptural themes, highlighting just how scripturally focused *Luke-Acts* really is.

#### **1. Exodos in Jerusalem**

*Speaking Truth to Power*<sup>34</sup> evokes a wide range of scriptural resonances, among which its *Exodos* shaping is formative, linking one journey narrative<sup>35</sup> with a second.<sup>36</sup> Timed during *Pesach* -- whose festival focus is rich in Exodus symbols, story, events and food references -- its place in the Lukan Jesus’ life is central.<sup>37</sup>

His ministry, especially its conflict, was his prophetic speaking truth to power. Jesus’ witnesses continued that same prophetic ministry under their exalted Lord,<sup>38</sup> and both Peter and Stephen understood Jesus to be God’s promised prophet-like-Moses,<sup>39</sup> now raised-up in both senses.

*Interpreter* has made much of Luke’s multivalent “*Exodos*.”<sup>40</sup> *Luke-Acts* is basically a trialogue among: its Deuteronomic norm;<sup>41</sup> Luke’s grasp of an Isaianic vision of a new Exodus

---

<sup>32</sup> Lukan shorthand: Acts 28:31, 23; *cf.*, 18:25; Luke 24:19 (τὰ περὶ Ἰησοῦ), 27 (τὰ περὶ ἑαυτοῦ).

<sup>33</sup> *Cf.*, Ro 1:1-6; Matt 1:1; *Son of David*, Mk 10:47-48, *usw.*

<sup>34</sup> Luke 19:41-Acts 8:3.

<sup>35</sup> Galilee to Jerusalem; Luke 9:51-19:40.

<sup>36</sup> Jerusalem to Rome, beginning at Acts 8:4 (see Acts 1:8).

<sup>37</sup> Luke 2:41-52; *luketheinterpreter.com*; W4. See also Luke 4:1-11; Acts 6:8-8:3.

<sup>38</sup> Chs 4-7; see Sleeman, M., (2009) on Jesus’ continuing Lordship...

<sup>39</sup> Acts 3:17-23 (Peter); 7:37, 51-53 (See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen).

<sup>40</sup> Luke 9:31: lit. “a going out” from Egypt or Babylon; metaphorically, death.

<sup>41</sup> *Esp.*, Deut 5-10.

from Babylon;<sup>42</sup> his distinctive account of Jesus' two-fold *Exodos* that he was to complete in Jerusalem -- his death and *post-mortem* leadership of a renewed People obedient to God's rule. Throughout, this Jesus is principally Israel's Davidic Messiah.

### *Ruler,<sup>43</sup> Covenant and Torah*

Recall *what* truth to *which* power. Jesus' Galilee ministry announced the *covenant's* central affirmation that God alone is Israel's King. By proclaiming that Rule of God, Jesus recalled his hearers to covenantal fidelity, implicitly warning them of the dangers of forgetting *Torah*. In Jerusalem, the conflict-narrative's triggers addressed the city and its Rulers who in practice had so ritualised Temple and scripture as to forget, like Solomon before them, the covenant's essential commands about idolatry and neighbourly love.<sup>44</sup>

Jesus' "cleansing" the Temple evoked both Jeremiah and Isaiah's recalling God's foundational acts;<sup>45</sup> his "not one stone upon another"<sup>46</sup> evoked the solemn warnings of Solomon's second theophany, and probably memories of Shiloh.<sup>47</sup> His Vineyard parable, however, resonated not only with an early Isaiah's warnings<sup>48</sup> but, by highlighting the rejection and killing of its owner's *son and heir*, echoed Luke's own narrative of Jesus' anointing.<sup>49</sup>

This central, bridging section of *Luke-Acts* is enclosed by two journey narratives. Together, they ensure that readers understand this conflict as Jesus' *Exodos* in Jerusalem.

## **2. Reading backwards from Jerusalem**

Looking back from the Jerusalem towards which Jesus had firmly set his face, Luke's distinctive interpretation of Jesus' story becomes clearer. It is what Luke has to say about his protagonist that gives his narrative its unity: his Transfiguration; his mission; his wilderness testing, and the Prologue's final scene form the core of Luke's pre-Jerusalem portrayal of Jesus.

---

<sup>42</sup> *Esp.* Isaiah 55-66.

<sup>43</sup> Ezekiel's oracle excoriated Israel's shepherds who plundered and were careless of their flock (Ezek 34; Luke 2); Luke's Isaianic subtext (Isa 55-66) to Luke's *Exodos* motif contrasted the righteous and the wicked (*e.g.*, Isa 57; 66:2b-4). Undergirding Luke's account of Peter's transformation, Psalm 146 celebrated Israel's God as the One to obey; Ps 2:1-2 contrasted with Ps 2:7-8. The Jerusalem-conflict was between those who listen and Rulers who will not.

<sup>44</sup> Highlighted by, but not limited to, Luke 16.

<sup>45</sup> Jer 7; Isa 56; see [luketheinterpreter.com](http://luketheinterpreter.com); Stephen.

<sup>46</sup> Luke 21:6; 1 Kgs 9:1-9; see [luketheinterpreter.com](http://luketheinterpreter.com); Stephen.

<sup>47</sup> 1 Kgs 9:1-9; Jer 7:3-15.

<sup>48</sup> Isa 5:1-7.

<sup>49</sup> Luke 3:21-22; *cf.*, Ps 2:7b-8; see Doble, P., (2014). *Cf.*, Luke's "Son of God" thread (reversed): Luke 22:70; 9:35; 3:21-22: 1:32, 35. *Cf.*, Paul, Acts 9:20.

What Luke does not say of Jesus should, however, also be clearly heard: he was indeed a true Davidid, but not *via* Solomon. Luke's Jesus-genealogy<sup>50</sup> spoke volumes to an age where Sirach's assessment of Solomon<sup>51</sup> crystallised the reasons underlying Israel's continuing hope in the David-promise: Solomon's youthful wisdom, however famed, proved no guarantee of his ultimate *Torah*-fidelity.<sup>52</sup> *Luke-Acts* implicitly contrasts Jesus' story with Solomon's.<sup>53</sup>

Jesus' witnesses finally recognised in this Son of David God's promised prophet-like-Moses,<sup>54</sup> and affirmed his *Torah*-fidelity to his death – he was *ὄντως δίκαιος*,<sup>55</sup> yet another Exodus colouring.

### ***i Transfiguration:***<sup>56</sup>

On the verge of *Luke-Acts*' first journey narrative<sup>57</sup> this distinctive version of a shared story is an *Exodos* way-marker. On this mountain Moses and Elijah, recalling Sinai and Carmel, belong to a broader synoptic tradition. Distinctively Lukan, however, is his disclosure that these three prophets were discussing the *Exodos* that Jesus was to fulfil or complete in Jerusalem. *Luke-Acts*' later developments disambiguate *ἐξοδος* to be both his death and his leading a new Exodus to freedom to be God's People.

This unit's end-stress is on three apostles' Sinai-evoking experience of a *bat qol* speaking from a cloud, affirming for them Jesus' anointing: "this is my Son; listen to him."<sup>58</sup> But readers had learnt earlier of Jesus' anointing commission: "you are my Son"<sup>59</sup> was God's purposeful anointing, clarified by Jesus' programmatic sermon at Nazareth.

### ***ii Jesus' Nazareth programme:***<sup>60</sup>

A Lukan distinctive, this account of Jesus' address draws upon Luke's Isaianic new Exodus base comprising Isaiah 55-66. From this base he later identified Jesus as the one promised as covenanting "*David's* holy things...,"<sup>61</sup> equipped to proclaim the completion of

---

<sup>50</sup> Luke 3:23-38.

<sup>51</sup> Sirach 47:12-22; 1 Kgs 11:1-13.

<sup>52</sup> On 1 Kgs 3-11 see Brueggemann, W., (2005).

<sup>53</sup> On Acts 7:47-53 see *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>54</sup> Acts 3:13-26 (Peter, Ch4); 7:2-56 (See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen).

<sup>55</sup> Luke 23:47; Acts 3:14 (Peter); 7:52 (Stephen); 22:14 (Ananias to Paul); *cf.*, Wisd 2:18; 10:15-11:14.

<sup>56</sup> Luke 9:28-36; *cf.*, Mark 9:2-18; Matt. 17:1-8.

<sup>57</sup> ...marked by its recalling Jesus-followers and crowds to the word of God, and to neighbourly love.

<sup>58</sup> Deut 18:15, *αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε*, *cf.*, 18:18-19,

<sup>59</sup> Luke 3:21-22.

<sup>60</sup> Luke 4:16-30.

<sup>61</sup> Isa 55:3; see *luketheinterpreter.com*; Paul.

Israel's incomplete return from Babylonian exile.<sup>62</sup> Luke's Nazareth unit has two parts: the first identifies Jesus' commissioned ministry-programme,<sup>63</sup> the second deals with the role of signs in his ministry.

### *Jesus' programme*

Affirming Jesus' Jewishness, Luke presents him as lector and interpreter in his home synagogue. The lection from Isa 61:1-2 ends mid-sentence, probably an *aposiopesis* allowing hearers to recall what the Lord's "favourable year" entails. Significantly, *this* lector is the Jesus previously identified as David's promised seed, anointed by God as "my Son," and filled with the Holy Spirit. Jesus identified his mission, according to the scriptures, as the new Exodus envisioned by Isaiah in one of a succession of oracles:

The Spirit of the Lord is upon *me*,  
because he has anointed *me*  
to bring *good news* to the poor. ...  
...to herald the year of the Lord's favour...<sup>64</sup>

Jesus' programme starkly contrasted with Solomon's amassing riches by exploiting people,<sup>65</sup> and with his hearers' own experience of Herodian rule under Roman suzerainty. Amazed by what they had heard from someone they knew -- that God had anointed him to inaugurate this year -- they wondered "Is not this Joseph's son?"<sup>66</sup>

### *Mission and sign*

This home-grown prophet knew, however, that his ministry<sup>67</sup> depended not on signs,<sup>68</sup> but on his and his hearers' faithfulness to God's word; that this new Exodus<sup>69</sup> was Israel's movement to an enlarged understanding of the people of God.<sup>70</sup> Elijah and Elisha before him had brought signs only to aliens, a Sidonian and a Syrian. His refusal of a sign to *validate* his role in God's renewed Exodus plan was of a piece with Jesus' earlier wilderness testing.

---

<sup>62</sup> On Luke's uses of Isa 55-66 see *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen, n100.

<sup>63</sup> See Doble, P., (1996), 25-69.

<sup>64</sup> Luke 4:19, κηρύξαι ἐνιαυτὸν κυρίου δεκτὸν whose source-text continues καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως...which, in the light of its context, is better understood as "recompense" in a good sense than as "vengeance."

<sup>65</sup> See, e.g., Brueggemann, W., (2005), 215-224, on Ps 71, Jeremiah 22:15-16, and *esp* Ezek 34; *cf.*, *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>66</sup> *Cf.*, Luke 3:23; on Jesus' "sonships" see Chs2&9.

<sup>67</sup> Isa 55:1-5; *cf.*, Acts 13:34b associated with Ps 2:7.

<sup>68</sup> Luke 4:23; *cf.*, Luke 11:29-32 (the sign of the *Son of man*); 23:6-9 (a Herod hoped-for a sign).

<sup>69</sup> Isa 55:6-13.

<sup>70</sup> Isa 56:1-8; *cf.*, Luke's fuller citing of Isa 40 – καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ (Luke 3:4-6).

### *iii Wilderness Testing:*<sup>71</sup>

Narratively, the newly-anointed Jesus was led by the Spirit into the Wilderness, there reliving Israel's *Exodus*. His twofold γέγραπται<sup>72</sup> -- and parallel εἶρηται citing events from Deuteronomy 6-9, echoing Moses' own Exodus -- affirm that David's later seed rejected the lures of power and institutional religiosity that seduced Israel to forget the God-giveness of all that is.

Luke's distinctively ordered test-sequencing prepares readers for the radical conflict between this man who had humbled himself and those who had exalted themselves.<sup>73</sup> His testing began (a) with the heart of *Torah*; (b) faced the seductions that had made Israel a rebellious People, and concluded (c) with the possibility that both scripture and Temple remained potential, corruptible sources of testing. In Nazareth, Jesus publicly embraced an Isaianic vision. The newly-anointed Jesus had already undergone personal testing that established his faithfulness in the covenant community committed to living by *Torah*, serving God and loving neighbour. In the Wilderness, each of Jesus' replies evoked Deuteronomy's wider context.<sup>74</sup>

#### *a. The Word of God (Luke 4:1-4; Deut 8:1-5).*

"Man shall not live by bread only..." For a Jew of Jesus' time his reply's unexpressed "but by every Word coming from the mouth of God"<sup>75</sup> embraced not only *Torah*, but creation also.<sup>76</sup> Among other sources, Pss 30-36 are *psalms of the righteous* ascribed to David. See especially 32:6-12 with its affirmation:

τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ κυρίου οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἐστερεώθησαν  
καὶ τῷ πνεύματι τοῦ στόματος αὐτοῦ πᾶσα ἡ δύναμις αὐτῶν...  
...because [the Lord] it was that spoke, and [the heavens] came to be;  
He it was that commanded, and they were created.<sup>77</sup>

Among the righteous, *Torah*-observant Israelites, human life was more than satisfying appetites; it was learning dependence on God for things created, and for *Torah* by which to live wisely and well.<sup>78</sup> In God's creation stones are stones and bread is bread.

#### *b. Neighbour-blind power corrupts (Luke 4:5-8; 16:13; Deut 8:1-20)*

---

<sup>71</sup> Luke 4:1-11.

<sup>72</sup> The tempter's γέγραπται formed part of Jesus' testing: *Torah* carried more weight than a psalmist.

<sup>73</sup> Luke 14:11; 18:14b; *cf.*, Deut 8:2-3, 11-16.

<sup>74</sup> *Esp.* Deut 5-10.

<sup>75</sup> Quoted by Matt 4:4.

<sup>76</sup> Gen 1:1-31 "...and God said..."; *cf.*, John 1:1-18; Proverbs 8:22-36; Wisd 9:1-4.

<sup>77</sup> Ps 32:6, 9; note that the Lukan Jesus' final word cited Ps 30:6 (Luke 23:46); see Doble, P., (1996).

<sup>78</sup> Wisd 16:24-26 (...ἵνα μάθωσιν οἱ υἱοὶ σου, οὓς ἠγάπησας, κύριε, ὅτι οὐχ αἱ γενέσεις τῶν καρπῶν τρέφουσιν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ῥῆμά σου τοὺς σοὶ πιστεύοντας διατηρεῖ.).



By contrast, this test's imagery asserts that it is not God but the tempter in whose gift the world lies; here is the ultimate corruption underlying Jesus' Vineyard parable and its echoing Ps 2:7-8 – if you are the Son of God.<sup>79</sup>

Again, differing from Matthew's version of this dual tradition, Luke's imagery includes no overt reference to a mountain, but his choice of verb, ἀνάγω, probably evokes his understanding its presence. This Pisgah-like viewing is not of a Promised Land of neighbourly concern and human flourishing, but a corruption of Nebo, promising world domination and exploitation.<sup>80</sup> At its heart stands the great lie: ...ὅτι ἐμοὶ παραδέδοται καὶ ὃ ἐὰν θέλω δίδωμι αὐτήν, based on the fundamental corruption, σὺ οὖν ἐὰν προσκυνήσης ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ, ἔσται σοῦ πᾶσα.<sup>81</sup> *Interpreter* has urged that Jesus' charge against Jerusalem's Rulers, and others in Israel, was that their minds (seduced by selfish accumulation<sup>82</sup>) and deeds (careless of their neighbours' needs) were idolatrous: he called their idol Mammon. Stephen's charge against the same Rulers equated them with those who worshipped the golden calf at Sinai.

Systems that lust for riches and power have always placed self-aggrandisement above gratitude for what is essentially gift; above reverence for its Giver, and above neighbourly love for fellow-humans for whom also that gift was given. "Worship the Lord your God; and serve only him;" in God's creation neighbourly sharing is the *service* of the One who is alone to be worshipped; none can serve God and Mammon<sup>83</sup> -- not even Solomon with all his glory.<sup>84</sup>

*c. Trusting not testing* (Luke 4:9-13; Deut 6:16, within 6:4-25)

Luke's final image is of Jerusalem's Temple, the site of Jesus' ultimate tests of obedience,<sup>85</sup> and of conflict ending in Stephen's death. Among a ruling elite who assumed the Vineyard to be theirs to exploit, and on trial by them, Jesus answered their "who are you?" by reaffirming the descriptors in Luke 9:18-36, and acknowledging what they articulated,<sup>86</sup> that he was David's successor and heir – Son of God. What might validate this Messiah's anointing? What was the evidence for his authority?

This test cited a David psalm of trust, hope, and deliverance. As a riposte to Jesus' γέγραπται the tempter offered his own:<sup>87</sup> gain credence in your mission by performing this

---

<sup>79</sup> Luke 3:21-22; 20:13-15a.

<sup>80</sup> Parodying Deut 34:1-5.

<sup>81</sup> Deut 5:6-12.

<sup>82</sup> Πλεονεξία.

<sup>83</sup> Luke 16:13//Matt 6:24.

<sup>84</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>85</sup> Mount of Olives (Luke 22:39-46) before his interrogation by the Sanhedrin (Luke 22:66-71).

<sup>86</sup> Luke 22:70 - ὑμεῖς λέγετε ὅτι ἐγώ εἰμι.

<sup>87</sup> Ps 90:11-12, *adapted*.

spectacular sign promised to David. Jesus' reply called upon a passage<sup>88</sup> where "it has been said" (εἶρηται) that "you shall not put the Lord your God to the test," itself evoking a passage<sup>89</sup> where, to pacify complaining Israelites, Moses offered them a sign to assure them of God's presence among them. Forgetfulness of God is what Jesus' mission challenged. He refused any probatory signs save *Torah*-fidelity and the sign of Jonah, and something greater than Solomon was there – the Son of man who had to suffer and be raised.<sup>90</sup>

#### ***iv. Jesus' first Pesach***<sup>91</sup>

In retrospect, the final scene in Luke's Prologue prepares readers for the drama about to unfold. In Jerusalem's Temple at *Pesach*, the young Jesus, Wisdom's child,<sup>92</sup> was about his father's business,<sup>93</sup> engaging in debate with those who were teaching. The Exodus setting for this boy's later conflict is clear. In an earlier essay I argued for further Solomonic parallels;<sup>94</sup> Elliott<sup>95</sup> has argued for resurrection hints. This boy is David's seed, the Messiah who is to suffer and be raised from the dead; the one to right Solomon's wrong, and be worthy of his father's throne.<sup>96</sup>

#### ***Summary***

At key moments in his narrative:

- from his Prologue's climax, portraying the boy Jesus' first Passover;
- through the newly-anointed Jesus' Wilderness-testings;
- then his public proclamation of his ministry's purpose,

Luke prepared his readers for that moment when they learned why Jesus set his face to go to Jerusalem -- to complete the *Exodos* he had initiated at Nazareth and fulfil long-held hopes of freedom from tyrannies. His was a two-fold *Exodos*: his death through lawless hands before his incorruptible reign as God's messiah at the head of a reconstituted Israel.<sup>97</sup> His death was not the end; Jesus and his followers looked beyond that.<sup>98</sup>

### **3. Looking forwards**

---

<sup>88</sup> Deut 6:10-25.

<sup>89</sup> Nu 20:1-13.

<sup>90</sup> Luke 11:27-32; see *luketheinterpreter.com*; W4 on this Lukan passage. *Cf.*, Ac 4:13-18.

<sup>91</sup> Luke 2:35-51.

<sup>92</sup> Luke 2:40, 52; *cf.*, 7:33-35.

<sup>93</sup> Luke 2:49... ἐν τοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς μου... See *luketheinterpreter.com*; W4.

<sup>94</sup> Doble, P., (2000).

<sup>95</sup> Elliott, J. K., (1972).

<sup>96</sup> Luke 1:32-33; Wisd 9:9-12, 17-18.

<sup>97</sup> In this aspect, Deuteronomy and Isaiah feature most prominently, as at Qumran.

<sup>98</sup> See Ch3.

The Jerusalem conflict's finale is Stephen's retelling of Israel's Exodus and of Moses' role in it, a dialogue among Deuteronomic, Isaianic, and Christian narratives. He enrolled his *Torah*-faithless hearers among both those calf-worshipping at Sinai and Isaiah's persisting ungodly. The continuity among Sinai and Jerusalem, *Torah* and Temple, Moses and David lay in the Ark, to replace whose tent Solomon built the Temple,<sup>99</sup> the *locus* for Jesus' conflict with the city's Rulers. Stephen's case was that their lawlessness continued to threaten not only the Temple's existence but that of Israel also; by clearly alluding to Deuteronomy 10:16 he invoked its contextualising *Torah*.<sup>100</sup>

*Transfiguration-Exaltation-Vision:*

On the verge of a second journey narrative, from speaking truth to power in Jerusalem to *kerygma* in Rome, Luke prefaced it with a parallel to his earlier Transfiguration narrative. Stephen's telling this Sanhedrin of his vision<sup>101</sup> ensured his death at their hands.

The three apostles had remained silent about their seeing Jesus in glory;<sup>102</sup> Stephen instantly bore witness to his vision<sup>103</sup> in which one Exodus dimension persists: Jesus' δίκαιος-descriptor evokes not only psalms of the righteous, but Wisdom's more developed model of the righteous man among the ungodly.<sup>104</sup> That model stands in a Solomonic context of God's requirements of Rulers. Solomon's prayer<sup>105</sup> for Σοφία is followed by an account from Adam to Moses of her guiding the People of God.

Establishing its δίκαιος-model in chapters 2-5, Wisdom retells the Exodus as a conflict between the righteous and the ungodly.<sup>106</sup> In that conflict, Moses is pre-eminent among the righteous.<sup>107</sup> Luke's Stephen reworked that conflict -- with ungodly Israelites replacing Egyptians. He also implied what Peter had inferred,<sup>108</sup> that by God's raising him from the dead, Jesus was also the promised Prophet-like-Moses and righteous one.<sup>109</sup> Wisdom's account of the Exodus is of special interest to *Interpreter*.

Stephen's vision of the exalted Jesus parallels earlier witnesses' "But God raised him from the dead:" Jesus' *Exodos* was fulfilled. Fulfilled in that Jesus' word to the Sanhedrin at

---

<sup>99</sup> Ps 131; 1 Kgs 8:1-11.

<sup>100</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>101</sup> Acts 7:55-56.

<sup>102</sup> Luke 9:36b.

<sup>103</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>104</sup> Wisd 2-5.

<sup>105</sup> Wisd 9.

<sup>106</sup> Wisd 10:15-11:14.

<sup>107</sup> Wisd 11:1-14.

<sup>108</sup> Acts 3:17-26. See Ch4.

<sup>109</sup> Acts 7:51-53.

his trial was fulfilled (Luke 22:69; Acts 7:55-56). Jesus' *Exodos* was fulfilled in the sense that this Moses-like-Prophet had been raised from the dead;<sup>110</sup> fulfilled in that, post-exaltation, Jesus' *gezerah shewa*<sup>111</sup> needed to be reinterpreted. This righteous Prophet was standing (ἑστῶτα),<sup>112</sup> not seated as David had written and Jesus said,<sup>113</sup> now proleptically fulfilling Wisdom's vision of God's vindicating the Righteous One in the presence of his oppressors.<sup>114</sup>

#### 4. Ἰησοῦς

Finally, we reflect on Jesus' name in *Luke-Acts*' Exodus context: is *this* prophet-like-Moses the Ἰησοῦς who *is* like Moses? His name was of interest to Matthew also, who in his distinctive Prologue played on its *Hoshea*<sup>115</sup> echoes: "She will bear a son, and you (Joseph) are to name him Ἰησοῦς, *for he will save his people from their sins.*" That Mary's and Joseph's child, of David's House, was named Joshua by divine command is significant for both Prologues. In an earlier passage, however, sited in the Tent of Testimony, with God present in the Cloud at its entrance,<sup>116</sup> Deuteronomy reported that God had commissioned Ἰησοῦς to complete the Exodus that Moses could not:

... [Moses] commanded Joshua and said,  
"Be manly and strong, for you shall bring the sons of Israel into the land  
that the Lord swore to them; he will be with you."<sup>117</sup>

Deuteronomy's Joshua fulfilled his Exodus commission and died in the Land. He was neither prophet nor is there report of his knowing God face to face.

*Luke-Acts* seems to have drawn its understanding of the Exodus largely from Deuteronomy that concludes:

And there has not again arisen (ἀνέστη) a prophet in Israel like  
Moses whom the LORD knew face to face...<sup>118</sup>

...its ἀνέστη recalls the now bivalent ἀναστήσω of Deut 18:18 argued by Peter and Stephen.

#### ***A cumulative argument***

---

<sup>110</sup> Deut 18:15, 18, προφήτην ἀναστήσω αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν ὡσπερ σὲ...paralleling the unexpectedness of meaning in Nathan's oracle.

<sup>111</sup> Luke 22:69.

<sup>112</sup> Acts 7:55 ἑστῶτα ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ θεοῦ; 7:56, ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστῶτα τοῦ θεοῦ.

<sup>113</sup> Ps 109:1, Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου Κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, adapted by Jesus at Luke 22:29.

<sup>114</sup> Wisd 4:16-5:23, esp 5:1, Τότε σήσεται ἐν παρρησίᾳ πολλῇ ὁ δίκαιος κατὰ πρόσωπον τῶν θλιψάντων αὐτὸν...

<sup>115</sup> For Moses' renaming Hoshea see Nu 13:16b.

<sup>116</sup> 1 Kgs 8:10-12; a paralleling of cloud (νεφέλη) with glory (δόξα) and God's "presence."

<sup>117</sup> See Deut 31:14-23 (NETS slightly adapted) - καὶ αὐτὸς ἔσται μετὰ σοῦ. Cf., Acts 10:38 - ὅτι ὁ θεὸς ἦν μετ' αὐτοῦ.

<sup>118</sup> Deut 34:9-12 (NETS).

Luke's retelling of Jesus' conflict-story, however, concludes with Stephen's vision of the exalted Jesus beyond death, having completed the *Exodos* that he was to fulfil in Jerusalem. Luke does play on the "save" element of Jesus' name, but relates it to Ezekiel's oracle of a new Exodus, a gathering and bringing home of Israel's plundered and lost sheep under the aegis of David *redivivus*: "Today, in David's city a *Saviour* has been born for you, who is the Messiah, the Lord."

The root of Jesus' name; the clarity of Luke's angelic proclamation to shepherds;<sup>119</sup> the circumcision and naming of Jesus,<sup>120</sup> who, Luke was at pains to emphasise, was also that promised prophet-like-Moses, together hint that Luke's *Exodos* thread is more than a glance at Deuteronomy's final paragraphs. Its οὐκ ἀνέστη ἔτι is answered by the Jesus-witnesses' repeated ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν ...<sup>121</sup>

*Interpreter's* focus, Jesus' central but problematic words are "according to the scriptures." Listening to Luke's narrative revealed how deeply set these sayings are in Luke's trialogue among (a) his reinterpreted Jesus-story; (b) *Torah's* requirements disclosed primarily through Deuteronomy; and (c) Isaiah's continuing hope of their Exile's end through God's restoring Israel under a faithful Davidid, thereby ending in Zion their renewed Exodus from an incomplete Exile. Luke's evocations, allusions and echoes of Israel's covenant belong as much to his "uses" of scripture as do labelled quotations.<sup>122</sup> Further, Israel's foundation story, of which the David-promise forms part, links many of the Jesus-descriptors that Luke also uses.

### **C. Jesus-descriptors in the Conflict Narrative**

The core of Luke's Jesus-story is his standpoint that uniquely God raised him from the dead and exalted him; his death resulted from a conflict over *Torah*-fidelity between Jesus and Jerusalem's Rulers. To tell his story, Luke drew on Jesus-descriptors that richly demonstrated that "it was written" that *the Messiah* was to suffer and to be raised from the dead. For example, four descriptors within the conflict-narrative are scriptural models shaping Luke's story, evocations of the cultural memory of Luke's world.

#### **1. Son of man.<sup>123</sup>**

The unparalleled shift in Luke 24 from Son of man to Messiah<sup>124</sup> defines Luke's understanding of both terms, an understanding rooted in Christian tradition. A Son of man

---

<sup>119</sup> Luke 2:11.

<sup>120</sup> Luke 2:21.

<sup>121</sup> Acts 2:24 *usw.*

<sup>122</sup> See E below.

<sup>123</sup> Primarily Dan 7:2-27.

<sup>124</sup> Ch3.

who goes to suffering and betrayal with a kiss forms the heart of Luke's Supper narrative.<sup>125</sup> The Son of man who is to rise from the dead and come in glory reaches its climax in *Luke-Acts'* significant *inclusio* -- Luke 22:69/Acts 7:56 -- which is also a *Jesus-logion* fulfilled.<sup>126</sup>

Evoking Daniel's visionary model of God's ultimate vindication of the faithful, suffering saints of the Most High, Luke's distinctive use carries his Jesus-story from Galilee<sup>127</sup> to its climax in Jerusalem.<sup>128</sup> There, echoing the Maccabaeian example of *Torah*-fidelity in the face of ruthless oppression, Stephen saw this Imperial conflict-model fulfilled in Jesus.

## 2. Righteous One.<sup>129</sup>

A Lukan distinctive, indebted to psalms and to Wisdom, this model was associated with Wisdom's reflection on Rulers, the Exodus, and its mockery of idolatry.<sup>130</sup> For Luke's story, we note the significance of one *inclusio*: a centurion, crystallising the manner of Jesus' dying said "This man was genuinely *δίκαιος*."<sup>131</sup> At the climactic end of the Jerusalem-conflict, Stephen accused his hearers of having murdered the innocent *δίκαιος*.<sup>132</sup> Echoing that descriptor, he conflated the climax of his Son of man model with the climax of Wisdom's righteous one:<sup>133</sup> he saw the Son of man standing (*ἑστῶτα*) at God's right hand.

Note that two-fold *ἑστῶτα* at 7:55-56, melding Wisdom's "στήσεται" (Wisd 5:1) with Jesus' (and Ps 109:1's) "sitting." Luke-Acts' *one protagonist*, Jesus, bears *many* descriptors including *Son of man* and *δίκαιος*. Luke's retrospective reading of scripture through a resurrection lens enabled him to make transitions, *e.g.*, from *Son of man* to *Messiah*.<sup>134</sup> Stephen's vision of the now glorified, once murdered Jesus (Acts 7:51-55) allowed him to hold together conceptually that *Son of man* and the distinctively Lukan rejected *δίκαιος*. Recalling Acts 7:52 (Luke 23:47)<sup>135</sup> and tradition's *Son of man-logion* distinctively reworked by Luke (Luke 22:69) before being fulfilled (Acts 7:55-56), we see how Luke's resurrection-glory-exaltation perspective allowed him to meld the vindications of the *Son of man* and of Wisdom's *δίκαιος*. Thus the psalmist's and Jesus' *pre-resurrection* καθήμενος (Luke 22:69) emerged as Stephen's *post-glorification* ἑστῶτα (Acts 7:55-56) evoking Wisdom's paradox of salvation. Luke embraced Wisdom's conflict-model, with its appeal for *Torah*-fidelity in the

---

<sup>125</sup> Luke 22:22, 48; for Luke 22:37 see 5i below.

<sup>126</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>127</sup> Luke 9:7-27 (who is this?).

<sup>128</sup> Acts 7:51-56; see *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>129</sup> Primarily Wisd. 2-5.

<sup>130</sup> B3 above.

<sup>131</sup> Luke 23:47.

<sup>132</sup> Acts 7:52.

<sup>133</sup> On Jesus as *δίκαιος* see Luke 23:47; Acts 3:14; 7:52; 22:14; *c.f.*, Doble, P., (1996; 2006; 2013).

<sup>134</sup> See Ch3 on Luke 24.

<sup>135</sup> *Cf.*, Acts 3:14; 22:14.

face of ruthless oppression by the obdurate godless in Israel;<sup>136</sup> the righteous are quite other.<sup>137</sup> His vision is righteous Stephen's final word -- except his prayer: "*Lord Jesus, receive my spirit.*"

### 3. Lord.<sup>138</sup>

Stephen's prayer<sup>139</sup> reminds us that "Lord" belongs to tradition that Luke inherited, then made his own. One of Luke's principal three, it forms an *inclusio* with his concluding picture of Paul's witnessing in Rome: Luke's Jesus-Triptych<sup>140</sup> and his summarising Paul's kerygmatic teaching<sup>141</sup> illustrate *Luke-Acts'* Davidic framework.

What is distinctively Lukan is Peter's mirroring the *logion* Jesus riddled for scribes.<sup>142</sup> In his Pentecost address expounding Joel's oracle,<sup>143</sup> Peter argued that God's promise had been fulfilled: "everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved."<sup>144</sup> He argued his case *via* the event of the resurrection -- understood as God's fulfilling an oath sworn to David<sup>145</sup> -- and the outpouring of Spirit.<sup>146</sup> Resolving Jesus' riddle to the scribes -- David was dead; he had never been exalted -- Peter proclaimed that God's raising Jesus from the dead had shown *how* David's son could be David's Lord: "God has made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified."

So at the culmination of the Jerusalem conflict-narrative dying Stephen prayed as *his Lord* had taught him to pray<sup>147</sup> for those who were persecuting him.<sup>148</sup>

### 4. Prophet.<sup>149</sup>

"Prophet" is Luke Johnson's key christological category.<sup>150</sup> I find, *per contra*, that Luke has systematically argued for Jesus as the "prophet-like-Moses" *within* a Davidic-

---

<sup>136</sup> *E.g.*, Wisd 1:16-2:11.

<sup>137</sup> Wisd 2:12-20.

<sup>138</sup> Primarily echoing Ps 109:1; Luke 20:41-44.

<sup>139</sup> Acts 7:60. See Hurtado, L., (2003), 140, 176, 179-184, 618.

<sup>140</sup> *Esp.* Luke 2:11; Saviour, Messiah, Lord.

<sup>141</sup> Acts 28:30-31; this salvation from God (28:28; *cf.*, 13:26) has come *via* the Lord Jesus Messiah.

<sup>142</sup> Luke 20:41-44; Ps 109:1.

<sup>143</sup> Acts 2:14b-36; see Ch4.

<sup>144</sup> Acts 2:21, 38-40; *cf.*, Joel 3.

<sup>145</sup> Acts 2:24-31; 2:30-31 echoes Ps 131:11-12.

<sup>146</sup> Acts 2:32-33.

<sup>147</sup> Luke 23:34; a long-disputed *crux*. For my reasons for taking seriously its not being unoriginal see *luketheinterpreter.com* -- "Father, forgive..."

<sup>148</sup> As we saw in the previous section, Stephen adapted Jesus' own *gezerah shewa* ' on Ps 109:1.

<sup>149</sup> Deut 18:15, 18.

<sup>150</sup> Johnson, L T, (2013), 145-161.

messianic context, and *via* his *haruzin* on Deuteronomy's "I will raise up" (ἀναστήσω).<sup>151</sup> "Prophet" thus evokes the ritual-cultural memory of Moses in Israel's founding story.

## 5. Servant?

We first make a simple distinction between "a servant-like mind" and "the Servant model." The Lukan Jesus' call to discipleship undoubtedly implied a transformed world-view that affirmed the values of neighbourly love, and rejected the valuing of a social hierarchy. Through gnomic saying,<sup>152</sup> parable,<sup>153</sup> and practice<sup>154</sup> Jesus' message was that in God's Kingdom a servant-like mind was a basic stance. His service-*motif* most probably derives from a Deuteronomic perspective – love your neighbour as you love yourself. His "I am among you as one who serves"<sup>155</sup> echoes his testing's core response: *Κύριον τὸν θεόν σου προσκυνήσεις καὶ αὐτῷ μόνῳ λατρεύσεις*.<sup>156</sup> That λατρεύω implies the associated command's ἀγαπάω covering both God and neighbour.<sup>157</sup> Luke's semantic map of service is wide-ranging.

Within *Interpreter's* reading of Luke's narrative there is however, little, if any room for the much touted Servant-*motif*. Provisionally sidelining the *contras*,<sup>158</sup> I have argued the case that Luke rightly affirmed that "it was written" that *the Messiah* must suffer and be raised. During discussions, however, two contexts have consistently been advanced as putative evidence for "the" Suffering Servant model as Luke's scriptural source for the Messiah's suffering; each must be addressed.

### *i. The Passover meal:*<sup>159</sup>

Bracketed by "this scripture *must be fulfilled* in me," and "...what is written about me *is being fulfilled*," Jesus alluded to Isa 53:12. Here, all depends on two factors: first, whether one judges that allusion in NA<sup>28</sup> to derive from a Hebrew or Greek source-text and how much of its co-text is in view. A Hebrew source qualifies "a righteous one" with "my servant;"<sup>160</sup> but

---

<sup>151</sup> Acts 3:18-23; *cf.*, Luke 4:24; 7:16; 13:31-35; 24: 24:19; 7:52. See Ch4; *cf.*, *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

<sup>152</sup> *E.g.*, Luke 14:11; 18:14b

<sup>153</sup> *E.g.*, Luke 10:25-37; 17:7-10.

<sup>154</sup> *E.g.*, Luke 7:24-34; 14:12-14; 15:1-3....

<sup>155</sup> Luke 22:24-34.

<sup>156</sup> Luke 4:8.

<sup>157</sup> Luke 10:25-28; crystallised Torah, *cf.*, Deut 10:12-16.

<sup>158</sup> Contra Strauss, M.L., (1995), Green, J.B., (1997) *et al.*

<sup>159</sup> Luke 22:37 *cf.*, Isa 53:10-12.

<sup>160</sup> Isa 53:11, NRSV...



LXX has no qualifying “servant,” leaving δίκαιος as the subject of the one “numbered among the lawless.”<sup>161</sup>

Second, what weight should be given to Luke’s distinctive *Son of man* framework for his account of this meal? *Luke-Acts* offers its distinctive fulfilment of the earlier Lukan *Son of man* sayings: “Judas, are you betraying the *Son of man* with a kiss?”<sup>162</sup> completes the table-saying about the *Son of man*’s destiny and betrayal.<sup>163</sup> On the cusp of Jesus’ arrival in Jerusalem, Luke had prepared readers for this moment, itself an adaptation of pre-journey sayings in Luke 9:<sup>164</sup>

See, we are going up to Jerusalem, and everything that is written about the *Son of man* by the prophets will be accomplished. <sup>32</sup> For he will be handed over to the Gentiles; and he will be mocked and insulted and spat upon. <sup>33</sup> After they have flogged him, they will kill him, and on the third day he will rise again.<sup>165</sup>

Luke’s distinctive framework, drawn from tradition’s descriptor, reaches its culmination in Stephen’s vision of the exalted *Son of man* standing as the vindicated δίκαιος at God’s right hand. The balance of evidence favours a Greek source for this allusion that then cohered with two of Luke’s major descriptors.<sup>166</sup>

#### ***ii. The Apostles’ Corporate Prayer:***<sup>167</sup>

At prayer the apostles twice speak of Jesus as “your holy servant.” Their speaking *also* of David as “your servant” (4:23), combined with this narrative-unit’s David framework, especially 4:25-28, make it probable that this is a wider reference to God’s servants than to any specific Isaianic construct.<sup>168</sup>

#### ***D. Narrative development and debating scripture***

Beyond *Interpreter*’s strict research confines *Luke-Acts* offers evidence that Luke’s narrative is consistent with our finding that Luke rightly claimed that scripture promised a suffering Messiah to be raised from the dead. Summaries of Paul’s ministry, especially of his conflict with the Sanhedrin,<sup>169</sup> tend to confirm *Interpreter*’s account.

---

<sup>161</sup> LXX; NETS.

<sup>162</sup> Luke 22:47-53.

<sup>163</sup> Luke 22:21-22.

<sup>164</sup> Luke 9:21-22, 44-45.

<sup>165</sup> Luke 18.31-33.

<sup>166</sup> *Contra*, Holladay, C. R., (2016), 190.

<sup>167</sup> Acts 4:24-30; see Ch7B2.

<sup>168</sup> With Hooker, M., (1959); *contra* Mallen, P., (2008).

<sup>169</sup> Acts 22:30-26:32.

To frame *Interpreter's* hypothesis for Luke's purposes in writing we drew on *Luke-Acts'* enigmatic ending;<sup>170</sup> notably, this features debate about the scriptures.<sup>171</sup> Luke highlights its great length,<sup>172</sup> and its topic clearly coheres with Luke's principal concerns: the "Kingdom of God" and "the things about Jesus." Further, Paul's final word concerns God's salvation.<sup>173</sup> From beginning to end, *Luke-Acts* needed to confirm that "It is written..."

Luke reports a Paul whose consistent proclamation is that the *Messiah* is Jesus. In his Thessalonikan synagogue debates he argued that case from scripture, *interpreting and demonstrating*<sup>174</sup> that the Messiah had to suffer and be raised from the dead. *Luke-Acts'* sequence of synagogue debates offers its window on to Luke's understanding of debates around scripture in formal,<sup>175</sup> and informal settings.<sup>176</sup>

### 1. Formal (synagogue) settings

Luke's Jewish focus is best understood in the light of his own *apologia* before Agrippa and Festus.<sup>177</sup> That specifies the grounds for Paul's journey to Rome as his own appeal to Caesar rather than any charge against him. More tellingly, it crystallises the Lukan Paul's reflection on his life so far in bondage to the Spirit.<sup>178</sup>

Reading backwards has many virtues – Paul's *captatio benevolentiae*<sup>179</sup> introduced his hope in promises particularised as his focus on resurrection as the key to the remainder of this unit.<sup>180</sup> His vision and commission are crucial to grasping the Lukan Paul's life and work.<sup>181</sup> "Forgiveness of sins" is probably shorthand for the now *completed Exodus*, and "among those sanctified by trust in me" echoes Jesus' commissioning of his witnesses.<sup>182</sup>

---

<sup>170</sup> Ch1A1.

<sup>171</sup> Acts 28:23-24.

<sup>172</sup> Remember Eutychus (Acts 20:7-12); *cf.*, [luketheinterpreter.com](http://luketheinterpreter.com); Paul; Luke probably condensed Paul's Antioch sermon.

<sup>173</sup> Acts 28:28.

<sup>174</sup> ...διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος. Luke used a range of verbs signifying debating and interpretative processes; e.g., ἀνακρίνω (17:4); διαλέγω (Acts 17:2; 18:4); διακατελέγχομαι (18:28); ἐκδιηγέομαι (13:41); πείθω (18:4).

<sup>175</sup> *E.g.*, in synagogues: Acts 14:1-3; 17:1-4, 10-12, 16-17; 18:4-5, 19-21; 19:8-9.

<sup>176</sup> *E.g.*, Acts 18:7-8; 19:8-10; 28:23-25a; *cf.*, tradition's account of Jesus' own appeal to scripture.

<sup>177</sup> Acts 26; *cf.*, Acts 28:17-22 on Paul's "innocence."

<sup>178</sup> *Cf.*, Acts 20:22-23; δεδεμένος ἐγὼ τῷ πνεύματι...τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον κατὰ πόλιν διαμαρτύρεται μοι λέγον ὅτι δεσμὰ καὶ θλίψεις με μένουσιν. A punning inversion?

<sup>179</sup> Acts 26:1-3.

<sup>180</sup> Acts 26:4-8.

<sup>181</sup> Acts 26:15b-18.

<sup>182</sup> Acts 26:18; *cf.*, Luke 24:45-48.

Then Paul's summary of his *kerygma*<sup>183</sup> confirms its rootedness in Jesus' teaching, and its coherence with the apostles' teaching: that the Kingdom of God calls for repentance and deeds consistent with that repentance; his own teaching was of only what Moses and prophets had said would happen; "[that] the Messiah would suffer and be the first to be raised from the dead," -- *Interpreter's* focal issue.

## 2. Informal settings

Athens and Miletus<sup>184</sup> offer Lukan insights into Paul among Gentiles and among "Christians" whom he styles as τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις, a term we encountered in Paul's *apologia*.<sup>185</sup> Our sole reason for reaching beyond *Interpreter's* limits is to indicate wider confirmation of Lukan coherence in the matter of its own thesis, that Luke was not mistaken. For example, at Athens, while idolatry was a major focus, Luke presented Paul's major perspective as Ἀνάστασις,<sup>186</sup> – thought by hearers to be a "foreign divinity," but according to Paul's own *apologia*, "light for Gentiles."<sup>187</sup> Even here, however, his practice was "to the Jew first..."<sup>188</sup>

Miletus has its own interesting secondary literature, and we note here only that it links well with Paul's *apologia* and with *Luke-Acts'* overall development. Recalling the Paul of the letters, his foundational activity among them had included "announcing my news to you"<sup>189</sup> and teaching<sup>190</sup> both publicly and house to house; bearing witness to Jews and Greeks about God-ward repentance and trusting fidelity (πίστις) towards our Lord Jesus;<sup>191</sup> going about proclaiming<sup>192</sup> God's Kingship.<sup>193</sup> This foundation picture accords well with Paul's activity in *Luke-Acts*; the remainder of his address to the Ephesian elders resonates with the pastoral nature of this man reflected in his canonical letters.

### ***E. Reference-frame: objections, resonances and evocations.***

This final note belongs to a different scholarly world from that of even five years ago when the commonest objection to *Interpreter's* case was "if Nathan's oracle is so important, why is it never cited?" Discussion since then has moved *Neutestamentlers'* discourse to a

---

<sup>183</sup> Acts 26:20-23.

<sup>184</sup> Acts 17:16-34 and 20:17-38 respectively.

<sup>185</sup> Acts 20:32; *cf.*, 26:18; 1 Cor 1:2.

<sup>186</sup> Acts 17:18; 30-32, ἀναστήσας αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν; ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν.

<sup>187</sup> Acts 26:23; Luke 2:29-32.

<sup>188</sup> Acts 17:17.

<sup>189</sup> ἀναγγέλλω.

<sup>190</sup> διδάσκω.

<sup>191</sup> Acts 20:21-22.

<sup>192</sup> κηρύσσω.

<sup>193</sup> Acts 20:25.

widened, less literary-focused understanding of *Luke-Acts' Weltanschauung*.<sup>194</sup> The role of scripture's ἀναστήσω in Luke's Jesus-triptych, in Luke 24, and in the scriptural reasoning of Acts' exegetical speeches has confirmed that what was implied was often the obvious to ritual-cultural memory.

Responding to that sentence's summary of Luke's uses of scripture, Sean Adams' question,<sup>195</sup> "then why does Luke *cite and label* Isaiah passages?" proved more demanding. My two-fold response now lies in

- the distribution of Isaianic quotations or adaptations throughout *Luke-Acts* and
- Luke's clear interest in Isaiah's envisioned Exodus, within *Luke-Acts'* firmly established Davidic-frame.

Luke's Jesus is the fulfilment of David-promises, introduced by the triptych that announces him as *Saviour* (Luke 2:11), echoes Ezekiel's oracle, and introduces Luke's "salvation" thread.<sup>196</sup> Luke's Jesus is that Davidic-Messiah who at Nazareth announced his *mission*, one envisioned by Isaiah, and as his distinctive introduction to John the Baptist's preaching exemplifies,<sup>197</sup> Luke embraced Isaiah's vision<sup>198</sup> of a widened hope of salvation.

Both Jesus' suffering<sup>199</sup> and resurrection<sup>200</sup> are rooted in the David-story; he is thus the Davidic Messiah who fulfilled Israel's uncompleted *Exodos* from captivity – Luke's Davidic frame-work supporting his Isaianic vision. An eclectic interpreter of Jesus' story and of Israel's scriptures, Luke distinguishes oracle from promise. Just as *Luke-Acts* has its affinities with 4Q174, so, like Qumran, Luke *prioritised* Isaiah among the Exilic prophets. He then acknowledged his source.

*Interpreter's* analytical diagram clarifies the positioning and contexts of his Isaianic Exodus thread at key stages in Jesus' story: Jesus' Nazareth programme moves towards his Transfiguration, whose distinctive *Exodos-logion* culminates in Stephen's excoriating accusations against Jesus' opponents.

---

<sup>194</sup> E.g., Hays, R. B., (2015, 2016); Kirk, A., (2018); Dunn, J. D. G., (2013a); Oropeza, B. J., & Moyise, S., (2016). Cf., Larry Hurtado's blog [<https://wp.me/pYZXr-2gE>] on early Christian bookishness.

<sup>195</sup> At the close of a seminar at Hawarden (2014?) where the *Annual Seminar on the use of the Old Testament in the New* habitually gathers. Good question: I rethought the whole book in the light of this revision of Luke's uses of scripture.

<sup>196</sup> E.g., Luke 2:11; 19:10; Acts 4:8-12; 13:22-26; 28:28. Cf., Ezek 34:11-24.

<sup>197</sup> Luke 3:6, cf., Isa 40:3-5.

<sup>198</sup> Isa 55-66.

<sup>199</sup> Ps 2:1-2; Acts 4:24-28.

<sup>200</sup> 2 Sam 7:12; Ezek 34:23; extended to Deut 18:18; Amos 9:11.

## 1. Narrative distribution

Luke 2:29-32/Isa 49:6.<sup>201</sup> Simeon's song probably evokes Luke's underlying Isaianic exodus *motif* of salvation to earth's end. Sharing its "salvation" theme with *Luke-Acts'* "Saviour" and Luke's form of John the Baptist's scriptural setting, the song's φῶς ἐθνῶν and the sense agreement of "before the face of all people" with "to earth's end" together offer strong support for this probability. Paul's citing, and later alluding to this passage<sup>202</sup> confirm it as part of Luke's Isaianic subtext serving his and Luke's Davidic-reference frame. For the rest, it will help to follow the analytic diagram.

### *i. Galilee*

**a Luke 3:4-6/Isa 40:3-5** (ὡς γέγραπται ἐν βιβλίῳ λόγων Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου). John the Baptist's setting in an Isaianic context belongs to the *fourfold* tradition. But Luke's citation is distinctive, leading to his broader vision of a restored People – *all flesh* shall see God's salvation.

**b Luke 4:16-19/Isa 61:1-2** (adapted) (βιβλίον τοῦ προφήτου Ἡσαΐου καὶ ἀναπτύξας τὸ βιβλίον εὗρεν τὸν τόπον οὗ ἦν γεγραμμένον·) This picture of Jesus in Nazareth's synagogue is a Lukan distinctive, rooting Jesus' *programme* scripturally. Jesus speaks as God's newly-anointed and tested Messiah, Son of God: this is his public declaration of who he is.<sup>203</sup> His widened vision of Israel's restoration within God's purposes provoked the antipathy Luke's Prologue envisaged.

### *ii. Jerusalem*

**a: Luke 19:46/Isa 56:7.** (γέγραπται); this is one element in tradition's compound quotation accompanying Jesus' "cleansing" of the Temple that initiated his *Speaking truth to Power*.

**b: Luke 22:37/Isa 53:12.** (τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί.) This is an allusion, not a citation, but is often appealed to in support of a Servant reading of *Luke-Acts*.<sup>204</sup> For fuller discussion of this passage, see C5 above.

**c: Acts 7:49-50/Isa 66.** (καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει). "What kind of House will you build for me?" expects a different answer from Jesus' earlier "a den of robbers."<sup>205</sup> Closing *Speaking truth to Power*, Stephen makes much of Isaiah's sense-unit 65:17-66:1-16, 22-23 that envisions God's new, post-Exilic creation.

---

<sup>201</sup> See Koet, B., (1989), 140, 144. On referencing-framing and labelled quotations, see Ch2C

Summary.

<sup>202</sup> Acts 13:47.

<sup>203</sup> Luke 4:21b.

<sup>204</sup> E.g., Holladay, C. R., (2016), 190; Carroll, J. T., (2012), 442.

<sup>205</sup> See *luketheinterpreter.com*; Stephen.

### **iii. Post-Jerusalem**

**Philip: Acts 8:30-35/ Isa 53:7-8.** (Φίλιππος ἤκουσεν αὐτοῦ ἀναγινώσκοντος Ἡσαΐαν τὸν προφήτην).<sup>206</sup> Undoing Deut 23:1, Philip's proclaiming "Jesus" to this Ethiopian eunuch as good news echoes Isa 56:1-8,<sup>207</sup> the cotext of Jesus' "House of Prayer" compound quotation.<sup>208</sup> This is a Lukan vision of the purpose of the New *Exodos*...from God's renewed community none is excluded.

### **iv. Paul**

**a Acts 13:34b/Isa 55:3** (οὕτως εἶρηκεν).<sup>209</sup> Paul here appeals to Isaiah's promise of a Davidic covenant that implies God's ἀναστήσω,<sup>210</sup> embedded in Luke's otherwise unrepresented crystallisation of Paul's synagogue *preaching*. This differs from Jesus' Nazareth programme in that it proclaims the result of Jesus' *Exodos* in Jerusalem.

**b: Acts 28:25/Isa 6:9-13** (καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν).<sup>211</sup> *Luke-Acts'* concluding citation, tradition sets this passage in the cotext of the Sower.<sup>212</sup> A prophet sows the word of God but...some flourish some don't; this prophet Paul persists.

## **2. Isaiah.**

Luke's distinctive Isaianic quotations and allusions lie mostly *within* a subtext (Isa 55-66), governed by his Davidic-Messiah frame, and developing his Exodus theme.<sup>213</sup> Luke's debts to tradition tend to *echo* his source-text's labelling formula; note how the label introducing the John the Baptist extract is echoed in Nazareth. Is this a Lukan fulfilment – Jesus is God's Messiah, and his Isaianic programme is the *how* of God's παράκλησις?<sup>214</sup>

In an age impatient for God's promised Messiah, Isaiah's hope-filled, broader vision spoke to early Christian tradition of the character of that bivalent *Exodos* focused on Jerusalem. As Paul announced, God's *Saviour*<sup>215</sup> was the agent of God's salvation,<sup>216</sup>

---

<sup>206</sup> ἢ δὲ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς...portion; summary? Cf., Wisd 2:12-20; Ps 36:12-20.

<sup>207</sup> Cf., Lev 21:16-23.

<sup>208</sup> Luke 19:46b.

<sup>209</sup> While an antecedent subject is unclear, Luke's conviction that the Holy Spirit underlay prophet's speech accords well with Wisdom's view (Wisd 7:27-28).

<sup>210</sup> Isa 55:3 (*incipit cf.*, "the Bush"); see *luketheinterpreter.com*; Paul.

<sup>211</sup> Cf., Acts 7:51-53.

<sup>212</sup> Cf., Luke 8:9-10 *et par cf.*, 11-15.

<sup>213</sup> Philip's encounter with the Ethiopian is anomalous.

<sup>214</sup> Isa 40:1; Luke 2:25.

<sup>215</sup> Acts 13:23: *cf.*, Luke 2:11.

<sup>216</sup> Acts 13:26; *cf.*, Acts 28:28.

fulfilling God's promises to David.<sup>217</sup> *Ezekiel's* David, scourge of self-aggrandising shepherds,<sup>218</sup> proved to be David's *Torah*-faithful son, Jesus, scourge of Jerusalem's unfaithful shepherds, and restorer to wholeness of God's flock. Among the major Exilic prophets, however, Isaiah held a special place for Luke, so was labelled, *signposting* his theology of salvation as *Luke-Acts* unfolded;<sup>219</sup> Luke apparently preferred Isaiah's *house of prayer* to Ezekiel's *rebuilt Temple*.<sup>220</sup>

***According to the scriptures.***

In Luke's hope-filled world, where cultural memory and vigorous scriptural debate characterised Second Temple Judaism's life, *Luke-Acts'* inner logic offered the ἀσφάλεια that Theophilus sought. Peter's exegetical activities were enriched by those of Stephen and Paul. They revealed how and where it was written that the Messiah must suffer and be raised. Through Jesus, God had fulfilled the two-fold David-promise – of a seed and a House – ensuring Israel's renewal.

8,200

---

<sup>217</sup> *luketheinterpreter.com*; Paul. *Cf.*, Acts 28:31; Luke 2:11; to Rome where Paul counter-culturally proclaimed God as King and Jesus as Saviour, Messiah and Lord.

<sup>218</sup> Ezek 34:1-24.

<sup>219</sup> For Qumran's discussions of Luke's base-text (2 Sam 7; 4Q174) and his dominant Deuteronomy and Isaiah debts, see *e.g.*, Vermes, G., (1994); Ulrich, E., (1999).

<sup>220</sup> *E.g.*, Ezek 40-44.