

The Law and the Gentiles in Acts 15: Divine Authority between the Scriptures of Israel and Jesus on the Law

by
Chen, Hui-Chun
(Peggy)

*Dissertation presented for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
Faculty of Theology at
Stellenbosch University*



Supervisor: Prof. Jeremy Punt

March 2017

Declaration

By submitting this dissertation electronically, I declare that the entirety of the work contained therein is my own, original work, that I am the sole author thereof (save to the extent explicitly otherwise stated), that reproduction and publication thereof by Stellenbosch University will not infringe any third party rights and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it for obtaining any qualification.

March 2017

Copyright © 2017 Stellenbosch University

All rights reserved

ABSTRACT

This dissertation reads Peter's speech and James' speech in Acts 15 in light of Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke. In Luke's presentation of the Jerusalem Council, Peter and James appropriate different aspects of Jesus' teaching. Recalling Jesus' taking issue with the Pharisees for focusing on the outside behavior of cleansing cups and plates in Luke 11:37-41, Peter in Acts 15 uses Jesus' emphases that it is *the inside* that renders a person clean; James reflects Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47 that the Scriptures speak of repentance for the forgiveness of sins among all the nations on the basis of *the name of Jesus*. In response to the demand of the Jewish believers for the Gentile believers to be circumcised and ordered to keep the law in relation to their salvation, Peter emphasizes the certainty of the salvation of Gentile believers, pointing out that God cleanses *their heart* when they respond to the gospel through faith (Acts 15:9); James uses the connection between the name of Jesus and the forgiveness of sins for including people within the Jesus movement. James in the book of Acts uses an Amos text from the Scriptures that speaks of Gentiles being included among the people of God as *called by God's name*. James emphasizes that the way for Gentile believers to bear *the name of God* is through their *calling upon the name of Jesus* for the forgiveness of sins. Therefore, James orders that the Gentile believers not be circumcised.

Through reference to Jesus' stress upon the importance of the inside in one's relationship with God, and to Jesus' teaching that his name offers forgiveness of sins, Luke in Acts shows that the identity of the Jesus movement is the purification of the heart and the calling upon the name of Jesus. These two elements are vital for Luke's presentation of what constitutes salvation.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie proefskrif vertolk Petrus en Jakobus se toesprake in Handeling 15 in die lig van Jesus se siening van die wet in die Evangelie van Lukas. In Lukas se uitbeelding van die Jerusalem Raad, neem Petrus en Jakobus verskillende aspekte van Jesus se onderrig in Lukas op. Gedagtig aan hoe Jesus teenoor die Fariseërs reageer het ten opsigte van hul fokus op uiterlike gedrag met verwysing na die was van bekere en borde in Lukas 11: 37-41, gebruik Petrus in Handeling 15 Jesus se beklemtoning dat 'n persoon aan die binnekant skoon moet wees; Jakobus weer weerspieël Jesus se onderrig in Lukas 24:47 dat die Bybelse Geskrifte die bekering tot vergifnis van sondes onder al die nasies benadruk op grond van *die naam van Jesus*. In reaksie op die vraag van die Joodse gelowiges of nie-Joodse gelowiges besny moet word en beveel moet word om die wet te hou met die oog op hul redding, beklemtoon Petrus die sekerheid van die redding van nie-Joodse gelowiges, en wys daarop dat God *hulle harte* reinig wanneer hulle reageer op die evangelie in die geloof (Hand 15: 9); Jakobus gebruik die verband tussen die naam van Jesus en die vergifnis van sonde ten opsigte van die insluiting van mense binne die Jesus-beweging. Jakobus maak in die boek Handeling gebruik van 'n Amos teks van die Bybelse Geskrifte wat praat van heidene wat ingesluit word as mense van God as *geroep in God se naam*. Jakobus beklemtoon dat vir nie-Joodse gelowiges die wyse om die *naam van God* te dra, is om hul *op die naam van Jesus te beroep* vir die vergifnis van sondes. Daarom beveel Jakobus dat die nie-Joodse gelowiges nie besny moet word nie.

Deur te verwys na Jesus se beklemtoning van die belangrikheid van die innerlike in 'n mens se verhouding met God, en Jesus se onderrig dat sy naam vergifnis bied van sondes, toon Lukas in Handeling die identiteit van die Jesus-beweging aan as die suiwering van harte en 'n beroep op die naam van Jesus. Hierdie twee elemente is deurslaggewend vir hoe Lukas redding uitbeeld.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

To complete a dissertation and thus a PhD. is no person's solo work and solo journey. Rather, along the way there are people who help the completion of this project. It is a great delight and privilege for me to express my gratitude here for people who have contributed to the completion of this dissertation.

First of all, I thank my supervisor, Dr. Jeremy Punt, for enabling my participation in the doctoral program in Stellenbosch University. During a one-month stay in Stellenbosch in early 2011, Dr. Punt helped me tremendously in thinking through the topic of this dissertation with me. He was willing and able to accommodate my meetings with him within his busy schedule, and I was able to complete the writing of the research proposal during my time there. In Dr. Punt, I see humility, human care and sympathy for people who are in difficulty, and critical scholarship. I have learned a lot from Dr. Punt's detailed comments in each draft of every chapter of this dissertation. His attentive and insightful responses to my email questions were invaluable during the process of writing. I realize that there are parts of this work that are still not up to Dr. Punt's critical standard, and so the shortcomings in this work remain mine.

Second, I thank Dr. William J. Larkin, who taught several N.T. courses during my Master of Divinity study at Columbia International University, Columbia, South Carolina, U.S.A. Dr. Larkin passed away on Feb 18th, 2014 due to pancreatic cancer. This work is dedicated to his memory. I have benefited from Dr. Larkin's interactions with me in several e-mails about the topic of this dissertation during the months of treatment prior to his death. I am honored and fortunate to have been Dr. Larkin's student.

Third, I thank Dr. Morris Vos, who taught me theological German the summer before I started my ThM study at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, Deerfield, Illinois, USA, in

2000. Later Dr. Vos was helpful in proofreading and editing the English of this work in each draft of every chapter. I thank him for his friendship and support during the writing process. Without that support and encouragement I would not have been able to come to this finish line. The shortcomings in terms of the use of English in this work remain mine.

I thank my parents, who have been in this long haul with me. I am fortunate to have parents who believe in education and who support their children to complete their dreams. The finish line is significant not only to me but also to them. Together we have longed to complete this PhD journey.

I thank my former colleagues, Dr. So-Young Chen and Dr. Tony Chen, in Holy Light Seminary, Kaohsiung, Taiwan, for their encouragement and prayers for me during the process of writing. They were in their first year of teaching at Holy Light Seminary, and yet they immediately extended their love to a colleague who is coping with the dual challenges of teaching and completing a PhD degree. I thank my friend Suzane Fan for her prayers for me to complete my doctoral study.

Finally, I thank God for His faithfulness in upholding me throughout the process of writing. This journey was obscured in darkness for quite an extended period of time. There were times when my prayer was that I do not know how to pray, and yet I experienced how a broken toe led me to concentrate on my writing intensively, and God in his providence gave a breakthrough in my writing in the summer of 2014.

CONTENTS

Chapter

INTRODUCTION	1
A Survey of Secondary Literature	3
Methodology	35
1. JESUS' VIEW OF THE LAW IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE	38
Introduction	38
Jesus' Teaching on the Law	39
Jesus' Passing References to the Law in Interactions with People	64
Jesus' Breaking the Sabbath	75
Jesus' Pronouncements of Woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44)	83
Conclusion	87
2. OPPOSING POSITIONS IN SECOND TEMPLE JEWISH ATTITUDES TO THE LAW.....	90
Introduction	90
Scholars' Review of E. P. Sanders' Covenantal Nomism	94
Rabbinic Judaism	117
Conclusion	136
3. PETER'S SPEECH IN THE JERUSALEM MEETING IN ACTS 15:1-21	144
Introduction	144
Innertextual Study	147
Intertexture in Peter's Speech	161
Ideological Texture	168
Conclusion	183

4. JAMES' USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN ACTS 15	184
Introduction	184
Inner Texture in James' Speech	186
Intertextual Study: James' Use of the Scriptures in Acts 15:16-18	190
Echo of Jesus' Reading of the Scriptures in James' Reading of the Scriptures	227
Social and Cultural Texture in James' Use of the Scriptures and Jesus' Teaching	234
CONCLUSION	243
BIBLIOGRAPHY	251

INTRODUCTION

This dissertation¹ studies Luke's presentation of Peter's speech and James' speech in the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 in light of Luke's portrayal of Jesus' comments on the law in the Gospel of Luke. The dissertation argues that in Luke's Acts 15 account, as the early church faces the demand to have the Gentile believers circumcised and ordered to keep the law, Luke's representation of Jesus' teachings of the law in the Gospel of Luke can be used for the resolution of the problem posed before the Council. In the account in Acts, Peter's talk of the cleansing of *the heart* (Acts 15:9) recalls Jesus' teaching of the cleansing of *the inside* in Luke 11:37-41. James' use of the Scriptures to speak of Gentiles called by God's *name* seeking the Lord (Acts 15:17) recalls Jesus' reading of the Scriptures as containing the preaching of repentance for forgiveness of sins in his *name* (Luke 24:47-48).² In Luke's

¹The style of footnotes in this dissertation follows Patrick H. Alexander et al., eds., *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999). Using the SBL style for footnotes, the chapters in this dissertation are treated separately so that the first bibliographic citation in each chapter is given in full form.

²This study indirectly supports the conviction that Luke and Acts are intended to be read together. Mikeal Parsons and Richard Pervo appealed in their *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993) for "suitable nuance" in regard to the unity of Luke and Acts (115). Pervo cautions, "The unity of Luke and Acts are questions to be pursued rather than presuppositions to be exploited. Pursuit is most fruitful in the area of themes, as Robert Tannehill's work has richly demonstrated. The continuity of salvation history is a governing theme that integrates the two volumes" (Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary* [ed. Harold W. Attridge; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009], 19-20).

depiction, taking up Jesus' interpretation of the Scriptures, James emphasizes that Gentiles are included among the people of God as Gentiles through calling upon the *name* of Jesus.

Through his presentation of Peter and James using Jesus' comment upon the law to solve the law problem for the Gentile believers, Luke³ stresses that the Gentile believers do not have to be circumcised and keep the law because the identity marks of the Jesus movement are the purification of heart and calling upon the name of Jesus. To Luke, having their hearts cleansed by God and their act of calling upon the name of Jesus are sufficient for the salvation of the Gentile believers; thus, the keeping of the law has no bearing for them in terms of salvation. With his focus on the identity marks of the Christian movement being the purification of heart and calling upon the name of Jesus, Luke shows that this Christian group, consisting now of Jewish believers and Gentile believers, continues the history of the people of God as depicted in the Scriptures.

Thus, the project of this dissertation is that Peter's speech and James' speech in Acts 15 are to be read against the background of Jesus' remarks on the law in the Gospel of Luke; as

³Following commentators like F. F. Bruce (*The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* [3d rev. and enl. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 1-9), Joseph A. Fitzmyer (*The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols; AB 28, 28A; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1981-85), 1:35-53; *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 50), and Craig S. Keener (*Acts: An Exegetical Commentary* [4 vols; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012-15], 1:406-16), this dissertation in harmony with church tradition accepts the identification of Luke as the author of the Gospel of Luke and Acts. Nevertheless, it is recognized that the presence or absence of this association of the author of Luke-Acts with the historical person of Luke is not germane to the interpretation of the text of Acts 15, as this work sets out to do. Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch (*Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts* [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008], 1) judge the traditional association of the author of Acts with Luke in Paul's writings as "presumed but unfounded." They do not provide any rationale or basis for this judgment. This dissertation finds Fitzmyer's comment on the church traditions in support of Lucan authorship of Luke-Acts convincing, but it is beyond the scope of this work to evaluate the church traditions themselves. Therefore, Luke in this dissertation is associated mainly with the Luke-Acts accounts in the NT, and not with the historical person of Luke.

demonstrated in the following literature review of the topic of law in Luke-Acts, the project of this dissertation has not been adequately addressed in Lucan studies of the law.

A Survey of Secondary Literature

In *Luke and the People of God* in the chapter "The Law in Luke-Acts" Jacob Jervell discusses the question of the importance of the law for Luke with reference to the major scholarly thrust that does not find the law particularly important to Luke, and in which there is a lack of "exhaustive monographs and essays" treating this topic.⁴ He refers to Franz Overbeck, who holds that "the author of Acts was unprincipled when he dealt with the law"⁵ and that the problem of the law is "of no concern" to Luke; Jervell also mentions Ernst Haenchen, who regards that the difficulty with the law is "only peripheral in Acts," and Hans Conzelmann, who comments that "the debate regarding the law is presented solely by means of historical reflection" and has no relevance to Luke's time.⁶

Rejecting the prevalent view that the problem of the law is already settled before the time of Luke, Jervell states that "[w]e may say that the problem was solved *de facto*, not *de jure*, that is, the idea was not developed into a generally accepted theology"; Jervell notes that "[t]he problem of the law was not solved by the admission of the uncircumcised," but rather "was more complicated than

⁴Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 133.

⁵According to Jervell, Overbeck sees that Luke teaches "justification by faith apart from the law (13:38f.)," and yet in Luke's depiction "Jewish Christians are obliged to keep the law unabridged, while Gentile Christians have only modified freedom from the law" (ibid).

⁶Ibid., 133-34.

that." ⁷ For Jervell, the theological idea involved with the issue of the law hangs on the connection between Israel and the law. Jervell argues that "[f]or Luke the law remains the law given to Israel on Sinai, in the strict meaning of the word, the law of Israel," and "Luke is concerned about the law because it is Israel's law."⁸ Jervell explains that Luke's portrayal of the Jewish believers' abiding by the law is important because by doing so they demonstrate that they are the people of God. Jervell contends that "Luke knows only one Israel, one people of God, one covenant" and that "[b]ecause Jewish Christians are the restored Israel, circumcision and law become the very marks of their identity."⁹

Jervell also insists that in Luke's mind the salvation of the Gentile believers is only "without circumcision, not without law" and explains that "[t]he apostolic decree enjoins Gentiles to keep the law, and they keep that part of the law required for them to live together with Jews."¹⁰ He finds that Luke's idea of the law is developed in "the conflict between church and synagogue": Luke "opposes Jews who charge Christian Jews with apostasy from Israel," and "this conflict is related to Paul, who is used as an argument against the church."¹¹ Jervell ends his discussion with a proposal for understanding Luke's view of the law: "Luke intended to show that the Jewish Christians' observance

⁷Ibid., 135.

⁸Ibid., 137.

⁹Ibid., 141, 142-43.

¹⁰Ibid., 144.

¹¹Ibid., 145-47.

of the law and the salvation of the Gentiles as an associate people, [*sic*] are the distinguishing marks of the Israel that Moses and the prophets predicted as the people of the promises of salvation."¹²

Stephen G. Wilson in his monograph *Luke and the Law* starts with a study of legal terms in Luke-Acts, continues with a thematic study of law in Luke's Gospel, follows with a presentation of law in Acts, and concludes with a chapter entitled "Law, Judaism and the Gentiles." In his first chapter on the legal expressions of Luke-Acts, he studies Luke's use of the words "law" (νόμος), "custom" (ἔθος) and "Moses." He notes that in some occurrences Luke uses law (νόμος) and custom (ἔθος) interchangeably and "moves naturally from the one to the other in describing the same phenomenon."¹³ Wilson finds the closest parallel to Luke's usage in the works of Josephus and to a lesser degree in Philo. Wilson describes that Josephus uses law (νόμος) and custom (ἔθος) interchangeably in the apologetic context of asking tolerance for Jewish religion because the Jewish customs are like the customs of other nations. He proposes that while Luke does not follow Josephus in describing and evaluating customs in general, Luke may share "the cosmopolitan tone and cultural magnanimity common to Josephus and Philo."¹⁴ Along the same line, Wilson proposes that "Luke's language implies an attitude towards Jewish law which is both tolerant, in that it upholds the right of the Jews to follow the practices most natural to them, and yet also restrictive, in that it would view as unnatural the imposition of this law" on Gentiles.¹⁵

¹²Ibid., 147.

¹³Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSM 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 4.

¹⁴Ibid., 10.

¹⁵Ibid., 11.

In the second chapter in his discussion of law in the Gospel of Luke, Wilson remarks that study in this area "has not been much," and where "the relevant material has been considered it has usually been in the context of an examination of Jesus' view of the law" with the noted exception of Jacob Jervell.¹⁶ Wilson's focus is on the final form of Luke's account and "the impression it conveys," and the questions about the sources Luke employs are used "only insofar as it contributes to this purpose"; in terms of the relationship of the synoptic gospels "[a] comparison of both individual pericopes and their overall effect in the three gospels can still be made without assuming the priority of one of them, although on occasions the two-document hypothesis may have to be assumed for the sake of argument."¹⁷

Based upon thematic study, Wilson discusses law in the Gospel of Luke in the categories of "Doing the Law," "Challenging the Law?," "Luke 16:16-18," and "Lucan Omissions." In each section, Wilson interacts with various scholars, and in the conclusion section he compares his findings to previous works in the area and evaluates them against his own conclusions. Wilson finds that Conzelmann makes almost no contribution to the topic of law in the Gospel of Luke and that in this regard Conzelmann is mainly controlled by his understanding of Luke 16:16-17. In Wilson's words, Conzelmann's interpretation of Luke 16:16-17 is that "[t]he law and the prophets, understood as a call to repentance, co-exist with the message of the kingdom, and the law is thus carefully slotted into Luke's conception of salvation-history"; Wilson further describes Conzelmann as holding that this line

¹⁶Ibid., 12. Wilson emphasizes that "it is a quite different matter to enquire after the Lucan understanding of Jesus' view of the law than to trace the same theme in the teaching of the historical Jesus. The situation of Luke and his readers and changes in Jewish practice and belief can significantly alter the picture" (ibid.).

¹⁷Ibid.

of thinking explains why the Jewish Christians and Paul keep the law, and it is not until the Apostolic Council with the issuing of the apostolic decree that the Jewish Christians are freed from the law.¹⁸

Wilson also refers to Hans Hübner, who takes Conzelmann's comment on Luke 16:16-17 and proposes that Luke "denies any abrogation of the law by Jesus and this explains his juxtaposition of [Luke] 16:16 and 16:17 and his omission of Mk 10:2f."¹⁹ Wilson adds that Jervell also holds that in Luke's account Jesus is obedient to the law, and Wilson presents Jervell's explanation that Luke has to present it this way because of the rejection of the charges of Stephen's speaking against the law (Acts 6:11f) and Luke's depiction of the Jewish Christians as being zealous for the law. Wilson comments that a characteristic point common among these scholarly treatments is "the attempt to find a consistent approach to the law in the Gospel and Acts."²⁰ He points out that this consistent understanding of the double work of Luke needs to be proved, rather than assumed. Wilson further adds Robert Banks' thought about Luke and the law: "Luke's view is dominated by christology—Jesus' preaching, teaching and healing ministry which calls men to salvation—and, though not explicitly, it is this which for Luke supersedes the law."²¹

Against these scholars' understandings of law in the Gospel of Luke, Wilson lists several concepts of the law that co-exist, including the prophetic function of the law (explicitly in Luke 24:27, 44 and allusively in Luke 9:29, 33; 16:16), the affirmation of certain requirements of the law (Luke 10:25f; 16:17; 16:29, 31; 18:18f; cf. 11:42), Jesus' undermining certain commands of the law (Luke

¹⁸Ibid., 54.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid., 55.

²¹Ibid.

6:1-11; 6:12f.; 13:10-17; 14:1-6; 11:41; 16:18; 18:18f), and the ambiguity in the juxtaposing of "potentially contradictory sayings" (Luke 11:41-2; 16:16-18).²² From his study Wilson concludes that there is no consistent pattern that would express Luke's view of the law. Wilson emphasizes that in Luke's presentation, sometimes Jesus upholds the law and sometimes he is against the law, and "[h]e does not stand under the law as Hübner and Jervell suppose, nor essentially above it as Banks suggests."²³ He thinks that the coexisting of the various ideas about the law in the Gospel of Luke "suggest that the question of Jesus' attitude towards the law was not a problem for Luke and his readers, at least at the time he composed the Gospel."²⁴ Wilson suggests that it is probable that Jewish Christians living "in a diaspora Judaism" were among Luke's readers, but he stresses that his hunch is that Luke wrote mainly for Gentile Christians "for whom those aspects of the law discussed in the Gospel were not a problem"; Wilson concludes the chapter by noting that to those Gentile Christians the impression they receive about the observance of the law would be positive and that "they might have concluded that the law remained a valid guide for Jews and Jewish-Christians," but in any case the issue of the relevance of the law for Gentiles "did not arise at this stage of the narrative."²⁵

In his chapter 3, "The Law in Acts," Wilson conducts his discussion in the order of the topics of "Law and salvation," "Keeping the law," and "Law and Gentiles." In the section of "Law and salvation," Wilson considers Acts 13:38-39 and Acts 15:9-11 and remarks that "[i]n both passages,

²²Ibid., 56.

²³Ibid., 57.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., 58.

with respect to salvation, the law is seen to be inadequate, irrelevant or both."²⁶ Regarding Luke's portrayal of the keeping of law by Jewish Christians in "Keeping the law," Wilson focuses upon the narratives related to Stephen and Paul. Through a discussion of the charges laid against Stephen (Acts 6:11, 13-14), Wilson underscores that Stephen is not against the law. As a reason why Luke endeavors to show that Paul abides by the law, Wilson offers that "the real issue for Luke was not the law *per se*" but rather saving "the contentious reputation of Paul, perhaps under fire from Jewish-Christian quarters."²⁷ In the section "Law and Gentiles" Wilson probes into the problem of the connection between Peter's vision in Acts 10-11 and the Apostolic Council in Acts 15 and aims to grasp the Lucan understanding of the decree by examining different proposals for the decree. His conclusions for the chapter, "The Law in Acts," are that "living according to the law ultimately has no bearing on the salvation of Jews or Gentiles," that the Jewish Christians' keeping the law as a way to express their piety is viewed positively, that the decrees the Gentile believers are to keep are apostolic rather than Mosaic in origin, and that "the law understood as prophecy plays an important role in Acts."²⁸

In his concluding chapter, "Law, Judaism and the Gentiles," Wilson pulls together his arguments in the previous chapters and considers their consequences. He relates Luke's view of the law to Luke's view of Judaism and the Jews. Wilson concludes that "[a]n important motif in Luke's view of the law is that it is the *ethos* of a particular *ethnos*" and in this way "akin to the views of hellenistic Jews and cultured pagans both of whom, though for different reasons, describe Jewish laws

²⁶Ibid., 61.

²⁷Ibid., 68.

²⁸Ibid., 102.

as 'customs.'²⁹ Wilson further remarks that when viewed against the backdrop of "hellenistic Jewish thought," "[t]he most important consequence for Luke's view of the law is that the laws/customs of Moses are viewed as the proper and peculiar possession of the Jews, appropriate to the expression of Jewish and Jewish-Christian piety but out of place if imposed upon Gentiles."³⁰ Wilson finds the impartiality of God to be Luke's theological foundation for this notion, namely, that God does not make distinction between Jews and Gentiles (Acts 10:34); such a theological basis differs from Jervell's proposal that the church is the reconstructed Israel, and thus both Jewish and Gentile believers abide by the law. Wilson emphasizes that "for Luke the problem of the law is primarily associated with the figure of Paul" and that "it is Paul and his reputation which are crucial and the question of the law is secondary to and illustrative of this primary concern."³¹ Wilson thinks that Luke writes mainly for Gentile Christians and that Luke's defense of Paul is also relevant to them.³²

Craig L. Blomberg starts his article, "The Law in Luke-Acts," with a reference to the opinion of Jacob Jervell that Luke's view of the law is the most conservative among New Testament writers and lists other scholars who have similar outlooks. Next he considers Wilson's *Luke and the*

²⁹Ibid., 103.

³⁰Ibid., 104.

³¹Ibid., 108.

³²Considering Jesus' ambivalence toward the law in the Gospel and Peter's negative view of the law in Acts, Wilson suggests that Luke's audience was Gentile and hypothesizes: "[I]f these Gentile Christians were of a Pauline stripe and Paul's reputation was under fire, it would be natural in defending him for Luke to present a consistent and exaggerated portrait of his commitment to the law" (ibid., 105-106).

Law and comments that Wilson's study "subjects Jervell's thesis to a penetrating critique."³³ Blomberg says that Wilson notes both positive and negative sides in Luke's attitude to the law and adds that Wilson thinks that the negative comments on the law are implicit while the positive comments are in general explicit. Acknowledging the positive portrayals of law-keeping in Luke-Acts, Blomberg asks the question whether the data should lead to the judgment that Jervell, Vielhauer, Sloyan, and Catchpole are correct that Luke unveils a view that "Jewish and Gentile Christians must each keep those parts of the Mosaic Law relevant to them, adding simply the belief in the resurrected Jesus as the promised Messiah."³⁴ He also asks whether one should follow Wilson's more subtle approach, which regards the keeping of the law in Luke's view as a demonstration of the piety of Jews and Jewish Christians.

Blomberg answers the questions he raises by directing attention to other scholars such as J. M. Creed and Robert Banks who do not view the issue of the law as a prominent one for Luke, and by listing some other explanations for Luke's view of the law. Then Blomberg lays out the objective for his study. He states that in light of the fact that "the role of the Law in Luke-Acts requires some further careful attention," and that "a weakness of almost all of the studies" he mentions is "their lack of close analysis of the function of the various verses and passages on the Law in the structure and progression of Luke's thought," he sets out to examine these references to the law "sequentially as they appear in Luke-Acts."³⁵

³³Craig L. Blomberg, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 22 (1984): 53.

³⁴*Ibid.*, 56.

³⁵*Ibid.*

In his analysis of law in Luke-Acts, by placing a verse or passage that deals with the Mosaic law in the development of the thought in a given verse or passage, Blomberg demonstrates repeatedly that obedience to the law is not Luke's focus. For example, in his study of Luke 1-2, Blomberg points out that even though the piety of characters like Zechariah and Elizabeth is noted, the thrust of these two chapters is on "the coming dawn of a new day, the fulfillment of the promises of redemption long awaited, and the inauguration of a new relationship between God and his people."³⁶ Another example can be seen in his comment on the early church's practice of attending the temple. Blomberg expresses that the Gospel of Luke ends with the disciples praising God in the temple, and "[l]ittle wonder then that Luke includes in his first summary of the activity of the church that they attended the temple together daily (Acts 2.46)."³⁷ Blomberg adds, "Yet Luke lays no stress on this fact, nor even on the fact that Peter and John went to the temple at the hour of the evening sacrifice (3.1)"; he emphasizes that "the only purpose of Acts 3.1 is to introduce the miracle story and speech by Peter which follow in vv. 2-26."³⁸

In his investigation of Luke's attitude to the law, Blomberg also observes Luke's depiction of the authority of Jesus above the law. This theme can be seen in Blomberg's interpretation of Luke 5:17-6:11, 11:41-42, 16:16-18, and 18:18-30. In his reading of Luke 6:1-5, Blomberg points out that "Jesus clearly appears to violate the Old Testament sabbath law" and that in Luke 6:5 "Luke brings out all the more clearly that Jesus takes a position above the Law."³⁹ In his remark on Luke

³⁶Ibid., 57.

³⁷Ibid., 62.

³⁸Ibid.

³⁹Ibid., 58-59.

11:41-42, Blomberg asserts that in Luke 11:41 "Jesus is turning an illustration about ritual purity into a more widely applicable statement about moral purity," and "[i]n this view, v. 41b potentially contains some very radical implications concerning the need for the cleanliness laws."⁴⁰ Blomberg sees that in Luke 16:16 "at least two ages are in view, Jesus belongs to the second age, and that second age has in some way superseded the first age, the age of the law and prophets"; he further asserts that Luke 16:17-18 illustrate "the principle of the new age announced in v. 16."⁴¹ In his explanation of Luke 18:18-30, using Banks' interpretation of this passage, Blomberg says that even though the law is referred to by Jesus, this appeal serves to prepare for the further claim that Jesus issues.

In the conclusion to his article, Blomberg probes into the question whether Luke considers that "Christians (or perhaps just Jewish Christians) must nevertheless keep the Mosaic Law as 'fruits befitting repentance,'" and he asserts that the evidence "consistently points in the opposite direction"; he explains that "[w]hat Luke does stress, through length and repetition of narrative, are the events which lead the early church (both Jew and Gentile) to break away from Judaism and from the Jewish law."⁴² Blomberg emphasizes that the main theme of Luke's attitude to the law is "freedom from the law" for Jewish and Gentile believers.⁴³ Moreover, Blomberg argues that "Luke's most important understanding of the Law" is that "the Law is preeminently prophecy, and specifically

⁴⁰Ibid., 60.

⁴¹Ibid., 60, 61.

⁴²Ibid., 70.

⁴³Ibid., 70.

prophecy about the coming Christ."⁴⁴ Blomberg adds that even though Luke does not provide any detail of how Jesus reads "the books of the Law to refer to himself," "[i]t seems fair, nevertheless, to term Luke's view of the Law a christological one."⁴⁵ Blomberg finds that to some degree Wilson is correct "in describing the prophetic and prescriptive aspects of Luke's view of the Law as unconnected," but he thinks that "at a Christological level, there is unity" in these two aspects; Blomberg proposes that "Luke sees *all* of the Hebrew Scriptures (Moses, prophets, and Psalms) as fulfilled in Christ—in his commandments and ethical instructions as well as in his actions in life and death."⁴⁶

F. Gerald Downing proposes to understand the tension between accounts of observance of the law and disregard of the Law in Luke-Acts, as noted by Blomberg, from the angle that Luke had an eye on Gentile readers, who might respond positively to a speech such as the one in Acts 17. He says, "It was a commonplace of contemporary thinking about religion and society that ancestral custom should be observed," and "such observance aims at human flourishing."⁴⁷

M. A. Seifrid, in his article "Jesus and the Law in Acts," argues that a new ethic, derived from the messianic status of Jesus, is in force in Luke-Acts. His main support for this view comes from Acts 15, especially the Apostolic Decree. He starts with the notion that professing Jesus as Messiah for the believing community in Acts "entails obedience to new demands" that are "beyond the Mosaic

⁴⁴Ibid., 70-71.

⁴⁵Ibid., 71.

⁴⁶Ibid. (emphasis in original)

⁴⁷F. Gerald Downing, "Freedom from the Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 49.

law"; by way of a comment on the conversion of Peter he then focuses on exegeting Acts 15 and the Apostolic Decree.⁴⁸

Seifrid makes his case indirectly. It emerges only toward the end of his article that the supposed new ethic derives from the messianic status of Jesus as portrayed in Acts 15. After emphasizing the roles of the Spirit and the Council in authorizing the decree and showing a close relationship between the Spirit and Jesus in Acts, Seifrid says, "The Spirit's endorsement of the demands placed on the Gentiles indicates an ethic based on Jesus' lordship."⁴⁹

In *Gesetz und Volk Gottes*, Matthias Klinghardt focuses on Luke's concept of law with the intention of gaining perspective on the function that Luke assigns to the law. He notes that scholars generally have emphasized that the Old Testament is of concern to Luke primarily for its prophecy of the Messiah. In contrast, though he recognizes that, for Luke, prophecy and law belong together, Klinghardt makes a plea for foregrounding the nature of the law as commandment: "den Gebotscharakter des Gesetzes."⁵⁰ An additional feature in Klinghardt's approach is his insistence that the relationship of Luke or his Christian community to Judaism must always be present in the background of any discussion of particular issues in Luke's narrative. This Christian-Jewish relationship Klinghardt accordingly characterizes as a "Hauptproblem."⁵¹

⁴⁸M. A. Seifrid, "Jesus and the Law in Acts," *JSNT* 30 (1987): 41.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 51.

⁵⁰Matthias Klinghardt, *Gesetz und Volk Gottes: Das lukanische Verständnis des Gesetzes nach Herkunft, Funktion und seinem Ort in der Geschichte des Urchristentums* (WUNT 2/32; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988), 11.

⁵¹*Ibid.*

Klinghardt's work raises penetrating questions about Jews and Gentiles in the intertestamental period and, in particular, the way in which Jews view the law. The Apostolic Decree is to be read in context, Klinghardt asserts, and the view of the law that emerges from Acts 15:10 must be shown to be consistent with other references to the law in Luke: "stimmig zu den anderen Gesetzesaussagen."⁵² Klinghardt holds that "das Verständnis des Aposteldekrets für die Beurteilung der Stellung der lk Gemeinde(n) zum Judentum" is furthermore "von zentraler Bedeutung."⁵³ He notes that, in considering the Apostolic decree, one must take Wilson's work into account.⁵⁴

In *Luke's Treatment of the Law*, Kalervo Salo starts his Introduction by noting how Jervell's article in the beginning of the 1970's triggered scholars' interest in working on Luke's stance toward the law. He then summarizes "six central themes discussed in modern works dealing with Luke's view of the law":

1. Does the author show interest or lack of interest toward the law?
2. Is Luke conservative or somewhat radical in his treatment of the law?
3. Does he have a consistent or an incoherent concept of the law?
4. Does he understand the law or have poor knowledge of it?
5. Does the issue belong, for Luke, to the past history or is it of present concern?
6. What is the most central issue for understanding Luke's treatment of the law?⁵⁵

Next he discusses the six points in turn with reference to each theme. He concludes that from this angle there is no scholarly consensus about Luke's view of the law and points out further that there are some subjects not amenable to these six points. He also remarks that an area of Luke's view of the law

⁵²Ibid., 13.

⁵³Ibid.

⁵⁴Ibid.

⁵⁵Kalervo Salo, *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation* (AASFDHL 57; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1991), 13.

"which is generally agreed" is "the scheme of promise," that is, for Luke, the law entails a predictive feature because "the Torah is understood to point forward to Jesus, the Messiah."⁵⁶

Given the preceding research on Luke's attitude to the law, Salo sets out the goal of his work as the "attempt to draw as comprehensive a picture as possible of Luke's own ideas of religious law" and "to obtain clarification to the issues debated in the scientific literature."⁵⁷ He then presents "three important studies concerning the role of the law in NT times" and notes that the three works show that "it is theoretically impossible to construct an exact definition of the religious law of first-century Judaism."⁵⁸ Salo next connects Luke's view of the law with covenantal nomism. He comments that even though Sanders has been criticized for insufficiency in his comparing two whole patterns of religion, Salo holds that covenantal nomism introduced by E. P. Sanders in his *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* "proves to be the most adequate description of the first-century Judaism"; he stresses that "scholars generally approve the description of covenantal nomism as such and tend to regard it as the best and most profound description offered of the Judaism of the first century."⁵⁹ Salo further observes that "modern interpreters of Luke's understanding of legal matters have virtually ignored the scheme of covenantal nomism," and it is in this area of lack of attention that Salo views his

⁵⁶Ibid., 23.

⁵⁷Ibid., 24.

⁵⁸Ibid., 25-26. The three works dealing with law in the NT time that Salo lists as important are "Gesetz und Gesetzeserfüllung im Frühjudentum" by Karlheinz Müller, "Jewish Law in the Time of Jesus: Towards a Clarification of the Problem" by Philip S. Alexander, and *Jewish Law from Jesus to the Mishnah* by E. P. Sanders.

⁵⁹Ibid., 28.

contribution to the scientific literature.⁶⁰ In relating covenantal nomism to Luke's view of the law, Salo limits his comparison to the passages "in which both the legal issues and salvation are discussed."⁶¹ In terms of the methodology employed for his work, Salo states, "Our investigation of Luke's reflection or lack of reflection of covenantal nomism requires a redaction-critical dimension: Is the scheme taken as such from tradition or is it a consciously developed part of his theology."⁶²

Adopting Hans Conzelmann's "understanding of Luke's view of salvation history" as "a productive element for revealing Luke's conscious plot,"⁶³ Salo proceeds to discuss Luke's attitude to the law in successive chapters on the times of Israel, Jesus, and the church. In his chapter on "The Time of Israel," Salo covers the infancy narratives (Luke 1-2) and preparation for Jesus' public ministry (Luke 3:1-4:13) with the major focus upon the infancy accounts. He emphasizes that in the infancy narratives Luke makes an effort to depict the keeping of the law positively. For example, Salo asserts that "Luke explicitly (unlike Matthew) mentions several times that the law is fulfilled (1:6; 2:22-24, 27b, 39)" and notes Luke's portrayal of the observance of the law by Jesus and his parents in the infancy narratives "(2:22-24, 27, 39, 41)"; he refers to the examples of Zechariah, Elizabeth, Simeon, and Anna whom Luke depicts as people "who represent legal piety during the period of Israel"; Salo especially notes that Luke 1-2 is filled with descriptions of God's guidance of various events, and within that context Salo views legal adherence as "part of God's plan for that time"; and Salo directs attention to Luke's connecting the Holy Spirit with obedience to the law "in the time prior to Jesus'

⁶⁰Ibid., 28, 31.

⁶¹Ibid., 29.

⁶²Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 31.

public ministry."⁶⁴ Salo also reflects upon the presence of covenantal nomism in Luke 1-2. He writes that "Luke's treatment of the law in the preliminary stage fits well with the concept of covenantal nomism, i.e. the role of the law is not predicted to be changed," but he adds that Luke's understanding of the concept of covenant differs from that of Judaism in that Luke views the covenant as speaking about future salvation while Judaism implies "membership in the covenant as basis of salvation."⁶⁵

In his chapter on "The Time of Jesus," Salo also presents Luke's rendering of Jesus' observance of the law in a positive light. For example, Salo notes that in Luke's account of Jesus' beginning ministry in the synagogue in Nazareth the phrase *κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς* (Luke 4:16) "is likely a Lukan saying in the present context, not part of his tradition," and from this he infers that "Luke wants to picture Jesus as a pious Jew, who regularly attends the Synagogue service"; in the passage of Jesus' healing of a leper (Luke 5:12-14), Salo observes that "Luke does not show any interest in Jesus' possible defilement" by touching a leper and underscores that "Luke, relying on Mark, wants to show Jesus' faithfulness to the ordinances of the Torah (5:14)"; Salo thinks that Luke 6:1-5 is not a challenge to the Sabbath law but concerns the interpretations of the Sabbath law by Jesus and the Pharisees and adds that "[e]ven if Jesus himself had the authority to interpret the Sabbath law, he, in his deeds, observed the Pharisaic halakah and did not 'work' on Sabbath"; in dealing with the pericope of Luke 7:36-50, Salo comments that "Luke redactionally allows Jesus to dine with a Pharisee," and "Luke's Jesus, in contrast to Mt/Mk, is willing to dine according to the Pharisaic halakah."⁶⁶ In terms of the relation of covenantal nomism to Luke's view of the law, Salo points out in the chapter on Jesus that

⁶⁴Ibid., 60-62.

⁶⁵Ibid., 62-63.

⁶⁶Ibid., 67-68, 70, 90-91, 95.

neither the texts that speak of the observance of the law (and the prophets) for salvation (Luke 10:25-28; 16:19-31) nor the texts that address "renouncing wealth for the poor" and "becoming a disciple" for salvation (Luke 18:18-30; 19:1-10) "fit into the Jewish scheme of covenantal nomism."⁶⁷

Salo's reading of Luke's presentation of the keeping of the law in a positive light also continues in his chapter on "The Time of the Church." In reference to Stephen's speech, Salo affirms that in Acts 7:38 "Luke reveals his own opinion: the law is living oracles for all Jews of all generations, including Jewish Christians, to whom Stephen also belonged"; in his discussion of Acts 7:51-53, Salo argues that Stephen does not criticize the law, but only that the Jews are not obedient to God's revealed will and that "Luke's purpose is to show, through the example of Stephen, that the Christians and their leaders did not break the law or speak against God."⁶⁸ In his comment on Cornelius in Acts 10:22 Salo underlines that with the expression of the recognition of Cornelius' piety by all Jews and with the use of the word δίκαιος, Luke shows that Cornelius also adheres to the law; Salo remarks that the abolishing of the food law in Peter's vision is not explicit.⁶⁹ Salo does not see any criticism of the law nor "any change in the role of the law" in the words of Acts 13:38f and argues that the text "simply states that Judaism, including its legal system, cannot provide an adequate basis for salvation."⁷⁰ Salo consistently presents Luke's depiction of Paul as abiding by the law and points out that "Luke's interest is to show that the whole of Jewish-Christianity (including Paul) remains faithful to the law."⁷¹ Salo

⁶⁷Ibid., 167.

⁶⁸Ibid., 181, 182.

⁶⁹Ibid., 205, 209-210.

⁷⁰Ibid., 218.

highlights that it is important for Luke that "the Jews of his community remain as its law-abiding members" while the Gentiles keep the decree.⁷²

In his Conclusion Salo surveys "the traditional legal material" that Luke used, Luke's redaction, the audience whom Luke intends for his double work, and "the essential elements of Luke's treatment of the law."⁷³ In this latter section Salo asserts that "[t]he key term to describe Luke's treatment of the law is legitimation"; he further explains that Luke tries to legitimate both Jewish Christianity and Gentile Christianity, and in relation to legitimation there arises "the issue of what the relationship should be between these two different Christian groups."⁷⁴ Salo concludes (1) that Luke does have any particular interest in the legal matters *per se*, but (2) that "Luke's view of the law is not so much conservative or radical, but practical," (3) that the presentation of the law in Luke-Acts is consistent because "[t]he author has a clear message concerning the law and he pushes it forward throughout the whole Double work," (4) that Luke does understand "the essentials of the law" but is not interested in the details and particulars of the law because Luke "wants to deal with more general principles which offer a certain freedom of interpretation and different conclusions for his readers," and (5) that "[t]he law is of present concern for Luke."⁷⁵ Toward the end of his Conclusion chapter, Salo

⁷¹Ibid., 282.

⁷²Ibid., 266.

⁷³Ibid., 289.

⁷⁴Ibid., 298-99.

⁷⁵Ibid., 301-303. These five points are Salo's responses to the first five issues in the "six central themes discussed in modern works dealing with Luke's view of the law" which he lists in his Introduction while his presentation in the Conclusion chapter about Luke's legitimation of Jewish and Gentile Christianity is a reply to point number 6, "What is the most central issue for understanding Luke's treatment of the law?" (ibid., 13).

again relates covenantal nomism to Luke's view of the law. He concludes that "Luke's theology of the law cannot be understood any more in terms of covenantal nomism, but, on the other hand, Luke still uses covenantal terminology to describe Christianity."⁷⁶ Salo reasons that in the Lucan account "[s]alvation does not depend on belonging to the covenant." Rather, people are "saved by belonging to the church which is the logical continuation of Judaism originating from the covenant of Abraham."⁷⁷

Helmut Merkel, in a chapter in a Festschrift, provides a rationale for the positive portrayal of law-observance of Jewish Christians in Acts. He tries to understand why Luke positively portrays Jewish Christians such as Paul as keeping the law. He observes in Paul's defense speech the use of the terms the fathers' law, the law of the Jews, the fathers' God, and custom inherited from the fathers (Acts 22:3; 25:8; 24:14; 28:17).⁷⁸ He notes that in Ephesus and more clearly in Jerusalem Paul is accused of teaching apostasy from Moses (Acts 18:13; 21:21).⁷⁹ In order to understand the positive portrayal of law-keeping by Jewish Christians in Acts, Merkel appeals to the conviction prevalent in the ancient world of the need to be loyal to the laws and customs inherited from the fathers.⁸⁰ Citing "den bekannten Hexameter des römischen Epikers Ennius," Josephus, and Celsus, Merkel concludes that the positive statements about the law and about the law-keeping of the early

⁷⁶Ibid., 304.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸Helmut Merkel, "Das Gesetz im lukanischen Doppelwerk," in *Schrift und Tradition: Festschrift für Josef Ernst zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Knut Backhaus and Franz Georg Untergaßmair; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996), 130.

⁷⁹Ibid.

⁸⁰Ibid.

Christians "stehen im Dienste der lukanischen Apologetik gegenüber der hellenistischen Bildungswelt."⁸¹

In his monograph *Studies in Early Christianity*, François Bovon devotes a section to the law in Luke-Acts. There are seven parts in his treatment: "Some Explanations," "The Main Problems," "The Major Lukan Texts Relating to the Law," "The Bibliography on the Subject," "The Attainment of Salvation according to Acts," "So What about the Law in the Gospel of Luke?" and "Conclusion." Except for the sections "The Main Problems," the bibliography, and the conclusion, the large number of subheadings in the various sections fail to demonstrate coherent links. He states that part of his purpose "will be to define the ties that Luke establishes between the ancient law of Moses and the new axioms of Jesus, while not forgetting the Christian ordinances, such as the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:23-29), that were inspired by the Holy Spirit and added by the church."⁸² This statement of purpose is followed by mention of the existence of at least two conceptions of the Apostolic Decree, which according to Bovon has bearing on his subject, which is to be "the distinction between moral law and ritual commandments," "the ecclesial function of the law," and "the prophetic and christological function of the law."⁸³

While Bovon's logic does not clearly emerge, his treatment of the law in Luke-Acts touches on many topics related to the law in connection with other themes such as eternal life. In addition, Bovon raises many penetrating questions, such as how to understand "the relationship

⁸¹Ibid., 130-133.

⁸²François Bovon, *Studies in Early Christianity* (WUNT 161; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2003), 60.

⁸³Ibid., 61.

between the law of Moses, the precepts of Jesus, and the ordinances of the apostles," how to "connect the ethical behavior of believers to their faith and repentance," and how to explain the impact upon the law of "the coming of the kingdom of God and its power and justice."⁸⁴

Bovon's main point is that Luke takes the law in its "spiritual emphasis,"⁸⁵ and "[t]he key to the Lukan ethics" is in Acts 10:34-35.⁸⁶ Due to "the Jewish Hellenistic heritage that the God-fearers followed before their adherence to Christianity" and "the Hellenist movement and the Pauline mission" which Luke joined, Luke interprets the law, says Bovon, in a new, radical way, and "this hermeneutical effort" used by Luke is started by Jesus.⁸⁷ Bovon explains Luke's approach:

[T]he Jesus whom he evokes has given up imposing submission to an impersonal law and advocates free adherence to a personal God. . . . [T]he law [to Jesus] is not a string of equivalent prescriptions, but a pyramid in which a hierarchy is to be honored. Luke believes that the two-part love commandment and the ten commandments, those aspects of the law that demand complete fidelity, constitute the top of the pyramid.⁸⁸

Philip Esler in his study *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts* discusses Luke's attitude to the law in light of the social, religious, and ethnic pressures on Luke's community. Esler begins a chapter on "The law" with a reference to the works of scholars such as Jervell, Wilson, and Blomberg, who have written extensively on Luke's view of the law. He points out that prior to these works, the study of Luke's attitude to the law only received comment "in passing in Lucan commentaries and in

⁸⁴Ibid., 62.

⁸⁵Ibid., 61.

⁸⁶Ibid., 70.

⁸⁷Ibid., 69.

⁸⁸Ibid., 70.

works on more general topics, such as the law in the Synoptic Gospels."⁸⁹ Esler attributes this lack of interest in Luke's view of the law among many scholars in the New Testament field to a belief that the law is not important to Luke, and concerning this point he references the writings of Overbeck, Haenchen, H. Schürmann, and Banks. He adds that "[a]llied to this belief is the common notion that Luke does not offer a consistent treatment of the law, especially in his Gospel" and directs attention to B. H. Branscomb and Wilson for support of this position.⁹⁰

Furthermore, Esler stresses that the important role that the law plays in Acts "has always been something of a stumbling-block for those who attribute to Luke a lack of interest in, or an inconsistent attitude to, the Jewish law."⁹¹ Having reviewed the state of scholarship on Luke's view of the law, Esler argues that a different reading of Luke's portrayal of the law is demanded once "the social, ethnic and political pressures" on his community are taken into account.⁹² Esler proposes that Luke has a deep concern for the law, and his view of the law is consistent and conservative. He points out that in light of the practice of table-fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians in Luke's community, which established the identity of "the Christian community *vis-à-vis* Judaism," it is inconceivable that Luke would not have an interest in the issue of the law.⁹³ Moreover, he says that

⁸⁹Philip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 110.

⁹⁰Ibid.

⁹¹Ibid.

⁹²Ibid., 111.

⁹³Ibid.

Luke's view of the law is likely to be conservative, given the way Luke legitimates table-fellowship as divinely oriented and approved by the Jerusalem Council.

Esler conducts his discussion about Luke's depiction of the law in the Gospel of Luke under the several categories of "*The infancy narratives*," "*Jesus' respect for the law*," "*Jesus' transcendence of the law*," "*Jesus' challenge to the law*," "*Jewish paranomia in the Third Gospel*," "*Luke 16.16-18*," and "*Lucan omissions of legal material*." In his portion on the infancy narratives Esler observes that in Luke's description Zechariah, Elisabeth, Mary, Joseph, Simeon, and Anna are all loyal to the law, and these six people realize the salvation which God promised the Israelites. Esler emphasizes that a main purpose in the first two chapters of the Gospel of Luke is "to show that the most outstanding of Jews are waiting for a redemption which the law cannot provide, and recognize in Jesus the Messiah and saviour, the agent of that redemption"; nevertheless, Esler points out that the arrival of Jesus "represents the culmination of the law, not its abrogation."⁹⁴ Moreover, Esler asserts that Simeon's words that Jesus will be "for the fall and the rise of many in Israel" (Luke 2:34) show that "while many Jews will accept Jesus, many will not," and this division of attitude implies that "those who reject Jesus also reject the ancestral traditions of the Jewish people which find their fulfillment in him."⁹⁵

In his segment on "*Jesus' respect for the law*," Esler recalls Jesus' attending synagogue (Luke 4:16) and Jesus' directing the cured lepers to show themselves to the priests (Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19). In "*Jesus' transcendence of the law*," Esler talks about the passages that deal with the Sabbath controversy (Luke 6:1-5, 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6). He emphasizes that Luke 6:1-5

⁹⁴Ibid., 113.

⁹⁵Ibid., 113, 114.

demonstrates that "Jesus claims the right to define the sabbath, even though he does not abrogate it" and states that this theme is also present in the other three passages dealing with the Sabbath episodes.⁹⁶ In order to understand Luke's position on the Sabbath, Esler argues, it is vital to take the background of Luke's community into consideration. He declares that Luke's depiction of Jesus' "assuming the validity of the Mosaic law" but arguing with the Pharisees and the scribes about the application of the Sabbath law would reassure both the Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in Luke's community; he thinks that this is because to the Jewish Christians the Mosaic law is not abandoned, and to the Gentile Christians "their failure to observe the sabbath was compatible with Jesus having transcended the law."⁹⁷

In his section on "*Jesus' challenge to the law*," Esler discusses the passage where Jesus tells the person who wishes to follow him to leave the dead to bury their dead (Acts 9:60). In "*Jewish paranomia in the Third Gospel*," Esler shows that the Jewish leaders have failed to keep the law. In this section, he especially deals with the passage of Luke 16:19-31. Against the interpretation of Luke 16:27-31 by Bultmann and the majority of commentators, Esler argues that "[t]he real point of this part of the story is that the five brothers of the rich man are leading a sinful life," and "the law and the prophets are not going to be effective in making them repent"; he adds, "But nor, says Abraham, would his brothers repent even if someone came back from the dead to warn them."⁹⁸ From the second point of his argument, Esler asserts that "[i]n the wider context of Luke-Acts, of course, Jesus does that" and

⁹⁶Ibid., 116.

⁹⁷Ibid., 117.

⁹⁸Ibid., 119.

concludes that "one aspect of the meaning of the parable is that the same Jews who refuse to recognize Jesus also fail to obey the commandments of the Mosaic law."⁹⁹

In his section on Luke 16:16-18, Esler starts with a reference to Hans Conzelmann's reading of Luke 16:16-17 and affirms that Conzelmann is correct in seeing Luke 16:17 as talking about the law and the prophets being continued in the proclamation of the kingdom. Esler points out that this interpretation is coherent with Luke's portrayal in Luke 1-2 and Luke's later presentation of "the salvation offered by Jesus as the prophesied fulfillment of the law."¹⁰⁰ He stresses that Luke 16:17 articulates a very important element in Luke's view of the law and asserts that "[o]ne of his main aims is to argue that Christianity does not involve the abrogation of the law, and 16.17 is directed to strengthening his case on this point."¹⁰¹ Esler transitions next to articulate that Luke's argument would hardly convince normal Jews given the fact of table-fellowship among Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians in his community and the teaching of Christian discipleship above family fidelities. Esler explains that the reason why Luke still wished to present the continuity of the keeping of the law among Christians is to legitimate the table-fellowship in his community and "to make the teaching of Jesus on divorce [in Luke 16:18] as palatable as possible for Jewish Christians"; Esler adds that Luke's effort can be seen in his placing Luke 16:18 after Luke 16:17 as an example of the intensification of the law, not a rejection of the law.¹⁰² In his part on "*Lucan omissions of legal material*," Esler discusses

⁹⁹Ibid.

¹⁰⁰Ibid., 120.

¹⁰¹Ibid.

¹⁰²Ibid.

the omission of two Marcan passages (Mark 7:1-23; 10:2-12) by Luke in light of the Jewish and Gentile audience for whom Luke was writing.

In the second part of his chapter on law, Esler deals with law in Acts under the categories of "*Stephen and the law*" and "*Paul and the law*." In "*Stephen and the law*," Esler refers to the Moses-Jesus typology in Stephen's speech and states, "Stephen, at least as Luke reports him, presents Moses in this light to challenge the jurisdiction of the Sanhedrin to try him"; Esler stresses that "Stephen's aim is to convey the ironical inappropriateness of the Jews appealing to Moses to condemn him, when Moses is the one whom they have always disregarded and who also predicted that a prophet, Jesus of course, would come after him (7.37)."¹⁰³

In "*Paul and the law*," Esler argues that the characteristic of Lucan depiction of Paul is the latter's obedience to the law. He adds that this depiction of Paul cannot be applied to the Jews in Acts and lays out that in Acts Luke enlarges the depiction of the Jews who oppose "Jesus and his teaching" as the ones who do not keep the law (Acts 9:23, 29; 14:19; 21:31; 23:12-15); he further states that "[t]he Jews also set themselves at odds with the law by not recognizing Jesus, whose coming has been predicted in the law and the prophets long ago."¹⁰⁴ Moreover, Esler points out that "Luke is quite open in Acts about the limitations of the law which arise inevitably from the fact that Jesus brings salvation, not the law," and directs attention to Paul's statement in Acts 13:38-39 and Peter's words in Acts 15:10.¹⁰⁵ Esler ends his discussion of Paul and the law in Acts with a reminder that "[w]hatever Luke might say about Paul, he could not obscure the fact that he lived and ate with Gentiles, thereby

¹⁰³Ibid., 124.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 126, 127.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 127.

endangering the separate existence of the Jewish *ethnos* and almost certainly renouncing the Levitical food laws"; Esler thus thinks that in Acts the Jewish accusation of Paul's acting against the law is correct.¹⁰⁶

In the conclusion to his chapter on law in Luke-Acts, Esler explains why Luke has to argue for "an impossible case for Christian beliefs and practices involving no breach of the Mosaic law."¹⁰⁷ The answer Esler offers is that "Luke was shaping the sources and traditions at his disposal in such a way as to satisfy some need of the community for whom he wrote."¹⁰⁸ He explains that the Jewish Christians in Luke's community were under threat from Jews or conservative Jewish Christians because of their eating together with the Gentile believers, and therefore Luke has to assure the Jewish Christians in his community that Christianity is not incompatible with Judaism and that it is the Jews themselves who are unfaithful to the law. Esler adds that because of the presence of the Gentile Christians in his community, Luke avoids technical discussion of the law.

William Loader in his monograph *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law* devotes a chapter to "Jesus' Attitude towards the Law according to Luke."¹⁰⁹ He starts with a literature review of scholars' views of law in Luke-Acts, follows with a discussion of Jesus' attitude to the law by going through the Gospel of Luke consecutively in the order of Luke 1:1-9:50, 9:51-19:27, and 19:28-24:53, and then presents data concerning the law from Acts. The thesis of his study of law in Luke-Acts is that Jesus'

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 128.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 129.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

¹⁰⁹William Loader, *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 273.

attitude to the law is positive, and this attitude is continued in the practice of the law in the early church as depicted in Acts.

In his review of Luke 1:1-9:50, Loader notes that the opening chapters of Luke are characterized by the fulfillment of the hope for Israel and reflect "strong Jewish piety and faithful Law observance."¹¹⁰ He emphasizes that the Torah piety depicted in the early chapters of Luke is continued in John the Baptist and Jesus. Loader says that Jesus "answers the devil's wiles with words of the Law" in the temptation scene (Luke 4:1-13), and Jesus instructs the healed leper to present himself to the priest (Luke 5:12-16).¹¹¹

Loader states that the Sabbath controversy over the disciples of Jesus plucking the grain to eat in Luke 6:1-5 shows that Jesus is an interpreter of the law, and he sees Jesus' interpretation of Sabbath law also in the other passages dealing with Sabbath controversy (Luke 13:10-16; 14:1-6). He asserts that in these Sabbath controversies Jesus does not violate the law. He also sees Jesus' obedience to the law in Jesus' dining with the Pharisees in Luke 7:36-50 and declares that this "implies sufficient acceptance of Pharisee norms on the part of Jesus as to make such fellowship possible."¹¹²

Loader says that in Luke 10:25-28 and Luke 18:18-23 Jesus directs his listeners to the law for the reception of eternal life, and that obeying the law is presumed in the parable of Lazarus and the rich man (Luke 16:19-31). Loader summarizes, "All three accounts imply a close connection between obeying the Law's demands and responding to the demands of Jesus."¹¹³ His comment on

¹¹⁰Ibid., 301.

¹¹¹Ibid., 304.

¹¹²Ibid., 318.

¹¹³Ibid., 345.

Luke 16:16-18 is that Jesus makes the law stricter with his teaching on divorce. In his review of Luke 19:28-24:53, Loader concludes that these chapters are indirectly related to the topic of Jesus and the law.

In the section of law in Acts, Loader says that in Acts the positive portrayal of the law is general. The believers gather in the temple for worship and teaching, and the pouring out of the Spirit on Pentecost echoes the giving of the law in the Sinai event. But Loader directs attention to passages where the observance of the law is focused and says that this will help to understand Luke's view of the law, which in turn will "have some bearing on his [Luke's] understanding of Jesus' attitude towards the Law."¹¹⁴ Loader discusses specifically Stephen's speech, Peter's vision, Paul's words in Acts 13:38-39, and the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15.

Loader says that Stephen's speech is not anti-temple, but is critical of an understanding of the temple that assumes that God can be bound to the temple. He explains that Peter's vision is concerned only with the Gentiles' being clean in status, not with the abolition of the food laws. He declares that Paul's words in Acts 13:38-39 should be understood as presenting a contrast "between limited forgiveness and unlimited forgiveness, as characterizing what is possible through the Law of Moses and what is possible through the gospel."¹¹⁵ In his section on Acts 15, Loader emphasizes that Peter's words in Acts 15:10 are a reminder to "his Jewish colleagues that they are just as much sinners as Gentiles are" in their failure to keep the law well; Peter does not intend for the Jewish believers that they discard the law.¹¹⁶ He also sees the decree both as providing for table fellowship between Jewish

¹¹⁴Ibid., 361.

¹¹⁵Ibid., 381.

¹¹⁶Ibid., 373.

believers and Gentile believers and as "application of Law."¹¹⁷ He further says that the decree is not a compromise between the Jewish believers and Gentile believers, but rather "between Luke's desire to affirm commitment to the Law and his ambivalence about its ritual demands."¹¹⁸ This tension has led some, he says, rightly to question whether Luke does this "to placate, perhaps unconsciously, sensitive Jewish Christians, while still putting all of the emphasis otherwise on a strongly moral and ethical understanding of the law."¹¹⁹

Loader accords the law a positive and continual place in Luke-Acts, from the pious keeping of the law in the opening chapters in Luke, to John the Baptist's preaching repentance for forgiveness of sins, to Jesus' teaching, and for the Jewish believers, including Paul, keeping the law. Loader at times argues by way of implication to give the law a positive place in Luke-Acts, as for example in his understanding of the Jewish national hope in the early chapters of the Gospel of Luke predisposing to a positive attitude toward the law, and at times he argues by way of discussion of passages that deal explicitly with the law.

What emerges out of the survey of the literature above is that scholars follow different interests when they consider Luke's view of the law. For example, Jervell emphasizes that in Luke's portrayal the Jewish Christians are the restored Israel, and thus it is important for them to keep the law; Downing and Merkel focus on providing rationale for the positive portrayal of the keeping of the law in Acts, and the reason each provides is along the line of respect for ancestral custom; after he examines how the topic of the law functions in passages dealing with the law in Luke-Acts, Blomberg argues that

¹¹⁷Ibid., 375.

¹¹⁸Ibid., 386.

¹¹⁹Ibid., 386-87.

obedience to the law is not Luke's emphasis; Wilson claims that any consistency of Luke's attitude to the law should not be assumed, and he shows that several concepts of the law co-exist in the Gospel of Luke, while in Acts the depiction of the law is positive; against Wilson's reading, several scholars (Salo, Esler, and Loader) assert a continuity in Luke's presentation of obedience to the law in the Gospel of Luke and Acts; Bovon raises penetrating question such as how to understand the relationship between the Mosaic law, the teachings of Jesus, and the orders of the apostles, and Seifrid argues that a new ethic, derived from the profession of Jesus as Messiah, is in force in Luke-Acts.

The present dissertation aims to contribute to the study of law in Luke-Acts by showing *how* Jesus' teachings on the law are continued in the early church on the exegetical level. Through this continuity, Jesus' teachings on the law are used by Luke to present his view of salvation and the identity marks of the Jesus movement. This work will show that not every aspect of Jesus' teachings of the law in the Gospel of Luke is used by Luke in his portrayal of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15; rather, Luke uses the parts of Jesus' teachings of the law in the Gospel of Luke that clarify the nature of the salvation of the early believers.

The approach of this dissertation has not been taken in any of the studies presented above relating to the Lucan view of the law. Bovon raises the question of how to understand the relationship between the Mosaic law, the teachings of Jesus, and the orders of the apostles, and Seifrid argues that a new ethic, derived from the profession of Jesus as Messiah, is in force in Luke-Acts, but both of them fail to develop their thesis. Bovon also states that Luke's interpretation of the law is started by Jesus but does not lay out his claim in further detail. Salo, Esler, and Loader emphasize Luke's portrayal of the observance of the law in Luke-Acts, but they fail to explore any connection this theme has between the two works of Luke. Lastly, Wilson presents various aspects of Luke's depiction of the law in the Gospel of Luke, but he does not deal with any connection between his finding of the

affirmation of certain requirements of the law in the Gospel of Luke and his observation of Luke's portrayal of the keeping of the law in Acts.

By laying out *how* the specifics of Jesus' teaching on the law are taken up by Peter and James in Luke's narrative of Acts 15, this dissertation shows that for Luke the issue of law-keeping has no bearing on the identity of the people of God, consisting now of Jewish believers and Gentile believers, in terms of salvation. Next follows a summary sketch of the methodology used in this dissertation to achieve the specific contribution of this work.

Methodology

This dissertation takes as its point of departure the accepted text of Luke-Acts. The nature of this study is literary; the arguments presented in this dissertation are based upon the thematic link between the Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles. Within the literary world of Luke-Acts, this study argues that Peter's speech and James' speech in Acts 15 can be read against Jesus' comments on the law in the Gospel of Luke. The methodology adopted in this dissertation for reading Acts 15 in light of Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke follows Vernon K. Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach in his *Exploring the Texture of Texts*.¹²⁰

In his study, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, Robbins states that "socio-rhetorical criticism exhibits five different angles to explore multiple textures within texts: (a) inner texture; (b) intertexture; (c) social and cultural texture; (d) ideological texture; and (e) sacred texture."¹²¹ In order to investigate the text of Acts 15 and the Gospel of Luke, this dissertation will employ inner texture,

¹²⁰Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996b).

¹²¹*Ibid.*, 3.

intertexture, and ideological texture.¹²² The reason to use inner texture is that this is the first step of immersing ourselves into the text. In doing so, we pay attention to the repetitions and progression of words in a text, the opening-middle-closing parts of the text, and its narrative, argumentative, and sensory-aesthetic aspect. In Robbins' words, inner texture provides a tool to "to gain an intimate knowledge of words, word patterns, voices, structures, devices, and modes in the text, which are the context for meanings and meaning-effects that an interpreter analyzes with the other readings of the text."¹²³ Robbins' concept of intertexture is kept in mind because this dissertation seeks to understand Luke's account of the Jerusalem Council in light of Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke; this reference of one text to another is itself an act of intertextual reading. James' use of the Scriptures is also an intertexture. Finally, Robbins' ideological texture provides a means to understand why Luke has to incorporate Jesus' view of the law in his narrative of the Jerusalem Council. My analysis will demonstrate the ideological link.¹²⁴

Sacred texture is not taken into consideration because this work focuses upon Luke's presentation of the Jerusalem Council rather than upon "the relation of humans to the divine" in the

¹²²The choice to focus on the three selected textures coheres with Robbins' comment that "[n]o interpreter will ever use all of the resources of socio-rhetorical criticism in any one interpretation" (ibid., 2).

¹²³Ibid. Of the six approaches Robbins lists in the inner texture, not all of them will be employed to study a text. Robbins notes in his chapter on inner texture, "Only very few interpreters, however advanced, will find the commitment, interest, or ability to perform all of these [six] strategies of analysis on one text in a sequence" and advises people to "experiment with three or four of the strategies of analysis on a particular span of text and select those that work most readily with it" (ibid., 7-8).

¹²⁴A detailed layout of Robbins' explanations of these three textures will be given in the chapters where they are employed.

text.¹²⁵ The social and cultural texture will be employed as needed to enhance certain viewpoints or themes. In our study of how the specific teachings of Jesus about the law in the Gospel of Luke is carried over to the account of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15, what we are looking for is the repetition of a word or similar terms or ideas, such as the cleansing of the inside in Luke 11:39-41 and the cleansing of heart in Acts 15:9. Therefore a full-scale analysis of social and cultural texture in every text covered in this dissertation is not required. In his chapter on social and cultural texture, Robbins explains that "[t]he social and cultural texture of a text emerges in specific social topics, common social and cultural topics, and final cultural categories."¹²⁶ This dissertation will examine the social and cultural texture of two passages in Acts (Acts 15:7-11, 14-21).

This dissertation seeks to contribute to Lucan study in the area of law in terms of the continuity between Jesus' view of the law and that of the early church on the exegetical level. The dissertation comprises four chapters. Chapter 1 presents Jesus' teachings on the law in the Gospel of Luke, Chapter 2 presents opposing understandings of Second Temple Jewish attitudes to the law, Chapter 3 studies Peter's speech in Acts 15, and Chapter 4 analyzes James' use of the Scriptures in Acts 15. The dissertation ends with a conclusion summarizing the findings as well as a suggestion for future research.

¹²⁵Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 4.

¹²⁶Ibid., 71. In specific social topics, Robbins lists the religious responses to the world in a text as conversionist, revolutionist, introversionist, Gnostic-Manipulationist, thaumaturgical, utopian, and introverted. In common social and cultural topics, Robbins discusses "the overall perception in the text of the context in which people live in the world" (ibid). In final cultural categories, Robbins presents "the manner in which people present their propositions, reasons, and arguments both to themselves and to other people" and portrays "different kinds of culture rhetoric" as dominant culture rhetoric, subculture rhetoric, counterculture rhetoric, contraculture rhetoric, and liminal culture rhetoric (ibid., 86-88).

CHAPTER 1

JESUS' VIEW OF THE LAW IN THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

Introduction

The study of Jesus' attitude to the law in the Gospel of Luke in this chapter takes into account the differentiation that must be made between a passage presenting a focal point of Jesus' view of the law and a passage that includes a merely passing reference to the law.¹ To derive from the narrative text a principle, or teaching, or doctrine that can be called "Jesus' view of the law," it is important to make distinctions in the narrative itself. Here Robert Banks' categories in discussing Jesus' attitude to the law are helpful. Banks groups the passages that are related to Jesus' view of the law into three types: "incidental sayings and actions alleged to bear on his attitude to the Law; debates and controversies over particular legal issues; teaching on the Law of a more general or extensive nature."²

¹This view is indirectly supported by two scholars in their comment on the importance of Luke 16:16-18. After presenting some scholars' interpretations of Luke 16:17, Darrell L. Bock (*Luke* [2 vols.; BECNT 3; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994-96], 1:1355) says, "What makes determining the best view difficult is that 16:17 is the only verse in the Lucan corpus that directly concerns the law." Matthias Klinghardt (*Gesetz und Volk Gottes: Das lukanische Verständnis des Gesetzes nach Herkunft, Funktion und seinem Ort in der Geschichte des Urchristentums* [WUNT 2/32; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988], 14) notes that the Lukan theology of the law is expressed in a nutshell in Luke 16:16-18.

²Robert Banks, *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition* (SNTSMS 28; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975), 89.

Following Banks' characteristic handling of the relevant passages, this chapter will present the discussions of Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke in the following categories: Jesus' teaching on the law (Luke 16:16-18; 16:19-32; 20:27-40; 24:44-47); Jesus' passing references to the law in interactions with people (Luke 5:12-16; 10:25-37; 18:18-30; 17:12-19); Jesus' breaking the Sabbath (6:1-5, 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6); and Jesus' pronouncements of woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44).

In its usage of Vernon K. Robbins' inner texture, intertexture, social and cultural texture, and ideological texture in his socio-rhetorical study,³ this chapter will only employ inner texture and intertexture in examining the text of the Gospel of Luke with a focus on Jesus' attitude to the law in various passages. In the inner texture study, due to the space of this chapter, the focus will be on repetitive texture and progressive texture, though at times these two are coupled with argumentative texture. As specified in the Introduction of this work, Robbins notes in his chapter on inner texture, "Only very few interpreters, however advanced, will find the commitment, interest, or ability to perform all of these [six] strategies of analysis on one text in a sequence" and advises people to "experiment with three or four of the strategies of analysis on a particular span of text and select those that work most readily with it."⁴

Jesus' Teaching on the Law

This section will deal with the following passages in the order listed: Luke 24:27, 44-47; 16:16-18; 16:19-31; 20:27-40. The reason for putting the study of Luke 24:27, 44-47 first, thereby

³Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996b).

⁴Ibid., 7-8.

breaking the sequential order of the passages analyzed in this section, is to see how the prophetic function of the law in Luke 24:27, 44-47 stands in relation to other functions of the law in the Gospel of Luke. S. G. Wilson⁵ finds that the prophetic function of the law coexists with other functions of the law in the Gospel of Luke while Craig L. Blomberg⁶ and M. A. Seifrid⁷ see the main function of the law in Luke-Acts as prophetic.

Luke 24:27, 44-47

In Luke's account of the post-resurrection appearances of Jesus in Luke 24, Jesus refers to Moses twice, first in his conversation with the two disciples⁸ on their way to Emmaus (v. 27) and then in his appearance before the eleven apostles and the people who are with them⁹ (v. 44). In deriving Jesus' attitude to the law from these two references to Moses in Luke 24, we need first to place the repetition of Moses in relation to other repetitions in Luke 24; that is, it is essential to site the two references to Moses within the general flow of thought of Luke 24. Below is the layout of the repetitive texture of Luke 24:

⁵Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSM 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 56.

⁶Craig L. Blomberg, "The Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 22 (1984): 70-71.

⁷Mark A. Seifrid, "Jesus and the Law in Acts," *JSNT* 30 (1987): 51-52.

⁸Bock (*Luke*, 2:1907) says that the expression " 'two of them' [in Luke 24:13] is an allusion to the group of disciples mentioned in 24:9." He further notes, "That the apostles are not meant is clear from the name *Cleopas* (24:18), who is not one of the Eleven."

⁹Bock (*ibid.*, 2:1921) calls these people who are with the eleven "an unspecified number of other disciples who had stayed behind in Jerusalem."

v. 1	tomb ¹⁰	they ^{11(2X)}		
v. 2		they		
	tomb			
v. 3		they		
v. 4		they(2X)		
v. 5		they(2X)		
v. 6			he(3X)	
v. 7			it is necessary	crucify
v. 8		they(2X)		
			his	
v. 9	tomb	they		
v. 10		they(3X)		
v. 11		they ¹²		
v. 12	tomb			
v. 13				Jerusalem
v. 14		they		
v. 15		they	he	
v. 16		their	him	
v. 17			he	
		them		
v. 18				Jerusalem
v. 19			he	
		them,they	him	prophet
v. 20			him(2X)	crucify
v. 21			he	
v. 22	tomb			
v. 23		they		
v. 24	tomb		him	
v. 25			he	
		them		prophets
v. 26			it is necessary	
v. 27				Moses prophets

¹⁰The Greek word for the tomb in v. 1 is *μνημα*, while for the rest of the occurrences of tomb in Luke 24 the Greek word *μνημεϊον* is used.

¹¹The first and third personal pronouns noted in this table at times render the personal pronouns hidden in the Greek verbs and at times render the personal nouns used in the Greek text.

¹²In v. 11, there are four personal pronouns of the third person, two being subjects hidden in the verbs, one being the third personal pronoun *αὐτός* in its plural form, and one being the third personal pronoun *αὐτή* in its plural form; this word "they" in the table noted for v. 11 is in the third personal feminine plural form.

	he		
	to them		Scriptures
v. 28	they(2X) he		
v. 29	they him		
	he		
	them		
v. 30	he		
	them he(2X)		
	to them		
v. 31	their, they him, he		
	them		
v. 32	they he		open Scriptures
v. 33	they	Jerusalem	
v. 33	they		
v. 34	he		
v. 35	they he		
	to them		
v. 36	they he		
	them, to them		
	to you		
v. 37	they		
v. 38	he		
	to them		
	you, your		
v. 39	you		
	my(2X), I he		
v. 40	he		
	to them		
v. 41	they he		
	to them		
	you		
v. 42	they to him		
v. 43	them he		
v. 44	he		
	them		
	my, I		
	you(2X) it is necessary	Moses prophets	
v. 45	he		open
	their		Scriptures
v. 46	he		
	to them		
v. 47		Jerusalem	
v. 48	you		
v. 49	I you(2X)		
v. 50	he		
	them his, he		

	them		
v. 51	them	he	
	them	he	
	them	he	
v. 52	they	him	Jerusalem
	they		
v. 53	they		

The repetitive texture of Luke 24 above shows many repetitions of the singular and plural of the third personal pronoun throughout the entire chapter. There are few times when this pattern of repetitions is interrupted by the repetitions of the singular of the first personal pronoun and the plural of the second personal pronoun, which occur in the attributed speech of Jesus in the later part of Luke 24 (vv. 36, 38-39, 41, 44, 48-49). According to the repetition of personal pronouns, Luke 24 may be divided into three scenes with focus on three groups. The first scene focuses on a group of women, who came to the tomb to anoint Jesus' body, where two men in brilliant clothing informed them that Jesus was raised (vv. 1-8). They then reported the words they heard to the eleven apostles, whose response was disbelief, but Peter came to the tomb, saw only the linen cloth, and was amazed (vv. 9-12).¹³ The second scene centers upon a group of two disciples, who are on their way to Emmaus, but they returned to Jerusalem to report to the eleven apostles when they had recognized that it is Jesus whom they had encountered on their journey (vv. 13-35).¹⁴ The third scene concerns Jesus'

¹³The first scene has a few repetitions of third personal pronouns in its feminine form αὐτή in plural forms in various cases (vv. 4-5, 11).

¹⁴This section is noted by many repetitions of the singular and plural of the third personal pronouns in masculine form (they, he). Moreover, this section is characterized by a reference to Jerusalem in the beginning and toward the end (vv. 13, 33).

appearance before the eleven apostles and the people who are with them, and his instruction to them (vv. 36-53).¹⁵

In each of the three scenes, the verb δεῖ ("it is necessary") is repeated (vv. 7, 26, 44). In scene two, the repetition of the word δεῖ with the reference to Moses, prophets, and Scriptures (vv. 26-27) forms a parallel with the repetitions of δεῖ in reference to Moses, the prophets, and the Scriptures in vv. 44-45. Therefore, it may be said that it is the expression "it is necessary" that ties the whole chapter of Luke 24 together: It is necessary for Christ to be crucified and resurrected because the Scriptures say so (vv. 26-27; 44-46).¹⁶ In more specific terms, it is Jesus' exposition of what the Scriptures say about him, his crucifixion, and resurrection that ties all of Luke 24 together.

Further, in Jesus' speech before the whole group of the disciples, a new element—the preaching of repentance in all the nations on the basis of the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of sins—is added to what is written in the Scriptures (v. 47). This new element is added because the disciples are to be the witnesses of the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ (v. 48). Jesus' emphasis in Luke 24:46-47 is also reflected in the speeches of Paul and James in Acts. In Paul's speech before king Agrippa, he says that what he testifies is nothing other than what the prophets and Moses say will take place, namely, the crucifixion and resurrection of the Messiah and the preaching of the light to the

¹⁵Like the second scene, the third scene also has many repetitions of the singular and plural of the third personal pronouns in masculine form (they, he). Nevertheless, this section starts with a breaking of this pattern by the addition of the plural of the second personal pronoun (you) in v. 36 which is repeated few times with the pattern similar to "I, you" or "you, I" (vv. 38-39, 41, 44, 48-49).

¹⁶Paul Schubert ("The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954* [ed. Walther Eltester; Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957], 173) says that Luke links "[t]he empty tomb story, the Emmaus story and the appearance to the eleven" together by "furnishing each of them with the same climax which we may briefly call 'the proof from prophecy' that Jesus is the Christ."

people of Israel and the nations (Acts 26:22-23). In the Jerusalem Council, James refers to the prophetic writings for the inclusion of Gentiles among the people of God (Acts 15:14-18).

In Luke 24, in sum, Jesus is saying that the Scriptures tell about two things: the crucifixion and resurrection of the Messiah, and the mission work of the early church. Jesus' two references to Moses in Luke 24:27, 44 demonstrate his conviction that Moses as part of the Scriptures¹⁷ speaks about the crucifixion and resurrection of the Messiah and about the mission assignment of the early church.

Luke 16:16-18

In Luke 16:16-18, Jesus says that the law and the prophets continue until John the Baptist; since then, the kingdom of God is preached, and everyone enters by force into it (v. 16). He further says that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one dot of the law to fall (v. 17). Jesus then gives his view on divorce (v. 18). In order to understand the correlation of these three verses in Luke 16:16-18 to arrive at Jesus' view of the law, this section will focus on two areas of studies.

The first is to trace the progression of the kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke in order to shed light upon the meaning of Luke 16:16a (the law and the prophets are until John the Baptist). This entails the relationship between the statement of the law and prophets continuing until John the Baptist (v. 16a) and the preaching of the kingdom of God (v. 16b). To study the kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke means to pay attention to any relationship with the law because, when Jesus

¹⁷Robert C. Tannehill (*Luke* [ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996], 360) comments that in Luke 24:44 "three divisions of scripture are mentioned: the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms."

notes the proclamation of the kingdom of God (v. 16b), he immediately adds that not one stroke of the pen will fall from the law (v. 17).

The second area is an intertextual study of Deut 24:1-4 to compare Moses' teaching about divorce with Jesus' comment on divorce in order to understand whether Jesus' teaching in Luke 16:18 is in continuity with Moses' emphasis or whether Jesus' view should be seen as moving beyond the law. The importance of the Deuteronomy passage in understanding Jesus' view of the law in Luke 16:16-18 is based upon the repetitive texture of Luke 16:16-18. The repetitive-progressive texture below shows that Luke 16:16-18 concerns the law, specifically Jesus' teaching about remarriage after divorce, which in Jesus' view is tantamount to committing adultery:

v.16 law

v.17 law

v.18 divorce(2X) marry(2X) commit adultery(2X)

The kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke

Below is a layout of the repetition of kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke:

Luke 4:43: Being hindered by the crowd from going away from them, Jesus told them that it is necessary for him to preach *the kingdom of God* in other cities because he was sent upon this.

Luke 6:20: In the sermon of the plain, Jesus teaches that *the kingdom of God* belongs to the poor.

Luke 7:28: Speaking about John the Baptist, Jesus says that he is greater than a prophet because he is the one who shall prepare the way of Jesus (vv. 26-27) and continues to state that no one born of the women is greater than him, but the least in *the kingdom of God* is greater than John the Baptist (v. 28).

Luke 8:1: Jesus is travelling according to city and village preaching and evangelising *the kingdom of God*, and the twelve disciples are with him.

Luke 8:10: Jesus explains to his disciples that the mystery of *the kingdom of God* is proclaimed to them but to the rest it is in the form of parables so that they might not be able to understand.

Luke 9:2: Jesus sent his twelve disciples to preach *the kingdom of God* and to heal the sick ones.

Luke 9:11: Jesus talks to the crowd about *the kingdom of God* and heals whomever has the need.

Luke 9:27: Jesus tells his disciples that there were some among them who would not taste death before they see *the kingdom of God*.

Luke 9:60: Jesus tells the wish-to-be disciple to leave the dead to bury themselves and come and proclaim *the kingdom of God*.

Luke 9:62: Addressing a person who asked to follow Jesus, but asked Jesus to permit him first to say good-bye to those in his house (v. 61), Jesus asserts that no one who puts the hand upon the plow and looks back is fit for *the kingdom of God* (v. 62).

Luke 10:9: Jesus commissioned the seventy-two disciples to the places he was about to go that they should heal the sick and say to them that *the kingdom of God* had come upon them.

Luke 10:11: Concerning the city which does not receive the seventy-two disciples, Jesus taught them that when they are leaving the city, they shall say, "The dust which had stuck to our shoes we wipe them off to you and know that *the kingdom of God* have drawn near."

Luke 11:2: Jesus teaches his disciples to pray for the coming of *kingdom of God*.

Luke 11:20: In response to the allegation that he casts out demons by Beelzebul (v. 15), Jesus says that every kingdom that is divided against itself shall be laid waste (v. 17). Jesus further questions, "If Satan is divided upon himself, how can his kingdom stand?" (v. 18). Jesus then says that if he is casting out demons by the finger of God, then *the kingdom of God* had come upon them (v. 20).

Luke 12:31: Jesus taught his disciples not to seek what to eat or what to drink, and not to be anxious (v. 29). Jesus told them to seek *God's kingdom*, and these things shall be added to them (v. 31).

Luke 12:32: Jesus told his disciples that the Father desires to give them *the kingdom*.

Luke 13:18, 20: Jesus asked, "To what shall I liken *the kingdom of God*?" (v. 18). Jesus likens the kingdom of God to a grain of mustard that a man casts into his garden, and the seed grows and becomes a tree, and the birds of the heaven settle upon its branches (v. 19). Again Jesus said, "To what shall I liken *the kingdom of God*?" (v. 20). Jesus likens it to leaven that when a woman receives it, she hides it in three measures of wheat flour until the whole is leavened (v. 21).

Luke 13:28-29: Responding to the question of why the ones who are saved are few, Jesus told them to strive to enter it through the narrow door (vv. 23-24a). The rationale Jesus gives is that many are seeking to enter it and are not able to do that (v. 24b). Jesus says that when people are shut outside of the door, there will be crying and gnashing of teeth when they shall see Abraham, Isaac, and all the prophets in *the kingdom of God* (v. 28). He says that people will come from the east, west, north, and south, and they shall recline in *the kingdom of God* (v. 29).

Luke 14:15: In response to Jesus' teaching about inviting the poor, the crippled, and the blind for meals because there shall be a payback in the resurrection of the righteous (vv. 12-14), one of the guests who heard these things said to Jesus, "Blessed is whoever eats bread in *the kingdom of God*" (v. 15).

Luke 16:16: The law and the prophets are until John; since then, *the kingdom of God* is being preached, and everyone enters forcibly to it.

Luke 17:20-21: A Pharisee asked Jesus when *the kingdom of God* shall come. Jesus told him that *the kingdom of God* does not come with observation (v. 20). Jesus further answers that *the kingdom of God* is within them.

Luke 18:16-17: In reaction to his disciples' scolding people for bringing babies to him (v. 15), Jesus announced, "Let the children come to me and do not stop them because *the kingdom of God* is of these" (v. 16). He further says, "Whoever does not receive *the kingdom of God* just as a child shall not enter into it" (v. 17).

Luke 18:24-25: When the ruler told Jesus that he had kept the laws "not to commit adultery, not to kill, not to steal, not to give false testimony and honour one's father and mother," Jesus told him to sell whatever he has and give to the poor so that he shall have treasures in heaven, then to come and follow him. When the ruler heard these words, he was grieved. Jesus saw him and said, "How difficult it is for the ones who have property to enter into *the kingdom of God*!" (v. 24). Jesus continued, "It is easier for a camel to go through the hole of a needle than for a rich man to go into *the kingdom of God*" (v. 25).

Luke 18:29: Continuing with Jesus' pronouncement upon the rich people, Peter said that they have left their possessions and followed Jesus (v. 28). Jesus says that people who for the sake of *the kingdom of God* have forsaken house, wife, brothers, parents, or children shall receive many times more in this life, and in the age to come, eternal life (vv. 29-30).

Luke 19:11-12, 15: When Jesus was near Jerusalem and people thought that *the kingdom of God* was about to come, Jesus told a parable (v. 11). Jesus said that a noble man went to a country far away to take for himself a kingdom and to return (v. 12). And after he took the kingdom, he returned and called the servants to whom he had given the silver in order that he might know what they had gained by trading (v. 15).

Luke 21:31: Jesus tells people that when they see these signs before the end time, then they know that *the kingdom of God* is near.

Luke 22:16: In the Passover meal, Jesus says that he shall not eat the Passover until it is fulfilled in *the kingdom of God*.

Luke 22:18: In the Passover meal, Jesus says that from now on he shall not drink from the fruit of the vine until *the kingdom of God* comes.

Luke 22:29-30: Jesus tells his disciples that just as his Father has conferred upon him *the kingdom*, he will confer *the kingdom* upon them (v. 29) so that they shall eat and drink at Jesus' table in his *kingdom*, and they shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.¹⁸

Luke 23:42: A prisoner who was crucified with Jesus asked Jesus to remember him when he goes to his kingdom.

Luke 23:51: Joseph is depicted as a man who is waiting for *the kingdom of God*.

In the progression of the repetition of the phrase "the kingdom of God" in the Gospel of Luke, Luke 7:28 is important for understanding Luke 16:16a because in both places John the Baptist is mentioned. Speaking about John the Baptist, Jesus says that he is greater than a prophet because he is the one who is preparing the way before Jesus (Luke 7:26-27). Jesus continues that no one born of women is greater than John the Baptist, but the least in the kingdom of God is greater than John the Baptist (Luke 7:28). In Luke's Gospel account, Jesus begins to preach the kingdom of God in Luke 4:43, and in Luke 7:26-27 John the Baptist is placed in the role of preparing Jesus' way before he comes, in fulfillment of the Scriptures.¹⁹ This sequence sheds light upon the interpretation of Luke

¹⁸Chrys C. Caragounis ("Kingdom of God/Kingdom of Heaven," in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels* [ed. Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight, and I. Howard Marshall; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992], 429) notes in regard to this passage that occasionally the kingdom in the Gospel of Luke "is ascribed to Jesus as given to him by the Father."

¹⁹In Luke 7:27, John the Baptist is said to prepare the way of Jesus in fulfilment of Mal

7:28: The reason why the least in the kingdom of God is greater than John the Baptist is because Jesus places John the Baptist in the preparation stage for the coming of the kingdom of God, and not in the fulfillment stage.²⁰

In light of this understanding of Luke 7:28, the phrase "the law and the prophets" in Luke 16:16a should be taken as referring to the Scriptures containing the promise of the future coming of the kingdom of God,²¹ and Jesus' statement in Luke 16:16a, "The law and the prophets are until

3:1 and Exod 23:20. The preparatory role of John the Baptist for Jesus is also noted at the beginning of the former's public ministry (Luke 3:3-6) and in Zechariah's song (Luke 1:76-77).

²⁰Bock (*Luke*, 1:675) in his comment on Luke 7:28 says that due to his assignment in proclaiming the new epoch, John is seen "as a member of the old order" but is not excluded from the kingdom. Joel B. Green (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 298) in expounding on Luke 7:24-28 says, "John is the end-time prophet foretold in the Scriptures, the Elijah figure who would forerun the coming of the Lord."

²¹A number of scholars in their study of the kingdom of God in the Scriptures note the connection between the future coming of the kingdom of God and the Davidic Messiah. For example, H. G. L. Peels ("The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *IDS* 35 [2001]: 186) says, "In the proclamation [by the prophets] of the kingdom of God that is near, an important place is given, among other things, to the expectation of the *YOM YHWH* (the Day of the Lord) and of the coming Davidic-messianic Ruler." Martin J. Selman ("The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament," *TynBul* 40 [1989]: 167) in his presentation of the kingdom of God in Chronicles says that "the Chronicler believed that the kingdom of God was made known through the Davidic dynasty." He further states, "While it is inaccurate to describe the Chronicler's outlook as eschatological, by bringing together this specifically human dimension with that of an absolute, eternal kingdom, hopes would inevitably have been stirred of another son of David who could more faithfully represent the kingdom of God on earth" (*ibid.*, 171). G. R. Beasley-Murray (*Jesus and the Kingdom of God* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986], 24) emphasizes that "the messianic hope was integrated into Israel's hope in Yahweh," and therefore it is comprehensible that "the expectation of the coming of the Messiah would have strengthened and sharpened the hope of the kingdom in the minds of the populace." These scholars' remarks on the relationship between the kingdom of God and the Messiah also cohere with the account in the Gospel of Luke. In the angel Gabriel's announcement to Mary, it is proclaimed that the Lord God shall give Jesus the throne of David his Father, and he shall rule over the house of Jacob forever, and there shall be no end of his kingdom (Luke 1:32-33). Therefore, it is understandable that, as the Davidic Messiah, Jesus is entitled to announce the arrival of the kingdom of God (Luke 4:43, 8:1). Just as the Father has conferred upon him the kingdom, Jesus tells his disciples that he will confer the kingdom upon them (Luke 22:29).

John the Baptist," should be taken to mean that John the Baptist belongs to the age of promise, since he prepares the way of Jesus (Luke 7:26-28).

With the meaning of Luke 16:16 being clarified, the next concern is to understand the relationship between Jesus' proclamation of the kingdom of God in Luke 16:16 and his comment in Luke 16:17 about not one stroke of the pen falling from the law. In Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of God in the Gospel of Luke, there is no mention of the kingdom of God and the keeping of the law except in Luke 16:16-18 and 18:18-25. The passage of Luke 18:18-30 will be treated in the later part of this chapter. Here it must be noted that even though the ruler who came to Jesus to ask him what he should do in order to inherit eternal life claimed that he had kept the laws that Jesus cited, he is nonetheless still not qualified to enter the kingdom of God.²² The qualification Jesus laid down for this ruler to enter the kingdom of God and to have eternal life is selling his possessions, giving to the poor, and following Jesus (Luke 18:22).

In Jesus' teaching about the character of the people who belong to the kingdom of God, obedience to the law is never emphasized. Rather, Jesus teaches that the kingdom of God belongs to the poor (Luke 6:20), to people who respond to the word of God and persevere in holding onto or living out the word (Luke 8:15), to people who follow Jesus with a single heart (Luke 9:62), to children (Luke

²²In Luke 18:18-30, eternal life and the kingdom of God are interchangeable ideas. This passage starts with a narration of the ruler's question about gaining eternal life and is transitioned to add the topic of the kingdom of God when Jesus comments how difficult it is for the rich people to enter the kingdom of God (Luke 18:24-25). At the end of this passage, the idea of eternal life is brought back when Jesus assures Peter that people who for the sake of the kingdom of God have forsaken house, wife, brothers, parents, or children shall receive them back many times in this life, and in the age to come, eternal life (Luke 18:29-30). The placement of eternal life and the kingdom of God together in Luke 18:18-30 may signal that entering the kingdom of God is the starting point, where one is ushered into its sphere, while eternal life is the ultimate reward one will receive in the kingdom of God.

18:16), and to people who receive the kingdom of God like a child (Luke 18:17). In contrast to these people, it is difficult for the rich to enter the kingdom of God (Luke 18:24-25).

How shall the finding above (Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of God having little to do with the keeping of the law) shed light upon the relationship between Luke 16:16 and Luke 16:17? It might seem plausible that, since in Jesus' teaching about the kingdom of God the keeping of the law is not emphasized, the keeping of the law has no place in the kingdom of God. However with the statement in Luke 16:17 Jesus adds to his teaching that the keeping of the law is still in force in the kingdom of God. This is further illustrated in Jesus' following comment about divorce, which brings us next to the interpretation of Luke 16:18.

Jesus' Interpretation of the Divorce Law in Luke 16:18

In Luke 16:18, Jesus states that everyone who divorces his wife and marries another commits adultery, and the one who marries the woman being divorced by her husband commits adultery. Jesus' statement in Luke 16:18 indicates that he considers remarriage after divorce as committing adultery; this should be understood as that Jesus is against divorce, which differs from what is allowed in the Mosaic law (Deut 24:1-4).²³

²³The allusion to Deut 24:1-4 in Luke 16:18 is an example of cultural intertexture. "Cultural intertexture appears in word and concept patterns and configuration; values, scripts, codes, or systems (e.g., purity, law, covenant); and myths (e.g., wisdom, Oedipus, Hermes)" Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 58). Within cultural intertexture Robbins defines reference as "a word or phrase that points to a personage or tradition known to people on the basis of tradition" and points out that "[a]n interpreter will be able to find various texts that exhibit meanings associated with a reference," while allusion he defines as "a statement that presupposes a tradition that exists in textual form, but the text being interpreted is not attempting to 'recite' the text" (ibid.). The repetition of law in Luke 16:16-17 refers to the Mosaic laws, and the topic of divorce in Luke 16:18 alludes to Deut 24:1-4.

Nevertheless, a close reading of Deut 24:1-4 shows that Jesus' teaching of divorce is in continuity with the intent of the Mosaic law and makes the latter stricter. In Deut 24:1-4, it is described that when a man takes a woman and lords it over her, and if she does not find grace in his eyes because he finds in her the nakedness of a thing,²⁴ he writes her a bill of divorcement, and gives it into her hand, and sends her from his house (Deut 24:1). This woman goes out from the house of the first husband and becomes the wife of another man (Deut 24:2). The second husband hates her, writes her a bill of divorce, gives it into her hand, and sends her from his house, or the second husband dies (Deut 24:3). Under either circumstance, the first husband who sent her away is not able to take her to be his wife again after she was defiled, because this thing is an abomination before the Lord, and the Israelites are warned not to sin against the land which the Lord their God gave them as an inheritance (Deut 24:4).

Concerning the meaning of Deut 24:1-4, Murray provides a helpful explanation. Citing several commentators' take on Deut 24:1-4, Murray concludes that verses 1-3 form the protasis while verse 4 is the apodosis. From this he asserts that the import of Deut 24:1-4 is not to authorize or sanction divorce; rather, "[i]t simply provides that if a man puts away his wife and she marries another man the former husband cannot under any conditions take her again to be his wife."²⁵ Murray further comments that under such a provision of law in Deut 24:1-4, divorce is actually discouraged: "[T]he

²⁴"Nakedness of a thing" is a literal translation of *ערוות דבר* in Deut 24:1MT. NRSV renders the phrase as "something objectionable"; NIV translates it as "something indecent." Concerning the meaning of "the nakedness of things," scholars have different proposals. For example, Peter C. Craigie (*The Book of Deuteronomy* [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976], 305) thinks that the terms may imply "[a] physical deficiency such as the inability to bear children"; John Murray ("Divorce," *WTJ* 9 [1946]: 42) suggests that "the indecency consisted in some kind of shameful conduct connected with sex life."

²⁵Murray, "Divorce," 35-36.

severity of the restriction imposed [for the first husband to be prohibited from remarrying his divorced wife if the latter had been remarried], together with the reason assigned for this restriction, enforces that discouragement."²⁶

Craigie also sees Deut 24:1-4 as dissuading divorce. In laying out what the defilement of the woman suggests in Deut 24:4, Craigie says,

[T]he language (*defiled*) suggests adultery (see Lev. 18:20). The sense is that the woman's remarriage after the first divorce is similar to adultery in that the woman cohabits with another man. However, if the woman were then to remarry her first husband, after divorcing the second, the analogy with adultery would become even more complete; the woman lives first with one man, then another, and finally returns to the first. Thus the intent of the legislation [in Deut 24:4] seems to be to apply certain restrictions on the already existing practice of divorce. If divorce became too easy, then it could be abused and it would become a 'legal' form of committing adultery.²⁷

These two scholars' explanations are persuasive. By prohibiting the first husband to remarry his divorced wife if the latter had been married again, there is a discouragement of divorce in the Mosaic law in Deut 24:1-4. Thus Jesus' statement in disallowing divorce at all in Luke 16:18 is a reconfiguration²⁸ of Deut 24:1-4, strengthening the intent of the Mosaic law in Deut 24:1-4.²⁹ Jesus is

²⁶Ibid., 44.

²⁷Craigie, *The Book of Deuteronomy*, 305.

²⁸In his intertexture study, Robbins describes reconfiguration as follows, "Reconfiguration is recounting a situation in a manner that makes the later event 'new' in relation to a previous event. Because the new event is similar to a previous event, the new event replaces or 'outshines' the previous event, making the previous event a 'foreshadowing' of the more recent one" (*Exploring the Texture*, 50).

²⁹Green (*Gospel*, 603-4) sees Jesus in Luke 16:17-18 as affirming the abiding validity of the law; on the issue of divorce and adultery Green argues that Jesus' interpretation "assumes the ongoing authority of the law (Deut 24:1-4), makes the Mosaic regulations more stringent than they appear in Deuteronomy, and challenges the relaxation of the law among his contemporaries."

challenging the Pharisees for their falling behind the intent of the law³⁰ even though they connect the kingdom of God with the keeping of the law.³¹ The Pharisees had overlooked the real intent of the law. Jesus' teaching on the kingdom of God is tied to the law, but only to the true intent of the law.³² Therefore, in a sense in Luke 16:18 Jesus elucidates the real meaning of the law or the intent of the law.

In light of the preceding discussion, to summarize Jesus' teaching in Luke 16:16-18 in relation to Jesus' attitude to the law, it is fitting here to close this section with a delineation of the argumentative texture of Luke 16:16-18:

- First Premise: The law and the prophets as a reference to the Scriptures contain the promise of the coming of the kingdom of God; the era of prophesying the coming of the kingdom of God is until John the Baptist. With the coming of Jesus Christ, the realization of the kingdom of God is preached, and everyone enters by force into the kingdom (Luke 16:16).
- Second Premise: With the preaching of the kingdom of God by me (Jesus), the law is not made void. To the contrary, it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than one hook of the law to fall (Luke 16:17).
- Conclusion: This is how the law is continued in my preaching of the kingdom of God: The intent of the law is continued and strengthened in my teaching. In allowing

³⁰Arguing a contrary position, Klinghardt (*Gesetz*, 89) explains: "16,18 hat damit eine vergleichbare Funktion wie die Besitzverzichtsforderung 16, 19ff bzw. der Vorwurf der Geldgier in 16,14: Das Gesetz soll umfassend und in pharisäischem Verständnis eingehalten werden." According to J. Carl Laney ("Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and the Issue of Divorce," *BSac* 149 [1992]: 14), "Most of the first-century Jewish teachers believed that Deuteronomy 24:1-4 authorized divorce. They differed only with regard to the legitimate grounds for divorce (*Gittin* 9:10)."

³¹This statement is based upon the view that Rabbinic Judaism reflects the views of Pharisees. For a discussion on the connection between the kingdom of God and the keeping of the law in rabbinic Judaism, see, for example, Solomon Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (New York: Schocken Books, 1961; repr., Woodstock, Vt.: Jewish Lights, 1993), 65-115, and Jacob Neusner and Bruce Chilton, *Jewish-Christian Debates: God, Kingdom, Messiah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998), 101-119.

³²Lukas Bormann (*Recht, Gerechtigkeit und Religion im Lukasevangelium* [SUNT 24; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001], 308-9) on the other hand says, "Das absolute Scheidungsverbot Jesu steht nicht in der schriftlichen Tora und begegnet nicht als Auslegung der Rabbinen." He calls Jesus' words in Luke 16:18 "eine neue Interpretation des νόμος" (*ibid.*, 309).

divorce, the Mosaic law is actually discouraging divorce by not allowing the husband to remarry his divorced wife if the latter had been married again after the divorce. I am making it tighter. I say that a remarriage after divorce is tantamount to committing adultery. Divorce is not allowed at all in the preaching of the kingdom of God.

Luke 16:19-31

The repetitive texture of Luke 16:19-31 shows a series of topics, such as rich, poor, Lazarus, Abraham, and Moses and the prophets. Below is a presentation of the repetitive texture:

v.19	rich				
v.20	poor	Lazarus			
v.21	rich				
v.22	poor	die	bosom	Abraham	
	rich		die		
v.23					torment
				Abraham	
		Lazarus	bosom		
v.24				Father Abraham	
		Lazarus			suffer pain
v.25				Abraham	
		Lazarus			suffer pain
v.26					
v.27				Father	
		him ³³		father	
v.28		he ³⁴			to them
					they
					torment
v.29				Abraham	they Moses and the prophets listen ³⁵
v.30				Father Abraham	they

³³The pronoun "him" in "you might send *him*" refers to Lazarus, and is placed in the same position as the word "Lazarus" in the above diagram.

³⁴The word "he" in "*he* might testify to them" refers to Lazarus, and is placed in the same position as the word "Lazarus" in the above diagram.

³⁵Due to lack of space, the word "listen" cannot be put next to the words "Moses and the prophets" and has to be moved to the next line.

from the dead³⁶
v.31

Moses and the prophets
they

listen from the dead³⁷

The repetitive texture above shows that there is a pairing up between the rich and the poor (vv. 19-22). The poor man called Lazarus died and was carried to the bosom of Abraham while the rich man suffered torment in the underworld (vv. 22-25). Abraham is addressed as Father three times when the rich man makes a request of him. In the first plea, the rich man asked Abraham to send Lazarus to him to alleviate his pain (v. 24), and in the second demand he petitioned Abraham to send Lazarus to the house of his father (v. 27). With the reference to the house of his father, the rich man shifted the focus to his five brothers. In Luke's account there are a few repetitions of the third personal pronouns "they" in both the request of the rich man and the answer of Abraham. The rich man asked Abraham to send Lazarus to his brothers to testify to them so that they would not come to this place of the torment (v. 28). Abraham's response is that his brothers have Moses and the prophets, and they should listen to them (v. 29). Nevertheless, the rich man asserts, in his last address to Abraham as father, that if a person from the dead came to them, they would repent (v. 30). Abraham's reply is that if they do not listen to Moses and the Prophets, neither would they be persuaded if anyone rises from the dead (v. 31).

In searching to derive Jesus' attitude to the law from Luke 16:19-31, a passage that narrates the reversal of the fate of rich and poor and the request of the rich man, what concerns us is the reference to Moses in v. 29 and v. 31. Abraham's reply to the rich man indicates that if one listens to

³⁶Due to lack of space, the prepositional phrase "from the dead" is moved to the next line so that it can parallel the repetition of the same phrase in the next verse.

³⁷Due to lack of space, the words "listen" and "from the dead" cannot be put next to the words "Moses and the prophets" and has to be moved to the next line.

and obeys the teachings of Moses and the Prophets, one would not end up in the place of torment. In light of the narrative, what the teachings of Moses and the Prophets refer to is almsgiving because in the parable told by Jesus what the rich man fails to do is to pay attention to the need of poor Lazarus at the gate of his mansion while the latter was alive on earth. Thus one may say on the basis of Luke 16:19-31 that Jesus sees that the command of the Mosaic law to care for the poor is to be continued.³⁸

Further, Jesus' parable in Luke 16:19-31 is a response to the Pharisees who complain about Jesus' association with sinners (Luke 15:1-2). As the Pharisees are critical of Jesus' breaking the law, Jesus' parable in Luke 16:19-31 is implying that actually they are the ones who break the law.

Concerning this, Luke Timothy Johnson explains,

As the rich man had scorned the demands of the Law and Prophets to give alms, so have they [the Pharisees] "mocked" Jesus' teaching on almsgiving (16:9-13). And in spite of their claim to hold the demands of the Law, they reject the outcasts among the people (15:1-2), just as the rich man had rejected Lazarus.³⁹

Even though almsgiving is perhaps too narrow a term to describe Jesus' teaching in Luke 16:9-13, it may be seen as implicit in the text. In Luke 16:9-13 Jesus is talking about faithfulness to God with the particular example of handling money in order to show exclusive devotion to God.

³⁸David W. Pao and Eckhard J. Schnabel ("Luke," in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* [eds. G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 345) note that the statement about listening to Moses and the Prophets in Luke 16:29 "echoes numerous OT passages that teach how fellow human beings should be treated, especially the poor (cf. Deut. 14:28-29; 15:1-3, 7-12; 22:1-2; 23:19; 24:7-15, 19-21; 25:13-14; Isa. 3:14-15; 5:7-8; 10:1-3; 32:6-7; 58:3, 6-10; Jer. 5:26-28; 7:5-6; Ezek. 18:12-18; 33:15; Amos 2:6-8; 5:11-12; 8:4-6; Mic. 2:1-2; 3:1-3; 6:10-11; Zech. 7:9-10; Mal 3:5)."

³⁹Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SPS 3; ed. Daniel J. Harrington, S. J.; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1991), 256. For a link between the Pharisees and the rich man in the parable, see also David B. Gowler, "'At His Gate Lay a Poor Man': A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31," *PRSt* 32 (2005): 249-65. Gowler says, "The Pharisees improperly grasp after material goods and honor. This characterization of the dishonorable social behavior of the Pharisees has direct implications for how we interpret the parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus" (255).

Giving alms to the poor is a demonstration of faithfulness to God in regard to handling money.

Therefore, Jesus points to the Pharisees for their failure to obey the law in attending to the need of the poor.

Luke 20:27-40

The repetitive texture in the innertexture of Luke 20:27-40 is presented below:

v.27	resurrection				
v.28	Moses	brother	died	wife ⁴⁰	without child
		brother		woman	
		brother			
v.29		seven brothers			
			the	woman	
			died		without child
v.30			the		
v.31			the		
		seven	died		
v.32				woman	
			died		
v.33				woman	
	resurrection			wife	
		seven		wife	
v.34					
			age		marry and be given in marriage
v.35			age		
	resurrection				neither marry nor be given in marriage
v.36					
	because		die		
	because				
	resurrection				
v.37	raise dead ones				
		Moses			
			God (3X)		
v.38			God		
	dead ones		living ones		
	because		live		
v.39					

⁴⁰The Greek word for the rendering of woman or wife in this chart is the same, γυνή.

v.40

The foregoing diagram of the repetitive texture shows that Luke 20:27-40 concerns resurrection in relation to the levirate law. This is seen in the repetition of resurrection in relation to the levirate law (with the repetition of woman, brother, and "to die") in the first part of Luke 20:27-40. Luke's account starts with the narration of certain Sadducees, who are noted as people who say that there is no resurrection (ἀνάστασις), coming to ask Jesus concerning Moses' teaching that when a brother who has a wife died and is childless, his brother should marry the sister-in-law and raise a seed for his brother (v. 28). Then these Sadducees put forward a case. There are seven brothers (v. 29a). The first one took a wife and died childless (v. 29b). The second one and the third one married her and the rest of the brothers also married her, but the seven brothers did not leave a child and all died (vv. 30-31). Later the woman also died (v. 32). Then comes the question these Sadducees posed for Jesus: at the resurrection, to which of the seven brothers should this woman be the wife since each of the seven brothers has taken her as his wife (v. 33)?

Jesus' answer first focuses on the contrast between two ages in the matter of marriage, as can be seen from the repetition of the words "age," "marry," and "give in marriage": The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage (v. 34), but the ones who are counted worthy to obtain also the resurrection from the dead neither marry nor are given in marriage (v. 35). Then with a repetition of the word "because" Jesus explains why this is so: Because they are not able to die and they are like angels, being in the state of resurrection (v. 36).

Next Jesus supports the fact of resurrection with evidence from Moses (vv. 37-38). He says concerning the fact that the dead are raised⁴¹ that Moses makes that fact known at the bush when

⁴¹About the repetition of the theme of resurrection in this passage, in vv. 27, 33, 35, 36 Luke's narrative has the noun ἀνάστασις, but in v. 37 the verb ἐγείρω is used.

he speaks of "the Lord the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob" (v. 37). With this reference to the statement of Moses, Jesus affirms that God is not the God of the dead but of the living because to him all live (v. 38).

To derive Jesus' attitude to the law from this passage, it is to be noted that Jesus teaches that a specific Mosaic law (the levirate law) only applies to people in this age and will not be continued in the age to come because in that age people will be in the resurrected state like angels (vv. 35-36). Jesus further uses the statement of Moses at the burning bush to support the fact of the resurrection (v. 37).⁴² It is clear that for Jesus, Moses bears a double witness, one to this age and the other to the age to come. To understand the relationship between these two references to Moses, it is necessary next to do an intertexture study of Luke 7:37.

Jesus' Citation of Exodus 3:6 in Luke 7:37

Jesus' citation of Moses' testifying at the bush to the declaration of God to be κύριον τὸν θεὸν Ἀβραὰμ καὶ θεὸν Ἰσαὰκ καὶ θεὸν Ἰακώβ refers to God's revelation of himself to Moses in the account of Exodus 3. Judging from the fact that in Luke's description Jesus specifies that it is *at*

⁴²Bock (*Luke*, 2:1625) argues cogently for the reading of resurrection in the account of Exodus 3. Bock says that the declaration of God through the angel of the Lord at the burning bush means that by announcing himself to be the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, "God is the God of promise and covenant"; he further spells out: "For the promises to the patriarchs to come to pass and for God to still be their God, resurrection must be a reality." Bock's reasoning provides a possible angle to understand how Jesus reads Exod 3:6 and has the textual support of the description of God's remembering the covenant he made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in Exod 2:24-25. In light of the framework of the fulfillment of covenant and promise suggested by Bock, it can be said that resurrection is implicit in God's declaration in Exod 3:6, and Jesus draws out or emphasizes this point. By explaining that Moses' phrase "the Lord God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob" refers to the resurrection of the dead and adding that God is the God of the living, not of the dead because all live to him (Luke 20:37-38), Jesus is saying that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob "must therefore still be alive" (Green, *Gospel*, 722).

the bush that Moses witnessed to the speaking of the above words, the words that Jesus quotes are most likely quotes taken from Exod 3:6, which reads ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ.⁴³ Nevertheless, the word κύριος, which is included in Jesus' citation, does not occur in Exod 3:6 but in Exod 3:15a and 3:16 where God repeats his identity.⁴⁴ Since Jesus' citation is mainly from Exod 3:6, but with the addition of κύριος from Exod 3:15, 16 where the declaration of the identity of God is similarly expressed, God's repeated disclosure of himself recorded in Exodus 3 is in the background of Jesus' citation in Luke 20:37.

The literary context of Exodus 3 is the Israelites' cry for deliverance from their slavery in Egypt. When God heard their groaning, he remembered the covenant he made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Exod 2:24-25). Thus it is understandable that in Yahweh's self-revelation to Moses, he announces himself to be the God of Moses' father, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob. However, in Luke's narrative, Jesus uses the Exodus 3 passage of God's revelation to Moses as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to make Moses disclose the identity of God. In Jesus' citation of Exod 3:6, the beginning words ἐγώ εἰμι, with which God disclosed his identity to Moses, are omitted. This appropriation of Exodus 3:6 can only be seen to mean that Jesus wants to make Moses the one

⁴³According to Exod 3:4-6, when Moses turned aside to see the burning bush, God's revelation of himself to be the God of his father is among the first words God made known to Moses.

⁴⁴At God's commissioning Moses to go to Pharaoh to bring the Israelites out of Egypt, Moses enquired about the name of the God whom he was to disclose to the Israelites. God told Moses to tell the Israelites, "I AM has sent me to you" (Exod 3:14 NRSV), and God also told Moses to tell the Israelites, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ, ἀπέσταλκέ με πρὸς ὑμᾶς (Exod 3:15a). This personality of God is repeated in God's sending Moses to go to the elders to inform them, Κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν ὤπταί μοι, θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαὰκ, καὶ θεὸς Ἰακώβ, (Exod 3:16).

responsible for disclosing the information of the resurrection of the dead, in distinction from Moses' giving the levirate law.

Jesus' distinction between Moses' witness to resurrection and Moses' handing down the levirate law is significant when compared with 4 Maccabees, where the theme of immortality in relation to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob and the keeping of the law are connected. The first place of the link between immortality and the keeping of the law in 4 Maccabees is in the author's commenting upon the death of the priest Eleazar due to his refusal to eat food forbidden by the law. The author of 4 Maccabees, who from the beginning and throughout the entire book has emphasized that only religious reasoning can tame passions and help one to keep the law, described people who used religion to master passion as "they who believe that to God they die not; for, as our forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, they live to God" (7:19).⁴⁵

The other place where a similar link appears is in 4 Maccabees 16:24-25, which reads: "With these arguments, the mother of seven, exhorting each of her sons, over-persuaded them from transgressing the commandment of God. And they saw this, too, that they who die for God live to God; as Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and all the patriarchs." It is clear that the reason why Eleazar and the mother with her seven sons choose to be tortured rather than to eat unclean food is their obedience to the law combined with their belief in immortality. Perhaps a causal relationship exists between the sacrifice made for obedience to the law and the reward of immortality in 4 Macc 16:24-25.

Jesus' distinguishing between Moses' giving the levirate law and Moses' disclosing the resurrection of the dead in Luke 20:27-38 shows that for Jesus the levirate law is transient; it is only practiced in the earthly life.

⁴⁵The quotation from 4 Maccabees is from Lancelot Charles Lee Brenton, *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986).

Conclusion to Jesus' Teaching on the Law

Before moving to the next section on "Jesus' Passing Reference to the Law in Interaction with People," it is necessary to see how the prophetic function of the law in Luke 24:27, 44-47 relates to other references to the law in Luke 16:16-18, 16:19-31, and 20:27-40. In Luke 24:27, 44-47 Jesus teaches that Moses as part of the Scriptures speaks about the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ (Luke 24:26-27, 44-46) and the mission task of the disciples of Jesus (Luke 24:47). In Luke 16:16-18 Jesus says that his teaching of the kingdom of God is connected with the law; Jesus makes the intent of the law stricter. Divorce is discouraged in Deut 24:1-4, and Jesus forbids divorce entirely (Luke 16:18). In Luke 16:19-31 Jesus' attitude to the law is that the teachings in the Scriptures (Moses and the Prophets) about caring for the poor should be practiced. The transient nature of the Mosaic law is seen in Luke 20:27-38; the levirate law, according to Jesus, should only be practiced in the earthly life. Nevertheless, Jesus emphasizes that Moses testifies to the eternal, the resurrection of the dead, which is not related to the Mosaic law.

The summary above shows that Wilson is correct in concluding that the prophetic function of the law coexists with other functions of the law in the Gospel of Luke. From the study of the four passages above (Luke 24:27, 44-47; 16:16-18; 16:19-31; 20:27-40), one sees that Jesus understands the law to speak about later events, including the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ and the mission work of the early church, while he also directs that the Mosaic law should be practiced in earthly life, including the levirate law and almsgiving. In the case of the levirate law, Jesus in his response to the enquiry of the Sadducees explains that this law only applies to the earthly life (Luke 20:27-40), which might be taken as a contradiction to Jesus' other teaching that it is easier for heaven and earth to pass away than for one dot or hook of the law to fall (Luke 16:17). But what Jesus means about one hook of the law not falling is seen in his comments upon the Mosaic law, as illustrated in his comments on divorce (Luke 16:18). Thus whether Jesus says through a parable that almsgiving should

be practiced or whether in forbidding divorce he makes the discouragement to divorce in the Mosaic law (Deut 24:1-4) tighter, the text shows the authority of Jesus concerning how the Mosaic law should be practiced after his coming.

Jesus' Passing References to the Law in Interactions with People

This section will deal first with Luke 5:12-16 and 17:11-19 together and follow with treatments of Luke 10:25-37 and 18:18-30 separately and sequentially. The reason why Luke 17:11-19 is discussed together with Luke 5:12-16, breaking the sequential order of the passages treated in this section, is that both texts have to do with a similar theme, namely, Jesus' cleansing the lepers.

Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19

The study of Jesus' cleansing the lepers in Luke 5:12-16 and 17:11-19 will focus on the former passage with the support of Luke 17:11-19 when the argument is needed. The repetitive texture in the innertexture of Luke 5:12-16 and 17:11-19 is presented first, followed by comments.

Luke 5:12-16

v.12	leprosy	will	cleanse
v.13		will	be cleansed
	leprosy		
v.14			cleansing
v.15			
v.16			

Luke 17:11-19

v.11	he	Samaria			
v.12	he		ten		
v.13			they	voice	
v.14			to them, they		they were cleansed
v.15				voice	glorify God
v.16	his, him				
	he	Samaritan			
v.17			ten		they were cleansed

in Luke 5:15 the theme of cleansing is not continued; rather, it is the fame concerning Jesus' ability to heal that is spread.⁴⁶ Also in Luke 17:11-19, following the repetition of the cleansing of the ten lepers (v. 14, 17) what is emphasized is the faith of this Samaritan (v. 19); this faith element is especially important in light of the fact that the identity of this person as a Samaritan receives emphasis in the passage.⁴⁷

Therefore it is concluded that Luke 5:12-16 and 17:11-19 show Jesus caring for the whole healing of the person who suffers from leprosy, seeing it as important for this person to be accepted by society, and ordering the person to go to the priest for the proof of cleansing.⁴⁸ Moreover, even though Jesus does direct the lepers to the priest as ordered in the Mosaic law, the keeping of the law is not the emphasis in the two passages. These two factors lead one to concur with Bovon in his comment on Luke 5:12-16, "In respect to his understanding of the Law, Luke wants

⁴⁶This point is supported by Joseph A. Fitzmyer's comment on Luke 5:12-16 saying, "As the episode stands in the Lucan Gospel, it is a simple miracle-story of healing" (*The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* [2 vols; AB 28, 28A; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1981-85], 1:572).

⁴⁷As can be seen from the layout of repetitions in Luke 17:11-19 above, for the leper who returned to thank Jesus there are three repetitions of his identity as a Samaritan. The first is that the region, Samaria, is identified (v. 11) in Luke's description of Jesus' crossing the borderland between Samaria and Galilee on his way to Jerusalem. The second is that his identity as a Samaritan is stated (v. 16). The last is when Jesus calls this Samaritan a foreigner when he wonders why only he returned to thank God.

⁴⁸Cf. François Bovon (*Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* [ed. Helmut Koester; trans. Christine M. Thomas; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002], 176), "In association with 4:27, the healing of the leper [in Luke 5:12-16] is a component of Jesus' messianic mission. As a physical miracle and a social reintegration simultaneously, it is, like the miraculous catch of fish (5:1-11), a sign of the divine economy and incorporation into the church."

neither to portray Jesus as especially observant nor to devalue legal purification vis-à-vis Christian healing."⁴⁹

Luke 10:25-37

The repetitive texture in the innertexture of Luke 10:25-37 is presented below:

v.25 do	life		
v.26			
v.27		neighbor	
v.28 do	live		
v.29		neighbor	
v.30			robbers
v.31		seeing	pass by on the opposite side of the road ⁵⁰
v.32		seeing	pass by on the opposite side of the road
v.33		seeing	
v.34			took care of him
v.35			take care of him
v.36		neighbor	robbers
v.37 do(2X)			

As can be seen from the repetitive texture above, Luke 10:25-37 concerns doing in order to gain life, and this is illustrated in the issue of "neighbor." In Luke's account, a lawyer, attempting to test Jesus, asked a question: "Teacher, what must I *do* that I shall have *eternal life*?" (v. 25). Jesus' response was to ask this lawyer what was written in the law and what his reading of the law was (v. 26). The lawyer answered: "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, with all your strength, and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself" (v. 27). Jesus replied that he had answered correctly and that he should *do* this and he shall *live* (v. 28). Through the repetition of the verb "to do" and of the idea about life, Jesus answered the lawyer's question. This lawyer aims to

⁴⁹Ibid.

⁵⁰The Greek word is ἀντιπαρέχομαι.

get from Jesus what he might *do* that he can have *eternal life* (v. 25). Jesus told him that he should *do* as he had answered and he shall *live*. Trying to justify himself, the lawyer asked Jesus: Who is my neighbor (v. 29)? Jesus' answer was in the form of a story (vv. 30-35).

In the story told by Jesus, a person fell victim to robbers on his way from Jerusalem to Jericho (v. 30), and in response to his ordeal the participle ἰδὼν (seeing v. 31) is repeated for the reaction of the three people identified. When a priest *sees*, he passes by on the opposite side of the road. When a Levite *sees*, he passes by on the opposite side of the road. The same verb ἀντιπαρέχομαι is used for the responses of the priest and the Levite; they acted the same way. A Samaritan is also described as *seeing*, and his response is described as having compassion. His compassionate acts are provided in vv. 34-35: he went to the wounded man and, after pouring on olive oil and wine, he bound up his wounds. After putting him on his animal, he led him to an inn and *took care of him*. Next day the Samaritan gave the innkeeper two denarius and said, "*Take care of him*, and whatever he might spend in addition, I shall pay you in my return." With the repetition of the verb "take care of," and the pronoun "him," the act of this Samaritan may be captured as taking care of that person. He does not ignore the need of that person.

Placed after the reported speech of this Samaritan is a question of Jesus given for the lawyer: "Which of these three do you think is a neighbor to the one who fell to the robbers?" (v. 36). The lawyer said, "The one who *does* mercy with him" (v. 37a). It was narrated then that Jesus said to him, "Go and *do* likewise" (v. 37b). At the end of this section, both Jesus and the lawyer are taken back to where the unit started: The lawyer asked Jesus what he should *do that he might have eternal life*. He comes to recognize that he needs to *do* mercy.

To derive Jesus' attitude to the law from this passage (Luke 10:25-37), it is to be noticed that Jesus does affirm the importance of doing the law to gain eternal life (vv. 25-28). It is the lawyer's further question concerning who is his neighbor that compels Jesus to elaborate on what doing the law

entails ("Love your neighbor as yourself"). In the story told by Jesus, the Samaritan is the hero. Jesus aims to have the lawyer copy the action of the Samaritan. Therefore, the identity of the Samaritan and his action in the story told by Jesus are crucial to unveiling Jesus' attitude to the law in this passage. The relationship between the identity of the figure in the story and Jesus' attitude toward the law requires a study of the social intertexture of the story, which is the social identity of Samaritan.⁵¹ This investigation of the social identity of the Samaritan will help us understand the emphasis of Jesus in using the example of a Samaritan to shed light upon his interpretation of the law of loving one's neighbor as oneself. It is to the study of the identity of the Samaritan that the next section turns.

An Intertexture: The Social Identity of the Samaritan

According to Robbins, whose methodology is followed here, to understand the "social meanings" of the phenomena in a given text, or, the meanings of the "social roles, identities, institutions, codes, and relationships" in a text, one can resort to the help of "texts, inscriptions, archaeological data, sculpture, paintings, and so on" outside a text.⁵² It is beyond the scope of this work to study the primary sources that provide us the information pertaining to Samaritans, and thus we will depend on works that have studied texts and archaeological findings related to Samaritans. Even in the study of secondary literature, it is beyond the span of this section to be exhaustive in many

⁵¹In the section of social intertexture in his chapter on "Intertexture," Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 62) says, "Social knowledge is commonly held by all persons of a region, no matter what their particular 'cultural' location may be." He further explains, "Social knowledge falls generally into the four following categories: *a. social role* (soldier, shepherd, slave, athlete) or *social identity* (Greek, Roman, Jew); *b. social institution* (empire, synagogue, trade workers' association, household); *c. social code* (e.g., honor, hospitality); *d. social relationship* (patron, friend, enemy, kin)" (*ibid.*, emphasis in original).

⁵²*Ibid.*, 63.

aspects related to the study of Samaritans, since not every aspect will directly shed light upon Luke 10:25-37.

The focus of this section concerning the social identity of the Samaritans is to understand how Jews viewed Samaritans in the first century rather than how Samaritans viewed themselves in the first century. The reason for this limitation is that in answering the Jewish lawyer's further question, Jesus brings in a Samaritan in the story narrated in Luke 10:30-35. We want to understand what a reference to a Samaritan might have meant to a Jewish person's perception of the Samaritan. In this regard it is useful to recall certain scholarly readings of Josephus' treatment of Samaritans. Josephus as a Jewish historian of the first century provides a comparable background to understand the Gospel of Luke, which shares the same first-century milieu.

Several scholars have noted the ambiguity in Josephus' account of the Samaritans. For example, R. J. Coggins points out that sometimes Josephus regards the Samaritans "as rivals to the Jerusalem community and essentially external to it; sometimes he regards them as part of the larger community of Judaism and true inheritors of the traditions of old."⁵³ Coggins attributes this phenomenon to the fact that "Josephus was writing at a time and in circumstances where the identification of the true Jewish community was inevitably to be a matter of prime concern."⁵⁴ Coggins adds that it is hard to judge whether Josephus' comment on the Samaritans is from his own observation, or whether it is based upon past traditions; nevertheless, he emphasizes, "a consciousness

⁵³R. J. Coggins, "The Samaritans in Josephus," in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (ed. Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata; Leiden: Brill, 1987), 257. See also James Alan Montgomery (*The Samaritans; The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature* [New York: Ktav, 1968], 156-7) for the reading of ambiguity in Josephus' works.

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, 261.

of unity between Jews and Samaritans continued in certain areas of life until well after the time of Josephus."⁵⁵

Sung Uk Lim also holds that Josephus presents "Judaean/Jewish identity in both an inclusive and exclusive relationship with the Samarians/Samaritans, in the context of the destruction of the Second Temple."⁵⁶ Magnar Kartveit argues that Josephus' version of the origin of Samaritans in *Ant. 9*, which "carries strong similarities to 2 Kgs 17," bears "the taint of contemporary polemics against the Samaritans, and therefore cannot be taken at face value."⁵⁷

In light of the discussion above, how shall one construct the social identity of a first-century Samaritan from a Jewish point of view? Even though Coggins and Lim think that Josephus' various depictions of Samaritans are due to his constructing the identity of the Jews, one can still say that Samaritans are regarded by some Jews as Jews in the first century,⁵⁸ or at least that in certain circumstances Samaritans are viewed as Jews if they fulfill certain requirements. Concerning this point, Lim explains,

By and large, Josephus acknowledges the Jewishness of the Samaritans to the extent that they conformed to the Jewish way of life. But he no longer regards them as Jewish on the

⁵⁵Ibid., 271. Gary N. Knoppers (*Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations* [New York: Oxford University Press, 2013], 219) also thinks that there is "long-range material evidence for ongoing engagement between some members of the two groups."

⁵⁶Sung Uk Lim, "Josephus Constructs the Samari(t)ans: A Strategic Construction of Judaean/Jewish Identity through the Rhetoric of Inclusion and Exclusion," *JTS* 64 (2013): 406.

⁵⁷Magnar Kartveit, *The Origin of the Samaritans* (VTSup 128; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 3.

⁵⁸Knoppers (*Jews and Samaritans*, 225) mentions that "during the 1st century and the early 2nd century . . . the Samaritans were (still) considered by at least some rabbis as Jews."

grounds that they were tolerant towards those Jews violating Jewish laws, or deserted the Jewish way of life and simultaneously adopted a non-Jewish, namely Greek, way of life.⁵⁹

The fact that Samaritans are regarded by some Jews as Jews in the first century sheds light upon our understanding of Jesus' using a Samaritan in the story in Luke 10:30-35. Jesus does not bring in a Gentile; rather, he brings in a Samaritan. A first-century Jewish hearer like the lawyer in Luke 10:25-37 would expect that this Samaritan also passes by on the opposite side of the road as do the priest and the Levite. Instead, this Samaritan who was expected to keep the law does not keep the law,⁶⁰ and yet Jesus commends him and tells the lawyer to follow the step of this Samaritan. This shows that Jesus is not operating under the framework of the law of Lev 19:18. According to Lev 19:18, the command to love one's neighbor as oneself is addressed to the Israelites who should do this to other Israelites.⁶¹ But in Luke's narration of the story told by Jesus, Jesus presents the character of the one who acts as a neighbor to the victim of the robbers. As Philip F. Esler concludes, in Luke 10:36-37 Jesus makes a general principle, and this principle is independent of the law: "Act as a neighbor (in the compassionate style of the Samaritan) to people in need."⁶²

⁵⁹Lim, "Josephus Constructs the Samari(t)ans," 429.

⁶⁰From the text, we do not know whether the Samaritan breaks the law, but judging the acts of the priest and the Levite, we do know that the Samaritan breaks the law. Fitzmyer (*The Gospel According to Luke*, 2:884) notes, "The regulations on defilement from contact with a dead body were also to be found in the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, but they did not hinder the Samaritan of the story from being motivated by his own pity and kindness, which enabled him to transcend such restrictions" (emphasis in original).

⁶¹Jacob Milgrom (*Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 3A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008], 1654) refers to a Rabbinic interpretation of Lev 19:18, "[T]he fact that love for the resident non-Israelite, the *gēr*, is reserved for v. 34 implies that *rēa'* here means 'fellow Israelite' (*Sipra Qedoshim* 8:4; Mishnah R. Eliezer 16)."

⁶²Philip F. Esler, "Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory," *BI* 8 (2000): 344-45.

Through consideration of the social identity of Samaritans in the first century in this section it is concluded that in Luke 10:25-37, even though Jesus affirms the summary of the law to love others as oneself, there is a move beyond the requirement of the law.

Luke 18:18-30

The repetitive texture in the innertexture of Luke 18:18-30 is presented below:

v.18	eternal life			
v.19				
v.20				
v.21		all		
v.22		all	follow	
v.23			rich	
v.24			money	the kingdom of God
v.25			a rich person	the kingdom of God
v.26				
v.27				
v.28				forsake
v.29		follow		forsake
v.30	eternal life		the kingdom of God	

The repetitive texture above shows that Luke 18:18-30 concerns eternal life (vv. 18, 30).

Central to the issue is the content of the "all" that one should do. A ruler came to Jesus asking him what he should do so that he could inherit eternal life (v. 18). Jesus refers him to the last five commandments in the Decalogue (vv. 19-20). The ruler responds claiming that he has kept *all* of these since his youth (v. 21). Jesus tells him that he still lacks one thing, namely that he should sell *all* that he has, give the proceeds to the poor, and come and follow Jesus (v. 22). Here it is clear that the ruler's idea of "all" that he should be committed to and Jesus' idea of "all" that the ruler should do are different. After the ruler is grieved by the demand of Jesus to give *all* that he has to the poor because he was exceedingly rich, Luke's account moves first to Jesus' comment upon the difficulty for rich people to

enter the kingdom of God. Then Peter claims that the disciples had forsaken all that they had and followed Jesus, and finally Jesus affirms that they shall have eternal life in the age to come (vv. 23-30).

To derive Jesus' attitude to the law from this passage, one has to note that Jesus' citation of the last five commandments of the Decalogue in the beginning of Luke 18:18-30 does not recur in the development within the narrative and that in Jesus' reply to Peter in vv. 29-30, who claimed to have done what Jesus had told this ruler to do (v. 28), Jesus does not mention the law. Therefore, it can be concluded that this passage does not present Jesus teaching that one must obey moral aspects of the law. Jesus' reference to the law in Luke 18:18-30 can only be seen as his tactic to start where his interlocutor stands, not as an endorsement of keeping these commandments. Moreover, the reference to eternal life (v. 18) in the beginning of Luke 18:18-30 and the repetition of eternal life (v. 30) at the end of this passage may be taken to mean that Jesus' response to Peter recorded in vv. 29-30 is the short answer for the ruler: the reward of following Jesus with the price tag of discipleship is eternal life.

Conclusion to Jesus' Passing References to the Law in Interactions with People

In the section above dealing with "Jesus' Passing References to the Law in Interactions with People" in the Gospel of Luke, four passages (Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19; 10:25-37; 18:18-30) are studied. What is common in these four passages is that in the beginning of each account obedience to the law is affirmed. But as Luke's narrative unfolds, the topic of the law is replaced by other topics (Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19) or there is a move beyond the Mosaic law (Luke 10:25-37; 18:18-30). In two accounts of Jesus' healing people who have leprosy, Jesus asked the cleansed lepers to show themselves to the priest (Luke 5:12-16; 17:11-19). However, in Luke 5:12-16, what is emphasized toward the end of the narrative is Jesus' ability to heal. In Luke 17:11-19 Jesus' healing of the ten lepers, the account focuses on the faith of the Samaritan, the foreigner. Moreover, it is suggested that

Jesus' command to have the healed lepers go and show themselves to the priests in Luke 5 and 17 should be regarded as integrating them back to the society.

In two reports of Luke where a question is posed to Jesus about what one must do in order to gain eternal life, the keeping of the law is affirmed initially, but as the narrative unfolds there is a move beyond the law (Luke 10:25-37; 18:18-30). In Luke 10:25-37 Jesus agrees with the lawyer in the latter's answer from the law to gain eternal life, but in Jesus' elaboration of the meaning of neighbor in response to the lawyer's question, there is a move beyond the law. Using some scholars' presentation of Josephus' portrayal of the Samaritans in the first century, it is understood that the Samaritans are regarded by some Jews as Jews and are therefore expected to keep the law. But in the story told by Jesus, the Samaritan did not obey the law as the priest and the Levite did and yet his character of acting as a neighbor to the victim of the robbers receives emphasis. This emphasis shows that Jesus is not working under the framework of Lev 19:18.⁶³ In Luke 18:18-30 Jesus' reference to the last five commandments in the Decalogue should be seen as Jesus' tactic to start with where this rich ruler stands; as Luke's account unfolds, it becomes clear that the way to attain eternal life is to follow Jesus.

Next follows the study of passages talking about Jesus' breaking the Sabbath law.

Jesus' Breaking the Sabbath

There are four passages (6:1-5, 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6) in the Gospel of Luke that present Jesus as breaking the Sabbath law. As will be seen below in the study of these four passages, it

⁶³Thus the lawyer's question in Luke 10:25-37 "Who is my neighbor?" leads to Jesus' answer "How to be a neighbor to people in need."

is clear from the different rationales that Jesus gives to justify his or his disciples' behavior of breaking the Sabbath, that Jesus is challenging the Pharisaic interpretation of the Sabbath law.

Luke 6:1-5

The repetitive texture of Luke 6:1-5 is presented below:

v. 1	Sabbath	eat		
v. 2			do	not lawful
	Sabbath			
v. 3			do	
v. 4		eat		not lawful
v. 5	Sabbath			

The repetitive texture shows that Luke 6:1-5 concerns an act of eating on the Sabbath, which is specified as doing what is not lawful. In Luke's account, on one Sabbath, as Jesus was going through the grain field, his disciples plucked and ate the ears of grains after rubbing them with their hands (v. 1). This behavior caused some of the Pharisees to question why they *did*⁶⁴ what *is not lawful* on the Sabbath (v. 2). In his response, Jesus refers to what David *did* (ἐποίησεν) when he was hungry. David went to the house of God, took and ate the bread of presentation, which *is not lawful* (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) to eat except for the priests, and gave to those who were with him (vv. 3-4). Jesus ends his response to the Pharisees with the statement, "The Son of Man is the Lord of the Sabbath" (v. 5).

Since the way for Jesus to respond to the accusation that he and his disciples broke the Sabbath law is by appealing to the example of David in the Scriptures,⁶⁵ and since Jesus' assertion that

⁶⁴The Greek of the Pharisees' direct question reads τί ποιεῖτε ὃ οὐκ ἔξεστιν τοῖς σάββασι. This clearly includes Jesus with the unlawful behavior of his disciples.

⁶⁵In the layout of the repetitive texture above, there is a parallel between the accusation of the Pharisees toward Jesus and his disciples and the act of David: both are specified as doing what is not lawful and both acts have to do with eating.

he is the Lord of the Sabbath follows his reference to David's act, it therefore becomes important to understand the point of Jesus' use of the episode of David. The intertexture illuminates the intention.

Intertexture in Luke 6:1-5

Jesus' reference to David's act in Luke's account may be termed as "[r]ecitation of a narrative in substantially one's own words."⁶⁶ The common terms between Luke 6:3-4 and 1 Samuel 21:1-6 are "David" and "the bread of presentation." First Samuel 21:1-6 says that David went to Nob to Ahimelech to ask for five loaves of bread or whatever else would be there (vv. 1-3). The priest Ahimelech told David that he only had holy bread and that it could be eaten only if his men had kept themselves from women (v. 4). David assured the priest that when he went on an expedition, women were always kept from them and that "the vessels of the young men are holy even when it is a common journey," not to mention the burden of the task they are now under (v. 5 NRSV). Therefore, the priest gave David the holy bread because there was no other bread except the bread of presentation, which was taken down that day from the presence of the Lord to be replaced by hot bread (v. 6).

In Jesus' narration of 1 Sam 21:1-6, Jesus talks about what David did when he and the others were hungry (v. 3) and says that David went to the house of God, and after he had received the bread of presentation, he ate and gave to those who were with him, which *is not lawful* (οὐκ ἔξεστιν) to eat except for the priests (v. 4). Jesus' rendering of 1 Sam 21:1-6 pinpoints that David and people who were with him were hungry and therefore he went to the house of God to take the holy bread. This is an interpretation of David's going to the priest in 1 Sam 21:1-6, where it is not said that David was hungry. Moreover, Jesus' words that the bread is not lawful to eat except for the priests (v. 4) are not

⁶⁶Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 43 (emphasis in original). This is how Robbins describes the reference to David's behavior in Mark 2:25-26, a parallel passage of Luke 6:3-4.

seen in 1 Sam 21:1-6. In that passage the priest Ahimelech does not inform David that the bread is unlawful for him to eat;⁶⁷ the priest told David that he only has holy bread if his men had kept themselves from women (v. 4).

From these two emphases of Jesus in his rendering of the account of 1 Sam 21:1-6, one may derive the attitude of Jesus to the law: Jesus emphasizes the need of David and his followers, and Jesus says that their act is against the law. Nevertheless, Jesus does not criticize the behavior of David. He uses the example of David to support his disciples' breaking the law.⁶⁸ Like David, the disciples of Jesus also have need, and their breaking the Sabbath should not be judged.

With Jesus' defense of the action of his disciples, the question to consider next is whether in Jesus' justification he places himself against the Pharisaic interpretations of the Sabbath or against the Sabbath law. This will have further implications for understanding Jesus' view of the law in Luke 6:1-5. For example, Blomberg thinks that in the account of Luke 6:1-5 it is the OT Sabbath law that Jesus violates, and this leads to his conclusion: "Luke brings out all the more clearly that Jesus takes a position above the Law," and this position is "Christ's estimate of the situation."⁶⁹

Blomberg argues, "Many commentators agree that plucking grain constituted harvesting, and harvesting was definitely forbidden in the Torah (Exod. 16.25-26; 34.21—both before and after

⁶⁷According to Lev 24:5-9, the twelve bread of presentation being placed on the table before the Lord on the Sabbath is for "Aaron and his descendants, who shall eat them in a holy place" (v. 9 NRSV).

⁶⁸Cf. Bock (*Luke*, 1:532), "What seems clear from the challenge of the Davidic example is that law is not always to be read in absolute terms. Compassion for life's basic needs is most absolute."

⁶⁹Blomberg, "Law," 59. The phrase "Christ's estimate of the situation" is Blomberg's quoting Banks, *Jesus and the Law*, 123.

Sinai!).⁷⁰ The response to Blomberg is that according to Exod 34:21, work in harvest period is indeed prohibited on the Sabbath; nevertheless, in Exod 34:21 it is not specified what acts constitute work in harvest season.⁷¹ Therefore, in Luke 6:1-5 the Pharisees' charging the act of the disciples of Jesus as violation of the Sabbath should be seen as their own interpretation of the Sabbath law,⁷² and Jesus' using the example of David shows his criticism of their interpretation.

With the reference to David's act, Jesus asserts that the Son of man is the Lord of the Sabbath (Luke 6:5). Therefore, the argumentative texture of Luke 6:1-5 may be presented as below:

Thesis:	Rubbing the ears of grain and eating it due to hunger does not violate the Sabbath law.
Rationale:	There is a precedent example for the breaking of the law due to hunger: David (and his people) ate the holy bread that is for the priest alone.
Additional Rationale:	The Son of the Man is the Lord of the Sabbath.

Here Jesus as the Lord of the Sabbath dictates that it is permissible to break the Sabbath law under specific circumstances, namely when there is human need. This emphasis of Jesus is not only seen in Luke 6:1-5, but is also in view in the rest of the three accounts of Jesus' healing work on the Sabbath: Jesus' healing of the man with the withered right hand (Luke 6:6-11), Jesus' healing of a woman who

⁷⁰Ibid., 58.

⁷¹The judgment receives indirect support from E. P. Sanders' (*Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE-66CE* [London: SCM Press, 1992], 208) explanation concerning the Sabbath command: "Short forms of the sabbath requirement appear in Ex. 34.21 and Lev. 19.3. In subsequent Israelite history the sabbath laws were elaborated. Jeremiah forbade carrying burdens in or out of the city, and even in or out of the house (Jer. 17.19-27). According to Neh. 10.31 the Israelites pledged themselves not to buy things from Gentiles or dubious Jews ('the people of the land') on the sabbath, as well as to let the land lie fallow and not to claim debts in the seventh year."

⁷²Robert C. Tannehill (*Luke*, 110) points out that the Pharisees consider plucking grain with the hands "as reaping (prohibited work), and rubbing the grain with the hands to get the husks off is considered threshing."

was bent over for 18 years (Luke 13:10-17), and Jesus' healing of a man suffering from dropsy (Luke 14:1-6).

Luke 6:6-11

The repetitive texture of Luke 6:6-11 is presented below:

v. 6 Sabbath	hand	withered
v. 7 Sabbath		
v. 8		withered
	hand	
v. 9 Sabbath		
v. 10	hand	(2X)
v. 11		

In the second Sabbath controversy that Luke records, *Sabbath* and the condition of a man's right *hand* being *withered* receive attention. Luke reports that on another *Sabbath*, Jesus was teaching in a synagogue, and a man with *a withered right hand* was present (v. 6). The Pharisees and the scribes are depicted as watching closely to see whether Jesus will do healing work on the *Sabbath* (v. 7). Knowing their thoughts, Jesus commanded the man with *the withered hand* to arise and stand in the middle (v. 8). Addressing the Pharisees and the scribes, Jesus asked, "Is it lawful on the *Sabbath* to do good or do harm, to save life or destroy it?" (v. 9). Looking around them all, Jesus told the man to extend his *hand*, and his *hand* was restored (v. 10). Luke ends his account with the report that the Pharisees and the scribes are filled with fury and discuss among themselves what they might do with Jesus (v. 11).

From Luke's report of the second Sabbath controversy summarized above, it is evident that Jesus intentionally challenges the Pharisees and the scribes in terms of their understanding of what comprises lawful and unlawful deeds on the Sabbath by calling the man with the withered right hand to stand in the middle and by posing a question to them concerning what deeds are lawful on the

Sabbath, be it destroying life or saving life. This shows that Jesus places the situation of the man above the Pharisaic interpretation of the Sabbath law.

Luke 13:10-17

The repetitive texture of Luke 13:10-17 is presented below:

v. 10	Sabbath					
v. 11	Behold!	woman	sickness	eighteen years		
v. 12		woman	sickness			
v. 13						
v. 14	Sabbath			heal	it is necessary	
				heal		
	Sabbath					
v. 15	Sabbath					loose
v. 16	Behold!			eighteen years	it is necessary	
v. 16						to be loosed
	Sabbath					
v. 17						

In Luke's account of Jesus' healing of a woman who was bent over for 18 years (Luke 13:10-17) in the context of the repetitions of "Sabbath," this woman's sickness receives attention (v. 11, 16). Her sickness leads to Jesus' healing, which then causes the exchange between the leader of the synagogue and Jesus concerning what *is necessary* to do on the Sabbath. Being angry that the healing work of Jesus was done on the Sabbath, the leader of the synagogue told the crowd that there are six days during which *it is necessary* (δεῖ) to work, and the healing should be done then, not on the Sabbath (v. 14). Jesus responded to this man by calling him a hypocrite and questioned whether each of them would not on the Sabbath *loosen* (λύει) his ox or sheep from the manger and lead it away to drink (v. 15). Jesus continues by asking, "For this daughter of Abraham whom Satan bound for 18 years, *was it not necessary* (δεῖ) for her *to be loosed* (λυθῆναι) from this bond on the Sabbath?" (v. 16). Luke closes his narrative with the impact of Jesus' reply: his words put all who are against him to shame, and all the crowd rejoiced over the glorious deeds done by Jesus.

From Jesus' answer to the leader of the synagogue, it is clear that his focus is on the plight of the woman, which is the reason why it is necessary for him to heal her on the Sabbath. But for the leader of the synagogue, six days are for work, including healing work, and Jesus should come and do it during those days, not on the Sabbath. The differing concerns between Jesus and the leader of the synagogue show that Jesus places this woman's need above the Pharisaic interpretation of the Sabbath law. This may show that for Jesus the true meaning of Sabbath is the restoration of the entire person. Moreover, the reference Jesus made to the practice of the leader of the synagogue and people like him, who would release animals for a drink on the Sabbath, argues that Jesus stands against their rigid interpretations of the Sabbath law that neglect the need of a person.

Luke 14:1-6

The repetitive texture of Luke 14:1-6 is presented below:

v. 1 Sabbath	Pharisees
v. 2	
v. 3	Pharisees
Sabbath	
v. 4	
v. 5 Sabbath	
v. 6	

The repetitive texture above shows that this passage concerns Sabbath and Pharisees. In Luke 14:1-6, Luke tells that on a Sabbath Jesus went to a certain one of the leaders of the Pharisees to eat (v. 1). A man suffering from dropsy was in front of him, which prompted Jesus to ask the Pharisees and scribes whether it is lawful to heal on the Sabbath or not (vv. 2-3). They were silent, and Jesus took hold of this person, healed him, and sent him away (v. 4). Jesus further enquired of them if their son or their ox fell into a pit on the Sabbath, would they not immediately pull them out (v. 5)? They are depicted as not being able to respond to Jesus' reasoning (v. 6). This event shows that once again when human need is placed before Jesus, Jesus' response is to attend to the need even on a Sabbath day.

In light of the study of the repetitive texture above, the argumentative texture of Luke 14:1-6 may be presented as follows:

Unstated major premise:	When a person is ill, out of compassion you would want to heal that person immediately.
Minor premise:	When your son or ox falls into a pit, you would immediately draw him out on the day of the Sabbath.
Conclusion:	It is lawful to heal on the Sabbath.

Conclusion to Jesus' Breaking the Sabbath

In the foregoing study of the four episodes on Jesus' violation of the Sabbath Law, it has been shown that Jesus places human need above the Pharisaic understanding of the Sabbath law (Luke 6:1-5; 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6). In Jesus' interpretation of the Sabbath law, these four episodes indicate that the compassionate act comprises the top layer of Jesus' ethics.⁷³ Moreover, the passage of Luke 6:1-5 indicates that Jesus possesses the authority to pronounce what is allowed on the Sabbath (Luke 6:5).

Jesus' Pronouncements of Woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44)

In Jesus' pronouncement of woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44), Jesus more directly comments upon the Pharisees' practice of the law in Luke 11:37-41 and Luke 11:42. The repetitive texture of Luke 11:37-41 is presented below:

v. 37	Pharisee	eat a meal
v. 38	Pharisee	meal

⁷³The idea of conceiving the ethics of Jesus in terms of layers is inspired by François Bovon (*Studies in Early Christianity* [WUNT 161; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2003], 70). Bovon says, "[To Jesus] the law is not a string of equivalent prescriptions, but a pyramid in which a hierarchy is to be honored. Luke believes that the two-part love commandment and the Ten Commandments, those aspects of the law that demand complete fidelity, constitute the top of the pyramid."

v. 39 Pharisees	the outside	cleanse	the inside
v. 40	the outside		the inside
v. 41		clean	what is inside

The repetitive texture of Luke 11:37-41 above shows that this passage is about Pharisees and their concerns over the stipulations of meals, which leads to the talk of outside and inside and the issue of cleansing (Luke 11:37-41). In Luke's account, a Pharisee invited Jesus for a meal and was amazed that Jesus did not wash his hands before the meal (vv. 37-38). This leads Jesus to comment that the Pharisees *cleanse the outside* of the cup and of the dish but *inside* they are full of robbery and wickedness (v. 39). Jesus then poses a question, "Fools, didn't the one who makes *the outside* also make *the inside*?" (v. 40). With this enquiry, Jesus states that giving of the alms concerning⁷⁴ *what is inside* will make everything *clean* with the Pharisees (v. 41).

From the repetitive texture⁷⁵ of Luke 11:37-41 above, it is observed that in Jesus' response to a Pharisee's surprise over his not washing his hands before the meal, there is a repetition of

⁷⁴As will be discussed below, some scholars view the words τὰ ἐνόητα in the clause τὰ ἐνόητα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην (Luke 11:41a) as an "accusative of respect." Concerning accusative of respect, Daniel B. Wallace (*Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996], 203) states, "The accusative substantive restricts the reference of the verbal action. It indicates *with reference to what* the verbal action is represented as true" (italics his emphasis). Wallace suggests to provide the words "*with reference to, or concerning*" before the accusative noun (ibid; his emphasis). The translation of τὰ ἐνόητα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην here adopts the suggestion of Wallace about the rendering of accusative of respect without specifying the meaning of this translation. A discussion of the meaning of τὰ ἐνόητα is provided in the later part of this section.

⁷⁵Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 8) comments, "The repetitive texture of a span of text regularly exhibits initial glimpses into the overall rhetorical movements in the discourse. Repetition does not reveal the precise nature of the boundaries between one unit and another. Also, repetition does not exhibit inner meanings in the sequences. But repetitive texture introduces interpreters to the overall forest, if you will, so they know where they are as they look at individual trees. Clusters of repetitive data give initial insight into the overall picture of the discourse. They provide an overarching view of the texture of the language that invites the interpreter to move yet closer to the details of the text."

the pattern of words "the outside; the inside" (vv. 39-40) and the words related with cleansing (vv. 39, 41).⁷⁶ Further, the progressive texture⁷⁷ shows that there is a progression from the references to the outside and inside (vv. 39-40) to what is inside (v. 41), and this movement is within the context of Jesus' talk about cleansing (vv. 39, 41). This move from the talk of the outside and inside to the inside in relation to the repetition of the concept of cleansing suggests that in contrast to the Pharisees' view of purity in terms of outward behavior, Jesus' emphasis upon purity is inward. Jesus calls the Pharisees to give alms "with reference to"⁷⁸ what is inside (τὰ ἐνόντα), and then everything will be clean (v. 41).

Concerning the relationship between almsgiving and what is inside (τὰ ἐνόντα) in Jesus' command to the Pharisees, τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην, Nolland links the words τὰ ἐνόντα to the clause τὰ ἐνόντα δότε ἐλεημοσύνην as "'an accusative of respect': 'in connection with what is inside . . . ,' and so, 'as an expression of what is inside.'"⁷⁹ Christopher Hays criticizes Nolland's understanding of almsgiving "as an expression of what is inside" by saying that "this interpretation is difficult since 'what is within' the Pharisees is plunder and wicked deeds."⁸⁰ Taking the phrase τὰ

⁷⁶The verb καθαρίζω is used in v. 39 while the adjective καθαρός is used in v. 41. The observation of the contrast between the inside and outside is inspired by John Nolland's treatment of Luke 11:37-44 in his commentary, *Luke 9:21-18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993), 660-66. A further reference to his view is given below.

⁷⁷Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 10) comments, "Progression emerges out of repetition. Indeed, repetition itself is one kind of progression, since movement from the first occurrence of a word to another occurrence is a forward movement—a progression—in the discourse. Focusing on progression within repetition adds more dimensions to the analysis. "

⁷⁸Again this is the adoption of Wallace's (*Greek Grammar*, 203) rendering of accusative of respect without spelling out its meaning.

⁷⁹Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 664.

⁸⁰Christopher Hays, "Beyond Mint and Rue: The Implications of Luke's Interpretive

ἐνόντα also as an accusative of respect, Hays argues that "give alms with respect to what is within" indicates that "almsgiving actually ameliorates the problem of what is within," and states that from the strict economic point of view, this interpretation speaks well of itself, "since by giving alms the Pharisees could disperse the defiling plunder they had amassed."⁸¹

In response to Hays' criticism of Nolland's interpretation of Luke 11:41a, it needs to be asked whether in Jesus' comment on the Pharisees' *inside* (τὸ ἔσωθεν) being full of robbery and wickedness (v. 39) and in his order to them to give alms with reference to *what is inside* (τὰ ἐνόντα), the two insides must be of the same content. If it is not, then there is no problem for Nolland to assert that Luke 11:41a means that almsgiving is "an expression of what is inside." As a matter of fact, it is better not to take the two insides in vv. 39, 41 as referring to the same content because in v. 39 there is a personal pronoun to limit the inside but in v. 41 there is no such specificity. Another way to respond to Hays is to use Bock's argument that the Pharisees' inside and robbery and wickedness are not identical: "Given its position ὑμῶν (your) modifies ἔσωθεν (inside) and refers to the inside of the person, moving from figure to application: 'your inside.' It does not refer to the later reference to extortion and wickedness as some suggest."⁸²

Moreover, in light of Jesus' earlier reference to God as the creator not only of the outside but also of the inside (v. 40),⁸³ it is better to see that in Jesus' order to the Pharisees to give alms with

Controversies for Modern Consumerism," *PT* 11 (2010): 385.

⁸¹Ibid.

⁸²Bock, *Luke*, 2:1113, note 13.

⁸³Concerning the question Jesus posed for the Pharisees to consider, "Didn't the one who makes the outside also make the inside?" (v. 40), Fitzmyer (*The Gospel According to Luke*, 2:945) views "the maker of the vessel" in Jesus' words as "God himself, whom Luke elsewhere (Acts 1:24;

respect to the heart, Jesus is zeroing in on the aspect of the inside (v. 41); he is calling the Pharisees to issue in deed from the inside in contrast to their sole concern of the outward behavior.⁸⁴ Jesus' reference to the inside in contrast to the Pharisees' focus upon outward deeds is continued in the next verse where Jesus states that the Pharisees tithe mint, rue, and every herb but neglect the justice and love of God (v. 42).⁸⁵ Therefore, it is concluded from Luke 11:37-41 that Jesus' view of purity is inward; the inward will show itself in the outward action. Jesus' focus upon the inner is appropriated by Peter in Luke's account of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:9) in his talk of God's cleansing the heart of the Gentile believers.

Conclusion

The study of Jesus' attitude to the law in the Gospel of Luke in this chapter was conducted in four areas of analysis: Jesus' teaching on the law (Luke 16:16-18; 16:19-32; 20:27-40; 24:44-47); Jesus' passing references to the law in interactions with people (Luke 5:12-16; 10:25-37;

15:8; . . . [Luke] 16:15) calls 'the knower of hearts.'" Nolland (*Luke 9:21-18:34*, 664) and Bock (*Luke*, 2:1114) also see a reference to God in Luke 11:40.

⁸⁴Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34*, 664. In Nolland's own words, "V 41 makes it clear that Luke's use of 'inside' and 'outside' does not mark a dualism of the inner and outer life of a person: the inner life expresses itself in outward actions and is to be contrasted to that which is *only* an outward display" (ibid., 664-65).

⁸⁵Even though the words "outside" and "inside" are not used in Luke 11:42, Jesus' comment in v. 42 is similar to that of v. 39: V. 39a You clean the outside of the cup and the plate, v. 42a You tithe mint, rue, and every herb; v. 39b but inside you are full of robbery and wickedness, v. 42b but you neglect the justice and love of God. Again the use of the outside and inside is an adoption of Nolland's framework in his exegesis of Luke 11:37-44. Johnson (*Gospel*, 192) reasons similarly, "Their [The Pharisees'] concern for the minutiae of tithing leads to neglect of the purpose of tithing, the care of the needy (Deut 14:22-29). More strikingly, their concern for outward purity hides a deep rapaciousness within. The 'love of God' should lead them to the doing of 'justice' by sharing their possessions with others."

18:18-30; 17:12-19); Jesus' breaking of the Sabbath (6:1-5, 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6); and Jesus' pronouncements of woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44). The result of the study is that Luke's Jesus holds diverse views of the law, which was already shown in the study of Jesus' teaching on the law (Luke 16:16-18; 16:19-32; 20:27-40; 24:44-47). Jesus taught that Moses as part of the Scriptures speaks prophetically of future events: the crucifixion and resurrection of Messiah, and the mission work of the early church (Luke 24:44-47). Jesus' preaching of the kingdom is not devoid of the law; instead, Moses' teaching concerning divorce in Deut 24:1-4 is continued in Jesus' prohibition of divorce, and Jesus makes the law stricter (Luke 16:16-18). The continuity of the practice of the Mosaic law in Jesus' teaching is also seen in the story told by Jesus about Lazarus (Luke 16:19-32). Obeying the teachings of Moses and the Prophets concerning caring for the poor is tantamount to avoiding punishment in hell (Luke 16:29). In Luke 20:27-40 Jesus says that the levirate law is only applied to earthly life, and concerning the life to come Moses testifies to the resurrected state, which refers to what Moses witnesses to at the burning bush prior to his receiving the law.

In the section on Jesus' passing references to the law in interactions with people (Luke 5:12-16; 10:25-37; 18:18-30; 17:12-19), a common feature of the four passages is that there is a reference to the obedience of the law in the early part of the narrative but as Luke's account progresses there is a move beyond the law. In Jesus' healing of the lepers in Luke 5:12-16 and 17:12-19, Jesus directed the cleansed lepers to go to the priest, but in Luke 5:12-16 it is Jesus' ability to heal that is emphasized in the end, and in Luke 17:12-19 it is the faith of the foreigner, the Samaritan, that is stressed in the end. In Luke 10:25-37 and 18:18-30, where the question concerning the acquiring of eternal life is posed to Jesus, initially the answer is affirmed in the keeping of the law but as Luke's narrative unfolds there is a move beyond the law. In Luke 10:25-37 Jesus agrees with the lawyer in the latter's answer from the law to gain eternal life, but in Jesus' elaboration of the meaning of neighbor in response to the lawyer's question, there is a move beyond the law. In the example of the lawyer, he

knows that the neighbors to whom his love is directed is not limited only to the Jews, but should be to people who are in need. For the rich ruler who responded that he had kept the last five laws of the Decalogue, the answer to gain eternal life is to become Jesus' disciple.

In the Sabbath controversies Jesus clearly opposes the Pharisaic interpretations of Sabbath and places the needs of people above the Pharisaic interpretations of Sabbath. In the last part of the study in this chapter, Jesus' pronouncement of woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44), it was concluded that even though Jesus is not rejecting explicitly the practice of the Pharisees in washing cups and plates and tithing, the argumentative emphasis of Jesus is upon the inner and how the inner influences the outer behavior.

As the early church was facing the problem of whether the Gentile believers needed to be circumcised and ordered to keep the Mosaic law, as Luke reports in Acts 15, Jesus' teachings on the law provided them with ways to tackle this problem. Even though in Luke's presentation the obedience of the law is part of the diversities in Jesus' attitude to the law, as noted in the summary of this chapter above, this aspect is not reflected in the speeches of Peter and James in Luke's narrative of Acts 15. Rather, in Luke's account, following in Jesus' footsteps, James emphasizes that the inclusion of the Gentiles is part of the plan of God as told in the Scriptures, and Peter in following the contrast between the inside and outside emphasizes the cleansing of the heart versus the keeping of the law. The rationale for Luke's using only this aspect will be provided in chapter 3 and 4 of this work. Peter's speech will be treated in Chapter 3 and James' speech will be treated in Chapter 4 of this dissertation. But before moving to these chapters, it is necessary to situate Jesus' talk of the law and James' and Peter's taking up part of Jesus' view of the law within scholarly discussions of law in Second Temple Judaism. It is to this topic that the next chapter moves.

CHAPTER 2
OPPOSING POSITIONS IN SECOND TEMPLE
JEWISH ATTITUDES TO THE LAW

Introduction

The centrality of the law in Judaism in the Second Temple period is assumed virtually unanimously by scholars. For example, speaking of the post-biblical period becoming "a 'sapiential milieu,'" Eckhard J. Schnabel says, "At the same time, the Torah became more and more the one entity which regulated practical life in every respect. The Torah penetrated every aspect of life—individual, social, and national."¹ Since the emphasis on the keeping of the law is a common phenomenon in the Second Temple period, the focus of this chapter will be in asking *why* the Jews thought the keeping of the law was important, at least as reflected in the literature of the time. In a way, this question is asking about *the function of the law* in the Second Temple period, and therefore it is necessary to consider E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*.² This work not only impacts significantly upon New

¹Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics* (WUNT 2/16; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 6.

²E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977). Sanders' *Jesus and Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985) touches on themes such as "Jesus and the Temple," "New Temple and Restoration in Jewish Literature," and "Other Indications of Restoration Eschatology" that do not relate directly to Acts 15. Even in Sanders' chapter on "The Law," the main focus is on giving Jesus' view of the law, which is not directly relevant to the project of this chapter of the dissertation, which is to understand why the Jews in the Second

Testament studies, but it also delineates a system called covenantal nomism within which the reason for the Jews' law-keeping in the Second Temple period is explained.

If Sanders is correct, then surely this idea of covenantal nomism should serve as the background to understand why, in the so-called Jerusalem Council, the Pharisaic believers insisted that it was necessary for the Gentile believers to be circumcised and be ordered to keep the law. Some scholars have done precisely that.³ Thus the first part of this chapter will center on a review of Sanders' work. In the scholarly response to Sanders' scheme, only one work will receive attention: *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*.⁴ It is reasonable to limit our consideration to the review of Sanders' work alone, in part because in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* "various corpora linked with Second Temple Judaism" are evaluated.⁵ Additionally this chapter uses *The Complexities*

Temple period viewed the keeping of the law as important.

³For scholars who have used Sanders' covenantal nomism to interpret Acts 15, see, for example, Kalervo Salo, *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation* (AASFDHL 57; Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1991); James Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (NC; Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996).

⁴D. A. Carson et al., eds., *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001).

⁵D. A. Carson, "Summaries and Conclusions," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 540. Carson in the conclusion of his edited volume mentions other works that also respond to Sanders' covenantal nomism (ibid., 540-42). One example is Mark Elliott's *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000). Elliott's work focuses on the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls and leaves out the rabbinic literature because he considers the rabbinic literature to be chronologically later than the New Testament documents and, therefore, not able to serve as background for understanding New Testament messages. Elliott challenges the framework of national covenant in Sanders' covenantal nomism.

of *Second Temple Judaism* as a convenient bridge to our thinking about why the Jews considered obedience to the law in the Second Temple period of such centrality.

In the years since the publication of Sanders' work, his proposal of covenantal nomism has been widely accepted. Even Jacob Neusner in his review of Sanders' monograph, though he complains that Sanders does not do justice to rabbinic literature on its own terms, nonetheless does not oppose Sanders' scheme of covenantal nomism.⁶ In contrast to scholars who see Sanders' proposal in a positive light, Carson's edited volume assesses whether Sanders' scheme of covenantal nomism fits with the data of Second Temple Jewish materials. Our discussion starts with a presentation of Sanders' major argument in regard to Palestinian Judaism (200 BCE to 200 CE) and follows with a summary of Carson's concluding remarks on Sanders' proposal. Next comes a presentation of Dunn's review of Carson's edited material. Dunn comments that actually Carson's work supports the soundness of the scheme of covenantal nomism. Dunn's comment leads us to examine whether Carson's edited volume in fact endorses covenantal nomism. Therefore, the first part of this chapter develops mainly in interaction with Carson, who criticizes Sanders' covenantal nomism, and Dunn, who defends Sanders'

⁶Jacob Neusner (review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*, HR 18 [1978]: 180) says, "Sanders does not come to Rabbinic Judaism (to focus upon what clearly is his principal polemical charge) to uncover the issues of Rabbinic Judaism. He brings to the Rabbinic sources the issues of Pauline scholarship and Paul. . . . Sanders does not describe Rabbinic Judaism through the systematic categories yielded by its principal documents. His chief purpose is to demonstrate that Rabbinism constitutes a system of covenantal nomism. While I think he is wholly correct in maintaining the importance of the conceptions of covenant and of grace, the polemic in behalf of Rabbinic legalism as covenantal does not bring to the fore what Rabbinic sources themselves wish to take as their principal theme and generative problem. For them, as he says, covenantal nomism is a datum. So far as Sanders proposes to demonstrate the importance to all the kinds of ancient Judaism of covenantal nomism, election, atonement, and the like, his work must be pronounced a complete success. So far as he claims to effect systematic description of Rabbinic Judaism ('a comparison of patterns of religion'), we have to evaluate that claim in its own terms."

covenantal nomism, to decide whether we should apply Sanders' concept of covenantal nomism to the study of Peter's speech in the next chapter (chapter 3) of this dissertation.

The second part of the chapter considers certain scholars' readings of the rabbinic literature. The reason to focus on the rabbinic literature is twofold. First of all, in the two causes given in Acts 15 for the Jerusalem meeting (Acts 15:1-2, 4-5), Jews from the sect of the Pharisees (v. 5) are specified as voicing their insistence upon the Gentile believers' keeping the law. Pharisaic believers are portrayed as the primary group to which Peter and James respond in their speeches. Since some scholars regard the rabbinic literature as reflecting the Pharisaic view of the law, it is important to present their readings of the rabbinic literature.

Through interaction with Carson and Dunn in their evaluations of Sanders' proposal and through reading scholarly interpretations of the rabbinic literature, this chapter helps to understand reasons why the Jews, especially the Pharisees, in the Second Temple period viewed law-keeping as important. This understanding will assist us in evaluating various interpretations of Acts 15:1 and 15:5 as we go to the next chapter to determine to what issue(s) Peter is responding in the Jerusalem Council. Some scholars do not think that salvation is an issue in the demand upon the Gentile believers to be circumcised and to keep the law, while other scholars insist that the Jerusalem meeting intends to deal decisively with the salvation problem of the Gentile believers. Still other scholar hold that the issues to be discussed in the Jerusalem meeting are a combination of soteriological and social issues.

In his account in Acts, Luke presents the Jewish believers as faithfully keeping the law. As we wrestle with whether we should adopt Sanders' covenantal nomism as the reason why Jews observe the law in the Second Temple period and consider various proposals for interpreting the rabbinic literature as the background for understanding the Pharisees' attitude to the law, we will gain vital background information for our analysis of Luke's view of the law in the section on the ideological texture in the next chapter.

Scholars' Review of E. P. Sanders' Covenantal Nomism

This section first presents Sanders' explanation of covenantal nomism, and then follows up with Carson's evaluation of Sanders' proposal and, connected with it, James Dunn's reading of Carson's edited work. The chapter then reviews Dunn's opinion and finally presents a conclusion.

E. P. Sanders' Covenantal Nomism

In the preface to his book, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, Sanders sets out six aims that he hopes to accomplish in his book. They are "to consider methodologically how to compare two (or more) related but different religions," "to destroy the view of Rabbinic Judaism which is still prevalent in much, perhaps most, New Testament scholarship," "to establish a different view of Rabbinic Judaism," "to argue a case concerning Palestinian Judaism (that is, Judaism as reflected in material of Palestinian provenance) as a whole," "to argue for a certain understanding of Paul," and "to carry out a comparison of Paul and Palestinian Judaism."⁷

In his treatment of Tannaitic literature, Sanders traces how rabbinic Judaism has been misunderstood in New Testament scholarship as "the antithesis of Christianity" and "a legalistic religion in which God was remote and inaccessible."⁸ He acknowledges the apologetic reason behind his study of "a large body of Rabbinic literature": "[T]o show that the systematic Rabbinic soteriology

⁷Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, xii.

⁸ Ibid., 33. F. Weber, E. Schürer, W. Bousset, and R. Bultmann are among the scholars Sanders lists whose false understanding of Judaism has had a great impact on New Testament scholarship. According to Sanders, Weber is the first one who painted this incorrect picture of Judaism, and his impact still "lives on in New Testament scholarship, unhindered by the fact that it has been denounced by such knowledgeable scholars as Moore and the others named by Loewe and despite the fact that many of its proponents, despite Moore's scathing criticism on this point, *still* cannot or do not look up the passages which they cite in support of their view and read them in context" (ibid., 36; his emphasis).

which is widely believed to be based on Rabbinic sources actually rests on a misunderstanding of them. The apologetic motive is not justification for our use of the material, but it is a point which has been borne in mind."⁹

The materials that Sanders uses in particular to reconstruct Palestinian Judaism are Tannaitic literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Apocrypha, and the OT Pseudepigrapha. Sanders aims to understand the relationship between covenant and law in the materials surveyed. His conclusion is that, except for Ben Sirach, the relationship between covenant and law is maintained in the documents studied. Covenant is offered by God's grace, and obedience (the keeping of the law) is a response to God's grace. He explains that the reason why Ben Sirach does not relate the keeping of the law to election is that Ben Sirach addresses the Israelites and deals with what is encountered in this world "by use of the general doctrine of retribution."¹⁰ He emphasizes that in IV Ezra the idea of covenant is still maintained even though it is perfect obedience that is required to stay in the covenant.

Sanders points out that even though the word "covenant" seldom occurs in the rabbinic literature, the idea is assumed, and he further states that "the Rabbinic discussions were largely directed toward the question of *how* to fulfil the covenantal obligations."¹¹ He stresses that the idea of the Jews' being loyal to their covenantal requirements is also seen in the majority of the rest of the literature. He adds that covenant is directly declared in the Dead Sea Scrolls, and there are requirements laid down for being admitted to and remaining in the covenant. While acknowledging

⁹Ibid., 70.

¹⁰Ibid., 420.

¹¹Ibid., 421.

that covenant does not appear often in the texts studied, Sanders holds that the idea is present and that obedience is viewed as the appropriate behavior in response to the covenant.

The conclusion that Sanders reaches for "the pattern of religion" in the period of the documents studied is called "covenantal nomism":

The "pattern" or "structure" of covenantal nomism is this: (1) God has chosen Israel and (2) given the law. The law implies both (3) God's promise to maintain the election and (4) the requirement to obey. (5) God rewards obedience and punishes transgression. (6) The law provides for means of atonement, and atonement results in (7) maintenance or re-establishment of the covenantal relationship. (8) All those who are maintained in the covenant by obedience, atonement and God's mercy belong to the group which will be saved. An important interpretation of the first and last points is that election and ultimately salvation are considered to be by God's mercy rather than human achievement.¹²

Sanders explains that not every element delineated above is included in every document studied, but the idea is presupposed. He says that even though the Qumran explanation of covenant and interpretation of the Mosaic Law differs from that of the rabbinic literature, the importance of covenant and of the keeping of the law is still underscored by both. Next is the presentation of Carson's evaluation of Sanders' proposal.

D. A. Carson's Response to Sanders' Covenantal Nomism

Carson's volume in response to Sanders' covenantal nomism encompasses the entire literature of the Second Temple period. At the end of the book Carson summarizes the findings of each contributor and comes to a conclusion. Providing a review of some of the key points of the contributors, Carson's remarks serve as a summary evaluation of Sanders' covenantal nomism. Carson's major points in his concluding section are as follows.

¹²Ibid., 422.

1. Based upon several scholars' finding that covenantal nomism can be used to describe "parts of their respective corpora," Carson concludes that Sanders is not wrong everywhere, but "he is wrong when he tries to establish that his category is right everywhere."¹³ Carson adds that several scholars who find covenantal nomism convenient to explain the corpora of their literature also find that the concept does not entirely fit. Carson refers to the examples of sinlessness, the personal choice to enter the community, and "the elaborate penance necessary to return to God" in the *Lives of Adam and Eve*, which all show that entrance is not by grace.¹⁴

2. Carson calls covenantal nomism "at best a reductionistic category" because there is too much emphasis on "*one kind* of biblical ideas" while the complementary ideas are overlooked.¹⁵ He gives several examples of other "ideas": there is a strong emphasis on "personal worth and meritorious righteousness in Judith or Tobit"; compared with 4 Ezra, 2 Enoch is "even more attached to works righteousness"; 4 Maccabees "is devoted to 'staying in,' with nothing left for 'getting in'"; in the *Testament of Moses* "the people 'get in' by grace, but they 'stay in' by God's determined grace as well"; within competing theologies in Tannaitic literature, "part of this heritage is certainly replete with merit theology."¹⁶

¹³Carson, "Summaries and Conclusions," 543.

¹⁴Ibid., 547.

¹⁵Ibid., 543 (emphasis in original).

¹⁶Ibid., 543-4.

3. Carson finds that "covenantal nomism is not only reductionistic, it is misleading," and he lists two reasons for this judgment.¹⁷ The first reason is that "deploying this one neat formula across literature so diverse engenders an assumption that there is more uniformity in the literature than there is."¹⁸ The second reason is that even though Sanders has erected covenantal nomism as a correction of merit theology, in fact covenantal nomism is not a response to merit theology, because "against merit theology stands grace."¹⁹ He further points out that Sanders "preserves grace in the 'getting in' while preserving works (and frequently some form or other of merit theology) in the 'staying in.'"²⁰

Carson states that "both poles—'getting in' and 'staying in'—need nuancing" and he provides questions to illustrate his point. For example, in terms of the assumption that "Israel is God's people by grace," he asks whether this assumption should "refer to the entire people at the moment of their initial calling" and raises the issues of the individual's entering "a special community, as at Qumran" and of the election category becoming more "a source of boasting than a source of gratitude and obligation."²¹

In terms of the teasing out of "staying in," Carson asks whether the keeping of the law should be seen entirely as being in conformity with God's gracious revelation or whether sometimes it

¹⁷Ibid., 544.

¹⁸Ibid.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., 545.

is put as a "human contribution to the entire scheme."²² He notes that there is a great flow of works-righteousness in the Tannaitic literature and certain forms of merit theology in *2 Enoch*, *4 Ezra*, and *2 Baruch*.²³ Carson acknowledges that the meaning of works-righteousness or merit theology needs elucidation in each example just as covenantal nomism needs clarification. He concludes that covenantal nomism appears not to be able to "accomplish what Sanders wants it to accomplish, viz. serve as an explanatory bulwark against all suggestions that some of this literature embraces works-righteousness and merit theology, precisely because covenantal nomism embraces the same phenomenon."²⁴

4. Carson says that in some of this literature the category of covenantal nomism is not suitable. He refers to Josephus for the depiction of the relationship between God and his people as being "arguably more indebted to the ancient system of benefaction and patronage"; he says that in Jubilees the getting-in is by God's grace but "final salvation finally depends on obedience"; he comments that "[i]n several of these sources (e.g. Philo, *Sibylline Oracles*), God's Law is either for Gentiles as well as Jews, or it is for all because it is nothing more than the finest articulation of the law of nature" and that "Philo is primarily interested in portraying the pilgrimage of the individual soul to God, not least by the acquisition of virtue."²⁵

5. Carson continues with the "unsuitability of the terminology" of covenantal nomism with reference to Seifrid's essay: "If 'covenant' and 'righteousness' are not customarily linked in

²²Ibid.

²³Ibid.

²⁴Ibid.

²⁵Ibid., 545-6.

Scripture, and if there are very good reasons for thinking that God's righteousness must be understood first and foremost in a creational context . . . , the fundamental assumptions behind covenantal nomism begin to crumble."²⁶

6. Carson refers to "a trajectory of developments" that some scholars have tracked in their study of the literature. He says that in reconstructing the textual development of 1QS, Bockmuehl "argues that its direction is precisely toward the sort of 'works of the law' that the apostle Paul would have opposed."²⁷ Carson also refers to Roland Deines essay, "The Pharisees between 'Judaism' and 'Common Judaism,'" noting that "Deines groups much of the literature into three periods, and it is the second period (leading up to the fall of Jerusalem and its temple) that presupposes not only heated competition among the groups that made up Judaism in the first century, but the rising influence of Pharisaism."²⁸

Given these summary remarks, Carson concludes that "the New Testament documents, not least Paul, must not be read against this reconstructed background—or, at least, must not be read *exclusively* against this background."²⁹ A comment upon Carson's conclusion will be made at the end of the next section together with an evaluation of Dunn's reading of Carson's edited work.

²⁶Ibid., 547.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸Ibid.

²⁹Ibid., 548.

James D. G. Dunn's Review of *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*

In his review of Carson's edited work, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (the first volume of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*), Dunn suggests as a better title: "*Justification and Variegated Covenantal Nomism*" in order to reflect "more accurately the fairly consistent findings of the essayists" in this book.³⁰ He finds that "the two elements within the twin emphasis (covenantal nomism) are given differing weightings, depending on circumstances," but, as "in prophet-type warning and exhortation, stronger weight is often given to the necessity of human obedience."³¹ To illustrate his finding, Dunn directs readers to the conclusions of some contributors to this volume. To evaluate whether Dunn's judgment is sound, the next section presents the conclusions of these authors in order to see whether their findings, as stated by Dunn, support Sanders' covenantal nomism.

1. In the section titled "*The Amidah and Series of Petitions*" in his study on "Psalms and Prayers," Daniel Falk presents two groups of prayers that bear similarities in themes to *Amidah*. He says that on the surface these prayers would correspond generally to covenantal nomism, but then adds the qualification that "to apply a broad theological banner over all these prayers would obscure somewhat the significantly different emphases with regard to how the people are related to God."³² He explains that the first group of prayers is national, with Israel being "the realm of God's salvation" and the enemy being external or foreign oppressors, and the harm is seen "either as punishment for sins

³⁰James D. G. Dunn, review of D. A. Carson et al., eds., *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*), *Trinity Journal* 25 (2004): 112.

³¹Ibid.

³²Daniel Falk, "Psalms and Prayers," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 23.

of the nation or persecution."³³ The second group of prayers, by contrast, is individual, and the need is to be delivered from "community and personal sin, and in some cases, demonic threat."³⁴ He further points out that these prayers "have become conventional patterns of prayer with stereotyped language," and "their significance to petitioners in a life setting" is little known.³⁵ Thus he suggests that when drawing conclusions about soteriology from these texts, one needs to distinguish "between the language of the prayer and the practical appropriation of the prayer which often remains unclear."³⁶

Evaluating Dunn's notion that Sanders' covenantal nomism is supported by Falk's conclusion, it has to be noted that throughout his presentation of examples of the prayers, Falk does repeatedly say that it is on the basis of the special relationship between God and Israel that these prayers are made. However, in the example of 11QPs^a 19:1-18, he states that "[n]either the covenant nor Israel are mentioned."³⁷ Falk also concludes his review of the prayers by stating that it is on the basis of God's mercy "and usually also his covenant" that God answers his people's prayers.³⁸ At this point, one may agree with Dunn in saying that the twin emphases of covenantal nomism receive different weightings in different contexts and that in the prayers reviewed by Falk the framework of covenant is emphasized. As to Falk's comment that covenantal nomism cannot cover the significantly

³³Ibid.

³⁴Ibid.

³⁵Ibid., 24.

³⁶Ibid.

³⁷Ibid., 22.

³⁸Ibid., 23.

different emphases of these prayers in their depictions of God's relating to his people, this may be understood to show that Sanders' scheme is not broad enough to cover everything.

Falk's remark about Sanders' proposal not being able to capture the unique emphasis of the prayers is also seen in his treatment of the *Psalms of Solomon*. After saying how the author or authors of the *Psalms of Solomon* would find covenantal nomism congenial, Falk argues that covenantal nomism "does not do justice to the rhetorical function of the *Psalms of Solomon*."³⁹ He explains, "A major preoccupation of these psalms is to reinforce community boundaries and one cannot escape that religious conduct is central to their group distinction."⁴⁰ Falk points out that in the psalms the psalmist stresses that his community keeps the law while the Jewish sinners break the law. Falk further asserts that the community's observance of the law "does not at all necessarily add up to a system of entitlement to God's mercy based upon one's actions," but he then adds, "[T]o designate this restricted group-centered soteriology 'covenantal nomism' is ultimately not helpful."⁴¹ Therefore, one may conclude that Falk's account of the emphasis on the observance of the law in the *Psalms of Solomon* by the psalmist and his community, which is to differentiate themselves from other Jewish sinners, does not cohere with the focus of the national covenantal framework that Dunn says is inherent in the twin emphases of covenantal nomism.⁴²

³⁹Ibid., 51.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Ibid.

⁴²In the section of "*Covenant and Law*" in his treatment of *Psalms of Solomon*, Falk says, "[I]t is not covenant Israel but the psalmist's community that is of primary concern, in keeping with the rhetorical function of the psalms. Furthermore, Israel is not coterminous with the devout in *Psalms of Solomon*. The devout are in Israel, but Israel also contains sinners who will be judged by the standard of the covenant and excluded from the eschatological blessings" (ibid., 50).

2. In reference to Peter Enns' essay on "Expansions of Scripture," Dunn cites Enns' section on "*1 Esdras*," "*Additions to Daniel: Song of the Three, Susanna, Bel and the Dragon*," "*Ps.-Philo's Book of Biblical Antiquities*," and "Jubilees" in support of Sanders' covenantal nomism. In his part on *1 Esdras*, Enns says that this book "generally supports Sanders' understanding of Second Temple Judaism, albeit indirectly. It tells the story of an elect people, a people who are 'in' but who have transgressed the law, and the steps taken in response to this transgression."⁴³ At several places, Enns emphasizes that this work deals with the relationship between God and his elect people. He refers to the depiction in *1 Esdras* that, after the Judahites were led back to the land after the exile, the returnees were careful in their keeping of the law, and notes that this caution can only be understood within the framework of covenant.

In his discussions of the additions to the book of Daniel, namely, the Song of the Three, Susanna, and Bel and the Dragon, twice Enns relates his study to Sanders' covenantal nomism. First, in his comment on Susanna, Enns says that there is a common theme in the additions to Daniel which he expounds as follows:

God is with *his people* even in Babylon. He is always with them, not because an occasional hero proves himself or herself worthy, but because Israel belongs to him. The examples of Susanna, Daniel, and the others serve to provide models of proper behavior for God's people living in a pagan (Hellenistic?) environment, but not simply to be good people individually, but to behave in such a way as is worthy of the covenant with which they as a people have been entrusted. Again, this is a long way from saying that Susanna proves or disproves Sanders' thesis. We can say, however, that it is in general consistent with such a thesis.⁴⁴

⁴³Peter Enns, "Expansions of Scripture," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 75.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, 81 (emphasis in original).

Second, in his remark on Bel and the Dragon, after proposing to understand the appearance of the prophet Habakkuk in the story as a connection to "the God who acted in the past," Enns continues by saying that the perspective he had brought on Bel and the Dragon and the additions to Daniel as a group "is worth introducing to the general discussion of 'getting in and staying in' raised by Sanders."⁴⁵ Then Enns recapitulates the common topic of these stories: "Being a Jew on enemy turf meant being a faithful Torah-keeper, which in the case of these stories can be boiled down to this: worship the true God whatever the circumstances. Remain true to him and he will deliver you."⁴⁶ Since the covenant between God and Israel is an emphasis in these three works, and the observance of the law is depicted in them, they provide a parallel to Sanders' scheme and may be taken, as Dunn does, as supporting Sanders' phrase.

Peter Enns' section on Pseudo-Philo's *Biblical Antiquities* (*L.A.B.*) emphasizes the importance of covenant and law in this work and suggests that the relationship of covenant to law is to be understood in light of the fact that the commandments are "the special privilege of those who already enjoy covenantal status."⁴⁷ This seems to affirm Dunn's judgment that scholars' findings in Carson's volume support Sanders' covenantal nomism. However Enns does not in any way relate the above conclusion to Sanders' covenantal nomism. Sanders is mentioned only at the beginning of the section on *L.A.B.* when Enns explains why he includes this work even though Sanders does not work on this text.

⁴⁵Ibid., 83.

⁴⁶Ibid., 83.

⁴⁷Ibid., 92.

In the section on Jubilees, Enns discusses the tension between election and salvation. He questions how the covenant of God can be the basis of Israel's salvation, while covenantal status can be forfeited by transgressing against the commandments that lead to death. In the end he concludes that Sanders' assessment of Jubilees is sound, and that despite individual transgressions of the commandments, the election of Israel is by God's grace. Following this discussion, Enns comments on the imprecision of soteriology in Jubilees:

Despite Sanders' arguments, it is still not entirely clear how "salvation" can be by grace but "staying saved" is a matter of strict obedience. If salvation can be lost by disobedience—i.e., if obedience is necessary to "preserve" salvation—in what sense can we say with Sanders that "salvation *depends* on the grace of God"? How can there be sins unto death when *election* is the basis of salvation?⁴⁸

Enns questions Sanders' seeming equation of salvation with election. He says that "[i]t might be less confusing to say that *election* is by grace but *salvation* is by obedience."⁴⁹ He further suggests that perhaps one should speak of "being in" instead of "getting in," because the former "is by birth; it is nationalistic."⁵⁰ On the other hand, he explains that staying in "is a matter of individual effort," and acknowledges that the "individual effort must be seen within the context of the individual's self-understanding and confidence as a Jew, a confidence that rests on God's faithfulness in calling a particular people to himself."⁵¹ According to Enns, God is inclined to forgive, as seen in the atonement procedures provided with Torah; nevertheless, "The point still remains, however, that the

⁴⁸Ibid., 97 (emphasis in original).

⁴⁹Ibid., 98 (emphasis in original).

⁵⁰Ibid.

⁵¹Ibid.

final outcome is based on more than initial inclusion in the covenant."⁵² Thus Enns' conclusion is that Second Temple literature, especially Jubilees, shows that ultimate salvation depends upon works. This can be seen as a different emphasis from Sanders, who emphasizes that salvation is by God's election through grace in the context of covenant.

3. Richard Bauckham says that his findings of 1 Enoch (with the exception of the Parables of Enoch, which Sanders does not include in his discussion) are in agreement with Sanders in that (a) the texts declare that "the righteous are the true Israel, sharply distinguished from the sinners, who are Jewish apostates or Gentile oppressors"; (b) "the classifications are holistic, concerned with fundamental and permanent loyalties rather than with individual transgressions or good works"; and (c) obeying the law is about "'staying in' rather than 'getting in.'"⁵³ Nevertheless, Bauckham finds that Sanders does not do justice to the texts of 1 Enoch by stating that they show "much the same pattern of religion" as the rabbinic writings: Bauckham thinks that this view of Sanders "results from isolating the particular question he is pursuing from its wider context of thought, as well as from playing down the material difference between larger and narrower definitions of the true Israel in favor of a purely formal understanding of the issues."⁵⁴

Bauckham explains that the subjects of righteousness and salvation in the Enoch literature occur in the context of a world currently controlled by evil "on a cosmic and universal scale" where "apostasy (getting out) is widespread and domination by the pagan enemies of God and his

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Richard Bauckham, "Apocalypses," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 148.

⁵⁴Ibid.

people an all too familiar fact."⁵⁵ In such a context, the righteous are assured of their election and of God's mercy and promises to them and are encouraged to be loyal to God and to his law. Less remarked in scholarship, according to Bauckham, is "the righteous remnant of Israel and the universal and cosmic vision of these writings"; in 1 Enoch, there is both "the vindication of the righteous" and a universal righteousness which is "the outcome of the contest against evil in which the righteous are currently engaged."⁵⁶ Bauckham's position is tantamount to arguing that the concept of covenantal nomism is too narrow to hold the entire content of 1 Enoch. Bauckham's insistence that apostasy in 1 Enoch is widespread, which seems to apply to the majority of the Israelites, seems to challenge Sanders' covenantal nomism, as argued by Elliott in his work *The Survivors of Israel*.⁵⁷ Bauckham's comment on 4 Ezra, however, does support Sanders' notion of covenantal nomism.

4. Robert A. Kugler on "Testaments" concludes that the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, the *Testament of Moses*, and the *Testament of Job* give qualified support to Sanders' covenantal nomism. According to Kugler,

The *Testament of Moses* seemed to favor the view that the people of Israel are indeed chosen, although their fate in relationship to God is not ultimately dependent on what they do, but on God's abiding decision for them. The *Testament of Job* does favor the view that one must remain faithful to the electing God of Israel to receive his benefits, but it does not require believers to keep particular laws to sustain their relationship with God. In like fashion the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* hold the view that God has chosen Israel for a special relationship, and seem to require mostly reliance on God and little in the way of specific law-keeping to sustain that relationship.⁵⁸

⁵⁵Ibid., 148-9.

⁵⁶Ibid., 149.

⁵⁷Elliott, *The Survivors of Israel*, 521-33.

⁵⁸Robert A. Kugler, "Testaments," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 213.

These three works, in his view, all emphasize the abiding covenantal relationship that God has with the Israelites, but there is no stress on the Israelites' keeping of the law to stay in the covenant. The question becomes how to understand Kugler's notion of "qualified support." Shall one take it along the lines of Carson that the qualified support weakens Sanders' proposal, or shall one take it along the lines of Dunn that it supports Sanders' covenantal nomism?

Based upon other specific statements of Kugler, it seems that Carson's judgment is more convincing. In the *Testament of Moses*, Kugler proposes to understand the theology of this book from the affirmation of Moses in chapter 12 that even though the Israelites "will suffer the natural consequences of good and bad action in this life," God, who "made creation for Israel," will keep "his covenant and oath to sustain the people."⁵⁹ Placing this theology in the first-century historical context in which it exerts its impact, Kugler notes the theological perspective that "while Israel may suffer at the hands of its enemies, God will vindicate her in the end of time."⁶⁰ Applying these perspectives to the problem of covenantal nomism, Kugler affirms, "Thus the *Testament of Moses* meets Sanders' notion of covenantal nomism at least half-way: the *Testament* does understand Israel to have been elected by God, but it seems to preclude the possibility that Israel could 'unelect' itself by a failure to keep the law."⁶¹

According to Kugler, one finds also in the *Testament of Job* a lack of emphasis upon the observance of the law as a way to stay in the covenant. Contextualizing this work historically in the

⁵⁹Ibid., 196-7.

⁶⁰Ibid., 197.

⁶¹Ibid., 197.

early Roman period of Jews in Egypt, Kugler believes that this work "argues for perseverance in the faith in anticipation of rewards from God."⁶² Relating this theological point to Sanders' covenantal nomism, Kugler says:

Although there is a sense in which the *Testament* seems to accept the notion that God elects the faithful—in this case an Egyptian—and requires of them steadfastness in that relationship, the work's lack of interest in Jewish law as the means by which a relationship to God is sustained undercuts the degree to which the *Testament* may be said to exhibit Sanders' covenantal nomism.⁶³

5. Donald E. Gowan on "Wisdom" says that in terms of "getting in," a special relationship between God and Israel is affirmed in Sirach, Baruch, Wisdom of Solomon, and 4 Maccabees, while it is well-hidden in the Sentences of Pseudo-Phocylides.⁶⁴ In terms of "staying in," Gowan says that Baruch is "the only book in this group to consider the continuation of the covenant relationship to be uncertain" and that in Wisdom of Solomon and 4 Maccabees, due to the setting of persecution, there is "more interest in divine support for those suffering for their faithfulness than concern about what they may have done wrong."⁶⁵ The conclusion Gowan makes is as follows:

The books [Sirach, Baruch, Wisdom of Solomon, 4 Maccabees] thus begin with the assumption that the readers are "in," and that there is another group, the enemies, who are "out." Given the hazardous nature of Jewish existence during these centuries, the most frequently expressed concern is not how to remain "in," but how to survive physically, both as individuals and as a

⁶²Ibid., 204.

⁶³Ibid.

⁶⁴Donald E. Gowan, "Wisdom," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 238.

⁶⁵Ibid.

community, and the Old Testament message that God preserves the righteous is reaffirmed in various ways for that reason.⁶⁶

Gowan's evaluation indicates that, when the context and message of these books are taken into consideration, Sanders' covenantal nomism seems not broad enough to encompass their material, such as the theme of suffering, which Gowan emphasizes.

6. In his study "1QS and Salvation at Qumran," Markus Bockmuehl says that his findings in the Community Rule "are not fundamentally incompatible with those reached in E. P. Sanders' famous study of 1977: Qumran manifests an eschatological faith in which salvation and atonement for sins are not humanly earned but divinely granted by predestined election and membership in the life of the observant covenant community."⁶⁷ Bockmuehl's concluding remark meets the criterion of what Dunn would regard as supporting Sanders' covenantal nomism.

In summary, it seems that Dunn's comment that Carson's edited two-volume work should be called *Justification and Variegated Covenantal Nomism* is not justified. Even though there are several examples that support Sanders' covenantal nomism, there are more examples that qualify the notion. Sanders' scheme is not broad enough to cover the significant emphases of certain works. Moreover, there are a few examples that disapprove of Sanders' proposal altogether. Dunn's main argument in viewing Carson's edited work as approving Sanders' covenantal nomism is that the two elements of Sanders' phrase are affirmed even though the weight each element receives might be different. This reading, however, can overlook the particular direction a scholar is pursuing. Two examples will suffice here.

⁶⁶Ibid., 239.

⁶⁷Markus Bockmuehl, "1QS and Salvation at Qumran," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 412.

Dunn's comment on Martin McNamara's essay, "Some Targum Themes," is that the latter's "objection to the phrase [covenantal nomism] is not to the double emphasis itself (pp. 352-53), but to the static character of the term 'nomism' (p. 355)."⁶⁸ Dunn's brief comment on McNamara is basically correct. Nevertheless, McNamara does not stop at the point of the static character of the law, but rather directs more attention toward how to understand "covenant" and even moves beyond covenant. McNamara explains that the word nomism "tends to denote a static position, conformity to a defined set of rules" while covenant "has reference to a living God" and "is not a term that describes a static religion."⁶⁹ He further stresses that "[c]ovenant cannot be defined by law, be that law as it was understood by Qumran, by early or later Rabbinic tradition, or by any other grouping" and suggests to understand the factor of obedience, which Sanders treats as an appropriate response to the covenant, not only as "obedience in response to covenant, obedience to commandments, but also obedience to the voice of the living God."⁷⁰ What McNamara aims at is that God's voice "may have been made known in laws or traditions, yet could again speak in a self-revelation as God himself would see fit to make."⁷¹ McNamara's view of obedience as a response to the voice of the living God may be understood as a qualification of Sanders' covenantal nomism. It suggests that Sanders' covenantal nomism cannot be the one umbrella under which everything is placed.

⁶⁸Dunn, Review of Carson et al., 113.

⁶⁹Martin McNamara, "Some Targum Themes," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 355.

⁷⁰Ibid., 355.

⁷¹Ibid., 355-6.

Dunn's reading of David Hay on "Philo of Alexandria" is that "it is not so much a matter of Philo disowning the double emphasis of the phrase as of recognizing Philo's idiosyncrasy (pp. 376-78)."⁷² According to Hay, Philo's view is that the law "provides means of restoring those who have transgressed."⁷³ He states that "Philo takes for granted God's love and willingness to forgive sinners who repent," and that even though Philo places emphasis on grace, he still affirms God's rewarding the righteous and punishing the wicked.⁷⁴

Nevertheless, in the earlier section "Israel, Jews, and Gentiles," Hay offers four qualifications that suggested to him that it is "not very useful to speak of Philo as a representative of 'covenantal nomism.'"⁷⁵ According to Hay, the first two of the qualifications are recognized by Sanders: (1) "Philo does not emphasize 'nomism' or offer clear ideas about the nation's future redemption or life after death"; (2) Philo's major concern is "with the individual's search for God"; (3) "Philo says very little about God's covenant(s) with Israel"; and (4) "his framework of religious thought is not soteriological."⁷⁶

Compared with Dunn's reading of Carson's volume, Simon J. Gathercole in his review of Carson's work offers a more balanced reading of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*:

⁷²Dunn, Review of Carson et al., 113.

⁷³David M. Hay, "Philo of Alexandria," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 376.

⁷⁴Ibid., 377-78.

⁷⁵Ibid., 370.

⁷⁶Ibid.

This volume at times agrees with Sanders' analysis with respect to some texts . . . , but also argues that other texts can construe the soteriological function of Law-observance differently. Such observance of Torah is noted in various places as crucial for acceptance within the covenant, maintenance of status within the covenant, and for eschatological salvation at the judgment.⁷⁷

Moreover, the evaluation of Dunn's review above shows that Carson is generally correct in his presentation of the findings of the contributors in his edited volume except on one major point. Carson repeatedly emphasizes in his summary that there is merit theology in certain works and that Sanders' covenantal nomism itself also contains merit theology. It is more likely that this shows Carson's own reading of the primary sources than of the essayists themselves. Two examples are given here.

Carson mentions that in Bockmuehl's reconstruction of the textual development of 1QS, the latter "argues that its direction is precisely toward the sort of 'works of the law' that the apostle Paul would have opposed."⁷⁸ This argument might cause one to wonder whether Bockmuehl challenges the earlier statement he made that 1QS conforms to Sanders' covenantal nomism. The answer is negative because Bockmuehl places this legal or theological development still in the covenantal framework. An emphasis in Bockmuehl's essay is that "the Qumran community had a strongly covenantal understanding of the salvation of Israel as centered in its own covenant community."⁷⁹

⁷⁷Gathercole, Simon J. "Early Judaism and Covenantal Nomism: A Review Article" (review of D. A. Carson et al., eds., *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* [vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*]), *The Evangelical Quarterly* 76 (2004): 155.

⁷⁸Carson, "Summaries and Conclusions," 547.

⁷⁹Bockmuehl, "1QS and Salvation at Qumran," 413.

Another example is when Carson says that, among the competing theologies within the Tannaitic literature, "part of this heritage is certainly replete with merit theology."⁸⁰ Philip S. Alexander, in his study on Tannaitic literature, makes the comment: "Tannaitic Judaism can be seen as fundamentally a religion of works-righteousness, and it is none the worse for that."⁸¹ To evaluate Carson's comment about merit theology in certain works in the Second Temple literature takes us beyond the scope of this chapter because it would require an in-depth study of the texts themselves.

Nevertheless, it has to be noted that certain scholars in Carson's edited volume do observe that works are needed to preserve one's salvation in the texts they studied. For example, Enns in his study of *Jubilees* says, "Despite the fact that covenant is the 'basis' of salvation, as Sanders argues, the fact remains that the texts discussed in this essay, and *Jubilees* especially, certainly emphasize the importance of obedience in maintaining that covenantal status, in staying saved."⁸² Carson in his conclusion also alludes to a comment made by Bauckham in his study of *4 Ezra* concerning works meriting salvation. When talking about the relationship between the contribution of the righteous to their salvation and God's grace in *4 Ezra*, Bauckham says,

God gives salvation to those members of his elect people who have kept the terms of the covenant and so merit the salvation promised in the covenant. . . . Undoubtedly the result is a strong emphasis on the need to merit eschatological reward by difficult obedience to the Law. . . . This does not make it, as Sanders thought, a unique exception to the "covenantal nomism" he described . . . But *4 Ezra* does rather importantly illustrate how the basic and very flexible pattern of covenantal nomism could take forms in which the emphasis is overwhelmingly on meriting salvation by works of obedience to the Law, with the result that

⁸⁰Ibid., 543-4.

⁸¹Philip S. Alexander, "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature," in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism* (vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*; ed. D. A. Carson et al.; WUNT 2/140; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001), 300.

⁸²Enns, "Expansions of Scripture," 98.

human achievement takes center-stage and God's grace, while presupposed, is effectively marginalized.⁸³

Even though the emphasis of Enns and Bauckham above does not mean that Sanders' covenantal nomism should be rejected, they do point out that in certain Jewish texts in the Second Temple period sometimes the focus is all on one's works, with the result that God's grace becomes sidelined, and works merit salvation. Their comments shed light on the Jewish believers' demand in Luke's account in Acts 15:1.

This review of Carson's edited volume of Sanders' scheme does not mean that Sanders' proposal should be rejected. Carson's review also does not mean that Sanders' scheme should be accepted without considering whether it is compatible with the texts studied. Several reviewers have noted that Sanders' covenantal nomism is not helpful in regard to the texts they analyzed. Therefore, when we go to the text of Acts 15 in the next chapter, the text of Acts 15 will be studied to determine whether it is amenable to Sanders' notion of covenantal nomism. For example, the connection between circumcision and salvation is clearly stated in Acts 15:1, and this is not in agreement with Sanders' covenantal nomism.

⁸³Bauckham, "Apocalypses," 173-4. On this point G. K. Beale ("The Overstated 'New' Perspective?" (review of D. A. Carson et al., eds., *The Paradoxes of Paul* [vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*]), *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19 (2009): 88) says, "Sanders' paradigm is, in reality, broad enough to allow for some Jewish sources to include a notion of special grace enabling one to keep the 'condition of staying in,' while allowing other sources to include an idea of this 'condition' entailing a concept of 'earning'/'merit.' Thus, it needs to be underscored that Sanders' model easily tolerates the notion that a person's repentance and obedience can be done apart from God's gracious and direct inner working, which in some sources is the key to 'staying in' and benefiting salvifically from God's gracious covenantal promises. It would seem that, in cases such as these, Sanders would have to agree that God's grace is only external (God alone has set up a covenantal framework in which one finds oneself), not internal, working to cause faith and obedience (though in Qumran, on the other hand, he sees that initial salvific insight comes from divine intervention within a person). Accordingly, there is room here for an independent human contribution of exercising faith or performing works or both. If this is not "merit" theology (which I think it is), then it comes exceedingly close to it."

Rabbinic Judaism

Through a study of rabbinic Judaism, this chapter next seeks to understand the request of the Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5. In Luke's account, when Paul and Barnabas were sent to Jerusalem to meet with the apostles and elders concerning the teaching of circumcision for salvation, the believers from the sect of the Pharisees insisted that it was necessary to circumcise the Gentile believers and have them keep the law. The motivation of these Pharisaic believers is not specified in Acts 15:5.

The reason to use rabbinic literature to shed light upon the request of the Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5 is mainly because of the comment Sanders had made about the connection between rabbinic Judaism and Pharisaism in his monograph, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*. In spelling out his assumption that the rabbinic material he used "provides an accurate presentation of Rabbinic discussions" in 70-200 CE "and especially . . . during the last two-thirds of the second century c.e.," Sanders further clarifies that he does not "suppose that it provides an accurate picture of Judaism or even of Pharisaism in the time of Jesus and Paul, although it would be surprising if there were no connection."⁸⁴ Elsewhere in *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* Sanders also notes that his intention is not "to discuss 'the religion of the Pharisees,' or that of any other party or sect *qua* party or sect," and that his discussion "focuses on bodies of literature, not on parties or sects which must be reconstructed from disparate sources."⁸⁵

Concerning Sanders' words that the reconstruction of sects has to be from different sources, it must be said here that it is beyond the scope of this dissertation to study various sources to

⁸⁴Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 60.

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, 62 (emphasis in original).

arrive at what we can call the first-century Pharisaism and from there to understand the request of the Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5. In his section on "Pharisees and Rabbis," Sanders refers to scholars who cite "Rabbinic passages as evidence for Pharisaism," scholars who are skeptical about finding Pharisaism in rabbinic literature, and scholars who have tried "to determine what can be surely known about the Pharisees based on Rabbinic evidence."⁸⁶ Based upon the precedent example given by Sanders of viewing a link between Pharisaism and rabbinic Judaism, this chapter adopts this position without entering into the debate with scholars who hold the opposite view. This decision is mainly based on convenient reasons: The rabbinic literature deals with the law, Acts 15 also revolves around the issue of the law, and some scholars connect Pharisaism with rabbinic literature. Therefore in the second part of this chapter we use the rabbinic literature to shed light upon the request of the Pharisees in Acts 15:5.

Moreover, Jacob Neusner's comment about the difference between Pharisees in Josephus' works and in the rabbinic traditions supports our decision to limit our study of the religious viewpoints of the Pharisees to the rabbinic literature. With reference to Steve Mason's chapters on Josephus' Pharisees in his co-edited volume, *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, Neusner points out that "Josephus's Pharisaic records pertain mostly to the years from the rise of the Hasmoneans to their fall" and that the Pharisees "were a political party that tried to get control of the government of Jewish Palestine, not a little sect drawn apart from the common society by observance of laws of table fellowship."⁸⁷ Neusner further states, with reference to several contributors in his co-edited volume,

⁸⁶Ibid., 60-61.

⁸⁷Jacob Neusner, "The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 CE: An Overview," in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees* (eds. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton; Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007), 301.

In Quest of the Historical Pharisees, that "the gospels' Pharisees appropriately are much like those of the rabbis; they belong to the Roman period, and their legal agendas are virtually identical: tithing, purity laws, Sabbath observance, vows, and the like."⁸⁸

Before moving next to the summary of some scholars' treatment of rabbinic Judaism, it is necessary to consider Sanders' reference to two scholars who have tried "to determine what can be surely known about the Pharisees based on Rabbinic evidence."⁸⁹ Neusner is one of them. Neusner's study comes into our focus in finding Pharisaic belief from the rabbinic literature. Neusner in a series of articles in his co-edited volume, *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, devotes attention to the study of pre-70 Pharisees in the rabbinic traditions. Neusner says that in rabbinic literature pertaining to the Pharisees, a main concern is for the laws of table fellowship. Their primary concern is for daily life. In Neusner's words,

The rabbis' Pharisees are mostly figures of the Late Herodian and Roman periods. They were a nonpolitical group, whose chief religious concerns were for the proper preservation of ritual purity in connection with eating secular food (not deriving from God's altar in the Jerusalem Temple or eaten in the Temple courtyard), and for the observance of the dietary laws of the day, especially those pertaining to the proper nurture and harvest of agricultural crops. Their secondary religious concern was with the proper governance of the party itself.⁹⁰

Neusner's portrayal of pre-70 Pharisees as being concerned especially with ritual purity finds a degree of support in Anthony J. Saldarini's treatment of the Pharisees in the rabbinic literature. While—according to Saldarini—Neusner holds the view that "the Pharisees ceased to be a politically active group, left the political arena during the time of Herod and the Romans and took on more

⁸⁸Ibid.

⁸⁹Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 61.

⁹⁰Neusner, "The Rabbinic Traditions," 301.

sectarian characteristics," for Saldarini, "the Pharisees were a politically and religiously based group in a complex society," and "they were always interested in political power and always a factor in society at large."⁹¹ In linking Pharisees with the rabbinic literature, Saldarini states,

When the Mishnah and Tosefta are analyzed using Neusner's criteria (the logic of Mishnah's argument and the attested attributions), by far the largest body of law which can be somewhat reliably assigned to the early and mid-first century concerns ritual purity, tithes and other food laws and sabbath and festival observance. . . . We do not know for certain who developed these laws dating from before the destruction, but the usual hypothesis that it was the Pharisees who bequeathed these laws to the first generation of rabbis after the destruction of the Temple is most probable, based on the gospel evidence of Pharisaic interest in purity and food and on Josephus' claim that the Pharisees had their own interpretation of some Jewish laws. Still, we must remain cautious because we do not know directly the authors of these laws.⁹²

Saldarini's reservation about reconstructing Pharisees "from stories of the pre-destruction sages and from the early stages of the mishnaic tradition" is also seen in his concluding chapter on the Pharisees: "[S]ince the traditions to be preserved in the Mishnah were selected by the post-destruction rabbis, their selection and narrow scope may reflect their interests rather than the traditions and interests of the Pharisees."⁹³ Nevertheless, in several places where Saldarini links Pharisees with the early tradition in the rabbinic literature, he does provide possible comparisons with Acts 15:5. For example, in explaining "the 'sectarian' agenda of the pre-70 sages" sociologically, Saldarini states that the emphasis on the observances of tithing, ritual purity by lay people, Sabbath,

⁹¹Anthony J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 132. Throughout his book Saldarini keeps emphasizing that in ancient society religion is embedded in politics. For example, in a sub-section called "Religion in Ancient Society," Saldarini states: "In traditional society, including the Roman empire and Jewish Palestinian society, religion was embedded in the political and social fabric of the community" (ibid., 5).

⁹²Ibid., 213.

⁹³Ibid., 286.

and other festivals "probably reflects the Pharisees' internal rules and program for a renewed Judaism."⁹⁴ In regard to the reformation that the Pharisees sought to bring to Judaism, Saldarini says, "The Pharisees probably sought a new, communal commitment to a strict Jewish way of life based on adherence to the covenant."⁹⁵

However, even with such comments that might provide a possible background to understand why the Pharisees in Luke's account in Acts 15:5 insist on circumcision and keeping the law for Gentile believers, Saldarini does not provide textual support for the points he makes. This is mainly due to the fact that Saldarini is using sociological categories to reconstruct the Pharisees from the rabbinic literature.⁹⁶ Since the focus of Saldarini in his reconstruction of the Pharisees from the rabbinic literature is on characterizing the Pharisees as a group, his approach offers little help in interpreting Acts 15:5, a project that depends more on belief of the Pharisees and less on sociological features.⁹⁷ Saldarini asserts that the rabbinic sages and Josephus "agree that the Pharisees were a

⁹⁴Ibid., 215.

⁹⁵Ibid., 282.

⁹⁶Agreeing with Neusner's caution against "calling the first century framers of Mishnah's early rules a 'sect,'" Saldarini then stresses, "Our own reconstruction of the Pharisees will use wider sociological categories in order to give greater precision and probability to hypotheses concerning the nature of the Pharisaic group" (ibid., 214).

⁹⁷For example, Saldarini proposes to understand "[t]he houses of Hillel and Shammai" as "factions, that is, temporary associations of disparate people grouped around a leader," and adds that "[t]hose factions which persist for a long time and outlive their leaders become a formal group with an organized, self-perpetuating leadership and defined social identity" (ibid., 210). He holds that the rise of factions is due to weakness in central authority in a society. He views "[t]he late first century and early second century accounts of the houses" as "one of many organizations of zealous Jews which provided a program for defending and reforming Judaism in the face of Roman and Hellenistic pressure" (ibid).

political, religious group which sought power and influence in Palestinian Judaism."⁹⁸ In a comment about "the 'sectarian' agenda of the pre-70 sages," Saldarini claims that "a complete account of the first century Pharisees' beliefs, rules, customs and commitments" does not come from rabbinic literature but from the Bible.⁹⁹

Even in his chapter on "Josephus' Descriptions of the Pharisees and Sadducees," where Saldarini lays out Josephus' portrayal of the belief of the Pharisees,¹⁰⁰ the content seems not to provide helpful points to understand Acts 15:5. The reason is that Josephus' rendering of the thought of the Pharisees is not related directly with the Pharisees' interpretation of the law¹⁰¹ while in Luke's account

⁹⁸Ibid., 211.

⁹⁹Ibid., 215. Saldarini explains that the Pharisees' "own internal literature would presume the fundamental beliefs and practices of Judaism, acceptance of the Bible and other major characteristics of Judaism" (ibid). He thinks that what separates the Pharisees from other groups in Judaism is "those (often minor) points of law and practice" which the Pharisees focus on (ibid., 215-16). He adds that "the tradition of using priestly laws concerning purity, food and marriage in order to separate, protect and identify Judaism goes back to the priestly tradition in the Exile and the regulations for Judaism championed by Ezra and Nehemiah in the restoration period" (ibid., 216).

¹⁰⁰According to Saldarini, the thought of the Pharisees as presented by Josephus in the *War* is that they "[a]ttribute everything to fate and to God," and "[t]o act rightly or wrongly rests mostly with humans but fate cooperates in each action," and they believe that "[e]very soul is imperishable," and "[o]nly the soul of the good passes into another body," but "[t]he souls of the wicked suffer eternal punishment" (ibid., 110). Saldarini says that in the *Antiquities* Josephus also provides a parallel description of the thought and behavior of the Pharisees to that in the *War*. In the chart that Saldarini lists for the thought of the Pharisees as depicted by Josephus in the *Antiquities*, the Pharisees "follow the guidance of what *logos* says is good," explain human doings "by a combination of fate and human will," and believe in the imperishableness of soul and "rewards and punishments under the earth" (ibid., 112-3).

¹⁰¹Even though Saldarini mentions that in the *War* Josephus "introduces the Pharisees by saying that they *are considered* the most accurate interpreters of the law," from Saldarini's further account Josephus does not expand on this point (ibid., 111; emphasis original). Saldarini points out that "Josephus keeps his distance from the Pharisees' reputation as the most accurate interpreters of the laws by the use of the Greek verb *dokeō*, just as he did when speaking of their activities during Alexandra's reign" (ibid). He also adds that Pharisees are "one of the schools of thought in Judaism,"

in Acts 15:5 the Pharisees insist to have the Gentile believers circumcised and ordered to keep the law. Moreover, in order to interpret Josephus' presentation of the Pharisees, Saldarini attempts to discern Josephus' purpose for writing. He says that Josephus likes order, not turmoil in society. Josephus mentions the Pharisees when there is disorder in society. It must be said that such political tendentiousness in Josephus does not contribute in a helpful way to understanding the issues present in Acts 15.

Returning to Neusner's rendering of pre-70 Pharisaism in the rabbinic documents as concerned about table fellowship, it needs to be noted that Neusner's proposal sheds possible light on Acts 15:5. The reason why the Pharisaic believers insist that it is necessary to have the Gentile believers circumcised and keep the law is that by doing so the Jewish believers can have table fellowship with the Gentile believers. As will be discussed in chapter 3 of this work, Mikeal C. Parsons views the request of the Pharisaic believers along this line.¹⁰² Nevertheless, there is a difficulty in applying Neusner's finding of the Pharisees' concerns in rabbinic literature to Acts 15:5. The concern for table fellowship may explain the Pharisaic believers' insistence upon the Gentile believers' keeping of the law, but it is not sufficient to explain their demand that the Gentile believers be circumcised. Therefore, it appears that the study of the Pharisees specifically in the rabbinic documents as a whole is relevant to our pursuit of understanding the reasons for the Pharisaic believers' demand in Acts 15:5.

but not the one "in which Josephus is most interested, though he does note their prominent reputation" (ibid).

¹⁰²Mikeal C. Parsons (*Acts* [Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008], 210) holds that the issue in Acts 15:5 has to do with "whether Gentiles and Jews can commingle without the Jews' being defiled by association with Gentiles, who are by nature unclean."

Next is a summary of the following scholarly views in their treatment of rabbinic Judaism: E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, George Foot Moore's *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, C. G. Montefiore's *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays*, Abraham Joshua Heschel's *Heavenly Torah*, Solomon Schechter's *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*, Friedrich Avemarie's *Tora und Leben*, and Philip S. Alexander's "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature." In the conclusion that follows, there will be a comment upon these various proposals and a comparison of various aspects of rabbinic Judaism with Acts 15.

E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*

Sanders says that he focused upon the Tannaitic Literature from 70-130 CE for his construction of Second Temple Judaism. Sanders acknowledges that Tannaitic literature is composite, but his focus is on how the religion functions in terms of entering and staying in. The point he repeats throughout the section on the Tannaitic Literature is that God chooses Israel and gives them a covenant, and Israel's response to God's reign as their king is to obey the commandments that God gave. He says that this election of God is unconditional, such that all Israel will be saved and will inherit the world to come, except for those who forfeit the covenant.

Sanders devotes several sections to the study of rabbinic religion. In "The election and the covenant," Sanders probes the rationales that the rabbis give for God's election of Israel. He first notes passages where "a Rabbi explicitly states that entrance into the covenant was prior to the fulfillment of commandments," that is, where God's election precedes any and all human responses.¹⁰³ Sanders then lays out three kinds of reasons given by the rabbis why God chose Israel. First, "God

¹⁰³Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 85.

offered the covenant (and the commandments attached to it) to all, but only Israel accepted it"; second, warrants for God's choice are found "either in the patriarchs or in the exodus generation or on the condition of future obedience"; and third, "God chose Israel for his name's sake."¹⁰⁴ Sanders emphasizes that reasons such as these show that "God's choice [of Israel] was not capricious or arbitrary."¹⁰⁵

In the section on "Obedience and disobedience; reward and punishment", Sanders argues that "[t]he statements [of the rabbis] that God pays what is due are partly for exhortative purposes, but also rest ... on the firm conviction that God is reasonable and just."¹⁰⁶ Sanders also cites the other thought of the rabbis that "God was merciful toward those who basically intended to obey, even though their performance might have been a long way from perfect."¹⁰⁷

In the section on "Reward and punishment and the world to come," Sanders presents the Tannaitic view that "punishment and reward are basically carried out in the world to come."¹⁰⁸ While being careful to show that God's justice is not a matter of "balancing merits against demerits," Sanders concludes,

Statements [of the rabbis] to the effect that a man should behave *as if* his deeds were evenly balanced and as if the next act would determine his fate, as well as statements that he is judged by the majority of his deeds, must be seen in the entire context of Rabbinic exhortation to obey

¹⁰⁴Ibid., 87-88.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., 98.

¹⁰⁶Ibid., 124.

¹⁰⁷Ibid., 125.

¹⁰⁸Ibid.

the commandments, which includes statements to the effect that one transgression may damn and that one fulfillment may save.¹⁰⁹

In the section on "Salvation by membership in the covenant and atonement," Sanders declares by way of summary:

The all-pervasive view is this: all Israelites have a share in the world to come unless they renounce it by renouncing God and his covenant. All sins, no matter of what gravity, which are committed within the covenant, may be forgiven as long as a man indicates his basic intention to keep the covenant by atoning, especially by repenting of transgression.¹¹⁰

George Foot Moore's Tannaitic Judaism

Moore argues that normative Judaism is rabbinic Judaism. In the first part of his work he traces aspects of the history of Second Temple Judaism such as the Maccabean revolt and the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE and 135 CE. In the second part he presents the doctrines of Judaism. He notes the perpetuity of the law. He devotes considerable space to the topic of repentance and forgiveness. He views the two laws (the written and the unwritten law of God) as the revealed will of God.

Concerning repentance, Moore says that the Mishnah "makes repentance the indispensable condition of the remission of every kind of sin, and this, with the other side of it, namely, that God freely and fully remits the sins of the penitent, is a cardinal doctrine of Judaism; it may properly be called the Jewish doctrine of salvation."¹¹¹ He emphasizes that before the destruction of

¹⁰⁹Ibid., 146.

¹¹⁰Ibid., 147.

¹¹¹George Foot Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim* (3 vols.; New York: Schocken Books, 1971), 2:500.

the temple in 70CE, "the principle had been established that the efficacy of every species of expiation was morally conditioned—without repentance no rites availed."¹¹²

Regarding forgiveness, Moore notes that forgiveness is "a prerogative of God," that God is merciful, that he "is moved to forgive sin by his own character," and that God's love for Israel is based upon his love for the fathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.¹¹³ Moore claims that there is no rabbinic teaching of the "merit of the fathers" as "corresponding to the Roman Catholic doctrine of the treasury of merits."¹¹⁴ He declares,

The "merit of the fathers" is no treasury of supererogatory and superabundant good works; and above all, there was no Church, and no Pope to dispense it upon his own conditions. That God, having regard to the character of the patriarchs, his relations to them and his promises to them, in his good pleasure shows special favor or undeserved lenience to their posterity, is a wholly different thing. Men may seek of God the forgiveness of sins "for the sake of the fathers"; but they cannot claim to have their demerit offset by the merit of the fathers.¹¹⁵

Moore's way of understanding correctly the "merit of the fathers" in rabbinic doctrine also occurs in Sanders, who makes similar comments in his treatment of the Tannaitic literature and mentions the work of Moore in this area.¹¹⁶

¹¹²Ibid., 2:505.

¹¹³Ibid., 2:535-6.

¹¹⁴Ibid., 2:544.

¹¹⁵Ibid., 2:544-5.

¹¹⁶Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 103-4, 183-98.

C G. Montefiore's *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays*¹¹⁷

Montefiore compares the Judaism of 300 or 500 CE with the Pauline epistles. His conclusion is that rabbinic Judaism is not the proper background for understanding Paul.¹¹⁸ He says that the God of rabbinic Judaism is near, and the keeping of the law depicted in it is joy, while Paul's Judaism is pessimistic and full of the uncertainty of overcoming sin. He emphasizes that if Paul were a typical rabbinic Jew, he would not have ignored "the Rabbinic doctrine of repentance."¹¹⁹

Even though Montefiore leaves to other scholars the question of the relationship between the Judaism of 300 or 500 CE and that of 50 CE, he does say that the Judaism of 50 CE should not be very different from that of 300 or 500 CE. He says that in rabbinic Judaism there is no despair for not being able to keep the law because the remedies of divine forgiveness and human repentance are provided in it. He further notes that rabbinic Judaism does not expect its people to keep the law perfectly. Moreover, God will help one to keep the law. He explains that Paul's Judaism is cold and rather pessimistic, and that it belongs to Diaspora Judaism. He says that the Jews in the Diaspora, surrounded by Gentiles, had perhaps grown to view the law as a list of Do's and Don'ts and were thus unlike the Jews in Palestine, who were accustomed to the traditions of the law. He further explains that

¹¹⁷C. G. Montefiore, *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays* (London: Max Goschen, 1914).

¹¹⁸For a critique of this view of Montefiore, see W. D. Davies, *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980), 1-16. Davies says that in the first century and prior, Jerusalem and Palestine were as much influenced by Hellenism as were other places in the Diaspora and that the Diaspora Jews were equally rooted in or connected with the Palestinian Judaism (for example, through the synagogue). Davies argues that Paul is deeply rooted in a rabbinic tradition.

¹¹⁹Montefiore, *Judaism*, 66.

the reasons why Paul has to critique the law include the Gentile mission, the Messiah, and mysticism. Montefiore does say that rabbinic Judaism fits better with Jesus than with Paul.

Abraham Joshua Heschel's *Heavenly Torah*¹²⁰

Heschel introduces the views of Rabbi Akiva and Rabbi Ishmael. The helpful point of this book is that through the introduction of these two rabbis one can understand how the later rabbinic inventions and expositions of the law can be classified according to these two schools. The portion that is particularly apropos entails Heschel's explanations that Rabbi Akiva held a strict view of obedience to the law while Rabbi Ishmael held a lenient view of the observance of the law. In Heschel's discussions of the keeping of the law, salvation by works and merit theology are not used as categories.

Solomon Schechter's *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*¹²¹

In the introduction, Schechter states the impossibility of arriving at "an orderly and complete system of Rabbinic theology" because the fragments that are preserved offer "some aspects of the theology of the Rabbis, which may again be modified by another aspect, giving us another side of the same subject."¹²² Like Heschel's *Heavenly Torah*, Schechter also emphasizes the aspect of joy in the keeping of the law. In describing the Father-Son relationship between God and Israel, Schechter says that a consequence "of this fatherly relation is that Israel feels a certain ease and delight in the

¹²⁰Abraham Joshua Heschel, *Heavenly Torah: As Refracted through the Generations* (ed. & trans. Gordon Tucker and Leonard Levine; New York: Continuum, 2010).

¹²¹Solomon Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (New York: Schocken Books, 1961; repr., Woodstock, Vt.: Jewish Lights, 1993).

¹²²Ibid., 16.

fulfillment of the Law" such that, even if Israel does not keep the Law perfectly, they know that "as a loving father" God will not direct his anger toward the son.¹²³

In the chapter "The Joy of the Law" Schechter lists reasons for Israel's zeal for the law, which are "the motive of love, the privilege of bearing witness to God's relationship to the world, the attainment of holiness in which the Law educated Israel," and "the joy felt by the Rabbis in the performance of the Law and the harmony which the Rabbis perceived in the life lived according to the Torah."¹²⁴ Earlier in the same chapter Schechter talks about *Lishmah*. He explains, "By *Lishmah* is understood the performance of the Law for its own sake, or rather for the sake of him who wrought (commanded) it, excluding all worldly intentions."¹²⁵ Schechter adds that doing the law for the sake of the law is "the highest ideal of the religionist," but because not everybody can reach that degree, some concessions were made.¹²⁶ Schechter adds that "the notion of *Lishmah* excluded even the intention of fulfilling a law with the hope of getting such rewards as are promised by the Scriptures."¹²⁷

While Sanders places the keeping of the law in the framework of covenant, Schechter puts God's demand of law-keeping in the framework of kingdom. The reason for God's demands of the

¹²³Ibid., 55.

¹²⁴Ibid., 168-9.

¹²⁵Ibid., 159-60.

¹²⁶Ibid., 161.

¹²⁷Ibid., 162.

Israelites that they keep his decrees is that they have received God's kingdom.¹²⁸ Characterizing Israel as a nation closely tied with the Torah, Schechter says that the way for the kingdom of heaven to be expanded is through repentance and proselytism, and he says that the Gentiles who fulfill the laws of the Torah may enter the kingdom of heaven.¹²⁹

Friedrich Avemarie's *Tora und Leben*¹³⁰

Avemarie opens his summary with the comment that, for the early rabbinic tradition, every attempt at a general answer to the question of the meaning of Torah for salvation is impossible. He points out that, concerning the meaning and purpose of the Torah and the reason why a person should keep it and fulfill its commandments, there are various responses in the rabbinic literature due to various definitions of Torah and consequently various functions of Torah. Avemarie spells out further the relationship between different definitions and various functions of Torah. (1) In relation to God, Torah appears as the absolute word of command, which is to be followed only because God has commanded it. (2) In relation to Israel, the Torah is God's gift of grace and salvation; Israel is chosen by God, and the acceptance of his kingship obliged Israel to accept his commandments, which puts her above other nations. (3) In view of the human individual and the human community, the Torah is useful in many ways. (4) From the aspect of punishment, Torah is the standard for the earthly and

¹²⁸Ibid., 116.

¹²⁹Ibid., 106.

¹³⁰Friedrich Avemarie, *Tora und Leben: Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur* (TSAJ 55; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996). The following recapitulation of the summary of his findings is from pages 575-84.

eschatological well-being of both Israel as a whole and individually; there is reward for observance of the law and punishment for transgression of the law.

However, Avemarie qualifies his words by saying that, strictly speaking, such a classification of rabbinic statements is not very appropriate because there is overlap in each of the categories and a less orderly picture in the sources. Moreover, he says that in a given text, several factors may come into play, but none of them is essential as an argumentative basis for the claims of Torah. At its most extreme, Avemarie says, the reason to keep the law is for the law's own sake. Avemarie notes further that the concepts employed in his study of early rabbinic thought were not always recognized by them and not always to the same degree, while some concepts have undoubtedly developed only over time. Some notions are found in the early rabbinic literature only sporadically or restrict themselves to an individual book or to certain complexes of tradition.

Nevertheless, Avemarie says that at least since the second century CE certain fundamental convictions have persisted without major modifications, including the idea that God is the Lord and that the duty of man is to obey; that the Torah is a gift of salvation and a badge of honor for Israel, and that the commandments serve life in the narrowest and in the broadest possible sense, both in this world and in the world to come, for the individual Israelite and for the people as a whole. He also notes the problem of the relationship between obedience and reward: even though it is indeed true that obedience leads to reward, there is also the exhortation to keep the law for the sake of God or for the sake of the law itself.

In clarifying the relationship between Torah and life, Avemarie says that Torah goes beyond the matter of leading to life. The requirement to keep the commandments, in the rabbinic view, is not one-sidedly dependent on Torah's relation to salvation and life, and yet acceptance and observance of the commandments do directly lead to salvation and life.

Avemarie approaches rabbinic soteriology in terms of what a person or what Israel should do to acquire earthly happiness and eternal life. He offers new insights from an examination of two areas—the demand for obedience and the assessment of human abilities. Concerning the demand for obedience, Avemarie says that there are very diverse views. In some texts, a proselyte is expected to embrace all of the laws, while in other the commandments that a proselyte has to practice are special and not very numerous. Extraordinary people who keep a law not merely for one day, but for a full year or longer, are known as "mighty ones" (Ps 103:20). Further, Avemarie cites two views on the requirement of doing the law: on the one hand, the texts emphasize that God's commandment is not overtaxing, but on the other hand there is the view that the demands of the Torah are much more stringent than idolatry. Avemarie concludes by emphasizing that the nature of human beings and the law is such that the law is doable, an idea rarely expressed but implied throughout rabbinic literature, and fundamentally different from that of Paul or the Qumran texts.

In his review of research Avemarie declares that the basic idea of Weber and Billerbeck's approach that Israel receives the commandments in order to win merits for eternal life is not tenable. Secondly, he states that the thesis of G. F. Moore that the participation of Israel in the coming world is founded solely on the fact of Israelites being the chosen people of God is also untenable. He points out that regardless of how one understands m. San. 10.1, which states that every Israelite shall have a share in the world to come, it is important not to ignore many other texts that connect the participation in the coming world in a unique way with the adoption of the Torah, its study, and the observance of its precepts.

Thirdly, Avemarie critiques Sanders' program where he follows Moore in tracing participation in eternal life back to God's covenant promise. By doing so, Sanders has removed the participation in eternal life so remotely from the connection between obedience and recompense that the only thing that remains is the requirement of a basic willingness to obey. Avemarie points out that

even though m. San. 10.1 can be harmonized with Sanders' argument, his approach does not take into account the many texts that make participation in eternal life and the world to come consequent upon obedient action. Avemarie finds that Sanders presupposes too great a divide between participation in the world to come and other beneficial effects of obedience. Noting that Torah gives people life in this world and life in the world to come, Avemarie downplays the aspect of covenant and argues that both temporal and eternal salvation are fruits of obedience to Torah.

Fourthly, Avemarie thinks that Schechter's rendering of the law in rabbinic literature is the most satisfactory because he takes note of the fact that the doing of the law leads to salvation. Avemarie concludes his summary of findings by commenting that the complexity of rabbinic opinions resists a consistent systematic order, no matter how desirable such a systematic presentation may seem. He says that if we were to reduce the meaning and purpose of the Torah to a short formula, it would be best to add the words "but also" to qualify what is being said. According to the rabbinic understanding, Torah is the means and way of life, the mediator of salvation. But it is also more than that: Israel keeps it because God gave it and because Israel loves it.

Philip S. Alexander's "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature"

Philip S. Alexander in his essay, "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature," focuses on Mishnah and *Sipre Deuteronomy* (as an example of the Tannaitic Midrashim), the two main genres of the Tannaitic literature. He starts his essay by locating the Tannaitic literature in its historical context. He says that rabbinic Judaism after 70 CE is a program that aims to make the whole society to be governed by the law. He emphasizes that this historical background is crucial to understanding Tannaitic literature.

In his study on the Mishnah, Alexander says that salvation in Mishnah is national, tied up with enjoyment of the blessing of the land, that law covers every aspect of life, and that the minutia

of the law led to the accusation of legalism. Alexander explains that the rabbis' response to the charge that the law is burdensome is that the law is the gift of love from God to Israel.

In his study of *Sipre Deuteronomy*, Alexander emphasizes that covenant is central "in defining God's relationship to Israel, and in defining Israel's supreme good," while it is "presupposed in the Mishnah, but little is said about it directly."¹³¹ He discusses the tension between God's choice of Israel and Israel's free choice of the covenant, pointing out that "Israel's choice of God is as important as God's choice of Israel."¹³² In discussing whether the covenant might seem to be conditioned under those constraints that "Israel will simply not fulfill" the terms of the covenant and "there will be little that God can do about it," Alexander agrees that *Sipre Deuteronomy* does not specifically address the issue. But he points out that "in keeping with the general drift of rabbinic thought, . . . God is the ultimate guarantor of the covenant and he will ensure that in the end it is fulfilled."¹³³ In his concluding theses, Alexander reiterates this notion that God in his grace will not allow his covenant with Israel to fail, but with a qualifier: "This idea . . . is, however, nowhere clearly articulated in Tannaitic literature, nor are its tensions with the doctrine of works righteousness ever deeply explored or finally resolved."¹³⁴

¹³¹Alexander, "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature," 289.

¹³²Ibid.

¹³³Ibid., 295.

¹³⁴Ibid., 300-301.

Conclusion

In responding to different scholars' reading of rabbinic Judaism, the major interaction will be with Sanders' handling of the Tannaitic literature. The reason is that Sanders' presentation provides ample citations of the Tannaitic resources from which we can assess his evaluations. It is beyond the scope of this section to go to the primary resources of the rabbinic literature and examine the views of each scholar. Therefore, our procedure will be to evaluate first Sanders' study of the Tannaitic literature and then other scholars' work on the rabbinic literature in question.

In Sanders' justification for his eclectic treatment of Tannaitic literature, he refers to Max Kadushin's view. He asserts that "some of Kadushin's main points" seem to him "to provide the only possible way of relating certain rabbinic sayings to one another" and he presents them as follows:

These points are (a) the emphasis on the possibility of differing interpretations of the same text and/or experience, each having its own internal logic and each valid in itself, without the interpretations' being related hierarchically or systematically to one another, and (b) the insistence on the coherence of Rabbinic thought.¹³⁵

By being open to Kadushin's (inclusive) view in the same way that Sanders approves his view, the possibility arises to consider the notion of works for salvation in the rabbinic thought that Sanders presents. In the section "The election and the covenant" Sanders discusses the reasons given by the rabbis why God chose Israel, and these include "merit found either in the patriarchs or in the exodus generation or on the condition of future obedience."¹³⁶ Detailing these three forms of merit, Sanders explains that "the merit (*zekut*) of the patriarchs" should be understood as because of the patriarchs.¹³⁷

¹³⁵ Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, 74.

¹³⁶Ibid., 87.

¹³⁷Ibid., 90.

Sanders also stresses that "the 'on condition that' sayings," for example when Rabbis talk about the exodus being "accomplished by God *on the condition that* Israel would take upon itself some commandment or other" should be understood together with "'confessing' a commandment"; furthermore, "'confessing' a commandment indicates one's acceptance of God's reign—his right to give commandments."¹³⁸ But in saying that God chose Israel because the Exodus generation fulfills certain commandments—a formulation that on a surface reading be taken as works for salvation—Sanders does not provide any explanation.¹³⁹

At the conclusion to the section "The election and the covenant" Sanders offers an answer for the diverse statements by the rabbis that "Israel merited the reward of the exodus because of fulfilling some commandment or other, while at others they can say that Israel did not have any merits, or that the rewards were given before the commandments were fulfilled": Sanders affirms that "[t]he Rabbis did not have the Pauline/Lutheran problem of 'works-righteousness,' and so felt no embarrassment at saying that the exodus was earned; yet that it was earned is certainly not a Rabbinic doctrine."¹⁴⁰ In response to Sanders, taking into consideration Kadushin's opinion to which Sanders

¹³⁸Ibid., 92-93.

¹³⁹In Sanders' reference to Mek. Pisha 5, the parts that read like works for salvation are as follows: "But as yet they had no religious duties [*mitsvot*] to perform by which to merit redemption, . . . Therefore the Holy One, blessed be He, assigned them two duties, the duty of the paschal sacrifice and the duty of circumcision, which they should perform so as to be worthy of redemption" (ibid., 89). Sanders also refers to another part in the Mekilta, where "R. Nehemiah is reported as saying that Israel was redeemed from Egypt as a reward for 'the faith with which they believed,' that is, God found in the Israelites a merit which could be rewarded" (ibid.). Sanders notes that this thought disagrees with the notion he presented earlier, "which was that God chose Israel without merit on Israel's part and that he gave the reward for the commandments before they were performed" (ibid., 90). Sanders further says that he will not "inquire now whether or not these views can be reconciled, but shall proceed to other explanations of why Israel was chosen" (ibid., 90).

¹⁴⁰Ibid., 100.

apparently assents, it must be argued that one should at least allow each view to be valid by itself. If so, then the links between works and salvation are evident in the rabbinic literature.

In his section on "Reward and punishment and the world to come" Sanders studies the passages "which are taken as proving that life in the world to come is earned *by* performing more commandments than the number of one's transgressions"; the main texts Sanders examines are "Kiddushin I. 10a and the material gathered around it in the Tosefta and the Talmuds, part of R. Akiba's saying in Aboth 3.15 (ET 3.16) to the effect that judgment is by the majority of deeds, and R. Eleazar's saying in Aboth 4.22 that everything is according to the reckoning."¹⁴¹ Sanders argues that in the texts he investigates there is no idea of weighing the doing of commandments against the transgressions of the commandments. In terms of Sanders' defense of his main thesis, we must say that it is a success because Sanders keeps emphasizing that in numerous places in the Tannaitic literature the idea is not in weighing, but in doing one commandment and the positive outcome that issues from that.

Nevertheless, in refuting the theme of weighing in the Tannaitic literature, Sanders overlooks that in some texts he studies there is a connection between doing one commandment and salvation (acquiring the world to come). For example, in Sanders' comment on Kiddushin I. 10a, Sanders says, "it is an exhortative affirmation that God rewards obedience and punishes transgression: if God gives the land to one who fulfils a commandment, fulfil a commandment! If God denies the land to one who transgresses, avoid transgression! . . . The point is to encourage people to obey and not transgress."¹⁴² It is true that the focus of Kiddushin I. 10a is about God's rewarding obedience and

¹⁴¹Ibid., 128-29 (emphasis in original).

¹⁴²Ibid., 129.

punishing disobedience, but Sanders fails to note in his comment that this rewarding and punishing have in view the inheritance of the land (or the world to come, as Sanders himself notes).¹⁴³

In his later comparison of "the 'weighing' passages . . . with the statements that the fulfilment of one commandment can save," Sanders stresses that neither theme is rabbinic doctrine; he further asserts that "if there is a 'doctrine' of salvation in Rabbinic religion, it is election and repentance."¹⁴⁴ In response to Sanders it must be noted that in his discussion there is only one place where he cites texts where the language of accepting and forsaking the yoke is used,¹⁴⁵ but in the majority of the texts cited by Sanders in his section on "Reward and punishment and the world to come," covenant is not directly in view.

In the section "Salvation by membership in the covenant and atonement" Sanders emphasizes that "all Israelites except unregenerate sinners have a share in the world to come," and argues that this point "is best proved in two ways: by the absence of any statements to the contrary and by considering the Rabbinic view of repentance and atonement."¹⁴⁶ In talking about the rabbinic

¹⁴³Commenting that Kiddushin I. 10a is "a very ancient mishnah," Sanders notes that the promise of inheriting the land was subsequently "taken to apply to the world to come" (ibid.). The comment in this paragraph that Sanders overlooks the note of works for salvation also applies to his concluding words in the same section, "Reward and punishment and the world to come": "Statements to the effect that a man should behave *as if* his deeds were evenly balanced and as if the next act would determine his fate, as well as statements that he is judged by the majority of his deeds, must be seen in the entire context of Rabbinic exhortation to obey the commandments, which includes statements to the effect that one transgression may damn and that one fulfilment may save" (ibid., 146 [emphasis in original]). Again the response to Sanders here is that when the result of one's obedience is salvation, Sanders' emphasis on exhortation to keep the commandments still has salvation in view.

¹⁴⁴Ibid., 141.

¹⁴⁵Ibid., 134-35.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., 150.

thought about atonement, Sanders finds that "there is a certain ambiguity in the Rabbinic attitude towards the sacrificial system and the Temple cultus."¹⁴⁷ Sanders explains that even though there is amplification of the function connected to the sacrifices, "true religion did not actually depend upon the sacrificial system."¹⁴⁸ Elsewhere Sanders states similarly that the rabbis "attempted to give to each sacrifice some specific atoning function," and "[t]his development is remarkable when one considers that during the entire Rabbinic period the Temple was destroyed."¹⁴⁹

Sanders' comment upon the development of atonement in view of the destruction of the temple is significant especially when taking into consideration Sanders' emphasis that the framework for understanding repentance and atonement is God's election of Israel.¹⁵⁰ Since the means for the individual Israelite to remain in the covenant is through repentance and atonement, how would the destruction of the temple affect the means to stay in the covenant through offering sacrifices required? Further, Sanders dates the Tannaitic literature to be 70-200 CE. How would this dating affect our understanding of atonement through sacrifices within the framework of the covenant, since according to this dating the amplification of the sacrificial laws in the Tannaitic literature comes after the destruction of the temple? This dating may show that atoning through sacrifices is a theory and that the amplification of the atoning function related to each sacrifice as the rabbis' emphasis on compilation of

¹⁴⁷Ibid., 163-64.

¹⁴⁸Ibid., 164.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., 163.

¹⁵⁰In Sanders' delineating "the overall pattern of Rabbinic religion," he lays out the pattern thus: "God has chosen Israel and Israel has accepted the election. In his role as King, God gave Israel commandments which they are to obey as best they can. . . . In case of failure to obey, however, man has recourse to divinely ordained means of atonement, in all of which repentance is required" (ibid., 180).

more laws instead of their being in the framework of the covenant.¹⁵¹ But again if the Tannaitic literature reflects earlier tradition, then our criticism needs to be toned down.

On the other hand, the question concerning the amplification of the sacrificial laws by the rabbis in view of the destruction of the temple still remains, even if we take into consideration Moore's statement that the Mishnah "makes repentance the indispensable condition of the remission of every kind of sin."¹⁵² Against the background of Moore's declaration, we have to ask why the rabbis felt the need to multiply the laws regarding sacrifice.

Our comment above about the notion of works for salvation within the Tannaitic literature finds support in Avemarie's criticism of Sanders' study. Avemarie criticizes Sanders for not taking into account the many texts that make participation in eternal life and the world to come consequent upon obedient action.¹⁵³ The existence of works for salvation in the Tannaitic literature guides us to see the possibility of understanding the Pharisaic believers' demand in Acts 15:5 along the line of doing of the law for the attainment of salvation.

¹⁵¹Related questions are: If Judaism can survive without the sacrificial system as claimed by Sanders, what is the point to derive more laws for atonement through sacrifices? Sanders mentions that there are Rabbis who view the sacrificial system as necessary and some as unnecessary. He adds: "In either case, however, the value of the sacrificial system was never denied, but Judaism continued to function without it" (ibid., 164). Moreover, even if Sanders claims that "[a]fter the destruction of the Temple, repentance was substituted for all the sacrifices prescribed in the law, although the Day of Atonement maintained a special place in Jewish life," this statement only raises the question concerning the point of the amplification of the laws related to sacrifices (ibid., 177).

¹⁵²Moore, *Judaism*, 2:500.

¹⁵³See also Simon J. Gathercole (*Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 149-56) for an endorsement of Avemarie's view in response to Sanders' covenantal nomism.

Schechter and Heschel emphasize the aspect of joy in keeping the law, and Schechter and Sanders hold that the law is doable because Israel does not have to keep the law perfectly. These two notions are different from Peter's description of the law in the Jerusalem meeting as the yoke that neither they nor their fathers are able to carry (Acts 15:10). These scholars' comment raises the question concerning whether the rabbinic background is applicable to understand Acts 15. This comment may apply to the criticism of Montefiore. Even though Montefiore leaves to other scholars the question of the relationship between the Judaism of 300 or 500 CE and that of 50 CE, he does say that the Judaism of 50 CE should not be very different from that of 300 or 500 CE. But Montefiore does not provide any proof to support his assumption.

Several scholars have emphasized that, in the view of the rabbis, the law contains God's revealed will; that is, the law is God's law. One may apply an idea from Avemarie's view of rabbinic Judaism to Acts 15:5: The reason why the Pharisaic believers insist that the Gentile believers need to be circumcised and to keep the law is because Torah appears as the absolute word of command from God. The Pharisees' zeal for the law may be because of their view that the law is God's law, and the law is and contains God's revealed will. When taking this view into consideration, it perhaps can also explain why James, after using Scriptures to rule that Gentile believers do not have to be circumcised and keep the law except for four requirements (Acts 15:14-20), nonetheless makes the statement that since the ancient days Moses has had people preaching about him (the Mosaic law) in the synagogues in every city on every Sabbath (Acts 15:21). That is, in Acts 15:21 James seems to stress that the universal teaching of the Mosaic Law needs to be respected because after all the law is God's law.

The fact that the Pharisees regard the law as the revealed will of God may explain why the Pharisaic believers, believing Jesus as the Lord and the Messiah, are characterized by James as being zealous for the law (Acts 21:20). The perspective proposed above may also explain why the piety of Ananias, who came to lay hands on Paul as a follow-up to Paul's Damascus experience, is

depicted in terms of being conformed to the law, as was testified by all the Jews living in that region (Acts 22:12).

A further consideration is the matter of the extent to which rabbinic Judaism can serve as a background to understand Acts 15. Shall one try to find one-to-one correspondence in terms of given ideas? What about when an idea in the rabbinic literature is at odds with an idea in Acts 15, as pointed out above? The discussions above are on the level of finding one-to-one correspondence. This is necessary because when an idea in the text of Acts 15 accords with an aspect of rabbinic Judaism, we understand that Luke is well within that environment. But when an idea in the text of Acts 15 (for example, Acts 15:10) is at odds with the rabbinic teaching of the law being doable and at odds with the joy of doing the law, it pushes us to probe into reasons why in Luke's presentation of the law there are differences from the rabbinic teachings. Therefore, in the final analysis we are not only looking for one-to-one correspondences, choosing one scholar's view as it coheres with our interpretation of a particular verse. Rather, all the different presentations of rabbinic Judaism contribute to our probing into Luke's view of the law, which is the substance of the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

PETER'S SPEECH IN THE JERUSALEM MEETING IN ACTS 15:1-21

Introduction

In the Gospel of Luke,¹ Jesus takes issue with the Pharisees and emphasizes the importance of the inside to render one clean. In the Jerusalem meeting in Acts, Peter takes up the same theme. This chapter will argue that the Gospel passage is an intertext² for Peter's argument before the assembly³ and will propose that Luke incorporates Jesus' words⁴ in Luke 11:39-41 in his narration of

¹In Luke 11:39-41, Jesus challenged the Pharisees to cleanse their inside (their heart) because it is full of robbery and wickedness. Jesus instructed them to give alms "as an expression of what is inside" (John Nolland, *Luke 9:21-18:34* [WBC 35B; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993], 664), and then they would be clean. A treatment of Luke 11:39-41 appears in chapter 1 of this dissertation.

²Vernon K. Robbins ("Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth And the Magnificat as a Test Case," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* [ed. Edgar V. McKnight and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon; Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994], 179) provides a helpful comment on the study of intertexture. He states, "[I]ntertextual comparison, analysis and interpretation . . . emerge from the following questions: From where has this passage adopted its language? With what texts does this text stand in dialogue?"

³The importance of the background of the cleansing of the heart has been well put by Loren T. Stuckenbruck ("The 'Cleansing' of the Gentiles: Background for the Rationale behind the Apostles' Decree," in *Aposteldekret und antikes Vereinswesen: Gemeinschaft und ihre Ordnung* [ed. Öhler, Markus; WUNT 280; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011], 66), "Where does the author of Acts get the idea of cleansing the Gentiles' hearts from? Is this simply the product of a literary dynamic, that is, is it a matter of drawing inference from the narrative in Acts 10-11? Does it reflect the influence of other early Christian traditions?" He further asks, "[H]ow is it that Gentile believers can be admitted as the people of God in a way that Jewish Christians would not be reasonably expected to have an

the Jerusalem meeting to enhance the soteriological emphasis in Peter's speech. In Luke's narration, Peter's speech is placed as a response to the demand of circumcision and the observance of the law on the Gentile believers in Acts 15:1, 5. Reading Peter's speech in light of his use of Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 shows that in his speech, appropriating Jesus' position, Peter stresses that what is important to God is what is in the inside (heart), not on the outside (circumcision and the keeping of the law); thus one should not impose circumcision and the keeping of the law upon the Gentiles as the way for them to relate to God.

The reason why Luke uses Jesus' teaching of the law in his recounting of the Jerusalem meeting is that Jesus' teaching about the importance of the inside (Luke 11:39-41) and of his name (Luke 24:47-48) represents vital elements in Luke's soteriology. This chapter will treat Peter's use of Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41 while the next chapter of this work will handle James' use of Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48 in Luke's account of the Jerusalem meeting in Acts 15. In his treatment of the questions of conversion and initiation for the followers of Jesus in Acts, Luke uses Jesus' emphasis on the inside. To Luke, salvation is mainly about the cleansing of the heart. The keeping of the law does not have a place in Luke's soteriology. However, given that the keeping of the law occupies much space in Luke's account in Acts and that obedience to the law is presented in a positive light, a discussion of this phenomenon will be offered in the last part of this chapter.

There are four parts in the present chapter. It will start with the innertextual analysis of Luke's account of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1-21). There are three sections in the innertextual

argument against?" (67-68).

⁴As used in this dissertation, "Jesus" refers to the literary Jesus, that is, the Jesus in Luke's depiction, not the historical Jesus. This usage holds not only for Luke's direct reference to Jesus but also for the literary Jesus in Luke's depiction of others' references to Jesus in Luke-Acts such as those of James and Peter.

study. First is a presentation of the repetitive-progressive texture of Acts 15:1-21 to show the general movement of topics in Luke's explanation of the Jerusalem Council. Next is a study of the argumentative texture of the occasion of the Jerusalem meeting to see to what issues Peter appropriates Jesus' reference to the inside. Then follows the study of the argumentative texture of Peter's speech to demonstrate the logical and qualitative progression in his speech with the purpose to show that the qualitative progression in Peter's speech makes better sense when one takes Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 into consideration. It is to argue that when reading Peter's speech against Jesus' teaching about cleansing in relation to the inside in Luke 11, not only is Peter's reference to God's cleansing of the heart of Gentile believers made understandable but also Peter's speaking of the Jewish believers' inability to keep the law is made intelligible.⁵ This proposal is elucidated in the second part of this chapter, *The Intertextual Study of Peter's Speech*. In that section, we will lay out how the contrast between the outside and the inside in Jesus' talk in Luke 11:39-41 is taken up in Peter's speech in Acts 15.

The third part of this chapter probes the ideological texture of the passage: Luke's use of "heart" in Luke-Acts with the specific focus upon the connection between heart and salvation. This investigation is followed by the study of Luke's depiction of the Jewish believers' keeping of the law in the last part of this chapter. A conclusion is provided toward the end of this chapter to summarize the findings.

⁵As a matter of fact, one could appeal to the language of heart in the Scriptures or the intertestamental background as Stuckenbruck ("The 'Cleansing' of the Gentiles," 70-88) does to explain the language of the cleansing of the heart in Peter's speech. But either of the two approaches would fail to explain why Peter contrasts God's cleansing the heart of the Gentile believers with the Jewish believers' inability to keep the law in Luke's narration.

Innertextual Study

The innertextual analysis of Acts 15:1-21 focuses upon the repetitive-progressive texture of Acts 15:1-21. This analysis is followed by analysis of the argumentative textures of Acts 15:1-5 and of Peter's speech in Acts 15:7-11.

Repetitive-progressive Texture in Acts 15:1-21

Layout of the repetitive-progressive texture⁶ of Acts 15:1-21:

v.1	circumcision; Moses; be saved				
v.2		dispute(2x)			
v.3			nations		
v.4				God	
v.5	circumcision; Moses				
v.6					
v.7		dispute	nations	believe	God
v.8					God the knower of heart
v.9				faith	
v.10					God heart
v.11	be saved			believe	
v.12			nations		God
v.13					
v.14			nations		God name
v.15					
v.16					I (4x)
v.17			nations		name
v.18					
v.19			nations		God
v.20					

⁶The grouping of repetitive and progressive textures under the one heading of repetitive-progressive texture follows Vernon K. Robbins, *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* (New York: Routledge, 1996a), even though, as specified in the introduction, the methodology of the present dissertation follows Robbins' *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996b). The main reason for this variant approach is that there is overlap between repetitive texture and progressive texture; as Robbins explains in *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, the repetition of a word becomes a progression (p. 10).

v.21 Moses

From the above schematic, the "forest"⁷ that one sees from the repetitions of words in Luke's record of the Jerusalem meeting is that the issue of circumcision and of Moses (vv. 1, 5) brings a dispute (v. 2, 7). The first occurrence of circumcision and Moses is tied with attaining salvation, but in the second occurrence of circumcision and Moses, the idea of being saved is dropped from the connection. Nevertheless, the verb *σώζω* reappears in Peter's speech (v.11). This dispute concerns whether the nations should keep the law or not. In relation to the nations, the element of faith in their salvation experience is emphasized in Peter's speech (vv. 7, 9), which Peter also points out in the salvation experience of the Jewish believers (v. 11). In response to the dispute over whether the Gentile believers need to be circumcised and ordered to keep the law, God is appealed to (vv. 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 19). His characterization as the knower of the heart and his activity in cleansing the hearts of people are noted (vv. 8-9), and his name is mentioned (vv. 14, 17).

Argumentative Texture

The argumentative texture focuses on the occasion for the Jerusalem meeting and on Peter's speech.

⁷When explaining the repetitive texture, Robbins says, "Repetition does not reveal the precise nature of the boundaries between one unit and another. Also, repetition does not exhibit inner meanings in the sequences. But repetitive texture introduces interpreters to the overall forest, if you will, so they know where they are as they look at individual trees" (*Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 8).

The Occasion for the Jerusalem Meeting

The cause that leads to the Jerusalem Council is presented in the following syllogistic reasoning:⁸

- "Unstated major premise": When there is an issue to be settled, the apostles and elders in the church of Jerusalem get together to solve the matter.
- "Minor premise [rationale]": The church of Antioch send delegates to the apostles and elders to consider the teaching of certain Jews from Judea that unless the Gentile believers are circumcised, they cannot be saved (vv. 1-2); in the presence of the apostles and elders, the Pharisaic believers insist that it is necessary to circumcise the Gentile believers and to order for them to keep the Mosaic law (v. 5).
- "Conclusion [thesis]": The apostles and the elders gather together to discuss whether the Gentile believers need to be circumcised and be ordered to keep the Mosaic law (v. 6).

The minor premise in the syllogistic reasoning as outlined above shows that there are two issues to be solved in the Jerusalem Council. One is the salvation issue (v. 1), and the other is a repetition of the demand of circumcision (v. 1) with the addition of the keeping of law⁹ without reasons provided (v. 5). Concerning how to understand the relationship between v. 1 and v. 5, or the issues to be discussed in the Jerusalem meeting, scholars have different opinions. A discussion of their views will pave the way for understanding the issues to which Peter's speech responds.

⁸The three categories in the syllogistic reasoning presented is an adoption of the syllogism laid out by Robbins in his section on "Argumentative Texture and Pattern" (ibid., 21). In that section Robbins states, "Rhetorical theory, both ancient and modern, presents extensive analytical tools for analyzing the argumentative texture of texts" (ibid.). Robbins next introduces a text from *Rhetorica ad Herennium* which includes the topics of "Thesis," "Rationales," "Contrary with Rationale," "Restatement of Thesis with Rationales," "Analogy," "Example and Testimony of Antiquity," and "Conclusion" (ibid., 21-22). Following this example, Robbins directs attention to "the thesis and rationales (or reasons) at the beginning" of the text cited and concludes: "A thesis and a rationale together make two-thirds of a logical syllogism," and "[w]hen one of the premises is present in the discourse, a reader or hearer is able to supply the missing premise" (ibid., 23).

⁹C. K. Barrett, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 2:705.

Concerning the issue to be resolved in the Jerusalem Council, Simon Butticaz does not think that the salvation of the Gentiles is at issue. He argues that the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles is already established in the Cornelius account in Acts 10-11 and is confirmed in the mixing of the Jewish and non-Jewish community in Antioch (Acts 11:19-26) and in the Pauline mission (Acts 13-14). He explains, "By raising the sensitive matter of circumcision, the Pharisees of Acts 15 accordingly move the issue of the salvation of pagans on to the level of social identity."¹⁰

Nevertheless, Butticaz cannot completely avoid the topic of salvation. Butticaz says that the opponents of Paul and Barnabas insist that "in order to be the People of God, the Church is bound to respect the Law and its ritual observances. Without that, pagans cannot be brought into God's covenant, and consequently, cannot obtain the promised salvation."¹¹ In arguing thus, Butticaz shows the inconsistency of his own position. Even though he insists that the issue to be resolved in the Jerusalem Council has nothing to do with salvation, Butticaz still brings back the topic of salvation and ties it to the question of keeping the law and the covenant.

Moreover, the notion of salvation is also seen in Butticaz's comment on Peter's speech, when he argues that Peter's account of the conversion of Cornelius introduces "a social identity perspective."¹² For Butticaz, the question becomes "whether circumcision, and, more generally, Torah ritual are indispensable prerequisites for *salvation*, or, in other words, conditions governing integration

¹⁰Simon Butticaz, "Acts 15 or the 'Return of the Repressed'? The Church and the Law in Acts," in *Torah in the New Testament: Papers Delivered at the Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008* (ed. Michael Tait and Peter Oakes; LNTS 401; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 120.

¹¹Ibid., 121.

¹²Ibid., 124.

into the People of the Covenant."¹³ Again Butticaz is not talking purely in terms of a social-identity perspective. Once again he has linked circumcision and "Torah ritual" to salvation.

Mikeal C. Parsons, who also uses social aspect to understand the issues to be resolved by the Jerusalem Council, proposes that "the conflict in Acts 15 has interrelated but ultimately distinct soteriological and social dimensions."¹⁴ Parsons views the demand of certain Jews from Judea in v. 1 as soteriological and the request of some Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5 as social. He does not think that the issue in Acts 15:5 concerns the salvation of the Gentiles; rather, it has to do with "whether Gentiles and Jews can commingle without the Jews' being defiled by association with Gentiles, who are by nature unclean."¹⁵

In contrast to Butticaz, who does not think that the salvation of the Gentiles is an issue for the Jerusalem Council, C. K. Barrett argues that both Acts 15:1 and Acts 15:5 concern salvation. Barrett points out that Acts 15:1 introduces "what the argument of the chapter is to be about. . . . [I]t will be about being saved, about being a Christian at all."¹⁶ He interprets Acts 15:5 as saying, "To be saved, men must become Jews."¹⁷

In short, the notion of salvation in the demand of some Jewish Christians from Judea, as stated in Acts 15:1, cannot be explained away. As is demonstrated in the repetitive-progressive texture

¹³Ibid., emphasis mine.

¹⁴Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts* (Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008), 208.

¹⁵Ibid., 210.

¹⁶Barrett, *Acts*, 2:699, 705.

¹⁷Ibid.

above, the word $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ is used in v. 1, and the same word is used again in Peter's speech (v. 11).

Peter's speech concerns defending the genuineness of the salvation of the Gentile believers, as will be argued in the next section. Thus siding with Parsons and Barrett, the teaching of some Jewish believers in Acts 15:1 is about salvation. But the question remains as to how to understand the Pharisaic believers' call in Acts 15:5. Should their request be regarded as facilitating the social interaction between Jewish believers and Gentile believers as Parsons argues, or is it about salvation as Barrett proposes? Or is Acts 15:5 about "the Jewish law, the Jewish way of life" as James Dunn argues?¹⁸

Appealing to the background of the enforcement of circumcision upon Gentiles who live in areas ruled by the Jews in the Jewish uprising against Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc 2:46), Parsons contends that the demand of the Pharisaic followers of Jesus in Acts 15:5 is a condition for Gentiles to reside in their midst.¹⁹ He adds further that Leviticus 17-18 also assumes "a social context of a Gentile minority living within the environs of a Jewish majority" and orders the "resident aliens" to keep certain "ritual and moral laws" so that they can associate with the Jews.²⁰ Parsons sees the decree ordered by James as a compromise with the Pharisaic believers' demand, stating that the provisions of the decree echo the stipulations for the "resident aliens" in Leviticus 17-18.²¹ But reading the decree against Leviticus 17-18 is not without its problems. For example, Barrett does not think there is any

¹⁸James D. G. Dunn (*The Acts of the Apostles* [NC; Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996], 200) comments Acts 15:5: "That circumcision was simply part of a whole package (the Jewish law, the Jewish way of life) is the assumption behind texts elsewhere such as Gal. 5.3 and James 2.10."

¹⁹Parsons, *Acts*, 210.

²⁰Ibid.

²¹Ibid., 214-15.

close connection between the decree and the rules for the Gentiles residing among Jews in Leviticus 17-18.²²

Based upon "the notion of necessity, compulsion" in the words τούτων τῶν ἐπ'ἀνάγκης in the letter sent to the Gentile believers in Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia (Acts 15:28), Barrett claims that Luke took the decree "not of courtesy [to the Jewish brothers] but of compulsion, and therefore presumably as a condition of salvation (cf. 15.1, 5)."²³ But it is too thin an argument to take the decree to be about salvation on the basis of "compulsory" language in τούτων τῶν ἐπ'ἀνάγκης in Acts 15:28. Perhaps it would be better for Barrett to develop the salvation point he mentioned in his evaluation of the four proposals for the background and purpose of the decree. In his assessment of the suggestion that the decree fundamentally asks the Gentile believers to forsake their religion, which

²²Barrett, *Acts*, 2:734. It is important to note that not every prohibition in the decree fits with the descriptions of Leviticus 17-18. The biggest problem of viewing the decree against the backdrop of Leviticus 17-18 is in the element of the strangled. Richard Bauckham, who regards the background of the decree to be Leviticus 17-18, reasons, "Lev. 17.13 is a positive prescription: that animals killed for eating must be slaughtered in such a way that their blood drains out. Abstention from πνικτά is the negative corollary, for an animal killed in such a way that the blood remains in it is 'choked'" ("James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)," in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* [ed. Ben Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996], 174). Obviously Bauckham is reading πνικτῶν into Lev 17:13 because this word πνικτῶν is not used there. Moreover, the concept is not even present in the Leviticus passage unless one concedes that James put πνικτός (πνικτῶν) next to blood to ensure that blood be taken as blood, not bloodshed. Nevertheless, to read the decree against Leviticus 17-18 has a strong attraction, namely, Acts 15:21 limits the background of the decree in Acts 15:20 to the Mosaic law. This is because a coordinate conjunction γάρ connects Acts 15:21 with Acts 15:20. Acts 15:21 provides a rationale for Acts 15:20. The emphasis of Acts 15:21 is the universality of the teaching of Moses in the synagogue on every Sabbath in every city. Perhaps we can only concur with the judgment of Terrance Callan that "the laws which underlie the Apostolic Decree are largely, but not exclusively, found in Leviticus 17-18" ("The Background of the Apostolic Decree [Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25]," *CBQ* 55 [1993]: 285). For an extensive argument against the proposal of Leviticus 17-18 being the background of the decree, see Stephen G. Wilson, *Luke and the Law* (SNTSMS 50; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 84-94.

²³Barrett, *Acts*, 2:745.

means to turn their backs on idolatry, Barrett says, "It should be noted that such commands, especially the prohibition of idolatry, would be necessary for salvation, and not merely in order to facilitate fellowship between Jewish Christians and Gentile Christians."²⁴ In his later reference to a better background for the decree, which is about three matters that a Jew is not allowed to compromise, Barrett states that this background fits easily with the proposal of pagan religion (idolatry). Nevertheless, the difficulty with the proposal of viewing pagan religion as the background for the decree is that the rationale to back up James' decision is related to the Mosaic law (Acts 15:21).

In light of the repetition of the verb $\sigma\acute{\omega}\zeta\omega$ in vv. 1 and 11, it is likely that the appeal of the Pharisaic believers (v. 5) should be seen as relating to salvation.²⁵ Peter's defense of the salvation of the Gentile believers without their keeping the law may also be seen as a response to the contention of the Pharisaic believers in v. 5. Appropriating Jesus' emphasis upon the inside in Jesus' taking the issue with the Pharisees, as will be argued below, Peter speaks of God's cleansing the hearts of the Gentile believers as a response to the Pharisaic believers' request. While the Pharisaic believers insist that it is necessary to circumcise the Gentile believers and have them observe the law, Peter talks about the inability of the Jews to observe the law and emphasizes that they also are saved on the basis of grace through faith. Therefore, in light of the focus on salvation in Peter's speech, the reading of salvation in the Pharisaic believers' request cannot be overlooked. Next is the argumentative texture of Peter's speech.

²⁴Ibid., 2:734. For a treatment of viewing the decree against the backdrop of pagan worship activities, see Ben Witherington, III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 462-64. Witherington regards the four items of prohibition in the decree as "referring to four different activities that were known or believed to transpire in pagan temples" (ibid., 464).

²⁵This reasoning and its further layout in this paragraph also responds to Dunn's reading of Acts 15:5.

Peter's Speech

The syllogistic reasoning²⁶ in Peter's speech may be presented as follows:

- "Unstated major premise": God's way of salvation for those who respond to the gospel with faith is that he gives the Holy Spirit to people and cleanses people's hearts, Jews and Gentiles alike.
- "Minor premise": When the Gentiles heard the gospel through my (Peter's) mouth and believed in the gospel, God testified to them by giving them the Holy Spirit just as to the Jewish believers, and God did not distinguish between the faith of Jews and Gentiles in cleansing the hearts of the Gentiles (vv. 7-9).
- "Conclusion": Therefore, to demand that the Gentile believers be circumcised and keep the Mosaic law is to test God in terms of whether God's work by itself is sufficient; this demand is a yoke upon the Gentile believers which neither our fathers nor us (the Jews) are able to carry (v. 10); on the contrary, through the grace of the Lord Jesus we (the Jewish believers) believe in order to be saved in the same manner as the Gentile believers (v.11).

The unstated major premise shows that Peter's speech concerns God's work of salvation in a person's life. This salvation involves a person's response, with faith, to the word of the gospel (v. 7). Along with the person's belief in the gospel is a description of two acts of God: God gives the Holy Spirit to that person (v. 8), and he cleanses that person's heart (v. 9).²⁷ Both acts are said to place the

²⁶Again the three categories used in the syllogistic reasoning are from the syllogism presented by Robbins in his section on "Argumentative Texture and Pattern" (*Exploring the Texture*, 21). For a layout of Robbins' explanation of the syllogism, see footnote 6 above.

²⁷Cf. C. K. Barrett (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* [2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994-98], 2:717) says, "It is by faith (not by circumcision or other legal works) that God's gift of the Spirit and of cleansing is received." Scholars hold various opinions regarding the link between faith and the cleansing of the heart. Stuckenbruck ("The 'Cleansing' of the Gentiles," 66) says, "the cleansing of hearts [of the Gentiles] is closely linked to the giving of the *Holy Spirit*; that is, the presence of the Holy Spirit within Gentiles renders them pure because something which is impure has been removed." Richard Bauckham ("James, Peter, and the Gentiles," in *The Mission of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity* [NovTSup 115; ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 114) acknowledges the link between the cleansing and the presence of the Spirit in this way: "That Gentiles could no longer be regarded as

salvation of the Gentile believers on a par with that of the Jewish believers. In the minor premise, this pattern of God's work of salvation applies to the Gentile believers just as to the Jewish believers.

In Luke's account Peter next draws a conclusion, which includes a question and a contrasting statement. Peter asks, "Why do you tempt God by placing a yoke upon the shoulder of the disciples which neither our fathers nor we were able to carry?" (v.10). Adding the requirement of the law upon the Gentile believers is tantamount to questioning the sufficiency of the work of God because God's actions of giving the Holy Spirit and cleansing the hearts of the Gentile believers have nothing to do with law-keeping. Peter's comment entails a characterization of the nature of the Jewish people's law-keeping: neither we nor our fathers were able to carry this burden. Peter contrasts the Jewish believers' inability to keep the law with their own salvation experience; in sum, we believe and so were saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus (v. 11).

profane was also required by God's gift of the Holy Spirit to these Gentiles." But Bauckham further states that the giving of the Spirit needs to be considered along with God's act of purifying "the hearts of these Gentiles by faith" (115), which aligns with the view of Barrett above. Martin M. Culy and Mikeal C. Parsons (*Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* [Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2003], 289) acknowledge that τῇ πίστει could be connected with the participle that follows, καθάριας τῶν καρδίας αὐτῶν, and translates Acts 15:9 as, "He made no distinction between them and us but cleansed their hearts through their faith"; they argue, however, that "given its position and the context it makes better sense to take τῇ πίστει with what precedes as a dative of reference that highlights the fact that the quality of the Gentiles' faith was the same as the Jews' faith" (289-90). Culy and Parsons emphasize that with respect to faith, the Jewish believers and the Gentile believers are the same. Their argument in taking τῇ πίστει with the description of God's not distinguishing (οὐθὲν διέκρινεν) is convincing. Assuming the rendering of Culy and Parsons in terms of the function of τῇ πίστει and viewing the participle καθάριας as functioning as means, Acts 15:9 can be rendered as: God does not distinguish between the Jewish believers and the Gentile believers with respect to faith *by* cleansing the hearts of the Gentile believers. Rendering the function of the participle καθάριας as means strengthens the proposal of Culy and Parsons: the reason why the faith of Jewish believers and that of Gentile believers are the same has nothing to do with keeping or not keeping the law. As to Stuckenbruck's linking the giving of the Spirit with the cleansing of the heart, an OT passage like Ezek 36:25-27 may show the connection. In the text of Acts 15:8-9, the two elements (the giving of the Spirit, the cleansing of the heart) are presented separately as given by God in response to the faith of the Gentiles.

In Peter's reasoning, there is a combination of logical progression and qualitative progression. The logical progression²⁸ can be seen in Luke's description of Peter's stating that God testifies to the Gentile believers by giving them *the Holy Spirit* just as to the Jewish believers (Acts 15:8). From Luke's repeated references to the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles in Acts 10-11,²⁹ it makes sense to hear Peter in his recapitulation of the conversion of Cornelius and his household in the Jerusalem meeting mention that God gives *the Holy Spirit* to the Gentile believers just as he did to the Jewish believers.

Luke's account in Acts 10-11 not only makes Peter's reference to the Holy Spirit in the Jerusalem meeting reasonable but also prepares the readers to expect Peter's emphasis upon *faith* in Luke's narration of the meeting. In Luke's account of Peter's preaching in Acts 10, the importance of belief to appropriate the offer of forgiveness of sins in Jesus' name is noted at the end of the sermon. According to Luke's narration of Peter's sermon, it is said that the word which God sent to the sons of

²⁸Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 23, quoting Kenneth Burke, *Counter-Statement* [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1931], 124) explains that logical progression "has 'the form of a perfectly conducted argument, advancing step by step. . . .' As the narrative proceeds, assertions are made that create specific expectations within the reader. Once the reader sees that many of these assertions are fulfilled within a short span of text, he or she expects a logical progression within the text that reliably fulfills all the assertions."

²⁹In Luke's narration of the falling of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentiles in Acts 10:44-48, it is described that while Peter was still speaking to the people gathered by Cornelius, *the Holy Spirit* fell upon the Gentiles (Acts 10:44), and the believers from the circumcision who went with Peter were amazed that the gift of *the Holy Spirit* had been poured out upon the Gentiles (Acts 10:45). Luke's narrative then posits a question from Peter: "Can anyone withhold the water for baptizing these people who have received *the Holy Spirit* just as we have?" (Acts 10:46 NRSV; emphasis mine). In Luke's account of Peter's response to the believers from the circumcision in Jerusalem concerning his having table fellowship with the uncircumcised people (Acts 11:1-18), Peter brings up again the falling of the Holy Spirit upon the Gentile believers (Acts 11:15), and recalls the words of the Lord that John baptized with water but they shall be baptized with *the Holy Spirit* (Acts 11:16). Then in Luke's narration Peter poses the question if God has given the Gentile believers the same gift just as when they believed in the Lord Jesus Christ, who was he to hinder God? (Acts 11:17).

Israel is preaching peace through Jesus Christ (Acts 10:36), that God anoints Jesus with the Holy Spirit and power and that he went around doing good works and healing all people who were oppressed by the devil because God is with him (Acts 10:38), that God raised Jesus on the third day to appear before the witnesses whom God had chosen beforehand (Acts 10:40-41), that God orders the apostles to preach to the people and to witness that Jesus is the one designated by God as the judge of the living and the dead, and that to him (Jesus Christ) all the prophets testify to the forgiveness of sins through the name of Jesus, to everyone who *believes in him* (Acts 10:42-43).³⁰ Therefore, it is logical to read in Peter's recollection of the Cornelius episode in Luke's narration of the Jerusalem meeting, how Peter reminds his fellow Jewish believers that in the early days God chose him so that through him the Gentiles would hear the gospel and *believe* it (Acts 15: 7) and that in the cleansing of people's hearts God does not distinguish between the *belief* of Jewish believers and Gentile believers (Acts 15:9).

Furthermore, Luke's account in Acts 11 about the salvation experience of the Jewish believers makes Peter's talk about the faith of the Jewish believers in the Jerusalem meeting in Acts 15 understandable. In Luke's narration of Peter's response to the charge from the believers of the circumcision in Jerusalem, Peter points out that God gives the Holy Spirit to the Gentile believers just as also to them (the Jewish believers) who *believe* in the Lord Jesus Christ (Acts 11:17). Thus even though according to Luke's account the occasion that leads to the Jerusalem meeting concerns the demand upon the Gentile believers to keep the law (Acts 15:1, 5), we read again Peter's reflection of the salvation experience of the Jewish believers in Luke's description of the meeting: Through the grace

³⁰Barrett (*Acts*, 1:528) comments that the final words, "*everyone who believes in him*," in Acts 10:43 are significant because "[t]he only qualification required is faith; it is not necessary to be, or to become, a Jew."

of the Lord Jesus we *believe* to be saved just as in the same manner as the Gentile believers (Acts 15:11).

Nevertheless, Luke's account in Acts 10-11 does not prepare readers to expect Peter's talk of God's cleansing the hearts of the Gentile believers and of the inability of the Jewish believers to keep the law in Acts 15. It is true that the idea of cleansing is present in Acts 10. Its first occurrence concerns food (Acts 10:15), and the second people (Acts 10:28). In Luke's narrative of the vision revealed to Peter when he was on the roof praying, it is described that Peter saw an object being lowered down from heaven with the inside full of four-footed animals, reptiles of the earth, and birds of the heaven (Acts 10:9-12), and a voice came to Peter and ordered him to rise, kill, and eat (Acts 10:13). In Luke's further narration, Peter responded declaring that he had never eaten anything that is *common and unclean* (Acts 10:14), and a voice came to Peter the second time saying that whatever God *has cleansed*, he should not consider common (Acts 10:15).

In Luke's later account of the Spirit's guidance of Peter to meet Cornelius (Acts 10:17-33), we see Peter's reference to *common and unclean* again, but this time Peter uses the words on people. In Cornelius' house, Peter said that it is deemed unlawful for Jews to associate with Gentiles, but God had shown him not to consider man as *common or unclean* (Acts 10:28). The two repetitions of the words *common* and *unclean* in Luke's narration of Peter's use show that Peter first understands what God *cleanses* concerning food and next applies God's cleaning to people. However, these two repetitions of the words *common* and *unclean* in Luke's narration seem in no way to prepare readers to anticipate that when Peter talks about cleansing again in relation to the Cornelius episode, it would be *heart* that God cleanses (Acts 15:8).³¹

³¹In his comment on God's act of cleansing *the hearts* of the Gentile believers in Acts 15:8, Barrett (*Acts*, 2:717) says, "There is no parallel to this in Acts. . . . Here in ch. 15 the cleansing

Similarly Peter's words that the Jews cannot keep the law in Acts 15:10 surprise the readers. Even though in light of Acts 7:53 that "Israel (past and present) has never been very successful in its observance of the law,"³² it is understandable for Peter to say so, one still has to ask why at this point in his presentation of the genuineness of the salvation of the Gentile believers Peter has to speak of the inability of the Jews to do the law.

The two points, "God's cleansing the hearts of the Gentiles" and "the inability of the Jews to do the law," in Peter's reasoning should be regarded as qualitative progression³³ and make sense when one takes Jesus' talk in Luke 11:39-41 into consideration.³⁴ In Luke's account, Peter's

takes place in view of the faith generated in Cornelius as he hears the word." See also the comments of Witherington (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 454 footnote 386), "Peter now understands more clearly that his vision was about the purification of the human heart," and Joseph Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 547), "He [Peter] is again offering an interpretation of the vision shown to him in 10:9-16."

³²Earl Richard, "The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15)," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1980 Seminar Papers* (ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; Chico, Calif.: Scholars, 1980), 271. Richard thinks that one should connect Acts 15:10 with Acts 7:53 (*ibid.*, 279 note 29). John Nolland ("A Fresh Look at Acts 15:10," *NTS* 27 [1980]: 109) suggests similarly, "The οὐτε οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν οὐτε ἡμεῖς links the Jewish Christians with the national solidarity of Israel." He further explains, "The Jewish national history demonstrated that there was a characteristic human inability to come up to the law's expectations, since their history embodied the ambivalence of commitment to the law but failure to keep it (Acts 7. 53)—no criticism of the law . . . , but a decisive indication that it is not the way of salvation" (110).

³³Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 23) describes that qualitative progressions "occur when an attribute of speech or action, which the reader had no reason to expect on the basis of a previous assertion, emerges in relation to one or more characters in the narrative." Robbins spells out further the nature of qualitative progression in his comment on Mark 15:16-24. He states, "This is the nature of a qualitative progression: the implied reader/hearer had no reason to know that mockery in this form would occur (even if one has remembered Mark 8:31-10:34), but when it does occur it seems a natural outcome of previous events. The result is the amplification of a logical progression (crucifixion) with a qualitative progression (mockery as a pseudo-king)" (*ibid.*, 27).

³⁴This reasoning also explains why among all the passages in the Gospel of Luke that speak of cleansing (Luke 4:27; 5:12, 13; 7:22; 11:39; 17:14, 17) only Luke 11:37-41 is isolated as the

contrasting God's cleansing the heart of the Gentile believers with the inability of the Jews to keep the law in Acts 15:9-10 is reminiscent of Jesus' emphasis upon cleansing issuing from a person's inside in contrast to the Pharisees' focus upon the outward cleansing of cups and plates in Luke 11:39-41. This resemblance leads us to move next to the intertexture of Peter's speech in Acts 15:7-11 to discuss how in Luke's narration Peter draws on Jesus' words and to what end this usage serves to respond to the issue handled in the Jerusalem meeting.

Intertexture in Peter's Speech

The basis to say that in Luke's narration Peter's words in Acts 15:9-10 use Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 is echo.³⁵ The word "cleanse" (καθαρίζω) and the concept pertaining to a person's inside (καρδία) in Acts 15:9 evokes Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41. The verb "cleanse" (καθαρίζω Luke 11:39) and the term that speaks of a person's inner (τὸ ἔσωθεν in Luke 11:39-40 and

text to consider in the comparison with Peter's speech in Acts 15. Luke 17:11-19 contains topics similar to Peter's speech in Acts 15. The elements of faith and saving are also seen in Luke 17:11-19. In Jesus' cleansing the ten lepers in Luke 17:11-19, Jesus commends the faith of a Samaritan and says that his faith had saved him. One could argue that Luke 17:11-19 is another intertext to understand Peter's speech in Acts 15 because the emphasis upon faith and salvation in Luke 17:11-19 corresponds to faith and salvation in Acts 15:7-11. Nevertheless, as presented above, the reference to faith and being saved in Acts 15:7-11 are viewed as logical progression.

³⁵Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 60) defines echo as "a word or phrase that evokes, or potentially evokes, a concept from cultural tradition." Even though Robbins places his discussion of echo in cultural intertexture, this arrangement may be seen as his attempt to broaden Richard B. Hays' (*Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Heaven: Yale University Press, 1989) limiting echo to the Scriptures. Robbins (*The Tapestry*, 108) states, "The boundaries both O'Day and Hays establish for their analyses occur as a result of establishing 'poetic' (Hays 1989: 176) rather than rhetorical boundaries. It would be extremely difficult for Hays to justify a limitation of Paul's echoes to scriptural echoes if he were interpreting the rhetoric of Paul's text. As rich as Hays's analysis and interpretation are, they reveal a highly limited perspective on the intertexture of Pauline discourse." Robbins' criticism of Hays' approach actually justifies our use of Robbins' definition of echo to discuss Peter's use of Jesus' words in Luke's account. The reason is that we expand the idea of echo to include echo in the works by the same author (Luke).

τὰ ἐνόντα in Luke 11:41) also occur in Luke 11:37-41. Moreover, the keeping of the law is noted in both passages, and the sayings about the keeping of the law in the two passages are placed against the sayings about the inside (Luke 11:38-39; Acts 15:9-10).³⁶ In both passages, God is depicted as in relation to the heart. The Luke 11:40 statement "Didn't the one who makes the outside also make the inside?" refers to God.³⁷ In Peter's speech, God is depicted as the knower of the heart (καρδιογνώστης Acts 15:8) and the one who cleanses the heart of the Gentile believer (Acts 15:9). Finally, both passages portray cleansing as having to do with a person's inside. In Luke 11:41 Jesus orders the Pharisees to give alms as an expression of the inside and says that by doing so everything will be clean with them.³⁸ In Luke's narration of the Jerusalem meeting, Peter declares that God cleanses the heart of the Gentile believers (Acts 15:9).

Peter's words in Acts 15:9-10 in Luke's account of the Jerusalem meeting evoke Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41, recontextualizing³⁹ Jesus' teachings in Luke 11:39-41. Jesus' talk about cleansing and the inside in Luke 11 was at the setting of a meal and prompted by the amazement of a Pharisee, who invited Jesus over for a meal and was astonished that Jesus did not wash his hands

³⁶Luke 11:39a states: "You Pharisees cleanse the outside of the cup and the plate," which corresponds to the keeping of the law; Luke 11:39b reads: "Your inside is full of robbery and wickedness," where a person's inside is stressed. Similarly, in Acts 15:9 God cleanses the hearts of the Gentile believers, a person's inside, and in Acts 15:10 Luke returns to the topic of keeping the law with specific reference to the inability of the Jews to do the law.

³⁷As explained in chapter 1 of this work, this explanation is an adoption of Joseph A. Fitzmyer's interpretation of Luke 11:40.

³⁸As is argued in chapter 1 of this work, this interpretation adopts John Nolland's explanation of Luke 11:37-41.

³⁹Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 48) explains that "[i]n contrast to recitation, recontextualization presents wording from biblical texts without explicit statement or implication that the words 'stand written' anywhere else. This may occur either in narration or in attributed speech."

before the meal (Luke 11:37-38). This reaction of the Pharisee caused Jesus to point out the problem of the Pharisees in neglecting the inner part of their lives (Luke 11:39). In calling up Jesus' instructions about cleansing as issuing from one's inside, Peter's words in Luke's narration are placed in the context of response to the demand of law-keeping on the Gentile believers from the Jewish believers (Acts 15:1, 5).

In the literary context of response to the order of the observance of the law on the Gentile believers (Acts 15:1, 5), Peter's use of Jesus' words in Luke 11 can be understood as follows: In Luke's account, Peter combines Jesus' directing the attention to the inside (Luke 11:39), Jesus' reference to God as the maker of the inside (Luke 11:40), and Jesus' pronouncement of cleansing from one's inside (Luke 11:41) to one idea: God cleanses the hearts of the Gentile believers (Acts 15:9). Through recontextualizing Jesus' words in Luke 11 in the context of discussing whether the Gentile believers need to keep the law or not, Peter emphasizes the work of God, and his stress can be understood as a response to the request of the Pharisaic believers in Luke's narrative. That is, in Luke's account as Jesus directs the Pharisees, whose focus is on the washing of the outside of cup and plate, to pay attention to their inner and how the inner issues in the outer, Peter's words in Acts 15:9-10 should be regarded as a reply to the Pharisaic believers, who insist that the Gentile believers need to be circumcised and ordered to keep the law, that God had cleansed the hearts of the Gentile believers.

In recontextualizing Jesus' teaching in Luke 11 in the different context of the demand of law-keeping upon the Gentile believers, Peter's words in Acts 15:7-11 also reconfigure⁴⁰ Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41. Jesus' talk in Luke 11:37-41 is in the order of pointing out the *inside* (τὸ ἔσωθεν)

⁴⁰Robbins (*The Tapestry*, 107) defines reconfiguration as "the restructuring of an antecedent tradition."

problem of the Pharisees (v. 39), God's care for the *inside* (τὰ ἐνόντα; v. 40),⁴¹ and Jesus' instruction to the Pharisees concerning the true meaning of cleanness as issuing from one's inner (v. 41). In Peter's speech, Peter first depicts God as the knower of the heart (καρδιογνώστης Acts 15:8), then speaks of God's act of cleansing the hearts of the Gentile believers (Acts 15:9), and finally points out the problem of the Pharisaic believers (Acts 15:10).⁴² In such a reconfiguration of Jesus' teaching in Peter's speech, there is a reversal of the rhetoric. In Luke's account in the Gospel of Luke, Jesus starts with pointing out the problem of the Pharisees (Luke 11:39) and works toward giving his opinion on what cleanness should be for the Pharisees (Luke 11:41); but in Luke's recounting in Acts, Peter begins with the talk about God's cleansing the hearts of the Gentile believers (Acts 15:9) and ends with a comment on the problem of the Pharisees (Acts 15:10). Peter reconfigures Jesus' words to make the diagnosis of the problem of the Pharisaic believers become the last item in his use of Jesus' teaching. This reconfiguring paves the way for Peter next to form the contrasting statement that it is through the grace of the Lord Jesus that the Jewish believers believe to be saved in the same manner as the Gentile believers (Acts 15:11). This reconfiguration of Jesus' teaching also allows Peter to move the talk about the problem of the Jewish believers (with the Pharisaic believers included) to the realm of salvation (Acts 15:11), thus also anchoring Peter's earlier reference to God's cleansing the hearts of Gentile believers within his discussion of salvation.

⁴¹As is shown in chapter 1 of this dissertation, Fitzmyer takes the maker of the inside (Luke 11:40) as reference to God.

⁴²In light of the Pharisaic believers' request in Acts 15:5 being part of the literary context for Peter's speech in Acts 15:7-11 and being one of the reasons (Acts 15:1, 5) depicted by Luke that occasioned the Jerusalem meeting, the inability of the Jewish believers to do the law in Acts 15:10 includes the Pharisaic believers.

Jesus' talk about the Pharisees' problem and his follow-up proposal for the Pharisees in Luke 11:39-41 do not specifically include reference to salvation, but by placing the inability of the Jews to do the law (Acts 15:10) as the last item in his use of Jesus' words to form a contrasting statement with salvation through the grace of the Lord Jesus (Acts 15:11), Peter reconfigures Jesus' words specifically to include the concept of salvation. This reconfiguration can be understood as Luke's effort to enhance the soteriological emphasis in Peter's speech. Among the "seven kinds of religious responses to the world" that Robbins adopts in his using "Bryan Wilson's typology of sects," the conversionist response is evident in Peter's speech in Acts 15:7-11.⁴³ Robbins lays out the conversionist response as follows:

The conversionist response is characterized by a view that the world is corrupt because people are corrupt. If people can be changed, the world will be changed. Salvation is considered to be available not through objective agencies but only by a profound and supernaturally wrought transformation of the self. The world itself will not change, but the presence of a new subjective orientation to it will itself be salvation.⁴⁴

In light of the description Robbins gives for the conversionist response, Peter's speech depicts a pessimistic view of the Jewish people under law: The Jewish forefathers and the Jews are said to be unable to do the law (Acts 15:10). Even though in Luke's narration Peter does not say that because the Jews are not able to keep the law, they are evil, the idea may be there. This thought is plausible when we bring in the proposal of Peter's use of Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41 in the former's speech in Acts 15. As laid out above, in Peter's reconfiguring of Jesus' words in Luke's account of the Jerusalem meeting, while Jesus comments on the inside problem of the Pharisees first in Luke 11:39-41 Peter places the problem of the Pharisaic believers last. In Luke 11:39 Jesus points out that the

⁴³Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 72.

⁴⁴Ibid.

Pharisees focus on the keeping of the law, and yet inside they are full of robbery and wickedness. Taking Jesus' criticism of the inside problem of the Pharisees as background for reading Peter's statement in Acts 15:10 explains the contrasting relationship between Acts 15:10 and Acts 15:11: We (the Jewish believers) are not able to keep the law *because we are evil*, and yet we are saved through the grace of the Lord Jesus.

Since people are evil and cannot keep the law, the "religious texture"⁴⁵ in Peter's speech emphasizes the importance and need for people to be changed, and this has to come from God. It is God who cleanses the hearts of the Jewish believers and the Gentile believers, and God gives the Holy Spirit to that person; the salvation experience of the Jewish and Gentile believers is said to be through the grace of the Lord Jesus appropriated by faith. This is the salvation depicted in Peter's speech in Acts 15. This is the Christian culture which Luke nurtures.⁴⁶

In summary, this section, *The Intertexture Study of Peter's Speech*, lays out Peter's use of Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41 in Luke's narration of the Jerusalem meeting in Acts 15. Based On the echo of Jesus' words from Luke 11:39-41 in Luke's account of the Council proceedings in Acts 15:9-10, this section argues that Peter recontextualizes and reconfigures Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41 to a soteriological context that deals with the demand of the observance of the law on the Gentile believers. In Peter's recontextualizing Jesus' words in Luke 11:39-41 in the context of discussing whether the Gentile believers need to keep the law or not, Peter recapitulates Jesus' instruction in Luke 11:39-41 to one theme: God cleanses the hearts of the Gentile believers (Acts 15:9). This summary is

⁴⁵Ibid.

⁴⁶Robbins (ibid.) says that applying the taxonomy of "typology of sects" developed by Bryan Wilson "to New Testament literature reveals the kinds of cultures earliest Christianity nurtured and maintained in the first-century Mediterranean world."

for Peter to emphasize the work of God as a response to the request of the Pharisaic believers (Acts 15:5). In Peter's reconfiguring Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 in Acts 15:9-10, Peter switches the order of Jesus' first pointing out the problem of the Pharisees (Luke 11:39) to the last item in his talk of the inability of the Jewish believers (with the Pharisaic believers included) to do the law. In Luke's narration, this reversal places Peter's use of Jesus' instruction in the soteriological context: Through the grace of the Lord Jesus the Jewish believers believed to be saved in the same manner as the Gentile believers (Acts 15:11); in Luke's telling, the inability of the Jewish believers to do the law (Acts 15:10) forms a contrasting statement with the Jewish believers' belief of salvation by the grace of the Lord Jesus (Acts 15:11). Peter's recontextualizing and reconfiguration of Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 in Acts 15:9-10 allows Luke to enhance the soteriological emphasis in Peter's speech, which can be seen from the conversionist response present in Peter's speech.

In the conversionist response in Peter's speech, the salvation depicted is from the work of God: God's granting the Holy Spirit, God's cleansing the heart, and salvation by the grace of the Lord Jesus. In the other parts of his work, Luke also places his references to heart in the domain of salvation. To further pursue the significance of Luke's using Jesus' teaching concerning the importance of the inside in Luke 11:39-41 in Peter's speech, it is necessary to inquire why Luke would be so interested in the matter of the heart.⁴⁷ It is to the ideological texture that the next section turns.

⁴⁷Luke's interest in the matter of heart is evident in the way in which he presents the elements of Peter's speech. Ronald D. Witherup ("Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study," *JSNT* 48 [1992]: 67-86) notes that, with the repetition of the same account accompanied by slight variations, what the author wishes to emphasize is given in the last account. In Luke's three accounts of the Cornelius episode (Acts 10, 11, 15), there is a progression of Peter's understanding of the command of God, starting from his vision and progressing from food to people and then to heart. One may conclude that in the account of the Cornelius episode, Luke aims to emphasize that in the matter of salvation of the Gentiles it is the heart that God cleansed.

Ideological Texture

Before delving into the ideological texture, it is necessary to talk about what is being looked at in the ideological texture. Since this dissertation uses Robbins' methodology, it is necessary to recall Robbins' definition of ideological texture and to interact with his view. Robbins says,

When a person reads for the ideological aspects of a text, he or she seeks to find both the interests of the author and how those interests are argued. . . . Ideological criticism thus is closely tied to investigation of the social location of the author and how that author is situated vis-à-vis the audience and the culture.⁴⁸

In a chapter entitled "The Social Location of the Implied Author," Robbins explores nine arenas of the social system including "Belief Systems and Ideologies."⁴⁹ Most relevant to the investigation in the current chapter is Robbins' approach to the ideology of Luke-Acts. Robbins argues that "[t]he implied author wishes to show that God has 'cleansed' a widely divergent and mixed group of peoples within a movement inaugurated by Jesus of Nazareth. The word 'cleansed' challenges the purity system of Judaism at its center."⁵⁰ He notes texts dealing with cleansing which are also included in the current chapter of this dissertation, such as Luke 11:40-41, Acts 10:15, and Acts 15:9. He connects purity with "devoutness" and "righteousness or innocence," which he says characterize "people associated with Christianity."⁵¹ With these statements, Robbins concludes that "the thought of the implied author is located in a social environment that accepts its foreignness and mixedness as

⁴⁸Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 118.

⁴⁹Vernon K. Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. Jerome H. Neyrey; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 310.

⁵⁰*Ibid.*, 328.

⁵¹*Ibid.*

blessed by God" and that "this confidence in God's action reflects a social location in which Christians consider themselves equal to Pharisees and able to challenge them."⁵²

In depicting the ideology of Luke-Acts, Robbins uses the language of purity to describe what the implied author does in portraying the Jesus movement. Robbins guides us to see that in Luke-Acts purity is connected with belief in Jesus, that the claim of God's cleansing diverse people groups puts the followers of Jesus in an equal position to challenge the views of the Pharisee believers, and that the marks of God's cleansing work in God's people are their devoutness and righteousness. Robbins has provided helpful thoughts about the relationship between purity and the Jesus movement, but a crucial element needs further development in Robbins' discussion of purity in Luke-Acts, namely, the "heart" that God cleanses, according to Acts 15:9.⁵³ That is, what challenges "the purity system of Judaism"⁵⁴ is the emphasis upon the inside in the Jesus movement. This is seen in Jesus' discourse in Luke 11:39-41, which is studied in chapter 1 of this work. Moreover, when we have a text like the one in Acts 7 that explicitly challenges the system of Judaism, the challenge lies in the realm of heart. Stephen accused his Jewish audience at being uncircumcised in ears and heart, as will be discussed in further detail below. Therefore, the ideological texture as part of our study of Peter's speech in Acts 15, a study of the use of "heart" in Luke-Acts, is conducted below. It will be argued that Luke's usage of the word "heart" is mainly associated with the theme of salvation. In Luke's presentation of the early

⁵²Ibid.

⁵³Even though Robbins includes Acts 15:9 in his talk of the diverse people groups which God cleanses in what he calls the Christian movement, he does not discuss the connection between purity and heart.

⁵⁴Robbins, "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts," 328.

Christian movement, he uses the language of heart in his discussion of the conversion-initiation and identity of the Christian. To Luke, having one's heart cleansed is the identity mark of being a Christian.

The Use of Heart in Luke-Acts

The word καρδία occurs 42 times in Luke-Acts. There are diversities in Luke's reference to heart, some of which are unrelated to a theological point, such as the heart being the place where one keeps and ponders what one has heard (Luke 1:66; 2:19, 51). In other instances the heart is the location where thoughts and reasoning occur (Luke 5:22; 9:47; 24:38; Acts 7:23, 39). The heart is connected with the emotion of joy (Acts 2:26; 14:17), and the action of people dissuading Paul from going up to Jerusalem is described as breaking his heart into pieces (Acts 21:13). Elsewhere in Luke-Acts, however, there is a connection between the theme of salvation and references to the heart.⁵⁵

In the *Magnificat* (Luke 1:47-55) Mary praises God for the salvation that God works for Israel, which involves God scattering the arrogant ones in the understanding of their *heart* (Luke 1:51) in conjunction with God's taking down the mighty from their throne and in contrast to God's lifting up the humble (Luke 1:52). The reversal language is continued in the next verse with Luke's description of God's filling the hungry ones with good things and sending the rich away empty (Luke 1:53). These eschatological reversals of God are then connected with God's helping Israel his servant to remember his mercies, just as he had said to the patriarchs, to Abraham and to his descendants forever (Luke 1:54-55). In the incipient fulfillment of the promise made to Israel, the aspect of heart is called for.

⁵⁵Hermie C. van Zyl ("The Soteriology of Acts: Restoration to Life," in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology* [ed. Jan G. van der Watt; NovTSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2005], 134) in his discussion of soteriological words used in Luke-Acts includes "purification (καθαρίζω) of the hearts."

The task of John the Baptist is described as involving the heart. In the announcement the angel made to Zechariah, it is said that his wife Elizabeth shall carry a son, and he shall call him John. The mission of John (the Baptist) is to turn the *hearts* of fathers to their children⁵⁶ and the disobedient to the thoughts of the righteous, to prepare for the Lord a ready people (Luke 1:17). The mission of Jesus as indicated in the birth stories is also involved with the heart. In taking the baby Jesus into his arms, the prophet Simeon praised God for the salvation God prepared before the face of all peoples, a light for the revelation of the Gentiles and glory for his people Israel (Luke 2:30-32); he further says that Jesus will be for the fall and rise of many in Israel and a sign to be spoken against, and that the thoughts of many *hearts* might be revealed (Luke 2:34-35). John the Baptist and Jesus are directly associated with the salvation that God has prepared. Jesus is the salvation prepared by God, while John the Baptist is the forerunner for this salvation. Jesus' mission will reveal the thoughts of many hearts. The Gospel of Luke shows that the thoughts of many people are exposed.⁵⁷

⁵⁶Joel B. Green (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 76) explains that the description of John the Baptist's mission as turning the hearts of the fathers to the children is from Mal 4:6 and is used by Luke to fill in "his portrait of John's mission by drawing on material related to eschatological Elijah." Green further states, "By this means Luke also stresses the orientation of John's ministry around calling people to repentance in their daily lives" (ibid). Green's emphasis on the theme of repentance in the portrait of John the Baptist's task as turning the hearts of the fathers to the children supports the argument of this section in connecting heart with the theme of salvation.

⁵⁷For example, in Luke 5:22 Jesus questioned the scribes and the Pharisees concerning their reasoning in their *hearts* about his announcement of forgiveness of sins to the paralytic. In Luke 9:47 it says that when Jesus knew the reasoning of his disciples' *hearts* concerning who should be the greatest among them, he put a child beside him. In Luke 11:39 Jesus says that *the inside* of the Pharisees is full of robbery and wickedness, and in Luke 16:15 Jesus says that the Pharisees are the ones who justified themselves before men, but God knows their *hearts*. By way of comparison, Green thinks that the reference to the revelation of the *thoughts* from many hearts in Luke 2:35 must be understood in a negative sense: "Simeon emphasizes the identification of Jesus himself as this point of crisis, the one destined within God's own purpose to reveal the secret thoughts of those who oppose the divine aim" (*Gospel*, 149, note 41). John Nolland (*Luke 1-9:20* [WBC 35A; Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989], 122) also takes *thoughts* in Luke 2:35 in a negative way and states, "In the body of the Gospel to

In the sermon on the plain Jesus says that the good man from the good storage of the *heart* brings forth the good, and the evil one from the evil (heart) brings forth evil. This is because out of the abundance of the *heart* one speaks (Luke 6:45). In Luke 6:43-44 Jesus emphasizes that each tree is known by its fruit: a good tree will not produce rotten fruit nor does a rotten tree produce good fruit. When reading Luke 6:45 in light of 6:43-44, we see that Jesus emphasizes that the inside (heart) issues forth into the outside (behavior). Luke 6:45 may be placed under the category of salvation because the transformation of one's life occurs and issues forth from the heart.⁵⁸

In the parable of the soil Jesus describes the seed which fell beside the road as those who hear but to whom the devil came and took away the word from their *hearts*, lest when they believe, they might be saved (Luke 8:12). Jesus explains the seed that fell on good soil as those who hear the word and hold it fast with good *heart* and produce fruit patiently (Luke 8:15). As in Luke 6:45 above, the heart in Luke 8:15 is related to the growth of one's transformed life.

In Luke 10:25 a lawyer approaches Jesus, asking him what he must do to have eternal life. Jesus directs him to the reading of the law (Luke 10:26). The lawyer recites the laws, which speak of loving the Lord God with all of one's *heart*, soul, strength, and mind, and loving one's neighbor as oneself (Luke 10:27). In response to the Pharisees' sneering at his talk about a person's not being able to serve both God and wealth, Jesus says that the Pharisees are the ones who justified

follow, Jesus' interaction with Pharisees and other religious leaders provides its own commentary on these words."

⁵⁸Darrell L. Bock (*A Theology of Luke and Acts: Biblical Theology of the New Testament* [ed. Andreas J. Köstenberger; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012], 265) in discussing repentance in his chapter on salvation in Luke-Acts says, "Bringing forth fruit is a natural outgrowth of repentance. Just as a good tree brings forth good fruit, so genuine repentance produces change in one's life (Luke 6:43-45)."

themselves before men (Luke 16:15a), but that God knows their *hearts* which are filled with abominations before God (Luke 16:15b).

Before proceeding to the study of heart in relation to salvation in Acts, it is necessary to comment on the texts covered so far. The study of heart and salvation in the Gospel of Luke shows that in Luke's account God sees people's heart, and Jesus emphasizes the importance of heart in the matter of salvation. In the *Magnificat*, even though the language of God's scattering the arrogant ones in the understanding of their *heart* (Luke 1:51) should be seen as part of the description that "denotes God's actions against the mighty and the proud (i.e. those opposing God), undertaken on behalf of the poor and the humble,"⁵⁹ the aspect of the *heart* of the arrogant ones is noted by God in Luke's account. This emphasis is also seen in Luke 16:15: God knows the *heart* of the Pharisees because what is exalted among men is an abomination before God (Luke 16:15b). In the parable of the soil Jesus emphasizes the connection between "faith and salvation,"⁶⁰ and this is described as occurring in the realm of the heart (Luke 8:12). Jesus also emphasizes the importance of the heart in one's transformed life (Luke 6:45; 8:15).

This emphasis on the role of the heart in salvation is carried forward to Acts, where the reference to heart is specifically connected with the proclamation of the gospel. At Pentecost, to the Jews who heard the sermon it was said that their *hearts* were stabbed, and they asked Peter what they should do (Acts 2:37). Peter tells them to repent, to be baptized in the name of Jesus, and then to receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:38). In Peter's speech in the Jerusalem meeting, the criterion

⁵⁹Gert J. Steyn, "Soteriological Perspectives in Luke's Gospel," in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology* (ed. Jan G. van der Watt; NovTSup 121; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 74.

⁶⁰Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (2 vols; AB 28, 28A; Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1981-85), 1:712.

for God not to distinguish between the faith of the Jews and that of the Gentiles is that God cleanses the hearts of the Gentiles (Acts 15:9). In Paul's ministry in Philippi, the Lord opens the *heart* of Lydia, a dealer of purple clothes and a God-fearer, to pay attention to what Paul was saying (Acts 16:14). As a result she and her household were baptized (Acts 16:15).

Corresponding to his depiction of people who respond to the message of salvation positively in connection with their heart condition, Luke also portrays people's rejection of this message of salvation as involving the heart. Stephen accused the Jews of being stiff-necked and uncircumcised in *hearts* and ears (Acts 7:51). This forms a contrast to Peter's words in Acts 15:9 where Gentile believers are depicted as having their hearts cleansed. In Acts 7:51, by contrast, it is the unbelieving Jews who are depicted as having uncircumcised hearts and ears. Their condition is then linked with their resisting the Holy Spirit and is further connected with their failure to keep the law. Thus here in Acts 7:51-53 we have a scenario which is exactly opposite to the one in Acts 15:7-9. In Acts 15:7-9, God's work in response to the belief of the Gentiles in the Gospel is that he gives them the Holy Spirit and cleanses their hearts. But in Acts 7:51-53, in their failure to respond to the gospel positively (as seen especially when they participate in the killing of the righteous one), the unbelieving Jews are said to be uncircumcised in their heart and to resist the Holy Spirit.

To the Jews in Rome who do not respond positively to his preaching Jesus Christ from the Scriptures (Acts 28:27), Paul applies Isa 6:9: The reason why the Israelites hear but do not understand and see but do not see is that their *heart* has become dull and they hear with their ears only with difficulty. They close their eyes lest they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears, and understand with their *heart*, and return, so that God would heal them (Acts 28:27). Paul concludes his speech with the words that this salvation of God is being sent to the Gentiles, and they will listen (Acts 28:28). Again salvation is connected with the heart; heart is the location of response to the message of salvation. Peter evaluates the heart of the former magician in Acts 8:21 and says that his *heart* is not

right before God. Peter asks the magician to repent from his wickedness and to ask the Lord that the thought of his *heart* be forgiven (Acts 8:22).

The foregoing study of heart in Acts shows that heart is specifically connected with the proclamation of the Gospel message. Of people who listen to Peter's sermon, it is said that their hearts were stabbed. God opened the heart of Lydia to pay attention to the preaching of Paul. But a more specific example of what God does with people's response to the Gospel message is in Acts 15:9: For the Gentile believers who respond to the Gospel with faith, it is said that God cleanses their heart. This talk of God's cleansing the heart of the Gentile believers in Acts 15:9 may be called the identity mark of being a follower of Jesus. Even though we only use one occurrence in Acts to say that God's cleansing work in Acts 15:9 may be termed the identity mark of being a follower of Jesus, judging upon how in several places in Acts Luke mentions the heart condition of a person in the initiation and conversion process (Acts 2:37, 16:14, 28:27-28) and how in connection with their rejection of the gospel Stephen accuses his Jewish audience of being uncircumcised in hearts and ears (Acts 7:51-53),⁶¹ our designation is reasonable.

Therefore, it is apparent that the reason why Luke is so interested in the matter of heart is that salvation depends on the heart, and the purification of the heart is the identity mark of being a follower of Jesus in the matter of conversion and initiation. In Luke's presentation this identity mark of heart is set in contrast to the keeping of the law. In Acts 15:9, Peter speaks of God's cleansing the heart of the Gentile believers and questions why the Jewish believers put the law, which they cannot keep,

⁶¹In Acts 7:52, Stephen accuses his audience of their fathers' persecuting the prophets and killing those who had proclaimed ahead about the coming of the righteous one, of which they are murderers and betrayers. He further charges his audience of receiving the law but not keeping the law (Acts 7:53).

upon the Gentile believers. The keeping of the law does not have a place (Acts 15:9-11). Luke assigns the law a place in salvation only when the law leads one to respond to the gospel as in Acts 7:53.⁶²

Even the example of Jesus' affirming the lawyer's reciting the law in Luke 10:25-28 is not against the contrast between the cleansing of the heart and the doing of the law in Acts 15:9. On a surface reading, Luke 10:25-28 may be understood to imply that the heart is connected with the doing of the law, such that in practicing the law the aspect of heart is indeed involved.⁶³ The lawyer recites the laws, which speak of loving the Lord God with one's *heart*, soul, strength, and mind, and loving one's neighbor as oneself, and Jesus confirms his answer by telling him to do so, and he shall live (Luke 10:27-28). But as Bock says, Luke 10:25 should be seen together with Luke 10:21-24; the love for God should lead one to respond to Jesus Christ.⁶⁴ Therefore, even the example of Luke 10:25-28 is not an exception to the connection between law, heart, and salvation in a way that law leads one to respond to the gospel as is indicated similarly in Acts 7:53.

⁶²Joseph Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 386) comments upon Stephen's indicting his audience for not observing the law: "What Stephen means is that they have not really understood what this law was teaching—another covert reference to the Lucan global understanding of the OT." Witherington (*The Acts of the Apostles*, 275) remarks upon Acts 7:53b: "Clearly enough Stephen believes the Law and indeed all of Scripture to be God's word, and so the ultimate indictment is that God's people have failed to keep it, including the prophetic portions which foretold the Righteous One." F. F. Bruce (*The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary* [3d rev. and enl. ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990], 209) notes of Acts 7:53: "The implication may be that the empirical Israel, represented by the high priest and his associates, never kept the law, whereas the true Israel, the followers of Jesus, did so."

⁶³To draw attention to the reference to the heart in the lawyer's citation of Deut 6:5 is not to overlook the fact that that "the primary purpose of this fourfold inventory is to stress the totality of one's love for God" (Green, *Luke*, 428, note 108).

⁶⁴Bock, *Luke*, 2:1027. In Bock's own words, "To love God is to be devoted to the teaching and person of Jesus."

In conclusion, in Acts Luke especially draws attention to the aspect of heart when he is depicting what is involved in the process of salvation. Having one's heart cleansed is the identity mark of being a follower of Jesus. Luke uses "heart" in his discussion of conversion and initiation, and he presents God's cleansing of the heart in contrast to the keeping of the law (Acts 15:9). Luke views that the right keeping of the law should lead one to embrace the gospel of Jesus Christ (Acts 7:53). Nevertheless, Luke devotes space to the Jewish believers' keeping the law, which is not related directly to the gospel of Jesus Christ, and even the Gentile believers are asked to comply with the four laws ordered in the Jerusalem meeting. The question arises as to how these factors relate to his not assigning salvation to the keeping of the law⁶⁵ and his using "heart" for his discussion of conversion and initiation. It is to a discussion of Luke's depiction of Jewish believers' doing the law that the next section turns.

Law in Acts

This section will inquire *why* Luke in his presentation of the law in Acts predominantly emphasizes Jewish believers' obedience to the law. Our treatment starts with a presentation of the data and follows with a summary and discussion of scholarly opinions.

Luke's account shows that it is necessary for the Jews to keep the law. In Acts 6:8-15 Stephen was accused of speaking against the temple and the law. Luke termed it a "false accusation," but this accusation nonetheless shows the importance of the temple and the law for the Jews. In his

⁶⁵That the keeping of the law does not have a place in the realm of salvation is seen not only in Peter's speech but also in Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch. At the end of Paul's speech in Pisidian Antioch, he says, "Through this man [Jesus] forgiveness of sins is being proclaimed to you, and [forgiveness] from all the things from which you were not able to be justified by the law of Moses. Everyone who believes in this man shall be justified" (Acts 13:38-39).

encounter with Cornelius, Peter tells Cornelius and the gathered people that it is *unlawful* for the Jews to associate with or to go to Gentiles (Acts 10:28a). *Unlawful* is a violation of the requirement of the law. Peter immediately follows this statement with the words that God had shown him not to consider anyone common or unclean (Acts 10:28b). Later when Peter goes up to Jerusalem, the believers from the circumcision take issue with him by saying that he had gone into the home of uncircumcised men and had eaten with them (Acts 11:3).

Before Paul took Timothy, he circumcised him because of the Jews in that region, who knew that his father was a Greek (Acts 16:1-3). In Corinth the Jews put Paul before the tribunal and said that he taught people to worship God in a manner contrary to the law (Acts 18:12-13). On his return to Syria at the end of his second mission trip, Paul had his hair cut in Cenchrea because he had taken a vow (Acts 18:18). At his return to Jerusalem after his third mission trip, James and the elders informed Paul that there were in Jerusalem many thousands of Jews who were believers, all of them zealous for the law, and that these Jewish believers had been led to believe that Paul had taught apostasy from Moses to the Jews in the Diaspora and that they were not to circumcise their children nor have them walk according to the customs. Thus James and the elders suggested that Paul take four men from among them who were under a vow, be cleansed with them, and pay for them so that all would know that he agrees to and follows the law. As for the Gentile believers, they told Paul that they had written to them to stay away from the four proscribed things (Acts 21:20-25).

When Paul was in the temple announcing the completion of his cleansing, the Jews from Asia stirred up the crowd, seized Paul, and accused him of teaching against the people, the law, and the temple (Acts 21:28). In his first defense speech before the Jews after his arrest by the Romans, which reports his conversion and call from God, Paul said that he was educated according to the exactness of the law from the fathers (Acts 22:3). He described Ananias, who came to announce the recovery of his eyesight and the call of God, as a man devout according to the law (Acts 22:12).

In Paul's defense speech before the council, when the high priest ordered a person to strike Paul after his testimony that he had led his life with good conscience before God, Paul responded by saying that the high priest was judging him on the standard of the law, and yet contrary to the law had ordered another to strike him (Acts 23:1-3). When Paul was notified that it was the high priest that he was reviling, Paul cited the Scripture, "You shall not speak badly about the leader of your people" (Acts 23:5).

Concerning the reasons why Luke presents the Jewish believers as faithfully keeping the law, scholars have varying opinions. Jacob Jervell argues that the reason why "Luke attaches importance to the Mosaic law and to the primitive church and Jewish Christians as being zealous for the law" is that "in this manner they prove their identity as the people of God, entitled to salvation."⁶⁶ The Jewish Christians are "the restored Israel," and "circumcision and law become the very marks of their identity."⁶⁷ Stephen G. Wilson says that the Jewish Christians' keeping the law is a way to express their piety.⁶⁸

F. Gerald Downing and Helmut Merkel see the accounts of observance of the law in Luke-Acts from the angle of respect for inherited custom. Downing says, "It was a commonplace of contemporary thinking about religion and society that ancestral custom should be observed," and "such observance aims at human flourishing."⁶⁹ In the same vein Merkel appeals to a conviction common in

⁶⁶Jacob Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972), 142.

⁶⁷*Ibid.*, 142-43.

⁶⁸Wilson, *Luke*, states that the law has not "been done away with" nor does the law lack a role "in Jewish or Jewish-Christian piety," but still it "is an inadequate vehicle of salvation" (59).

⁶⁹F. Gerald Downing, "Freedom from the Law in Luke-Acts," *JSNT* 26 (1986): 49.

the ancient world, namely, the necessity to be loyal to the laws and customs inherited from the fathers. Such a notion helps, he says, to understand the positive portrayal of law-keeping by Jewish Christians in Acts.⁷⁰ Merkel observes the use of such concepts as the law of the fathers, the law of the Jews, the father's God, and the custom inherited from the fathers in Paul's defense speeches (Acts 22:3; 25:8; 24:14; 28:17).⁷¹ He also notes that in Ephesus and more clearly in Jerusalem Paul is accused of teaching apostasy from Moses (Acts 18:13; 21:21).⁷²

According to Philip Esler, the reason why Luke has to present Jewish Christians faithfully keeping the law is because the Jewish Christians were under threat. He explains that the Lucan community consisted of Gentile believers and Jewish believers, who were engaging in table fellowship, which is against the ethos of the Jewish nation. In order to legitimate the Lucan community, Luke has to portray the law as conservative, even though this depiction runs against "essential features of the Christian tradition" and "the fact of Jewish-Gentile eucharistic fellowship."⁷³

Bock describes the portrayal of Jewish believers' keeping the law as rooted in Luke's respect for the law. As he says, "The law does not justify, but it can teach and instruct. So he calls on those who belong to the community to show it some respect, provided they do not exalt it to a place

⁷⁰Helmut Merkel, "Das Gesetz im lukanischen Doppelwerk," in *Schrift und Tradition: Festschrift für Josef Ernst zum 70. Geburtstag* (ed. Knut Backhaus and Franz Georg Untergaßmair; Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996), 130.

⁷¹Ibid.

⁷²Ibid.

⁷³Philip Francis Esler, *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology* (SNTSMS 57; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 129.

where its goal in promise is lost."⁷⁴ He also says that for Luke "law-abiding is an acceptable option for Jewish believers as they seek to reach out to other Jews, but in no case should it get in the way of Jew-Gentile unity in the church or the gospel of salvation by faith through Jesus Christ alone."⁷⁵

Among these scholarly explanations for Luke's account of Jewish believers' keeping the law, the proposals of Downing and Merkel regarding respect for ancestral custom are the most persuasive. As noted above, Merkel observes the use of such concepts as the law of the fathers, the law of the Jews, the father's God, and the custom inherited from the fathers in Paul's defense speeches. Added evidence in favor of Merkel's proof is that the "customs" are cited by James and the elders in informing Paul that the Jewish believers in Jerusalem had been led to believe that Paul had taught apostasy from Moses to the Jews in the Diaspora and that they were not to circumcise their children nor have them walk according to the *customs* (Acts 21:21).

When viewing Luke's depiction of the Jewish believers' doing the law in light of the custom inherited from their fathers, Bock with good reason says that Luke portrays Jewish believers' keeping the law out of Luke's respect for the law. Paul's circumcising Timothy may also support Bock's view that the reason that Jewish believers follow the law is to promote their outreach to fellow Jews.

Jervell's insistence that by their doing the law the Jewish Christians "prove their identity as the people of God, entitled to salvation" runs against Peter's assertion in Acts 15:10. Moreover, none of the descriptions that Luke gives for the Jewish believers' keeping the law in Acts occurs in the context of salvation. As to Jervell's insistence that the Jewish Christians are the restored Israel, and that

⁷⁴Bock, *A Theology of Luke and Acts*, 369.

⁷⁵Ibid., 359.

circumcision and the keeping of the law are their identity marks, it must be noted that the earlier part of this paper has already demonstrated that having one's heart cleansed is the identity mark of the followers of Jesus. Their identity is no longer circumcision and the keeping of the law, which can be seen in Stephen's indicting his Jewish audience as uncircumcised in hearts and ears in their rejection of the gospel.

Esler proposes that the reason why Luke has to portray Jewish Christians faithfully keeping the law is that they were under threat due to the practice of table fellowship between Jewish believers and Gentile believers in the Lucan community. However it must be stated in response that in reading passages which deal with the early followers of Jesus, to take what is laid down for facilitating the table fellowship of early believers as a reflection of the time of the author needs further data to support it.⁷⁶

In conclusion, it is better to see that that the identity mark of the Jesus movement is the purification of the heart. Since this foundation is secure for Luke, then there is no problem for Luke to depict the Jewish Christians as faithfully keeping the law due to his respect for their ancestral custom. Luke's emphasis upon the purification of the heart as the identity mark of the Jesus movement also indicates that Christians claim the fulfillment of the promise of the new heart in the Scriptures for themselves.⁷⁷

⁷⁶Luke T. Johnson ("On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay," in *SBL 1979 Seminar Papers* [vol. 1; ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1979], 87-100) offers a similar caution. He indicates that, even for the occasional epistles of Paul, it is not easy to find a community in every letter, and he claims that an author can have a literary or theological aim for his writing without addressing a community.

⁷⁷Peter's reference to God's cleansing the hearts of the believers, both Jewish believers and Gentile believers, recalls the Scriptural theme of God's giving a new heart. The unilateral work of God in giving the Israelites a new heart is seen in Jer 24:7, 31:31-34, 32:39-40 and Ezek 11:19, 36:25-27. See Werner E. Lemke, "Circumcision of the Heart: The Journey of a Biblical Metaphor," in *A God*

Conclusion

This chapter argues that in Luke's narrative, Peter's reference to God's cleansing the heart of the Gentile believers in Acts 15:9 is an appropriation of Jesus' emphasis upon the inside in rendering a person clean in Luke 11:37-41. Just as Jesus takes issue with the Pharisees in their focus upon outward behavior (the cleansing of cups and plates), Peter responds to the request of the Pharisaic believers by contrasting God's purifying the heart of the Gentile believers with the inability of the Jews to keep the law. In light of Peter's defending the genuineness of the salvation of the Gentile believers in his speech in Acts 15:7-11 as a response to the two issues in Acts 15:1 and 15:5, it is proposed to understand the request of the Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5 along the line of salvation. This proposal has further support from Peter's emphasis on the fact that like the Gentile believers, the Jewish believers also are saved on the basis of grace through faith.

This understanding of the demand of the Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5 as to gain salvation is contrary to E. P. Sanders' depiction of Second Temple Judaism as covenantal nomism, which is discussed in detail in chapter 2 of this work. Further, Luke's respect for the ancestral custom of the Jewish believers in his descriptions of their observance of the law also shows that their keeping of the law is not to keep themselves in the covenant in order to secure final salvation. Through his relating the language of heart with the theme of salvation, Luke declares that the salvation of the followers of Jesus lies in their hearts being cleansed, and this is their identity mark as belonging to the people of God. Put another way, in Luke's presentation of the Jesus movement in Acts, he uses the term heart in his discussion of the conversion, initiation, and the very identity of the Christian believer.

So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller (ed. Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2003), 312-16.

CHAPTER 4

JAMES' USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN ACTS 15

Introduction

According to Luke's account, after his resurrection Jesus opened his disciples' minds to understand the Scriptures concerning the suffering and resurrection of the Messiah, and the mission work of the early church (Luke 24:44-47). Concerning the missionary task of the early church, Luke's Jesus¹ showed them that the Scriptures talk about the preaching of repentance for the forgiveness of sins in his name among all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem, and about how his disciples will be witnesses of these things (Luke 24:47-48). The purpose of the present chapter is to understand James' use of the Scriptures as presented in Acts 15:15-18 in light of Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48. It will be argued that Jesus' emphasis that his *name* provides the forgiveness of sins as his disciples carry out the task of proclamation of repentance (Luke 24:47-48) is reflected in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 to depict the Gentiles as the ones who are called by God's *name* (Acts 15:17).

James' emphasis upon *God's name* is due to the fact that he is describing how the act of God as promised in the Scriptures conforms to the act of God in Peter's experience with the conversion

¹As specified in chapter 3 of this dissertation, "Jesus" in this work refers to the literary Jesus, that is, the Jesus in Luke's depiction, not the historical Jesus. This usage holds not only for Luke's direct reference to Jesus but also for the literary Jesus in Luke's depiction of others' references to Jesus in Luke-Acts such as those of James and Peter.

of Cornelius and his household. Nevertheless, this chapter will argue that Jesus' emphasis upon *name* must have played a role also in James' choosing a text from the Scriptures that stresses Gentile believers' identity as people *called by God's name*. By adopting Jesus' use of *name*, James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 implies that the Gentile believers *called by God's name* seek the Lord Jesus by *calling upon the name of Jesus*.² Since the identity of the Gentile believers is people called by God's *name* through their calling upon the name of Jesus, James orders not to trouble the Gentile believers except to require them to stay away from the four stated prohibitions.³

To show the presence of Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48 in James' use of the Scriptures, this chapter will start with an innertextual analysis of James' speech. In the innertextual study, it will be pointed out that in light of the progression of names in Acts, the progression from *name* to *the Lord* in James' speech should be understood as referring to the Lord Jesus. The second part of this chapter is the intertextual study of James' use of the Scriptures. It will be argued that in James' use of the Scriptures, Amos 9:11-12 is placed in the context of the early church. Furthermore, it is in James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12 that Jesus' teaching concerning his name in Luke 24:47-48 is seen as echoed in James' use of Amos 9:11-12, which is done in the third part of this chapter. The last section of this chapter is the study of social and cultural texture; with reference to Jesus' view of the law in James' use of the Scriptures this section handles questions such as what kind of religious response to

²The Lord whom the Gentiles are to seek in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 will be identified as Jesus in the analysis below in the section of James' use of the Scriptures.

³As emphasized by the majority of scholars, James appropriates the message of Amos 9:11-12 meaning that Gentiles would be included among the people of God *as Gentiles*, and he therefore ordered that the law not be imposed upon them. The conclusion laid out in the present chapter builds on this commonly held notion by adding that James' attention to Jesus' name also played a further role in his reading of the Scriptures.

the world is entailed in James' use of the Scriptures, what kind of rhetoric James uses, and what objective he achieves.

Inner Texture in James' Speech

In the inner texture of James' speech, the focus will be on the repetitive-progressive texture of James' speech.

Repetitive-Progressive Texture in James' Speech

Below is a diagram of the repetitive texture in James' speech.

v.14	God		nations	name	
v.15					
v.16		I shall return			
		I shall rebuild			
		I shall rebuild			
		I shall restore			
v.17			nations	name	Lord (2X)
v.18					
v.19		turning to ⁴	nations		
	God ⁵				
v.20					<u>to order</u>
					<u>to stay away from</u> ⁶
v.21					

In the repetitive data demonstrated above, there are three sets of topics in James' speech. First of all, there is the repetition of God and his acts and of nations and their act (vv. 14-19). Of God it is said that he shall return, rebuild (2X), and restore (v. 16), and nations are said to turn to God (v. 19).

⁴This is a rendering of the participle ἐπιστρέφουσιν.

⁵God is placed in the second line to show the word order in the Greek text.

⁶Both words (*to order*, *to stay away from*) in Acts 15:20 are in the infinitive form.

Within this repetitive pattern, the progression (the progressive thought) is that nations' turning to God follows God's doings.⁷ Second, there is repetition that includes name and Lord. The relationship between name and Lord will be studied below.⁸ Third, there is repetition that highlights the grammatical element of infinitive that shows the resolution of James.⁹

An analysis of the progressive texture of name in Acts helps to understand the meaning of the progression from name to Lord in James' speech. Below is a presentation of the progression of the repetition of name in Acts, excluding the occurrences of name as the identity of a person:

Acts 2:21: Whoever calls upon *the name of the Lord* shall be saved.

Acts 2:38: Repent and each of you be baptized *in the name of Jesus Christ* for forgiveness of sins and reception of the Holy Spirit.

Acts 3:6: In *the name of Jesus Christ* the Nazarene, Peter commands the lame person to arise and walk.

Acts 3:16a: On the basis of believing in his *name*, the *name* of Jesus strengthened a lame man.

Acts 4:7: The high priest and people who were associated with him asked Peter and John by what power or *name* they did this.¹⁰

⁷When talking about progressive texture Vernon K. Robbins (*Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* [Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996b], 10) comments, "Progression emerges out of repetition. Indeed, repetition itself is one kind of progression, since movement from the first occurrence of a word to another occurrence is a forward movement—a progression—in the discourse. Focusing on progression within repetition adds more dimensions to the analysis."

⁸I delineate the relationship between name and the Lord only later. Cf. Robbins' remark, "Repetition does not reveal the precise nature of the boundaries between one unit and another. Also, repetition does not exhibit inner meanings in the sequences. But repetitive texture introduces interpreters to the overall forest, if you will, so they know where they are as they look at individual trees" (Ibid., 8).

⁹Here our focus is simply on the repetition of the infinitive form without delving into the connection of these two infinitive forms. Martin M. Culy and Mikeal C. Parsons (*Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text* [Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2003], 294-95) take the articular infinitive τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι (to stay away from) as the purpose for ἐπιστεῖλαι (to order) while C. K. Barrett (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* [2 vols.; ICC; Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994-98], 2:730) views τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι as the content of ἐπιστεῖλαι (to order).

¹⁰Joseph Fitzmyer (*The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* [AB 31; New York: Doubleday, 1998], 300) takes "this" as the healing of the lame person,

- Acts 4:10: By *the name of Jesus Christ* the Nazarene, this person stood whole before you.
- Acts 4:12: There is no salvation in another; for there is no other *name* under heaven given among men by which it is necessary for us to be saved.
- Acts 4:17: The Sanhedrin ordered Peter and John not to teach in *the name of Jesus*.
- Acts 4:30: The believers asked God to stretch out his hand so that through *the name of Jesus* healing, signs, and wonders would be done.
- Acts 5:28: The high priest reminded the apostles that they had warned them not to teach *in the name of Jesus*.
- Acts 5:40: The Sanhedrin ordered the apostles not to teach *in the name of Jesus*.
- Acts 5:41: The apostles rejoiced that they were considered worthy to be dishonored for the *name*.
- Acts 8:12: Philip preached about the kingdom of God and *the name of Jesus Christ*.
- Acts 8:16: The believers in Samaria were only baptized into *the name of the Lord Jesus*.
- Acts 9:14: Paul has authority from the high priest to bind all the people who call upon *the name of Jesus Christ*.
- Acts 9:15: Paul is to carry *the name of Jesus* before Gentiles, kings, and sons of Israel.
- Acts 9:16: The Lord Jesus told Ananias that he would show Paul all that is necessary for him to suffer for his *name*.
- Acts 9:21: Paul used to destroy people who call upon *the name of Jesus*.
- Acts 9:27: Barnabas explains how after conversion Paul spoke boldly in *the name of Jesus* in Damascus.
- Acts 9:28: Paul spoke boldly in *the name of Jesus* in Jerusalem.
- Acts 10:48: Peter ordered Cornelius and the other Gentiles to be baptized in *the name of Jesus Christ*.
- Acts 10:43: All the prophets testify that everyone who believes in Jesus receives forgiveness of sins through *the name of Jesus*.
- Acts 15:14: God visited the nations to take from them a people for his *name*.
- Acts 15:17: The remnants of men and all the nations upon which *God's name* is called might seek the Lord.
- Acts 15:26: Paul and Barnabas are the ones who risk their lives for the *name* of Jesus Christ.
- Acts 16:18: In the *name of Jesus Christ* Paul ordered the spirit to come out of the slave girl.
- Acts 18:15: Gallio says that if the issue brought before him concerns speech, *names*, or the Jewish law, the Jews should see to them themselves.
- Acts 19:5: The believers in Ephesus who had only received John's baptism were baptized into *the name of Jesus*.
- Acts 19:13: Some Jews tried casting out demons in the *name of the Lord Jesus*.
- Acts 19:17: When the news about the sons of a Jewish priest being overpowered by the man with the evil spirit in their exorcism in *the name of Jesus*, was made known to the Jews and Greeks living in Ephesus, fear came upon all, and *the name of the Lord Jesus* was magnified.
- Acts 22:16: Ananias ordered Paul to be baptized and to call upon *the name of Jesus* to have his sins forgiven.
- Acts 26:9: Paul states that he used to think that it is necessary to do many things against *the name of Jesus* the Nazarene.

while Ben Witherington, III (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998], 193) thinks that "this" may include the preaching in the temple area and the curing of the lame person. Witherington's explanation is favored because the following verses have both events in view (Acts 4:7, 10).

Of the list above on the repetition of name in Acts, the majority of the appearances of name are related to Jesus while God's name has only two occurrences in Acts 15:14 and 15:17. There are six occurrences where name is associated with the Lord (Acts 2:21; 8:16; 9:15; 15:17; 19:13; 19:17). In these six occurrences, there are three occurrences where name is specified as *the Lord Jesus* (Acts 8:16; 19:13; 19:17) while in Acts 9:15 the Lord, which refers to Jesus, is associated with name.¹¹ Both Acts 2:21 and 15:17 are citations from the Scriptures, and the Lord cited in the contexts of Joel and Amos refers to God. Nevertheless, in light of the Jesus story that Peter lays out right after his citation of Joel 3:5a in Acts 2:21 and especially in light of Peter's assertion that God has made Jesus *Lord* and Christ (Acts 2:36),¹² it is clear that Jesus is the *Lord* to whom Peter intends his audience to respond so that they can be saved. This understanding of Peter's use of Joel 3:5a in Acts 2:21 is also supported by

¹¹Acts 9:15 reads that *the Lord* told Ananias to go without hesitation to Saul because he is a chosen instrument to him to carry his *name* before Gentiles, kings, and sons of Israel. The *Lord* in Acts 9:15 refers to *Jesus* because according to Acts 9:17, when Ananias went to Saul, he informed him that *the Lord*, who is *Jesus*, had sent him and had appeared to Saul on the way he came so that he might receive sight and be full of the Holy Spirit. Concerning the presence of the word *Jesus* in some manuscripts in Acts 9:17, Bruce M. Metzger (*A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994], 320) says, "[A] majority of the Committee was impressed by the weight of early and diverse external support for its inclusion (P⁴⁵, 74 ⋈ A B C E most minuscules vg)."

¹²In Luke's account, Peter declares that Jesus the Nazarene was a man attested by God to the Jews with *δυνάμει καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις*, but the Jews nailed Jesus on the cross, which fulfills God's plan, but God raised him from the dead. Then Peter uses Ps 15:8-11 LXX to shed light on this resurrection. The ground for Peter to claim Ps 15:8-11 LXX as support is the promise of the Davidic covenant. Peter explains that because David is a prophet and because of the promise God made with him, there will be one who sits upon his throne. He thus states regarding the resurrection of Jesus that his body will not be left in Hades nor will it see corruption (Acts 2:30-31). Then Peter talks about Jesus' being raised to the right hand of God and receiving the promise of the Holy Spirit from the Father. Jesus pours out the Holy Spirit, to which the audiences of Peter bear witness. With another scriptural citation from Ps 109:1 LXX, Peter shows that the "Lord" David refers to in Ps 109:1 LXX does not refer to David himself but to Jesus. Thus toward the end Peter is able to state with confidence, "Therefore let the entire house of Israel know with certainty that God has made him both Lord and Messiah, this Jesus whom you crucified" (Acts 2:36 NRSV).

Peter's response to the members of audience who were convicted by the message and asked Peter what they should do (Acts 2:37): they should repent, each be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for the forgiveness of their sins, and then they can receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:37-38).

The question remains whether, in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17, it is possible that *the Lord* whom the remnants of men are said to seek refers to Jesus. This is likely, especially in light of the fact that *the Lord* whom the remnants of men are said to seek does not appear in Amos 9:12 LXX. It is possible that with the addition of the words *the Lord*, James stresses that the way for the Gentiles to be included among the people of God is through their seeking *the Lord Jesus*. To refine the reference more fully, it is necessary next to turn to the intertexture of James' use of Amos 9:11-12.

Intertextual Study: James' Use of the Scriptures in Acts 15:16-18

James' use of the Scriptures in Acts 15:16-18 can be interpreted according to Robbins' oral-scribal intertexture.¹³ James refers to the words of the prophets in order to confirm Peter's experience of God's action in the saving of Cornelius and his household.¹⁴ Of the five ways

¹³Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 40) defines, "Oral-scribal intertexture involves a text's use of any other text outside of itself, whether it is an inscription, the work of a Greek poet, noncanonical apocalyptic material, or the Hebrew Bible."

¹⁴W. Edward Glenny ("The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Acts 15," *BBR* 22 [2012]: 15) holds that James' interpretation of the Scriptures in Acts 15:13-18 is guided by his understanding of God's outpouring of the Spirit upon Cornelius and the Gentiles in the ministries of Peter, Paul, and Barnabas in Acts 15:7-12. Hendrick Hoet ("ΕΞ 'ΕΘΝΩΝ ΛΑΟΝ (AC 15, 14)," in *Luke and His Readers: Festschrift A. Denaux* [ed. R. Bieringer et al.; BETL 182; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005], 404) expresses a similar view, identifying two movements in James' speech. On the one hand, the Scriptures help James understand Peter's experience; conversely Peter's experience helps James more deeply understand the Scriptures, whereby Hoet claims that "a new understanding of the Scriptures goes hand in hand with a new understanding of the history." Hoet qualifies this statement by saying that James understands Peter's experience as being in conformity

("recitation, recontextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification, and thematic elaboration")¹⁵ Robbins lays out for the oral-scribal intertexture, James' use of Amos 9:11-12 recontextualizes Amos 9:11-12.¹⁶ The major text that James uses is Amos 9:11-12. James also uses Isa 45:21. In James' use of Amos 9:11-12 there are words which are not seen in Amos 9:11-12 MT and LXX. The opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω (Acts 15:16) do not occur in Amos 9:11 MT and LXX. James' use of Amos 9:12 is in deviation from Amos 9:12 MT and aligns with Amos 9:12 LXX, but even in James' citing Amos 9:12 LXX, there is in Acts 15:17a the addition of the words τὸν κύριον as an object for the verb "to seek." These various wordings and additions from Amos 9:11-12 MT suggest that, in Luke's account, James places Amos 9:11-12 in the context of the era of the church,¹⁷ and with the support of Isa 45:21, which has to do with the nations, Amos 9:11-12 is interpreted to refer to the Gentiles' seeking the Lord Jesus in the time of the church.

James' reading of the Scriptures this way resembles Jesus' reading of the Scriptures in Luke 24:47. Assuming the unity of Luke-Acts, Luke has prepared the readers to anticipate James' way of reading the Scriptures. In Luke's account, after his resurrection Jesus explained the Scriptures to his disciples asserting that the suffering and resurrection of the Messiah and the preaching of repentance

with the Scriptures.

¹⁵Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 40.

¹⁶Concerning recontextualization, Robbins (*ibid.*, 48) explains, "In contrast to recitation, recontextualization presents wording from biblical texts without explicit statement or implication that the words 'stand written' anywhere else. This may occur either in narration or in attributed speech. It is possible, of course, to have an explicit recitation that by virtue of its placement, attribution, or rewording has been recontextualized."

¹⁷This is an adoption of Pierre-Antoine Paulo's reading of James' use of Amos 9:11-12. A layout of Paulo's view will be offered below.

for the forgiveness of sins in his name among all the nations are written in the Scriptures (Luke 24:47). As Jesus reads the Scriptures, he finds that they contain the event of the church, that is, the mission work of the church. In James' reading, the Scriptures also contain the event of the church, that is, the Gentiles' being called by God's name and seeking the Lord Jesus. Jesus' reference to *name* is echoed in James' use of *name*.

To support the proposal that Jesus' reference to *name* in Luke 24:47-48 is being echoed in James' use of *name* in Acts 15:17, the following section first considers the text of Amos 9:11-12 by comparing the Amos text that James used with the MT and LXX and by ascertaining the meaning of Amos 9:11-12 MT and Amos 9:11-12 LXX. The section proceeds with a consideration of how Amos 9:11-12 is recontextualized in James' use of it. The thrust of this section is to lay the foundation for next section, which presents discussion of Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 as echoed in the recontextualization of Amos 9:11-12.

James' Use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17

James' use of Amos 9:11-12, especially Amos 9:12, follows the text of Amos 9:11-12 LXX closely. The texts of Acts 15:16-17, Amos 9:11-12 LXX, and Amos 9:11-12 MT will be compared. Discussion of the meaning of Amos 9:11-12 MT and Amos 9:11-12 LXX respectively follows. James' use of Amos 9:11-12 LXX will then be presented.

The Texts of Amos 9:11-12 MT, Amos 9:11-12 LXX, and Acts 15:16-17

The texts of Amos 9:11-12 MT, Amos 9:11-12 LXX, and Acts 15:16-17 are laid out as follows:

Amos 9:11 MT בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא In that day

Amos 9:11 LXX ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ In that day

Acts 15:16 μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω After these things I shall return

Amos 9:11 MT אֶקִּים אֶת־סֹכֶת דָּוִד הַנִּפְּלָה I shall raise up the fallen tent of David.

Amos 9:11 LXX ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν I shall raise up the fallen tent of David.

Acts 15:16 καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν and I shall rebuild the fallen tent of David.

Amos 9:11 MT וְגִדְדֵיהֶּן אֶת־פְּרָצֶיהֶן and I shall wall up its breaches.

Amos 9:11 LXX καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς and I shall rebuild its ruins.

Acts 15:16 Omitted

Amos 9:11 MT וְהִרְסֵהוּ אֶקִּים וּבְנִיתִיהָ I shall raise up its ruins and rebuild it.

Amos 9:11 LXX καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω αὐτήν and I shall raise up its ruins and rebuild it.

Acts 15:16 καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν and I shall rebuild its ruins and restore it.

Amos 9:11 MT כִּי־מִי עוֹלָם as the days of the old

Amos 9:11 LXX καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος just as the days of the old

Acts 15:16 Omitted

James' opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω are different from Amos 9:11 LXX ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ and Amos 9:11 MT בְּיוֹם הַהוּא. James' use of Amos 9:11 in Acts 15:16 generally follows Amos 9:11 LXX except that there are omissions and substitutions of verbs. Amos 9:11 LXX reads ἀναστήσω τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυὶδ τὴν πεπτωκυῖαν, and Acts 15:16 replaces ἀναστήσω with the verb ἀνοικοδομήσω. The use of different verbs from Amos 9:11 LXX is seen again in the use of ἀνοικοδομήσω in place of ἀναστήσω, and ἀνορθώσω in place of ἀνοικοδομήσω in the sentence καὶ τὰ κατεσκαμμένα αὐτῆς ἀνοικοδομήσω καὶ ἀνορθώσω αὐτήν in Acts 15:16. The sentence καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς, which follows the statement of the promise to raise up the fallen tent of David, and the closing phrase καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος in Amos 9:11 LXX are omitted in Acts 15:16.

Comparing Amos 9:11 LXX with Amos 9:11 MT, the chief difference is "the translator's harmonization of the Hebrew pronominal suffixes ('their breaches,' fem. pl.; 'his ruins,' mas.

sing.; and 'her' fem. sing.) so they all refer to the 'tent.'"¹⁸ This is also reflected in Acts 15:16.

Comparing Acts 15:16 with Amos 9:11 LXX, it is necessary to ask whether in Luke's account in Acts 15:16 James is intending a difference with the substitutions of one verb for the other. As noted above, twice in James' use ἀνοικοδομέω is employed instead of ἀνίστημι. But when ἀνοικοδομέω is used in Amos 9:11 LXX, another verb ἀνορθόω is used by James instead. It is observed here that James' use of various verbs from Amos 9:11 LXX is best seen as stylistic. The reason is that with James' favoring of the word ἀνοικοδομέω, one might use the word to support some scholars' interpretation of the tent as a reference to the temple; ἀνοικοδομέω in the LXX is used to refer to the building of a town, a city, and a house, and in Zech 1:16 it is used with the reference to the building of the temple. Nevertheless, in James' use of ἀνορθόω in place of ἀνοικοδομέω, this usage may be taken as a support for some scholars' interpreting the raising up of the tent of David to refer to the restoration of the Davidic dynasty. In the LXX, in several occurrences ἀνορθόω is used for the promise that God will build the throne of David forever (2 Sam 7:13, 16; 1Chr 17:12, 14, 24; 1Chr 22:10).

Therefore, it is concluded here that James' use of various verbs from the LXX is best seen as stylistic, and the meaning of the raising of the tent of David in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 should not be decided on the basis of the verbs used. Nevertheless, James' omission of the phrase καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος is significant. It suggests that the restoration that James pictures is different from that of Amos 9:11-12.¹⁹ We can only understand how different this restoration would

¹⁸W. Edward Glenny, *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos* (VTSup 126; Leiden: Brill, 2009), 217.

¹⁹Commenting upon the omission of the phrase כִּימִי עוֹלָם in Acts 15:17, Barrett (*Acts*, 2:725) says, "Acts is concerned with something new, not a renewal of the past though it was foretold in the past."

be from that of Amos after we have studied James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12. It is evident that the omission of the phrase καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος prepares for James to side with Amos 9:12 LXX in Acts 15:17, which diverges significantly from Amos 9:12MT. Amos 9:11-12 mainly has to do with the restoration of the Davidic dynasty, but James transforms the text to refer mainly to the Gentile mission as foretold in the Scriptures.

Acts 15:17 generally follows Amos 9:12 LXX, but Amos 9:12 LXX has a major textual variance from Amos 9:12 MT. The layout of the three texts is below:

Amos 9:12 MT למען יירשו את־שארית אדום וכל־הגוים אשר־נקרא שמי עליהם
נאם־יהוה עשה זאת

in order that they shall possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations over whom my name has been called, says the Lord who does this.

Amos 9:12 LXX ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς λέγει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ
ποιῶν ταῦτα

in order that the remnant of the men might seek, and all the nations over whom my name has been called (might seek), says Lord the God who is doing these things.

Acts 15:17 ὅπως ἂν ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸν κύριον
καὶ πάντα τὰ ἔθνη ἐφ' οὓς ἐπικέκληται τὸ ὄνομά μου ἐπ' αὐτούς, λέγει κύριος ποιῶν ταῦτα
in order that the remnant of the men might seek the Lord, and all the nations over whom my name has been called (might seek the Lord), says the Lord who is doing these things.

There are two differences between Amos 9:12 LXX and Acts 15:17. In James' use of Amos 9:12a LXX in Acts 15:17a, the words τὸν κύριον are added as an object for the verb "to seek." Furthermore, the designation of the speaker in Amos 9:12b LXX with the words κύριος ὁ θεὸς is changed in Acts 15:17b, where the subject of the action is only κύριος. The omission of the words ὁ θεὸς in Acts 15:17b may seem to obscure the identity of κύριος.

The significant textual variance lies in Acts 15:17a and Amos 9:12a LXX against Amos 9:12a MT. Acts 15:17a and Amos 9:12a LXX read ὅπως ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων (in order that the remnants of men might seek [the Lord: the addition in Acts 15:17])

against MT Amos 9:12a אֶת־שְׂאֵרֵי אֲדוֹם יִירְשׁוּ (in order that they might possess the remnant of Edom). The textual difference involves a change from לִמְעַן יִירְשׁוּ (that they may possess) to יִדְרְשׁוּ לִמְעַן (that they might seek) and אֲדוֹם (Edom) to אָדָם (mankind). The direct object marker (אֶת) in Amos 9:12 MT is also dropped so that "the remnants of men" becomes the subject in Amos 9:12 LXX.²⁰

Scholars have presented various explanations for the textual difference between Amos 9:12b LXX and Amos 9:12b MT. For example, Michael Braun thinks that the Hebrew text James used is "divergent from the MT and superior to it."²¹ Ådna seconds Braun's view; he does not think that Acts 15:16-18 depends upon the LXX text but rather upon an independent text, the proto-Masoretic, and he goes to the Qumran text to support his view.²² Bauckham proposes that a Jewish Christian "may have known a Hebrew text like that translated by the LXX, but, even if not, would have recognized that the LXX represents, not a misreading, but either a variant text or a deliberate alternative reading of the text" because "Jewish exegetes were accustomed to choosing among variants the reading which suited their interpretation, or to exploiting more than one."²³

²⁰O. Palmer Robertson, "Hermeneutics of Continuity," in *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments* (ed. John S. Feinberg; Westchester, Ill.: Crossway, 1988), 97-98.

²¹Michael Braun, "James' Use of Amos at the Jerusalem Council: Steps toward a Possible Solution of the Textual and Theological Problems," *JETS* 20 (1977): 117.

²²Jostein Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift als Zeuge der Heidenmission: Die Rezeption von Amos 9,11-12 in Apg 15,16-18," in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche: Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Jostein Ådna, Scott J. Hafemann, and Otfried Hofius; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 13, 16-18.

²³Richard Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)," in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts* (ed. Ben Witherington III; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Thinking similarly to Bauckham, R. Timothy McLay explains that it is possible that the translators' understanding of Amos 9:12 would have been influenced by the "clause *and all the nations over whom my name has been called*" together with the theological notion "that *the rest/remainder of the peoples* would seek the Lord after the restoration of the people of Israel."²⁴ Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva reason similarly and conclude that the changes made to the Hebrew text make the text more fitting to the issue of Acts 15.²⁵

The above summary of some scholars' solutions for the textual divergence between Amos 9:12b MT and Amos 9:12b LXX indicates the complexity of the textual problem. Several issues arise from their explanations about the text of Amos 9:12 that James uses, including the textual history of the Hebrew Bible and the interpretation of the Septuagint. These two areas are beyond the scope of this section. McLay's explanation, noted above, however, is helpful especially in understanding the divergence. We can view Amos 9:12 LXX "a deliberate alternative reading of the text," an elucidation given by Bauckham among the reasons he gives for the textual variance.²⁶ The concerns of scholars such as Braun and Ådna, who think that Amos 9:12 LXX uses a different Hebrew text, cannot be exhaustively addressed here. While avoiding further probing into the textual history of the Hebrew Bible, we find Wolfgang Kraus' insight nonetheless helpful:

1996), 160-61.

²⁴R. Timothy McLay, *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 23. McLay says that in the Minor Prophets there are instances of confusion of consonants in translation, but a total of three changes in the one variant reading of Amos 9:12 "means that the alteration was probably not simply a case of misreading the consonantal text" (ibid.).

²⁵Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 195.

²⁶Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 160-61.

Since we have no textual witnesses that could testify to another text type for Amos, the best thing we can do is to assume that a consonantal text that was essentially the same as the MT was the *Vorlage* for the Septuagint. Appealing to the idea of "textual pluriformity and variety," the existence of which in ancient Judaism can basically not be denied, is too vague and does not help us here.²⁷

The question one needs to ask at this point is whether, in the translation of Amos 9:12 MT, the LXX text departs from the meaning of Amos 9:12 MT. This question is pertinent to the pursuit of James' use of Amos 9:11-12 because if the LXX text of Amos 9:12 differs in meaning from the MT text, then James' siding with the LXX text will significantly illuminate James' use of Amos 9:11-12. Even if the LXX text only draws out the intended meaning of the MT, this fact tells us something about the context of James' speech. Therefore, first it is necessary to ascertain the meaning of Amos 9:11-12 before being able to understand James' use of the passage. In the next section the meaning of Amos 9:11-12MT is investigated, with special emphasis on understanding the raised tent of David and the possession of the remnants of Edom and all the nations called by God's name.

The Meaning of Amos 9:11-12 MT

According to Billy K. Smith and Franklin S. Page, "Most interpreters agree that David's *sukkat* . . . is a metaphor for Davidic rule or some aspect of it."²⁸ Following this majority view, they think that the tent of David refers to David's dynasty, which is called his "house" in 2 Sam 7:5-16.

²⁷Wolfgang Kraus, "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11-12 as a Test Case," in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect* (ed. Robert J. V. Hiebert, et al.; SBLSCS 56; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010), 176. Kraus explains that the quotation is "[a]gainst the authors cited by Ådna, 'Die Heilige Schrift,' 5, 11" (footnote 34, p. 176).

²⁸Billy K. Smith and Franklin S. Page, *Amos, Obadiah, Jonah* (NAC 19B; Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1995), 165.

During "Amos's time it was tottering and in need of stabilization."²⁹ Jörg Jeremias reads Amos 9:11 in light of Amos 9:8 and explains that the surviving house of Jacob can not be without any political form: Thus he takes the booth of David as referring to "an especially simple edifice not yet deserving the name 'house'" and says that God's making it as in the days of old "alludes to God's ideal beginning with the Davidic dynasty (cf. 2 Sam 7) before the sin of God's kings thwarted God's plans."³⁰

Drawing out the significance of various pronominal suffixes used, Thomas Edward McComiskey explains first of all that the breaches (fem. pl.) which the Lord would repair refer to "the divided kingdom," its (masc. sing.) ruins which the Lord would restore are David's ruins, and the object "it" (fem. sing.) for the verb "rebuild" refers to the tent (fem.): He therefore concludes that the "Davidic dynasty, represented by the tent, was, according to Amos, to be restored."³¹ Shalom M. Paul also takes the raising up of the fallen tent of David as a reference to "the restoration of the Davidic dynasty and kingdom."³² Max E. Polley links Amos 9:11-12 with the theme of social justice in the book of Amos and understands Amos 9:11-12 to say that the coming Davidic king "would establish a proper

²⁹Ibid.

³⁰Jörg Jeremias, *The Book of Amos: A Commentary* (trans. Douglas W. Stott; OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1998), 167. Jeremias explains that he takes the restoration of the booth of David as a simple edifice because of "[t]he dual image of the breaches of the booth that can yet be repaired, and of the ruins that are to be rebuilt," which do not fit the descriptions of a booth (ibid.).

³¹Thomas Edward McComiskey, "Amos," in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary* (ed. Frank Gaebel; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985), 329.

³²Shalom M. Paul, *Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos* (ed. Frank Moore Cross; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991), 289.

judicial system to ensure that justice rolls on like waters and righteousness as a never-ceasing stream."³³

Nevertheless, against the dominant view of linking the raising up of the fallen tent of David with the restoration of the Davidic dynasty and its association, there are scholars who hold other opinions concerning the booth of David. For example, Robert Coote argues that the key to interpreting "the tent of David" should be "the image of the hut" rather than "the figure of David." He suggests that the imagery of the booth "represents dependency on Yahweh rather than self-sufficiency. . . . The strength of the new cities lies in collective solidarity, the absence of monarchist power, and the protection of Yahweh."³⁴ Sabine Nägele identifies the meaning of the term "booth" as "temple" in a traditional meaning and "Jerusalem" in a later extended usage.³⁵

John Anthony Dunne agrees with Nägele's notion of the booth referring to the temple and Jerusalem. Dunne says that the word סכה originally was associated with the feast of tabernacles and later connected with harvest. He finds the theme of harvest present in Amos 9:13-15: "The rebuilding of 'David's tent' leads to an abundance of fertility in the land (Amos 9:13-15)."³⁶ He then posits an association between temple and fertility, though he does not exclude the idea of the kingdom from the phrase "the tent of David." Nevertheless, he is of the opinion that the major focus of the

³³Max Polley, *Amos and the Davidic Empire: A Socio-Historical Approach* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 134-35.

³⁴Robert Coote, *Amos among the Prophets: Composition and Theology* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981), 125.

³⁵Sabine Nägele, *Laubhütte Davids und Wolkensohn: eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Amos 9, 11 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese* (AGJU 24; Leiden: Brill, 1995), 237.

³⁶John Anthony Dunne, "David's Tent as Temple in Amos 9:11-15: Understanding the Epilogue of Amos and Considering Implications for the Unity of the Book," *WTJ* 73 (2011): 364-65.

phrase "the tent of David" lies on the temple, and he asserts that the prophecy highlights "one major aspect of the future blessing, namely, the [climactic] establishment of the divine dwelling place and the implications that this will have."³⁷

Referring to Kenneth Pomykala's study, Greg Goswell supports the understanding of the booth of David as "the temple and Jerusalem as a unit": Citing Pomykala, Goswell states that the term "fallen," which describes the booth of David, "can apply to destroyed cities (e.g. 'Fallen, fallen is Babylon' [Isa. 21:9])," and the words used in Amos 9:11 ("breaches, ruins, rebuild") also correspond to a city: Such an emphasis upon the city of Jerusalem in Amos 9:11 would also form an inclusio with Amos 1:2.³⁸

In arguing for his understanding of the booth of David to signify "Jerusalem as a cultic centre, with the temple as its focal point," Goswell observes that the use of the words "fall" and "rise" in Amos 5:2 and 8:14, which are related to a cultic emphasis, indicates that the same words in Amos 9:11 also have "a cultic focus."³⁹ He then adduces a parallel to Amos 9:11 in Isa 4:6, "where the word 'booth' is used of the cloud, smoke and fire that will cover future Zion."⁴⁰ In the use of cloud and fire, Goswell finds the connection to the presence of God in the tabernacle and the filling of the cloud in Solomon's temple. Goswell states that Isa 4:2-6 has often been taken as "a companion passage to Isa

³⁷Ibid., 366.

³⁸Greg Goswell, "David in the Prophecy of Amos," *VT* 61 (2011): 252.

³⁹Ibid.

⁴⁰Ibid.

2:1-4 about 'the mountain of the house of the Lord,' and this suggests that the temple is also in view in Isaiah 4."⁴¹ Goswell also finds a parallel to Amos 9:11 in Isa 16:5.

Of the arguments that Goswell uses to support his proposal for reading the booth of David as referring to Jerusalem with its cultic focus, his reference to the context of Amos (the use of the same vocabulary of fall and rise in Amos 5:2, 8:14, and 9:11) seems best to support his thesis. Dunne also seems convincing in using Amos 9:13-15 to interpret Amos 9:11 so as to render the meaning of the tent of David as pointing toward Jerusalem and the temple, though Goswell presents more persuasive evidence. Goswell seems also to be correct in using the meaning of the "tent" in Isa 4:6 to shed light upon the significance of the term the booth of David in Amos 9:11. Nevertheless, in response to those who have taken the tent of David in Amos 9:11 as Jerusalem/temple, Kraus' cautions that :

[the word] σκηνή covers a variety of ideas and cannot be limited to the tabernacle or Jerusalem. There is, of course, no doubt that σκηνή can denote Jerusalem or the sanctuary, but the question is whether this aspect is always implied and therefore has to be taken into account in Amos 9:11.⁴²

Kraus suggests that in order to understand the meaning of the phrase σκηνή Δαυίδ, one should not only look at the word σκηνή but at the collocation σκηνή Δαυίδ together.⁴³ Kraus finds Isa 16:5, the other occurrence of σκηνή Δαυίδ in the Septuagint in the rendering of the Hebrew דָּוִד לְהַלְלָהּ, as the text that is "comparable to Amos 9:11 with regard to content."⁴⁴ Goswell also takes Isa

⁴¹Ibid., 253.

⁴²Kraus, "The Role of the Septuagint," 177.

⁴³Ibid.

⁴⁴Ibid., 179.

16:5 into account as a support for his understanding of the booth of David as Jerusalem/temple. Goswell says, "In line with the idea of the temple as a place of asylum . . . , [Isa]16:1-4 describe Moabite emissaries seeking asylum from the Davidic ruler who sits enthroned 'in the tent of David' (16:5)."⁴⁵

Kraus has a different interpretation of Isa 16:5. He acknowledges that in Isa 16:5 σκηνη Δαυίδ refers to Jerusalem where "a successor to the throne of David" reigns, but he argues that "σκηνη Δαυίδ is not an equivalent for the city of Jerusalem but a symbolic expression for the Davidic reign."⁴⁶ In an article studying the relationship between the new covenant and promises referring to David in the future in the books of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Isaiah, Bernard Gosse says that Isa 16:5 appears to cover the theme of the New David in Isa 55:3 ("apparaît donc comme une reprise du thème du nouveau David de lv 3") but without reference to the new covenant.⁴⁷ Gosse's understanding of Isa 16:5 as a David reference clearly supports Kraus' conception of Isa 16:5.

However, the argument for taking the tent of David in Amos 9:11 as a reference to Jerusalem/temple is able to explain why the reference to the nations in Amos 9:12 follows immediately upon the raising up of the tent of David in Amos 9:11. As summarized above, Goswell links Amos 9:11 with Isa 4:6 and next links Isa 4:2-6 with Isa 2:1-4. Isaiah 2:2 says, "In days to come the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established as the highest of the mountains . . . ; all the nations shall stream to it" (NRSV). In the words of Marvin A. Sweeney, "Isaiah 2-4 posits neither a Davidic

⁴⁵Goswell, "David," 254.

⁴⁶Kraus, "The Role of the Septuagint," 179.

⁴⁷Bernard Gosse, "La nouvelle alliance et les promesses d'avenir se référant à David dans les livres de Jérémie, Ezéchiel et Isaie," *VT* 41 (1991): 428.

monarch nor a gentile monarch in its vision of the future, but points only to YHWH as the sovereign."⁴⁸ Thus a reference to the temple in the tent of David in Amos 9:11 would be able to explain the element of the nations in Amos 9:12.

Nevertheless, Sweeney emphasizes that in Micah 4-5, which is similar in content to Isa 2:2-4, a restored Davidic king "presumably serves as the focal point for YHWH's rule over the nations in the envisioned era of peace."⁴⁹ One may also conclude that the raising up of the fallen booth of David in Amos 9:11 refers to the restoration of the Davidic dynasty or reign. Unlike the proposal of viewing the tent of David as Jerusalem/temple, which is able to garner support from the context of the book of Amos, this prophecy in Amos 9:11 joins other prophecies such as Isa 16:5 that speak of the restoration of the Davidic reign.

Coote, as noted above, argues that the key to interpreting the tent of David is the imagery of the hut rather than the person of David. However, if the virtue of the new cities is their lack of kingly power, as Coote implies, there would be no point of mentioning David at all in the text. If Coote had taken the phrase "the tent of David" in its entirety to interpret the phrase instead of using the image of tent to interpret the phrase, the conclusion would have been different.

Considering that the meaning of the raising of the fallen tent of David lies in the restoration of the Davidic reign, one must then understand the connotation of possessing Edom and the remnant of nations along with this restoration. While various scholars, as noted above, have taken the

⁴⁸Marvin A. Sweeney, "Micah's Debate with Isaiah," *JSOT* 93 (2011): 121.

⁴⁹*Ibid.*, 120. Sweeney does not think that Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 are talking about the same thing: "Whereas the book of Isaiah presents a scenario of worldwide punishment of both the nations and Israel by YHWH that will result in peace and universal recognition of YHWH at Zion, Micah presents a scenario in which peace among the nations and universal recognition of YHWH will emerge following a period in which a new Davidic king will arise to punish the nations for their own prior abuse of Israel" (*ibid.*, 113).

dispossessing of Edom and the remnant of nations as their being under the authority of the Davidic rule, there remains a difficulty: The nations are designated as the ones called by God's name. The difficulty of reconciling the assertion of the Davidic rule over the remnants of Edom and the nations on the one hand with the description of the nations as the ones called by God's name on the other hand is especially felt in the commentary of Andersen and Freedman.

Andersen and Freedman find that the statement that "Yahweh's name is pronounced over all the nations is unprecedented."⁵⁰ Because they cannot reconcile this text with other passages that designate God's name over either the temple or Israel (2 Chr 7:14, Isa 63:19), they make the relative clause אשר־נקרא שמי עליהם the subject of Amos 9:12; thus Andersen and Freedman render Amos 9:12 to mean that Israel, over whom God's name is invoked, will possess the remnant of Edom and all the nations.⁵¹ Moreover, Andersen and Freedman recognize that the omission of את before "all the nations" is against normal syntax, so they categorize the conjunction "and" (ו), which joins the remnant of Edom and all the nations, as "epexegetic or emphatic," and on this basis they give another interpretation for 9:12: "The remnant of the Edomites will be dispossessed by a coalition of nations bearing the name of Yahweh."⁵² On the omission of את, Aaron Park says that it can be argued that "the object marker is not absolutely required," and this is the assumption of most commentators.⁵³

⁵⁰Francis Andersen and David Freedman, *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB24 A; New York: Doubleday, 1989), 890.

⁵¹Ibid., 891.

⁵²Ibid., 917.

⁵³Aaron Park, *The Book of Amos as Composed and Read in Antiquity* (SBL 37; New York: Peter Lang, 2001), 127.

Thus it is better to take the remnant of Edom and all the nations as the object of the verb to possess, and ask why Edom is singled out.⁵⁴

The notion of God's name being called over an object is, among its other usages in the Scriptures, a phrase used of the Israelites, God's people (Deut 28:10; 2 Chron 7:14; Jer 14:9; Dan 9:19).⁵⁵ The fact that a phrase descriptive of the Israelites is applied to the nations indicates that in Amos 9:11 the nations who are designated as being called by God's name are God's people. Therefore, Bauckham is right when he says, "Even the MT could easily have been understood by a Jewish Christian as predicting the extension of Israel's covenant status and privileges to the Gentile nations."⁵⁶

In Amos 9:12MT, the verb "possess" signals the inclusion of the nations among the people of God, depicted from the perspective of Israel: With the revival of the Davidic empire, the imagery speaks of the growth and expansion of the Davidic empire, which "possesses" the nations called by God's name. Either the succession of the Davidic kings or the Israelites may be said to "possess" the other nations.

Therefore, it is concluded that in Amos 9:11-12 MT the raising up of the tent of David refers to the restoration of the Davidic reign. With this restoration, the Gentiles are included among the people of God even though the language speaks of them being possessed by the Davidic empire.

⁵⁴Robertson ("Hermeneutics of Continuity," 91-93) says that the reason why Edom is singled out is because of its hostile history with the Davidic dynasty. Even such a hated enemy is included among the people of God.

⁵⁵The above scriptural references are from Bauckham ("James and the Gentiles," 168). Bauckham explains that the idiom **שְׂמִי עֲלֵיהֶם נִקְרָא** "expresses ownership, and is used especially of YHWH's ownership of the ark, the Temple, the city of Jerusalem, and the people of Israel" (ibid.).

⁵⁶Ibid., 169.

Amos 9:11-12 LXX

Adopting McLay's explanation of the textual variance between Amos 9:12b LXX and Amos 9:12b MT, laid out above, the LXX text of Amos 9:12 may be understood in the following scenario. The translator sees the clause in Amos 9:12 MT of God's name being invoked over the Gentiles and understands it as indicating that Gentiles are included among the people of God. At the same time the translator—influenced by other prophetic texts that speak of Gentiles seeking the Lord at the end time—changes the text of Amos 9:12 MT from the possession of "the remnant of Edom and the nations called by God's name" to "the remnants of men and the nations called by God's name shall seek."

Texts that speak of the Gentiles seeking God in the Scriptures help us to understand why the translator changes Amos 9:12 MT. As mentioned above, Isaiah 2 and Micah 4 speak of the Gentiles seeking God. Additionally, Zech 2:11a⁵⁷ reads, "Many nations shall join themselves to the Lord on that day, and shall be my people" (NRSV). Amos 9:11-12 LXX shows that there is a close relationship between God's acting in the house of David and the Gentiles' seeking. By aligning with Amos 9:12 LXX, in Luke's account James adds *the Lord* as the object of the Gentiles' seeking. In order to specify the reference of the Lord, it is necessary next to turn to the larger discussion of James' use of Amos 9:11-12.

James' Use of Amos 9:11-12

In talking about James' use of Amos 9:11-12, it is necessary to include James' use of other texts of the Scriptures because they together form a united voice agreeing with God's activity in

⁵⁷Kraus considers this passage in "The Role of the Septuagint," 182.

the conversion of Cornelius and his household (Acts 15:14), an instance of the presence of Gentiles among the people of God. It is by a discussion of other citations from the Scriptures that we can begin to understand how Amos 9:11-12 is recontextualized in James' use. As noted above, in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 there are words which are not seen in Amos 9:11-12 MT and LXX. The opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω (Acts 15:16) and the closing terms γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος (Acts 15:18) in James' citation do not occur in Amos 9:11 MT and LXX. Additionally, there is in Acts 15:17a the addition of the words τὸν κύριον as an object for the verb "to seek."

Therefore, in discussing James' use of Amos 9:11-12, this section will start with analysis of the referent of the opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω, then move to discuss the meaning of the raising up of the fallen tent in James' use. From then we will proceed to consider the referent of the words τὸν κύριον, and end with a discussion of the closing terms γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος (Acts 15:18). A discussion of James' recontextualization of Amos 9:11-12 will conclude this section.

Referent of the Words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω

There are several suggestions for the prophetic texts which lie behind the words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω. Barrett thinks that Acts portrayal of James changing the opening phrase from ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ in Amos 9:11 LXX to μετὰ ταῦτα may have subconsciously recalled Jer 12:15.⁵⁸ Bauckham takes μετὰ ταῦτα from Hos 3:5 and ἀναστρέψω as an allusion to Jer 12:15-16.⁵⁹

⁵⁸Barrett, *Acts*, 2:725.

⁵⁹Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 163.

On the other hand, O. Palmer Robertson thinks that μετὰ ταῦτα or μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω is a rendering of the phrase "in that day" in Amos 9:11 MT and LXX.⁶⁰ He argues that the phrase "in that day" in Amos 9:11 cannot mean that the restoration promised by Yahweh for Israel (Amos 9:11-15) occurs simultaneously with the judgments of God on Israel (Amos 9:1-10).⁶¹ Thus Robertson concludes that the phrase "in that day" in Amos 9:11 indicates the time following upon the judgments, and James' use of μετὰ ταῦτα or μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω is "a proper translation of Amos' 'in that day.'"⁶² Pierre-Antoine Paulo⁶³ and Earl Richard,⁶⁴ by contrast, both take μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω as referring to Acts 7:42-43, the other clear Amos citation in Acts.

Among these proposals, the references to Hos 3:5 and Jer 12:15(-16) should be ruled out, for a number of reasons. In regard to Bauckham's suggestion of seeing Hos 3:5 behind μετὰ ταῦτα, it has to be noted that the subject of the verb to "return" is different in Acts 15:16 and Hos 3:5. In Acts 15:16 the subject of the return is singular, ἀναστρέψω, the Lord's return. But in Hos 3:5 it is after the Israelites lost their kings, temple, and the sacrifices for many days that they will return (ἐπιστρέψουσιν) and seek the Lord their God and David their king. Besides, Hosea 3 emphasizes "the inactivity of God," and the passage presents "no indication of the means that Yahweh will use to bring

⁶⁰Robertson, "Hermeneutics of Continuity," 97.

⁶¹Ibid., 90.

⁶²Ibid., 97.

⁶³Pierre-Antoine Paulo, *Le problème ecclésial des Actes à la lumière de deux prophéties d'Amos* (RNS 3; Montréal: Bellarmin, 1985), 79-85.

⁶⁴Earl Richard, "The Creative Use of Amos," *NovT* 24 (1982): 49-50.

about this return."⁶⁵ Acts 15:16 focuses by contrast on the action of God: He raises up the fallen tent of David.

A similar evaluation applies to the suggestion of Jer 12:15(-16). In Jer 12:14-17, which follows the message of punishment upon Judah (12:7-13), Yahweh addresses the nations with the words of destruction (12:14) and restoration (12:15-17). He is about to pluck the nations from their land (12:14). But after (μετὰ) Yahweh punishes the nations, he promises to return (ἐπιστρέψω), have compassion on the nations, and bring them back to their land. While it is not to be denied that the Gentiles also benefit from God's return in James' use of Amos 9:11, the first beneficiary in that context is the Israelites. Moreover, as Robertson says, Amos 9:11-15 has the judgment in Amos 9:1-10 in view; after the judgment on Israel, the restoration promised for Israel is presented. In Jer 12 the words of the restoration promised by God for the nations are framed by words of God's judgment.

Moreover, the emphasis on proselytizing the nations in Jer 12:16-17 raises questions when fitting Jer 12:15 within the context of Acts 15. Jeremiah 12:16-17 reads, "And then, if they will diligently learn the ways of my people, to swear by my name, 'As the LORD lives,' as they taught my people to swear by Baal, then they shall be built up in the midst of my people. But if any nation will not listen, then I will completely uproot it and destroy it, says the LORD" (NRSV). Walter Brueggemann says that according to Jer 12:16-17, "the future of the nations is conditioned by the torah."⁶⁶ John Bracke expresses a similar reading of Jer 12:16-17: The nations will be judged according to the same

⁶⁵Francis I. Andersen and David Noel Freedman, *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 24; Garden City: Doubleday, 1980), 307.

⁶⁶Walter Brueggemann, *To Pluck Up, to Tear Down: A Commentary on the Book of Jeremiah 1-25* (ITC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 120.

standard as the Israelites under the covenant blessings and curses.⁶⁷ A question arises: How can an allusion to Jer 12:15 not be a convincing proof for the Pharisaic believers present in the meeting to reinforce the notion that the Gentiles must abide by the whole law (Acts 15:5)? Therefore, it is not likely that the words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω in Acts 15:16 allude to Jer 12:15.

Robertson's proposal as described above, that μετὰ ταῦτα or μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω is a rendering of the phrase "in that day" in Amos 9:11 MT and LXX explains James' use of μετὰ ταῦτα but cannot explain his addition of ἀναστρέψω. As Robertson points out, the time for the restoration depicted in Amos 9:11-12 is after the judgments in Amos 9:1-10. Thus James rightly renders the phrase "in that day" as μετὰ ταῦτα. But the judgment message of God in Amos 9:1-10 does not state that, together with or due to the judgment pronounced by God, God went away and would therefore needs to "come back." The words μετὰ ταῦτα render "in that day," but the word ἀναστρέψω needs to be explained from some other source.

Both Richard and Paulo connect James' opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω with the use of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43. Their proposals demand a hearing, especially in light of the fact that in Amos 5:25-27 God announces that he will send the Israelites into exile beyond Damascus due to their idolatry. But the text of Amos does not go on to say that God went away because of their idolatry. On the other hand, in Stephen's use of Amos 5:25-27, Stephen first states that, due to the event of the golden calf (Acts 7:40-41), God *turned away* and gave them over to serve or worship the star of the heaven (Acts 7:42a) as written in the book of the prophets, at which point he cites Amos 5:25-27.

⁶⁷John Bracke, *Jeremiah 1-29* (WBC; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2000), 117.

Richard gives several reasons to support his view of connecting James' opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω in his quotation of Amos 9:11-12 with the use of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43. He says that in Acts 7 Luke deals with early Jewish history, but in Acts 15 Luke "dwells upon the contemporary period, i.e., the post-exilic renewal of Israel."⁶⁸ Besides, Richard notes that there are related themes common to Acts 7:42-46 and Acts 15:16-18: "tabernacle, David, 'build/rebuild', and lastly the important idea associated with the root στρέψω."⁶⁹ He also says that "the added reference to the tabernacle in relation to David in Acts vii 42-46, as here [Acts 15:16], reinforces this conclusion," and further claims that "the term 'rebuild' (twice used in xv 16) as well as the accumulation of 'building' imagery reinforces the earlier house-tabernacle-place motif of ch.vii."⁷⁰ Finally, in Acts 7:42, God turns away (ἔστρεψεν) from his people because they reject Moses and in their hearts they turn (ἔστράφησαν) to Egypt (Acts 7:39), while in Acts 15:16 God "turns back" (ἀναστρέψω) to his people.⁷¹

Paulo thinks in similar terms as Richard. He says that the two Amos quotations in Acts make a "partie de tout un circuit structuré": The same God who once turned away from his unfaithful people resolves to turn back.⁷² Regarding Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43 and Amos 9:11-12 in Acts

⁶⁸Richard, "Creative Use," 49.

⁶⁹Ibid.

⁷⁰Ibid.

⁷¹Ibid., 49-50.

⁷²Paulo, *Le problème ecclésial*, 79.

15:16-17 as an apologetic summary explaining the situation of the church vis-à-vis Israel,⁷³ Paulo states that the Amos 5 quotation in Acts 7 talks about the origin and idolatry of the blindness of Israel while the citation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15 shows how the church comes into being. He says that "Au temps de la restauration messianique, dans la communauté du salut inaugurée par le Ressuscité, les nations abandonneront leur culte idolâtrique pour chercher le Seigneur."⁷⁴

In evaluating the proposals of Richard and Paulo, it is to be noted first that Richard's attempt to connect tabernacle, David, and the word "building" in Acts 7 with the tabernacle of David and the word "rebuilding" in Acts 15 is not convincing. The tabernacle of David should be taken as one phrase in Acts 15:16 to arrive at its meaning, whereas the ideas of "tabernacle" and "David" are separate in Acts 7:42-46.⁷⁵ Richard's connection of the two Amos quotations in Acts to the early Jewish history and post-exilic renewal of Israel, however, is useful as a probe into James' use of the Scriptures, as is Paulo's linking of the two Amos citations as about Israel and church. Their proposals are helpful because the notion of God's returning in James' opening phrase in Acts 15:16 is explained by the connection of James' use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 with the citation of Amos 5:25-27 in Acts 7:42-43. As Paulo proposes, God's turning away in Acts 7 and his returning in Acts 15 form a

⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴Ibid., 84.

⁷⁵Richard's argument would support the opinion of taking the raising up of the tabernacle of David as related to the building of the eschatological temple, but in the earlier part of this paper it has been demonstrated that the raising up of the tent of David should be taken as the restoration of the Davidic dynasty or reign. Moreover, Richard's connecting Acts 7 with Acts 15 with "tabernacle" recalls the usage of the Qumran community in CD 7:15-16. This will be discussed below. The key word for the Qumran community to connect Amos 5:26-27 and Amos 9:11 is "tabernacle."

"partie de tout un circuit structure."⁷⁶ In light of Richard's understanding of James' use of Amos 9:11-12 as reflecting Israel's post-exilic renewal and Paulo's interpreting James' use of Amos 9:11-12 as concerning the church, the opening phrase μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 sets the tone for understanding his use of the Scriptures: James places Amos 9:11-12 in the time of the Jesus movement, as narrated in Acts. In light of this understanding, the raising up of the tent of David in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 is related to Jesus because in Luke's narration of the Jesus movement in Luke-Acts, the figure David is linked with Jesus; besides, *the Lord* the Gentiles are said to seek, the addition to Amos 9:12 LXX in James' use of Amos 9:11-12, is *the Lord Jesus*, according to the account in Acts. It is to a discussion of these two elements that the next two sections turn. But before moving to the sections of the referent of the raising of the tent of David and that of the Lord, it would be helpful to turn to the Qumran writings, where the two Amos quotations are also used.⁷⁷ The purpose is to show that James in Luke's account is not the only one who places Amos 9:11-12 in the context of the history of its own community.

The Damascus Document 7:15-16 reads, "*I will exile the tabernacle of your king and the bases of your statues from my tent to Damascus. The Books of the Law are the tabernacle of the king; as God said, I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen.*"⁷⁸ CD 7:15 uses Amos 5:26-27, while CD 7:16 uses Amos 9:11. Amos 5:26-27 concerns the threat of exile due to the idolatry of Israel, but in its recontextualization of Amos 5:26-27 the Qumran community changes it to "a promise of

⁷⁶Paulo, *Le problème ecclésial*, 79.

⁷⁷Paulo also mentions this occurrence (*ibid.*, 126).

⁷⁸Geza Vermes, *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (New York: Penguin Books, 1997), 133 (emphasis in original).

salvation."⁷⁹ "Damascus" is the key word in their choosing this text and interpretation. The Qumran community uses Amos 5:26-27 to explain their existence in Damascus. They are the remnants after God's punishment who did not become apostate, but were spared and "escaped to the land of the north."⁸⁰

Amos 9:11 is then cited to support their reading of "the tabernacle of the king": "The Books of the Law are the *tabernacle* of the king; as God said, *I will raise up the tabernacle of David which is fallen.*"⁸¹ Thus they understood Amos 9:11 as fulfilled in themselves. The raising up of the tent of David means that "the Torah is fulfilled in its eschatological validity."⁸² Now their community is where God's teachings are interpreted rightly and obeyed.

Next is a study of the referent of the raising up of the tent of David in this new group, the early followers of Jesus.

Referent of the Raising up of the Tent of David in Acts 15:16

To understand what the raising of the tent of David means in James' speaking of its fulfillment in the Christian community, it is necessary to view it in the context of the repetition of "David" in the progression of Luke-Acts. David is an important literary marker already in the Gospel. Except for the occurrences where David is mentioned as the author of a given psalm (Luke 20:42-43;

⁷⁹Ibid., 126.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Ibid., 133 (emphasis in original).

⁸² Sabine Nägele, *Laubhütte Davids und Wolkensohn: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Amos 9,11 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese* (AGJU 24; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995), 224.

Acts 1:16, 2:25, 2:34, 4:25) or where an historical event is linked with David (Acts 2:29, 7:45, 13:22, 13:36), there is a consistent development of the theme that Jesus Christ is the one who sits upon the throne of David. Even with the depictions of David as the author of a given psalm, there is still a connection between David and Jesus in some passages in that David speaks of the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 2:25) and the ascension of Jesus (Acts 2:34), and in the Gospel he also speaks about Christ (Luke 20:42-43).⁸³ The narration of an historical event concerning David also provides context for mentioning the seed that comes from him (Acts 2:29, 13:22, and 13:36). Therefore, in what follows the link between David and Jesus will be presented in consecutive order as this theme occurs in Luke-Acts.

The virgin to whom the angel Gabriel came was identified as one who is betrothed to a man named Joseph from the house of *David* (Luke 1:27). In the angel's annunciation to Mary, it is said of the child whom she will bear and name Jesus that he shall be called the son of the most high and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father *David*, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob, and there shall be no end of his kingdom (Luke 1:32-33).

In the song of Zechariah, Zechariah praised the Lord God of Israel that he had visited⁸⁴ and made salvation for his people (Luke 1:68). Zechariah further describes this salvation as God's

⁸³Mark L. Strauss ("David," in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology* [ed. T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 2000], 442) says that for Luke "David's role as prophet of the Christ" is significant. He points out that in Acts it is explicitly stated that "[i]n Psalm 2 the Lord spoke 'by the Holy Spirit *through* the mouth of . . . David' (Acts 4:25)" and that "David's prophetic testimony is crucial in the apologetic argument of Peter's Pentecost speech" (ibid. [emphasis in original]). Strauss explains that "since David was a prophet (and since he neither rose from the dead nor ascended to heaven), Psalms 16 and 110 may be interpreted as predictions of the resurrection and ascension of the Christ (Acts 2:29-31)" (ibid). He believes that "[t]his emphasis on David as prophet reflects Luke's belief in the continuity of salvation history. The whole of the OT revelation—'all that the prophets have spoken . . . in all the Scriptures'—points forward to the coming of the Christ (Luke 24:25-27)" (ibid).

⁸⁴This word was also used in Acts 15:14 in James' speaking of God's *visiting* the nations to take a people for his name.

raising a horn of salvation in the house of *David* (Luke 1:69). In the decree issued by Caesar Augustus for every citizen to register, Joseph went up from the city of Nazareth in Galilee to the city of *David* in Judea called Bethlehem because he was from the house of *David* (Luke 2:4). At the birth of Jesus, the angel of the Lord announced this news to the shepherds proclaiming that a savior who is Christ the Lord was born for them in the city of *David* (Luke 2:11) and that this wonderful news is for all people (Luke 2:10).

In Luke's Gospel, the genealogy of Jesus is traced to David (Luke 3:31). In asking for healing, the blind man on Jesus' way to Jericho addressed Jesus as *Son of David*⁸⁵ and begged for mercy (Luke 18:37-38). In the question that Jesus posed to the scribes, he asked them how people can claim that Christ is the son of *David* (Luke 20:41). Referring to David's words in Psalm 110:1, Jesus further asked, "Since *David* called Christ the Lord, how can Christ be David's son?" (Luke 20:42-44).

In Acts, the figure of David continues to occupy an important place in the narrative. In Peter's speech in Acts 2, Peter cites Joel 3:1-5 to claim fulfillment of the Scriptural promise of the pouring out of the Spirit at the end time and proceeds to expound the identity of the Lord, urging that everyone should call on him to be saved. Concerning the identity of the Lord, Peter appeals to *David*, who presages the resurrection of Jesus in Psalm 16. He further says that the reason why David can do so is that David is a prophet and knows that God had sworn an oath to him that his son shall sit on his throne, so he foresaw and spoke about the resurrection of Jesus (Acts 2: 25-31). Then Peter proclaims that after being raised to the right hand of God, Jesus pours out the Holy Spirit as the audience of Peter

⁸⁵Robert Tannehill (*Luke* [ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996], 274) comments that the title "Son of David" called out by the beggar "fits the Davidic messianism so strongly expressed in the Lukan infancy narrative and in the mission speeches to Jews in Acts." Joel B. Green (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 663) expresses a similar thought on the beggar's address to Jesus.

had witnessed (Acts 2:33). Next Peter refers to *David's* words in Psalm 110:1 for support of Jesus' ascension to the right hand of God, and he ends his speech with the assertion that God made Jesus Lord and Messiah (Acts 2:34-36).

In Paul's speech in Acts 13, Paul preaches that after removing Saul (from the throne) God raised *David* as king. Paul goes on to say that from David's seed God has raised a savior, Jesus, according to the promise (Acts 13:22-23). Paul emphasizes that, through the resurrection of Jesus, God had fulfilled the promise made to the patriarchs of the Jews, and he cites a series of texts from the Scriptures (Ps 2:7, Isa 55:3, and Ps 16:10) to support the resurrection and incorruption of Jesus. He says that *David* died and saw corruption, but he whom God had raised did not see corruption (Acts 13:32-37).

The last occurrence of David in Luke-Acts is in James' use of Amos 9:11-12. In light of this progression of references to David in Luke-Acts, Luke probably intends his readers to understand James' reference to the raising up of the tent of David in connection with the Messiah as the descendant of David being put on his throne in fulfillment of the promise God made to David, all of which occurs through the resurrection of Jesus.⁸⁶ This is the means by which the house of Israel receives salvation. This salvation of the Israelites is termed "the forgiveness of sins" in Paul's speech in Acts 13.⁸⁷ In Luke's Gospel, this salvation is presented as being for all the people (Luke 2:10).

⁸⁶In interpreting Paul's use of Psalm 2:7 in Acts 13:33, H.C. Leupold (*Exposition of the Psalms* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961], 51) understands that the resurrection of Jesus fulfills the promise of a Davidic heir on the throne: As there was a day in the life of David when he was proclaimed as God's son, there would be a day in Christ's life when his relationship with the Father is pronounced "in a most significant way," that is, by the resurrection.

⁸⁷Cf. Barrett (*Acts*, 2:725), who says it is possible that the phrase "the restored tabernacle of David" indicates "the restoration in the sense of the conversion of Israel."

This Christological reading of the raising up of the tent of David in Acts 15:16 is supported by Ernst Haenchen. He holds that Luke as author views the restored tabernacle of David "as adumbrating the story of Jesus, culminating in the Resurrection, in which the promise made to David has been fulfilled: the Jesus event that will cause the Gentiles to seek the Lord."⁸⁸ Jacques Dupont also views the raising up of the tent of David as occurring with the resurrection and the ascension of Jesus to the right hand of God.⁸⁹ As to the Christological reading of the restored tent of David, Max Turner observes,

One can barely imagine any Jew speaking of God's re-establishment of the royal 'house of David' in glory *without* implying the Davidide's [sic] saving and restoring rule in Israel (cf. Lk. 1.68-71); for within a Jewish context to be given the throne of David *meant* to exercise rule 'over Jacob' (Lk. 1.32).⁹⁰

Turner holds that Luke intends the rebuilding of the fallen tent of David

to mean more than that a descendent of David's line has at last been appointed as king. He means also that the Davidide's [sic] powerful restoring rule in Zion has been re-established (perhaps in and through a growing restored 'household' of faithful 'servants' [after the analogy of 4.29 in the context of 4.25-30]), so that 'the rest of men' might now seek the God of Israel in accordance with the ancient hopes (cf. 15.17c, 18a).⁹¹

⁸⁸Ernst Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* (trans. Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn; ed. R. McL. Wilson; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971), 448.

⁸⁹Jacques Dupont, " 'Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombée' (Ac 15, 15= Am 9, 11)," in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80. Geburtstag* (ed. Erich Gräßer and Otto Merk; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985), 32. Dupont thinks that the tent of David is the house of David "considérée dans le piteux état où elle se trouve depuis la disparition de la monarchie" (ibid., 31). He further notes that the house of David should not be confused with the house of Israel (Acts 2:26, 7:42) (ibid., 31-32). Citing Acts 2:34, Dupont asserts that the house of David was rebuilt, and that the throne of David was recovered "au moment où Dieu a ressuscité Jésus pour le faire asseoir à sa droite" (ibid., 32).

⁹⁰Max Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (JPTSUP 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000), 314; Luke 1:33 should be read along with the text that Turner cites.

⁹¹Ibid., parenthetical statements in original.

Turner's questioning of the exclusively Christological reading of the restored tent of David is an important reminder.⁹² He is helpful in guiding attention to the language of reigning over Israel in Luke 1:32-33 and Luke 1:68-71.

A word needs to be said here about some scholars' taking the erected tent of David as a reference to Jewish followers of Jesus Christ. For example, Ådna thinks that the restored tent of David refers to the eschatological temple and should be identified with "Gottesvolk Israel in der Gestalt der Gemeinschaft der jesugläubigen Juden," and he further says that "seitdem Gott diese Ekklesia Jesu errichtet hat, werden nun auch die Heiden durch die Missionsarbeit des Paulus (und anderer) in sie aufgenommen."⁹³ In a similar vein Richard says,

God's visitation [in Acts 15:14] has repeatedly been actualized through Jewish missionaries (3-4, 7, 12), i.e., 'rebuilt' Israel (16) and the synagogue (21). As he visited his people Israel through the Jesus event (see Luke 1: 68; 7: 16), so now through the reconstructed Israel he "visits the Gentiles. . . ." No longer does man [sic] build a house for God (Acts 7:47, 49), but God rebuilds Israel (under the image of tabernacle of David), that all nations may enter.⁹⁴

Ådna and Richard both take the restored tent of David as referring to Jewish believers of Jesus. Common among Turner, Ådna, and Richard is their speaking of the inclusion of the Gentiles through the evangelism of the Jewish believers of Jesus Christ, but how they provide the basis for this

⁹²Cf. Mark Strauss (*The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* [JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995], 190) modifies Haenchen's view stating, "Luke takes the promised rebuilding of τὴν σκηνὴν Δαβὶδ as a reference to the restoration of the Davidic dynasty accomplished through the life, death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus."

⁹³Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 22.

⁹⁴Earl Richard, "The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15)," in *Society of Biblical Literature 1980 Seminar Papers* (ed. Paul J. Achtemeier; Chico: Scholars, 1980), 271-72.

is different. In light of the study of the repetition of the word "David" in Luke-Acts above, Turner's explication should be favored because ultimately it is Jesus, the descendant of David, who caused the Gentiles to be included. This may be seen in the angels' announcement to the shepherds that this good news concerning the birth of a savior who is Christ the Lord in the city of David is for all people (Luke 2:10), as previously noted.

Thus, in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 with the opening phrase *μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω* situating Amos 9:11-12 in the context of the Jesus movement, James uses the rebuilding of the fallen tent of David in Amos 9:11 to refer to the resurrection of Jesus, his being placed on the throne of David. On the other hand, the reference to the witness of the Jewish Christians is also in view in the phrase "the restored tent of David." As Turner says, the restoration of the throne of David includes the restoring rule in Israel, and this restoring rule according to the account of Acts is through the Jewish Christians. Next is to understand the addition "the Lord" in James' use of Amos 9:11-12.

Referent of the Term τὸν κύριον

This section examines whether the words τὸν κύριον added in Acts 15:17 allude to Zech 8:22 as suggested by Bauckham⁹⁵ or whether the addition serves to emphasize that it is the Lord Jesus whom the Gentiles seek in their response to God's act of raising up the tent of David. This section will start with an examination of Bauckham's proposal. Bauckham's view of τὸν κύριον as an allusion to Zech 8:22 is part of his proposal to regard James' use of the Scriptures as referring to the building of the eschatological temple. He explains that

all variations of the text of Acts 15.16-18 from that of Amos 9.11-12 LXX belong to a consistent interpretation of the text with the help of related texts which refer to the building of

⁹⁵Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 162-63.

the eschatological Temple (Hos. 3.4-5; Jer. 12.15-16) and the conversion of the nations (Jer. 12.15-16; Zech. 8.22; Isa. 45.20-23) in the messianic age.⁹⁶

Bauckham sees Amos 9:11-12 and Zech 8:22 sharing a similar theme. He takes the tent of David in Amos 9:11 as the building of the "eschatological Temple."⁹⁷ He explains that Zech 8:22 "predicts that, following the laying of the foundation for the rebuilding of the Temple (8.9) and YHWH's return (cf. Acts 15.16a) to dwell in Zion (8.3), the Gentiles will be drawn to seek the presence of YHWH in his Temple."⁹⁸

If one accepts the erected tent of David in Amos 9:11 as the building of the eschatological temple, then by appealing to Qumran pesher exegesis (*gezērâ šāwâ*) as Bauckham does, "the Lord" in Acts 15:17 would allude to Zech 8:22. Indeed in Zech 8:9 reference is made to the temple, but this is to encourage the remnant of the people who saw the foundation being laid to remember God's words spoken through the prophets. Bauckham's rendering of Zech 8:9, by contrast, becomes a historical sequence such that, after the laying of the foundation of the temple and YHWH's return to dwell in Zion, the nations will seek the Lord. This is not to say that a historical sequence of this sort is wrong. Rather, the focus of Zechariah 8 is on God's promise to return to Zion and to bring the exiles back to Jerusalem and the blessing that God is set to bring to the remnants there. It is because of the restoration that God provided for Israel that the nations seek God.⁹⁹

⁹⁶Ibid., 165.

⁹⁷Ibid., 159.

⁹⁸Ibid., 162.

⁹⁹David L. Petersen (*Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary* [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984], 318) comments on the language of nations in Zech 8:22: "Judah had just gone through a period in which many of its towns were destroyed and left uninhabited. For Judahites to look forward to a time at which other city dwellers would travel to Judah, presumably to the city of

As mentioned earlier, the present dissertation takes the raising up of the tent of David as referring to the restoration of the Davidic reign. In adopting this interpretation, God's return to dwell in Jerusalem as presented in Zechariah 8 and God's raising up the tent of David in Acts 15 are not to be seen as addressing the same topic. The allusion to Zech 8:22-23 remains a background echo, but not because of the rationale of the building up of the eschatological temple in the manner that Bauckham suggests.

The phrase "to seek the Lord" in the prophetic writings generally has the Israelites as its subject, but not in Amos 9:12 or Zech 8:22-23.¹⁰⁰ It is very likely due to the similar messages in Zechariah 8:22-23 and Amos 9:11-12 that James alludes to this former text to support Amos 9:11-12.¹⁰¹ The *gezērâ šāwâ* method is still applicable here. A similar word (to seek) and similar message (Gentile nations return to the Lord following the restoration of Israel) connect the two passages. James' use of Amos 9:11-12 depicts the Davidic heir on the throne through the resurrection of Jesus and the rule that he exercises over Israel. The Israelites will benefit from this rulership. As these points are established in the text, there follows the idea of the nations seeking the Lord. With the word "seek" James recalls Zech 8:22-23, which indicates that, due to the restorations and blessing that God brought to the Israelites, the nations will come to the Israelites in order to go to Jerusalem together to seek the Lord.

Jerusalem itself, comprises a radical change of fortune for this scattered people. It is this radical message which the author quietly introduces with the more typical language of nations seeking Yahweh."

¹⁰⁰The verb "to seek" takes different objects, but generally has to do with the Israelites. For example, they are exhorted to seek the Lord, or righteousness and justice. Only in Amos 9:11-12 and Zech 8:22-23 are Gentiles said to seek the Lord.

¹⁰¹The reason for using the language of likelihood for the allusion to Zechariah 8:22 is that the words "the Lord" might be a mere addition to the verb "to seek."

If the words *the Lord* in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 allude to Zech 8:22-23, the fact remains that the words *the Lord* are lacking in the LXX text of Amos. In the section on Amos 9:11-12 LXX above, adopting McLay's position on the textual variance between Amos 9:12b LXX and Amos 9:12b MT, it is explained that the reason why the translator made the changes on the Hebrew text of Amos 9:12 is that the translator is influenced by the sayings of Gentiles seeking the Lord at the end time in the prophetic writings. The words *the Lord* added to Amos 9:12 LXX would seem to make the effect of the prophetic writing stronger. Zech 8:22-23 states that, due to the restorations and blessing that God brought to the Israelites, the nations come to the Israelites in order to go to Jerusalem together to seek the Lord. It is not clear that Jerusalem receives emphasis in James' use of Amos 9:11-12. In light of the focus upon missions work in the nations, as seen in Acts 13-14, prior to the account of the Jerusalem meeting in Acts 15, the notion of seeking the Lord in Jerusalem in the allusion to Zech 8:22-23 in Acts 15:17 does not figure prominently. The simpler explanation proposed here is that the addition *the Lord* in Luke's account refers to *the Lord Jesus*. In recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12 LXX within the early Jesus movement, James specifies that it is the Lord (Jesus) whom the Gentile believers seek in response to the restoration of the Davidic rule through the resurrection of Jesus. Next is a study of the referent of the words γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος in Acts 15:18.

Referent of the Words γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος

Scholars generally take the final words γνωστὰ ἀπ' αἰῶνος in Acts 15:18 as referring to Isa 45:21.¹⁰² Isaiah 45:21 LXX reads τίς ἀκουστὰ ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς while Isa 45:21

¹⁰²For example, Hans Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; trans. James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 117; James D. G. Dunn, *The Acts of the Apostles* (NC; Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996), 203.

MT reads **מִי הַשְׁמִיעַ זֶה מִקְרָם**. Scholars provide various explanations for how the words $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi' \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$ came into Acts 15:18. For example, Ådna says that "das Verb $\pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$ und das Demonstrativpronomen $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ " in Acts 15:17 connect Amos 9:12 and Isa 45:21.¹⁰³ Ådna thinks that possibly Acts 15:18 is based on the MT, explaining that **מִקְרָם** is usually rendered as $\acute{\alpha}\pi' (\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \tau\eta\varsigma)$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\eta\varsigma$ as in Mic 5:1 or Hab 1:12. But it can also be translated as $\pi\rho\delta \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$ (Ps 74:12 [73:12 LXX]), and Ådna concludes that through **עוֹלָם [יְמֵי]** in the end of Amos 9:11 James is able to link Amos 9:11-12 with Isa 45:21.¹⁰⁴

Ådna's explanation for how the words $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi' \alpha\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$ in Acts 15:18 are based on Isa 45:21 MT is convincing, but his conclusion that through **עוֹלָם [יְמֵי]** in the end of Amos 9:11 James links Amos 9:11-12 with Isa 45:21 is questionable, because James omits **עוֹלָם כִּימֵי** in his use of Amos 9:11. To help us understand James' use of Isa 45:21, the question that needs to be asked is—what is made known of the old, according to Isa 45:21?

In Isa 45:20-21 Yahweh addresses the survivors of the nations¹⁰⁵ in general, and the nations are pictured in the divine court. Isaiah 45:21a reads, "Declare and present your case; let them take counsel together! Who told *this* long ago? Who declared it of old? Was it not I, the Lord?" (NRSV; emphasis mine). Concerning the referent of the word "this," John N. Oswalt offers "the

¹⁰³Ådna, "Die Heilige Schrift," 10.

¹⁰⁴Ibid.

¹⁰⁵J. Alec Motyer (*The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary* [Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1993], 365) says that the survivors of the nations are people "who have come to Israel to find the Lord, thus escaping the fate that awaits idolaters."

specific prophecy of Cyrus and the Babylonian overthrow"¹⁰⁶ while Motyer equates it with "the Lord's determination to take a worldwide people for himself."¹⁰⁷ Nevertheless, commentators all emphasize the element of surprise in v. 22-25. Judgment for the nations does not follow the trial; instead the nations are invited to take part in salvation.¹⁰⁸ "The old division between Israel and the nations has been forced to give way before the salvation that God has both promised and achieved."¹⁰⁹

It must be said here that both Oswalt's rendering of *this* and Motyer's explanation of *this* in Isa 45:21a have support from Isaiah 45. Isaiah 45:1-13, which speaks about Cyrus, supports Oswalt's point while Isa 45:22-23 confirms Motyer's argument. It is beyond the scope of this section to enter into the discussion of Isaiah 45 to determine the exact referent of *this* in Isa 45:21. Nevertheless, in light of the salvation promised to the nations in Isa 45:22-25, as pointed out by scholars, James' use of Isa 45:21 in Acts 15:18 indicates that what has been made known from of old concerns God's promise to save the nations.

Taking James' use of Isa 45:21 in Acts 15:18 with his use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 shows that, in James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12 in the early Jesus movement, the emphasis is upon the conversion of the nations. This emphasis coheres with James' summary of Peter's experience in the conversion of Cornelius where James reports that God visited to take from the nations

¹⁰⁶John Oswalt, *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 40-66* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 222.

¹⁰⁷Motyer, *Prophecy of Isaiah*, 365.

¹⁰⁸For example, Brevard Childs, *Isaiah* (OTL; Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 355-56, and Claus Westermann, *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary* (OTL; trans. David M.G. Stalker; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969), 175-76.

¹⁰⁹Childs, *Isaiah*, 355-56.

a people for his name (Acts 15:14), and James further states that the words of the prophets agree with Peter's experience (Acts 15:15). It is in the emphasis upon the salvation of the nations in James' use of the Scriptures that Jesus' reading of the Scriptures in Luke 24:47-48 is echoed, to which the next section turns.

*Echo of Jesus' Reading of the Scriptures
in James' Reading of the Scriptures*

In Luke's account, after his resurrection Jesus opened his disciples' minds to understand the Scriptures concerning the suffering and resurrection of the Messiah and the mission work of the early church (Luke 24:44-48). Concerning the mission task of the early church, Jesus shows that the Scriptures talk about the preaching of repentance for the forgiveness of sins in his *name* among all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem, and his disciples will be witnesses of this (Luke 24:47-48). James' reading of the Scriptures as delineated above also shows that the Scriptures speak of the early church (the Jesus movement): Placing Amos 9:11-12 in the context of the Jesus movement, Amos 9:11-12 speaks of God's act of raising Jesus from the dead (in fulfillment of the promise God made to David), and the Gentile believers (the nations) over whom God's *name* is called seek the Lord Jesus. With the support of Isa 45:21, the salvation of the nations is shown to be God's ancient plan. This section investigates *how* Jesus' reference to his *name* in his reading of the Scriptures is echoed in James' use of Amos 9:12 where James indicates that the nations over whom God's *name* has been called might seek the Lord Jesus. While the dominant methodology employed in this work is Robbins' socio-rhetorical reading, for this section we turn to Robbins' cultural intertexture.

Robbins defines echo as "a word or phrase that evokes, or potentially evokes, a concept from cultural tradition. In other words, echo does not contain either a word or phrase that is

'indisputably' from only one cultural tradition."¹¹⁰ Robbins' definition enables us to investigate the question how the word *name* in James' use of Amos 9:12 recalls Jesus' reference to his *name* in his reading of the Scriptures. Before detailing Jesus' reference to his *name* in Luke 24:47 as it is echoed in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Luke's portrayal, we provide select examples of Robbins' use of echo to guide our reading.

In Robbins' study of echo as one kind of cultural intertexture, he refers to Burton L. Mack's "analysis of the use of *paideia* (instruction on how to live a successful life according to the values of Greek society) in Mark 4:1-34, the text on the planting of seeds."¹¹¹ Based on the Greek and Latin texts Mack uses to validate his reading, which are reproduced by Robbins, we see that not only the same word, *seed*, used in Mark 4:1-34, appears in the Greek and Latin text Mack presents, but also that there are similar descriptions common to these texts, such as the scattering of seeds and the seed's falling on good ground and the result it produces. In his own text (Mark 15), Robbins restricts his talk about cultural intertexture to a short text in Dio Chrysostom, which speaks about a ritual in "the Sacian festival in the eastern Mediterranean" where a prisoner sentenced to death is released to be treated like a king but later was killed.¹¹² In laying out "the interaction of two major cultural intertextures in the Markan account," Robbins proposes to understand the crucifixion account in Mark as "a manifestation of the experience of a suffering righteous one according to Jewish traditions" and "a manifestation of a

¹¹⁰Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 60.

¹¹¹Ibid.

¹¹²Ibid., 61.

Mediterranean cultural ritual in which the humiliation of a prisoner mocks the role and activities of a king."¹¹³

Robbins' concept of echo in his study of cultural intertexture accordingly requires that when one talks about a text's echoing a former text, there should not only be a repetition of the same word(s) but also similar descriptions or content. Applying this criterion of echo to our case, what justifies our investigation of Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 being echoed in James' use of Scriptures in Acts 15:16-18 is not just the repetition of the same word *name* but also similar subjects in the two texts. In Luke's account, the Jesus of the gospel foreshadows the evangelism work of his disciples, which becomes thematically central in Acts, and foresees that his disciples will be witnesses of the preaching of repentance for forgiveness of sins on the basis of his name in all the nations. As we have demonstrated in James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12 above, the conversion of the nations is the emphasis there, and this theme is also present in James' use of Isa 45:21 in Acts 15:18. Thus we not only see the repetition of *name* but also the repetition of *all the nations* in both Luke 24:47 and Acts 15:16-17. Furthermore, in the section of James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12 above, it is proposed that the raising up of the tent of David in James' use refers to the resurrection and ascension of Jesus, his being placed on the throne of David, and in response to this act of God, *the Lord* whom the nations are said to seek is *the Lord Jesus*. Thus Robbins' concept is useful in understanding James' use of Amos 9:11-12 as an echo of Jesus' reference to his name in Luke 24:47-48.

The prepositional phrase, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, in Jesus' words in Luke 24:47 can be taken as an adverb modifying the infinitive, to be preached, or as an adjective modifying the noun, repentance. That is, ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ in Luke's account can be taken as that Jesus foresees that

¹¹³Ibid.

his disciples' witness will be done *in his name* or repentance of forgiveness of sins is on the basis of *Jesus' name*. Since both aspects are included in the reference to the repetition of Jesus' name in Acts,¹¹⁴ our approach to understand the meaning of Luke 24:47-48 will be first through performing the progressive texture of preaching in Acts to see the content of preaching. Below is the layout of the repetition of the verb, to preach, in Acts.

Acts 8:5: In the city of Samaria Philip *preached Christ*.

Acts 9:20: After his conversion, in the synagogues in Damascus Paul *preached Christ that he is the Son of God*.

Acts 10:37: John the Baptist preached the baptism of repentance.

Acts 10:42: In Peter's evangelistic sermon to Cornelius and his household, Peter states that in Jesus' appearance after his resurrection he ordered his disciples to *preach* to the people and testify that *he (Jesus) is the one designated by God to be the judge of both the living and the dead*.

Acts 15:21: From ancient ages, in every city Moses has people who *preach him [Moses]* in the synagogues in every Sabbath as he was read.

Acts 19:13: Certain Jewish exorcists who are going about attempt to name on those who have the evil spirits the name of Jesus the Lord saying, "I adjure you *Jesus* whom Paul *preaches*."

Acts 20:25: Paul *preaches the kingdom*.

Acts 28:31: Paul *preaches the kingdom of God* and teaches the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ.

With the exception of Acts 10:37 and 15:21, the occurrences of the verb, "to preach," in Acts have as their object Jesus Christ as the content of the preaching: Christ (Acts 8:5; 9:20), Jesus as the judge of both the living and the dead (Acts 10:42), and Jesus (Acts 19:13). In Acts 28:31 the object for Paul's preaching is the kingdom of God, but next to Paul's preaching of the kingdom of God it is said that Paul teaches the things concerning the Lord Jesus Christ, and a coordinate conjunction καὶ connects the two statements. This structure suggests that Paul's preaching in Acts 28:31 has also to do with Christ.¹¹⁵ This understanding should also apply to the explanation of Paul's *preaching the kingdom* in his farewell speech to the leaders in the Ephesus church (Acts 20:25).¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴For the witness of Christians done in the name of Jesus, see Acts 9:27-28; 16:18; for salvation offered through the name of Jesus, see Acts 2:21, 38; 4:12; 22:16.

¹¹⁵Cf. Barrett (*Acts*, 2:1252-53), "As elsewhere (e.g. 28.23) the *kingdom of God* serves

The progressive texture of the verb "to preach" in Acts above helps us to understand the meaning of Luke 24:47-48 by telling us that the preaching of the early church has as its object and its focus Jesus Christ, and hence his name. The repetition of Jesus' name in Acts is employed for a multiplicity of themes: through the name of Jesus salvation is offered (Acts 2:21, 38; 4:12; 22:16), Christians are identified as people who call upon the name of Jesus (Acts 9:14, 21), the witness of Christians was done in the name of Jesus (Acts 9:27-28; 16:18), baptism takes place in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48), the name of Jesus Christ is able to heal and cast out demons (Acts 3:6, 16; 4:10, 30; 19:13, 17), name gives one authority to do certain things (Acts 4:7), the leaders in the Sanhedrin ordered the apostles not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus (Acts 4:17; 5:28, 40), Christians suffer for the name of Jesus Christ (Acts 5:41; 9:16), Jesus' name is the content of the preachings of Philip and Paul (Acts 8:12; 9:15), and Paul acts against the name of Jesus Christ by persecuting Christians (Acts 26:9-11).

With the various themes associated with the repetition of Jesus' *name* in Acts, the emphasis on repentance for forgiveness of sins in Luke 24:47 limits the understanding of Jesus' *name* in Luke 24:47. This stress is seen in Acts: Through the name of Jesus salvation is offered (Acts 2:21, 38; 4:12; 22:16), baptism takes place in the name of Jesus (Acts 2:38; 8:16; 10:48), and Christians are

as a general summary of the Christian message as preached by the apostles and others; the phrase that follows, τὰ περὶ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ . . . , brings out its Christological content. The verse emphasizes ' . . . Jesus Christus als den einen Inhalt der paulinischen Verkündigung' (Stählin 329). 'The Kingdom of God is founded on, and consists in, the knowledge of the redemption procured by Christ' (Calvin 2.314). κηρύσσων and διδάσκων are here synonyms; Luke does not seem to be distinguishing between two different kinds of communication."

¹¹⁶Cf. For the meaning of the kingdom of God in Acts 20:25, Barrett (*ibid.*, 2:973) directs our attention to Acts 8:12; 19:8; 28:23, 31. He explains that the kingdom of God in Acts 20:25 "means in effect the recognized content of Christian preaching, and is so expressed in order to bring out the continuity between the preaching of Jesus and the preaching of the post-resurrection church."

identified as people who call upon the name of Jesus (Acts 9:14, 21). Moreover, Acts 10:43 bears a close relationship with Luke 24:47 and justifies our reading that in Luke 24:47 Jesus' name mainly has to do with forgiveness of sins. In Luke's account, addressing Cornelius and his household, Peter testifies that to him (Jesus Christ) all the prophets witness to the forgiveness of sins through the name of Jesus, to everyone who believes in him (Acts 10:43).

With the meaning of Luke 24:47 secured, next is to move to show *how* Jesus' reference to his *name* as the basis of salvation in Luke 24:47 is echoed in James' use of Amos 9:12 that the remnants of men and *all the nations over whom God's name is called might seek the Lord*. There are a couple of elements involved in seeing the echo there. First of all, as explained by Bauckham noted above, the idiom *נקרא שמי עליהם* "expresses ownership, and is used especially of YHWH's ownership of the ark, the Temple, the city of Jerusalem, and the people of Israel."¹¹⁷ Applying this explanation to James' use of Amos 9:12 indicates that a phrase descriptive of the Israelites is used on the Gentiles in Acts 15:17; thus the nations who are designated as being called by God's name means that they are God's people. Second, as argued above, in James' placing Amos 9:11-12 in the context of the church, *the Lord* whom the remnants of men and all the nations (Gentiles) are said to seek is *the Lord Jesus*. Therefore, James' criterion for describing of the nations (Gentiles) as part of the people of God is that they seek the Lord Jesus. Third, a diagram of the repetitive texture in James' speech above shows that there is the repetition of nations, name, and Lord in James' speech in Acts 15. With the Lord being understood as the Lord Jesus, the repetition of *nations* and *name* in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 naturally calls up Jesus' words in Luke 24:47, where *name* and *nations* are also used.

¹¹⁷Bauckham, "James and the Gentiles," 168.

In Jesus' reading of the Scriptures in Luke 24:47-48, Jesus says that the Scriptures speak of the preaching of repentance for forgiveness of sins in his *name* to *all the nations*. In James' use of Amos 9:12 we see the response to such preaching to all the nations¹¹⁸ foretold by Jesus in Luke' account: *All the nations (Gentiles)* over whom God's *name* is called might seek the Lord Jesus. James' speech recalls Jesus' emphasis upon his *name* in Luke 24:47-48 and thus helps us to understand *how* all the nations (Gentiles) over whom God's name is called might seek the Lord (Acts 15:17): It is through their calling upon the name of Jesus. Jesus emphasized the preaching of the forgiveness of sins *in his name*¹¹⁹ in all the nations, and this is depicted to be fulfilled in Acts in the disciples' urging people to *call upon the name of Jesus* for salvation and for forgiveness of sins (Acts 2:21; 2:38; 4:12; 8:12; 22:16). The believers who respond to the preaching of the disciples positively are called people who *call upon the name of Jesus* (Acts 9:14, 21).

Jesus' stress upon his *name* in Luke 24:47 is in relation to the salvation of the nations: repentance for forgiveness of sins. Therefore, viewing Jesus' words in Luke 24:47 as echoed in Acts 15:17 helps us to locate James' use of Amos 9:11-12 in the realm of salvation, and this theme (the theme of the salvation of the nations) also figures in James' use of Isa 45:21 in Acts 15:18. Barrett,

¹¹⁸Taking Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 as echoed in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 indirectly supports the proposal of some scholars who view the raising up of the fallen tent of David in Acts 15:16 as the witness of the Jewish Christians. See above in the section on the referent of the raising up of the fallen tent of David for a presentation of these scholars' proposals.

¹¹⁹Joel B. Green (*The Gospel of Luke* [NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997], 858) comments: "Since these disciples are to continue Jesus' ministry, perhaps it is not surprising that they are to proclaim the salvific message 'in his name.'"

when he argues that the issue set to be resolved in the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15:1, 5) has to do with salvation, is correct on that point, even though his reasoning is flawed.¹²⁰

With the reference to Jesus' speaking of his name in Luke 24:47-48 as echoed in James' placing Amos 9:11-12 in the context of the early church, how does this echo inform us of the salvation view inherent in James' use of the Scriptures and what kind of rhetoric does he present? These questions are important because they give us insight in terms of how James' appeal to the Scriptures in Luke's account solves a law problem and how the rhetoric he uses presents his point and persuades the audience. This leads us to the next section of social and cultural texture of James' speech.

*Social and Cultural Texture in James' Use of the Scriptures
and Jesus' Teaching*

In his chapter on social and cultural texture, Robbins explains that "[t]he social and cultural texture of a text emerges in specific social topics, common social and cultural topics, and final cultural categories."¹²¹ In specific social topics, Robbins lists the religious responses to the world in a text as conversionist, revolutionist, introversionist, Gnostic-Manipulationist, thaumaturgical, utopian, and introverted. In common social and cultural topics, Robbins discusses "the overall perception in the text of the context in which people live in the world."¹²² In final cultural categories, Robbins presents "the manner in which people present their propositions, reasons, and arguments both to themselves and

¹²⁰For a critique of Barrett's proposal, see chapter 3 of this dissertation.

¹²¹Robbins, *Exploring the Texture*, 71.

¹²²Ibid.

to other people" and portrays "different kinds of culture rhetoric" as dominant culture rhetoric, subculture rhetoric, counterculture rhetoric, contraculture rhetoric, and liminal culture rhetoric.¹²³

Of the three categories Robbins lists for investigating social and cultural texture of a text, only specific social topics and final cultural categories will be used to understand the religious responses present in James' use of the Scriptures and of Jesus' teaching and the rhetoric he uses. Our focus on James' use of the Scriptures renders unnecessary the use of Robbins' category of common social and cultural topics.¹²⁴

In specific social topics, the religious responses to the world present in James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12, his use of Isa 45:21, and the echo of Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48 in his use of Amos 9:11-12 are reformist,¹²⁵ conversionist,¹²⁶ and gnostic-manipulationist.¹²⁷ The

¹²³Ibid., 86-88

¹²⁴Robbins (ibid., 76, 77, 79, 80) provides a wealth of categories to place a text "in first-century Mediterranean society," for example "Honor, Guilt, and Rights Cultures," "Dyadic and individualist Personalities," "Dyadic and Legal Contracts and Agreements," and "Challenge-Response."

¹²⁵Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 73) explains reformist response as follows: "[E]vil may be dealt with according to supernaturally given insights about the ways in which social organization should be amended. Investigation of the ways of the world and recommendations for amending it are the essential orientation. The specific alterations to be made are revealed to people whose hearts and minds are open to supernatural influence." Robbins (*The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology* [New York: Routledge, 1996a], 149) also points out that reformist argumentation "encourages active association with the world without becoming part of it."

¹²⁶Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 72) defines conversionist as follows: "The conversionist response is characterized by a view that the world is corrupt because people are corrupt. If people can be changed, the world will be changed. Salvation is considered to be available not through objective agencies but only by a profound and supernaturally wrought transformation of the self. The world itself will not change, but the presence of a new subjective orientation to it will itself be salvation." Robbins provides further account of the conversionist response. He explains that conversionist argumentation "takes no interest in programs of social reform or in the political solution of social problems and may even be actively hostile to them. The judgment on humans and events

reformist response can be seen in James' use of Amos 9:11 describing God's act of rebuilding the fallen tent of David. In an article, "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case," Robbins provides helpful explanation for identifying reformist response in distinction from revolutionist and utopian response(s) in a text. Robbins asks,

Does Mary's discourse introduce a revolutionist vision in which God's power 'destroys' the present evil world, a utopian vision in which God's power 'replaces' the present social structures and powerful people with a new kind of structure and role for leaders, or a reformist vision in which God's power 'changes' something within the present system to make it function benevolently?¹²⁸

Using Robbins' elucidation of the reformist response, it is found that the benefit that God's rebuilding of the fallen tent of David brings to people in the current system is salvation, termed as forgiveness of sins specifically. In the section of the raising up of the fallen tent of David above, it is argued that the literary marker of David in Luke-Acts is closely associated with Jesus Christ and that Jesus Christ is the one who sits upon the throne of David. The effect from Jesus Christ being put on the throne of David in Luke's account is primarily associated with salvation. For example, in the song of Zechariah, Zechariah praises the Lord, the God of Israel, for the redemption he has worked for his people (Luke 1:68) and further describes this redemption of God as *God's raising the horn of salvation*

tends to be moralizing, because it is grounded in a belief that humans are entirely responsible for their actions" (*The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*, 147).

¹²⁷Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 73) explains that in the gnostic-manipulationist response, "[s]alvation is possible in the world, and evil may be overcome if people learn the right means, improved techniques, to deal with their problems." Elsewhere he provides further description: "Gnostic manipulationist argumentation insists especially on particular and distinctive knowledge. By and large, it accepts the outside world and its goals. It proclaims a more spiritualized and ethereal version of the cultural ends of global society, but it does not reject them" (*The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*, 148).

¹²⁸Vernon K. Robbins, "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case," in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament* (ed. Edgar V. Mcknight and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon; Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994), 190.

in the house of David in fulfillment of the words spoken by the prophets (Luke 1:69-70). The salvation brought by the horn that God raised is further explained as rescue from the enemies of the Jews and from the hand of all who hated them (Luke 1:71). Another benefit from the horn of salvation is that after the Jewish people were rescued from the hand of their enemies, they could serve God in holiness and righteousness all their days (Luke 1:72-75). The third benefit related with the raising of the horn of salvation is forgiveness of sins. The ministry of John the Baptist is characterized as to go before the face of the Lord "to give knowledge of salvation to his people by the forgiveness of their sins" (Luke 1:77 NRSV).

At the birth of Jesus, the angel of the Lord announced this news to the shepherd proclaiming that *a savior* who is Christ the Lord was born for them in the city of *David* (Luke 2:11), and this wonderful news is for all people (Luke 2:10). A great portion of Peter's speech in Acts 2 is an exposition of Jesus Christ as the Davidic heir raised by God in fulfillment of the promise God made to David (Acts 2:22-36). Yet the christology elaborated by Peter serves to explain the pouring out of the Holy Spirit: Peter says that after the resurrection, Jesus was exalted to the right hand of God, and when he received the promise of the Holy Spirit, Jesus poured out the Spirit upon the apostles (Acts 2:32-33). Thus we may say that the benefit from Jesus' being on the throne of David is the giving of the Holy Spirit, and the reception of the Holy Spirit is related to the forgiveness of sins. The Jews who heard the sermon of Peter were convicted by the message, and they asked Peter what they should do. Peter responded saying that they should repent, each be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ for *the forgiveness of their sins*, and then they can receive the gift of the Holy Spirit (Acts 2:37-38).

The association between salvation and Jesus the heir of David is also seen in Paul's speech in Acts 13. In Acts 13, Paul's narrative of Israel's history starts with the election of the fathers and aims to arrive at King David. The election of the fathers (v. 17a), the time in Egypt (v. 17b), the Exodus event (v. 17c), the time in the wilderness (v. 18), the possession of the land (v. 19), and the

period of the judges (v. 20) are all covered briefly. But when it comes to the era of the kings (vv. 21-22), Paul dwells on it at greater length. Paul proclaims that from David's seed according to promise God has led for Israel *a savior*, Jesus (v. 23), and describes how John the Baptist's ministry prepares the way for the coming of Jesus (vv. 24-25). The title Paul applies to the Davidic heir Jesus is *savior* (σωτήρ).

After proclaiming that Jesus is the savior from the Davidic line whom God gave to Israel (v. 23), in verse 26 Paul continues the theme of promise and fulfillment; he addresses both Jews and God-fearers saying that *the word of this salvation* was sent to them. Then Paul talks about the death and resurrection of Jesus in verses 27-31.¹²⁹ The word of salvation refers to Jesus.¹³⁰ The offer from the word of salvation is forgiveness of sins: After Paul has argued how Jesus' resurrection into incorruption is the fulfillment of the promise God made with the fathers of the Jewish people (vv. 32-37), he offers an exhortation (vv. 38-39) and a warning (vv. 40-41). In the exhortation, Paul announces that through Jesus *forgiveness of sins* has been proclaimed, and from all things they are not able to be justified from by the law of Moses, in Jesus everyone who believes will be justified (vv. 38-39).

In conclusion, the salvation pictured in Zechariah's song from the raising of the horn of salvation in the house of David has both the political (deliverance from the enemies of the Jewish

¹²⁹Paul's words on the death and resurrection of Jesus in Acts 13:27-31 are introduced by the word γάρ in verse 27. Conzelmann (*Acts of the Apostles*, 105) explains that the word γάρ "is only a transitional particle, indicating the reason why salvation can now be proclaimed."

¹³⁰C. A. Joachim Pillai (*Apostolic Interpretation of History: A Commentary on Acts 13:16-41* [Hicksville, N.Y.: Exposition, 1980], 30-31) aptly explains this word of salvation as "God's significant intervention in the redemptive act accomplished by and in Jesus. Not merely the teaching of Jesus, but the 'fact' of Jesus and the saving events connected with this fact constitute the 'message of salvation' sent to God's people."

people) and spiritual aspect (the forgiveness of sins).¹³¹ This political aspect is also seen in the angel's annunciation to Mary that the child whom she will bear and name Jesus shall be called the son of the most high, and the Lord God shall give him the throne of his father *David*, and he shall reign over the house of Jacob, and there shall be no end of his kingdom (Luke 1:32-33). Nevertheless, in Peter's speech in Acts 2 and Paul's speech in Acts 13 the result of Jesus' being put on the throne of David is mainly spiritual, namely, the forgiveness of sins. It is beyond the scope of this dissertation to study and explain the transition from a rhetoric of the physical and spiritual in the Gospel of Luke to the language in Acts with its essentially spiritual focus. Nevertheless, based on Peter's sermon in Acts 2 and Paul's sermon in Acts 13, it is clear that Luke has prepared his readers for the spiritual understanding that the

¹³¹Concerning how to interpret the meaning of salvation in the hymn of Zechariah, scholars have different opinions. Regarding the conflict between the understanding of salvation "from our enemies" in Luke 1:71 and salvation in terms of forgiveness of sins in Luke 1:77, Tannehill (*Luke*, 62) says, "In the ancient Jewish context, many would admit that Israel's sins were responsible for its captivity. Therefore, forgiveness is necessary for the renewal of its national life." Expressing a similar view to Tannehill, Green (*Gospel*, 114-15) says, "Zechariah's Song seems to portray two conflicting images of salvation, the one social and political, the other spiritual. . . . [Luke] does so in a way fully congruent with important strands of soteriology in Second Temple Judaism, where forgiveness of sins and restoration as a people were both woven into the tapestry of divine redemption. For Luke, the reconciliation of God's people and deliverance from enemies are both part of one divine movement. For him, visions of salvation cannot be categorized as social or religious or political, for the epoch of peace is characterized by all of these." On the other hand, Mark Coleridge (*The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2* [JSNTSup 88; Sheffield: JSOT, 1993], 121) argues that Luke 1:77 is a reinterpretation of Luke 1:70-75 and says that the salvation "the horn of salvation" will bring through forgiveness of sins "implies that the real enemy is not the aggressive neighbor whose military pressure disallows peace, but the sin which disallows peace of another kind." François Bovon (*Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50* [trans. Christine M. Thomas; ed. Helmut Koester; Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002], 74, 75) views Luke 1:71 as "a *Hebrew Bible* formulation (in the language of the exodus) of a *New Testament* reality," and he thinks that in Luke 1:74b-75 Luke has preserved the Jewish perspective of "a cultic existence in the Holy Land" and "has neither universalized nor eschatologized it, but has definitely considered the soteriological effect of Jesus' life and its ultimate universal significance, and perhaps even conceives of holiness and righteousness as a summary of the two greatest commandments."

outcome of God's rebuilding the fallen tent of David in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 is *reformist*: God's act has brought the offer of salvation and forgiveness of sins to people under the Roman rule.

Conversionist response is clearly seen in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17: All the Gentiles over whom God's name is called might seek the Lord Jesus by calling upon the name of Jesus. As pointed out above, in Acts the name of Jesus is how people receive salvation and forgiveness of sins. The salvation of the nations is also present in James' use of Isa 45:21 in Acts 15:18. "Seeking the Lord by calling upon the name of Jesus" shows, furthermore, a gnostic-manipulationist response. The means to obtain salvation is by seeking the Lord Jesus through calling upon the name of Jesus.

The thaumaturgical¹³² response can be seen in James' summarizing Peter's experience in the conversion of Cornelius and his household as God's having visited to take from the nations a people for his name (Acts 15:14).¹³³ The reformist, conversionist, and gnostic-manipulationist responses present in James' use of the Scriptures and his calling up of Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48 are subordinate to the thaumaturgical response. This subordination is based on James' further announcement that the words of the prophets agree with Peter's experience (Acts 15:15-18). To argue for such a subordination would indicate that the basis for the offer of salvation through God's raising the fallen tent of David, and the validity for the Gentiles to seek the Lord Jesus by calling upon the name of Jesus is *God's prior act of intervention to include the nations as part of the people of God*.

¹³²According to Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 73), "The thaumaturgical response focuses on the individual's concern for relief from present and specific ills by special dispensations. . . . Salvation takes the form of healing, assuagement of grief, restoration after loss, reassurance, the foresight and avoidance of calamity, and the guarantee of eternal (or at least continuing) life after death."

¹³³In Luke's account in Acts 10-11, the appearance of the angel of the Lord to Cornelius in a vision, the Spirit's guidance of Peter, and the pouring out of the Holy Spirit on Cornelius and his household qualify Acts 15:14 to be called a thaumaturgical response.

This argumentation will have a bearing on understanding the rhetoric that James uses to respond to the demand of law-keeping on Gentile believers. Next is an application of Robbins' final cultural categories to the rhetoric which James uses.

James' appeal to the authority of God's act of including the nations as part of the people of God, his citing the Scriptures in conformity with this act of God, and his reference to Jesus' teaching concerning his name show that, among the Jewish Christians, James uses dominant culture rhetoric.¹³⁴ This rhetoric is in distinction to the subculture rhetoric,¹³⁵ which can be seen in the demand of the Pharisaic believers. According to Luke's account, the Pharisaic believers insist that *it is necessary* (δεῖ) to circumcise the Gentile believers and order them to keep the law (Acts 15:5). But in James' response appealing to the authority of Jesus' teaching, what is necessary for the Gentile believers to do is to call upon the name of Jesus.

When taking Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 as echoed in James' use of Amos 9:11-12, we see in James' speech a response to the request of the Pharisaic believers. In Luke 24:44, Jesus says that *it is necessary* (δεῖ) for all the things written in the Scriptures (the law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms) concerning him to be fulfilled. In Jesus' exposition of the Scriptures, he speaks of the suffering and resurrection of the Messiah, and the preaching of repentance for forgiveness of sins in his name to all the nations to be written in the Scriptures. By appealing to the authority of Jesus' reading of the Scriptures, James responds to the request of the Pharisaic believers concerning the necessity to

¹³⁴Robbins (*Exploring the Texture*, 86) explains that dominant culture rhetoric "presents a system of attitudes, values, dispositions, and norms that the speaker either presupposes or asserts are supported by social structures vested with power to impose its goals on people in a significantly broad territorial region."

¹³⁵Robbins (*ibid.*, 86) states that subculture rhetoric "imitates the attitudes, values, dispositions, and norms of dominant culture rhetoric, and it claims to enact them better than members of dominant status."

circumcise the Gentiles and have them abide by the law. Thus in Luke's account, we see an example of the unity of Luke-Acts in the reference to Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke for the resolution of a law problem in the Jerusalem Meeting in Acts 15.

Therefore, it can be concluded that in Luke's narrative in Acts 15 James, being guided by God's acting in history and Jesus' reading of the Scriptures, uses prophetic writings to solve a law problem—he shows that the inclusion of the Gentiles among the people of God is God's ancient plan. God's act in history with the coming of the Messiah creates the identity of the people of God centered on the name of Jesus Christ. Therefore, James ordered that the keeping of the law should not be imposed upon Gentile believers. The purpose of the decree, then, is really to meet the needs of the Jewish believers.

CONCLUSION

This dissertation reads Peter's speech and James' speech in Luke's narrative of the Jerusalem Council in Acts 15 in light of Luke's portrayal of Jesus' attitude to the law in the Gospel of Luke. Luke's presentation of Jesus' position in relation to the law was examined in detail in Chapter 1 of this dissertation. Chapter 1 discusses Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke in the categories of Jesus' teaching on the law (Luke 16:16-18; 16:19-32; 20:27-40; 24:44-47), Jesus' passing references to the law in interactions with people (Luke 5:12-16; 10:25-37; 18:18-30; 17:12-19), Jesus' breaking the Sabbath (6:1-5, 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6), and Jesus' pronouncement of woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44).

In the section of Jesus' teaching on the law, Luke 24:44-47 was first studied to see how the prophetic function of the law in Luke 24:27, 44-47 stands in relation to other functions of the law in the Gospel of Luke. In Luke 24:44-47, Jesus teaches that the Scriptures, consisting of the law of Moses, the prophets, and the psalms, speak about the crucifixion and resurrection of the Messiah, and the mission work of the early church. In regard to the mission assignment of the early church, Jesus lays out that his disciples shall witness to the forgiveness of sins in all the nations on the basis of the name of Jesus. In Luke 16:16-18, Jesus' teaching of the kingdom of God is connected with the law, and the manner of the connection is that Jesus makes the intent of the law stricter.

In Luke 16:19-31, the teachings of Moses and the Prophets that one needs to pay attention to are almsgiving because in the parable told by Jesus what the rich man fails to do is pay attention to the needs of poor Lazarus at the gate of his mansion while he was on earth. Thus in Luke 16:19-31, Jesus regards the command of the Mosaic law to care for the poor to be continued. In Luke 20:27-38, Jesus teaches that a specific Mosaic law (the levirate law) is only to be practiced in the earthly life and will not be continued in the age to come. He also uses the statement of Moses at the burning bush to emphasize that Moses testifies to the eternal aspect of the resurrection of the dead, which is not related to the Mosaic law.

In the section of Jesus' passing references to the law in interactions with people (Luke 5:12-16; 10:25-37; 18:18-30; 17:12-19), Luke 5:12-16 and 17:12-19 were treated together because both passages deal with Jesus' cleansing of lepers. It was concluded that Jesus' cleansing of the lepers does not focus primarily on the instruction of obedience to the law, but rather was intended to restore the lepers to society by directing them to present themselves to the priest and show their cleansing. In Luke 10:25-37, in answering the lawyer's question concerning who his neighbor is, Jesus' instruction to have the lawyer follow the Samaritan's example shows that Jesus is not operating under the framework of the law of Lev 19:18. In Luke 10:25-37, even though Jesus affirms the summary of the law to love others as oneself, there is a move beyond the requirement of the law. In Luke 18:18-30, Luke's account of Jesus' answering a ruler's question concerning how to inherit eternal life, Jesus' view of the law is that the way to gain eternal life is not through the practice of the law but through becoming a disciple of Jesus.

In four passages that deal with Jesus' breaking the Sabbath (6:1-5, 6-11; 13:10-17; 14:1-6), Jesus places human need above the Pharisaic interpretation of the Sabbath law. In Luke 6:1-5, in response to the Pharisees' charging his disciples of breaking the Sabbath by rubbing the ears of grain with their hands and eating, Jesus refers to David's breaking the law out of his need. This emphasis of

Jesus on meeting human need is not only seen in Luke 6:1-5, but is also in view in Jesus' healing of the man with the withered right hand (Luke 6:6-11), his healing of a woman who was bent over for 18 years (Luke 13:10-17), and his healing of a man suffering from dropsy (Luke 14:1-6).

In the last section of the study of Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke, Jesus' pronouncement of woes upon the Pharisees (Luke 11:37-44) was analyzed with the focus upon Luke 11:37-41 and a brief comment on Luke 11:42. Inspired by John Nolland's treatment of Luke 11:37-44, it was argued that Luke 11:37-41, where Jesus criticizes the Pharisees for being exclusively concerned with the outside behaviors of cleansing cups and plates and neglecting their inward problem. This shows that Jesus' view of purity is inward; the inward will show itself in outward action. Jesus' reference to the inside in contrast to the Pharisees' focus upon outward deeds is also in view in Luke 11:42, where Jesus states that the Pharisees tithe mint, rue, and every herb but neglect the justice and love of God (v. 42).

Chapter 2 of this dissertation probed the function of law-keeping in the Second Temple period. The reason for devoting a chapter to the function of law-keeping in the Second Temple period was to shed light on Luke's presentation of certain Jewish beliefs and Pharisaic teachings. According to Luke, the Pharisees say that unless the Gentile believers are circumcised, they cannot be saved (Acts 15:1), and the Gentile believers must be circumcised and ordered to keep the law (Acts 15:5). To understand why the Jews in the Second Temple period understood the keeping of the law to be important, E. P. Sanders' *Paul and Palestinian Judaism* was studied. Sanders' proposed schema of covenantal nomism has won such wide acceptance that the Judaism he depicted is often adopted to interpret the New Testament text. Through a study of D. A. Carson's co-edited volume, *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*, and James Dunn's review of Carson's co-edited material, it was found that several reviewers in Carson's co-edited volume critiqued Sanders' covenantal nomism in regard to the texts they analyzed, and a few of them disapproved of Sanders' proposal altogether.

These scholars' comments provide caution in using Sanders' covenantal nomism in the interpretation of Acts 15. The association of salvation with circumcision in certain Jewish believers' teachings in Acts 15:1 is not consonant with Sanders' covenantal nomism. Covenantal nomism emphasizes that the Jews' law-keeping in the Second Temple period is not related to earning salvation but to keeping oneself in the covenant, and is for that reason not appropriate to interpret Acts 15:1.

The second part of Chapter 2 was devoted to a summary and a comment of some scholarly treatments of rabbinic Judaism. The purpose of this study was to shed light on the motivation of the Pharisaic believers who insist on the necessity of Gentile believers' being circumcised and ordered to keep the law in Luke's account of Acts 15. According to Sanders' study, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism*, some scholars link Pharisaism with rabbinic Judaism. Based upon this scholarly view together with the thinking that the rabbinic literature talks about the law, and Acts 15 talks about the law, a discussion of some study of rabbinic literature is done in this section of Chapter 2 to shed light on Acts 15:5. The remark on some scholarly treatment of rabbinic literature covered in this part of the chapter focuses on Sanders' presentation of the Tannaitic literature because Sanders provides many citations from the Tannaitic literature for us to evaluate his conclusion. The criticism focuses on Sanders' neglect of the element of works for salvation in the Tannaitic literature. Our comment is supported by Avemarie. Concerning the linking between law-keeping and salvation, the emphasis of Friedrich Avemarie in his study of rabbinic Judaism, *Tora und Leben*, on the role the observance of the law plays in salvation provides a comparable background to Acts 15:5.

In chapter 3 of this work, Jesus' comment on the Pharisees' problem in Luke 11:37-41 is used to understand Peter's speech in Acts 15:7-11. After a presentation of the repetitive-progressive texture of Acts 15:7-11 and the argumentative texture of the occasion that leads to the Jerusalem meeting, this chapter demonstrates the logical and qualitative progressions in Peter's speech. In the qualitative progression, it is argued that the elements of God's cleansing the hearts of the Gentile

believers and the inability of the Jewish believers to do the law in Peter's speech in Acts 15 make sense when taking Jesus' words in Luke 11:37-41 into consideration.

The next section, "The Intertexture Study of Peter's Speech," lays out how Peter's words in Acts 15:7-11 recall Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 in Luke's narration. This portion presents the linguistic similarities between Jesus' words and Peter's speech in Luke's portrayal, which provide the basis for us to say that Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 is echoed in Luke's narration of Peter's words in Acts 15:9-10. In this context of recalling Jesus' teaching in Luke 11:39-41 in Luke's narrative, Peter recontextualizes Jesus' words to a context of the demand of obedience to the law on the Gentile believers, and in Luke's portrayal he reconfigures the order of Jesus' words to make the problem of the Pharisaic believers in their failure to do the law become the last item in Peter's use of Jesus' words. In Peter's saying that the Jewish believers are not able to keep the law (Acts 15:9), this reconfiguration forms a contrast with his statement of salvation through the grace of the Lord Jesus (Acts 15:11). With such a reconfiguration of Jesus' words in Luke 11:37-41, Peter moves the talk about the problem of the Jewish believers (with the Pharisaic believers included) to the sphere of salvation (Acts 15:11), thus also locating Peter's earlier reference to God's cleansing the hearts of Gentile believers within his discussion of salvation. This reconfiguration is Luke's effort to enhance the soteriological emphasis in Peter's speech.

The third section of this chapter is then a study of Luke's use of heart. It is concluded there that the issue of the heart is important for Luke in his depiction of conversion and initiation into the Jesus movement. To Luke, one of the identity marks of the Jesus movement is the purification of heart. The last section of this chapter aims to understand Luke's positive portrayal of Jewish believers' keeping the law. It is concluded that since Luke has secured the identity mark of the followers of the Jesus movement as purification of heart, due to respect for the ancestral custom of the Jewish believers there is no problem for him to depict Jewish believers keeping the law.

In Chapter 4 of this dissertation, James' use of the Scriptures in Acts 15:16-18 is studied in light of Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48. This chapter argues that in Luke's portrayal, Jesus' reference to his *name* as providing forgiveness of sins in the mission task of the early church in his reading of the Scriptures is reflected in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 to depict the Gentiles as the ones who are called by God's *name* (Acts 15:17). This chapter starts with a study of the repetitive-progressive texture in James' speech in Acts 15:14-21. In this part, it is pointed out that there is a progression from name to the Lord in James' speech; in light of the progression of names in Acts and the association between name and the Lord in Acts, it is proposed that *the Lord* in James' speech should be understood as referring to the Lord Jesus.

The second part of this chapter is an intertextual study of James' use of the Scriptures. In this section, the texts of Amos 9:11-12 MT, Amos 9:11-12 LXX, and Acts 15:16-17 are compared and the meanings of Amos 9:11-12 MT and Amos 9:11-12 LXX are ascertained. By comparing Acts 15:16-17 with Amos 9:11-12 LXX, the text which Acts 15:16-17 follows closely, this chapter proceeds to discuss James' use of Amos 9:11-12. This chapter proposes that the opening words μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω locate James' use of Amos 9:11-12 in the time of the church and that the Lord, the addition to Amos 9:11-12 LXX in James' use of Amos 9:11-12, refers to the Lord Jesus. Taking James' use of Isa 45:21 in Acts 15:18 with his use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17, this section ends with the note that in James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12 in the early Jesus movement, the emphasis is upon the conversion of the nations.

The third part of this chapter is a layout of the echo of Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17. It is stressed that both texts have similar themes (the evangelism work of the disciples of Jesus in Luke 24:47-48; the conversion of the nations in Acts 15:17) and repetitions of same words (name, *all the nations*). Next is a study of the prepositional phrase, ἐπὶ

τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ, in Jesus' words in Luke 24:47, and it is concluded that Jesus' name is associated with salvation (the forgiveness of sins). With the meaning of Jesus' name in Luke 24:47 clarified, this section next moves to show *how* Jesus' reference to his *name* as the basis of salvation in Luke 24:47 is echoed in James' use of Amos 9:12, and it is elucidated that in James' use of Amos 9:12 in Acts 15:17 the Gentiles called by God's *name* were said to seek the Lord (Jesus) *by calling upon the name of Jesus*.

The last part of chapter 4 is a study of the social and cultural texture in James' use of the Scriptures and Jesus' Teaching. Taking the echo of Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 into account, this section claims that the religious responses to the world present in James' recontextualizing Amos 9:11-12, his use of Isa 45:21, and the echo of Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48 in his use of Amos 9:11-12 are reformist, conversionist, and gnostic-manipulationist. In the reformist response, it is observed that the benefit that God's rebuilding of the fallen tent of David brings to people under Roman rule is salvation, termed as forgiveness of sins specifically. Taking the echo of Jesus' words in Luke 24:47-48 in James' use of Amos 9:11-12 into consideration also shows that James' use of the Scriptures expresses dominant culture rhetoric, and this rhetoric in Luke's narrative responds to the subculture rhetoric that can be seen in the demand of the Pharisaic believers in Acts 15:5: While the Pharisaic believers insist that *it is necessary* (δεῖ) to circumcise the Gentile believers and order them to keep the law, by appealing to Jesus' teaching in Luke 24:47-48 concerning *what is necessary* (δεῖ), James in Luke's account emphasizes the sufficiency of the Gentile believers' calling upon the name of Jesus.

In conclusion, this dissertation has demonstrated on an exegetical level *how* Luke uses Jesus' teachings of the law in the Gospel of Luke in his presentation of the solution of the law problem facing the early church in Acts 15. Luke presents Peter and James in Acts using Jesus' comment upon the law in order to depict the identity of the Jesus movement. This dissertation has demonstrated that it is crucial for Luke to stress the identity marks of the Jesus movement as being the purification of the

heart and calling upon the name of Jesus, or, in other words, to emphasize that the entry requirements for joining in the Christian group are the purification of the heart and calling upon the name of Jesus. The reason is that these are crucial elements in his view of what constitutes salvation.

In terms of *how* Luke's portrayal of Jesus' view of the law in the Gospel of Luke is related to Luke's presentation of the issues of law in Acts, this work limits its investigation to Luke 11:37-41, 24:47-48, and Acts 15. More work can be done in this area. Scholars have noted the continuity between the keeping of the law in the Gospel of Luke and Acts, but there is still lacking in works that treat the correlations of the topic of law in the Gospel of Luke and Acts, such as *how* a theme related to the law in the Gospel of Luke is continued in Acts on an exegetical level. This kind of study is a way for us to better understand Luke's view of the law and other themes in Lukan theology related to Luke's concern.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ådna, Jostein. "Die Heilige Schrift als Zeuge der Heidenmission. Die Rezeption von Amos 9,11-12 in Apg 15, 16-18." Pages 1-23 in *Evangelium Schriftauslegung Kirche: Festschrift für Peter Stuhlmacher zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Jostein Ådna, Scott J. Hafemann, and Otfried Hofemann. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997.
- Alexander, Patrick H., John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley A. Decker-Lucke, and for the Society of Biblical Literature David L. Petersen, eds. *The SBL Handbook of Style: For Ancient Near Eastern, Biblical, and Early Christian Studies*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999.
- Alexander, Philip S. "Torah and Salvation in Tannaitic Literature." Pages 261-301 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Hosea: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24. Garden City: Doubleday, 1980.
- _____. *Amos: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 24A. New York: Doubleday, 1989.
- Avemarie, Friedrich. *Tora und Leben : Untersuchungen zur Heilsbedeutung der Tora in der frühen rabbinischen Literatur*. Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum 55. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1996.
- Banks, Robert. *Jesus and the Law in the Synoptic Tradition*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 28. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1994-98.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Gentiles (Acts 15.13-21)." Pages 154-84 in *History, Literature, and Society in the Book of Acts*. Edited by Ben Witherington III. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- _____. "Apocalypses." Pages 135-87 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A.

Seifrid. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.

_____. "James, Peter, and the Gentiles." Pages 91-142 in *The Mission of James, Peter, and Paul: Tensions in Early Christianity*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 115. Edited by Bruce Chilton and Craig A. Evans. Leiden: Brill, 2005.

Beale, G. K. "The Overstated 'New' Perspective?" (review of D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *The Paradoxes of Paul*. Vol. 2 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism*). *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 19 (2009): 85-94.

Beasley-Murray, G. R. *Jesus and the Kingdom of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Blomberg, Craig L. "The Law in Luke-Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 22 (1984): 53-80.

Bock, Darrell L. *Luke*. 2 volumes. Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 3. Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994-96.

_____. *A Theology of Luke and Acts: Biblical Theology of the New Testament*. Edited by Andreas J. Köstenberger. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2012.

Bockmuehl, Markus. "1QS and Salvation at Qumran." Pages 381-414 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.

Bormann, Lukas. *Recht, Gerechtigkeit und Religion im Lukasevangelium*. Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001.

Bovon, François. *Luke 1: A Commentary on the Gospel of Luke 1:1-9:50*. Edited by Helmut Koester. Translated by Christine M. Thomas. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2002.

_____. *Studies in Early Christianity*. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament* 161. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2003.

Bracke, John. *Jeremiah 1-29*. Word Biblical Commentary. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2000.

Braun, Michael A. "James' Use of Amos at the Jerusalem Council: Steps toward a Possible Solution of the Textual and Theological Problems." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 20 (1977): 113-21.

- Brenton, Lancelot Charles Lee. *The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1986.
- Bruce, F. F. *The Acts of the Apostles: Greek Text with Introduction and Commentary*. 3d Rev. and enl. ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *To Pluck Up, to Tear Down: A Commentary on the Book of Jeremiah 1-25*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.
- Butticaz, Simon. "Acts 15 or the 'Return of the Repressed'? The Church and the Law in Acts." Pages 118-32 in *Torah in the New Testament: Papers Delivered at the Manchester-Lausanne Seminar of June 2008*. Edited by Michael Tait and Peter Oakes. Library of New Testament Studies 401. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Callan, Terrance. "The Background of the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:20, 29; 21:25)." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 55 (1993): 284-97.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. "Kingdom of God/Kingdom of Heaven." Pages 417-30 in *Dictionary of Jesus and the Gospels*. Edited by Joel B. Green, Scot McKnight and I. Howard Marshall. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992.
- Carson, D. A. "Summaries and Conclusions." Pages 505-48 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Carson, D. A., Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid, eds. *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Childs, Brevard S. *Isaiah*. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Coggins, R. J. "The Samaritans in Josephus." Pages 257-73 in *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and Gohei Hata. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- Coleridge, Mark. *The Birth of the Lukan Narrative: Narrative as Christology in Luke 1-2*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 88. Sheffield: JSOT, 1993.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *Acts of the Apostles*. Hermeneia. Edited by Eldon Jap Epp with Christopher R. Matthews. Translated by James Limburg, A. Thomas Kraabel, and Donald H. Juel. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- Coote, Robert. *Amos among the Prophets: Composition and Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981.

- Craigie, Peter C. *The Book of Deuteronomy*. The New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.
- Culy, Martin M., and Mikeal C. Parsons. *Acts: A Handbook on the Greek Text*. Waco: Baylor University Press, 2003.
- Davies, W. D. *Paul and Rabbinic Judaism: Some Rabbinic Elements in Pauline Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- Downing, F. Gerald. "Freedom from the Law in Luke-Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 26 (1986): 49-52.
- Dunn, James D. G. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Narrative Commentaries. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1996.
- _____. Review of D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism*. *Trinity Journal* 25 (2004): 111-13.
- Dunne, John Anthony. "David's Tent as Temple in Amos 9:11-15: Understanding the Epilogue of Amos and Considering Implications for the Unity of the Book." *Westminster Theological Journal* 73 (2011): 363-74.
- Dupont, Jacques. "'Je rebâtirai la cabane de David qui est tombée' (Ac 15, 15= Am 9, 11)." Pages 19-32 in *Glaube und Eschatologie: Festschrift für Werner Georg Kümmel zum 80. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erich Gräßer and Otto Merk. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Elliott, Mark Adam. *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Enns, Peter. "Expansions of Scripture." Pages 73-98 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- _____. "Jesus and the Reduction of Intergroup Conflict: The Parable of the Good Samaritan in the Light of Social Identity Theory." *Biblical Interpretation* 8 (2000): 325-57.
- Falk, Daniel. "Psalms and Prayers." Pages 7-56 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark

- A. Seifrid. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Gospel according to Luke: Introduction, Translation, and Notes.* 2 vols. Anchor Bible 28, 28A. Garden City, N. Y.: Doubleday, 1981-85.
- _____. *The Acts of the Apostles: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* Anchor Bible 31. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Gathercole, Simon J. *Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- _____. "Early Judaism and Covenantal Nomism: A Review Article" (review of D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid, eds., *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism.* Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism: A Fresh Appraisal of Paul and Second Temple Judaism*). *The Evangelical Quarterly* 76 (2004): 153-62.
- Glenny, W. Edward. *Finding Meaning in the Text: Translation Technique and Theology in the Septuagint of Amos.* Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 126. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- _____. "The Septuagint and Apostolic Hermeneutics: Amos 9 in Acts 15." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 22 (2012): 1-26.
- Gosse, Bernard. "La nouvelle alliance et les promesses d'avenir se référant à David dans les livres de Jérémie, Ezéchiel et Isaïe." *Vetus Testamentum* 41 (1991): 419-28.
- Goswell, Greg. "David in the Prophecy of Amos." *Vetus Testamentum* 61 (2011): 243-57.
- Gowan, Donald E. "Wisdom." Pages 215-39 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism.* Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism.* Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Gowler, David B. "'At His Gate Lay a Poor Man': A Dialogic Reading of Luke 16:19-31." *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 32 (2005): 249-65.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke.* New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- Haenchen, Ernst. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary.* Translated by Bernard Noble and Gerald Shinn. Edited by R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971.
- Hay, David M. "Philo of Alexandria." Pages 357-79 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism.* Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism.* Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140.* Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.

- Hays, Christopher. "Beyond Mint and Rue: The Implications of Luke's Interpretive Controversies for Modern Consumerism." *Political Theology* 11 (2010): 383-98.
- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Heschel, Abraham Joshua. *Heavenly Torah: As Refracted through the Generations*. Edited and Translated by Gordon Tucker and Leonard Levine. New York: Continuum, 2010.
- Hoet, Hendrick. "ΕΞ 'ΕΘΝΩΝ ΛΑΟΝ (AC 15, 14)." Pages 397-413 in *Luke and His Readers: Festschrift A. Denaux*. Edited by R. Bieringer et al. Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologiarum lovaniensium 182. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2005.
- Jeremias, Jörg. *The Book of Amos: A Commentary*. Translated by Douglas W. Stott. The Old Testament Library. Louisville, Ky.: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972.
- Jobs, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. "On Finding the Lukan Community: A Cautious Cautionary Essay." Pages 87-100 in *SBL 1979 Seminar Papers*. Vol. 1. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Missoula: Scholars, 1979.
- _____. *The Gospel of Luke*. Sacra Pagina Series 3. Edited by Daniel J. Harrington, S. J. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1991.
- Kartveit, Magnar. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 128. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- Keener, Craig S. *Acts: An Exegetical Commentary*. 4 vols; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2012-15.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. *Gesetz und Volk Gottes: Das lukanische Verständnis des Gesetzes nach Herkunft, Funktion und seinem Ort in der Geschichte des Urchristentums*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 32. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1988.
- Knoppers, Gary N. *Jews and Samaritans: The Origins and History of Their Early Relations*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Kraus, Wolfgang. "The Role of the Septuagint in the New Testament: Amos 9:11-12 as a Test Case." Pages 171-90 in *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*. Edited by Robert J. V. Hiebert with the assistance of colleagues in the Septuagint Institute, Trinity Western University. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies 56. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2010.

- Kugler, Robert A. "Testaments." Pages 189-213 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Laney, J. Carl. "Deuteronomy 24:1-4 and the Issue of Divorce." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 149 (1992): 3-15.
- Lemke, Werner E. "Circumcision of the Heart: The Journey of a Biblical Metaphor." Pages 299-319 in *A God So Near: Essays on Old Testament Theology in Honor of Patrick D. Miller*. Edited by Brent A. Strawn and Nancy R. Bowen. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2003.
- Leupold, H. C. *Exposition of the Psalms*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1961.
- Lim, Sung Uk. "Josephus Constructs the Samari(t)ans: A Strategic Construction of Judaeon/Jewish Identity through the Rhetoric of Inclusion and Exclusion." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 64 (2013): 404-31.
- Loader, William. *Jesus' Attitude towards the Law: A Study of the Gospels*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.
- Malina, Bruce J., and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Book of Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- McComiskey, Thomas Edward. "Amos." Pages 269-331 in *The Expositor's Bible Commentary*. Edited by Frank E. Gaebelein. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985.
- McLay, R. Timothy. *The Use of the Septuagint in New Testament Research*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- McNamara, Martin. "Some Targum Themes." Pages 303-56 in *The Complexities of Second Temple Judaism*. Vol. 1 of *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Edited by D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien and Mark A. Seifrid. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 140. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 2001.
- Merkel, Helmut. "Das Gesetz im lukanischen Doppelwerk." Pages 119-133 in *Schrift und Tradition: Festschrift für Josef Ernst zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Knut Backhaus and Franz Georg Untergaßmair. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1996.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 1994.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 17-22: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. Anchor Bible 3A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Montefiore, C. G. *Judaism and St. Paul: Two Essays*. London: Max Goschen, 1914.

- Montgomery, James Alan. *The Samaritans; The Earliest Jewish Sect: Their History, Theology and Literature*. New York: Ktav, 1968.
- Moore, George Foot. *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era: The Age of the Tannaim*. 3 vols. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.
- Motyer, J. Alec. *The Prophecy of Isaiah: An Introduction & Commentary*. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1993.
- Murray, John. "Divorce." *Westminster Theological Journal* 9 (1946): 31-46.
- Nägele, Sabine. *Laubhütte Davids und Wolkensohn: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Studie zu Amos 9, 11 in der jüdischen und christlichen Exegese*. Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums 24. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1995.
- Neusner, Jacob. Review of E. P. Sanders, *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. *History of Religions* 18 (1978): 177-91.
- _____. "The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees before 70 CE: An Overview." Pages 297-311 in *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*. Edited by Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- Neusner, Jacob, and Bruce Chilton. *Jewish-Christian Debates: God, Kingdom, Messiah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1998.
- Nolland, John. "A Fresh Look at Acts 15:10." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980): 105-14.
- _____. *Luke 1-9:20*. Word Biblical Commentary 35A. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1989.
- _____. *Luke 9:21-18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35B. Dallas, Tex.: Word Books, 1993.
- Oswalt, John. *The Book of Isaiah Chapters 40-66*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Pao, David W. and Eckhard J. Schnabel. "Luke." Pages 251-414 in *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Edited by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Park, Aaron. *The Book of Amos as Composed and Read in Antiquity*. Society of Biblical Literature 37. New York: Peter Lang, 2001.
- Parsons, Mikeal C. *Acts*. Paideia: Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2008.
- Parsons, Mikeal C., and Richard Pervo. *Rethinking the Unity of Luke and Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993.

- Paul, Shalom M. *Amos: A Commentary on the Book of Amos*. Edited by Frank Moore Cross. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1991.
- Paulo, Pierre-Antoine. *Le problème ecclésial des Actes à la lumière de deux prophéties d'Amos*. Recherches Nouvelle Série 3. Montréal: Bellarmin, 1985.
- Peels, H. G. L. "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament." *In die Skriflig* 35 (2001): 173-89.
- Pervo, Richard I. *Acts: A Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2009.
- Petersen, David L. *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8: A Commentary*. The Old Testament Library. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1984.
- Pillai, C. A. Joachim. *Apostolic Interpretation of History: A Commentary on Acts 13:16-41*. Hicksville, N.Y.: Exposition, 1980.
- Polley, Max E. *Amos and the Davidic Empire: A Socio-Historical Approach*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Richard, Earl. "The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15)." Pages 267-76 in *Society of Biblical Literature 1980 Seminar Papers*. Edited by Paul J. Achtemeier. Chico: Scholars, 1980.
- _____. "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts." *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1982): 37-53.
- Robbins, Vernon K. "The Social Location of the Implied Author of Luke-Acts." Pages 305-32 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991.
- _____. "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificat as a Test Case." Pages 164-209 in *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*. Edited by Edgar V. Mcknight and Elizabeth Struthers Malbon. Valley Forge, Pa.: Trinity Press International, 1994.
- _____. *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: Rhetoric, Society and Ideology*. New York: Routledge, 1996a.
- _____. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge, Penn.: Trinity Press International, 1996b.
- Robertson, O. Palmer. "Hermeneutics of Continuity." Pages 89-108 in *Continuity And Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship between the Old and New Testaments*. Edited by John S. Feinberg. Westchester, Ill.: Crossway, 1988.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988.

- Salo, Kalervo. *Luke's Treatment of the Law: A Redaction-Critical Investigation*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 57. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1991.
- Sanders, E. P. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- _____. *Jesus and Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1985.
- _____. *Judaism: Practice & Belief 63 BCE-66CE*. London: SCM Press, 1992.
- Schechter, Solomon. *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology*. New York: Schocken Books, 1961. Repr., Woodstock, Vt.: Jewish Lights, 1993.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 16. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1985.
- Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." Pages 165-86 in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebenzigsten Geburtstag am 20. August 1954*. Edited by Eltester, Walther. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann, 1957.
- Seifrid, M. A. "Jesus and the Law in Acts." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 30 (1987): 39-57.
- Selman, Martin J. "The Kingdom of God in the Old Testament." *Tyndale Bulletin* 40 (1989): 161-83.
- Smith, Billy K., and Franklin S. Page. *Amos, Obadiah, Jonah*. The New American Commentary 19B. Nashville, Tenn.: Broadman & Holman, 1995.
- Steyn, Gert J. "Soteriological Perspectives in Luke's Gospel." Pages 67-99 in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplement Series 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.
- _____. "David." Pages 435-43 in *New Dictionary of Biblical Theology*. Edited by T. Desmond Alexander and Brian S. Rosner. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 2000.
- Stuckenbruck, Loren T. "The 'Cleansing' of the Gentiles: Background for the Rationale behind the Apostles' Decree in Acts 15." Pages 65-90 in *Aposteldekret und antikes Vereinswesen: Gemeinschaft und ihre Ordnung*. Edited by Markus Öhler. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 280. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Sweeney, Marvin A. "Micah's Debate with Isaiah." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 93 (2011): 111-24.
- Tannehill, Robert C. *Luke*. Abingdon New Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1996.
- Turner, Max. *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts*. Journal of Pentecostal Theology Supplement Series 9. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 2000.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English*. New York: Penguin Books, 1997.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament with Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996.
- Westermann, Claus. *Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Translated by David M. G. Stalker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- Wilson, Stephen G. *Luke and the Law*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Witherington, Ben, III. *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Witherup, Ronald D. "Functional Redundancy in the Acts of the Apostles: A Case Study." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 48(1992): 67-86.
- Zyl, Hermie C. van. "The Soteriology of Acts: Restoration to Life." Pages 133-60 in *Salvation in the New Testament: Perspectives on Soteriology*. Edited by Jan G. van der Watt. Supplements to Novum Testamentum 121. Leiden: Brill, 2005.