

## THE DAVIDIC MESSIAH IN LUKE-ACTS

F. F. BRUCE

While Dr. LaSor is best known as a Hebraist and an Old Testament specialist, he has not excluded the Greek language or the New Testament from his scholarly exploration. His *Handbook of New Testament Greek: An Inductive Approach Based on the Greek Texts of Acts* and his commentary on Acts, *Church Alive!* bear witness to his interest and competence in the latter fields. It is a pleasure for one who first entered the world of biblical and New Testament scholarship with a study of Acts to share in this tribute of admiration and friendship to Dr. LaSor with a brief survey of one aspect of the use of the Old Testament in Luke-Acts.

### I. LUKE'S NATIVITY NARRATIVE

One of the most noteworthy negative features in Jesus' allusions to his identity or rule is the absence of any appeal to the promises attached to the house of David. He did not repudiate the designation "son of David" when it was given to him by others,<sup>1</sup> but on the only occasion when he himself is recorded to have raised the subject, it was to point out the inadequacy of the designation "son of David" for one whom David recognized to be his lord.<sup>2</sup> (There is nothing to suggest that his riposte to the Pharisees who criticized his disciples for plucking and eating some ears of grain on the sabbath, "Have you not read what David did...?" implies that if David could override the law on occasion, so *a fortiori* could the son of David.)<sup>3</sup>

When Jesus was challenged by the high priest, at his appearance before the Sanhedrin, to say whether or not he was the Messiah, he acknowledged that, if this was the title on which his judges insisted, he had no option but to lay claim to it. But he went on immediately to show in what sense he claimed it by using the transcendent imagery of apocalyptic and not the language in which the hope of the restoration of the Davidic monarchy was traditionally couched.<sup>4</sup>

Yet, if it is plain that Jesus did not use this language of himself, it is equally plain that others used it of him, and that from an early date. When Paul introduces his letter to the Christians of Rome with a reference to Jesus' being "descended from David according to the flesh,"<sup>5</sup> he is probably not using the

[p.8]

terminology which he found most congenial but adapting the words of a Christian confession which he assumed would be as familiar in Rome as he knew it to be in the Eastern Mediterranean. When he expresses his own insight into the identity of Jesus, he uses different language,<sup>6</sup> but by the same token he knew the language quoted in Rom 1:3 to be primitive—the language used by some who were in Christ before himself. This is confirmed by the

testimony of non-Pauline writings of the New Testament, and not least by that of the writings of Luke.

The nativity narratives of both Matthew and Luke attest Jesus' descent from David, but Luke's narrative does so with special emphasis. Luke indicates that both Jesus and his forerunner were born into a circle of pious people who looked for the near fulfillment of the ancestral hope of Israel and associated that fulfillment with the coming of the long-expected prince of the house of David. In this regard they show a striking affinity with the pious circle from which, a few decades earlier, the Psalms of Solomon came, with their reprobation of the Hasmonean usurpers who had "laid waste the throne of David," and their earnest prayer that God would soon raise up the rightful heir to that throne to put down the oppressors of Israel and restore his people's fortunes. The prophecies of the wealth of nations being brought to enrich the city of God would then be realized, but above all Jerusalem would once again be known as the city of righteousness: "for all will be holy, and their king is the anointed Lord."<sup>7</sup> Commentators generally regard this last phrase (*christos kyrios*) as a Greek mistranslation of the lost Hebrew original (*m<sup>e</sup>šīḥ YHWH*), but this is doubtful. If YHWH had been the Hebrew wording, the translators had ample precedent in the Septuagint to guide them to its proper rendering *christos kyriou*. We must bear in mind the occurrence of the same phrase *christos kyrios* in the angelic message to the shepherds near Bethlehem<sup>8</sup> (although this has also, but unconvincingly, been explained as a comparable mistranslation).

Luke's record introduces the Davidic motif when he tells how, six months after the announcement of the impending birth of John the Baptist, the angel Gabriel came to Nazareth to make a similar announcement to Mary, "a virgin betrothed to a man whose name was Joseph, of the house of David."<sup>9</sup> Here, as in Matthew's record,<sup>10</sup> it is Joseph who is said to have been of Davidic descent: all that can be known of Mary's family must be inferred from the statement that she was related to John's mother Elizabeth, who belonged to "the daughters of Aaron."<sup>11</sup> Luke leaves his readers in no doubt that Jesus was conceived while his mother was still a virgin, but that in law Joseph was his father; hence in law Jesus ranked as a son of David, while by divine providence he was marked out as *the* son of David in whom the age-long promises were to meet their fulfillment. Hence Gabriel speaks thus to Mary about her coming son:

He will be great, and will be called the Son of the Most High;  
and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David,  
and he will reign over the house of Jacob for ever;  
and of his kingdom there will be no end.<sup>12</sup>

It is not difficult to recognize in these words an echo of various Old Testament

[p.9]

passages, such as Isaiah's oracle of the prince of the four names, whose government will be established without end "upon the throne of David, to uphold it with justice and with righteousness from this time forth and for evermore."<sup>13</sup>

The same note is struck in Zechariah's song of praise at the birth of his son—the more surprisingly, as Zechariah was a priest and did not belong to the royal line which was the subject of the Davidic promises. Yet in the birth of John he greeted a token of what was shortly to be fulfilled in the royal line:

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel,  
for he has visited and redeemed his people,  
and has raised up a horn of salvation for us  
in the house of his servant David,  
as he spoke by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old....<sup>14</sup>

We may discern this note again in the angels' good news to the shepherds: "to you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour, who is Christ the Lord (*christos kyrios* 'the anointed Lord')." <sup>15</sup> Why in the city of David? Because, as Luke tells us in his own prosaic narrative, in pursuance of a census decree of the Roman Emperor, Joseph "went up from Galilee, from the city of Nazareth, to Judea, to the city of David, which is called Bethlehem, because he was of the house and lineage of David, to be enrolled with Mary, his betrothed, who was with child." <sup>16</sup>

A similarly matter-of-fact datum, albeit in another genre, is provided by Luke in his genealogical table which traces Jesus' lineage back through Joseph to David (and beyond David to Abraham and Adam)—not, however (as in the Matthean genealogy), through the succession of kings descended from David (Solomon and his heirs) but through Nathan, another son of David, and his completely obscure descendants. <sup>17</sup> Whatever significance there is in this curious fact does not lie on the surface; anyone undertaking to lay it bare must explain at the same time why Luke's line coincides with the more illustrious line in the persons of Shealtiel and Prince Zerubbabel. <sup>18</sup>

After the genealogy, however, no mention is made of Jesus' Davidic descent throughout the whole Gospel of Luke except once, incidentally, by the blind man of Jericho. <sup>19</sup> Remarkably enough, Luke's description of the triumphal entry into Jerusalem suppresses the reference to "the kingdom of our father David" which Mark's parallel narrative puts on the lips of the pilgrim crowd. <sup>20</sup> Like an underground stream, nevertheless, the Davidic motif emerges into the light of day again when we come to the apostolic preaching in Luke's second volume. Its absence from the record of Jesus' ministry deserves to be invested with all the importance which is attached, in current gospel criticism, to the "criterion of dissimilarity."

## II. PENTECOST IN JERUSALEM

Of the speeches in Acts there are two in particular which insist that Jesus was descended from David and that in him the divine promises made to or through

[p.10]

David were realized: Peter's speech in Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost and Paul's speech in the synagogue of Pisidian Antioch. Although there are differences in detail between the two speeches in their deployment of the Davidic theme, they share sufficient common ground to suggest that both draw upon an early pattern of Christian preaching which maintained that the resurrection of Jesus fulfilled certain well-known scriptures. Of these scriptures, the sixteenth psalm figures in both speeches.

Peter's speech in Jerusalem begins by explaining the phenomena that have amazed his audience—those attendant on the descent of the Spirit—in terms of the prophecy of Joel 2:28-

32; then he goes on to announce that Jesus of Nazareth, so recently put to death in that city, has been raised from the dead. Peter and his associates can bear first-hand testimony to his resurrection, and in it they see clearly the fulfillment of the hope expressed in Ps 16:10:

thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades,  
nor let thy holy one see corruption.<sup>21</sup>

By common consent this psalm was ascribed to David; what then could be the meaning of the confidence to which these words of David give utterance? We might say today that, whoever the author was, he was voicing his assurance that God would deliver him from death in some critical situation. But this would not satisfy the hermeneutical principles underlying the application of the words in Peter's speech: however many deliverances from death the psalmist experienced, one day death caught up with him, so that his soul was given over to Hades and his body did undergo corruption. (The exegesis here depends on the Greek rather than the Hebrew text: 'corruption,' Greek *diaphthora*, renders Hebrew *šahat* 'the pit,' which stands in synonymous parallelism with *š'ôl* 'Hades.')

The interpretation of the passage in Peter's speech extracts the last ounce of significance from the words, for they were the words of a prophet. The oracle entitled "the last words of David" opens with the claim:

The Spirit of Yahweh speaks by me,  
his word is upon my tongue<sup>22</sup>

—and everything in the Psalter spoken by David, or attributed to David, is understood in the light of this claim. Every word must be given its full weight, and so the confidence expressed in Ps 16:10 is referred not to an occasional deliverance from death but to absolute deliverance, such as Jesus experienced. The words, then, cannot be applicable to David, since he "died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day."<sup>23</sup> Yet they were spoken by him, and spoken in the first person singular; this must therefore be one of those places where the messianic Spirit spoke in the prophets, "predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glories."<sup>24</sup> David, by the Spirit, spoke not *in propria persona* but as the mouthpiece of his greater son, the Messiah, who as a matter of now attested fact "was not abandoned to Hades, nor did his flesh see corruption."<sup>25</sup>

But if Jesus' resurrection, to which his followers were witnesses, declared

[p.11]

him to be the Messiah, then other oracles which, by general agreement, pointed to the Messiah must have come true of him. When Jesus, in debate with the scribes during Holy Week, asked how the Messiah could be David's son if David by inspiration called him "my lord," it was accepted by him and them alike that Ps 110:1 ("Yahweh's oracle to my lord: 'Sit at my right hand....'") was a prophetic utterance of David and that the person invited to sit at God's right hand was the Messiah.<sup>26</sup> Peter, having affirmed Jesus to be the Messiah, can now go on to affirm that these words must therefore apply to him (as they could obviously not apply to David): "Being therefore exalted at the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, he has poured out this which you see and hear.... Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly that God has made this Jesus... both Lord and Messiah (*kyrios* and *christos*)."<sup>27</sup>

The primitiveness of the use of Ps 110:1 as a *testimonium* to the exaltation of Jesus is seen by the way in which it crops up in so many strata of the New Testament. Once again, Paul's evidence in his letter to the Romans is important, for his reference in Rom 8:34 to "Christ Jesus. . . , who is at the right hand of God, who also makes intercession for us," is probably (like his reference to Jesus' Davidic descent in Rom 1:3) taken from an early confession of faith.<sup>28</sup>

### III. AT PISIDIAN ANTIOCH

The Davidic-Messiah group of *testimonia* is by no means the only one found in the speeches in the early chapters of Acts—we may think of the combination of the Servant-of-Yahweh theme with the Prophet-like-Moses theme in Peter's speech in the temple court in Acts 3:1 3-26<sup>29</sup>—but Luke may have reasons of his own for putting it in the forefront of the apostolic preaching. The next outstanding occasion on which the Davidic-Messiah theme is emphasized in the apostolic preaching is in Paul's synagogue address at Pisidian Antioch.

This address begins with an outline of the mighty acts of God in the history of Israel from the Exodus to the rise of David.<sup>30</sup> This outline, as the late George Ernest Wright pointed out, summarizes the Old Testament *kerygma*, Israel's salvation-history as it was recited in the national worship.<sup>31</sup> A good example of this is presented by Psalm 78, which surveys Yahweh's dealings with the nation from the days of Egypt and the wilderness until

he chose David his servant...  
to be the shepherd of Jacob his people,  
of Israel his inheritance.<sup>32</sup>

But, whereas the psalmist sees the rise of David and his dynasty, with the establishment of the sanctuary on Zion, as the climax of salvation-history,<sup>33</sup> Paul treats it as a stage on the way to the real climax, for he moves directly from David to Jesus, the son of David: "Of this man's posterity God has brought to Israel a Saviour, Jesus, as he promised."<sup>34</sup> Then follows an outline of the New Testa-

[p.12]

ment *kerygma* which, as regularly in the gospel tradition, finds its inception in John's baptismal ministry<sup>35</sup> and its culmination in the death and resurrection of Jesus.

After the reference to those who were eyewitnesses of the risen Christ come the *testimonia*. One has not hitherto been used in Acts<sup>36</sup>—the oracle of Ps 2:7, in which Yahweh addresses his anointed one with the acclamation:

Thou art my Son,  
today I have begotten thee.

This is adduced as a *testimonium* to God's "raising" of Jesus<sup>37</sup>—not, probably, to his being raised from the dead but to his being raised up as Israel's deliverer (just as, earlier in the address, God is said to have "raised up David to be their king"<sup>38</sup>). In the original Lucan account of Jesus' baptism this may well have been the precise wording of the heavenly voice

(it is so read in the Western text).<sup>39</sup> The occasion indicated in the present context is best taken similarly as the baptism of Jesus; it was then that (as Peter put it in the house of Cornelius) “God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Spirit and with power.”<sup>40</sup> (It might be argued against this that Paul himself thinks of the *resurrection* as the occasion when Jesus was “designated Son of God in power,”<sup>41</sup> but the phrase “in power” there may be understood by way of contrast with his being “crucified in weakness.”<sup>42</sup> It was the Son of God that was crucified as truly as it was the Son of God that was raised from the dead—but in being raised from the dead he was effectively shown to be the Son of God.)

One of the *testimonia* adduced at Pisidian Antioch for the resurrection of Jesus is Ps 16:10, as it had been in Jerusalem at the first Christian Pentecost.<sup>43</sup> But at Pisidian Antioch it is associated interestingly with Isa 55:3 where God, restoring his people after exile, promises to give them “the holy and sure blessings of David.”<sup>44</sup> Both in Hebrew and in Greek these two *testimonia* are linked by a common term: we have here an instance of the rabbinical interpretative principle *g<sup>e</sup>zera<sup>h</sup> sawa<sup>h</sup>* (‘equal category’). In the Hebrew text *ḥasîd* (‘holy one’) in Ps 16:10 is cognate with *ḥasdê* (‘covenant mercies’) in Isa 55:3; in the Septuagint the same adjective *hosios* is used in both places (in the masculine singular in the former and in the neuter plural in the latter). This provided sufficient ground to join the two in a common exegetical schema. If Jesus, the son of David, was the “holy one” of God who was saved from undergoing corruption, his resurrection was the means by which God kept his undertaking to fulfill for his people the covenant mercies promised to David and his dynasty. As Paul expresses it in 1 Cor 15:25, Jesus, having been raised from the dead, must reign until God “has put all his enemies under his feet.”<sup>45</sup>

Is this speech at Pisidian Antioch genuinely Pauline? The point that might particularly give us pause is the statement in it that, after his resurrection, Jesus “for many days appeared to those who came up with him from Galilee to Jerusalem, who are now his witnesses to the people.”<sup>46</sup> Here at least Luke is reproducing the general terms of the apostolic preaching rather than Paul’s dis-

[p.13]

tinutive witness: we may be sure that at this point Paul would say, and indeed did say, “Last of all... he appeared also to me.”<sup>47</sup>

But the Pauline authenticity of the speech is not put in question by the emphasis which it lays on the Davidic motif, in contrast to the absence of such emphasis in Paul’s letters. This is synagogue evangelism, not Christian instruction, and Paul could have taken the cue for his address from the contents of one or the other of the scripture lessons for the day.<sup>48</sup>

Of the *testimonia* adduced thus far, two have unmistakable reference to the king of Israel and the other Isa 55:3) explicitly mentions David. Ps 2:7 and Ps 110:1 both preserve divine oracles of reassurance and victory addressed to the king, perhaps forming part of the enthronement liturgy. The former certainly<sup>49</sup> and the latter probably<sup>50</sup> were understood as messianic before the beginning of the Christian era; when Jesus was identified with the Messiah, therefore, it was a foregone conclusion that they should be interpreted with reference to him. The same is true of the mention of the covenant mercies promised to David in Isa 55:3. Once Jesus was acknowledged to be the son of David *par excellence*, these covenant mercies were seen to be secured in him, the more so if the end-time David of that context,

given as “a witness to the peoples,”<sup>51</sup> was recognized to be the same person as the suffering and triumphant Servant of chapters 42-53.

Psalm 16, on the other hand, made no reference to any king, and there is no evidence that it was thought of as messianic in any sense before the apostolic age. Its enlistment as a *testimonium* is the result of exclusively Christian insight or inspiration. It was in the light of the Easter event that the appropriateness of the psalmist’s confident hope of preservation from death to the resurrection of Jesus was appreciated. Since the psalm was traditionally Davidic, the conclusion was not far to seek that this confident hope was voiced by David through the spirit of prophecy, and came historically true in the experience of great David’s greater Son.

#### IV. THE GENTILE MISSION

There is one further messianic *testimonium* in Acts which will repay attention. Towards the end of the book of Amos there is an oracle relating to the Davidic dynasty which proclaims that, although that dynasty has fallen on evil days, its past glories are nevertheless to be restored. In the heyday of David’s imperial power he had extended his sway over the Edomites and other neighboring ethnic groups. These became not only David’s vassals but also subjects of Yahweh, whom David worshiped and by whose grace he won his victories.<sup>52</sup> The “shields of the earth” thus belonged to the God of Israel; by his name the subject nations were called.<sup>53</sup> Hence the prophecy of restoration says:

“In that day I will raise up  
the booth of David that is fallen  
and repair its breaches,  
and raise up its ruins,

[p.14]

and rebuild it as in the days of old;  
that they may possess the remnant of Edom  
and all the nations who are called by my name,”  
says Yahweh who does this.<sup>54</sup>

The Septuagint rendering of this oracle provides a good example of the spiritualizing tendency of that version. Instead of a program of renewed imperial expansion it presents a picture of religious conversion:

“In that day I will raise up David’s fallen tent  
and rebuild its wreckage  
and raise up its ruins,  
and rebuild it as in the days of old;  
that the remnant of mankind may seek out,  
even all the nations on whom my name has been called,”  
says the Lord who does this.

The most crucial change here is the vocalization of *'dm* as *'adam* (‘mankind’) instead of *'edom* (‘Edom’); this has changed the whole tone of the oracle. Here it is reinterpreted so as to convey a promise like that of Isa 55:3-4, where the fulfillment of the covenant mercies

promised to David brings hope for the world at large, in keeping with Israel's mission to impart the knowledge of the true God to her neighbors. The reading of the verb *yîr<sup>e</sup>šû* ('may possess') as *yidr<sup>e</sup>šû* ('may seek') may have been due to a scribal slip, but it helps the reinterpretation. Whereas "the remnant of Edom" was the object of the verb "may possess" in the original text,<sup>55</sup> "the remnant of mankind" becomes the subject of the verb "may seek" in the Greek version, while the unexpressed object of this verb is probably to be understood as "me" (the Lord). The point of the Greek version then is that, thanks to the witness of Israel, the nations will seek the God of Israel and become his subjects.

The Hebrew text was used as a *testimonium* in the Damascus Document, where "the booth of David" is identified with "the booth of the king" in Amos 5:26 (a revocalization of "Sakkuth your king") and the two oracles together are interpreted of the restoration of the law to its place of supremacy in the assembly of the saints (the Qumran community).<sup>56</sup> This denudes it of all messianic significance in the proper sense.

The Greek text is used as a *testimonium* in Luke's account of the Council of Jerusalem. Here the apostles and elders meet to consider the terms on which Gentile believers in Jesus may be enrolled among the people of God in this new age. They listen to arguments on this side and that, until James the Just sums up the sense of the meeting. He expresses approval of Peter's exhortation, based on personal experience, not to impose on the Gentiles conditions which God himself had manifestly not required, for "with this," he says, "the words of the prophets agree, as it is written:

'After this I will return,  
and rebuild David's fallen tent;

[p.15]

I will rebuild its ruins  
and I will set it up,  
that the rest of mankind may seek the Lord,  
even all the Gentiles who are called by my name,'  
says the Lord, who has made these things known  
from of old."<sup>57</sup>

Apart from minor changes at the beginning and the end of the quotation,<sup>58</sup> this is essentially the Septuagint rendering. Now the object sought by the remnant of mankind is made explicit: it is the Lord. But now the rebuilding of David's fallen tent has a more precise relevance than was possible for the pre-Christian Greek translator and spiritualizer. The "remnant of mankind," i.e., the non-Jewish nations, by hearing and obeying the gospel of Christ, are yielding allegiance to the Son of David. The Son of David is extending his sovereignty over a wider empire than David himself ever controlled, and extending it by the persuasion of love, not by force of arms. This and similar Old Testament oracles are now receiving a more detailed and literal fulfillment than either the Hebrew prophets or even their Greek interpreters could have envisaged.<sup>59</sup>

## V. A DAVIDIC COMPILATION



These messianic *testimonia* in Acts do not stand in isolation from one another. They bear witness to the exegetical activity which was vigorously pursued in the early church—more particularly, to the compilation of a body of texts linked in their original setting by a common reference to David and his line (whether expressly or by implication) and in their new setting by their appropriateness to the saving work accomplished by Jesus, the Son of David, both in his earthly experience and in its far-reaching sequel. This compilation of Davidic *testimonia* is attested in other New Testament documents,<sup>60</sup> but pre-eminently in Luke’s nativity narrative and in the speeches in Acts. So basic is it in the Lucan writings that references to David’s enemies in the Psalter can be applied, without any need for justifying argument, to the enemies of Jesus—whether to Judas Iscariot<sup>61</sup> or to “Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and the peoples of Israel.”<sup>62</sup>

If, as I have argued elsewhere,<sup>63</sup> the speeches in Acts are not Lucan compositions *in toto*, but are based on material substantially earlier than Luke’s own literary activity, then this Davidic strand of Christian interpretation is so much the more primitive: it represents one of several creative lines of Old Testament exegesis to which the Christ-event gave rise in the earliest days of the church’s existence<sup>64</sup>

## *NOTES*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Mark 10:47-48; Matt 15:22.

<sup>2</sup> Mark 12:35-37.

<sup>3</sup> Mark 2:25-26; cf. I Sam 21:1-6.

<sup>4</sup> Mark 14:61-62.

<sup>5</sup> Rom 1:3.

<sup>6</sup> Paul had access to a corpus of Davidic-Messiah *testimonia* but made little use of it. In Rom 15:12 he quotes Isa 11:10, a prophecy regarding the “root of Jesse,” with reference to the Gentile mission rather than to the identity of Jesus. In v 9 he has similarly quoted Ps 18:49 = 2 Sam 22:50 without the contextual mention of David. The phrase “descended from David” in 2 Tim 2:8 is repeated from Rom 1:3.

<sup>7</sup> *Pss Sol* 17:5-36.

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

<sup>9</sup> Luke 1:26-27.

<sup>10</sup> Matt 1:1-16, 20.

<sup>11</sup> Luke 1:5.

<sup>12</sup> Luke 1:32-33.

<sup>13</sup> Isa 9:6-7.

<sup>14</sup> Luke 1:67-79.

<sup>15</sup> Luke 2:10-11.

<sup>16</sup> Luke 2:1-5. In Matt 2:5-6 the birth in Bethlehem is viewed as fulfilling the oracle of Mic 5:2.

<sup>17</sup> Luke 3:23-38; contrast Matt 1:6ff. For Nathan (Luke 3:31) cf. 2 Sam 5:14; 1 Chr 3:5.

<sup>18</sup> Luke 3:27 (cf. Matt 1:12), where “rhesa” probably represents Aram. *reša* ‘prince,’ the title of Zerubbabel, not a separate name.

<sup>19</sup> Luke 18:38-39.

<sup>20</sup> Luke 19:38, as against Mark 11:9-10. But Luke replaces Mark’s “Blessed is he who comes...” with “Blessed is the King who comes...”

<sup>21</sup> Acts 2:16-28, especially vv 25-28. The superscription in MT and LXX alike designate Psalm 16 (LXX 15) as Davidic.

<sup>22</sup> 2 Sam 23:2.

<sup>23</sup> Acts 2:29.

<sup>24</sup> 1 Pet 1:11.

<sup>25</sup> Acts 2:31.

<sup>26</sup> Mark 12:35-37.

<sup>27</sup> Acts 2:33-36.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Heb 1:3, etc.; 1 Pet 3:22.

- 
- <sup>29</sup> Cf. J. A. T. Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" in *Twelve New Testament Studies* (London: SCM, 1962): 139ff.
- <sup>30</sup> Acts 13:16-41.
- <sup>31</sup> G. E. Wright, *God Who Acts* (London: SCM, 1952): 70-81.
- <sup>32</sup> Ps 78:70-71.
- <sup>33</sup> Ps 78:67-72.
- <sup>34</sup> Acts 13:23.
- <sup>35</sup> Cf. Acts 1:22; 10:37.
- <sup>36</sup> The first two verses of Psalm 2 are quoted and interpreted in Acts 4:25-28; cf p. 15 with n. 62 below.
- <sup>37</sup> Acts 13:33.
- <sup>38</sup> Acts 13:22.
- <sup>39</sup> Luke 3:22 (cf. RSV margin).
- <sup>40</sup> Acts 10:38.
- <sup>41</sup> Rom 1:4; cf Mark 9:1.
- <sup>42</sup> 2 Cor 13:4.
- <sup>43</sup> Acts 13:35.
- <sup>44</sup> Acts 13:34.
- <sup>45</sup> In fulfillment of Ps 110:1.
- <sup>46</sup> Acts 13:31.
- <sup>47</sup> 1 Cor 15:8.
- <sup>48</sup> For the reading of "the law and the prophets" see Acts 13:15.
- <sup>49</sup> Cf. *Pss Sol* 17:26, where Ps 2:9 is applied to the expected Davidic king.
- <sup>50</sup> There are messianic overtones, drawn from Psalm 110, in the proclamation of Simon as "leader and high priest forever" in 1 Macc 14:41ff.
- <sup>51</sup> Isa 55:4.
- <sup>52</sup> Ps 18:43-50.
- <sup>53</sup> Ps 47:3, 9.
- <sup>54</sup> Amos 9:11-12.
- <sup>55</sup> This is plain from the presence before *š'ērīt* ('remnant') of the accusative prefix 'et, to which LXX here offers no equivalent.
- <sup>56</sup> CD 7:14ff.
- <sup>57</sup> Acts 15:16-18.
- <sup>58</sup> These minor changes may be the result of conflation of *testimonia* in a collection; the wording at the beginning of the quotation resembles that of Jer 12:15, and the wording at the end resembles that of Isa 45:21.
- <sup>59</sup> C. C. Torrey argued that even the MT could have served James' purpose, "since it predicted that 'the tabernacle of David,' i.e., the church of the Messiah, would 'gain possession of all the nations which are called by the name [of the God of Israel]'" (*The Composition and Date of Acts* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, 1916]: 38-39).
- <sup>60</sup> Cf. Rev 5:5; 22:16; Heb 1:5,13; 5:5-6. The ascription to Jesus of the perpetual priesthood of Melchizedek's order announced in Ps 110:4 (an ascription not found in the New Testament outside Hebrews) is based on the recognition that the oracle in that verse must be addressed to the same person as the oracle in v 1 (i.e., the Davidic king).
- <sup>61</sup> Cf. the quotation in Acts 1:20 of Ps 69:25 and Ps 109:8 (both traditionally Davidic psalms). For other *testimonia* drawn from Psalm 69, see John 2:17; Rom 15:3.
- <sup>62</sup> Acts 4:27, interpreting Ps 2:1-2.
- <sup>63</sup> F. F. Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles* (London: Tyndale, 1951): 18ff.
- <sup>64</sup> Cf. C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1944): 17ff.; *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbet, 1952): 28ff., 104-06, *et passim*.