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The speech in Acts 3 bristles with exegetical difficulties. Elements in it seem to contradict dominant motifs of Luke's christology, so that some have seen in Acts 3,19-21 evidence for an unassimilated "earliest christology." The debates regarding Acts 3,19-26 concern both Luke's literary methods and his theological emphases. By focussing on this passage, we wish to contribute to both levels of Luke-Acts discussion. First we shall argue that a Lukan time-scheme which implies an inaugurated eschatology clarifies the christology of Luke-Acts, as well as the obscurities of this passage. Then we shall consider Luke's use of sources and the "earliest christology" question in Acts 3,19-21, and try to show that Luke thoroughly assimilated whatever sources or traditions he had to his own theological framework.

The Timetable Behind Acts 3,19-26

Our first task is to reconstruct the time-scheme implied by Acts 3,19-26. Acts 3,19 is a call to repentance in the present, for a future purpose that the χρόνος θεουργίας may come from the Lord and he send the foreordained Christ (3,20). This Christ must (συνειδήσει) in the present be received in heaven, the place from which he will be sent. He will remain in heaven, ἐν οὐρανῷ διότι ἐκστασάμενος, ζήσει καὶ θανατώσεις, as God predicted through his prophets from of old (3,21). What is the relationship between these χρόνοι (3,20), the sending of the Christ (3,20), and the χρόνοι in 3,21?

Some commentators equate the time-intervals behind χρόνοι and χρόνοι and relate them to each other as subjective and objective aspects of the same events. Others distinguish between the χρόνος and χρόνοι, saying that χρόνος began with the sending of the Spirit whereas the χρόνοι refer to the ultimate end when the Christ will be sent.

One approach to resolving this question is to look at the significance of the singular and plural forms in Luke's predictive and eschatological uses of the words for time χρόνος, χρόνοι and άποκαταστάσεις. For example, is there a significant difference between the singular χρόνος in Acts 1,6 and the plural χρόνοι here in 3,21 and in Acts 1,7 (with χρόνος)? The general usages of the singular and plural of Greek words for time and their relationship to their semitic OT counterparts suggest the hypothesis that the plural refers to an extended period of time and/or a succession of events, whereas the singular refers to each actual saving event and/or its moment of occurrence, whether it be an event along the history of salvation (cf. those of the Moses deliverance in the Acts 7 speech and Jesus' earthly visitation in Lk 19,44), or the final event, the Day of the Lord (OT and Joel cited in Acts 2,20) and the sending of the Christ (Acts 3,20).

This hypothesis is borne out in Luke's usage of these three words. Especially characteristic are his juxtapositions...
of the plural for the times and events leading up to the end and the singular for this end. Thus in the programmatic Joel quotation with its Lukan modifications, both the OT source (Ac 2,18) and the Lukan additions (in Ac 2,17) distinguish the plural for the series of events and prolonged time-span leading up to the end (the outpouring of the Spirit, prophesying, wonders and signs and cosmic occurrences, Ac 2,17-20a) from the singular for the ultimate Day of the Lord (Ac 2,20b) which will occur in a definitive way at their end. The same juxtaposition between plural and singular is repeated often enough in the Lk 17 eschatological address to be judged a deliberate Lukan pattern.

This Lukan differentiation between singular and plural in time expressions throws light on his meaning in Ac 3,20-21. If as in Lk 21,24, Ac 14,17 and 17,26 the plural οὐρανοῦ implies a time span rather than an instantaneous moment, the implication in Ac 3,20 seems to be that the sending of the Christ, a singular occurrence (cf. the aorist subjunctive instead of the present), takes place at a moment within the time span of οὐρανοῦ. Which is more probable, the beginning, middle or end of the οὐρανοῦ? First verse 21 implies that the sending coincides with the ultimate end, as distinguished from the present when the challenge to repent is being given and when the Christ is in heaven. Yet the οὐρανοῦ as well as the sending of the Christ follow upon conversion. It is therefore possible (though not necessary) to see these times as beginning with conversion and leading up to the final sending at their end point.

My contention is that Ac 3,22-26 is meant to indicate that this sending does not take place at the beginning of these times of predicted fulfillment/restoration, since at least one of these predictions, that of Moses for a prophet to be raised up, has already been fulfilled in Jesus. The emphasis in the phrase "until the times of fulfillment/restoration of all" (that was predicted) must therefore fall on the all.

Some predictions have come true: Jesus was raised, fulfilling the prediction cited in Ac 3,22. The warning to heed this prophet in Ac 3,23 applies (though not exclusively) to the present occasion of the speech. The other prophets from Samuel on referred to "these days" (3,24), which have obviously begun (so the force of ἄρα in 3,26) and to which no definite end is mentioned. Other predictions have not yet been fulfilled by the time of the speech, such as the response of the hearers and the blessing of others after the listeners (3,26 "first"). Jesus will be in heaven until all that was predicted is fulfilled. The context of 3,22-26 implies that the sending will occur at the end of these times of fulfillment/restoration, as their definitive climax.

If these χρόνοι in 3,21 have already begun, it seems most reasonable to interpret 3,20 to mean that the times of refreshment also have begun for those who have converted (at least all those in Acts 2), and that they are another aspect of these same χρόνοι. Both the οὐρανοῦ of 3,20 and the χρόνοι of 3,21 will only reach their definitive completion with the sending of the Christ from heaven, but they have begun with the conversions and healing and outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2
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and 3. This is an "inaugurated eschatology," as distinguished from either a completely futuristic or a completely realized eschatology.

This conclusion is given further support by a study of Luke's use of εἰς χρόνον. Corresponding to Luke's distinction between singular and plural in his words for time is a similar pattern in his use of εἰς χρόνον with the singular or plural genitive. Here in Ac 3,21 εἰς χρόνον is followed by the plural genitive. His only other use of εἰς χρόνον with the plural genitive is in Ac 20,6, where εἰς χρόνον ἑκάστου ἡμέρας expresses the extent of time it took to sail from Philippi to Troas, and refers to the travelers' arrival, which obviously happened at the end of the five days.12

The Lukan uses of εἰς χρόνον (and it occurs more often in Acts than in any other book of the NT) corroborate the analysis of Luke's distinction in meaning between singular and plural expressions for time and my contention that Ac 3,21 refers to the completion rather than the beginning of the times of apokatastasis.13

Applying the "inaugurated eschatology" explanation to Ac 3,19-26 gives the following interpretation to the passage. God's raising of the prophet in Ac 3,22 is the beginning of the times of fulfillment/restoration. All who do not listen to this prophet will be cut off from the people (3,23). All the prophecies from Samuel on predicted these days (3,24). The present is the object of their predictions, and the listeners ("you") are the recipients of their promises and blessings from the covenant with Abraham (3,25). These blessings will take place through Abraham's seed (singular for Jesus rather than collective for Israel) and will benefit all the tribes of the earth (3,25). The listening Jews are the first recipients of these blessings which are mediated by God's raising up his servant and sending him to bless "you" on the condition and occasion of each listener's conversion (3,26).

In other words, the now of the speech, the contemporaneous time span indicated by the plural "these days" of 3,24, is the critical occasion of decision for either the Abrahamic blessings or excommunication from this people.

The raising of the prophet (3,22) and God's servant (3,26) are the same event, as almost all the commentators agree. But from this it does not necessarily follow, as most of them suggest, that the raising must refer to the earthly ministry of Jesus rather than his resurrection. For in Luke-Acts, rejection of Jesus in his ministry does not in itself cut off those who reject him from the people of the promises. If that were true, according to Luke's account of the rejection and passion of Jesus, the Jews of Jerusalem would have already been cut off from the people of the promises, and there would be no point to this speech. This speech is precisely offering the Jews of Jerusalem another chance to reverse their previous rejection of Jesus.

The condition sine qua non for this offer of a second chance is the resurrection of Jesus. This resurrection is the past event (and therefore the participle ἁρπαξας is aorist) which was the prerequisite for God to send (also in the past)
Jesus. The only irreversible rejection of Jesus, the only rejection that cuts a person off from the people of the promise, is the rejection of the risen Jesus, just as the Abrahamic blessings which include the whole earth are only able to be fulfilled first in the Jews because of Jesus as raised and vindicated. The verb ἀναστήσας as it is used in Ac 3,22 and 3,26 must therefore include in its meaning the literal resurrection of Jesus.

Then how can the sending of Jesus in the past tense in 3,26 be reconciled with the sending of Jesus still to come in 3,20? There is fairly general consensus that the sending in 3,20 refers to the final coming of Jesus after the present period. It is also generally agreed that 3,20 has at least the appearance of a Jewish expectation of a definitive coming of the Christ, whether this is an archaic tradition or an instance of Lukan archaising. In either case, the past tense in 3,26 indicates a partial re-interpretation of this expectation, by showing that the Moses prediction has already been fulfilled in Jesus' resurrection, and in some sense (though not yet the definitive sense) Jesus has already been sent.

Ac 3,13-16 indicates how the risen Jesus can be said to have been sent and to be blessing those who convert, and nonetheless still be awaited from heaven (3,20). Both Ac 3,13-16 and 3,26 portray God vis-à-vis the people of the Abrahamic promises. Both refer to Jesus as σάρκας (3,13 and 26). Ac 3,12-16 make clear that the healing that occasions the speech is not due to the apostles, not even to their interceding with an absent God (cf. ἐπιτρέπεισαι and rabbinic theories of intercession). But in this healing which has taken place here and now God was glorifying his servant Jesus whom he had already "raised from the dead" (3,15).

The same pattern of God glorifying/sending his servant Jesus after he raised him occurs in 3,13 and 15, and 3,26. The content of sending in 3,26 can be inferred from 3,16 -- Jesus was present to this lame man in his name, even though in another sense he is absent in heaven (3,21) for this period. In other words, 3,13-16 show that the risen Jesus is sent to the listeners in the apostles, their invoking his name and their witness to him and preaching of his word.

This interpretation of ἀναστήσας in Ac 3,26 accords perfectly with its context. It takes place after Jesus' resurrection; it is contemporaneous with "blessing" as typified by the healing of the lame man (the force of the present participle blessing is time-contemporaneous with the main verb sent); and it brings with it an offer of blessing which is contingent upon the listeners' repentance, the main object of the speech.

To this extent, Haenchen's difficulty with ἀναστήσας is solved through re-interpretation, which exemplifies at least Lane's basic insight about reinterpretation of eschatological expectations through periodization. The futuristic eschatology of 3,20 is modified to a more inaugurated eschatology by 3,22-26, which does not eliminate the futuristic element of the final coming of Jesus, but calls attention to the beginning of the fulfillment in the period of the last days (plural, Ac 2,17) which has already occurred and which will
culminate in the ultimate (and singular) day of the Lord (Ac 2,20). Moses prophesied the beginning of the times of fulfillment/restoration in the resurrection of Jesus which has occurred (3,22). The following prophets identified these times of fulfillment/restoration with "these days" (3,24), which will culminate in the final sending of Jesus when all has been fulfilled and restored (3,21).

UNASSIMILATED SOURCES AND LUKAN REDACTION

The question whether the material in Ac 3,19-21 is evidence for pre-Pauline christologies or Lukan archaising is important because this passage is the main basis for the widespread assumption that "Messiah" was first used for Jesus within a futuristic eschatology.16 If the pericope proves not to sustain this assumption, that explanation for the origin of the title Christ for Jesus loses its most important corroborating evidence.

G. Lohfink has succinctly surveyed the history and state of this question.19 O. Bauernfeind was the catalyst for most of the subsequent discussion. His thesis about an Elijah-expectation transposed to a Christian note was taken up by U. Wilckens, E. Schweizer and Helmut Flender. J. A. T. Robinson's "Most Primitive Christology" revived an old thesis of A. Harnack's that Ac 3,20 portrays Jesus as only Messias designated until the parousia.40 Ferdinand Hahn took up Robinson's thesis in Christologische Hoheitstitel (pp. 184-186). Dieter Georgi argued from this passage and Mk 2,20 and Phil 2,9 that the earliest christology was Jesus' withdrawal to heaven, and resurrection was a later conclusion.41 But E. Haenchen and H. Conzelmann in their commentaries reacted against the Bauernfeind and Robinson theses, arguing for Lukan composition. G. Voss argued against Hahn that Ac 3,20 portrays a Messias Constitutus. Lohfink himself follows in the line of Haenchen, Voss and Conzelmann but with attention to the history of traditions behind this text.22

My procedure will be first to examine Bauernfeind's hypothesis, then the source of his insight, Sirach 48, and propose a different relationship between this Elijah tradition and Luke-Acts. As corroborating evidence for my alternate hypothesis I will allude briefly to Luke's similar uses of the Solomon (son of David) typology of Wisdom 7 in the infancy narratives and the Moses parallels that are commonly acknowledged in Acts 7.

O. Bauernfeind was led to his theory of an Elijah-source by the similarities in wording between the Acts 3 speech and the ending of the Book of the Twelve Prophets, Mal 3,23f (LXX Mal 4,5-6). There God promises to send (Ἀγγέλος Ἐληλ) Elijah, who will prepare for the final day of the Lord by restoring (ἀνακαινίζω) the heart of the father to his son and a man (his neighbor), lest God punish the land. Bauernfeind argued that in place of the current "foreordained Christ" stood "Elijah" in an earlier stage of the text. The notion of heaven taking someone away fits the Elijah-model in Sir 48, 10.3

The link between Moses and Elijah in the transfiguration and the reference to Moses in the following verse, Ac 3,22, is
another possible indication of an original piece of Elijah-tradition in Ac 3,20-21. Bauernfeind is not sure whether it was Luke or his source who christianized the Elijah-motif of Ac 3,19-25, e.g., by changing an original 'Hλαυ (έστω μν) to the present προκάτεχενένων ὑπίπ τις τών 'Ἰσραήλ. Indications that such Elijah expectations existed and were applied to Jesus are the popular identifications of Jesus with Elijah mentioned in Mk 8,28 par Lk 9,19 and Mk 5,15 par Lk 9,8,24 The identification of John the Baptist with Elijah after the transfiguration (Mk 9,12 par Mt 17,11) is omitted by Luke. Bauernfeind argues that in fact the images of Elijah and of the Messiah coalesced under the aspect of "restoration," which is the kernel of all eschatology.26

When I followed Bauernfeind's hint and looked at the Elijah-Elisha sequence in Sir 48,1-18, it immediately became evident that not only the verses on which Bauernfeind focussed (vv. 9-10) but this whole section has many impressive resonances with themes pervading Luke-Acts and with some of what hitherto seemed Luke's stranger peculiarities.

Let us indicate some of these Elijah coincidences, following the order of Sir 48,1-18, and then highlight what seems to be some of its more important contributions to the programmatic of Luke-Acts. Most of these Lukan allusions are to Elijah-Elisha material in Kings and Malachi as well as in Sirach, but a few point specifically to Sirach. Sir 48,1 begins, ἔν τις ἄγνωστος ἢ Μαλακίοις, καὶ οὐκ ἔθεσαν ἑαυτοὺς υπὸ τοὺς σαβαὼν; cf. the people's reaction to the Naim raising in Lk 7,16. Sir 48,3b mentions Elijah's calling down fire; cf. Lk 9,54 in reaction to the rejection by the Samaritans. Sir 48,4 "Ὡς ἔστω μν, Ελλην, in your ἱερομόρφον" has echoes in Ac 3,13. The raising of the dead man in Sir 48,5, along with the Kings accounts, provide typology for the Naim raising in Lk 7,11-16. Elijah's humiliation of the kings and mighty in Sir 48,6 has resonances in the Magnificat (Lk 1,45f). Elijah's hearing judgment on Sinai/Horeb (Sir 48,7) corresponds both to Moses and the transfiguration. In most of these cases, the Nestle margins rightly show that Luke is not just using Sirach but is more obviously citing other passages and common OT patterns.

Elijah's anointing of kings and of prophets as successors after him (Sir 48,8) has echoes in the Pentecost anointing of the apostles as successors after Jesus. As Elijah was assumed into heaven (σαλαχασθείς) in a fiery whirlwind (Sir 48,9) so Jesus was taken up in a cloud in Ac 1,9. What is striking about Sir 48,10 is that it is as taken up into heaven that Elijah is said to be prepared for judicial convictions (κατάκαπην), as Jesus in heaven is to remain there until the completion of the times in Ac 3,20-21, and it is in or from heaven that Elijah will turn the heart of the father toward the son (cf. Lk 1,17 for John) and restore the tribes of Jacob (cf. Ac 3,21 and 25). In Acts it is likewise as taken into heaven that Jesus is ready for the final judgment in its time and is bringing Jews and gentiles to conversions (through his apostles, thus restoring the Jewish people (cf. Jervell).

The emphasis in Ac 1,9-11 on the disciples watching Jesus be taken up in the cloud corresponds to the condition Elijah gave Elisha for receiving double his spirit: this would occur only if Elisha saw Elijah being taken up (2 Kgs 2,9-10).
More important for Luke-Acts, after Elijah's departure Elisha was filled with his Spirit (Sir 48,12 Rahlfs), to which corresponds the ascension-pentecost sequence and especially the reception of the Spirit by the Christian missionaries, the apostles, Stephen and Paul. For the rest of this Sirach's verse, "and in his days he did not tremble before a ruler and no one overpowered him," is fulfilled in the repeated confrontations with authorities by Christian preachers, capped by the last words of Acts about Paul preaching μετὰ τῆς ἱεραρχίας ἀκμάζως (Ac 28,31). That nothing was too hard for Elisha (Sir 48,13) is echoed especially in the apostles' beatings and imprisonments and Paul's sufferings (especially from Acts 21 on) and shipwreck and snakebite (Ac 27-28). Elisha's τέσσαρα in his lifetime have many correspondences in Acts, but not the marvels of his death, unless one considers Paul's failure to fall over dead from the snake as the onlookers expected in Ac 28,6.

Perhaps no one of these prefigurations taken singly is conclusive, though accumulated they do indicate that Luke consciously gave an Elijah-Elisha tone to his presentation. And in the light of all these indications of Elijah-Elisha typology, the correspondence between the conclusion of Sirach's Elijah-Elisha section and the theme of Luke-Acts is too striking to be purely coincidental. For this section in Sirach is climaxed by the conclusion about the reaction of the laos to Elijah and Elisha, which corresponds to the people's reaction to Jesus and the Christian missionaries in Luke-Acts, even to details that are perplexing in the Lukan narrative.

"For all this, οὐκ ἤπειρον ὀ ν Λαός and they did not forsake their sins" (Sir 48,15): as in the Acts 7 speech the people's second rejection of Moses, despite his confirmation by God after their first rejection, parallels in Acts the second rejection of Jesus confirmed by the resurrection and addressing them in his missionaries, so here there is a double rejection of Elijah and Elisha, to which corresponds the rejection of Jesus and his missionaries.

Corresponding to the punishment for this double rejection of Elijah and Elisha by being carried away captive from their land and scattered all over the earth (Sir 48,15) is the destruction of Jerusalem in Luke, especially Lk 21,24 "they will be taken away captive to all the nations" (where the wording differs but the idea corresponds). Luke portrays in Jesus' prophecy the destruction of Jerusalem as punishment for the rejection of Jesus (Lk 19,44; cf. Lk 13,34f and 21,22), which in Acts is shown to be a double rejection both of Jesus and of his successors.

Even the notion of a remnant of the laos in Sir 48,16 is frequent in Luke-Acts, from the people John prepared to the missionary call in Acts to be saved from this evil generation (Ac 2,40-41), though Jervell would not agree this is a small number, as described in Sir 48,15. But the ending of this verse, which states that some did what was pleasing, others multiplied sins, throws light on the confusing and artificial progression in Ac 28,24-27, where the mixed reaction of some believing and some disbelieving Paul is followed by Paul's seemingly exaggerated response of the complete rejection of Is 6,9-10. Here in the portrayal of the people's response to
Elijah and Elisha in Sir 48,15-16 is a literary model for the same theme which is characteristic of Luke-Acts.

What all this indicates is that Luke used the Elijah-Elisha story as told in Kings and elaborated in Malachi and Sir 48 and the like as one of his typological models for Luke-Acts. So Wilson remarks that "For Luke, Elijah was a model of the godly man, and he wants to use him typologically of both John and Jesus, more especially of Jesus. For this reason Luke avoids directly identifying Elijah with either John or Jesus." But this remark should be extended to include Elisha and the missionaries in Acts.

Nor is this typology to be overstressed. It is just one among several Luke uses. The Moses and Joseph typologies in the Acts 7 speech are common knowledge, and Bihler elaborates on the relationships between the speeches in Acts 7 and Acts 3,30

Most scholars agree that archaic elements are present in Ac 3,19-21, and our argument in no way denies this. The main issue is how Luke used his sources. Though few would boldly argue that Luke took a scissors-and-paste approach to his sources, some of the scholarly attempts to find sources in Acts or argue to earliest christologies would logically seem to imply such a procedure on Luke's part. Our argument is meant to call attention to this problem lurking behind some of those arguments for sources. It confirms much of the recent discussion in the literature and in the SBL Luke-Acts Group on this issue. In this passage, so often considered a prime example of unassimilated source material, it is clear that Luke has thoroughly assimilated any traditions or sources he had to his own inaugurated eschatology, which is his consistent framework for the material in Acts.

For the questions raised by this paper, the most important material which Luke thus structures by his inaugurated eschatology is his christology. There are at least two phases to Lukian christology, which correspond to the saving plan of God that Jesus is fulfilling. To these two phases, the infancy narratives can be considered an introduction, predicting in Jesus a fulfillment of the OT longings for a savior, Christ, Lord, son of God from the House of David. The rest of Luke-Acts fills in the content of these (and other) christological expressions.

The first phase of Luke's christology is inaugurated by Jesus' anointing as Christ, Lord and son of God at the Jordan, and carried through in his prophetic mission of preaching, healing and exorcising, and in his death in which he was rejected as were all the other prophets (Lk 3,21-22; 4,17-21; Ac 10,36; 4,25-28).

The second phase begins with Jesus' resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand, which the Acts speeches interpret as Jesus' enthronement as Christ and Lord (Ac 2,36) and son of God (Ac 13,33). This follows the pattern of David himself, who was anointed king some time before he was enthroned as king. From God's right hand, Jesus pours out the Spirit (Ac 2,33) which signals the inauguration of the eschatological period ("last days," Ac 2,17) when the Spirit is poured out
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Most scholars agree that archaic elements are present in Ac 3,19-21, and our argument in no way denies this. The main issue is how Luke used his sources. Though few would baldly argue that Luke took a scissors-and-paste approach to his sources, some of the scholarly attempts to find sources in Acts or argue to earliest christologies would logically seem to imply such a procedure on Luke's part. Our argument is meant to call attention to this problem lurking behind some of these arguments for sources. It confirms much of the recent discussion in the literature and in the Bultmann-Lukan Group on this issue. In this passage, so often considered a prime example of unassimilated source material, it is clear that Luke has thoroughly assimilated any traditions or sources he had to his own inaugurated eschatology, which is his consistent framework for the material in Acts.

For the questions raised by this paper, the most important material which Luke thus structures by his inaugurated eschatology is his christology. There are at least two phases to Lukan christology, which correspond to the saving plan of God that Jesus is fulfilling. To these two phases, the infancy narratives can be considered an introduction, predicting in Jesus a fulfillment of the OT longings for a savior, Christ, Lord, son of God from the House of David. The rest of Luke-Acts fills in the content of these (and other) christological expressions.

The first phase of Luke's christology is inaugurated by Jesus' anointing as Christ, Lord and son of God at the Jordan, and carried through in his prophetic mission of preaching, healing, expelling evil spirits, and in his death in which he was rejected as were all the other prophets (Lk 3,21-22; 4,17-21; Ac 10,38; 4,25-28).

The second phase begins with Jesus' resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand, which the Acts speeches interpret as Jesus' enthronement as Christ and lord (Ac 2,36) and son of God (Ac 13,33). This follows the pattern of David himself, who was anointed king some time before he was enthroned as king. From God's right hand, Jesus pours out the Spirit (Ac 2,33) which signals the inauguration of the late eschatological period ("last days," Ac 2,17) when the Spirit is poured out on all flesh. This extended period (Ac 2,17-20, cf. Ac 1,6-8) will be ended by the great and final day of the Lord (Jesus -- Ac 2,20-21). This extended eschatological period, the final parousia corresponds exactly to our interpretation of the "times of restoration" when Jesus is in heaven (Ac 3,21) before his return (Ac 3,20).

It is also possible to show, but not here for lack of space, that a major function of the title "the Christ" in Luke-Acts is to situate Jesus within God's OT plan for saving his people Israel. The "times and seasons" of God's plan account for Jesus' inaugurations eschatologically and the phases in his christology (Ac 1,7; 17,26,30-31; cf. 13,29-33,41).

Both uses of "the Christ" in the Acts 3 speech do situate Jesus in the context of God's saving plan. Ac 3,16 explicitly relates the Christ to God as "his Christ": "What God foretold through all his prophets, that his Christ would suffer, he has fulfilled in this way." The death of Jesus fulfills the OT plan of God for his Christ.

Ac 3,20 likewise links the Christ to the Jewish people according to God's plan. Jesus is called "the Christ chosen for you." Though it is abstractly possible to interpret this as a "Christ-elect" by analogy to a "president-elect," Luke's context has subsumed this phrase into his own framework. The only other uses of the word in the NT are applied by Luke to Paul as "chosen" for witness (Ac 22,14; 26,16), an immediate, not future, mission. In Ac 3,20, the phrase "the Christ chosen for you" is primarily meant to underline that the God who saved his people from Egypt is also saving his people in Israel and elsewhere. A similar pattern with another synonymous root appears in the peculiarly Lukan use of "this is my son, the chosen one" in Lk 9,35 and the taunt of the Jewish leaders of the crucified Jesus, "if this is the Christ of God, the chosen one" (Lk 23,35). The phrase in Ac 3,20 clearly corresponds to Luke's own theological emphasis on God as primary agent of all that happened to and through Jesus.

One conclusion is clear, and important for attempts to reconstruct the history of early Christian christology. Because it is so difficult to determine whether the archaic elements in this passage belong to an internally consistent primitive christology or were assembled from various traditions by Luke, Ac 3,20-21 cannot bear the weight put on it for the reconstruction of the earliest christology. Those who argue for the removal of the Christ in a futuristic eschatology as an old christology that those based on faith in resurrection or resurrection can claim in this passage only very ambiguous evidence.

Because of Lukans working and the evidence of his own themes here, Ac 3,19-21 cannot invalidate the more traditional opinions that eschatological hopes for Jesus' return as Christ are consequently, not a cause, of the early Christian experience of the Spirit, apostolic witness to the resurrection, and
the physical absence of Jesus. The liturgical Maranatha, for example, only makes sense as addressed to someone experienced as alive (after his death) and in communication (through his Spirit) but physically absent -- no one prays to a corpse or to someone who cannot hear the prayer; and if he were already fully present there would be no need to ask him to come. The early passion traditions are built on the understanding of the resurrection as God's vindication of Jesus. The experience of the Spirit and witness to the resurrection seen as God's vindication of the Jesus who died as "king of the Jews" seems a much more likely source of the community's awareness of Jesus as the Christ than Jewish eschatological traditions.

CONCLUSION

We have argued that a Lukan timetable which implies an inaugurated eschatology makes sense of the exegetical obscurities in Ac 3,19-26, as well as of the christology in these verses. The fact that the eschatological and christological patterns of 3,19-26 correspond so perfectly to those in the rest of Acts demonstrates that whatever early traditions or sources Luke had he quite thoroughly assimilated to his own theological framework. This passage does not contain pieces of traditional material that do not fit into Luke's plan. Rather, Luke used typologies and patterns from the (Gk) OT to structure his own material. Just as the OT historians tried to show how all that happened in the history of the Israelite people was according to the plan of God and corresponded to how the people obeyed God, so Luke extended this same goal and pattern to his account of what happened among Christians (Lk 1,1-4; Ac 1,1-8).

As a result of his concern to relate all that happened to the saving plan of God, Luke clearly shows that Jesus was the Christ sent by God and fulfilling God's will according to his timetable. In his earthly mission he was anointed Christ and Lord and son of God, but it was not till his resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand that he was enthroned as such in glory. Before that could happen, the Christ had to suffer and rise. As risen, he inaugurates the eschatological age leading to the end by pouring out the Spirit on all flesh. He will remain in heaven till the times of the restoration and fulfillment of all that God had foretold through the prophets (Ac 3,21). Then God will send him again in the parousia on the final day (Ac 3,20). Clearly, Ac 3,19-26 confirms that Luke's christology is heavily influenced by his eschatology.

FOOTNOTES


3William L. Lane's parallelism between repentance and
receiving the Spirit (Ac 2,38) and repentance and coming of
times of refreshment (Ac 3,19-20), in his Times of Refreshment.
A Study of Eschatological Periodization in Judaism and Chris-
tianity (Dissertation, Harvard Divinity School, 1962), pp. 171-
172, 179-180, 205.

F. Overbeck reverses this—the καιρός refer to the
parousia and the χρόνον to "these days" of Ac 3,24, W. M. L.
denWette, Kurze Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte, 4th ed. by
F. Overbeck. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zum NT, Band
1, Teil 4 (Leipzig, 1870), pp. 54-55.

Vol. 2 (Boston, 1878); "for either way, the χρόνον ἀκομα. will
imply the time or period of the ἀποκατ., not the moment only,
when it begins or is completed, as καιρός (not καιρος) ἀποκατ.
might."

Cf. "Time" in McKenzie's Dictionary of the Bible, pp. 891-
892, and in IDB, Vol. 4, pp. 643-646 (author E. Jenni).

For the purposes of our question, the distinction between
singular and plural is more relevant than the various differ-
entiating nuances among the three words.

Thus in Lk 17,22 the plural refers to an extended period
— "the days will come when you long to see one of the days of
the son of man," and is juxtaposed to the singular for the
actual coming in Lk 17,24: "so will be the son of man in his
day." This pattern with plural and singular is repeated twice
more in rapid succession. In Lk 17,26 the (plural) days of
the son of man will be like the (plural) days of Noah, which
men fill with earthly pursuits heedless of the impending doom,
"until the (singular) day Noah entered the ark" (Lk 17,27) and
the cataclysm destroyed all. Lk 17,28-29 repeats the pattern
for the days of Lot and 17,30-31 draws the moral for the (sin-
gular) day when the Son of man will be revealed. The escha-
tological discourse in Lk 21 also distinguishes the plural
for preliminary events from the singular for the ultimate end.
So the plural is used in Lk 21,6 and 22 for the events of the
destruction of Jerusalem and in 21,24 for the times of the
gentiles, whereas the singular refers to the ultimate end in
Lk 21,8 (in false predictions) and 21,34, where "that day"
will fall upon them suddenly "like a snare." This differen-
tiated application of singular and plural is frequent through-
cut Luke-Acts. One of the closest parallels to the plural of
Ac 3,19-26 is Ac 13,41.

The same relationship may plausibly be inferred between
the sending of the Christ and the χρόνον ἀποκαταστάσεως θάνατος
by God foretold through the prophets in Ac 3,21. If χρόνον
here implies a span of time, as distinguished from the defini-
tive now in time implied by the singular in Ac 1,6 (the restor-
aton of the kingdom to Israel seen as a single definitive
 event), the same question presents itself, whether the sending
takes place at the beginning or end of these χρόνον. For
another interpretation see M. Dennis Hamm, S.J. This Sign of
Healing, Acts 3:1-10: A Study in Lukan Theology (Dissertation,
St. Louis University, 1975), pp. 161-162.

For this particular question it does not matter whether
"raise up" refers to Jesus' resurrection or earthly appearance.

11Cf., e.g., A. Harnack, The Date of the Acts and of the Synoptic Gospels, tr. by J. R. Wilkinson, Crown Theological Library, 33 (New York, 1911), p. 67 n. 2, who relates "times of restoration" to repentance of the Jews à la Ro,11. (Cf. also Jervel.) P. Overbeck's interpretation of the relationship between 3,21 and 3,22-26 is similar to ours, but he reserves the ναιπο λεγεταις (3,20) for the parousia last it be tautologous with 3,21. "These days" of 3,24 refer the times of apokatastasis in 3,21 to the time of the speaker, and the content of these times is given by the citations in 3,22-24. The people of God will be restored through a separation of those who heed the Messiah preached by the apostles from those who reject this preaching and are thus cut off from the salvation in the kingdom of God. Thus the "times of apokatastasis" are the same as the "last days" of Ac 2,17 -- the time between the first and second coming to which the Joel prediction is applied (deWette's Kurze Erklärung d. Apg., p. 55).

13Bengel’s Gnomon I, p. 768 and F. Overbeck (de Wette’s Kurze Erklärung d. Apg., p. 55) agree with this interpretation of διά. Bengel and Overbeck cite Ac 20,6 "in five days" as a parallel, and Bengel adds Ac 13,11 "for a season." Cf. also the note in Frisk: "as an adverb, preposition or conjunction, διά has the meaning "bis zum Ende, völlig; bis (zu) so lange als," from the time of the Iliad (p. 203 ad voc.). He also refers to the possible later blurring of its meaning through contamination with οφθαλμός. (H. Frisk, Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Vol. I, p. 203, ad voc.) This contradicts Bauer: ""Διά kann natürlich nur heissen: bis zum Beginn, nicht: bis zur Vollendung" (App., p. 69).
paper content
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26 Ibid., p. 69.


There are also suggestive typological analogies between Wisdom 7's picture of Solomon (son of David) and that of Jesus in Luke, which lend further plausibility to our interpretation of Luke's typological use of Sirach 48 and the Elijah-Elisha motifs. Note especially Wis 7,4 and Lk 2,7; Wis 7,5-6 and Ac 13,24, Lk 2,7 and 9,30; Wis 7,7 and Lk 3,21-22; Wis 7,8 and Lk 4,5-8. The Wisdom 7 picture of Solomon's birth, reception of the Spirit of wisdom, and preference for this Spirit of wisdom over power and wealth is paralleled in order by Luke's account of Jesus' birth, baptism and temptation.


33 And see G. Voss, Christologie, pp. 151-152.


35 Cf. W. Grundmann, "xon" in TdNT 9, p. 539 and n. 309 in refutation of Hahn's assigning parousia and exaltation to different communities.
