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ABSTRACT
THE SEPTUAGINTAL ISAIAH USE OF ΝΟΜΟΣ
IN THE LUKAN PRESENTATION NARRATIVE

Mark Walter Koehne, B.A., M.A.
Marquette University, 2010

Scholars have examined several motifs in Luke 2:22-35, the “Presentation” of the Gospel of Luke. However, scholarship scarcely has treated the theme of νόμος, the Septuagintal word Luke uses as a translation of the Hebrew word תורה. Νόμος is mentioned four times in the Presentation narrative; it also is a word in Septuagintal Isaiah to which the metaphor of light in Luke 2:32 alludes. In 2:22-32—a pivotal piece within Luke-Acts—νόμος relates to several themes, including ones David Pao discusses in his study on Isaiah’s portrayal of Israel’s restoration, appropriated by Luke. My dissertation investigates, for the first time, the Septuagintal Isaian use of νόμος in this pericope.

My thesis is that Luke’s use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope highlights Jesus’ identity as the Messiah who will restore and fulfill Israel. Methodologically, I use intertextual narrative interpretation. In Chapter One, I examine Luke’s transitional, dual use of νόμος in the pericope. This includes Luke’s use of νόμος on the surface of the text, and his allusive appropriation, in Luke 2:32, of νόμος in the LXX-Isaiah. In Chapter Two I discuss in greater depth an overriding theme of Luke-Acts—the new exodus—and the Isaian motif of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel which establishes and informs this theme. I outline the process of Israel’s restoration, including the role of Septuagintal Isaian νόμος within it. In my discussion, I critique David Pao’s six themes of the restoration of Israel. I argue that Luke 2:32 alludes to νόμος, situated within a Davidic context and integral to Isaiah’s motif of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel. I show that, consequently, this Lukan allusion discloses Jesus as the Servant Messiah who restores Israel and offers salvation to the Gentiles.

Chapter Three addresses the influence of δικαιοσύνη of the LXX-Isaiah on Luke’s appropriation of νόμος. In conclusion, I present the results of this study. Additionally, I address methodological implications of intertextual analysis, and of interpretation of the Book of Isaiah at the turn of the era.
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Introduction

1. History of research on the problem


¹ Appendix 1 displays the English translation and New Testament Greek of Luke 2:22-35. The source of all English biblical quotations, unless otherwise noted, is the NAB. Also, in this dissertation, “Presentation” is capitalized because of its importance as the title of the main pericope under study, Luke 2:22-35.

Generally, the theme of Jerusalem and the temple is significant in Luke because it dominates the second half of the Gospel in a few ways. These include the following: Jesus’ passion and death, which take place in Jerusalem; the sacrifice in the temple and the rending of the veil upon Jesus’ death; and the appearances of the the risen Jesus in Jerusalem, in which he begins his mission from there “to the ends of the earth.” Bart Ehrman provides an additional insight to Luke’s emphasis on the importance of the temple by comparing its emphasis to the ways in which the other Gospels address the temple theme. Ehrman notes the following. First, unlike Matthew and Mark, Luke

---


stresses Jesus’ infancy and childhood associations with the Jerusalem temple. Second, in the pericope of the three temptations of Jesus found in both Matthew and Luke (Matt 4:1-11; Luke 4:1-13), the order of the second and third temptations are reversed between the two. Whereas in Matthew Jesus is tempted the third time to worship Satan, in Luke the third and final temptation consists of Jesus throwing himself off the top of the temple of Jerusalem. For Luke, it seems, the temple is the locus of significance in the narrative of Jesus’ life. Third, unlike the other Gospels, Luke’s narration of Jesus’ final trip to Jerusalem is extensive, beginning in Chapter 9 and finishing in Chapter 19. Fourth, unlike the other Gospels, the Gospel of Luke essentially begins and ends in the temple of Jerusalem.7

Raymond Brown’s analysis of the significance of the temple in Luke 1-2, particularly the temple scene beginning with the Torah-observant Zechariah and Elizabeth, and ending with another Torah-observant man and woman, Simeon and Anna, reflects the Samuel and Daniel backgrounds of the Old Testament. The Presentation narrative parallels the Eli, Elkanah, and Hannah (Anna) narrative of I Sam 1-2.8 In reflection, Brown first notes that after Hannah’s God-given conception and birth of Samuel, Hannah (or Anna—also the name of Simeon’s counterpart) brought her child to the sanctuary at Shiloh, and offered him to the Lord’s service (I Sam 1:24-28). There Hannah and her husband met with the aged priest Eli; similarly, Mary and Joseph

---

encountered Simeon, a man aware of nearing the end of his life. Second, Eli blessed Elkanah and Hannah (I Sam 2:20), as Simeon blessed Joseph and Mary (Luke 2:34). Third, the Samuel story mentions women ministering at the sanctuary’s door (I Sam 2:22); similarly, Luke describes Anna who “never left the temple courts; day and night she worshiped God, fasting and praying” (2:37). Fourth, the conclusion (Luke 2:40), describing how “the child grew up and became strong, filled with wisdom and favored by God,” echoes I Sam 2:21,26: “The young child Samuel grew in the presence of the Lord…Samuel continued to grow both in stature and in favor with the Lord and with men.”

Brown also proffers, as a possibility, Dan 9:21-24 as a source that informed Luke’s first two temple scenes. According to Brown, this passage may have influenced Luke’s inclusion of the pericope of Jesus at the temple. Dan 9:21-24 “forms the background of Gabriel’s appearance to Zechariah in 1:8-23, an appearance that marks the end of the seventy weeks of years. In Dan 9:24 we are told that when this comes, the Holy of Holies will be anointed. As I pointed out…it is difficult to know whether the Holy of Holies or most Holy means a thing, a place, or a person.” Brown suggests that Luke may have interpreted the Holy of Holies to mean a person. In the angel Gabriel’s appearance to Mary, he told her that the miraculously conceived child would “be called holy” (1:35). Mary and Joseph bring the child Jesus to the temple because he is

---

10 Ibid., 450.
considered “holy to the Lord” (2:23). Brown then asks, “Is this the anointing of the Most Holy foretold by Daniel for the end of the seventy weeks of years?”

These scholarly insights about the temple in the Presentation pericope support details related to my thesis. In particular, I will incorporate these insights to show—through Luke’s Isaian lens—the relationship between νόμος and the temple, and the glory of the temple.

The second new thought is that the salvation effected by the Messiah will result in the concomitant glorification of Israel and light of revelation to the Gentiles. This prophecy of universal salvation within this pericope, and the Presentation narrative as a whole, are permeated with Isaianic motifs. Many scholars have addressed this prophecy on universal salvation and Israel’s glorification, and its relation to the rest of Luke-Acts, from various angles. For example, William Kurz, S.J., in explaining functions within Luke’s Luke-Acts narrative, highlights Acts 28 in relation to the prophecy as a means by which Luke provides closure in plotting Luke-Acts. David Pao also situates the prophecy within Luke’s “new exodus” program as an anticipation of fulfillment in Acts. Kenneth Litwak, Steven Plymale, and Strauss focus on the relationship of the Davidic Messiah to the subject of universal salvation within the prophecy. And

---

Geoffrey Grogan examines an aspect of the prophecy that has received little attention, i.e., the reversal of the order of the object of salvation: Gentiles first, Israel second.¹⁵

The third new thought in this pericope is the ominous prophecy of Israel’s dichotomous rejection and acceptance of its Messiah: Jesus will prompt the “fall and the rising of many in Israel” (Luke 2:34). Until this point in Luke, response to the Messiah’s birth has been entirely positive. However, in this second oracle, the narrative presents a starkly alternative response that foreshadows the oppositional drama in the rejection, suffering, and death of Jesus in Luke, and the rejection and suffering of the early disciples of Jesus in the Acts of the Apostles. The Servant passages in Isaiah may reflect the dynamic of falling and rising among Israelites, and of their suffering and contradiction collectively. However, the stone metaphor in Isa 8:14-15, 28:16, and Ps 118:22—used also in Luke 20:17-18—is probably what Simeon intended. Luke 2:34 foreshadows in Acts the disbelief of many Jews, and the belief of other Jews—of the reunion and refinement of the remnant of Israel, and of the Servant’s light to the Gentiles.¹⁶

As seen above, theologians and exegetes have noted and studied these three developments within the Lukan narrative. However, there are other developments within the Lukan Presentation pericope that scarcely have received treatment. Perhaps

---


¹⁶ Koehne, Jesus the Torah, 14; Strauss, The Davidic Messiah, 119-120; Grogan, The Light and the Stone, 160-163.
the foremost is the occurrence of νόμος, the Septuagintal word Luke uses as a translation of the Hebrew word ḫōرة meaning direction or teaching. Νόμος is mentioned explicitly four times in the Presentation narrative: Luke 2:22, 2:23, 2:24, and 2:27. As I will explain in Chapter One, νόμος also is a word in Septuagintal Isaiah to which the metaphor of light in Luke 2:32 alludes. Luke 2:22-35—as a pivotal piece within the Lukan narrative—contributes significantly then to understanding the meaning of νόμος in Luke-Acts. And within this piece, Simeon’s first oracle, about the Messiah child Jesus—“a light for revelation to the Gentiles and glory for your people Israel” (Luke 2:32)—is especially important to this meaning. An understanding of the role of νόμος in the allusions contained in this pericope and particularly in Luke 2:32 would contribute an important development beyond the study of David Pao on significant themes of the “programs” of Isaiah and Luke/Acts regarding the restoration of Israel (Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus). This study, which I believe is a significant advancement in Lukan studies, omits the mention and influence of Torah from these programs, or theological perspectives. However, Pao should have included it in order to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of Israel’s restoration according to Isaiah and Luke.

Three previously formulated interpretations of the theme of νόμος in Luke 2:22-35 deserve mention. The first is Prévost’s observation that Luke’s focus on νόμος in the Presentation expresses the dual mystery of Jesus’ humanity and divinity disclosed through his Incarnation. Prévost remarks that Luke’s focus on the law is striking because it is not his habitual preoccupation. In addition to Luke’s intention to underline the deeply religious fidelity of Jesus’ parents, Luke focuses on Jesus’ consecration to the
Lord as the first-born Son. Joseph and Mary present him to the Lord, acknowledging Jesus’ belonging both to the chosen people, and, as the first-born Son *par excellence*, his belonging to the Father. According to Prévost, the Presentation narrative is unconcerned with ritualism, despite the references to the law. Rather, these references “express the two basic dimensions of the mystery of Jesus’ incarnation (He is fully son of Israel) and transcendence (He is the First-born, consecrated to the Lord in unique and absolute manner).”

Though Prévost seems to dichotomize Jesus’ incarnation and transcendence as if they are unrelated, I think he is making this point: the references to the law in the Presentation narrative convey two realities about Jesus. First, they express his humanity tangibly lived as a faithful Israelite; second, they express his divine Sonship.

The second previously formulated interpretation of the theme of νόμος is Litwak’s and Strauss’s point that the Isaianic category of the “Servant” plays a key role in the salvation Jesus will bring. Though this does not directly bear on the subject of νόμος, it relates significantly to it because, as I will explain in this dissertation, the individual (not corporate) Servant of YHWH is Torah, or νόμος, in person. The third is the thesis in my article entitled “Jesus the Torah: An Exegesis of the Presentation, Luke 2:22-35,” published in Scripture Bulletin. This thesis claims that the presentation of Jesus in the temple (Luke 2:22-35) signals the restoration and fulfillment of Israel and its Torah,

---

17 Prévost, “Presentation of Jesus,” 276-277.
19 Koehne, *Jesus the Torah*, 5-17.
effected by Jesus, the Davidic Messiah.20 The “fulfillment of Israel and its Torah” refers to the Messiah’s work and accomplishment of universal salvation and divine instruction. In addition, I contend in the article that the relationship between God’s glory and νόμος, disclosed in the allusional context of the passage, provides the key to understanding Israel’s restoration and fulfillment. An implication of this is that Jesus is portrayed in the Presentation passage as Torah, or νόμος, in person.

These previously formulated interpretations have led to a more thorough and comprehensive understanding of νόμος in Luke 2:22-35. However, no one has attempted a focused investigation of the Septuagintal Isaian use of νόμος, contextually supported and related to themes already well understood and established, including to the themes discussed in Pao’s study on Israel’s restoration. By more precisely determining the pedagogical nature of νόμος and its relation to the messianic function of the Servant of YHWH, this kind of investigation would provide a more nuanced, further developed insight into Luke’s use and theology of νόμος within and related to this key passage. My dissertation will attempt such an investigation and, therefore, will include a careful look at Luke’s use of Isaiah in a version approximated best by what we refer to as the Septuagint. In this way, the dissertation aims to provide further insight into the way in which the Isaian motif of the restoration and salvific mission of Israel, within Luke’s Presentation narrative, depends on the Septuagintal Isaian use of νόμος.

---

20 Eugene LaVerdiere, in *Luke* (Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1980), 35-37, briefly discusses the theme of fulfillment of Israel within the Presentation pericope. However, he does not develop this theme or relate the relevance of Torah to this fulfillment. In addition, though, he does discuss the pericope’s portrayal of Israel’s transition and transformation into the new messianic era, an important point in this dissertation.
In my dissertation, I will argue that the Septuagintal Isaian use of νόμος is a key theme—used in two distinct ways—in this motif of restoration and fulfillment, without which the restoration and universal salvific mission could never take place.

To summarize: further study and clarification of the meaning of νόμος in Luke 2:22-35 and of meaning of this word alluded to by this gospel pericope should enhance our understanding of the perspective on the Isaian motif of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel in Luke and Acts.

2. Thesis and dissertation layout

The thesis of my dissertation is that Luke’s use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope (Luke 2:22-35) highlights Jesus’ identity as the Messiah who will restore and fulfill Israel. Though this thesis is more focused and nuanced than the one argued for by my article mentioned above, the two theses are identical substantially. That is, in both theses, I argue that, in the Presentation pericope, Luke uses νόμος as a translation of Torah within the Isaian motif of Israel’s restoration and universal salvific mission, to identify Jesus as the Messiah who restores and fulfills Israel. The purpose of this dissertation, in contrast to the article, is to show—comprehensively and more precisely—how νόμος, in Luke 2:22-35, points to and identifies Jesus as this Messiah.

In the following matter of this introduction, I will discuss the relevant presuppositions of this dissertation and the literary context of Luke-Acts. Then I will explain my methodology. In the first part of the body of this paper—Chapter One—I
will examine Luke’s transitional, dual use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope. This examination will include Luke’s use of νόμος on the surface of the text in the Presentation, and his allusive appropriation, in Luke 2:32, of νόμος in the LXX of Isaiah.

In Chapter Two, as an essential link to my analysis of Luke’s use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope, I will discuss in greater depth an overriding theme of Luke-Acts—the new exodus—and the Isaian motif of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel which establishes and informs this theme. I will outline the process of Israel’s restoration, including the role of the Septuagintal Isaian νόμος within this restoration. In my discussion of this process, I will critique David Pao’s six themes of the restoration of Israel. Then I will argue that Luke 2:32 alludes to νόμος, within a Davidic context, in Isaiah’s comprehensive motif of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel. I will show that, consequently, this Lukan allusion discloses Jesus as the Servant Messiah who restores Israel and leads and accomplishes its mission to save the Gentiles.

Chapter Three will address the influence of δικαιοσύνη of the LXX of Isaiah on Luke’s appropriation of the Septuagintal Isaian νόμος. An awareness of this influence contributes to a more finely nuanced understanding of Luke’s use of the LXX Isaian νόμος. After discussing the relevance of this influence, and posing questions concerning this relevance, I will discuss and define the classical Greek meaning of δικαιοσύνη. Then I will explore the meaning of δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah, and the Septuagintal Isaian distinction between Israelites and Gentiles in reference to the relationship between δικαιοσύνη and νόμος. Next, I will explain the subtle difference betweenצדק in the MT of Isaiah and δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah. Finally, in this
chapter, I will discuss Luke’s appropriation of δικαιοσύνη as it relates to νόμος in the LXX of Isaiah and how this further helps us understand Luke’s use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope.

In the Conclusion, I will present the results of this study. Certain issues emerge from it, including the following: the hermeneutical approach to Luke-Acts within intertextual analysis, the relation of the LXX of Isaiah to the MT of Isaiah, continuity of Luke-Acts with the Old Testament, use of the Book of Isaiah at the turn of the era, divergent meanings of Torah at the turn of the era, and the relation of Christology and ecclesiology to Jewish messianism at the turn of the era. I briefly will address and discuss some implications of the methodological issues mentioned above, i.e., the hermeneutical approach to Luke-Acts within intertextual analysis, and interpretation of the Book of Isaiah at the turn of the era.


This dissertation presupposes authorial and narrative unity of the Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles, and that Luke 2:22-35 is material particular to Luke, independent of other synoptic traditions. I also assume that the Luke-Acts narrative, as a composite writing, is historiographical in relation to biblical events, and that the Septuagint of Isaiah and the LXX at large, with its minor variant readings available to us,
are at least reasonably equivalent to the Septuagintal source(s) Luke used. As a genre, Hellenistic historiography (like biblical historiography; i.e. 1-2 Chronicles) is a selectively written account of past events composed to present the purpose for which the account was written. This purpose could consist of providing identification and validation of those presently living, or providing exemplary virtue to strengthen the implied reader.

Pao surmises, in relation to identification of Isaian motifs, that “the probability of audience literacy can be hypothesized,” and that this probability is based on a few factors. First, other early Christian works extensively used Isaiah. Second, the Lukan text itself reflects the training of Christian converts in Israel’s Scripture. Third, the narrative itself pervasively uses scriptural quotations, allusions, and patterns. In addition, if we assume the possibility that at least some of Luke’s wider audience could recognize his use of the Isaian new exodus paradigm, then Luke may have intended to appropriate the paradigm.

Familiarity with the Septuagint (i.e., practically speaking, the Greek Old Testament) among Luke’s implied readers is a significant factor for their literary comprehension of Luke-Acts. This familiarity is probable, and therefore is an assumption we can grant. William Kurz suggests that the numerous gaps in Luke

---

21 In this particular context I am defining “historiography” as a genre, not as a method of historical study.
23 Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 36-37.
presuppose knowledge of the Greek Old Testament among its readers. Septuagintal allusions to events, persons, and teachings permeate Luke-Acts. Unlike the Gospel of Matthew’s announced Septuagintal quotations, Luke typically alludes to the Old Testament or echoes elements contained within it. This presumes that the intended readers identify these allusions and echoes, and understand the connections they make. For example, Luke’s readers were expected to hear the echoes of Hannah’s song (1 Samuel 2:1-10) in Mary’s canticle (Luke 1:46-55), and to apprehend Jesus’ identity more thoroughly by implicit comparison to Moses and the Davidic Messiah, among other Old Testament notables. Luke’s intended readers, in their familiarity with the LXX, could easily fill in many Lukan gaps.26

Though Luke used a Septuagintal source or sources, and at least some of his implied readers would likely have been familiar with that particular LXX, or those Septuagintal versions, we cannot assume that Luke’s LXX is the same as known mss; i.e., it is identical to a version known today. Therefore, we also cannot assume that Luke altered the LXX we have today when we note divergences between the LXX within Luke, and known LXX mss. Divergences could result, for example, from Luke’s use of a Greek Old Testament version unknown today, freehand insertions of the LXX into Luke-Acts, Luke’s composition of his Greek Gospel that may have included sources originally written in Hebrew or Aramaic,27 or “Hebraicizing” texts available to Luke.28

---

27 Translation of Hebrew or Aramaic into the Greek of Luke-Acts would only make a substantial difference if quotations and allusions to Old Testament Greek and Old Testament Hebrew or Aramaic—presumably based considerably on Hebrew—diverged in meaning. Typically they would not, because Septuagintal Greek is translation Greek, the syntax of which is Hebraic, not
Hebraic tendencies in Luke have been noted; e.g., several scholars contend that
the Nunc Dimittis itself was composed originally in Hebrew because it is composed of
three neatly placed trimeter couplets.\textsuperscript{29} Other examples (to mention a mere two) are
Raymond Brown’s observation that in Luke 2:32, the lack of articles with nouns
marked preference for Ἱεροσολυμ, a transliteration from the Hebrew over the more
proper Greek form.\textsuperscript{30} However, despite minor variations between the Greek content of
Luke’s appropriation of Old Testament material, and the Greek of our LXX, there is no
reason not to accept general agreement between our LXX and Luke’s.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{28} Pao, \textit{Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus}, 6.
\textsuperscript{29} Steven F. Plymale, “The Prayer of Simeon (Luke 2:29-32),” 35-36. See also Frederick W. Danker,
\textsuperscript{30} Brown, \textit{Birth of the Messiah}, 436-438, 440.
\textsuperscript{31} Also, the wording of Septuagintal variations today strongly agree. In this dissertation, I am
consulting with Sir Lancelot C. L. Brenton, \textit{The Septuagint with Apocrypha: Greek and English}
(London: Hendrickson, 1999). However, I will quote the LXX—apart from the Book of Isaiah—
from Alfred Rahlfs, ed., \textit{Septuaginta} (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2006). Brenton’s
description is based upon the codex Vaticanus, with some variants of codex Alexandrinus
(mentioned in footnotes) affecting the translation only where the Vaticanus was mutilated.
Almost all scholars concede on authorial unity of Luke-Acts. Both external and internal evidence strongly suggest that Luke authored this double volume work. The oldest Gospel manuscript identifies Luke—in the attached title—as its author. The Muratorian Canon and Irenaeus also identify Luke as the author of this Gospel. Other early Christian authors conclude the same; with no dissent on this point, the early Church universally affirmed Lukan authorship of the third Gospel. Internal evidence consists of the following. The Greek style of Luke and Acts is similar. The “prefaces” (Luke 1:1-4 and Acts 1:1-3) are similar and both designate Θεόφιλος as the recipient of the two-volume work. In addition, the plot line logically continues from Luke 24 to Acts 1, lending greater credence to authorial unity. Acts 1:1 contributes to this end as well: “In the first book, Theophilus, I dealt with all that Jesus did and taught until the

Rahlfs’s edition, however, is based on the codex Vaticanus principally, but also the textual variants in codex Alexandrinus and codex Sinaiticus. Rahlfs adopts these variants to more likely represent the LXX that would have been used by most Jews. I will quote the LXX of Isaiah from Joseph Ziegler, ed., Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum, Vol. XIV Isaias (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1983). Scholars still regard Ziegler’s critical commentary on Isaiah as standard, and I believe it is more precise than the Brenton or Rahlfs editions: e.g., in contrast to the other two, Ziegler favors a more likely accurate reading of Isa 42:4—see Chapter One, Part Four of this dissertation.

33 By “strongly suggest,” I do not mean that identification of the single author as Luke is unanimous among scholars.
34 I am assuming a second century dating, c. 170-80 A.D., of the Muratorian Canon.
36 Cadbury suggests that the other three Gospels—perhaps to justify their historical unity—separated “Luke-Acts” from their connected position among the texts approved by early ecclesial authority.
day he was taken up, after giving instructions through the holy Spirit to the apostles whom he had chosen.”

Perhaps the most significant piece of internal evidence is the “we-passages” in Acts 16:10-17, 20:5-15, 21:1-18, 27:1-28:16. They seem to suggest that the author was a companion of Paul and an eyewitness to the recorded events. These passages cannot be fully explained by literary convention: ancient literature does not show parallels to this, and in other Lukan sailing accounts, “we-passages” are missing. Kurz explains the significance of the “we-passages” as they relate to narrative function: “…the use of a first-person character narrator in sections from Acts…makes narrative claims that the implied author was a companion on some of Paul’s later journeys. This implies that he was an eyewitness to the events he narrates in the first person, which naturally would make his account more vivid and authoritative.”

Most scholars view Luke-Acts as a single, two-volume work—a united narrative, and this dissertation also adopts this approach. Litwak defines narrative as “a temporal sequence of events and situations, which relate to one specific subject, in which one or more situations or events have a cause-and-effect relation with other situations and events, which has a beginning, a middle, and an end, and which has a goal in view.” Though this definition seems a bit cumbersome, I do think it is useful for the purpose of this study.
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37 See Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 37.
38 Pao, Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus, 22.
40 Ibid., 9, 186.
41 Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 41.
With this understanding of narrative, Litwak discusses four reasons that argue for narrative unity Luke-Acts. First, Luke-Acts presents a continuous movement of temporal events. An exception is Acts 1:1-12; however, even this links together the Gospel of Luke and Acts of the Apostles. Second, both the Gospel and Acts relate to one subject: the working out of God’s plan, primarily in and through Jesus and his first followers. Third, Luke narrates “causal” connections between numerous situations and events in both works. For example, events of Luke 1-2 prepare for or establish the basis for all of the following events in Luke-Acts. Closely related to causality in a narrative is a “goal.” “Luke-Acts as a narrative may be seen to provide a chain of events which result in God’s salvation being offered not only to Israel but to the whole world, which is arguably the ‘goal’ of Luke’s narrative.” Tannehill views the goal similarly: Luke-Acts is the story of God’s promise to Israel concerning its salvation through its Messiah, who will be the Savior of all the nations.42 Fourth, in narrative fashion, Luke-Acts has a beginning, a middle, and an end. Luke’s narrative of the story of God’s providential plan—to save all humanity—begins with John and ends with Paul in Rome: the story is about Jesus and Paul’s proclamation of him all the way to Rome.43 Luke-Acts is a unified narrative.


43 Litwak, Echoes of Scripture, 41-42.
4. Methodology

My methodology consists of intertextual narrative interpretation, with emphasis on Old Testament reference and allusion in the pericope interpreted. Kurz defines intertextuality as “interrelationships of particular texts with other texts, as well as within the broader context of language and culture.”\(^4^4\) The primary interpretative principle of intertextuality is that understanding texts adequately or as well as possible requires a relational perspective, over and against viewing them in total isolation or independence of one another. Although intertextuality includes canonical and cultural implications, I will limit the range of the meaning of this term within this study to exegetical and theological concerns regarding the biblical documents, or narratives, under consideration. In this sense my methodology is intertextual narrative interpretation, and will include intratextuality\(^4^5\) within Luke-Acts, and intertextuality between Luke-Acts and the Old Testament, as they relate to my hermeneutic.

Intertextuality includes explicit references or quotations, allusions, images, and themes informing a whole passage.\(^4^6\) Quotations are the most obvious and indisputable form of intertextuality. Allusion is the next most overt form. This dissertation adopts Robert Gundry’s definition of allusion as a recognizable thought-connection between an


\(^{4^5}\) Intratextuality refers to interrelationships of textual parts within the same document.

OT and NT passage. In *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, Litwak discusses John Hollander’s explanation of the term, “transumption.” Transumption is the proper name of “the operation of intertextual echo.” Transumption also is known as “metalepsis”—the way in which a text is taken up and altered by another text through an “echo” of the former. Transumption, then, is the effect of an echo or allusion upon the successor text.

Luke 1:7 provides an example of an echo, the transumption of which I will explain: “But they had no child, because Elizabeth was barren and both were advanced in years.” Litwak observes that Luke 1:7 echoes Gen 11:30 and 18:11a, Judg 13:2, and 2 Kgdms 4:14 (LXX). The annunciation language of the Old Testament texts to pious, childless couples is similar. In addition to the narrative similarity among the texts—each couple was childless and aged—all accounts have certain words in common, e.g., “barren” (στείρα) and “child” (τέκνον). The effect of these echoes upon Luke 1:7—the way in which these texts are taken up and altered by Luke—points to something new and dramatic in history that yet is richly a part of Israel’s heritage: God will again intervene so that a faithful, married Israelite couple will conceive and bear a son whom YHWH will call to a great task.

Echoing makes a figure, and the interpretive power raises its volume louder than the original, becoming a diachronic trope. Diachronic, allusive figures—tropes of transumption—cover a wide array of controlled repetition of a word or phrase. We distinguish between an echo and allusion by determining the degree and kind of

---


incorporation in the later work. Generally, an allusion would incorporate more words from a certain part in the former text than an echo. An allusion involves a greater extent of borrowing from the precursor text.

Specifically, an allusion is a recognizable thought-connection precisely because the reader recognizes words that make the thought-connection possible. An echo does not depend on wording to effect transumption. An echo is an instance in which an image or theme of one text is taken up and changed by another text through a repetition of the former. We can identify both echoes and allusions through the criteria of availability and volume. Richard Hays, in *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*, established criteria for determining the presence of echoes. Hays lists seven criteria, only two (availability and volume) of which Robert R. Brawley and Litwak believe are necessary because five of the others overlap. I also follow Brawley’s and Liwak’s opinion on this matter. Hays explains availability and volume.

First, availability refers to the accessibility of the source of the transumption to the author and original readers. Old Testament scrolls—the sources of these echoes—were available to first century readers, such as Luke. Second, volume refers to how much repetition of words or patterns of words of the precursor text (e.g., Isaiah) consist in the allusion or echo, and refers as well to the prominence of the precursor text in the Old Testament and the degree to which the echo receives rhetorical stress in the

---


successor text. The volume is greater to the degree to which the exact wording of the precursor text repeats itself. For example, we can perceive a greater volume of the Abraham cycle in Luke to the extent that Luke used more wording from that cycle.

The other five “overlapping” criteria, the third through the seventh, are the following. The third is recurrence. The reader of a biblical document may identify what he or she perceives is an intertext. The more the author of the document at hand uses this perceived intertext elsewhere in the text, the greater is the likelihood that the perceived intertext was intended as such by the author. “The more often Isaiah is explicitly quoted in Luke-Acts, the more likely it is that there are intertextual echoes of Isaiah present.”

The fourth criterion is thematic coherence. This refers to the congruency and coherency with which the wording, images, and context of the precursor text integrate into the successor text and other Old Testament references of this text. Thus, we would expect the allusion of the canticle of Zechariah in Luke (particularly Luke 1:76) to Isaiah 40:1-11 (particularly Isaiah 40:3) to cohere with Luke’s themes and other references to the Old Testament.

Historical plausibility is the fifth criterion. This means that it is plausible to assert that Luke, as a first-century author steeped in the Old Testament, intended to appropriate the intertextual material under consideration. Luke’s appropriation of material from the Elijah-Elisha narrative, for example, would be plausible.

---

51 Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture*, 42.
The sixth criterion, history of interpretation, refers to the increased likelihood of identifying an echo or allusion, etc., if previous interpreters also have identified the same intertextual material. This criterion should not preclude us from identifying other intertextual items, but could aid in avoiding arbitrary identification.

The seventh criterion is satisfaction—the proposed intertextual reading satisfies if it makes sense contextually. It should illuminate the surrounding discourse. This criterion addresses the status regarding the relationship between the proposed intertextual material and the experience of competent readers of a contemporary community. The proposal, that Luke appropriates Abrahamic motifs in Luke 1, satisfies contextually.

The third through seventh criteria for identifying echoes and allusions are helpful to understand the nuances contained within the first two criteria. However, again, they are unnecessary as distinct criteria, because they overlap; e.g., “recurrence” and “satisfaction” are forms of “volume,” and “historical plausibility” is a form of “availability.” All criteria can be reduced to intertextual material available to the author, and successor text use of the intertext or its context (e.g., Isaiah or Isaian context) with sufficient frequency to validate the proposed intertextual item.

Another distinction is important: a theme informing a whole passage, or even an entire narrative, is like an echo, only larger, i.e., a mega-echo—also known as a motif—

---

53 Litwak, *Echoes of Scripture*, 63.
such as the Elijah/Elisha and Isaianic new exodus themes of Luke-Acts, identified and studied by scholars such as Thomas Brodie and David Pao.\textsuperscript{54}

This dissertation will address all of these types of intertextuality. While I acknowledge the importance of Litwak’s emphasis on “echoes of the Scriptures of Israel” to achieve a balanced overall perception of Luke’s textual patterns and hermeneutics, this study is much narrower in focus than Litwak’s \textit{Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts} and therefore employs a more specific methodological approach focusing on examination of clear allusions, without excluding identification of possible intertextual echoes and motifs. Although intertextual interpretation, within the methodological limits I have set for this dissertation, is related to narrative analysis \textit{per se}, the two may not be identified with each other strictly. This study will not be focusing on primary narrative features, such as plot, and we will be examining Isaiah. In addition, intertextual analysis involves the diachronic inspection of transumption. The exact relationship between narrative criticism and intertextual criticism is not addressed by this dissertation, but is an important, ongoing methodological question that should be further researched in scholarship today.

I. Luke’s transitional use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope

1. The meanings of νόμος as a translation of Torah

In the Presentation pericope, the word νόμος surfaces four times in Luke 2:22, 2:23, 2:24, and 2:27, and in 2:32 νόμος emerges once as an allusion through its metaphor—“light.” Before I discuss the place of νόμος on the surface of the text in the Presentation pericope, I will explain the derivative verb of νόμος, and the meanings νόμος conveys from its Septuagintal and New Testament context. These meanings, subsequently, are based on translation from Hebrew in its Old Testament context. Then I will explain briefly the interpretation of νόμος, beginning in the first century A.D., in both its written and oral form.

The Greek verb from which νόμος is derived is νέμω, to parcel out, especially food or grazing to animals. Typically, English translations of the Septuagint and New Testament render νόμος “law,” usually meaning decree or instruction, as if the source of the decree or instruction has parceled it out. νόμος is a translation of the Hebrew

---

word תורה, or Torah, meaning direction or teaching.⁵⁹ תора may derive from ירה—to throw or shoot.⁶⁰ In the Hif`il stem, it means to direct, teach, or instruct, although scholars dispute this definition. תורה also may derive from another verb ירה (used only in the Hif`il), meaning to proclaim or instruct with the fingers or hand.⁶¹

Moses Maimonides, or Rabbi Moshe ben Maimon, the renowned Jewish rabbi, physician, philosopher, and theologian of the Middle Ages, clarified and systematized the Old Testament biblical use and concept of Torah.⁶² Among many of his works, he compiled the Mishneh Torah as a religious guide and codification of Talmudic law, based on God’s revelation and tradition; it retains authority today. Maimonides philosophically expounded the principles of the Mishneh Torah in The Guide for the Perplexed.⁶³ He defined Torah as God’s instruction, because it leads to the truth.⁶⁴ Jacob Neusner’s simple and general definition of Torah—God’s revelation—is similar.⁶⁵ John L. McKenzie defines Torah as divine instruction or utterance.⁶⁶ The earliest biblical narrative references to Torah or νόμος (in the Septuagint) are Exodus 12:49, 13:9, and

⁶¹ Ibid., 435-436. Koehler and Baumgartner, The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, vol. 2, pp. 436-37, and vol. 4, p. 1710, favors the second view, i.e., תורה derives from ירה, to instruct with the fingers or hand, and ultimately from ורא, a multi-linguistic Mesopotamian word meaning “to proclaim.”
⁶³ Ibid., xxxvii, xl-xli.
⁶⁴ Ibid., 464.
16:4. In these instances, νόμος means instruction, direction, or divine utterance. This especially is clear in 16:4, in which walking in or following God’s νόμος implies “direction” from instruction or the divine utterance.

Generally, and most commonly, Torah means any part or all of God’s revelation through Moses to the Israelites on Mount Sinai. Circumcising a boy on the eighth day (Lev 12:3; cf. Gen 17:12; Luke 2:21; John 7:22) is one example, among hundreds, of keeping Torah according to Mosaic law. Torah also may refer to the first five books of Moses, the Pentateuch (e.g., 2 Macc 15:9). However, specifically—first and foremost on Mount Sinai—YHWH spoke and then wrote his Torah (Exod 24:12) to the Israelites on Sinai, as presented in the narratives of Exodus 20 and Deuteronomy 5. He spoke his words (λόγους, or commandments (προστάγματα)) (Exod 20:1, 6, 22; Deut 5:22, 29) and nothing more;67 Moses did not mediate at this point, and—as Brevard
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67 Throughout this dissertation, when a Septuagintal word or wording is relevant to cite, I will quote it and then—when comparison may be helpful—I will quote its corresponding Masoretic word/wording together, and in that order. The LXX and Masoretic differ especially in Jeremiah and Job, in which the LXX is much shorter and ordered differently, and in Esther, in which a significant number of verses in the Septuagint have no MT parallel. Apart from these books, the Masoretic wording— with certain known exceptions, e.g., see Isac Leo Seeligmann, The Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies (FAT 40; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 208-221—represents the likely (proto-Masoretic) source from which the corresponding Septuagintal word was translated. This is true even when the LXX seems to be following a textual tradition other than the MT (e.g., Isa 36:11), because a proto-Masoretic text would likely be the source of early Hebraic variants. The Book of Isaiah is an example of Masoretic or proto-Masoretic foundation. Thus, John Olley contends that, among the many passages he examined in detail, the LXX is “almost certainly based on MT, but differing in exact meaning”—see John W. Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah: a Contextual Study (SCSS 8; Ann Arbor, Mich.: Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1979), 111. Olley—in agreement with a general consensus among scholars—also views the LXX of Isaiah as the work of one translator, except (perhaps) chapters 36-39. See Olley, 8-9. See also Ronald Troxel, LXX-Isaiah as a Translation and Interpretation: The Strategies of the Translator of the Septuagint of Isaiah (JSJSup 124; ed. John J. Collins; Leiden: Brill, 2008), 1. Edward Young, in The Book of Isaiah (vol. 1; Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1999), 480-484, after discussing the differences of the Book of Isaiah among the MT, the Greek versions, the two
Childs notes—YHWH addressed these words to all Israelites, not just specific segments within Israel.68 Λόγος—in reference to νόμος—signifies divine utterance, particularly related to the Decalogue; προστάγμα more generally signifies ordinance of authority.69 All other “laws,” also called ordinances, statutes, or decrees, often referred to as δικαίωμα/חקי or κρίμα/משפט (e.g., Exod 21:1; Deut 6:1), follow the Decalogue, are secondary to it and to the ἀγάπη/אהבה (love) that informs the “ten words.” The ordinances that follow the Decalogue do not reflect unmediated divine origin in the narrative, and their object or usefulness are not always immediately evident, as Maimonides implies in his discussion about distinctions within ordinances.70 Concerning the two books that narrate the Decalogue event, Deuteronomy is known especially for its emphasis on ἀγάπη (love) as the underlying cause and incentive of the Israelite’s fidelity to Torah (e.g., Deut 6:5, 11:22). However, Exodus also incorporates ἀγάπη as the substrate of fidelity to the Decalogue (Exod 20:6).71 The commandments of love for God and neighbor (Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18) specifically reflect the Decalogic

Qumran manuscripts, and the Isaiah manuscript of the Wady el-Murrabaat, argues that the Masoretic “represents essentially the original Hebrew text.” Regarding Qumran textual diversity, Emmanuel Tov has argued that most biblical manuscripts are proto-MT in text type and that these manuscripts usually were more carefully copied than manuscripts of other text types. See Russell T. Fuller, “Text of the Old Testament,” EDB 1289-90. Regarding alternate views that emphasize distinction of Hebraic text types rather than variegated textual transmission, see John J. Collins, “Dead Sea Scrolls,” ABD 2: 89-90, Bruce K. Waltke, “Samaritan Pentateuch,” ABD 5: 934-935, and Melvin K. H. Peters, ABD 5:1096-1097. I will follow the approach that the MT represents a proto-MT—an essentially original Hebrew text upon which other recensions ultimately were based. Citing the MT, then, when comparison is helpful, aids in a more nuanced understanding of the Septagintal word or reference at hand by showcasing the theological emphasis reflected in the Septuagintal translation.

substrate of love, although Lev 19:18 is not associated directly to either Decalogue narrative.

Νόμος, then, is Torah. Torah—in its early, striking narrative emphasis (e.g., Exod 24:12)—is YHWH’s instruction of the commandments of love, i.e., the “words” on Sinai informed by love. The Book of Isaiah uses νόμος in this way predominantly, if not exclusively; in Part Three of this chapter, I will show how this is inferred from the relevant Isaiah contexts. Νόμος occurs twelve times in the LXX of Isaiah (1:10, 2:3, 5:24, 8:16, 8:20, 24:5, 24:27, 30:9, 33:6, 42:24, 51:4, 51:7); in this study, I will focus attention on 1:10, 2:3, 51:4, and 51:7. Philip Harner also argues that Isaiah’s use of the divine self-predication, “I am YHWH,” pronounced in God’s revelation on Sinai, functioned to communicate themes of both grace and law. Therefore, Harner contends that according to Isaiah, God expected faithful obedience to the covenant of Sinai.

Roland de Vaux points out that the Sinai covenant was established principally upon the obligations of fidelity to the Decalogue, beginning with the prohibition against idolatry. Although Harner discusses these themes relative to Isaiah 40-55, his thesis presupposes that wherever the divine self-predication, “I am YHWH,” is found in the Old Testament, the same self-predication communicates themes of grace and law. Other Old Testament texts that feature this divine self-predication include Hosea, Leviticus,
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72 For a discussion on this particular biblical sense of Torah, see Abraham Joshua Heschel, Heavenly Torah as Refracted through the Generations (ed. and trans. Gordon Tucker; New York: Continuum, 2008), 371.
73 Hatch, A Concordance to the Septuagint, 948.
Ezekiel, Deuteronomy, Judges, I Kings, Psalm 61, Jeremiah, Joel, Zechariah, and Isaiah 1-39 (specifically Isa 27:3) and 56-66 (specifically 60:16, 22, and 61:8). Harner’s study shows us that, for Isaiah, the Decalogue was an implied reality in the life of God’s people, and was significant to their understanding of covenantal commitment and fidelity to Torah.

In the mind of first century A.D. interpreters, Isaiah—in its entirety—was unified: I will argue, then, that first century interpreters regarded the Decalogic commandments and Sinaic covenant as important themes within Isaiah, which informed for these readers the meaning of νόμος contained within the book. Joseph Jensen, in examining Isaiah’s use of Torah, misses this crucial point on the Decalogic nature of Torah. However, in Jensen’s discussion on estimating Isaiah’s possible influence on Israel’s wisdom tradition, Jenson rightly proposes that the use of this term “indicates an attempt to situate all wisdom in Yahweh and to derive all wise instruction from Him alone.”

So, in summary, the first and primary emphasis of the meaning of νόμος in the biblical narrative is YHWH’s sacred Decalogue of spoken and written commandments of love on Mount Sinai. Secondarily—at least based on narrative sequence of God’s revelation on Mount Sinai—the biblical perspective of Torah also came to mean any or

---

77 Although in the Book of Isaiah the relationship between the use of Torah and Israel’s wisdom tradition is important, treatment of this relationship is beyond the scope of this dissertation.
all of YWHW’s instruction of his revelation on Mount Sinai, most of which was
mediated by Moses through numerous laws, both apodictic and casuistic.\textsuperscript{79}

New Testament Greek also reflects a dual meaning applied to νόμος. The “Oral
Torah,” developed by the postexilic Pharisaic movement in Judaism to ensure
observance of Mosaic precepts, does not have the same meaning as νόμος does in the
New Testament. The New Testament may have identified Oral Torah with “human
tradition” (e.g., Matt 15:3, 6; Mark 7:8). Jon Levenson correctly observes that Torah or
νόμος, in the common and secondary narrative sense, was indispensable to the early
Church.\textsuperscript{80} The New Testament also refers to νόμος, in the primary narrative sense,
several times (e.g., Matt 19:16-19; Mark 10:17-19; Luke 10:25-28, 18:18-20; James 2:10-12).
Torah or νόμος, understood both in the primary narrative sense, YHWH’s spoken and
written commandments of love at Sinai, and the secondary narrative Mosaic precept
sense, was indispensable as well to Judaism following the destruction of the temple in 70
A.D.

A literary example of this that is especially pertinent to this study is Targum
Isaiah. Scholars, such as Brown, Bruce Chilton, Pao, and Strauss have related aspects of

\textsuperscript{79} Apodictic law is characterized by personal address in the imperative mood; e.g., “You shall
not…” Casuistic law is characterized by an action and its stipulated consequences, an “if…then”
condition. For a discussion on their distinctiveness as well as their integration, see Jon D.

\textsuperscript{80} Jon D. Levenson, \textit{The Death and Resurrection of the Beloved Son: The Transformation of Child
Targum Isaiah to illumine a Lukan topic under discussion. In his translation and analysis of Targum Isaiah, explains how “law” or “teaching” (אָוָה— the Aramaic equivalent to Torah) is central to it. In substitution of “law,” Chilton also uses the translational term, “teaching.” This is because the “meturgeman,” i.e., the liturgical translator, held that the law—a living tradition—was given on Mount Sinai to Israel alone, who heard this teaching (Tg. Isa. 43:12). This point is significant, because the only teaching the people heard on Mount Sinai was the Decalogue, unmediated by Moses.

The Targum emphasizes that Israel fell from God’s Memra, or teaching. Memra, God’s “Word,” may be the most common targumic paraphrase for God, and it is employed to show God’s address to Israel. Other targumic terms that personify divine attributes are the spirit, the wisdom, and the Shekinah. The Old Testament provided the basis of these. For example, the spirit hovered over the waters (Gen 1:2), the wisdom of God helped create the world (Prov 8:22 ff.), and by the Shekinah, YHWH’s

---


83 Ibid., 13, 15, 128.
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visible presence filled the temple (I Kgs 8:10). The Old Testament also informed the concept and use of Memra in Targumic and rabbinical literature, e.g., YHWH’s sends forth his word to accomplish the purpose for which it was sent (Isa 55:11). Philo of Alexandria (ca. 20 B.C.-ca. 50 A.D.) synthesized rabbinic development of a Memra hypostasis and Greek speculation on the Logos, and seems to have treated the personified, divine attributes as intermediate beings, distinct from God and the angels.

Memra, or the divine address, also provided Israel with an occasion to reciprocate to God. The Memra from which Israel fell, or failed to reciprocate according to Targum Isaiah, is God’s teaching or law: “Hear, heavens, which trembled when I gave my law to my people…they have rebelled against my Memra…my people have not had the intelligence to return to my law.” Consequently, according to Targum Isaiah, when God removed his Shekinah following the rebellion of Israel, repentance, meaning return and adherence to his teaching, was required for its restoration. Obedience to God’s teaching was the condition upon which Israel’s restoration and messianic vindication was rendered possible; concomitantly, the
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88 Some of several other examples are found in the following: Isa 9:7, 40:8; Pss 33:6, 33:9, 107:20, 119:89, 147:15; Sirach 42:15; Wisdom 9:1, 16:12, 18:15.
90 Chilton, The Glory of Israel, 56.
91 Ibid., 13.
92 Ibid., 54-55, 38.
Messiah’s program—crucial in the Targum—was to restore this teaching. Subsequently, in the historical drama portayed in the Targum, the keepers of the law would join the Messiah’s glory in the restoration of Israel and of the sanctuary in Jerusalem, the locus of divine power.\footnote{Ibid., 13-14, 98.}

Chilton’s research shows us that these contents concerning God’s teaching or law in Targum Isaiah demonstrate the likelihood of Torah themes—including that of the primary narrative understanding of Torah—trajecting within first century interpretation of Isaiah. Although this Targum, in its various phases of production, may have been written and redacted in its final form in the second or even third century A.D., its contents probably reflect oral and written traditions—particularly from the Tannaitic phase—that originate in the first century.\footnote{Bruce Chilton, \textit{The Isaiah Targum} (vol. 11 of \textit{The Aramaic Bible}; Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1990), xx-xxv; Jacob Neusner, \textit{Messiah in Context} (Philadelphia, Pa.: Fortress Press, 1984), 240; Gabriele Boccaccini, “Targum,” \textit{EDB} 1275-1276.} Chilton designates Targum Isaiah as an early Targum relative to formation of other rabbinic works. He proposes that “the conservative nature of its formation, in which traditions from the past were collected and handed on by the framework interpreters, suggests that some of the material available in the Targum represents the early Judaism in which Jesus himself believed, and which was the basis of his distinctive preaching.”\footnote{Bruce Chilton, \textit{A Galilean Rabbi and His Bible: Jesus’ Use of the Interpreted Scripture of His Time} (consulting ed. Robert J. Karris, O.F.M.; GNS 8; Wilmington, Del.: Michael Glazier, 1984), 57.} Chilton’s work discloses that Targum Isaiah also reflects belief in the divine quality of the Memra or Torah, and of its identification with God’s glory and its integral relationship with the temple. We also
will see these themes reflected in Luke’s appropriation of Torah, or νόμος, in the first century A.D.

However, Matthew Powell, in drawing from rabbinical sources, has shown that the integral relation between Torah and the temple also may be compared by structural parallelism: we may view, through the lens of Jewish tradition, the structure of the temple mirroring the structure of Torah. Just as the five Books of Moses are the center of Torah tradition, so too the Holy of Holies is the center of the Jerusalem temple. The Prophets and then the Writings surround the Books of Moses; they may be viewed as concentric circles, expounding and explaining the innermost circle—the Pentateuch. The Prophets and the Writings may also be viewed as the entrance to and barrier for Torah: they illumine knowledge contained in the Books of Moses, and protect abuse and misrepresentation of that knowledge.

Seen in this way, the Prophets and the Writings function as do the vestibule and sanctuary of the temple. By passing through the vestibule into the sanctuary, we approach the originally revealed truths of God; this mirrors the individual’s movement toward truth contained in the Books of Moses, and in both cases it is a movement toward the divine presence. In addition, the Oral Torah—concretely realized in the Talmudic Palestinian edition (350-400 A.D.) and Babylonian edition (500-600 A.D.), and
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viewed through the two basic strata, the Mishna and Gemara—added interpretative layers to the existing Torah. For the Torah of Sinai to achieve full expression, the divine revelation required the “chain of tradition,” the process of navigating through the truths of Torah, the “architecture of truth.”

The chain of tradition, as “the continuous effort to reconstruct the past for the future,” consists of links formed by each generation of Israel that receives Torah. This reception of Torah binds the community of Israel together and binds Israel to God. This binding process of tradition and its formative effect provide a link to the future. However, all Torah composed after the divine instruction given to Moses is an interpretation of the “original” Torah at Sinai. The chain of tradition, which “defines the process by which the Torah has been both sustained and developed,” and the architecture of truth—the access to understanding the truths of Torah—complement one another. They are the two fundamental components of symbolic imagination inherited and conveyed in Jewish tradition.

Eventually, in rabbinical literature in the first seven centuries A.D., Torah connoted a broad range of words and ideas. Neusner asserts that “the word Torah
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100 Ben Zion Bokser and Baruch M. Bokser provide a thorough and concise explanation of the development of the Oral Torah, and particularly that of the Talmud, in The Talmud: Selected Writings (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 3-15.
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103 Ibid., 82.
stood for everything; and so it does today. The Torah symbolizes the whole, at once and entire.”¹⁰⁴ In distinction to this panoply of meaning which provides context in understanding the full implications of Torah, we have studied and will continue to study in this dissertation the two particular meanings Luke-Acts and the Book of Isaiah apply to Torah or νόμος, i.e., νόμος in its primary Sinai narrative sense, the commandments of love, and νόμος in its Mosaic precept sense.

2. The meaning of νόμος on the surface of the text in the Presentation

In the Presentation pericope, νόμος—the word, not the allusion to the word—is used in the secondary sense, i.e., the collection of YHWH’s written instruction of his revelation on Mount Sinai, mediated by Moses. Νόμος first appears in Luke 2:22, and then again in 2:23-24 to form a thematic unit on the purification of Mary and the consecration of Jesus in adherence to the works of the law of Moses.

This passage on the purification and presentation is not merely a narrative technique to bring Joseph, Mary, and Jesus from Bethlehem to Jerusalem and its temple. Nor is this passage merely intended as historical data consonant with Luke’s purpose contained within his prologue. Rather, Luke 2:22-24 naturally follows from the prescription in Leviticus that required Jesus’ circumcision mentioned in Luke 2:21. In addition, 2:22-24 theologically establishes the following scenes with Anna the Prophetess (2:36-38) and the boy Jesus in the temple (Luke 2:41-52).

¹⁰⁴ Neusner, *The Oral Torah*, 174-175.
In relation to the Gospel of Luke overall, Luke 2:22-24 illustrates two simultaneous realities in the lives of pious, faithful Israelites at the turn of the century. The first is adherence to Mosaic legislation in anticipation of the promise of the Davidic messianic reign.\(^\text{105}\) The second is solidarity among Israelites, whose origin and integrity stem from the exodus liberation and covenant mediated by Moses, and whose foretold emancipation through a new exodus has now arrived.\(^\text{106}\) Anticipation and arrival, and promise and fulfillment converge.

In the first exodus narrative, the multi-tribal Hebrew confederation united under Moses and Aaron in a divinely engineered escape from Egypt. Now, in Luke’s Gospel, Israelites faithful to the Decalogue and to the Mosaic law will experience a new exodus under the leadership of a new Moses, the Davidic Messiah. The emphasis in Luke 2:22-24 on fidelity of holy Israelites to the Mosaic νόμος, in the broader narrative sense of Torah described above, accentuates these two realities that converge to form one transition in Israel. The Mosaic νόμος in Luke-Acts points to both the Israelite heritage of the exodus, and to its provisional character which will have served its purpose upon the arrival of the Davidic Messiah. Regard for the Davidic Messiah—by anticipation or fulfillment—and loving fidelity to the decalogic Words of YHWH on Sinai create this convergence and make the transition between the two socio-religious realities possible.


\(^{106}\) In reference to the subject matter, I am using the word “Israelite” in this study, instead of “Jew,” simply to underscore Luke’s heightened perspective that all of Israel will be restored—all twelve tribes—not only the Judahites (Jews) and Benjaminites, the tribes of the south.

In Luke 2:22-24, Joseph and Mary fulfill two laws of Moses. Though they coincide temporally, they are distinct. The first, written in Lev 12, is the mother’s purification after giving birth. In this law, if a woman gives birth to a boy, she is considered unclean for seven days. On the eighth, the boy is circumcised, and the mother spends thirty-three days more in purification, totaling forty days of uncleanness. Following this, she brings to the priest a lamb for a holocaust and a pigeon or turtledove.

109 Ibid.
for a sin offering.\textsuperscript{110} The priest offers them up to make atonement for her, so she may be clean again. If the mother cannot afford a lamb, however, she may take two turtledoves or two pigeons, one for a holocaust and one for a sin offering. The priest again offers them up to make atonement.

Luke virtually quotes Lev 12:6 in his opening words of 2:22, and the sacrifice of two turtledoves or two young pigeons cites Lev 12:8. "Their purification" (τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν) is the reading best attested by the Nestle-Aland text. No Mosaic legislation or other Jewish tradition necessitates purification for anyone other than the mother.

Scholars have attempted to solve this exegetical problem in various ways. For example, Raymond Brown believes that Luke erred and thought that both parents required purification.\textsuperscript{111} However, there are other plausible theological or grammatical reasons that could explain the apparent inaccuracy. Moreover, a mistake over such a basic, well-known, and frequently applied law is very unlikely considering Luke’s frequent, deft, and subtle use of the Old Testament.

In contrast to the error theory, another interpretation, favored by Origen, is that "their" (αὐτῶν) refers to Mary and Jesus: we may apply this interpretation by asserting that αὐτῶν pertains to Mary, and to mother and child, in a general sense.\textsuperscript{112} Another explanation, however, is that αὐτῶν is subjective, meaning "their purification ritual for

---

\textsuperscript{110} A holocaust was a burnt offering, considered as a gift for God. The sin offering is accomplished for purificatory purposes (e.g., Lev. 12:6, 8; 14:19, 22, 31; 15:15, 30; Num 6:11, 14, 16). See McKenzie, “Sacrifice,” DB 757, and Gary A. Anderson, “Sacrifices and Offerings,” EDB 1148-1150.

\textsuperscript{111} Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, 448-449.

\textsuperscript{112} Ibid., 436; Koehne, Jesus the Torah, 6.
Mary,” or “their purification of Mary through the offering of two turtledoves or two young pigeons.”

Prévost’s position can accommodate this explanation: he contends that Luke’s repeated mention of the “law of the Lord” is deliberate, especially in the introduction and conclusion of the Presentation account. In both, Joseph and Mary fulfill the νόμος, as bookends of the pericope. To illustrate, in the beginning of the pericope (Luke 2:22) we read, “When the days were completed for their purification according to the law of Moses…” At the end of the pericope (Luke 2:39) we read, “When they had fulfilled all of the prescriptions of the law of the Lord…” Thus, according to Prévost, αὐτῶν functions to provide grammatical structure.

The second Mosaic law Joseph and Mary fulfill is the consecration of the first-born male child to YHWH (Exod 13:1-2, 11-12). The consecration or presentation to the Lord served as a sign of YHWH’s mighty deliverance of the Hebrews out of Egypt (Exod 13:14-16). Redemption of the first-born son cost five shekels, equivalent to twenty denarii (Num 18:15-17). Traditionally, then, the presentation to the Lord related to his sparing the life of the Hebrew first-born when he slew the Egyptian first-born.

According to Mosaic law, the first-born was to offer his life in special service to the Lord, though the Tribe of Levi took this over (in cult, at least), replacing the first-born (Num 8:15-16). The legal provisions in Num 18:15-16 recognized this change, and allowed

[113] Brown believes this position is implausible: Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, 436. However, he interprets the position as referring to Jesus’ purification; rather, it refers to Mary’s. “They brought him up” (ἀνήγαγον αὐτῶν), the first part of Luke 22b, refers back a verse to “him” (αὐτῶν) (Jesus), and does not have to refer to Jesus as the object of their purification in 2:22a. In the subjective explanation of this position, Mary is the logical object of their purification.

redemption of the first-born, while the Levites remained in service. The redemption fee had to be paid at the temple, but the Mosaic law did not obligate parents to present and redeem their child in the temple.\(^{115}\)

Then why does Luke recount Joseph and Mary going to Jerusalem and presenting Jesus in the temple? And why does Luke omit mention of redemption for five shekels? Luke, in the Presentation narrative, illustrates a close analogy between the relation of Samuel and the sanctuary in Shiloh to Jesus and the temple in Jerusalem. Luke 2:22-24 establishes the Jerusalem-bound direction and tone of the narrative on the Presentation. Jesus is taken up to Jerusalem (ἀνῆγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς Ἰεροσόλυμα)—up to Mount Zion—perhaps in a foreshadowing of the Cross. In Luke’s version of the Transfiguration of Jesus, his suffering and death seem implied in Moses’s and Elijah’s conversation with Jesus about the exodus he would accomplish in Jerusalem (Luke 9:31). In the Jerusalem temple, He then is consecrated or presented as the first-born son to the Lord in obedience to the law of the Lord. In view of Luke’s theology of the temple and his focus on Jerusalem, sacrificial/Passover/Exodus imagery seems to emerge subtly.\(^{116}\)

\(^{115}\) See Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, 447-448, on his summary of the application of these laws.

\(^{116}\) In particular, drawing from observations listed above, Luke’s mention of the law of the consecration of the first-born son, within the context of the temple, evokes memory of the first Passover in Egypt, including the sacrifice of the lamb, the death of the unprotected first-born (e.g., Exod 13:14-16), and the ensuing exodus. In addition, and in preparation for continued exodus imagery, Joseph’s and Mary’s taking Jesus up to Jerusalem for his presentation to the Lord as the first-born son primes us for the Transfiguration recounted in Luke (Luke 9:28-36), in which Moses and Elijah speak to Jesus about his forthcoming exodus in Jerusalem. From the cloud that cast a shadow over them, a voice said, “This is my chosen Son; listen to him.” In Luke, the presentation and consecration of the first-born son, Jesus, suggests what the Transfiguration explicates: Jesus is the chosen and consecrated first-born Son of God whom the Father commissions to a new exodus, and Jerusalem is integral to this divine commission.
Mosaic law did not require Jesus’ consecration in the temple; in Luke’s parallelism of the Presentation to the story of Samuel and the sanctuary, Jesus’ dedication may correspond to the type of practice found in 1 Sam 1:24-28 in which the child, acknowledged as belonging to the Lord, is given to him in the temple. This connection of Jesus’ consecration to his presence in the temple is stronger if it was intended to fulfill Malachi 3:1: “And suddenly there will come to the temple the Lord whom you seek, and the messenger of the covenant whom you desire.” Both the link to Samuel and the fulfillment of the Malachi prophecy may be what Luke had in mind theologically, “after investigating everything accurately anew…” (Luke 1:3). This intertextual disclosure also may reflect the foundation of Luke’s overriding themes: Jesus’ divine Sonship in his relation to the Father and his mission within the world.

Apparently for Luke, then, Joseph, Mary, and Jesus went up to the Jerusalem temple for two reasons, and both in faithful, if not generous, response to Mosaic law. First, they went up to have Mary purified, though a woman was not obligated to make a journey to the temple to fulfill this law. Second, they went up to fulfill prophecy and to consecrate Jesus in the temple, after the manner of Samuel’s presentation in the sanctuary. In their familiarity with the story of Samuel, they may have believed that Jesus was similar to Samuel in his distinct call to offer his life in service to God. Joseph and Mary knew that Jesus had an exceptional and singularly unique relationship with

---

118 Of course, Samuel’s consecration in the sanctuary differed; e.g., Hannah offered Samuel as a perpetual Nazirite (1 Sam 1:22-24).
the Lord (e.g., Luke 1:26-38; cf. Matt 1:18-25), to whom later the preadolescent Jesus—in the temple—would call “Father” (Luke 2:49).

Luke may have omitted mention of the redemption of the first-born for five shekels simply because it was not significant enough to the purpose of the narrative. However, Luke’s omission may again reflect theological subtlety: an option of Mary and Joseph not to redeem their first-born male from service to the Lord might imply precisely their intention to consecrate the child Jesus, to offer him to the service of the Lord.

In Luke 2:22-24, Luke presents positively works of the law—the full range of Mosaic precepts—at this time in history, i.e., turn of the millennium, the first century A.D. This introduction to the temple scene is a selective illustration of Mary’s and Joseph’s adherence to this second, broader understanding of νόμος. Luke’s positive portrayal of Mosaic law is strengthened by considering the Gospel’s earlier reference to Jesus’ circumcision (Luke 2:21) and the righteousness of Zechariah and Elizabeth (Luke 1:6). Moreover, Luke portrays Joseph and Mary as middle to lower socio-economic class Israelites. They apparently cannot afford a lamb as a holocaust for Mary’s ritual purification, so they opt for the two turtledoves or two young pigeons. The poverty of this family—a poverty that could not afford a birthplace for their child except for a feeding trough (φάτνη)—aligned themselves with the poor and the humble (ענוים) among Israel. This was a people of special concern to YHWH throughout the Old Testament; the Book of Isaiah illustrates this concern particularly well. Joseph, Mary,
and Jesus are aligned in solidarity with the marginalized and poor, these groups of which are objects of divine blessing in Luke’s Gospel.

Thus, in Luke 2:22-24, Luke the historian, narrator, and theologian depicts, within a powerful transition in history, exemplary fidelity to the νόμος of the covenant of Sinai. This fidelity is showcased among Israelites who are divinely instrumental in inaugurating the messianic era. The presentation of Jesus in the temple is a sign that the messianic era has begun.

3. Simeon’s righteousness and the internal restoration of Israel

Luke 2:25a further informs the reader on the meaning of νόμος as it has been understood in the narrative of the Gospel to this point. Luke presents Simeon of Jerusalem as a man “righteous and devout.” Earlier in Luke 1:6, Zechariah and Elizabeth are described as righteous in that they observe “all the commandments and ordinances of the Lord blamelessly.” “Righteousness” (Δικαιοσύνη/צדק) in Judaism meant faithfulness to the commandments of Torah. This faithfulness is the loving response of God’s people called for by YHWH to sustain the covenant of Sinai. Ironically, the Hebraic names of Zechariah (ゼカリヤ) and Elizabeth (אלישבע) mean “YHWH

119 Later, in Luke 23:47, Jesus is singled out by the centurion as righteous: “Surely this man was righteous” (NRSV) Ὄντως ὁ ἀνθρώπος ὁ δίκαιος δίκαιος ἦν. This statement implies a connection to Wis 2:12-20, in which the righteous man is God’s son, who suffers, dies, and is vindicated. Luke 23:47 also refers to YHWH’s righteous, suffering servant (Isa 53:11).
has remembered” and “God of the oath,” respectively. Their names in unison recall first the fidelity required of both YHWH and Israel to the covenantal oath. Second, by implication from covenant fidelity, their names recall God’s promises through the patriarchs and prophets to restore the (entire) house of Jacob and bring all nations to Zion to be instructed in the ways of the Lord. These points concerning the meanings the two names convey may have been relevant to Luke’s source or sources on the narrative of Elizabeth and Zechariah.

Luke clarifies Simeon’s righteousness through the use of a hendiadys—using two words to express one concept; his righteousness is devout, εὐλαβής, i.e., “taking well,” or internalized. However, Simeon does not merely embody an ideal of Hellenistic morality, an ideal one might expect Luke to highlight for a predominantly Hellenistic audience.121 Only Luke uses the word εὐλαβής in the New Testament; he uses it here and in Acts 2:5, 8:2, and 22:12. In all cases its connotation is positive. Luke describes Simeon’s devotion as one that is “awaiting the consolation of Israel” (προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ). This description, one of confident trust in the reliability and fulfillment of God’s Word, is reminiscent of the exemplary Old Testament faith required of Habakkuk by Yahweh (Hab 2:4).122 The object of Simeon’s constancy and anticipation

121 See Lukas Bormann, Recht, Gerechtigkeit und Religion im Lukasevangelium (Göttingen: Vanderhoeck und Ruprecht, 2001), 228.
122 In the LXX of Hab 2:4, “the righteous shall live by my faithfulness (πίστεώς μου)” contrasts in wording with the MT, “The righteous will live by his faithfulness (באמונתו).” In the LXX, πιστις often is best rendered “faithfulness”: this especially is the case when it is a translational derivative of πίστις. See Lust, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, 377. The genitive pronoun μου in Hab. 2:4 (LXX, except in Codex Alexandrinus, in which it is missing) may be a translation from a Hebraic source other than proto-MT. More likely, the LXX translation from a proto-MT intends to accentuate God’s exemplary faithfulness required of his faithful people.
echoes, especially, two Isaian passages, Isaiah 40:1-11 and 52:8-12. In these passages, God’s people are comforted, Zion is restored, and the word of God “stands forever.” Isa 40:1-11 emphasizes God’s initiative and reliability, and Isa 52:8-11 conveys YHWH’s consolation through redemption.

Isa 40:1-11 follows the mood created by Isa 38-39. In Chapter 38, King Hezekiah recovers from deathly illness and enjoys peace following the imminent threat of his own death. However, in Chapter 39 Hezekiah receives the Babylonian envoys sent to deliver gifts and letters celebrating Hezekiah’s good news. Hezekiah showed the messengers his entire treasury. In response to this, Isaiah prophesies the transitory peace of Hezekiah’s days, followed by the disaster of Babylonian conquest and deportation. Thus Chapters 38-39 point forward to the Babylonian captivity and the depiction in Isa 40:1-11 of the despondent aftermath of Judah and its great city, a despondency that only YHWH can save and restore. Luke implies Simeon’s familiarity with the Book of Isaiah. The consolation Simeon awaited was a new exodus initiated and led by the Lord himself. Isa 40:3 and 5 connote this kind of exodus: YHWH will manifest his glory, only he will clear a passageway through a desert instead of a sea. Human glory, conversely, is transitory and entirely dependent on God; the Lord’s glory is permanent (Isa 40:6-8). Isaiah declares that the “word” of Israel’s God “stands forever.”

Isa 52:8-12, particularly 52:9, continues this theme in Isaiah of the Lord consoling his people Israel—especially the inhabitants of Jerusalem—through redemption. Luke’s portrayal of Simeon’s apparent awareness of these texts suggest that the Jerusalem temple is a central locus of concern in God’s act of redemption and consolation. Indeed, Chilton’s analysis of Targum Isaiah shows us that for first and second century Judaism, the temple and Jerusalem are necessary components of Israel’s restoration, even after the destruction of Jerusalem. The echo of Luke 2:25—Isa 52:9, ὅτι ἠλέησε κύριος αὐτήν—supplements the stronger echo, or probable allusion—Isa 40:1. In this allusion, the verb παρακαλεῖτε (second person plural, imperative of παρακαλέω) relates directly to the noun παράκλησιν (singular, accusative of παράκλησις) in Luke 2:25. In combination, the realities to which these echoes point fulfill the anticipation of Simeon’s patient waiting, of his faithfulness to God’s word of consolation to Israel.

The description of the Lord comforting his people also echoes Isa 49:13, 51:3, 57:18, 61:2, and 66:10-13. In the context surrounding these verses, the condition of obedience to νόμος is implicit for consolation: Isaiah presupposes that God’s people are his people precisely because of their obedience. Isa 51:3 of 51:1-7, a pericope embracing this motif of the Lord’s comfort for Zion, is one such example of this: “Yes, the Lord shall comfort Zion (Καὶ σὺ νῦν παρακαλέσω, Σιὼν/יהוה ציון) and have pity on all her ruins.”

124 Chilton, The Glory of Israel, 97-98.
125 Because Isa 51:1-7 is important to the development of this dissertation’s thesis, Appendix II displays the pericope in its English translation with key words and phrases translated in the LXX Greek and MT Hebrew.
Simeon’s devotion, therefore, implies faithfulness to God’s νόμος or instruction, and consequently implies trust in his promises (cf. Isa 40:8; 51:4, 7), also. Simeon’s righteousness, then, is not self-focused or ostentatious. Rather, it is pure and oriented to God. Simeon’s righteousness and purity, or authentic righteousness, echoes Psalm 24:4: “3 Who may go up to the mountain of the Lord? Who can stand in his holy place? 4 The clean of hand and pure of heart, (Ἀθῶος χερσιν και καθαρός τῇ καρδίᾳ/ใคร ידם נקי ואור לבר) who are not devoted to idols, who have not sworn falsely (Ps 24:3-4).”

In the psalm, the “clean of hand,” refers to righteousness and righteous acts in general, but also to the interior innocence which informs these acts. However, “pure of heart” refers exclusively to a sincere, faithful disposition. Luke’s hendiadys of Simeon, i.e., his dual qualities of righteousness and devotion, “parallels” this Hebraic synthetic, clarifying parallelism. Other motifs of the Presentation narrative also echo elements in Psalm 24, such as the temple (vv. 3, 7), God’s glory (v. 7), seeing God (v. 6), and God’s salvation (v. 5).

Simeon’s righteousness anticipates Jesus’ teaching on the restoration of the substantial meaning of living the νόμος, or Torah, or, in other words, of following God’s

---

127 See Pss. 18:21; 26:6, 10; 73:13; and 125:3. Perhaps a better, literal literal translation of Ἀθῶος χερσιν is “innocent of hand.” The evil works of the hand, cited in 26:10 and 125:3, affirm the external, literal quality of the acts of the “hand,” in addition to its internal, metaphorical quality of moral innocence or moral corruption.
129 On the semantic quality of synthetic parallelism, see Adele Berlin, “Parallelism,” ABD 5:156-159.
way for the Israelites. This way consists of total love of God, and love of neighbor, as Jesus teaches in Luke 10:25-28, in which he reiterates and combines Deuteronomy 6:4-5—drawn from both the MT and LXX—and Leviticus 19:18:

There was a scholar of the law who stood up to test him and said, “Teacher, what must I do to inherit eternal life?” Jesus said to him, “What is written in the law? How do you read it?” He said in reply, “You shall love the Lord, your God, with all your heart, with all your being, with all your strength, and with all your mind, and your neighbor as yourself.” He replied to him, “You have answered correctly; do this and you will live.”

In the Gospel of Luke, the disciple of Jesus expresses this love by embracing God’s word with a good heart: “But as for the seed that fell on rich soil, they are the ones who, when they have heard the word, embrace it with a generous and good heart, and bear fruit through perseverance;” “…blessed are those who hear the word of God and observe it” (Luke 8:15, 11:28). The faithful disciple, then, observes the Lord’s commandments, or “words,” he spoke to the Israelites from Sinai:

“You know the commandments, ‘You shall not commit adultery; you shall not kill; you shall not steal; you shall not bear false witness; honor your father and your mother.’” (Luke 18:20).

In Luke, Jesus advances this understanding of the fundamental meaning of living Torah, i.e., loving fidelity to the “words” of YHWH. We may further grasp this approach toward Torah—one cultivated within the Jewish matrix of Jesus’ religious and cultural

---

heritage during the first century A.D.—by examining its distinctiveness in the following points.\textsuperscript{131}

The first two points, discussed in the above section, “1. The meanings of νόμος as a translation of Torah,” are the first part of this examination of the distinctiveness of the fundamental meaning of living Torah: loving fidelity to YHWH’s words. To explain more thoroughly the substance of νόμος according to the Pentateuchal narrative, I will restate these two points in the following. First, in this narrative, the Decalogue (Ten Commandments) is the only piece of the Pentateuch unmediated by Moses and written by God himself (Exod 20:1, 22; 24:12; 31:18; Deut 5:4-5). According to the narrative in both Exodus and Deuteronomy, in YHWH’s establishing his covenant with the Israelites, Moses mediated for them only after YHWH spoke his words (e.g., Exod 20:22-26), and especially after they failed in their fidelity to their God in the “golden calf” incident.\textsuperscript{132} Moses established the Levitical ministry for ritual service, with numerous precepts attached to this institution, after the mass disobedience (e.g., Exod 32:1-29).

\textsuperscript{131} Of course, this miniature treatment on the substance of νόμος, or Torah, according to the Pentateuchal narrative, is merely a summary of a common position. A thorough explanation of this interpretation is well beyond the scope of this study. However, some explanation is warranted, I think, to provide further clarity to the thesis.

\textsuperscript{132} The following discussion on the relationship of and distinction between the Decalogue and Mosaic law is based on my interpretation of the Pentateuchal narrative on this topic. This interpretation represents a common Christian view, beginning in the New Testament, of the Old Testament and Mosaic precepts. I concur with Moses Maimonides that the principal purpose of the Mosaic law was to promote knowledge and service of God, and therefore eliminate idolatry, and to remove injustice among the Israelites. For the same point of view, see Heschel, \textit{Heavenly Torah}, 84. Sacrifices are secondary in importance and are provisionally obligatory. Their object is worshipping God’s name and destroying idolatry. (Moses Maimonides, \textit{The Guide for the Perplexed}, 542-544, 535, 532). Other views on the relationship of and distinction between the Decalogue and Mosaic law often accentuate one of the following: A) the union of the Decalogue and Mosaic law and the insignificant distinction between them, B) a negative view of Mosaic law in contrast to a positive view of the Decalogue, and C) the transitoriness of both as cultural expressions that fade in time.
Second, the Ten Commandments are addressed to everyone—not specific segments—within Israel.\(^{133}\)

Third, the Decalogue is the deed of the covenant of Sinai.\(^{134}\) Only the Decalogue has a special designation—“these words” (Exod 20:1, Deut 5:22)—and is repeated in Deuteronomy. In addition, the Decalogue is distinguished from the other laws because of the sense of finality noted in Deuteronomy 5:22: “These words, and nothing more.” Fourth, within the narrative, אהבה (love) is the substrate that informs the Ten Commandments, and it is the primary though not sole motive for keeping them. Loving YHWH and being faithful to his words is a theme found throughout various parts of the Pentateuch, and is incorporated in the Decalogue itself (Exod 20:6; Deut 5:10).\(^{135}\)

The narrative in Deuteronomy tells us that God himself will effect this love within his people by excising their disobedient disposition: “The Lord, your God, will circumcise your hearts and the hearts of your descendents, that you may love the Lord, your God, with all your heart and all your soul, and so may live” (Deut 30:6). The interior obedience and devotion to YHWH is the substance of living the Torah.\(^{136}\)

The message of several biblical prophets not only is consistent with this, but affirms it as well. Jeremiah, for example, reiterates the real problem of his contemporaries—they are uncircumcised of heart:

\(^{133}\) See Brevard S. Childs, *Old Testament Theology*, 63.

\(^{134}\) See Roland de Vaux, *Ancient Israel*, 147.

\(^{135}\) In the Pentateuchal narrative, we read of the motivational love for keeping the commandments first in Exodus, then in Leviticus regarding love of neighbor (19:18), and then from Moses on the plains of Moab, in Deuteronomy.

For the sake of the Lord, be circumcised, remove the foreskins of your hearts, O men of Judah and citizens of Jerusalem: lest my anger break out like fire, and burn till none can quench it, because of your evil deeds. (Jer 4:4)

See, days are coming, says the Lord, when I will demand an account of all those circumcised in their flesh: Egypt and Judah, Edom and the Ammonites, Moab and the desert dwellers who shave their temples [i.e., circumcise themselves]. For all these nations, like the whole house of Israel, are uncircumcised in heart. (Jer 9:24-25)

Similarly, Ezekiel says, “I will give you a new heart and place a new spirit within you, taking from your bodies your stony hearts and giving you natural hearts. I will put my spirit within you and make you live by my statutes, careful to observe my decrees” (Ezek 36:26-27). According to the prophecies or declarations attributed to Samuel, David, Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, and Micah, the secondary, temporally necessary, but ultimately provisional laws of Moses are validated by the motive of loving obedience and loving kindness. These laws can even be foreign to the heart of Torah and offensive when engaged by those doing evil (e.g., Isa 1:10-14; Amos 5:22-25). Similarly, priestly instruction in Leviticus viewed Mosaic law as dependent upon Israelite fidelity to the definitive commandments of the Decalogue. Leviticus 26 stipulates that continued violation of the Sinai covenant, for which loving obedience to YHWH’s words were necessary, would unleash covenant curses. These curses included YHWH’s termination of the cultic order (e.g., Lev 26: 1-2, 31).137 The historical, situational context in the Pentateuchal narratives, as well as the covenantal curses in Leviticus—activated on the

condition of unrelenting disobedience against YHWH’s commandments—imply the temporally binding yet provisional nature of Mosaic law.

In the prophetic narrative in 1 Sam 15, Samuel castigates Saul for disobeying the command of the Lord and offering sacrifice after the battle against Amalek: “Does the Lord so delight in holocausts and sacrifices as in obedience to the command of the Lord? Obedience is better than sacrifice, and submission than the fat of rams” (1 Sam 15:22). In Ps 40:7-9, part of a Psalm attributed to David, we again hear the theme of the superordination of obedience to material sacrifices: “Sacrifice and offering you do not want; but ears open to obedience you gave me. Holocausts and sin-offerings you do not require; so I said, ‘Here I am; your commands for me are written in the scroll. To do your will is my delight; my God, your law is in my heart!’”

In Isaiah 1:10-15, apart from obedience to νόμος, YHWH finds no pleasure in sacrifice: they are worthless. Instead, the “people of Gemorrah”—a metaphor for Jerusalemites—should put away their misdeeds, cease doing evil, learn to do good, and make justice their aim ( Isa 1:10, 16-17).

Hosea seems to disavow sacrifice altogether: “For it is love (ἔλεος/חסד) that I desire, not sacrifice, and knowledge of God rather than holocausts” (Hosea 6:6). However, like statements of other prophets discussed in this chapter, Hosea affirms love as the object of God’s will, and love as the indispensable prerequisite of any acceptable animal or cereal sacrifice. Amos likewise prophesies YHWH’s word of displeasure toward sacrifice for the sake of sacrifice, unless accompanied by justice:

---

138 Here the NAB follows the MT and translates חסד as love.
I hate, I spurn your feasts, I take no pleasure in your solemnities; your cereal offerings I will not accept, nor consider your stall-fed peace offerings... But if you would offer me holocausts, then let justice surge like water, and goodness like an unfailing stream. Did you bring me sacrifices and offerings for forty years in the desert, O house of Israel? (Amos 5:22-25)

Micah also asserts YHWH’s disinterest in material sacrifice, and his aversion toward animal and cereal sacrificial compensation for sin, unaccompanied by goodness. Instead, Micah exclaims, “You have been told, O man, what is good, and what the Lord required of you: only to do the right and to love goodness, and to walk humbly with your God” (Mic 6:6-8.)

This prophetic literature reflects the belief within ancient Israel that true dedication to Torah is sincere, interior devotion to God and his commandments. True dedication to Torah, then, is an interior righteousness, an authentic righteousness. In the Old Testament, interior uprightness or righteousness—a virtue or quality describing Simeon—is linked to opposition to decalogic violations. For example, Hos 4:1b-2a:

“There is no fidelity, no mercy, no knowledge of God in the land. False swearing, lying, murder, stealing and adultery!” In another example, Jer 7:3, 9-10a adds the violation of idolatry: “Thus says the Lord of hosts, the God of Israel: Reform your ways and your deeds, so that I may remain with you in this place...Are you to steal and murder,

---

This question may refer to the provisional nature of the Mosaic law, required by YHWH and understood by the Israelites as a prescriptive, practical supplement, in general, to the “Ten Words” following the golden calf incident. Cf. Jer 7:21-23: When YHWH libertated the Israelites and brought them out of the land of Egypt, he “gave them no command concerning holocaust or sacrifice”; rather, he commanded them to listen to his voice. This is a reference to the Decalogue and the interior disposition of faithful love required for the covenantal relationship. Narratively, Mosaic law followed this; it was not immediately required.
commit adultery and perjury, burn incense to Baal, go after strange gods that you know not, and yet come to stand before me in this house which bears my name...?" In the Book of Isaiah, the Israelite’s pursuit of righteousness in Isa 51:1 introduces the pericope of Isa 51:1-7. In this pericope, righteousness is meant as more than just keeping the commandments; rather, it is interior obedience to νόμος. Isa 51:7 parallels Isa 51:1:

1 Listen to me, you who pursue justice/righteousness (τὸ δίκαιον/צדק),140 who seek the Lord;

7 Hear me, you who know justice/righteousness (κρίσις/צדק),141 you people who have my teaching (νόμος/תורה) at heart:

Isaiah’s identification of righteousness (v. 1, LXX and MT) with keeping the νόμος or Torah at heart (v. 7) is apparent. We also see this identification in Isa 1, in which the content of νόμος is disclosed both generally and by implication among violators of νόμος—among those rejecting righteousness—in a similar way that we see in Hosea and Jeremiah above. The difference between the examples of Hosea and

140 “Righteousness,” or “loyalty to that which is right,” in vv. 1 and 7 is a more precise translation of צדק than is “justice,” the translated word of the NAB. However, concerning the LXX—albeit a translation of the MT—“justice” probably is the best translation of τὸ δίκαιον. See the following: Chapter Three of this dissertation; Lust, A Greek – English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part I: A-I, 115; and Koehler, The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament 3:1005.

141 The parallelism between righteousness, and fidelity to νόμος, is found in the two lines, v. 1 and v. 7; parallelism between righteousness and fidelity to νόμος also occurs with the bicolon of v. 7 in the MT, but not in the LXX. This could indicate that, as Olley suggests (‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 101), the translator substitutes the word κρίσιν for the MT equivalent δικαιοσύνη to encourage Israel to persevere in obedience to νόμος among the nations, for God will show that Israel is in the right and that resistance to νόμος incurs God’s judgment and justice. Olley bolsters his view by comparing Isa 51:14 and 23 to demonstrate the dual emphasis of salvation and judgment in Isa 51. In addition, I think that the translator emphasizes—because of persecution (51:7-8)—the double-edged sword of νόμος, i.e., νόμος as an agent of salvation/an agent of judgment.
Jeremiah cited above, and Isaiah, is that in Isaiah righteousness specifically is contrasted to these decalogic violations. For example, in Isa 1:10, 16-17a, 19-21, 23, 25-26, Isaiah exclaims:

Hear the word of the Lord, princes of Sodom! Listen to the instruction (νόμος/תור) of our God...Put away your misdeeds...learn to do good...If you are willing, and obey, you shall eat the good things of the land; but if you refuse and resist, the sword shall consume you...How has she turned to adulteress, the faithful city, so upright! Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη/צדק) used to lodge within her, but now, murderers...Your princes are rebels and comrades of thieves...I will turn my hand against you, and refine your dross in the furnace...I will restore your judges as at first...after that you shall be called city of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη/צדק), faithful city!

From this text, murdering and stealing—two direct violations of YHWH’s commandments—emerge. Idolatry, the other violation mentioned in the above selection, is condemned also later in Isaiah 2 (e.g., Isa 2:8, 18). Moreover, Jerusalem’s adultery, i.e., idolatry, naturally evokes recall of the commandment prohibiting adultery. Citations of commandment violations emerge elsewhere in Isaiah, e.g., sorcery (idolatry), adultery, lust, child sacrifice (murder) and avarice (Isa 57:3-5, 17).

Conversely, commandment fidelity also is cited, e.g., keeping the Sabbath and loving the Lord’s name (Isa 56:4, 6). The content of Isa 2 suggests, therefore, that νόμος consists of the commandments of the Decalogue and the implications of covenant fidelity (e.g., seeking justice and goodness) relative to them. Walter Eichrodt observes that Isaiah subtly affirms the Sinai covenant; Isaiah presupposes this covenant by disclosing

---

142 In these verses from Isa 1, the NAB translates the MT כּוֹדֵס as “justice.”
YHWH’s condemnation of corrupt Israel society as well as his promise of a new beginning for Israel.\textsuperscript{143} Eichrodt’s observation supports the contention that the Decalogue was important to aspects of Isaian prophecy, accommodates Harner’s perspective on the dual themes of grace and Sinaic law in Isaiah, and lends credence to the significance of a new exodus motif in Isaiah.

Jesus’ teaching in Luke, as well as in the other Gospels, follows in and builds on this biblical tradition. Simeon’s inner-driven righteousness validates and points to this teaching, first disclosed in seminal and prophetic form in Luke 2:32. Later, in the narrative of the Gospel of Luke, the adult Jesus will preach and teach it to restore the true meaning of righteousness, the foundational and substantial meaning of νόμος. Luke’s portrayal of this prophetic function of Jesus’ messiahship, as teacher and promulgator of νόμος, is consonant with Isaian traditions of messiahship in Israel both just prior to and closely following Lukan authorship.

An example of the former that I will discuss in Part Four of this chapter is a Dead Sea Scroll fragment, and an example of the latter is Chilton’s treatment of the relationship of the Messiah to Torah in the Isaiah Targum. I will address this in Part Five. As with the Targum Isaiah-Lukan connection, several scholars have related Isaian

\textsuperscript{143} John J. Schmitt, \textit{Isaiah and His Interpreters} (New York: Paulist Press, 1986), 90-91. Eichrodt contends that, in general, the prophets of the Old Testament presupposed the validity of Mosaic law, alluded to the Decalogue and Sinai covenant, but emphasized the importance of interior covenant fidelity to YHWH—the gracious covenant initiator—and of relationship with him which undergirded the purpose of the Decalogue. Isaiah, in particular, highlights the sovereignty of YHWH, to which the concept of covenant leads. The prophetic message and criticism reflected a primarily religious, not ethical, orientation, and this is why the categorical imperative of Mosaic law is not explicated. Walther Eichrodt, \textit{Theology of the Old Testament} (Trans. J. A. Baker; vol. 1; Philadelphia: The Westminster Press, 1961), 36-37, 51-52,

Some of these scholars, two of whom I will cite when discussing the fragment, are Brown, James Charlesworth, John Collins, Oscar Cullman, Litwak, Pao, Strauss, and Geza Vermes.\(^{144}\)

In Luke 2:25a-29, we see the instructive and driving force of the Holy Spirit upon Simeon in the prelude to the beginning of the Nunc Dimittis, and we note the final explicit reference to νόμος (v. 27). “The custom of the law” (τὸ εἰθυσμένον τοῦ νόμου) refers to the consecration of Jesus, not the purification of Mary, because of “in regard to him” (περὶ αὐτοῦ) that follows. The Holy Spirit’s presence with Simeon and the revelation given to him within the Presentation pericope legitimizes his role, representation, and message. Also, the action of the Holy Spirit upon Simeon prefigures the work of the Holy Spirit in Acts upon the disciples of Jesus through their proclamation of obedience to God and his νόμος (e.g., Acts 4:19-20, 7:53, 23:3-5), their prophecy, and their witness to Jesus as the Christ.

Luke’s reference to the object of the revelation, the Messiah of the Lord, is Jesus. Seen in the light of Luke 1:32-33 and 2:11, Jesus is the Davidic Messiah:\(^{145}\) “He will be

---


great and will be called Son of the Most High, and the Lord God will give him the
throne of David his father, and he will rule over the house of Jacob forever, and of his
kingdom there will be no end “(Luke 1:32-33)...“For today in the city of David a savior
has been born for you who is Messiah and Lord” (Luke 2:11). Part Four of this chapter
will explore Luke’s portrayal of the Davidic messiahship of Jesus as a crucial link for
understanding the explicit and allusive roles of νόμος in the Presentation pericope.

In Luke 2:27-29, Simeon enters the temple in the Spirit. As he is about to perform
the custom of the law in regard to the child Jesus, he takes Jesus into his arms and
“blessed God.” Simeon’s request to God, “you may let your servant go in peace,
according to your word,” echoes Genesis 15:15—“You[Abram], however, shall join your
forefathers in peace,” and Genesis 46:30—“At last I [Israel] can die, now that I have seen
for myself that Joseph is still alive.” In this request, Luke portrays Simeon’s trust in and
gratitude for God’s word.

Following this section, and v. 27 in particular, νόμος no longer appears on the
surface of the Presentation pericope. However, we will see that Luke, in the next three
verses of this pericope, will highlight the role of νόμος through allusion.


In this study thus far, I have identified intertextual echoes resonating through the
Presentation pericope. In verses 30-32—a unit within the Nunc Dimittis—Luke
masterfully draws from the Old Testament more so than ever to accentuate this narrative climax of the Presentation. Simeon, in addition to foreshadowing the drama in Acts,\textsuperscript{146} prophesies the restoration and fulfillment of Israel. “For my eyes have seen your salvation” (ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ μου τὸ σωτηρίον σου) alludes to several passages. In Job 19:25-27 and 42:5, Job proclaims that he himself shall see God with his own eyes; and later in the narrative, states that he has even seen him:\textsuperscript{147}

But as for me, I know that my Vindicator lives, and that he will at last stand forth upon the dust; whom I myself shall see: my own eyes (ἐὼφακεν),\textsuperscript{148} not another’s, shall behold him, and from my flesh I shall see God; my inmost being is consumed with longing. (Job 19:25-27)

I had heard you by word of mouth, but now my eye has seen you (νυνι δὲ ὁ ὀφθαλμός μου ἑώρακε σε). (Job 42:5)

Luke 2:30 parallels these verses in Job in certain key words, albeit not many, and also parallels them in exclamatory tone. For this reason, I think Luke 2:30 alludes to—more than echoes—Job 19:25-27 and perhaps 42:5.\textsuperscript{149} In other words, this is a recognizable thought-connection in which wording contributes to this connection. Although in the Presentation pericope Simeon hardly experiences the moral and spiritual crisis and suffering that Job does, narrators of both books depict the longing


\textsuperscript{147} Scholars have debated extensively over Job 19:25-27. This passage has textual variants between the LXX and MT, and within both as well. All variants are consistent regarding the allusions under consideration, however.

\textsuperscript{148} The LXX referred to here, in contrast to the NAB, is translated, “which my eye has seen.”

\textsuperscript{149} See p. 20. An allusion incorporates more words from a certain part in the former text than an echo; an allusion borrows more from the precursor text. By contrast, an echo does not depend on wording for transumption to take place.
and then awe of seeing the God-redeemer (ἀλέναος ἐστιν ὁ ἐκλύειν με μέλλων/ יְהֹוָה), face to face. This recognizable thought-connection, with certain word parallelism and similarity, marks it as an allusion.

Luke 2:31, “which you prepared in sight of all the peoples” (ὅ ἡτοίμασας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαῶν), alludes to Isa 40:5, and 52:10. These verses contain the prophecy that the salvation and glory of the Lord shall be revealed and seen by all people: “Then the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all mankind shall see it together (καὶ ὁφεται πᾶσα σαφεῖ, τὸ σωτηρίου τοῦ θεοῦ); for the mouth of the Lord has spoken” (Isa 40:5), and “The Lord has bared his holy arm in the sight of all the nations (ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν); all the ends of the earth will behold the salvation of our God (τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ) (Isa 52:10). Isa 52:10 is the object of the allusion of Luke 2:30-31.

Luke 2:30-31 also alludes to Pss 67:3 and 98:2-3. These Psalm verses supply in Luke additional intertextual depth about God’s saving power among all the nations: “So may your way be known upon the earth; among all nations, your salvation” (67:3), and “The Lord has made his salvation known: in the sight of the nations he has revealed his justice. He has remembered his kindness and his faithfulness toward the house of Israel. All the ends of the earth have seen the salvation by our God” (98:2-3).

In Luke 2:30, τὸ σωτηρίου σου alludes not only to proclamations and prophecies of YHWH’s deeds, but also recalls κέρας σωτηρίας ἐν οἴκῳ Δαυίδ (“a horn of

---

150 Although the Greek wording does not correspond to the Hebrew, both affirm the certainty that God will deliver/redeem.
salvation...in the house of David”) in Luke 1:69. Strauss suggests, along with others, that Luke’s “use of the neuter adjective σωτήριον (cf. Isa. 40.5) instead of the feminine noun σωτηρία may serve to emphasize that it is not just the salvation but the salvation-bringer himself who is in view.”

The salvation presented in person that is evoked in Job and implied in Luke, i.e., the salvation upon which Simeon is gazing, is none other than the child Jesus. Litwak concurs with Noland on Simeon’s statement: salvation is embodied in Jesus the Messiah.

Luke 2:32 φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνων καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ — the focal point of this dissertation— alludes to and echoes several verses in Isaiah. Isa 42:1-4, 6 identifies the Servant of YHWH as the covenant of the people and light for the nations:

Here is my servant whom I uphold, my chosen one with whom I am pleased, upon whom I have put my spirit; he shall bring forth justice to the nations...the coastlands will wait for his teaching (καὶ ἐπὶ τῷ νόμῳ αὐτοῦ ἔθνη ἐλπιοῦσιν/νόματι Ἰσραήλ)¹⁵³...I have grasped you by the hand...and set you as a covenant

¹⁵³ The Septuagintal reading here—as in all LXX of Isaiah citations in this study—is found in Ziegler’s Göttingen edition of Isaias. Brenton and Rahlfs render the same reading with a substitution: ονόματι in place of νόμω. Although I think (as Ziegler) that νόμω is the better contextual fit, and matches the MT, the alternate reading may have emerged at first from an ambiguous reading off a mutilated text—the two words are spelled similarly, and a scribal move may have opted for ονόματι. Although the Gospel of Matthew (12:21) quotes Isaiah 40:4 in this way, I do not think Matthew or a related tradition deliberately replaced νόμω with ονόματι to Christologize the text. The development of the alternate reading with ονόματι probably preceded Gospel formation, and “name” theology during the earlier intertestamental period may have engendered this development. Name theology refers to the development of “reverence for the divine name,” the turning point of which occurred during the exile. See, for example, William M. Schniedewind, “The Evolution of Name Theology,” in The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph Klein (eds. Matt Graham, Steven McKenzie, Gary Knoppers; London: Continuum, 2003), 228-239. However, despite significant Christological implications, as well, of Ziegler’s rendering of νόμως, Matthew may have selected the ονόματι textual interpretation to underscore the authority of the servant of YHWH in Isaiah. Underscoring this authority also is
of the people, a light for the nations (εἰς διαθήκην γένους, εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν/לברית גויים)... 

For Simeon, then, the Servant and Davidic Messiah are the same. We see this Lukan/Isaian connection of the Davidic Messiah to the Servant in other ways. For example, Isa 52:10—the object of the allusion of Luke 2:30-31, in which Simeon views the Davidic Messiah as salvation in person—just precedes and prepares for Isa 52:13, the introduction to the suffering Servant pericope. This suggests that Luke may again have had this connection in mind.

Luke 2:32 continues Simeon’s prophecy about Jesus, that he will be “a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and glory for your people Israel.” This verse alludes to Isa 42:6 above—the Servant will be “a light for the nations,” and to Isa 46:13 and 49:6: “I will put salvation within Zion, and give to Israel my glory” (δόξασμα/תפארה) (Isa 46:13); “Is it too little, he says, for you to be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and restore the survivors of Israel? I will make you a light to the nations (εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν/לאור גויים) that my salvation may reach to the ends of the earth” (Isa 49:6).

consonant with a subtle but apparent Septuagintal emphasis against idolatry in Isa 42:1-4 within an anti-idolatry context found in the MT of Isaiah as well. See Pao, Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus, 181-193. The Septuagintal Isaian emphasis against idolatry is further bolstered by the translator. He adds to the MT in 42:4 by inserting “he shall shine out” ἀναλάμψει in reference to the Servant Messiah as light, or νόμος: the first commandment of νόμος is the prohibition of idolatry. Thus, we see in the LXX of Isaiah a slight accentuation on the Servant Messiah as νόμος in person.  

154 Δόξασμα is a semitism: Lust, A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Part 1, 120; Hatch, Concordance to the Septuagint, 344; Koehler, The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, 4:1772-73, on the nuanced meaning of glory as “honor.”  

155 Against codex Alexandrinus and MT, and favoring codex Sinaiticus, Brenton and Rahlfs insert εἰς διαθήκην γένους immediately preceding εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν. Divergences within Septuagintal Isaiah typically stem from two streams of tradition: “Der griech. Is.-Text ist durchgehend in zwei
In Isa 46:13, “I will...give Israel my glory,” is the object of the allusion in Luke 2:32b, “and glory for your people Israel.” Isa 46:13 already contains the element of salvation, as seen above: this element bridges the introduction of Simeon’s prophecy in Luke 2:30-31 to the other part of Simeon’s prophecy in Luke 2:32a: “a light for revelation to the Gentiles,” which alludes to Isa 49:6. Here, as “a light to the nations,” the Servant raises up and restores “the tribes of Jacob...the survivors of Israel.” YHWH makes the Servant “a light to the nations,” that his “salvation may reach to the ends of the earth.” Thus, the element of salvation in Isa 49:13 reinforces the relation of Luke 2:30-31 to Luke 2:32.

The twelve tribes of “Israel,” not Judah and Benjamin alone, are the visible object of the restoration. This is dependent on and accompanies the internal restoration of heeding the Servant’s voice, of being attentive to νόμος in one’s heart: “Who among you fears the Lord, heeds his servant’s voice” (ἀκούσατω τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ ισραήλ αὐτοῦ/σώματος (Isa 50:10); “Be attentive to me, my people; my folk, give ear to me. For law (νόμος/θαῦμα) shall go forth from my presence, and my judgment, as the light of the peoples (φῶς ἐθνῶν/עמים/לעורים)...Hear me, you who know righteousness, you people who have my teaching (ὁ νόμος μου/תקני/heart) at heart” (Isa 51:4, 7). The prophecy...
of raising up and reuniting the twelve tribes is astounding, for the Assyrians
substantially dispersed the ten northern tribes and absorbed them into Assyria and other
lands.\(^{158}\)

The restoration of Israel is accomplished, then, in the fulfillment of the
prophecies of the Servant being made “a light to the nations,” that God’s salvation may
reach “the ends of the earth.”\(^{159}\) In doing so, the Servant’s teaching and redemption (cf.
Isa 53:10-12) will extend to and reach the descendents of the dispersed ten northern
tribes. In this light emanating from Zion, the Davidic Messiah will restore and unite all
of YHWH’s people. In the next chapter I will discuss the indispensable role of νόμος in
accomplishing both the restoration and fulfillment of Israel, as depicted in the
Septuagintal Isaiah. Below, in the following, I will discuss the relation between νόμος
and God’s glory, light, temple, and, of course, Jesus, the main subject of the Presentation
narrative. The role of νόμος in accomplishing both the restoration and fulfillment of
Israel incorporates these elements of the narrative.

Simeon’s prophecy that Jesus will be the “glory” of Israel means—according to
the Isaian intercontext which informs Luke’s narrative—that God and his image will be
present, to all Israel, in Jesus.\(^{160}\) In the Book of Isaiah (e.g., Isa 2:10, 2:19, 2:21), God’s

\(^{158}\) A significant number of Israelites (of the ten northern tribes of Israel) were deported into
Assyria itself. The Israelite population in Galilee was almost obliterated by the Assyrian king,
Tiglath-pileser. Other peoples were not settled in Galilee in this aspect of the deportation, and a
tiny Israelite remnant remained. See K. Lawson Younger, Jr., “Israelites in Exile,” BAR 29, no. 6

\(^{159}\) The first phase of the restoration, however, began with Jesus’ Galilean ministry, e.g., Luke 4:14-
15.

\(^{160}\) I refer here to “glory” in a traditionally interpreted and Isaian sense, i.e., the mystery of the
appearance of God’s image. For a use of its meaning, and a discussion of its ambiguity, see Carol
glory (δόξα/הלָּדוֹת) is an aspect of his majesty or power (יִסְכֻּ֣ךְ/גאֵנוֹ).

God’s glory is the divine disclosure of his presence:

In the year King Uzziah died, I saw the Lord seated on a high and lofty throne, with the train of his garment filling the temple. Seraphim were stationed above; each of them had six wings: with two they veiled their faces, with two they veiled their feet, and with two they hovered aloft. “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of hosts!” they cried to the other. “All the earth is filled with his glory (δόξα/حسب)!” At the sound of that cry, the frame of the door shook and the house was filled with smoke. (Isa 6:1-3)

The temple is holy, and is significant in its holiness, especially because it contains and manifests the disclosure of God’s presence—his glory. Concretely, the temple is the base of God’s throne. However, as the narrative of Isaiah asserts through the seraphim, God’s glory fills not only the temple but the whole earth.

God’s glory is seen:

The desert and the parched land will exult; the steppe will rejoice and bloom. They will bloom with abundant flowers, and rejoice with joyful song. The glory (δόξα/حسب) of Lebanon will be given to them, the splendor (τιμή/דר) of Carmel


161 The Septuagintal translator of Isaiah uses the word ἰσχύς; the Masoretic word in the same place is גאֵנוֹ. I propose three different explanations for this occurrence: A) the translator was translating from a different Hebraic Isaiah text than that from which the MT was translated; B) The LXX word that matches גאֵנוֹ the best according to its primary meaning is μεγαλειότης or μεγαλωσύνη; the translator was unaware of the primary meaning of גאֵנוֹ, majesty, and instead translated from its secondary meaning, power; and C) for theological reasons, the translator wished to emphasize the secondary meaning of גאֵנוֹ—might or power—and therefore used the word ἰσχύς. Based on the probability of a proto-Masoretic source, and the depth of the translator’s vocabulary, I think “C” is most likely.
and Sharon; they will see the glory (δόξα/כבוד) of the Lord, the splendor (ὕψος/הדר) of our God. (Isa 35:1-2)

I come to gather nations of every language; they shall come and see my glory (δόξα/כבוד). (Isa 66:18)

Other significant narratives within the Old Testament also share the Isaian insight of God’s glory and its relation to the temple. For example, in Exodus and I Kings, God’s glory reveals his special presence and discloses the function of the tent or the temple built as the abode of his glory. In the narrative of Exod 33:7-23, Moses pitched the “tent of meeting” outside the camp. Those who consulted YHWH went to this meeting tent. When Moses approached it, the people would rise and remain at the entrance of their own tents. As Moses went into the tent of meeting, the “pillar of cloud” descended upon its entrance, while YHWH spoke to Moses “face to face.” When Moses returned to the camp, Joshua would keep to his post at the meeting tent.

Regarding the reason for God’s abode within the tent, Exod 25:22 specifies that God’s meeting place with Moses, and the location where God would tell Moses all the commands he wished to give the Israelites, was on the Ark of the Ten Commandments of the Covenant. Specifically, God’s glory hovered above the propitiatory and between the two cherubim. 1 Kings 8:9 also asserts that the Ark contained the stone tablets Moses had put there when the Lord made a covenant with the Israelites at Horeb. God’s glory and the Ark of the Ten Commandments of the Covenant were temporally and theologically related.
During Moses’s conversations with YHWH, Moses inquired of the ways of the Lord, and asked God about assistance in leading his people onward. Moses queried, “You have said, ’You are my intimate friend,’ and also, ’You have found favor with me.’ Now, if I have found favor with you, do let me know your ways so that, in knowing you, I may continue to find favor with you. Then too, this nation is, after all, your own people” (Exod 33:12-13). YHWH answered, “I myself will go along, to give you rest” (Exod 33:14). Moses responded to God by insisting that, to demonstrate divine favor upon them among other nations on earth, the Lord must accompany the Israelites on the way to “the land flowing with milk and honey” (Exod 33:3). YHWH granted Moses’s request because the Lord favored him, considering Moses his intimate friend. Moses then pleaded, “Do let me see your glory (δόξα/ךֵּבָדך)!” (Exod 33:18). God answered, “I will make all my beauty (δόξα/תוב) pass before you,” and in your presence I will pronounce my name, ‘Lord’” (Κύριος/יהוה) (Exod 33:18-19). YHWH showed favor upon Moses, but would not allow him to see his face, lest Moses die. Then God explained to Moses how he would protect him when his glory passed by so that Moses would see his back, but be shielded from seeing his face.

This narrative discloses a key connection between the tent of meeting, knowledge of God’s ways and the words of YHWH—the Decalogue—and God’s mysterious presence manifested by his glory. The tent of meeting provided physical access to the divine presence, hovering over the tablets within the Ark of the Covenant.

162 Most likely, the LXX translated the Hebrew תוב, meaning goodness or beauty, as δόξα to render a parallel response to Moses’s exclamation, “Do let me see your glory!”
Within the tent, the column of cloud represented the presence of YHWH, from which his glory passed—in I Kings 8:10-13, the cloud and God’s glory are the same, and it is within the cloud that the Lord dwells. Yet, in addition, in Exod 33:12-13, God’s intimacy with Moses is demonstrated by communicating divine knowledge of his ways; this is done from the propitiary of the Ark containing the tablets of “these words.” Thus, the words, or radical Torah of YHWH, are inextricably linked to the ways or knowledge of God. And God’s knowledge is, in some mysterious sense, related or equivalent to the inner reality of his glory. Hence, the ultimate significance of the tent of meeting, or later the temple, relates to the Torah of the words of YHWH.

The narrative in 1 Kings 9:1-9 makes a similar point. In it, after Solomon finished building the temple, the Lord appeared to him again, as he had in Gibeon. He assured Solomon that he had consecrated the temple, that his “eyes” and “heart” would be there always, and that Solomon would live in his presence if he lived as his father David did—sincerely and uprightly—doing just as the Lord commanded. YHWH reiterated his covenantal promise to David, that he established David’s throne of sovereignty forever, when he promised David, “You shall always have someone from your line on the throne of Israel” (1 Kings 9:5). Then God warned Solomon that disobedience to his commandments and statutes, and proceeding “to venerate and worship strange gods,” a reference to the first commandment, would result in disaster: YHWH would cut off Israel from the land, repudiate the temple, which then would become “a heap of ruins” (1 Kings 9:8). In this potential scenario, every passerby would ask in amazement how the Lord could have done this: “Men will answer, ‘They forsook the Lord, their God,
who brought their fathers out of the land of Egypt; they adopted strange gods which they worshiped and served. That is why the Lord has brought down upon them all this evil” (1 Kings 9:9).

Again, as in Exodus 33, 1 Kings 9 associates YHWH’s presence and glory to the temple in relation to the commandments—the Torah. 1 Kings 9, however, stresses obedience to Torah: Solomon is no Moses, and we know the hypothetical narrative scenario in 1 Kings 9 became reality, particularly as we know that Solomon, later in his reign, began to worship strange gods in dramatic fashion.

In Isaiah, in addition to the splendorous and visible characteristics of God’s glory, the δόξα shines through the child born to Israel, the God-hero and eternal successor of David’s throne, for the sake of God’s people. The context from which Isaiah speaks is the gloom and despair of Assyrian invasion in the north and the irreparable damage of sin and atrophy of goodness among Israelites (e.g., Isa 1:16-20, 3:13-14, 6:8-13). In contrast to such despair, Isaiah speaks the word of YHWH:

The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; upon those who dwelt in the land of gloom a light has shone...For a child is born to us, a son is given us; upon his shoulder dominion rests. They name him Wonder-Counselor, God-Hero, Father-Forever, Prince of Peace. His dominion is vast and forever peaceful, from David’s throne, and over his kingdom, which he confirms and sustains by judgment and justice, both now and forever. The zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this! (Isa 9:1, 5-6)

Likewise, the δόξα shines through the chosen one, YHWH’s Servant—a greater than Cyrus. And the glory shines within him, and upon those who live in darkness, as he begins to speak to the world about his mission to restore the tribes of Israel and save
the Gentiles: “I, the Lord, have called you for the victory of justice...and set you as a
covenant of the people, a light for the nations (εἰς φῶς ἔστην ἡ γῆ
καὶ οἱ ἔθνη), to open the eyes of the blind, to bring out prisoners from confinement, and from the dungeon, those who
live in darkness” (Isa 42:6-7). Isa 49:3, 5-6—the next Isaiah Servant passage—discloses
more about the relation between the Servant and God’s glory. Note the three references
to glory and light:

You are my servant, he said to me, Israel, through whom I show my glory
(ἐν σοι δοξασθήσομαι/אתפאר בך)164...For now the Lord has spoken who formed
me as his servant from the womb, that Jacob may be brought back to him; and I
am made glorious (δοξασθήσομαι/ואכבד) in the sight of the Lord,165 and my God
is now my strength! Is it too little, he says, for you to be my servant, to raise up
the tribes of Jacob, and restore the survivors of Israel; I will make you a light to
the nations (εἰς φῶς ἔστην ἡ γῆ/לאור גויים), that my salvation may reach to the ends of
the earth. (Isa 49:3, 5-6)

As the light to the nations, Isaiah discloses in Isa 55:3-5 that the Servant is the
Davidic Messiah:

Give ear and come to me; hear me, that your soul may live. I will make an
everlasting covenant with you—the faithful promises of David (τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ
tὰ πιστά/הנאמנים דוד חסדי).166 See (ἰδοὺ/דו), I have made him a witness to the

---

163 Here, as in various places throughout this dissertation, certain verses and pericopes are
repeated, though for different reasons.
164 ἐν σοι δοξασθῇσομαι—in you I will be glorified: passive, first person singular, future
indictative. ἡ γῆ/אתפאר—in (or through) whom I will glorify myself: Hitpa‘el, first person singular,
imperfect.
165 ואכבד—for (or and) I am honored (or glorified): Nif’al, first person singular, imperfect, Waw
Conversive.
166 The faithful “holy things” (LXX) or “mercies” (MT) are the promises of David. The preceding
reference to covenant, and its messianic implications, support this interpretation. See, for
example, 2 Sam 7:8-16, 23:5, and Ps 89:28-38. The Greek and Hebrew of “the faithful promises of
peoples, and leader and commander of the peoples. Surely (הנ) you will summon nations you know not, and nations that do not know you will hasten to you, because of YHWH your God, the Holy One of Israel, for he has endowed you with splendor.  

Not all scholars refer to Isaiah 55:3-5 as an individual (as opposed to collective) Servant of God passage. For example, Walter Brueggemann presupposes the involvement of a Davidic agent. However, Brueggemann emphasizes in these verses the role that Israel the nation plays covenantally and politically in its superordinance to other nations that will rely upon Israel and look to it in its exemplary relationship with YHWH. Claus Westermann views corporate Israel, i.e., Israel the nation, as the witness, leader, commander of peoples, the one who summons nations, the one to whom nations haste, and the one endowed by YHWH with splendor. This is because, in Westermann’s interpretation, following his mentor, von Rad, the promises made to David are to be realized in Israel. E. Power, however, argues that David—not collective Israel or an individual Messiah—is the “witness to the peoples, and leader and commander of nations” (Isa 55:4), and is the person addressed in the second person singular in Isa 55:5. The blessings or gifts of David, Power contends, are defined

---

David” express a genitival relationship understood from the context in Greek (with the indeclinable “David”) and from the construct state in the Hebrew.  

167 The NAB translation of Isa 55:3-5 is atypically weak; instead, I have used the NIV for this passage, except for my insertion in 55:5 of “YHWH” in place of the NIV’s “Lord,” and “the faithful promises to David” in place of “my faithful love promised to David.”  


according to Ps 18:44 (or Ps 17:43-45, LXX), and from its context immediately following, 18:45-46:170

You rescued me from the strife of peoples; you made me head over nations. A people I had not known became my slaves; as soon as they heard of me they obeyed. Foreigners cringed before me; their courage failed; they came trembling from their fortresses. (Ps 18:44-46)

However, contends Klaus Koch, the majority of scholars interpret the Servant of God as an individual, and not only in Isa 55:3-5: the view of the Servant of God as collective Israel fails to explain the sharper individual features of the Servant liturgies, and—the reason that I proffered earlier—fails to explain that the Servant is entrusted with an action affecting Israel. That is, the Servant is entrusted with liberating the exiles and restoring anew the Twelve Tribes as an association.171 Koch argues for a kingly Servant from the line of David, i.e., a Davidic kingly Messiah.172 Young argues likewise.173

Perhaps most notably, because of the nature of this study, first century Luke also understands the issue of the question of the identity of the Servant of YHWH (cf. Acts 8:26 ff.), and affirms the individual, messianic interpretation within Isa 53:174 “corporate

---

172 Ibid., 145.
Israel” is not an option. Moreover—in reference to Isa 55:3-5—Luke implies in Acts 13:34, in a quotation of the LXX of Isaiah 55:3, that the Servant is the Davidic Holy One, namely, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus, in quoting Isa 53:12 in Luke 22:37, identifies himself with the suffering Servant of YHWH: “For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in me, namely, ‘He was counted among the wicked.’” And, in Luke 24:26, Jesus identifies himself as the Messiah, and seems to identify himself by function as the suffering Servant as well: “Was it not necessary that the Messiah should suffer these things and enter into his glory?”

Young eliminates the interpretation of Isa 55:3-5 that identifies David as the unnamed, great leader of the nations, for the following reasons. First, the introductory “see” or “behold” (ἰδοὺ/הָן) usually is futuristic. Second, it is unusual to refer to David at a point in the passage where the implications of the covenantal promises made to David—directed toward the future after David’s literal reign—are highlighted. Third, the description does not seem to apply accurately to the historical David. Fourth, in accord with Luke’s interpretation in Acts 13:34, the context seems to require an interpretation related to the object of the promises made to David: the pronominal object (in Greek) or pronominal suffix (in Hebrew) to “I have made” in verse 4 seems to refer to the promises of David, i.e., the Messiah, and in the following verse it is this promise, or Messiah, who acts and calls upon the nations.

shows us that in the first century Jesus explicitly was identified with the Isaian Servant of YHWH. On the exclusive distinction between the corporate servant and an individual Servant Messiah, as portrayed in Isaiah, see p. 141.
In addition to Young’s arguments, the interpretation that David is the unnamed great leader is inconsistent with the very reason Power proffers this position, namely, that Ps 18:44-46 defines the meaning of the promises of David in Isa 55:3. Ps 18:44-46 undoubtedly is an intended allusion, but only to show both the similarity and distinction between the action of the “promise” of David and of David himself. In Ps 18:44-46, David’s subjugated peoples failed in their strife against him; then, from their fortresses, they cringed before David, trembled in fear, and obeyed—or feigned obedience (ὗιοι ἀλλότριοι ἐψεύσαντο μοι), according to Ps 17:45, LXX. In Isa 55:3-5, strife, fear, and subjugation are absent, and the nations make haste to the witness and leader. In addition, this pericope ends in a way similar to the Servant song of Isa 49:

When kings see you, they shall stand up, and princes shall prostrate themselves because of the Lord [YHWH] who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel who has chosen you. (Isa 49:7)

The example above of the Servant song, or the references to the Servant as light to the nations (Isa 42:6, 49:6, 50:10 in conjunction with 51:4) or the nations awaiting his teaching (Isa 42:4, 50:10 in conjunction with Isa 51:4-5), form a connection to Isa 55:3-5. These references even further help us identify the unnamed witness and leader of the nations as the Servant of YHWH himself, who also is the heir to the throne of David—the great promise of David. In the history of interpretation in Christian literature, this position of identifying the unnamed leader of Isa 55 as the Davidic Servant Messiah first
was proposed by Tertullian, and then Leo the Great.\textsuperscript{176} Israel the nation also participates in the everlasting covenant by extension and dependence upon the Servant of YHWH, but is not, per se, the designated witness and commander of the nations delineated in Isa 55:3-5. However, certain personal characteristics of the individual Servant depicted in various Servant of YHWH pericopes relate well to corporate Israel. These characteristics include the ideal obedience to which the Servant is called, and the glory of the Servant, emanating from the temple within Zion, such that the Servant also may be viewed as Israel in person.

Nevertheless, certain Isaian pericopes may seem to suggest that the term “servant,” in reference to Israel, is best understood as corporate Israel, e.g., in Isa 41:8-14. In this pericope, Israel is portrayed as a worm in relation to YHWH and to the instrument of his deliverance, Cyrus. In the other Servant passages discussed in this dissertation, the Servant of YHWH always is depicted honorably in relation to YHWH, and without need for personal redemption, unlike the servant’s portrayal in Isa 41:8-14.

The Davidic Messiah, who attracts the nations whom he has not known, i.e., has not possessed intimately as his very own, is therefore the Servant Messiah of Isa 42 and 49\textsuperscript{176}—the “light to the nations/Gentiles.”\textsuperscript{177} How, precisely, are we to understand the


\textsuperscript{176} Because of my contention that the Book of Isaiah, when interpreted as prophetic narrative, depicts the Servant of YHWH as the Davidic Messiah, I will, at points in this dissertation, refer to the Servant of YHWH as the Servant Messiah. Darrell Bock, in \textit{Proclamation From Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology} (JSNTSup 12; Great Britain: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), uses a similar messianic term, i.e., Messiah-Servant, that he believes is the foundational christological category for Luke. See Mark Allan Powell, \textit{What Are They Saying About Luke?} (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 67-68.
Servant Messiah as the light to the Gentiles? Because in Isaiah the light is Torah, and the Servant Messiah is the conduit of Torah and Torah in person, we then can see that the Servant Messiah is this universal light about which Isaiah writes. Isa 2:2-3, 5, within which is Isaiah’s first use of the word “light,” introduces elements of this Isaian portrayal of Torah:

In days to come, the mountain of the Lord’s house shall be established as the highest mountain and raised above the hills. All nations shall stream toward it; many peoples shall come and say: “Come, let us climb the Lord’s mountain, to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may instruct us in his ways (τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτοῦ/דרכיו), and we may walk in his paths (ἐν αὐτῷ/בארחתיו),”178 For from Zion shall go forth instruction (νόμος/תורה), and the word of the Lord (λόγος κυρίου/יהוה ודבר) from Jerusalem…O House of Jacob, let us walk in the light (φωτὶ κυρίου/יהוה באור) of the Lord.

This entire section, Isa 2:1-5, particularly vv. 2-4, is very similar to Micah 4:1-5. Young concisely describes the major positions of interpretation on the origin of Isaiah 2:2-4 in relation to Micah 4:1-5.179 Isa 2:1-5 displays narrative unity within its immediate context, as well as in its apparent agreement with Isa 9:1 and 11:1, and its apparent relation to 11:6ff., 32:1-4, and 51:4-5.180 The narrative unity of Isa 2:1-5 supports the plausibility of the position, among others discussed by Young, which contends that the

---

177 This, of course, presupposes the narrative unity of the entire Book of Isaiah, a unity assumed by Luke and the first century A.D. Isaian readership.
178 The Septuagintal translation, πορευσόμεθα ἐν αὐτῇ (“we will walk in it”) suggests that the Hebrew words for way(s) and path(s) were so synonymous and interchangeable that the third person feminine singular pronoun “it” (the antecedent of which is ὁδὸν) sufficed to substitute for “path.”
179 Young, The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-18, 110-113.
180 Ibid., 111.
This dissertation will view Isa 2:1-5 as first century readers would have viewed it—as a prophetic pericope narratively related to the rest of Isaiah.

Given the presupposition above, i.e., narrative unity in first century interpretation of Isaiah, “light” is a metaphor for νόμος in Isa 2, and is applied as this metaphor in other areas of Isaiah where the wording and context are the same or similar (e.g., Isa 42, 49, 51). Isaiah’s use of nominal and clausal apposition are types of Hebraic lexical and grammatical parallelism that include both paradigmatic and syntagmatic elements. In Appendix 3, I lay out Isa 2:1-5 in English translation and in the MT—representing the Hebrew from which the parallelism originated. Below, in the following, I describe Isaiah’s use of apposition that illustrates his metaphorical use of “light.”

As a prelude to these steps, we observe that Isa 2:2 envisions the mountain of the Jerusalem temple—Mount Zion—as the highest mountain to which all nations stream. The temple in its original and ideal condition and status would enshrine the Ark of the Covenant, upon which hovered the glory of God. Thus, God’s glory would illuminate

---

181 Ibid., 94-113.
182 In addition to the use of the word “light,” Isa 2:4, 42:1,3-4 and 51:4 use the terms “judgment” and “justice” in reference to the “nations.”
the temple, a likely assumption considering this perfected and eschatological depiction of Jerusalem.

In the first step of Isaiah’s use of apposition, light in the concluding v. 5 is in apposition to “paths” in the MT, or (in the LXX) to “it,” referring back to “way” (ὁδός, or “ways” in the MT), a synonymous term for paths. Paths and light are coordinated and therefore are in the same case, and a relationship of identity subsists between them.\(^{184}\) They also both agree in determination. We shall infer—as did the Septuagintal Isaian translator—that light is identified with ways also, since ways and paths are synonymous.

The parallelism of this distich—v. 5 line 2 with “light” and v. 3 line 5 with “paths”—is semantically synonymous and grammatically and lexically paradigmatic, in identical predicate form. The parallelism also is emblematic, i.e., metaphorical.\(^{185}\)

Second, in v. 3, “divine instruction” or “Torah” (νόμος) clarifies the meaning of ways and paths with its introduction of כי, and by its illustration of directionality; νόμος, emanating from the glory of the temple, is the path/way. In addition, the “Word of the Lord” also is in apposition to νόμος; both, within the same sentence or thought, proceed from Zion, or Jerusalem. Third, in v. 3 line 4, the “ways” seem to be the source of Torah, implied in this verse in its predicate form. In the representative Hebrew—the MT—ירבד מדרשי נ of means, primarily, “from of”; i.e., that God may instruct us “from”

\(^{184}\) An element of Hebraic apposition is identification between the two nouns. See Joüon, A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew, 477. In general, a noun or noun phrase is in apposition to another noun or noun phrase when it explains it and is parallel to it grammatically. See Gavin Betts, New Testament Greek (Chicago: McGraw-Hill, 2004), X.

\(^{185}\) Berlin, ABD 5:157.
the source of the instruction—from the “ways,” or νόμος/Torah. In addition to suggesting that “ways” is νόμος which provides the instruction, this grammatical construction illustrates God’s initiative and implies that the favorable human response to God—found immediately next in line 5—is to follow in his paths, i.e., divine instruction. In conclusion, Isaiah’s use of apposition in this pericope identifies light with paths, paths with ways, paths and ways with Torah, and therefore Torah with light.

Thus, through appositional technique, Isaiah uses the word light as a metaphor for divine instruction, or νόμος, and we already have seen in this study that Isaiah identifies νόμος with YHWH’s commandments of love. Although scholars generally have overlooked this metaphor, Eichrodt, Olley, and Young are exceptions. Eichrodt recognizes the Isaian symbol: “it is precisely in his role as covenant-mediator that the ‘ebed is to be the ‘light of the Gentiles’ and Yahweh’s law is to shine out from the newly created people of God over the whole world, bringing the nations into voluntary subjection to the divine order revealed in it.”

Olley’s concluding two lines of ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study—a sentence representative of his awareness of this metaphor in the study—is “The interpretation of ‘light’ in terms of ‘law’ is quite evident.” Young cites Isaiah’s use of light as a metaphor for Torah (νόμος) in this Isa 2 pericope by noting that light is associated with “he may instruct” of v.3; this corresponds, particularly, with the third step I mentioned in the depiction above on Isaiah’s use of apposition to define his metaphorical use light.

187 Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 151.
188 Young, The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1-18, 114-115.
By extension, light also is a metaphor for νόμος in Isa 5:20, 24:

Woe to those who call evil good, and good evil, who change darkness into light, and light into darkness...For they have spurned the law of the Lord of hosts, and scorned the word of the Holy One of Israel.

In this pericope, Isa 5:8-24, the prophet reproaches the “men of Judah” for their arrogance and evil, and concludes in summary that their sinful ways are disobedience to Torah (νόμος) and will result in their destruction: “their blossom will scatter like dust” (Isa 5:24). In Isa 5:20 of this passage, YHWH pronounces woe and condemnation upon their moral relativizing; within this pronouncement, Isaiah places light (φῶς) in apposition to “goodness” (καλός). We may naturally assume that goodness in the mindset of an Israelite is equivalent to obedience to Torah; by defining the problem of moral evil, Isa 5:24 validates this assumption, and in so doing, presents light as a metaphor for Torah, i.e., obedience or fidelity to it.

Isa 51:4 also identifies light as a metaphor of νόμος: instruction goes forth “as the light of the peoples.” In addition, “salvation” in “salvation shall go forth” is in apposition to divine instruction (νόμος) in “divine instruction shall go forth.” In Isa 51 of the LXX of Isaiah, the translator again uses the term εἰς φῶς ἑθνῶν: the prophet already has referred to the Servant Messiah as εἰς φῶς ἑθνῶν. Now, in Isa 51:4 and 61:3 (discussed below), Isaiah implies that the Servant Messiah’s radiant glory shines upon and saves the Lord’s people throughout Israel and among the Gentiles:
Who among you fears the Lord, heeds his servant’s voice...Be attentive to me, my people; my folk, give ear to me. For law (divine instruction) shall go forth from my presence, (ὅτι νόμος παρ ἐμοῦ ἔξελεύσεται/ זֶצַא/ נִזְכַּר) and my judgment (καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου/הַכְּרֵיָה), as the light of the peoples (εἰς φῶς ἔθνων)

I will make my justice come speedily; my salvation shall go forth (ἔξελεύσεται τὸ σωτήριόν μου/בש שפטי) [and my arm shall judge the nations]; in me shall the coastlands hope, and my arm they shall await. (Isa 51:4-5)

Isaiah already has identified light as νόμος in Isa 2. Since Isa 2 depicts “judgment” as a consequence of νόμος—“For from Zion shall go forth instruction, and the Word of the Lord from Jerusalem. He shall judge between the nations” (Isa 2:3-4)—we should best interpret καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου as a descriptive effect of or supplement to νόμος, εἰς φῶς ἔθνων. Verse 7 of this pericope in Isa 51 corroborates this interpretation: the object of this message of the Lord is not judgment of the nations, but his faithful people (51:4) who pursue righteousness (51:1)—who have the νόμος of God at heart.

Moreover, as I discussed in footnote 134, the LXX of Isa 51 accentuates the elements of judgment and justice as associated with νόμος: divine instruction will save unless it is rejected; then it will judge and execute justice.

---

189 In the LXX of Isaiah, the translator uses the term εἰς φῶς ἔθνων three times: Isa 42:6, 49:6, and 51:4. Luke’s use of these words in Luke 2:32, as well as so many words and phrases also found in the Septuagint, demonstrates his use of an LXX source or a source reliant on the Septuagint.

190 ἔξελεύσεται ως φῶς το σωτήριόν μου according to Vaticanus; Sinaiticus reads ὡς εἰς φῶς. As I have discussed, I favor Ziegler’s translation over others, such as Rahlfs’s and Brenton’s; in this case, I think Ziegler’s preference for the MT and Alexandrinus reading is likely and that ως φῶς should be omitted. However, if the translator actually added ως φῶς, I think he did so to compare God’s salvation with light, and imply that the νόμος brings salvation. Otherwise, the translation may have been based on a slightly different proto-Masoretic text. Because of the liberty with which the translator uses Greek to express theological perspective, and because of the tangible meaning νόμος conveys and its usage in Isa 2, I think it is likely the translator would have implied (for emphasis), by this grammatical insertion, that νόμος (= God’s ways) brings salvation. See footnote 141 on Olley’s insight and my further commentary on it. According to a less likely translation presented by Ralphs and Brenton, I think the interpretation above on the translator’s emphasis on νόμος as salvation-bringer is all the more probable because Isa 51 portrays νόμος as a double-edged sword of salvation/judgment.
Through carefully crafted and repeated parallelism, in Isa 2, 9, 42, 49, and now 50:10a in its narrative flow with 51, Isaiah also implies that the Servant Messiah εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν not only shines upon the Lord’s people, but is the νόμος itself. In capsule summary, as we have seen, Isa 2 establishes Isaiah’s use of the word light as a metaphor for divine instruction, or νόμος. Isa 9 and 42 present the Servant Messiah as the light to the nations whose νόμος extends, or, in greater congruency with the metaphor, “radiates” to the coastlands and the ends of the earth (42:4, 49:6). In 50:10a and its narrative connection to 51:1 and 51:4, Isaiah illustrates that the Servant Messiah is the source and instrument of Torah, or light to the nations, that must be heard and heeded. The Servant of YHWH—the Servant Messiah—is light, among other things, and light is the divine instruction (νόμος) emanating to the coastlands and nations from the throne of David’s “promise” on Mount Zion. Thus, the Servant Messiah is νόμος in person.

The δόξα also shines not only from the Servant Messiah, but also upon God’s faithful people, represented as Zion, in Isa 60:1-3:

Rise up in splendor! Your light (φῶς/אור) has come, the glory (δόξα/כבוד) of the Lord shines upon you. See, darkness covers the earth, and thick clouds cover the peoples; but upon you the Lord shines, and over you appears his glory (δόξα/כבוד). Nations shall walk by your light, and kings by your shining radiance.

Twice in this passage, “glory” is in apposition to light. This suggests to us that, for Isaiah, glory and light are identical or closely related. We have seen the relationship of these two words in Isa 49:3 and 49:6: “You are my servant, he said to me, Israel,
through whom I show my glory...I will make you a light to the nations.” We also have seen that, for Isaiah, light is a metaphor for νόμος. We can infer, then, that according to the Book of Isaiah, God’s glory must be identical to or closely related to νόμος. Yet God’s glory is visible, and νόμος is not, per se; however, νόμος saves, and the Servant Messiah is νόμος in person. From this also, then, we may infer that, for Isaiah, νόμος is the inner reality of God’s glory. This is all the more apparent, in examining the narrative of Exod 33:7-23, by observing that Moses’s intimate encounter with God’s glory was an encounter especially with knowledge of the “ways of God.” Moreover, the tablets of the Torah constituted the essential content of the Ark of the Covenant, upon which God’s glory rested and visibly manifested itself. The “way” of God, as noted in Isa 2, is a synonymous term for νόμος.

Isa 61:1-3 illustrates another way the Servant Messiah imparts or bestows glory upon the faithful people of YHWH. However, prior to discussing this example illustrated in 61:1-3, I must note that this pericope is highly significant in Lukan studies for two reasons, both of which are relevant to my thesis. First, Jesus, in Luke’s pericope concerning the rejection of Jesus at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30), quotes Isa 61:1-2, 58:6, and 42:7, and in doing so, identifies himself as the Servant Messiah of YHWH. In Luke 7:18-23191—a pericope significant to Jesus’ messianic self-understanding, and self-identification as the Isaian Servant Messiah—Jesus’ response to the disciples of John the Baptist echoes messianic deeds detailed in an Essenian document, the *Messianic*

Apocalypse (4Q521). This document was written also at the turn of the era, but up to one hundred and twenty-five years earlier than the Gospel of Luke. The unknown author of the Messianic Apocalypse appropriated Isaian material on the Servant Messiah—most notably an allusion to Isa 61:1—and Jesus’ words in Luke 7:22, “the dead are raised, the poor have the good news proclaimed to them,” match the Hebrew wording in Line 12 of 4Q521. Thus, apparently drawing from Isaian messianic traditions then current, Luke appropriated Isa 61:1-2 as an important piece to explain Jesus’ self-understanding.

---

192 See, for example: Collins, “Jesus, Messianism and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 112-119; Vermes, The Complete Dead Sea Scrolls in English, 412-413; and Michael O. Wise and James D. Tabor, “The Messiah at Qumran,” BAR 18, no. 6 (November/December1992): 60-65. An unknown Jew probably wrote the Messianic Apocalypse during the first century B.C. This Hebraic fragment found at Qumran may reflect the Davidic messianic trajectory of that time within Jewish messianism. This trajectory diverged from and contrasted with the previous dominant trajectory within messianism, that of diversified expectation which posited two messiahs—one kingly and one priestly. See Strauss, The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts, 241-242, on the kingly and Davidic features of the Servant of Isa 42, 49, and 61, from which the Messianic Apocalypse quotes. At least three factors produced the single Davidic messianic expectation during the Roman-Herodian period (75 B.C.-68 A.D.). The first is the expectation of a Davidic warrior king, found in such documents as the War Rule (4Q285), Psalms of Solomon, the Son of God fragment (4Q246), and the Book of Isaiah. The second is the expectation of a Davidic Servant Messiah, as portrayed in the Book of Isaiah. The third is the expectation of a Davidic Servant Messiah, as portrayed in the Book of Isaiah. Aspects of this Servant Messiah are reflected in the Messianic Apocalypse (4Q521), 11QMelch (11Q13), the New Testament, and perhaps early traditions in the formation of the Book of the Similitudes. Regarding the Similitudes, and traditions concerning the convergence of Servant and messianic titles upon Enoch, see Andrei Orlov, “The Learned Savant Who Guards the Secrets of the Great Gods: Evolution of the Roles and Titles of the Seventh Antediluvian Hero in Mesopotamian and Enochic Traditions: Part II: Enochic Traditions,” Scrinium II. Universum Hagiographicum. Mémorial R. P. Michel van Esbroeck, S. J. (1934-2003) (ed. B. Lourié; St. Pétersbourg, 2006), 174-178, 182. A third are the social/political factors of the Hasmonean royalty despoiling the Davidic throne (104-76 B.C.), combined by the Roman conquest of Pompey (63 B.C.) with its desecration of the Holy of Holies. The factors that produced the single Davidic messianic expectation also overlap, or may relate to each other. For example, Émile Puech, La Croyance des Esséniens en la Vie Future: Immortalité, Résurrection, Vie Éternelle? I: La Résurrection des Morts et le Contexte Scripturaire (Paris: Librairie LeCoffre, 1993), 125, notes that the Psalms of Solomon, which impart “l’attente du messie davidique,” allude to the Roman conquest of Pompey: “On y a reconnu des allusions historiques au siège du temple par Pompée en 63…”

193 See the previous footnote on Isaian messianic traditions during the turn of the era.
as the Servant Messiah, prophesied in Isaiah, who brings YHWH’s words of salvation to the humble who are faithful to his νόμος.

Second, Isa 61:1-3 is a compound of Isa 11:2, 42:1, 49:8, and 50:4, 5: the promises made in these passages are fulfilled in 61:1-3. This confirms what the Isaian narrative had been intimating until this point: the Servant of YHWH is the Davidic Messiah. This also, among other reasons, suggests the narrative unity of Isaiah. Luke’s portrayal of Jesus’ quoting Isa 61 (and 42) reflects Luke’s view throughout Luke-Acts that Jesus is the Davidic, Servant Messiah.

We shall return now to Isa 61:1-3 and its portrayal of another way the Servant Messiah imparts or bestows glory upon the faithful people of YHWH. Vv. 1-3 illustrate the Servant Messiah placing or bestowing a “garment of glory” upon the humble, faithful people of YHWH who mourn over sin:

The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because the Lord has anointed me; He has sent me to bring glad tidings to the lowly, to heal the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives and release to the prisoners, to announce a year of favor from the Lord and a day of vindication by our God, to comfort all who mourn; to place on those who mourn in Zion a diadem instead of ashes, to give them oil of gladness in place of mourning, a glorious mantle (καταστολὴν δόξας/יהולא/מששהחלה) instead of a listless spirit (πνεύματος ἀκηδίας/疟/) (הה). They will be called oaks of justice (δικαιοσύνη/צדק), planted by the Lord to show his glory (להתפאר/ shemale).195

In this pericope, the Servant Messiah bestows upon God’s humble people a “garment of glory” (LXX) instead of a “spirit of heaviness.” The context suggests that

195 The translator uses the noun, δόξα; the MT uses להתפאר the infinitive construct of Hitpa’el for meaning “to display splendor of oneself.”
the spirit of heaviness (LXX) parallels, i.e., specifically is in apposition to, in the phrases preceding this one, the words “mourning” and “ashes. Mourning and ashes refer to genuine repentance; thus, the spirit of heaviness is a spirit of repentance. The garment of glory then procures the glorious “oaks of righteousness.” As we have seen, earlier in Isaiah (e.g., Isa 51), righteousness is the quality of obedience to νόμος. Νόμος, as I have argued, is the inner reality of God’s glory. The garment of glory is, as it would seem, the grace YHWH showers, following repentance, to plant oaks of righteousness. Thus, the steps in these comparisons are the following: first, God’s humble people mourn over sin in repentance; second, the Servant Messiah bestows upon them a garment of glory; third, through the Servant Messiah’s bestowal of the glorious garments, YHWH plants righteousness, or fidelity toward divine instruction, in his people.

Finally, in Isaiah, God’s glory is the glory of the righteous—the handiwork of God that shows his glory:

No longer shall the sun be your light by day, nor the brightness of the moon shine upon you at night; the Lord shall be your light forever, your God shall be your glory (דָּוָא/תפארה). No longer shall your sun go down, or your moon withdraw, for the Lord will be your light forever, and the days of your mourning shall be at an end. Your people shall all be just (דִּקְאֵי/צדיקים), they shall always possess the land, they, the bud of my planting, my handiwork to show my glory (דָּוָא/להתפאר). (Isa 60:19-21)

In 60:19, glory is in apposition to light; again in Isaiah, glory and light, in reference to the messianic era, are parallel to connote—in some way or in a particular overlapping attribute—they are identical. For practical purposes, we may assume that
Isaiah presents them as the same reality; I have argued for a distinction, i.e., the light or νόμος, according to Isaiah, is the inner reality of God’s glory.

5. Νόμος as accommodator and link to traditions

Chilton has demonstrated, in his analysis of the Targum Isaiah, that interpretation of Isaiah into the first and second centuries recognized the relationship between νόμος or Torah and God’s glory. Namely, obedience to Torah ensures the return of the presence of the Shekinah to the temple, and the source of the teaching of Torah is found there as well.

Thus, the temple derives its significance from God’s glory, manifested by the Shekinah, and the importance of God’s glory is related directly to the presence of Torah within. Powell’s observation of the parallel between the temple and the Torah is relevant here, too: within Powell’s construct, we can envision that the deepest, most radical dimension of Torah is found in the core, in the words of YHWH within the Ark of the Covenant. Likewise, the Ark of the Covenant in the Holy of Holies is the radical core of the temple.

Exod 19-24 depicts the means by which God descends to humanity and humanity can reach God—through the holy mountain, the archetype of the temple. In Exodus, YHWH’s initiative provides the contact between the human and the divine. He speaks his “words” on Mount Sinai to Israel without the mediation of Moses. Yet, even

---

with Mosaic mediation following the Decalogue, YHWH initiates the legislative revelation and determines its contents. Sacrifice offered to God fulfills his will provisionally, and reflects human desire to please the divine. At the outset, however, in the most direct, revelatory way, YHWH bestows upon Israel and humanity, in the climactic contact between the human and the divine, the gift of divine knowledge and the deed of the covenant—the Decalogue informed by love. In loving response in the covenant of Sinai, the children of Israel were to faithfully embrace the commandments. Within the temple, also, we find the source of knowledge or ways of God, his divine instruction, concretely present in the tablets of the Ark of the Covenant, enveloped and covered by God’s glory.

We may use νόμος or Torah, then—as the Isaian narrative presents it and in its interpretation at the turn of the era in the first century A.D.—to integrate theological reflection on major religious and social realities. We already have seen immediately above that νόμος informs the meaning and relevance of God’s glory, and that God’s Ark of the Covenant and overarching glory in turn are the realities which the Dwelling of the meeting tent and later the temple were intended to serve. That is, the Dwelling of the meeting tent and the temple were made to enshrine YHWH and the knowledge he imparts to humanity through Israel (Exod 40; 2 Samuel 7:1-7; 1 Kings 9:3). At the juncture of the temple, through chosen mediation, the children of Israel can meet their God. 2 Samuel 7:12-16, and, arguably, other Old Testament texts, also establish the inextricable connection between the promised Davidic heir and the presence of God’s glory and the temple. The New Testament, e.g., Luke-Acts, and other Jewish literature
at the turn of the era, e.g., the Isaiah Targum, also demonstrate the same. The Davidic Messiah re-establishes and fulfills the human-divine contact procured by the Sinai covenant.

However, when the glory of God—hovering above the Ark and between the cherubim—departed after the destruction of the First Temple, the Second Temple could not rise from its shadow. Martha Himmelfarb argues that, under Ezekiel’s influence, in the Second Temple period, those Israelites—and especially priests—disenchanted with the infidelity of God’s people, began to view the earthly temple as merely a copy of the true, heavenly temple. The Book of Isaiah also influenced theological thought through its prophecies of an eschatological return of glory, and its affirmations of Zion’s worldly, but also eschatological, prominence.

These Ezekielian and Isaian influences, in turn, cultivated the growth of Intertestamental and New Testament traditions of ascent theology, such as Enoch’s ascent depicted in the Book of Watchers. Not surprisingly, messianic concepts and expectations generally oriented either toward a return of God’s glory in this world along with its manifestation in the world to come, e.g., the Synoptic mini-apocalypses and the Book of Revelation, or emphasized other-worldly encounters with glory in the heavenly temple.

---

200 A developed treatment of these themes, and exceptions to them, is beyond the scope of this dissertation. Mention of these themes is relevant within the broader discussion above.
Seen in the formative matrix of ascent theology, and the absence of the Shekina and temple sacrifice, certain Intertestamental texts reflect the convergence of messianic and Servant titles or functions upon a heavenly character, such as the Messiah in the Messianic Apocalypse, Enoch in the Book of the Similitudes, e.g., the Messiah as light to the Gentiles in #48, or the Isaian Servant Messiah/Danielic Son of Man related to or in association with a heavenly character, such as Melchizedek in 11QMelch. Although the connection among the promised Davidic heir, the presence of God’s glory, and the temple may have acquired a different emphasis or configuration in ascent theology within Intertestamental and New Testament literature, still the relation among them remained intact. As the earthly temple became further removed, tangibly, in the life of the Israelite following its first and second destructions, νόμος or Torah, in its general application and as an object of piety, filled the gap.

However, νόμος—in its primary, narrative meaning—contributed as a means of linking theological concepts especially by uniting Sinai/Mosaic traditions to Zion/Davidic traditions. The Decalogue, in its formative substrate of love, as evinced by both the Exodus and Deuteronomy narratives, is substantive to both sets of traditions. In the Sinai/Mosaic traditions, the Ten Commandments are foundational, and in the Zion/Davidic traditions, YHWH manifests “these words” as light to the nations, fulfilling eschatological/messianic prophecies, such as of Jeremiah (31:33) and Ezekiel

201 See also work by Andrei Orlov, Enochic Traditions, 172-182.
(36:26-27). In this radical sense, νόμος conceptually accommodates and merges these two realities, and synthesizes traditions related to them, such as trajectories concerning God’s glory and mountain/temple.


Luke 2:33-35, the conclusion of the Presentation narrative following the climactic prophecy of Simeon in v. 32,\(^{203}\) masterfully shows fulfillment in Luke’s use of νόμος in the narrative. Before I explicate how these final verses accomplish this, I will discuss Luke 2:33-35 and the allusive character of Simeon’s final prophetic utterances. This will substantiate the purpose for which these oracles serve in completing the Presentation narrative.

This final part of the Presentation also is the first time in Luke’s narrative that conflict is associated with Jesus.\(^{204}\) The Servant passages in Isaiah reflect the dynamic of falling and rising among Israelites, and of contradiction. However, the stone metaphor in Isa 8:14-15, 28:16, and Ps 118:22 (used also in Luke 20:17-18) is probably what Luke intended. God, warning Isaiah not to walk in the way of his people, but to fear and regard him ( Isa 8:11-13), tells Isaiah that he (God) will be a stumbling stone to both northern and southern “houses of Israel”: “Yet he [the Lord] shall be a snare, an obstacle and a stumbling stone to both the houses of Israel, a trap and a snare to those

---

\(^{203}\) Some may end this narrative at verse 40, a natural break prior to the pericope on the boy Jesus in the temple. However, this narrative then should begin at verse 21, and address all of Luke’s treatment on the infancy of Jesus after his birth.

who dwell in Jerusalem; and many among them shall stumble and fall, broken, snared, and captured” (Isa 8:14-15). Later in the Book of Isaiah, in an oracle against Judah, God offers a refuge amidst the surrounding falsehood spawned by the religious leaders of Jerusalem: “See, I am laying a stone in Zion, a stone that has been tested, a precious cornerstone as a sure foundation; he who puts his faith in it shall not be shaken” (Isa 28:16). The precious cornerstone God lays in Jerusalem—a symbolic temple cornerstone—will cause disaster among some, and save others.

Luke 2:34 foreshadows in Acts the disbelief of many Jews—and the belief of other Jews—in God’s plan of salvation for Israel and humanity. This plan would reunite and refine the remnant of Israel, and radiate the Servant’s light to the Gentiles. In addition, Simeon prophesies to Mary that along with the contradiction of her son, a sword will pierce her—that is, her “soul”—“so that the secret thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.” This echoes and refers to prophecies and themes in the Book of Zechariah, in anticipation of a major point concerning judgment in Luke.

---


206 For a discussion of various issues concerning the Book of Zechariah, including the theme of doom that colors chapters 9-11, and theme of promise concerning chapters 12-14, see David L. Petersen, “Book of Zechariah: 9-14,” ABD 6:1065-68.

207 Commentaries on the sword which pierces Mary miss the connection to Zechariah and other parts of Luke, with the partial exception of André Feuillet, “L’épreuve prédite à Marie par le vieillard Siméon (Luc, II 35a),” in A la Recontre de Dieu (Memorial A. Gelin; Le Puy: Mappus, 1961), 258-261—see Brown, 463. These commentaries usually focus instead on interpreting this verse as it stands, apart from its allusion to the Old Testament and Lukan context. Brown examines a few indirect references in the Old Testament, but misses the allusion to Zechariah, and the way in which it relates to and clarifies the first part of the Presentation narrative. See Brown, The Birth of the Messiah, 463-466.
In Zechariah, YHWH enjoins the House of Judah and Israel the good they must do, and the evil vices they must avoid, including plotting evil against each other in their hearts (Zech 8:16-17)—“For all these things I hate, says the Lord.” God emphasizes his judgment preceding the new order, and his opposition to falsehood, false prophecy, and the “spirit of uncleanness” (8:17, 10:2, 13:2-3). Then, in Zech 12:10, the inhabitants of the House of David and Jerusalem “look on him whom they have thrust through [pierced], and they shall mourn for him as one mourns for an only son, and they shall grieve over him as one grieves over a firstborn.” A few verses later in Zechariah (13:1-9), the inhabitants are open to “a fountain to purify from sin and uncleanness.” False prophets, in their secret lies, are exposed, and the spirit of uncleanness is removed. The Lord will strike the shepherd with the sword, and so will test, refine, and save his obedient, faithful people (Zech 13:7-9). The shepherd—YHWH’s “associate”—contextually is the “only son” thrust through.

In Luke, judgment at the end of history includes the revelation or exposure of all that is done or known, hidden in secret. For example, in reference to the reality of Gehenna, as well as the time of the coming of the Son of Man and accompanying

---

208 John 19:37 quotes this: Ὄψονται εἰς ὃν ἐξεκέντησαν “They will look upon him whom they have pierced.” The wording is from the Masoretic. The LXX of Zech 12:10: ἐπιβλέψονται πρὸς μὲ ἄνθρωποι κατωρχημένου. The Hebrew reads יְבֵשׁ אֲלֵיהוּ מַקְדֵשׁ. God, the speaker, is pierced, as Brown correctly observes in The Birth of the Messiah, 463. Luke’s account of Simeon’s prophecy seems to favor the Hebrew over the LXX of Zechariah. Is this because the Simeon account was originally a Hebraic piece, perhaps translated into Greek, that then Luke appropriated into his Gospel, as I have suggested earlier in this study? A modest treatment of this question lies beyond the scope of this paper. Nevertheless, I propose that, with the given evidence we have on the structure of the Simeon prophecies in general, and the apparent appropriation of the Hebraic text of Zechariah at this point—unless Luke is following an unknown Septuagintal version about which we have even less evidence—Luke most likely is incorporating a Hebraic source for the Simeon prophecies.
persecution, Jesus disclosed to his disciples, “There is nothing concealed that will not be revealed, nor secret that will not be known” (Luke 12:2). And, in Luke 8:17: “For there is nothing hidden that will not become visible, and nothing secret that will not be known and come to light.” Luke, it seems, is applying Simeon’s prophecy of Mary in this light. Namely, as Jesus, the first-born/shepherd, will be struck and thrust through by the sword as a sign of contradiction, so too will Mary be pierced by the sword. But her pain, in union with her son, will be purely emotional and spiritual, through her “soul.” Jesus’ mother—as one who shares in the pain of the suffering Servant Messiah—“shall look on him whom they have thrust through, and…shall mourn for him as one mourns for an only son, and…shall grieve over him as one grieves over a first-born” (Zech 12:10).

From the context of Zech 12-13, and by divine favor according to Simeon’s prophecy, Mary’s pierced soul would effect an awareness in her of two realities, “so that the secret thoughts of many hearts may be revealed”: first, of the hitherto concealed falsehood and spirit of uncleanness of the House of David, i.e., the tribe of Judah from whom the Messiah comes; and second, of the refining of God’s faithful people. Simeon, then, is prophesying about Mary in continuity with and in partial fulfillment of Zechariah. To elucidate the meaning of this dramatic, messianic oracle, Luke supplies the context.

Luke shows the reader, within Luke 2:33-35, the fulfillment of the purpose of the consecration of the child Jesus in the temple: Jesus is destined, as the mysteriously divine, Davidic firstborn and only son, to suffer and die in Jerusalem. As the symbolic cornerstone of the temple (Isa 28:16, 8:14-15), he is rejected by some of his own, i.e., the
“builders” (Ps 118:22), but purifies the rest through his sacrifice (Zech 13, Luke 2:34).

The mother of this divinely characterized,209 Davidic savior-king (Zech 9:9-10, 14:9) witnesses his suffering and is enlightened about the ensuing purification (Zech 13; Luke 2:35). The death of the Davidic Messiah precipitates a fountain of grace upon God’s people (Zech 12:10) and ushers in God’s permanent presence and light (8:3, 13:9, 14:7) among his faithful people in a purified temple (8:9 with 14:21) and transformed Jerusalem. Thus, God’s glory or light—his νόμος—returns to the temple and to the holy city, permanently. Simeon’s concluding oracles provide purpose and finality to the actions and prophecies—to the content imbued with the explicit and implicit references to νόμος—in the preceding material in the Presentation narrative.

---

209 As mentioned in footnote 208, God himself is the “pierced one” and the “only son.” Though astonishing, we must let the text speak for itself. Zech 14:3-4, among other passages, likewise implies divinity in the agent who fights against the nations, “whose feet shall rest upon the Mount of Olives.” These divine attributions are preceded and succeeded by other traditions as well, e.g., Isa 9:5 (“God-hero,” noting that the divine part of this designation הָיָה also surfaces in Isa 10:21, and always is reserved for the one God—see Strong, Isaiah: Chapters 1-18, 335-338), Melchizedek in 11QMelch, and the Messiah in the Messianic Apocalypse. The divine attribution in Isa 9:5 suggests that a unified and comprehensive view of the Davidic Servant Messiah within the Book of Isaiah would have identified him, in some mysterious way, as divine as well as human. This tangible interpretation of Isaiah, however, could only be gleaned from the MT and Septuagintal Codex Alexandrinus: other codices of the LXX-Isaiah 9:5 exclude “God-hero” and other descriptions of the messianic child depicted in the MT and Alexandrinus. At most, a unified reading of the Septuagint of Isaiah would have implied divinity of the Servant Messiah because of his qualities only God possesses and functions only God performs. For example, the Servant Messiah is God’s νόμος/light and imparts his glory (42:6, 61:3). The Isaian portrayal of the grandeur and power of Torah, and its metaphor of glorious light—found in the person of the Servant Messiah—relates closely to a later Tannaic emphasis about Torah as consisting of fire from heaven. See Heschel, Heavenly Torah, 333.
7. **Summary and elaboration on Luke’s allusive appropriation of the LXX of Isaiah**

In summary and in further elaboration on Luke’s allusive appropriation of the LXX of Isaiah in the Presentation pericope, we can note the following. We have seen that Simeon’s prophecy about the child Jesus, highlighted by φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἑθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, alludes to certain passages in the Septuagintal Isaiah. In Isaiah, the “light” to the nations is νόμος (e.g., 51:4). Νόμος is the inner reality of God’s glory. In Exodus 33:7-23, in Moses’ view of YHWH’s glory and beauty, the Lord bestowed favor upon him, teaching Moses knowledge of his ways. This instruction of the knowledge of YHWH’s ways is the meaning of νόμος. Moses, then, saw God’s glory and entered into divine instruction. In Isaiah, the light to the nations—νόμος (Isa 2:3, 5; 51:4)—is great and glorious (42:21, 60:1-3) and requires obedience (1:10). The rejection of God is the disobedience of His word, or νόμος.

Three examples, among others in Isaiah, illustrate this. The first, Isa 5:24, is a prophecy of Israel’s abandonment of God by rejection of his νόμος, and the severe judgment, through Assyria’s destructive and enslaving conquest, that corresponds to Israel’s rejection of νόμος. As in Isa 2, the λόγος—through apposition—is νόμος:

Therefore, as the tongue of fire licks up stubble, as dry grass shrivels in the flame, even so their root shall become rotten and their blossom scatter like dust; for they have spurned the law (νόμος/תורה) of the Lord of hosts, and scorned the word (λόγος/אמר) of the Holy One of Israel. (Isa 5:24)
The second is Isa 30:9. In using language employed in Isa 1—cf. 1:4, wicked and corrupt people and children—Isaiah identifies Israel as a rebellious people, disobedient to νόμος:

This is a rebellious people, deceitful children, children who refuse to obey the law (νόμος/תורה) of the Lord. (Isa 30:9)

The third is Isa 42:24. Isaiah asks the question to Israel: Who gave Israel over to plunder, deportation, exile, and almost complete ruin (by the Assyrians and Babylonians)? The prophet answers his own question in a two-fold manner: the Lord himself, and Israelites disobedient to νόμος. Again, God’s ways are identified as νόμος:

Who was it that gave Jacob to be plundered, Israel to the despoilers? Was it not the Lord, against whom we have sinned? In his ways they refused to walk, his law they disobeyed. (Isa 42:24)

The νόμος is the word and way of the Lord, and is his light from Mount Zion (2:3, 5; 51:4); the Servant Messiah is νόμος in person (50:10 with 51:4). The Servant Messiah restores “the survivors of Israel” (49:6), teaches (42:4), and, through suffering and bearing guilt, saves all nations, to the ends of the earth (2:3, 49:6, 53:11-12). Those who seek the Lord and heed his Servant Messiah have the νόμος at heart (50:10, 51:7).

---

210 Young, Isaiah: Chapters 19-39, 344.
Through the intertextual tool of allusion, Luke’s material on Simeon’s prophecy views Jesus—the Servant Messiah, glory, way, word, and light of YHWH—as the νόμος.\(^{211}\)

Also, in supplemental harmony and conclusion within the Presentation pericope, Luke incorporates Simeon’s oracles that appropriate not only Isaian material but also Psalm 118 and especially Zechariah. These prophecies provide context and purpose to the movement of νόμος in Luke 2:22-33: the suffering and death of the consecrated firstborn procures the ever-abiding presence of νόμος in the temple of the purified and transformed Jerusalem.

8. The LXX of Isaiah and the saving power of νόμος

The LXX of Isaiah, in regard to material in the Presentation narrative that is the object of allusion, follows the Masoretic closely. It differs from the Masoretic especially in a subtle theological emphasis: the Septuagint slightly accentuates “salvation.” As we have seen, Luke 2:30 alludes to Isa 40:5: καὶ ὄψεται πᾶσα σάρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ; the MT does not use the word salvation, though it could be implied from Isaiah’s use of “glory” in the same verse. According to the Septuagintal Isaian reading favored by Rahlfs and Brenton, another instance of the translator’s emphasis on the word “salvation” occurs in Isa 51.\(^{212}\) Here, the translator seems to draw attention to the relationship between νόμος and salvation, and to the contrasting effects of judgment

\(^{211}\) Koehne, *Jesus the Torah*, 13-14.
\(^{212}\) See footnotes 141 and 190.
and justice in rejection of νόμος. If anything, then, the Isaian, Septuagintal translator highlights the significance of νόμος because of its salvific relevance. Although I do not agree with Rahlfs and Brenton’s translational interpretation of Isa 51:5, based on Codex Vaticanus, I do think the translator highlights the salvific significance of νόμος regardless. In Chapter Three, “The influence of Septuagintal δικαιοσύνη on Luke’s appropriation of Septuagintal νόμος,” I will discuss Luke’s appropriation, within the allusion of 2:32 in the Presentation pericope, of this Septuagintal emphasis on salvation.


We must not forget that the function of νόμος must be related to Luke’s principal intention in writing his Gospel. Thus, the function of νόμος on the surface of the Presentation narrative, namely in Luke 2:22-24, 27, as well as by allusion in Luke 2:32, is, generally, to contribute to providing an orderly narrative concerning the teachings Theophilus received. Specifically, though, Luke seems to accomplish three tasks in using νόμος in such a concentrated way in this particular pericope.

First, the Gospel of Luke begins in eloquent Greek and Hellenistic style. Yet, quickly, by Luke 1:5, the narrative steps into a Hebraic, Israelite world and culture replete with Mosaic and Davidic themes. Prévost’s insight is helpful here: the Mosaic law of consecrating the first-born underscores, among other things, the covenant relationship of Israel to YHWH, the devotion and fidelity required by this relationship,
and the supreme importance—at this time in history—of Jewish covenantal integrity in fidelity to the laws of Moses for YHWH’s sake. Thus, one purpose of Luke’s use of νόμος with such frequency and depth in the Presentation narrative is to show a transition from the Hellenistic world to the Hebraic/Aramaic Israelite world imbued with Mosaic and Davidic themes.

This use of νόμος accommodates the position—thoroughly argued by Kurz—that Luke wrote primarily for Christian readers. Non-Christian pagans and non-Christian Jews would relate less to this portrayal of transition from a Hellenistic to a Hebraic world than would Christian Jews or Gentile Christians seeking to affirm or understand the Biblical foundation of their faith. Though the laws of Moses do not reflect Davidic themes per se, Deuteronomy does anticipate a great prophetic successor of Moses, “the prophet like me” (Deut 18:15, 18). This prophecy contributed to New Testament comparison and association of Jesus to Moses, including the Lukan prophecy/fulfillment correlation between the two (e.g., Acts 3:11-26, 7:37), and contributed as well to appropriation of characteristics of Moses in describing the persona and mission of Jesus. In addition, Luke’s allusion to νόμος in Luke 2:32 appropriates the Davidic, messianic theme, about which I will discuss further in the next chapter.


---

narrative, we see a fragmented, Israelite people living in an era on the cusp of change from life under Mosaic legislation with Davidic, messianic promise, to imminent and ripe Davidic messianic fulfillment. Within Luke 2:22-38, Luke uses νόμος explicitly concerning Mosaic ordinances, and allusively according to the primary, narrative sense concerning the Servant Messiah, Torah in person. Luke’s emphasis and placement of this term reflects the movement, then, from a Mosaic to a messianic world—one in which the Davidic Messiah’s presence will be reality, and the commandments of love will advance universally.

Third, Luke’s use νόμος in the Presentation pericope underscores the transition, found within the overall narrative of Luke-Acts, from life in the aftermath of the renowned and ancient exodus, to a new exodus (e.g., Luke 9:31 and the pericope of the Transfiguration). Luke’s Septuagintal Isaian, allusive use of νόμος in Luke 2:32 signals that change, in which the Messiah—the light to the nations which await his teaching215—will lead his people into a new exodus. As we will see in the next chapter, David Pao’s major contribution to Lukan studies is an enhanced understanding of the new exodus theme within Luke-Acts; I will incorporate his schema of themes of Israel’s restoration within the new exodus, according to Isaiah, into a more comprehensive framework. In addition, I will explain the indispensable role of νόμος within this overarching framework. In the Presentation narrative, Luke’s allusion to νόμος (Luke 2:32) anticipates and signals this new exodus theme.


Following the Presentation narrative, Luke uses the word νόμος six more times in his Gospel, and twenty-one times in Acts of the Apostles. Throughout Luke-Acts, he also uses the word φῶς eight times, including one verbal equivalent in Luke 1:79, in the sense he used it in Luke 2:32—as a metaphor for νόμος. Throughout Luke-Acts, νόμος always refers to God’s instruction at Sinai in the secondary and broader sense, or even to his instruction and words throughout the five “Books of Moses.” This probably reflects common usage of this term. However, it may also reflect Luke’s sensitivity toward Israel’s historical transition from the people of the dramatic first exodus, under the law of Moses, to the same “people” about to experience the great new exodus, under the reign of the great prophet about whom Moses spoke, the Davidic Servant Messiah.

φῶς, however, as a Septuagintal Isaian metaphor for νόμος in Luke-Acts, serves to contrast the secondary sense with the primary sense, i.e., YHWH’s particular instruction on Sinai—the commandments of love. We find examples of φῶς used in this way, apart from Luke 2:32, in the following in Acts: 13:47; 22:6, 9, 11; 26: 13, 18; and 26:23. I will explain how φῶς is used in these references after the following discussion on Luke 1:79. In Luke 1:79, φῶς is not used but is implied in the Canticle of Zechariah:

---

217 For example, see Luke 16:16 and Luke 24:44 on this third and broadest sense concerning the entire Pentateuch.
And you, child, will be called prophet of the Most High, for you will go before the Lord to prepare his ways, to give his people knowledge of salvation through the forgiveness of their sins, because of the tender mercy of our God by which the daybreak from on high will visit us to shine (ἐπιφανεῖν) on those who sit in darkness and death’s shadow, to guide our feet into the path of peace.

This verse in Luke clearly alludes to Isa 40:2-3: “Speak tenderly to Jerusalem, and proclaim to her...her guilt is expiated...a voice cries out: in the desert prepare the way of the Lord!...the glory of the Lord shall be revealed”. It also echoes Isa 9:1, 5-6: “The people who walked in darkness have seen a great light; upon those who dwelt in the land of gloom a light has shone...For a child is born to us...They name him...Prince of Peace. His dominion is vast and forever peaceful.” Considering the references to God’s glory and light, and the implied salvation through the Davidic reign from Mount Zion, Luke 1:79 also may echo Isa 2:

“Come, let us climb the Lord’s mountain, to the house of the God of Jacob, that he may instruct us in his ways, and we may walk in his paths.” For from Zion shall go forth instruction, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem...O house of Jacob, come, let us walk in the light of the Lord!

As we have seen, Luke uses φῶς as a metaphor for νόμος, in the primary sense, in Luke 2:32; in Acts 13:47—for the first time in Acts of the Apostles—Luke alludes in the same way to Isaiah, and thus most likely has νόμος in mind. In Acts 13:47, Paul and Barnabas are commanded by Christ to act as an extension of him as νόμος or divine

---

218 The context of “preparing the way of the Lord” is Isaian and related to Jerusalem’s expiation of guilt (Isa 40:1-5).
instruction to the Gentiles: “For so the Lord has commanded us, ‘I have made you a light to the Gentiles, that you may be an instrument of salvation to the ends of the earth.’” In Acts 22:6, 9, 11, the (literal) light from Christ, striking Saul on his journey to Damascus, is associated with Christ’s glory: “Since I could see nothing because of the brightness (δόξα) of the light, I was led by hand by my companions and entered Damascus” (Acts 22:11).

Then, in Acts 26, Paul, formerly Saul, in his own defense before King Agrippa, repeats the story of his journey to Damascus. Paul refers to the φῶς from the sky (Acts 26:13), but adds words of Jesus missing from the account in Acts 22. These words include the following, reminiscent of the way in which Isa 5:20, 24 contrasts light and darkness in moral terms, related to Torah: “I shall deliver you from this people and from the Gentiles to whom I send you, to open their eyes that they may turn from darkness to light (φῶς) and from the power of Satan to God, so that they may obtain forgiveness of sins and an inheritance among those who have been consecrated by faith in me” (Acts 26:17-18).

As we will see in the next chapter according to the Isaian perspective of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel, “turning” from darkness to light procures, with God’s favor, forgiveness of sins. “Light,” the object of this turn, is God’s νόμος. In a few more verses in the Acts narrative, 26:23 confirms this point when Paul tells King Agrippa “that the Messiah must suffer and that, as the first to rise from the dead, he would proclaim light (φῶς…καταγγέλλειν) both to our people and to the Gentiles. This testimony to King Agrippa again affirms the fulfillment of the Isaian prophecies.
that the Servant Messiah—νόμος in person—as glory and light to both the Jews and the Gentiles, will transmit divine instruction. Light—an Isaian metaphor for God’s instruction, or words of love spoken by YHWH on Mount Sinai—is proclaimed; it is something both Israelites and Gentiles hear and receive. Thus, Luke explicitly uses νόμος in the general, secondary sense in Luke-Acts, as well as uses φῶς as a Septuagintal Isaian metaphor for νόμος in the primary, narrative sense. This shows us that Luke is distinguishing between the primary and secondary definitions of Torah, or νόμος, throughout Luke-Acts to highlight God’s powerful movement among his people from life under Mosaic legislation of the first exodus, to life in the new exodus through faith in the prophesied Davidic Servant Messiah, the Son of God.


As I mentioned previously, Simeon’s oracles in Luke 2:34-35 illustrate the fulfillment of the consecration of the child Jesus in the Jerusalem temple. Through the rejection, suffering and death of the consecrated Servant Messiah—the symbolic cornerstone of the temple—the νόμος and therefore glory of God will return to the temple. Luke continues to present the theme of the relationship between νόμος and the
temple in Luke 2:41-52. In Luke’s Gospel, this occasion of finding Jesus in the Jerusalem temple is the first time we are aware of Jesus (νόμος personified, according to Luke 2:32) returning to—going up to—Jerusalem from Nazareth in Galilee.

In this pericope, Mary, Joseph, and Jesus visit Jerusalem for the feast of Passover. When Mary and Joseph began their return to Nazareth, they realized after a day’s travel that Jesus was missing from their caravan. They returned to Jerusalem to look for him, and after three days (μετὰ ἡμέρας τρεῖς) they found him in the temple. Raymond Brown points out that “after three days” is never used elsewhere in Luke as a reference to resurrection, unlike “on the third day” which is used by Luke six times in reference to the resurrection.219 However, I propose that Luke is intimating subtly—rather than directly presenting—the resurrection motif, for certain elements suggest it. After the Passover in Jerusalem, Jesus disappears. Then, after three days, they “found” him in the temple—this evokes the precious temple cornerstone imagery echoed in the Presentation narrative. The sequence of these events anticipates the resurrection of Jesus.

As I explained on pp. 96-97 and 100, Luke appropriates Isaiah’s symbolic temple cornerstone imagery through Simeon’s prophecy to show the prophetic fulfillment of the Messiah’s rising following his contradiction/rejection. The Isaian imagery illustrates the downfall of unfaithful Israelites and implies a “comeback” victory for YHWH’s agent symbolized as a temple cornerstone. Thus, in Isa 8:14-15, God will be a stumbling stone and a snare for the wayward people in Jerusalem of both houses of Israel. And in Isa 28:16 with Ps 118:22, God will establish in Zion (Jerusalem) the precious temple cornerstone.

---

cornerstone rejected by the builders; those who have faith in it will not be shaken. In Luke, Simeon seems to employ this imagery to vividly convey in 2:34 the fulfillment not only of the fall of many in Israel, but also the rising of Israelites who put their faith in the precious cornerstone, a symbol of the Servant Messiah who will—after rejection by the builders—come back, i.e., from the dead. And, as the risen, precious temple cornerstone, the νόμος in person will return to glorify the temple, or even become the temple, as cornerstone and light converge.

In considering Luke’s use of Isaian imagery in Luke 2:34, “finding Jesus three days later in the temple” is yet another subtle narrative touch of Luke to guide Theolphilus to understand the orderly sequence of the teachings “he” has received. Moreover, Jesus’ presence in the temple and his discussion of νόμος with the teachers suggest an anticipation of the return of the glory to the temple, according to the imagery discussed above—a presence Second Temple Jews longed for in anticipation of the messianic era. We may find another subtle reference to νόμος in this pericope. Luke tells us in 2:51-52: “He went down with them and came to Nazareth, and was obedient to them; and his mother kept all these things in her heart. And Jesus advanced [in] wisdom and favor before God and men.” The final part of 2:52 seems to allude to Proverbs 3:4, in regard to the son who is loyal to the commandments, the νόμος: “Then you will win favor and good esteem before God and man.” The twelve-year-old Jesus exemplifies the νόμος and makes himself present in the temple.

Luke 21: 5-6, 20-24, 23:44-46, and Acts 6:8-15 and Acts 7 all relate hostility toward νόμος to the demise of the temple, about which I will explain in the following. Fidelity
to νόμος always determined the life and very existence of the temple according to the words of the Lord to Solomon, the first temple builder:220

If you live in my presence as your father David lived, sincerely and uprightly, doing just as I have commanded you, keeping my statutes and decrees, I will establish your throne of sovereignty over Israel forever, as I promised your father David...But if you and your descendents ever withdraw from me, fail to keep the commandments and statutes which I set before you, and proceed to venerate and worship strange gods, I will cut off Israel from the land I gave them and repudiate the temple I have consecrated to my honor...this temple shall become a heap of ruins. (I Kings 9:4-8)

Jesus prophesies the destruction of Jerusalem and its temple in Luke 21: 5-6, 20-24. In Acts, Stephen condemns the Sanhedrin’s infidelity toward νόμος (7:51-53), just as their ancestors rejected Torah (according to the primary narrative sense) following the golden calf incident (7:38-43). In this pericope, Stephen speaks coolly toward the temple of his time (7:47-50). In these examples from Luke and Acts, the temple is spoken of less than favorably because of disobedience to YHWH’s words; the temple only has positive value insofar as Israelites are faithful to God. 1 Kings 9:1-9 is crucial to this understanding.

Likewise, in Luke 23:44-46, after the completion of three hours of darkness, the veil of the temple is torn down the middle upon the final words and death of Jesus on the Cross. This showcases the irony of making or “cutting” (ברך) a covenant: the tearing of the veil down the middle suggests both the covenantal curse and ominous destruction

220 Probably νόμος is understood here in its primary sense because of its priority over the secondary sense according to the word of YHWH among the prophets, but especially because of the reference here to the first commandment, the prohibition of idolatry.
of the Second Temple in Israel’s failure to accept νόμος—along with its consequent rejection of the temple “cornerstone”—as well as the ratification of a new covenant (Luke 22:20). In this ratification, as LaVerdiere observes, Jesus’ death occurs during afternoon prayer and sacrifice in the temple, suggesting that the sacrifice of Christ has replaced sacrifices in the Holy of Holies; this may reflect, again, the transition from Mosaic legislation to the new exodus forged and led by the suffering Servant Messiah, the paschal Lamb of God. In addition, the atoning death of the Servant Messiah at the completion of the eclipse and the breaking of daylight, signals the revelatory light of Torah in person precisely at the time of the parting of the veil. There, at the rending of the veil, the sacred “words” once were found—in the Ark of the Covenant within the Holy of Holies, hidden by the veil.

Luke is consistent in the way he depicts the relationship between the νόμος and the temple in the Presentation narrative and throughout the rest of Luke-Acts. The temple has value when it houses what it was intended to—the glory of God, within which resides the words of the way of God. Ultimately, in Isaiah’s and Luke’s vision, only the νόμος or φῶς, in the Davidic messianic reign of the new exodus, can permanently restore the temple.

---

221 In Biblical Israel, severing into two was one image of the consequence of covenantal violation, or of new covenant ratification, or of both. For example, see Gen 15:7-21, and McKenzie, “Covenant,” DB 154, along with Mendenhall, “Covenant,” ABD 1:1190.
II. Luke’s appropriation of the role of νόμος in the Isaian motif of Israel’s restoration and fulfillment

1. The new exodus and the restoration of Israel

Isaiah depicts Judah’s deliverance from Babylon and Israel’s movement into its messianic, eschatological future as a new exodus. Isaiah portrays both elements—Judah’s deliverance and Israel’s movement—as if the first merges into the second at some point in history. Yet the two are distinguished by certain pericopes. For example, we see a prime example of Judah’s release, in terms associated with the exodus, in Isa 52:7-12.223 In contradistinction, we see, in the messianic era of the root of Jesse (Isa 11:10-17), the attraction of the Gentiles and the reconstitution of the tribes of Israel illustrated in thickly coated exodus terminology.

However, even in their distinction, deliverance from Babylon is virtually always related to the messianic/eschatological era, such as the eschatological prelude of 52:1 in relation to 52:7-12 above, or the ransomed returning to Zion, crowned with everlasting joy (51:11). Cyril of Alexandria, Eusebius of Caesarea, Theodoret of Cyrus, John Chrysostom, Origen of Alexandria, and Leo the Great all interpreted at least facets of 52:1-12 in messianic terms.224 According to Isaiah, it seems that the exilic community becomes, at some point in history, a utopian Israel in the messianic era.

223 See Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 21-22, on the historical tradition within Isaiah of the release from Babylon as a second exodus.

224 Wilken, Isaiah Interpreted by Early Christian and Medieval Commentators, 400-410.
David Pao has examined Isaiah’s new exodus motif, including themes of Israel’s restoration within that motif. In addition, Pao has provided a useful and valuable insight for Lukan studies in his explanation of Luke’s appropriation of this Isaian motif with its related thematic elements. Pao’s work is relevant to this study and its thesis, and I will present and examine this aspect of Pao’s research, and propose a more comprehensive understanding of Isaiah’s depiction of the restoration of Israel.

Kenneth Litwak, in *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts*, succinctly summarizes Pao’s position and unique contribution:

A recent work, which may be placed under the category of intertextuality, is that of David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, which seeks to ‘examine the appropriation of the Isaianic New Exodus in the narrative of Acts’. By the Isaianc exodus, Pao is referring to the manner in which Isaiah takes up the foundation story of Exodus in order to provide identity for the exilic community as God’s people.

Although Pao’s work focuses on the new exodus motif and its Old Testament appropriation in Acts, Litwak cites a few of Pao’s points relevant to the study of this motif in Luke-Acts. First, Pao emphasizes that biblical quotations from the Old Testament should not be viewed as isolated statements without significance beyond immediate context. Isaiah’s new exodus motif is used in Acts to reflect the development of the early Church’s identity, and the appropriation of Israel’s foundational story lends validation to a claim by the early Church to be God’s true people among competing voices.

---

Second, Pao notes that earlier studies in intertextuality within Luke-Acts emphasize Christology. This, however, has overshadowed the ecclesiological function of “evocation.” Pao’s use of the term “evocation” highlights the scriptural traditions recalled in certain key words that may carry more significance than the content explicated in the quotations and allusions. Pao asserts that the emphasis placed on explicit quotations is imbalanced; other modes of using Scripture should be examined, also. This imbalance emphasizes isolated quotations without awareness of other patterns that may exist within the context of these quotations. Consequentially, speech and narrative dichotomize. The relationship between Old Testament quotations embedded in Lukan speeches, and development of the wider plot within narrative frequently has gone unnoticed.

Third, Pao contends that we should read Acts through the “hermeneutical framework” of Isaiah’s new exodus. Fourth, Pao also emphasizes Luke’s use of Scripture in Acts for ecclesiological purposes, to construct the identity of the early Christian Church. These emphases on the ecclesiological function of the Old Testament, use of Scripture to validate group identity, and biblical perspective that integrates all scriptural intertexts constructively departs from most previous studies.

I subscribe to Litwak’s wholistic approach toward intertextuality, and Pao’s contention that Acts should be read through the “hermeneutical framework” of Isaiah’s new exodus. However, this study focuses particular attention on the allusion of Luke 2:32, and also views Luke through the hermeneutical framework of the new exodus depicted by Isaiah. Although Pao concentrates his work on the Isaian new exodus
program in Acts, he also draws attention to key texts in Luke (e.g., Luke 4:16-30 and 24:44-49) that underscore this theme and inform its development throughout Acts. I already have argued that the Presentation narrative incorporates the Isaian new exodus theme. According to Pao’s hermeneutical perspective, this insight would be expected, since Pao contends that the common Isaian story underlies both works: “the presence of the common story behind both volumes of the Lukan writings cannot be ignored.”

Pao argues that the overarching theme of the restoration of Israel is foundational for the Isaian new exodus program. He also clarifies that restoration “does not simply point towards the arrival of a certain historical point of time. The claim of restoration…constitutes an attempt to provide a normative definition concerning the nature of the eschatological Israel.” Pao identifies six interrelated themes of Israel’s restoration, found throughout the Book of Isaiah, though most concentrated in Isa 40-55.

Following next, in Parts Two and Three of this chapter, I will introduce the outline of a more comprehensive approach to understanding the Isaian motif of Israel’s restoration, and then critique Pao’s presentation and commentary of the themes and explain how they fit into the more comprehensive picture of the restoration of Israel according to Isaiah.

---

227 Ibid., 111-112.
228 Ibid., 111.
2. **Outline of the process of Israel’s restoration, including the role of νόμος within this restoration, according to Isaiah**

The complete process of Israel’s restoration according to Isaiah consists of the following: 1) the redeeming purification from sin; 2) repentance; 3) the emergence of the νόμος/Servant Messiah, 4) the rebuilding of the Davidic kingdom; 5) the reconstitution of Israel; 6) the ingathering of the exiles; 7) the inclusion of outcasts; 8) the bestowal of the Spirit upon God’s people, and 9) the faithful reciprocation to the νόμος (the Servant Messiah).

3. **Critique of David Pao’s six themes of the restoration of Israel**

As mentioned above, David Pao cites and explains six of these themes. Because of the importance of his work in this regard, I now will discuss Pao’s examination of these in the following, and then incorporate his insights—while adjusting some of them—into a comprehensive and coherent view of the Isaian motif of the restoration of Israel.\(^\text{229}\)

Pao’s first theme is “The Reconstitution of Israel.” In Chapter One of this dissertation, I discussed the historical situation of the disunification of Israel, the role of

\(^{229}\) In reference to the Book of Isaiah, Pao bases his examination of these Isaian themes on the MT. See Pao, pp. 111-121.
the Davidic Messiah and νόμος, and the distinction between external and internal restoration. For Pao, the restoration of Israel focuses on the reunification of Israel, including the hope of such reunification. This emphasis is apparent in the immediate consequence of YHWH’s declaration in the prologue of Isa 40-55, in which God announces through Isaiah the message of comfort: “Comfort, give comfort to my people, says your God” (40:1). In this new era YHWH comes with might and mercy for his people, Israel (40:10-11, 49:13). The reconstitution of Israel manifests two expectations: the twelve tribes will reunify as they once were (49:6, 63:17b), and the two “kingdoms” will reunite (Isa 11:13). Isaiah considers the reconstitution a new creation.\textsuperscript{230}

Pao’s second theme is “The Ingathering of the Exiles.” By exiles, Pao means northern Israelite deportees and those exiled during the Babylonian Captivity. Pao believes that the ingathering of the exiles is integral to the reconstitution of Israel. The prologue of Isaiah 40-55 expresses this relationship (40:11),\textsuperscript{231} and passages concerning the ingathering are found throughout Isaiah 40-55. In an address to Israel, YHWH declares:

\begin{verbatim}
Fear not, for I am with you;
from the east I will bring back your descendents,
from the west I will gather you.
I will say to the north: Give them up!
and to the south: Hold not back!
Bring my sons from afar,
and my daughters from the end of the earth…(Isa 43:5-6)
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{230} Ibid., 112-113.
\textsuperscript{231} In both the LXX (συνάξει) and MT (יקבץ), Isaiah emphasizes God’s gathering—the opposite of exilic scattering.
Emphasis on the ingathering of the exiles relates to the concern for the land. The reconstitution of Israel is possible only with physical locality that provides substance to a reconstitution. YHWH’s promise of salvation to his people therefore is linked intimately with emphasis on the return to the promised land: “Thus says the Lord: in a time of favor I have answered you, on the day of salvation I help you, to restore the land and allot the desolate heritages…” (Isa 49:8). In Isaiah, YHWH’s enduring love of Zion also symbolizes concern for the land: possessing the land includes inheritance of the Lord’s holy mountain (Isa 57:13). The numerous references to Zion/Jerusalem in Isaiah, and its emphasis as the center of divine reign and activity testify that they function not primarily as geographical labels, but rather as icons representing the history and future of God’s people.232

The role of νόμος in the “ingathering of the exiles” is central. This is true particularly of the importance of the presence of νόμος in Mount Zion in relation to the ingathering. The centrality of νόμος to this theme is a point of discussion later in this chapter in Part Four, “Luke’s allusion to the νόμος of the Davidic covenant in Israel’s complete restoration and its fulfillment of salvation to the Gentiles.”

Pao’s third theme is “The Community of the Spirit.” In Chapter One, I quoted and explained the depiction in Isa 61:1-3 of the Servant Messiah bestowing upon God’s people the presence of the Spirit. In this pericope, the Spirit transforms them from the repentant to those faithful to νόμος, becoming “oaks of righteousness.” The righteous,

232 Ibid., 113-115.
Isa 60:19-22 tells us, are God’s handiwork who show his glory. Pao rightly recognizes the community of the Spirit as a theme within Isaiah’s motif of the restoration of Israel. The power and work of the Holy Spirit characterize the reconstituted people of God. In Isa 44:1-4, YHWH promises the Spirit upon a reconstituted, corporate Israel:

Hear then, O Jacob, my servant, Israel, whom I have chosen. Thus says the Lord who made you, Your help, who formed you from the womb: Fear not, O Jacob, my servant, the darling whom I have chosen. I will pour out water on the thirsty ground, and streams upon the dry land; I will pour out my spirit upon your offspring, and my blessing on your descendents. They shall spring up amid the verdure, like poplars beside the flowing waters.

Similarly, in 42:1, YHWH promises the Spirit to the Servant Messiah who carries out his will.233

Pao identifies “The Rebuilding of the Davidic Kingdom” as the fourth theme. Although Pao adequately explains the significance of the re-emergence of the Davidic kingdom in relation to the restoration of Israel according to Isaiah’s perspective, he does not underscore its centrality in the Isaian new exodus, nor does he relate it to νόμος. Nevertheless, his explanation summarizes the theme of the rebuilding the Davidic kingdom, along with its eschatological implications, as an important element in the restoration of Israel according to Isaiah. Pao notes that Israel’s memory of the glorious

---

233 Ibid., 115-116.
kingdom of David contributes importantly to the formation of the envisioned restored Israel. For example, Isa 55:3, part of the epilogue of Isa 40-55, evokes the promises to David.

Several pericopes in Isaiah 1-39 explicitly mention the expectation of David’s messianic successor. For example, in Isaiah 9 the enthronement hymn announces the coming of the Davidic Messiah king and his eschatological kingdom:

For a child is born to us, a son given us;  
upon his shoulder dominion rests;  
They name him Wonder-Counselor, God-Hero,  
Father-Forever, Prince of Peace.  
His dominion is vast  
and forever peaceful,  
from David’s throne, and over his kingdom,  
which he confirms and sustains by judgment and justice,  
both now and forever.  
The zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this! (Isa 9:6-7)

The reign of the promised Davidic figure signals the end of suffering and the inauguration of YHWH’s eschatological rule: “When the struggle is ended, the ruin complete, and they have done with trampling the land, a throne shall be set up in mercy, and on it shall sit in fidelity in David’s tent a judge upholding right and prompt to do justice” (Isa 16:4b-5). In this passage, Pao notes an important connection among Davidic promise, the restoration, and the return of glory to Israel:

The explicit reference to the symbol “David” points to the construction of a future that will witness the return of the glory of Israel. It is this “glorious” state that forms the basis of the hope of restoration. The entire vision of restoration can be best summarized by the statement: “In the
Lord all the offspring of Israel shall triumph and glory” (45:25); and it is in this age that “the glory of the Lord shall be revealed” (40:5).

Pao’s selection of Davidic passages in Isaiah reflects his wholistic, integrating approach toward interpreting this book. Viewing Isaiah as a narrative unity, rather than as three separate entities—in modern convention known as Proto-Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah, and Trito-Isaiah, enables Pao to comprehend the Book of Isaiah and articulate theological perspectives within it through the same lens as Luke and first century Jews. Because Pao acknowledges that the glorious Davidic state “forms the basis of the hope of restoration,” and through the Davidic reign God’s glory will be revealed, it seems that Pao should present the “Rebuilding of the Davidic Kingdom” as a central or dominant theme among the others. This theme seems to be the driving force behind not only Isaiah’s program of the restoration of Israel, but also as a force extending throughout the Isaian new exodus. Or perhaps we should present the causative agent of the Davidic Kingdom as the central or dominant theme among others.

Pao’s fifth theme is “Repentance and the Turn to the Lord.” Pao discusses the importance of historical setting, and discusses the theme, as he does the other themes, from the perspective of narrative unity. Israel’s restoration presupposes an exile in which its people are scattered, and often sold into slavery, throughout neighboring lands. In Isaiah, the suffering of Israelites is understood as YHWH’s punishment for their sins. This is a recurring theme within Isaiah 1-39, and clearly is stated in Isaiah

234 Ibid., 117-118.
235 Ibid., 118.
50:1: “It was for your sins that you were sold, for your crimes that your mother was dismissed.” In spite of Jacob’s (Israel’s) rebellion against God, depicted in Isa 40-55 (e.g., Isa 43:24-25), God’s mercy has redeemed them; he has wiped out their offenses for his sake, and beckoned Israel—whom he has not forgotten—to reciprocate: “Return to me, for I have redeemed you” (Isa 44:22).\(^{236}\)

Pao’s selections from Isaiah show that though redemption is an initiative of God, repentance is—at least in part—an act of the will: “Seek the Lord while he may be found, call him while he is near. Let the scoundrel forsake his way, and the wicked man his thoughts; let him turn to the Lord for mercy; to our God, who is generous in forgiving” (Isa 55:6-7). Repentance removes the barrier impeding redemption: “...it is your crimes that separate you from your God, it is your sins that make him hide his face so that he will not hear you” (Isa 59:2); “He shall come to Zion a redeemer to those of Jacob who turn from sin, says the Lord” (Isa 59:20). We have seen in Chapter One that, from the Isaian framework, the messianic bestowal of righteousness is a pneumatological grace in itself, and that righteousness is the quality of adherence or obedience to νόμος. God’s response to repentance is directly related to this νόμος; i.e., repentance draws YHWH’s infused grace of righteousness, or fidelity to νόμος.

The final theme Pao identifies in the Isaian view of the restoration of Israel is “The Inclusion of the Outcasts.” In distinction from his focus on the nations in the new exodus, Isaiah also delineates the “outcasts” of Israel as a primary concern in the

\(^{236}\) Ibid., 118-120. Isa 44:21b-22 provides an example of the servant Israel portrayed as a nation, not as a man.
restoration of Israel. Pao highlights three texts to illustrate this sixth and final theme within the restoration: Isa 11:12 and 56:8 on gathering the outcasts, understood generally, and 56:4-5, on including and honoring a specific group of outcasts—eunuchs faithful to the covenant. Pao explains that the pronounced emphasis on the eunuch’s condition highlights concern for outcasts in the reconstitution of Israel. This reconstitution will be greater than the state of the past, for every member will witness God’s mighty acts.237

4. Luke’s allusion to the νόμος of the Davidic covenant

in Israel’s complete restoration and its fulfillment of salvation to the Gentiles

Luke 2:32 distinguishes between two facets or operations of God’s salvation: a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of God’s people, Israel. Geoffrey Grogan, noting the position of the two, suggests that the order of the Gentiles placed first may refer to Simeon’s insight, guided by the prophecies of Isaiah, about the rejection of the Messiah among some Israelites, and may refer generally to the order of repentance and blessing between the two.238 In Part Three of this chapter above, I summarized and discussed the themes of Isaiah’s program of Israel’s restoration identified by Pao. These themes, again, are the reconstitution of Israel, the ingathering

of the exiles, the community of the Spirit, the rebuilding of the Davidic kingdom, repentance and turn to the Lord, and the inclusion of the outcasts. According to Pao’s schema, Israel’s restoration is one of three major Isaian themes Luke uses to construct an identity claim for the early Christian community. The other two are the “Universal Revelation of the Glory/Salvation of God,” and “The Power of the Word of God and the Fragility of the People.” In reference to the former, Pao clearly distinguishes between Israel’s restoration and the universal revelation of the nations as separate major themes, united by the narrative of Isa 40-55. However, this distinction, as well as their relationship, are reflected in Luke 2:32 in which God’s salvation is both “a light for revelation to the Gentiles” and “glory for your [God’s] people Israel.”

In Isa 42:6, to which Luke 2:32 alludes, YHWH forms his Servant Messiah and sets him as a “covenant of the people” and a “light for the nations.” The nature of the covenant with Israel, according to the messianic context, is the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant: the Servant Messiah will take the throne of his father David on Mount Zion, toward which all nations, including the descendents of the exiles, will stream. A consequence of this covenant fulfillment may be, in light of the new exodus perceived by Isaiah, the re-establishment of the broken covenant of Sinai with YHWH. The fulfillment of the Davidic covenant and the removal of the curses attached to the Mosaic covenant (e.g., the succession of curses delineated in Leviticus 26:14-46 and

239 Pao, 45, 48.
240 Scripture references to the Davidic covenant abound. The best known and narratively first among them probably is 2 Samuel 7:12-16.
Deuteronomy 27) would allow God’s glory to return to and permeate Israel. The establishment of the Servant Messiah as the “covenant of the people” implies a united, restored Israel; “the people” consist of all Twelve Tribes.

Sequentially, as delineated in the Book of Isaiah, YHWH—through the Servant Messiah—first must restore Israel externally and internally before the Messiah instructs and saves the nations. Isa 49:6, to which Luke 2:32 also alludes, reflects this order: “Is it too little, he says, for you to be my servant, to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and restore the survivors of Israel; I will make you a light to the nations, that my salvation may reach to the ends of the earth.” Isa 46:13, another Isaian verse to which Luke 2:32 alludes, implies an externally and internally restored Israel: “I will put salvation within Zion, and give to Israel my glory.” According to Isaian context, the glory of the restored Israel, at first, is distinct from YHWH’s outwardly emanating light, i.e., νόμος, given to the nations and provided as the path of the Gentiles en route to Mount Zion from which the light came. However, Isa 2, among other pericopes and passages I already have explained, illustrates the relationship between the “glory of Israel” and the “light of revelation to the Gentiles”: the νόμος first glorifies the restored Israel, and then fulfills the status and purpose of Jerusalem/Israel as a glorious and saving beacon of light to the Gentiles.

241 See Mendenhall, “Covenant,” 1181-82, 1184-87, for a discussion on the origin, function, and implementation of covenantal imposition of curses.

242 The external restoration consists of the reunification of the Twelve Tribes; the internal restoration consists of the unified House of Jacob (Israel) walking faithfully in the paths of YHWH’s instruction—of his νόμος or Torah—the source of which is YHWH and the Servant Messiah at Mount Zion (e.g., Isa 2:2-3, 5; 42:1-6; 49:6; 50:10-51:5; 55:3-5).
In reference to “The Power of the Word and the Fragility of the People,” Pao underscores, in the context of the new exodus prophecies in Isaiah, the power of YHWH’s word “contrasted with the impotence of the idols.\(^{243}\) Pao has correctly identified an emphasis within Isaiah regarding the sovereignty of God’s word, and its driving force in forging the new exodus through its creative agency. We see this, for example, in the prologue (Isa 40:1-11) and epilogue (Isa 55:10-13) of Isaiah 40-55. However, Pao has not recognized that the “word” is νόμος, the light of the Gentiles and an integral element of the glory of Israel.\(^{244}\) Νόμος is missing from Pao’s assessment of the structure and movement of Isaiah’s program of the new exodus, and of a significant aspect of this program—the themes of the restoration of Israel.

Yet, the Isaian motif of the restoration and universal salvific mission of Israel depends on the agency of νόμος/Torah. As we have seen, the emergence of νόμος is the glory of Israel’s restoration, and also, at the same time, is the Davidic agent that procures a significant part of this restoration. Likewise, νόμος is the light of salvation of the Gentiles, and the agent who produces this light. Because νόμος is the Davidic agent, I suggest that we view the rebuilding of the Davidic kingdom, among Pao’s themes of restoration, as one of the first ones sequentially.\(^{245}\) Isa 59:19-60:3 and 32:15-16, both of which look to a bestowal of God’s spirit and a messianic kingdom of righteousness, delineate a progressive order for the themes of the restoration and the fulfillment of Israel:

\(^{243}\) Pao, 49-50, 59, 167-180.

\(^{244}\) See the discussion on this in Chapter One, regarding Isa 2 and the relation of “word” to νόμος.

\(^{245}\) Pao does not state or imply, however, that the themes of the restoration of Israel are necessarily sequential.
He shall come to Zion a redeemer to those of Jacob who turn from sin, says the Lord. This is the covenant with them which I myself have made, says the Lord: My spirit which is upon you and my words that I have put into your mouth shall never leave your mouth, nor the mouths of your children not the mouths of your children’s children from now on and forever, says the Lord. Rise up in splendor! Your light has come, the glory of the Lord shines upon you. See, darkness covers the earth, and thick clouds cover the peoples; but upon you the Lord shines, and over you appears his glory. Nations shall walk by your light, and kings by your shining radiance. (Isa 59:19-60:3)

Isa 59:19-60:13, a key passage for Pao and for this dissertation, provides an order of events regarding the Isaian motif of the restoration and universal salvific mission of Israel. First, some of “those of Jacob” (Israel) turn from sin (Isa 59:20b). Second, a redeemer comes to Zion (59:20a). Although this pericope does not address the reconstitution of Israel, the ingathering of the exiles, or the inclusion of the outcasts, these themes, addressed in other passages already explored in this study, sequentially follow the Redeemers’s arrival but precede the bestowal of the Spirit. Third, the Lord bestows his Spirit upon his repentant people (59:21). Fourth, the Lord’s words are placed into the mouths of his Spirit-endowed, faithful people (59:21). This covenantal action of the Spirit is reminiscent of the prophesied bestowal of νόμος, i.e., Decalogue, or YHWH’s ten “words” of love, written on hearts (Jeremiah 31:33), only it pertains to “living out” or obeying and transmitting this νόμος. Thus, the final event or activity is the positive or obedient response of God’s people to his word or instruction.

246 Jeremiah’s prophesied bestowal of νόμος may correspond to Isaiah’s prophesied bestowal of the Spirit upon God’s people.
This is corroborated by another passage, Isa 32:15-16, in which the spirit produces righteousness, or the positive response to νόμος. The action of the Servant Messiah in Isa 61:1-3 replicates the same sequence: repentance, the redemptive activity of the Servant Messiah, bestowal of the spirit, and righteousness, or faithful response to God’s νόμος. However, Isaiah 43:24-25 discloses a prelude to this sequence: “You did not buy me sweet cane for money, nor fill me with the fat of your sacrifices; instead, you burdened me with your sins, and wearied me with your crimes. It is I, I, who wipe out, for my own sake, your offenses; your sins I remember no more.” Isa 44:21b-22 reflects the same insight: “Remember this, O Jacob, you, O Israel, who are my servant! I formed you to be a servant for me; O Israel, by me you shall never be forgotten: I have brushed away your offenses like a cloud, your sins like a mist; return to me, for I have redeemed you.”

In these two passages, God—in some undisclosed way—removes sin, or purifies Israelites, for his own sake. God’s redeeming purification allows the sinner to come back to him: “Return to me, for I have redeemed you.” In Isa 53:10-12, the Servant Messiah plays a part in this removal of sin: “…he gives his life as an offering for sin…through his suffering, my servant shall justify many, and their guilt he shall bear…he shall take away the sins of many.” The complete process of Israel’s restoration, then, consists of the following: the redeeming purification from sin, repentance, the emergence of the νόμος/Servant Messiah, the rebuilding of the Davidic kingdom, the reconstitution of Israel, the ingathering of the exiles, the inclusion of outcasts, the
bestowal of the Spirit upon God’s people, and the faithful response to νόμος, i.e., to the Servant Messiah.

Without νόμος, the Davidic kingdom could not be rebuilt, the restoration of Israel could not attain completion, and the Gentiles could not be saved. This point on Israel’s fulfillment is all the more apparent considering the emphasis of Septuagintal Isaiah on the theme of salvation. The Davidic Servant Messiah—νόμος in person—is the indispensable link to both Israel’s restoration and salvation, and Israel’s universal salvific mission to the nations.

5. *Jesus: the Servant Messiah who restores and fulfills Israel*

In Chapter One, I established that Luke 2:32, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, is an allusion to certain verses in Isaiah. These verses are the following: Isa 42:6, 49:6, and 51:4 on identification of the Servant of YHWH as the covenant of the people and a light for the nations; and Isa 46:13, on God’s plan to give Israel his glory. I suggested that Simeon’s prophecy—that Jesus will be the “glory” of Israel—means, according to the Isaian intercontext, that God and his image will be present, to all Israel, in Jesus as the divine glory. By virtue of the allusion to the symbolic temple cornerstone, Simeon’s prophecy, specifically uttered in Luke 2:34, also intimates that Jesus will be present to Israel as the new temple of the reconstituted Twelve Tribes. I also suggested that “light” in Septuagintal Isaiah, as well as Masoretic Isaiah, according to appositional function, is a metaphor for Torah or νόμος according to
the first and primary meaning of the Exodus and Deuteronomy narratives—i.e., YHWH’s instruction on Sinai, the commandments of love, given directly to the Israelites.

In light of this, and from our study of a comprehensive view of the Isaian motif of the restoration and universal salvific mission of Israel, Simeon’s oracle in Luke 2:32 clearly alludes to the leading and indispensable role of the Septuagintal νόμος in this restoration and accomplishment of universal salvation. Within the Isaian motif of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel, the Davidic Servant Messiah is νόμος in person. Septuagintal Isaiah accentuates this, such as in Isa 42:4 (discussed in footnote 153), in which the translator adds “he shall shine out” ἀναλάμψει in reference to the Servant Messiah as light, or νόμος. The quality of the Servant Messiah’s personhood is significant to our understanding of the role of νόμος because this Messiah, according to the Davidic covenant, is essential to Israel’s restoration and fulfillment. Thus νόμος, from the perspective of convergence of meaning with the Isaian Davidic Messiah, also is essential to this restoration and fulfillment.

Prior to Luke 2:32, Luke identifies Jesus as the Messiah in the Presentation pericope. Probably, and only in subtlety for reasons discussed in Chapter One, we may designate Jesus’ consecration in the temple as the first identification of Jesus’ messiahship in this pericope. Explicitly, Luke identifies Jesus as the Messiah in 2:26 and—through Simeon’s oracle—in 2:30. Then, in 2:32, through the metaphor of “light,” Simeon also identifies Jesus as νόμος. Prior to this in the pericope, νόμος reflects specific laws of Moses. Luke’s dual use of νόμος in 2:22-35, then, accentuates the differentiated use of this term. By contrast to Luke’s predominant use of νόμος in the
Presentation narrative, his singular metaphorical reference to νόμος highlights Jesus’ identity as the Messiah who will restore and fulfill Israel. Luke’s use of this term in this pericope substantiates a New Testament view that validates both the Sinai/Mosaic covenant and Zion/Davidic covenant, and affirms their intimate and permanent relation to each other.
III. The influence of Septuagintal Isaiah δικαιοσύνη on Luke’s appropriation of Septuagintal Isaiah νόμος

1. The relevance of this influence

In Chapter Two, Part Eight, I explained the relation between νόμος and salvation in Septuagintal Isaiah. In summary, Septuagintal Isaiah emphasizes this relationship apparently to underscore how the response of Israelites or Gentiles to νόμος effects either just vindication and blessing, or punishment and condemnation. This rather forensic emphasis, exemplified in the LXX of Isaiah, is related to the use of the word δικαιοσύνη in Septuagintal Isaiah.247 I have shown and discussed in this dissertation the contextual interdependence between νόμος and δικαιοσύνη, e.g., on pp. 49-50, 55-58, 65, 83-84, and 87-88. The relationship clearly is evident. The questions at issue, then, are these: Does the Isaian translator of the LXX alter the meaning of δικαιοσύνη from the Hebrew source word of the translation, צדק? If so, does Luke appropriate this altered meaning as it concerns his use of νόμος? Does this make a difference in the key role νόμος plays in the Presentation pericope? Consequently, would a nuanced alteration of this sort also color Luke’s portrayal of Jesus’ messianic restoration of Israel and universal salvation of the Gentiles?

In the following pages of this chapter, I will answer these questions and show how the results of this study within my dissertation affect the premises of its thesis. A work of foremost importance to the questions I pose above, and one that I already have referred to a few times thus far, is Olly’s ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah: A Contextual Study. Olley’s “main aim is to determine how one of the LXX translators, namely the Isaiah translator, interpreted one important Hebrew root, וָצֵק: what he understood to be the meaning of the Hebrew words he read and of the Greek words he used, in their respective contexts.” Throughout the first five parts of this chapter, I will incorporate varied observations of Olley’s on the contents contained in these parts. This will, in turn, contribute to Part Six of this chapter in which I consider the benefit these observations may have in providing a more nuanced understanding of my thesis.

2. The classical Greek meaning of δικαιοσύνη

Δικαιοσύνη in classical Greek means “justice” or “righteousness”; it is an abstract noun, and refers to a quality or virtue of a person or community which is

---


249 Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 17.

characterized by law conformity and taking only that which is one’s due. Δικαιοσύνη brings about and maintains societal harmony and well-being, giving to each person their due. Legislating and enforcing laws help accomplish δικαιοσύνη, and therefore rulers and judges have important roles in their society.

With reference to individuals, Plato was concerned with δικαιοσύνη in terms of personal, interior harmony; however, generally, δικαιοσύνη was understood as a virtue exercised in external, social acts. To δικαιον refers similarly to a person’s public responsibilities for the community’s well-being, including temple worship and public ceremonial works. Among English translations of δικαιοσύνη, “justice” is the most suitable forensically, while “righteousness,” “uprightness,” or “integrity” may be the most suitable in broader contexts.

3. The meaning of δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah

In the sixty-six instances of the MT Isaiah’s use of the word צדק or צדקLabour, the LXX of Isaiah uses δικαιοσύνη in its stead forty-five times, and cognate words nine times. Apart from these occurrences δικαιοσύνη is used five times. Because of such a

---

251 Ibid., 41.
253 Plato: The Republic, IV: 433a, 434c, 441c-444e.
254 Olley, “Righteousness” in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 41.
256 The cognate words are תו δיקαιון, δיקאוס, and δικαιουν. See Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 65, 129.
significant correlation between these words, a brief summary of Olley’s study of this
correlation is appropriate to address the meaning of δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah.

In the LXX of Isaiah, δικαιοσύνη refers to people—typically Israel, Zion, or the
community—and to God. Δικαιοσύνη may refer to Zion, Israel, or the redeemed Israel
where there is good order, or just harmony, in which right prevails and injustices are
corrected (32:16-17; 59:9, 14; 61:3, 11). 257

Israelite society consisting of the “just harmony” associated with δικαιοσύνη
includes rulers who either have this virtue themselves or are responsible for cultivating
it within the community (1:21, 26; 9:6; 11:5; 16:5; 60:17). At times, the LXX of Isaiah
portrays δικαιοσύνη as a virtue pertaining to law-keeping and reverence of God,
contrasted with stealing or wrongdoing (33:5, 6, 15; 56:1a; 58:2; 61:11; 64:5; and 5:7; 54:14;
61:8). In these cases, ἴδιος, fidelity to the covenant relationship, and δικαιοσύνη, in the
classical Greek sense, overlap because of the social context of the word, but not because
of the semantic meaning itself. That is, the LXX reader probably would associate
δικαιοσύνη with God’s νόμος because of its social, covenantal context, but not because
of the Hebraic meaning behind δικαιοσύνη itself. 258

In reference to people and society, use of δικαιοσύνη within the LXX of Isaiah
echoes use of this word from classical Greek. In examining, then, the semantic
divergence between ἰδιος and δικαιοσύνη, we may conclude that the LXX of Isaiah
translator is thinking of Greek connotations within a biblical context. This also is true

257 Ibid., 112.
258 Ibid., 112-113.
concerning the Septuagintal reference to God’s δικαιοσύνη or his will for the emergence of δικαιοσύνη. God’s “justice” expresses itself in the following ways: deliverance of Israel from being mistreated by the nations among whom it dwells (46:12-13, 59:17); punishment of the wicked (45:23-25, 59:17); or a combination of these (41:1-13, 45:23-25, 46:12-13, 59:17, 63:1). צדק also reflects the duality of delivery/vindication and punishment, and thus there is semantic overlap between צדק and δικαιοσύνη. However, cases in which δικαιοσύνη does not render צדק suggests that, according to the translator, δικαιοσύνη more narrowly means “justice.”

It seems that, for the Isaiah translator, divine δικαιοσύνη refers to God’s character and actions as ruler or judge. God delivers Israel from unjust treatment by enemies, and punishes evildoers. God also acted justly when Israel rebelled, and God permitted deportation and exile (Chapter 63); but God pities Israel in its repentance and conversion to loyalty to the Lord—as a “judge,” God shows “pity” (e.g., 30:18). His mercy also extends to proselytes (54:15). Where the context does not refer to Israel’s sins, but rather its unjust oppression by enemies or its doing what is right, then δικαιοσύνη is used distinctively to refer to Israel’s deliverance and punishment of the wicked. But where the context emphasizes Israel’s sins, the translator translates צדק as ἐλεημοσύνη to refer to God’s deliverance.

259 Ibid., 114-115.
260 Ibid., 115.
261 Ibid., 116.
In the LXX of Isaiah, δικαιοσύνη nowhere means “victory” or “deliverance” per se; rather, the translation underscores Israel’s deliverance as an effect of God’s justice. Nevertheless, the LXX of Isaiah uses δικαιοσύνη predominantly regarding God’s saving action, bestowing “mercy”—in his justice—upon the repentant and those obedient to his νόμος.262

4. Δικαιοσύνη and νόμος: their contextual interdependence and distinction between Israelites and Gentiles

Earlier in this chapter, on page 132, I list references in this study that present and also discuss examples of contextual interdependence between δικαιοσύνη and νόμος in the LXX of Isaiah. In summary, these instances of contextual interdependence consist of the following. First, in Isa 1:10, God commands obedience to his νόμος. This is the νόμος of primary narrative meaning, as I have shown in examples and commentary on Isa 1 of decalogic violations and the contrary, positive response of fidelity YHWH enjoins upon his people. In this pericope, God foretells that he will transform Jerusalem, following her intense purification, from rebellion and abandonment of νόμος to the city that will then be called πόλις δικαιοσύνης (1:25-26).

Second, in Isa 42:6, the Servant Messiah is called in δικαιοσύνη to be a covenant of a people and a light of the Gentiles. Light, as we have seen, is a metaphor for νόμος. We see this metaphor again in Isa 51:5. In the pericope that surrounds it—Isa 51:1-8 (displayed in Appendix II)—a cognate of δικαιοσύνη, τὸ δίκαιον, emerges once, and

262 Ibid., 117.
δικαιοσύνη emerges four times. This pericope is the third example of the contextual interdependence between δικαιοσύνη and νόμος in Septuagintal Isaiah. The MT and Septuagintal Isaian translator both use Torah/νόμος twice (51:4, 7): νόμος goes forth from God’s presence (51:4), and those who have his νόμος at heart should not fear reproach.

At the beginning of the pericope, Isaiah introduces a word of encouragement to those who pursue τὸ δίκαιον. These are also the ones who seek the Lord, await his νόμος proceeding from him, and keep it at heart. In LXX Isa 51:5, God’s δικαιοσύνη proceeds speedily from him: δικαιοσύνη is in apposition to νόμος in 51:4, and 51:5a is in clausal apposition to 51:4b in Septuagintal Isaiah:

4 Be attentive to me, my people; my folk, give ear to me. For law shall go forth from my presence, (ὅτι νόμος παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται/כי תורה ממני) and my judgment (καὶ ἡ κρίσις μου/כִּי הַשָּׁפָטִים), as the light of the peoples (εἰς φῶς ἔδωκα/לָאָו לְעָם).

5 I will make my justice/righteousness come speedily; my salvation shall go forth [as light—Codex Vaticanus] (ἐξελεύσεται [ὡς φῶς] τὸ σωτήριόν μου/ישעי יצא) and my arm shall judge [bring justice to] the nations;263 in me shall the coastlands hope, and my arm they shall await.

In 51:6, δικαιοσύνη, “justice,” is in apposition to “salvation”: both justice and salvation—or the salvation of justice—are permanent dispensations of God’s merciful

---

263 The LXX reads: “and on my arm the Gentiles shall trust.”
justice. This kind of action and dispensation, as the reward or punishment based on a people’s obedience or disobedience to νόμος, we would expect from the Septuagintal Isaian translator. The last occurrence of δικαιοσύνη in this pericope is 51:8, and resembles the combination of salvation and justice in 51:6, only the order is reversed:

8 They shall be like a garment eaten by moths,
like wool consumed by grubs;
but my justice shall remain forever
and my salvation, for all generations.

The fourth example of the contextual interdependence of δικαιοσύνη and νόμος in Septuagintal Isaiah is found in 60:20-21 with the cognate word δίκαιος: 20 “No longer shall your sun go down, or your moon withdraw, for the Lord will be your light (φῶς) forever, and the days of your mourning shall be at an end. 21 Your people shall all be just (δίκαιος), they shall always possess the land, they, the bud of my planting, my handiwork to show my glory.”264 Considering the use of light as a metaphor for divine instruction or knowledge, spanning various sections of the Book of Isaiah, the light of the Lord may very well refer to or at least imply the eternal presence or emanation of divine disclosure, or νόμος.265 Only the just—those responsive to divinely cultivated grace to obey νόμος so as to give God and neighbor their due—qualify for God’s just bestowal of the “land.”

264 The LXX reads differently at 60:21b: “Your people also shall be just; and they shall inherit the land forever, persevering that for which they planted, even the works of their hands, for glory.”
265 See p. 85-87.
266 See, for example, Isa 61:3: “oaks of justice” are planted or cultivated to become just. Human righteousness is a gift or work of God; free will to collaborate with God’s work or refuse his gift is affirmed in Isaiah, e.g., 1:19-20.
The fifth example is similar to the fourth, and is mentioned in its footnote reference. In 61:3, the Lord shows his glory by planting “oaks of righteousness (δικαιοσύνη).” This use of δικαιοσύνη relates to νόμος because the Servant Messiah, νόμος in person, bestows this gift upon the humble. In the Book of Isaiah, the humble are well-disposed to νόμος, e.g., Isa 66:2, 5.

In the examples provided above, we see various dimensions of a relationship of interdependence between δικαιοσύνη and νόμος in Septuagintal Isaiah. For instance, human justice is demonstrated by obedience to νόμος, and God, in turn, saves the just by bestowing upon them an eternity of just conditions in a city and in a land renewed for their well-being. Olley has demonstrated that Septuagintal Isaian δικαιοσύνη means “justice.” However, Olley also has shown that the meaning δικαιοσύνη and νόμος have in relation to each other in Septuagintal Isaiah differs between the Israelites and the Gentiles. For the Israelites, the combined meaning refers to God’s justice in enjoining νόμος and requiring Israeliite allegiance to it. Israeliite fidelity to νόμος is a just reciprocation to God and secures harmony among people. Therefore, obedience to νόμος occasions justice toward God and others. In this obedience to νόμος, and possible persecution because of fidelity to it, Israelites are justly rewarded. In the first few centuries B.C., Israelites referred to in the Septuagint were mostly the survivors of the exile, predominantly Judahites, or Jews, but also included the northern Israelites deported and dispersed by Assyria and absorbed by the nations.

---

267 See pp. 83-84.
268 Ibid., 104, 113-117.
269 See, for example, Isa 49:6 and 56:8.
and the challenges among Israelites to adhere to νόμος, were not uncommon within these altered social and religious climates.

However, Septuagintal Isaiah, in its combined meaning of δικαιοσύνη and νόμος concerning Gentiles, underscores both Gentile participation in the life of God’s people, as well as the risk of Gentile condemnation. Olley illustrates this point in several ways. I will represent Olley’s argument in the following.

First, as I have already discussed,²⁷⁰ in Isa 51:7 the translator substitutes the word κρίσιν for the MT equivalent of ἡ δικαιοσύνη, probably to encourage Israel to persevere in obedience to νόμος among the nations. God will show that Israel is in the right and that resistance to νόμος incurs God’s judgment and justice. Olley supports his view by comparing Isa 51:14 and 23 to demonstrate the dual emphasis of salvation and judgment in Isa 51. Because of persecution (51:7-8), the translator seems to emphasize the double-edged sword of νόμος as an agent of salvation and an agent of judgment. This is one of several instances of the Septuagint advancing the position that Gentiles who unjustly reject νόμος place themselves unfavorably under divine judgement.

Second, as implied in the example above, the LXX of Isaiah depicts two options for Gentiles: either enter God’s covenantal people, or be ashamed and confounded. LXX Isa 45:15-25, 66:5, and also 51:4-6 illustrate this depiction. However, Septuagintal Isaiah presents a role for Gentiles that secures divine refuge: proselytism.²⁷¹ LXX Isa 14:1 and especially 54:15 translates its source to include the notion of the proselyte: “Behold,

---

²⁷⁰ See footnote 134.
proselytes shall come to you by me and shall run to you for refuge.” The translator seems to regard Gentile conversion to Judaism as a safeguard against God’s wrath. This Septuagintal interpretative innovation accentuates Gentile involvement positively, and concomitantly highlights Gentile disaster in rejection of God’s will.

Third, Septuagintal Isaiah also highlights the role the nations and especially kings play in their importance as recipients of God’s νόμος and in their allegiance to it. For example, LXX Isa 42:1-9 uses ἐθνη three times, compared to its equivalent גוים twice in MT Isa 42:1-9: ἐθνη emerges in v. 4 of Septuagintal Isaiah, where גוים is missing in MT Isaiah. In LXX Isa 51:4, unlike the MT, Gentile kings are recipients of God’s word concerning his νόμος. Similarly, in MT Isa 60:3, kings walk to the brightness of God’s dawn (לעם), but in LXX Isa 60:3, kings walk by God’s light (τῷ φωτὶ).

I suggest that the Septuagintal translator tacitly advances a conviction that God’s justice will succeed in restoring the full House of Israel, i.e., retrieve the dispersed of northern Israel and Judean exiles lost among the nations. Simultaneously, but in a different divine program, the translator also advances the conviction that Gentiles who accept the light of νόμος will be brought into one congregation of Israel; those Gentiles who do not, will be put to shame. Hence, Septuagintal Isaiah is not nationalistic in anti-Gentilism. More accurately, Septuagintal Isaiah is nationally
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272 Ibid., 117.
273 Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 150-151.
274 In Isaiah, Israelites of the Diaspora are restored to Israel in the same way the Gentiles are brought into Israel—by following the light (Torah) emanating from Mount Zion (Isa 2:2-6). The dispersed Israelites—the major part of the House of Jacob—return to the light of the Lord (Isa 2:6). Unless I distinguish otherwise in this dissertation, references to Gentiles include Israelites of the Diaspora, for the two groups are indistinguishable on a practical basis.
universalistic. Israel extends to the Gentiles to incorporate them, but only on God’s terms.

The role of the Gentiles in Isaiah, emphasized slightly in the LXX, is not illustrated in corporate features by the Servant of YHWH. The Servant Messiah (not the purely corporate servant discussed earlier in this dissertation)—interpreted in the biblical era as the same Servant throughout Isaiah—is one man, e.g., Isa 53:6, 8. There also is no evidence to suggest the Servant Messiah, per se, is corporate.

At first glance, LXX of Isa 49:1-6—specifically vv. 5-6 in contrast to the MT—may seem like an exception: “And now, thus says the Lord who formed me from the womb to be his own servant, to gather Jacob to him and Israel. I shall be gathered and glorified before the Lord (συναχθήσομαι καὶ δοξασθήσομαι ἐναντίον κυρίου/MT—he shall be gathered ἡσυχ and I shall be honored in the eyes of YHWH), and my God shall be my strength. It is a great thing for you to be called my servant, to establish the tribes of Jacob, and to recover the dispersion of Israel…” The translator’s alteration, “I shall be gathered,” does not refer to corporate Israel as an entity apart from the Servant Messiah, for the context argues against this. Rather, following the Servant’s gathering the Tribes of Israel, the translator emphasizes the Lord’s gathering or uniting of Israel with the Servant leading as a kinsman/redeemer and representative spokesman of Israel: the Servant and corporate Israel are intimately united, yet still distinct. The purpose of the LXX of Isaiah was to provide a good translation, not a mistranslation. In the words of
Troxel, the translator “was concerned to convey the sense of Isaiah to his readers.”

Thus, in Isa 49:1-6, the translator seems to emphasize the relationship between the Servant Messiah and corporate Israel—“to convey the sense of Isaiah.” The translator, however, is not confusing or interchanging the two.

However, by extension or incorporation, we should infer that Israelites and Gentiles become, by the Servant Messiah’s power (e.g., Isa 42:1-7, 61:3), righteous servants that are faithful to Torah (e.g., 51:7, 56:1-7, 60:21, 61:3), priests and people that offer sacrifice (19:19-25, 56:7, 66:21), witnesses to the truth of God and his providential plan and deeds (43:10-12), and people endowed with a royal status (60:14). The Servant Messiah bestows power and privilege upon Israelites and Gentile-Israelites, i.e., Gentiles incorporated into Israel. In this, they share in his mission, and in their mission with each other, of fulfilling Israel’s destiny according to the divine plan. In a secondary and applied sense, Israelites do become incorporated into the mission of the Servant Messiah as servants chosen by YHWH (43:10).

---

275 Troxel, *LXX-Isaiah as Translation and Interpretation*, 291. “Even though every translation engages in...transfer at the grammatical and semantic levels, the types of expansion and reformulation found in LXX-Isaiah attest a translator concerned to bring an understanding of Isaiah to his Greek readers, not simply a competent representation of its sentences” (287). The translator’s literary techniques show this, for example, by interpreting a word “in the light of one occurring later in the context (e.g., πρὶν ἢ γνώναι αὐτόν || לְדָעָתָו , 7:15, based on πρὶν ἢ γνώναι || דַעְתּוֹ n. 16)...” (288).

276 Although Mallen, *The Reading and Transformation of Isaiah in Luke-Acts*, 112, correctly identifies a relationship between the Servant figure of Isa 42:6 and 49:6, and Israel the nation, or a righteous remnant representing Israel, the two cannot be equated without the qualification explained above.
5. צדק in the MT of Isaiah and δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah

We have seen that δικαιοσύνη, the most common Septuagintal translation of צדק, from the MT Isaiah, retains the same meaning in the LXX of Isaiah as it had in classical Greek. The difference between this use of the word in Septuagintal Isaiah and classical Greek is that in the former the biblical context applies δικαιοσύνη—in its classical meaning of justice—to God and the biblical contents of salvation history.277

Δικαιοσύνη is very similar in meaning to צדק, only δικαιοσύνη is restricted in one key way compared to its Hebrew source word. צדק means “rightness,” or “that which is right.”278 Rightness is the correct measure or way things ought to be according to a standard. Comprehensively and ultimately, throughout Scripture, that standard is God’s will, or God’s word.279 All human standards are subsumed under this and are judged by it. God’s word specifies and articulates his will. Therefore, God’s word is a concrete expression of the divine standard.

In the biblical narrative, starting at the Sinai covenant with Moses and the Israelites, God manifestly revealed his word—his words or commandments—the deed of the covenant and the basis of loving God. If keeping or obeying Torah in this primary
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277 See Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 113, 115.
278 Koehler, The Hebrew & Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament, 3:1005, and Olley, ‘Righteousness in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 102, 113. This definition is conceded among grammarians. צדק has a complex array of closely related meanings; an analysis or even summary of this is beyond the scope of this study. Suffice to say, these tightly variegated meanings can be categorized in two ways: relational and legal, although the legal generally is subsumed under the relational. See James Strong, “The New Strong’s Expanded Dictionary of the Words in the Hebrew Bible,” The New Strong’s Expanded Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible, 236, and Koehler, 3:1004-1006.
279 E.g., Ps 35:24, 28; 72:1; Isa 51:1.
narrative sense is the essence of doing what is right, according to God’s standard of rightness, then fidelity or faithfulness to the standard determines rightness, or צדק with God and his covenant. צדק means faithfulness or trustworthiness, but does not, in itself, refer to content. However, צדק refers to a specific standard of the way things ought to be. צדק is an appropriate word in Isaian covenantal contexts to refer to faithfulness to the divine standard—God’s revelatory words on Sinai—by which all other standards are judged. God’s צדק, on the other hand, is fidelity to his own standard, and fulfills his covenantal promises on behalf of his people. צדק, or faithfulness to God’s word is an interior act, though it often is manifested outwardly. Isa 51:7 reflects the interior dimension of righteousness: those pursuing and knowing צדק have God’s Torah at heart. Obedience to YHWH’s Torah comes from within: it is an act of the will (Isa 1:10, 19; Ps 40:9). Hab 2:4—a noted verse in this study—affirms, as well, the relation between interior disposition and righteousness: interior faithfulness is the hallmark of the righteous person. Keeping the commandments, and other examples of righteous deeds that relate to the words of Sinai and express covenant fidelity (e.g., Isa 56:1-6, 58:6-7), flow from the interior reality of love (אהבה). אהבה is intrinsic to Decalogue obedience and is cited, from that context, in Isa

280 See Isa 59:9 for another righteousness-light (Torah) connection. In this verse and the surrounding pericope, evil intentions and deeds distance people from the righteousness to see the light or Torah, or find the truth. The truth, or standard is אמן, the same word meaning faithfulness. From the context, the object of faithfulness is light, or Torah.


282 E.g., Isa 41:10, 51:5.
56:6: “The foreigners...loving the name of the Lord (יהוה)...keep the Sabbath free from profanation and hold to my covenant.”

צדק in the MT of Isaiah and δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah are distinguished from each other because צדק includes the notion of justice, but transcends it. The Isaian meaning of צדק, loving faithfulness to Torah, must include justice as a function of faithfulness to Torah; but צדק is relational; i.e., it is focused on a person, not an abstract idea of equity and balance. Often, justice is integral to righteousness. For example, most if not all of the Decalogue enjoins justice—or at least elements of justice—toward God and neighbor. The chief motive, however, is love toward YHWH: fidelity to the covenant demonstrates this love. The difference between צדק and δικαιοσύνη is slight but still significant.

6. Luke’s appropriation of δικαιοσύνη as it relates to νόμος in the LXX of Isaiah

As we approach a conclusion in this chapter on the study of the relationship of δικαιοσύνη to νόμος in Septuagintal Isaiah, I will address the unanswered questions at the beginning of the chapter: The first question, “Does the Isaian translator of the LXX alter the meaning of δικαιοσύνη from the Hebrew source word of the translation, צדק?,’’ I have answered affirmatively. “Justice” is similar to but still different than “loving faithfulness to God’s word.” Δικαιοσύνη works adequately—at best—in the translation but is not as comprehensive and distinctly relational as the source word. I will now

address the second question: “If the Isaian translator alters the meaning, does Luke appropriate this altered meaning as it concerns his use of νόμος?

Olley points out that the Book of Isaiah was a major source for the early Christian view that the righteousness of God is salvific. Yet, significantly, the LXX does not convey this meaning, but rather conveys the divine image of the just deliverer whose salvation is the bestowal of justice. Olley further suggests that other factors may have affected New Testament use of Greek words besides the possibility of Septuagintal words in their context. These factors may have included Intertestamental literature and the familiarity of New Testament writers not only with Greek but also Aramaic, both linguae francae of the time that reflects the geographical expanse of the world of the New Testament. Although this dissertation does not intend to investigate and propose non-Septuagintal factors that may have affected the varied New Testament use of δικαιοσύνη in reference to Isaiah, the connection between God’s righteousness—understood from its Hebraic context—and salvation is apparent. God’s righteousness, in distinction from human righteousness, is God’s faithfulness to his word, and therefore to his promises. God’s righteousness is salvific, then, because his faithfulness delivers his promises of love and salvation.

In addition to the early Christian view that presented a perspective of God’s righteousness that contrasted at least partially with Septuagintal Isaiah, Luke-Acts itself reflects the Hebraic meaning and biblical connotation of צדק in its use of δικαιοσύνη.

---

284 Olley, ‘Righteousness’ in the Septuagint of Isaiah, 127.
285 Ibid., 127.
except in the purely Greco-Roman context of Luke 23:47. Luke seems to be aware of the Septuagintal limitation of the Greek meaning attached to the word. In Luke-Acts, we can identify instances in which δικαιοσύνη is isolated from its Septuagintal Isaian meaning, in which covenant faithfulness is underscored with no reference to justice. This in turn shows us that Luke, in his knowledge of Greek as well as his apparently strong familiarity with the covenantal meaning of frequent biblical words, adopts the covenantal biblical meaning of righteousness in his use of δικαιοσύνη.

One instance of this isolation in Luke’s infancy narrative—the broader narrative context of the Presentation pericope—is in Luke 1:17.

Here Luke uses δικαίων, a cognate, in contrast to the disobedient: “He will go before him in the spirit and power of Elijah to turn the hearts of fathers toward children and the disobedient to the understanding [wisdom] of the righteous (δικαίων), to prepare a people fit for the Lord.” The “disobedient” contrast well with the meaning of צדק—the obedience or faithfulness to Torah—and nowhere in this verse or immediate context does Luke present the concept of justice.

Furthermore, within the Canticle of Zechariah (Luke 1:67-80), in Luke 1:72, again in reference to Zechariah concerning John the Baptist, Zechariah proclaims that God has promised through the holy prophets “to show mercy to our fathers and to be mindful of his holy covenant.” This kind of language, situated in the broader context of the life and role of Zechariah within the infancy narrative, suggests that the reference to δικαίων in 1:17 reflects a covenantal fidelity and relational meaning primarily. The covenantal
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286 We examined Simeon’s righteousness of covenant fidelity earlier in this dissertation.
promise theme also is evident in the neighboring canticle of Mary (Luke 1:46-55), in which mercy is highlighted as a covenantal promise—not an act of justice. Likewise, in the canticle of Zechariah, God saves from injustice because of the covenant (1:72-73); mercy is the incentive to save, not justice, per se (1:77-78). Similarly in the canticle, God’s salvation through the forgiveness of sins omits the consequence of shame. Justice is not the issue.

Luke adopts the Hebraic meaning of δικαιοσύνη. Apparently, then, he also did not appropriate a connotation of νόμος influenced substantially by the concept of justice. As such, the Septuagintal definition of δικαιοσύνη did not make a direct difference in the key role νόμος plays in the Presentation pericope. And, to answer the last question posed in the beginning of this chapter, since Luke did not alter the meaning of Ἰσραήλ by adopting a Septuagintal definition of δικαιοσύνη, his portrayal of Jesus’ messianic restoration of Israel and universal salvation of the Gentiles also remains uncolored—directly—by the Septuagintal stroke of the classical Greek meaning of δικαιοσύνη.

However, as previously discussed, Luke’s inversion of the Isaian order of salvation (Luke 2:32) draws special attention because of its intrinsic peculiarity, and, more specifically, because it occurs at the climax of the Nunc Dimittis. In this climax, Simeon, moved by the Holy Spirit, presents light as a metaphor for νόμος and foretells the restoration and fulfillment of Israel. Here, Luke appropriates, albeit indirectly, the Septuagintal implication of the contextual interdependence between νόμος and δικαιοσύνη. God’s merciful justice toward the Gentiles, and the Gentile engagement of
acting justly by converting and obeying the revelation of νόμος, accentuate Gentile salvation and their turn to the glory of Israel—the light radiating from Mount Zion.

Grogan suggests that the inversion occurs because of the order of conversion between Jews and Gentiles. More likely, however, the order reflects Luke’s appropriation of this Septuagintal emphasis on Gentile participation in Israel’s mission, probably inspired by the belief in the merciful justice of God that spares converts from divine judgment, invites them into glorious salvation, and commissions them into his service. A close look at Septuagintal Isa 46:13, in conjunction with 60:1-3—which supplies its context—emphasizes Gentile inclusion and salvation at the glorified destination of Mount Zion. Isa 46:13, as we have seen, is the object of the allusion of Luke 2:32 concerning “glory for your people Israel.”

In Isa 46:13—the end of a chapter condemning idolatry and encouraging the faithful—God manifests his presence to Israel in Zion, a foreboding of his judgment against the idol-dependent nations and of his salvific justice for Israel. Isa 60:1-3, informed by the immediately preceding verses (Isa 59:20-21) on the new covenant concerning God’s “words” (cf. Jer 31:33 and Ezek 36:24-27), describes the divine operation of this salvific act. God’s presence—the light of his νόμος—descending upon and dwelling in Zion, radiates throughout the world. This light then gathers and guides converted nations and their leaders.
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287 See p. 6.
288 This emphasis, discussed earlier in the chapter, may reflect the Septuagintal Sitz im Leben which required significant interaction with Gentile populations.
If Luke’s order does reflect this Septuagintal emphasis, then it suggests that Luke’s message is intended largely for Gentiles, including descendents of dispersed Israelites. Luke-Acts, of course, is renowned for highlighting the importance of Gentile conversion.

Building on this, Luke’s inverted order in Luke 2:32 also reflects the Isaian sequence of culmination of the fulfillment of the Gentiles. In Isa 2:1-5, 60:1-7, 62:1-3, and 66:18-20, νόμος moves among Gentiles in the following order. First the revelatory light of Torah reaches the Gentiles. Then the faithful among the Gentiles traverse to the source of light and see the glory of God residing in the heart of Israel, the renewed Jerusalem—Mount Zion.

In my commentary above, I tacitly answered the final two questions: “Does this make a difference in the key role νόμος plays in the Presentation pericope?”

“Consequently, would a nuanced alteration of this sort also color Luke’s portrayal of Jesus’ messianic restoration of Israel and universal salvation of the Gentiles?” Directly, the answer to both questions is “no.” However, indirectly, the Septuagintal alteration in Isaiah places more attention on Gentiles and dispersed Israelites, accentuates their potential shame as well as importance and glory, and underscores, for Luke, the Isaian sequence of culmination of fulfillment of the Gentiles. Thus, Luke, in the Presentation
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289 Luke handily drops clues about his recognition of the importance of Israelites of the Diaspora, including, for example, the unnecessary tribal identification of Anna of the Tribe of Asher (Luke 2:36), and Peter’s address to “Israelites” at Pentecost (Acts 2:22).
290 See, for example, Acts 13:43.
291 Isa 62:1-3 does not depict the nations en route to Jerusalem.
292 “This” refers to Luke’s appropriation of an altered Septuagintal meaning of ἡ δικαιοσύνη as it concerns his use of νόμος.
pericope and throughout Luke-Acts, highlights Jesus’ universal salvation, and Jesus’ complementary and foundational work—the restoration of Israel.

In Luke-Acts, Jesus, as νόμος or Torah in person, plays an especially important messianic role in drawing various peoples of the world to himself and guiding them “by” his light—a Septuagintal Isaian nuance—and by incorporating Gentiles into his work of salvation. This is an emphasis in Luke-Acts. For example, in Acts, Jesus commissions Paul and Barnabus to be light before Gentiles and their dignitaries and authorities—such as Cornelius and King Agrippa—and to empower them to hear the Gospel or spread it to others as well.

Complementing the Gentile mission, in Luke-Acts, is Jesus’ restoration of Israel. Jesus, the Davidic heir—in his prophesied death and resurrection—also establishes the Davidic messianic reign on Mount Zion, and at Pentecost his Spirit is poured out to purify and transform the repentant (Acts 1-2). Here we see the elements of the divine design in Israel’s reconstitution: the redeeming purification from sin, repentance, the emergence of the νόμος/Servant Messiah, the rebuilding of the Davidic kingdom, the reconstitution of Israel, the ingathering of the exiles, the inclusion of outcasts, the bestowal of the Spirit upon God’s people, and the faithful reciprocation to the νόμος (the Servant Messiah). Jesus, the Davidic Servant Messiah, commissions the representatives of the Twelve Tribes—the Twelve Apostles, the men of Galilee (Acts 1:1-12, 2: 29-36)—to serve as his witnesses (Acts 1:8; cf. Isa 43:10-13) to the whole House of Israel and to the ends of the earth (Acts 2:36, 1:8). Jesus the Servant Messiah

---

thus is Torah in person whose light—established on Zion, a like-Sinai—glorifies the
Davidic Kingdom of the whole House of Israel, and whose light emanates from Mount
Zion. In this light, he instructs, saves, and incorporates the dispersed Israelites and
Gentile converts into his mission and into the fulfillment of Israel.
Conclusion

1. Sequence within conclusion

To conclude, I first will address three exegetical topics. The first topic pertains to a specific aspect of Luke’s use of νόμος in the presentation narrative—the demonstrability that Luke 2:32 is an allusion to the Isaian νόμος. The second and third topics are two methodological issues in current scholarship that relate to the methodological approach adopted in this dissertation.

Second, I briefly will summarize the development of my thesis argument and thereby present the results of this study. These results, I hope, will in some way contribute to the following: our understanding of Luke’s use of νόμος in the Presentation narrative; the relation among νόμος, the temple, and God’s glory depicted in Luke-Acts; peculiarities of the LXX of Isaiah relative to the MT of Isaiah in reference to νόμος; continuity of Luke-Acts with the Old Testament and continuity of the Mosaic/Sinai motif with the Davidic/Zion motif; divergent—and particularly dual—narrative meanings of Torah; and the relation of Christology and ecclesiology, particularly from the context of the new exodus, to Lukan interpretation of messianism within Isaiah.
2. The demonstrability that Luke 2:32 is an allusion to the Isaian νόμος

In this dissertation, I established that Luke 2:32, φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἑθνῶν καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ, is an allusion to certain verses in Isaiah. I also listed in Chapter Two, Part Five the verses to which Luke 2:32 alludes: Isa 42:6, 49:6, and 51:4 on identification of the Servant of YHWH as the covenant of the people and a light for the nations; and Isa 46:13, on God’s plan to give Israel his glory. Within these verses, Septuagintal Isaiah employs light as a metaphor for νόμος that we recognize in his appositional technique. Thus, Luke 2:32 alludes to νόμος—the object of the metaphor “light” in the verses mentioned above—of Septuagintal Isaiah.

Does the comprehensive use of Hays’s seven criteria for determining the presence of echoes and allusions validate this allusion to νόμος in Luke 2:32? Certainly we could assess this presence by reducing the criteria to the two that are necessary, availability and volume, and accommodate the other five. However, Hays’s seven criteria offer the advantage of a more thorough assessment. Hays acknowledges the relative distinction between allusion and echo by asserting that “allusion is used of obvious intertextual references, echo of subtler ones.”294 I further distinguish between them by predicating that an allusion, unlike an echo, requires wording to effect transumption.295

294 Hays, Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul, 29.
295 See pp. 20-21 of this dissertation for a discussion about distinction between allusion and echo.
In the following, then, we will apply Hays’s criteria for determining the validity of νόμος as an object of the allusion of Luke 2:32.

Wording in Isa 42:6 (εἰς φῶς ἔθνων), 49:6 (εἰς φῶς ἔθνων), and 51:4 (φῶς ἔθνων) are the sources of Luke’s allusion to Isaiah’s “light” as a metaphor for νόμος. The sources were accessible to Luke and his original readers because—as I explained in Chapter One—Isaian scrolls were accessible to first century Jews. “Availability,” then, is a validating criterion of νόμος as an object of the allusion of Luke 2:32. “Volume” also is a validating criterion. The inclusion of the two keys words in the precursor texts—φῶς ἔθνων—are repeated in the allusion contained in Luke 2:32 (φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνων).296 In addition, φῶς ἔθνων is prominent in Isaiah: we read it in all three sources of Luke’s allusion to Isaiah’s “light” listed above. Certainly, this allusion receives rhetorical stress in Luke 2:32; it is the meaning of “salvation” in Luke 2:30 prophesied and proclaimed by Simeon in his Nunc Dimittis, a summary statement of Luke-Acts. Because the exact wording of the precursor texts repeats itself in Luke 2:32, the volume, as a validating criterion, is pronounced.

Because availability and volume—the two essential criteria for assessing the presence of allusions—already qualify as validating criteria, we need not pursue this investigation further to demonstrate the validity of νόμος as an object of the allusion of Luke 2:32. However, as noted above, an assessment of this allusion according to the

296 ἀποκάλυψις, of course, is significant because it reinforces the purpose of the light: YHWH’s disclosure of himself and his ways to the nations, by means of his Servant Messiah, in fulfillment of the Davidic covenant.
third through seventh criteria will clarify all the more the nuances reflected in the availability and volume of the allusion. Below is this continuing assessment.


“Thematic coherence” is a validating criterion. The wording, images, and context of Isa 42:6, 49:6, and 51:4 integrate into the Presentation narrative and the other Old Testament references contained within the narrative matrix. Some examples of these references are elements of the verses within the Presentation pericope that allude to Isaian Servant Messiah themes related to Septuagintal Isaian νόμος, such as Christ (v. 26), salvation (v. 30), and glory of Israel (v. 32).

“Historical plausibility” is a validating criterion. We may assert confidently that first century Luke, steeped in the Old Testament, intended to appropriate the Isaian material studied in this dissertation. Luke’s appropriation of Septuagintal Isaian Servant Messiah material is plausible.

“History of interpretation” is a validating criterion, although it is sparsely attested. Young, Olley, and Eichrodt identified Isaiah’s use of light as a metaphor for νόμος: this Isaian metaphor is the crucial link to the obvious Isaian allusion many commentators have found in Luke 2:32. The “light” metaphor, then, substantiates Luke
2:32 as a more penetrating allusion to Septuagintal Isaian νόμος, as well. I intend that this dissertation may further corroborate and clarify this allusion contained in Luke 2:32.

The final criterion, “satisfaction,” also validates νόμος as an object of the allusion of Luke 2:32. This criterion is similar to “thematic coherence.” Satisfaction assesses, rather subjectively, the contextual sense of the intertextual reading; in this case, I propose that the allusion of Luke 2:32, of which νόμος is the object, satisfies the context and illuminates the surrounding discourse for the same reason I gave above regarding thematic coherence. In addition, more generally, identifying and studying νόμος as an object of the allusion of Luke 2:32—a project of this dissertation—addresses certain issues, such as the meaning in Luke of “light for revelation to the Gentiles,” and the relationship of Torah to the Servant Messiah and the glory of Israel. I treat these issues in Chapters 1-3 of this dissertation.

Though I hope my dissertation has contributed toward a better understanding of this significant allusion, I should also add that the transumption of the allusion, through which νόμος emerges, naturally reflects functions and qualities of the Servant Messiah. This Messiah intricately relates to νόμος, and, even more so, is νόμος in person. Thus, the allusion to the pedagogical and saving power of νόμος focuses on the revelatory words of YHWH—the commandments of love—and incorporates all dimensions of the Servant Messiah, νόμος in person. This means that, for example, the suffering and redemptive act of the Servant Messiah in Isa 52-53 precedes and then effects the movement of the revelation of YHWH’s words, and informs the depth and intricacy of
their meaning. The transumption of the allusion to νόμος opens a window to view dimensions of the radical Torah that stretch to a transcendent, messianic horizon.

3. Methodological considerations

I have adopted an intertextual methodological approach to study the Septuagintal Isaian use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope; this presupposes, according to the view of Isaiah at the turn of the era, that one author—the Prophet Isaiah—wrote the Book of Isaiah. In this third part of my Conclusion, I will address these two methodological issues: the hermeneutical approach to Luke-Acts within intertextual analysis, and interpretation of the Book of Isaiah at the turn of the era.

Brawley, Strauss, Pao, and Litwak all have impacted Lukan studies with helpful, if not novel, approaches to understanding and interpreting intertextuality within Luke-Acts. Brawley asserts that intertextuality ripples within Luke-Acts because Luke constantly appropriates Old Testament textual patterns: when readers identify allusions, these allusions cue them to hear more expansive contextual voices. This basic insight


298 The methodological issues noted above, along with the topics related to the results of this study according to the development of my thesis argument, are quite significant to scholarly research and theological development. However, anything more than a brief treatment of these methodological issues or of the results of the thesis argument is beyond the scope of this narrow, specialized study. Nevertheless, the implications of these issues and results do raise important questions or “leads” to possible solutions.

is perhaps the most practical and logical hermeneutical strategy in Lukan intertextual analysis.

While examining the theme of the fulfillment of the promises to David through Jesus the Messiah, Strauss’s methodological approach broadly employs Luke’s “proclamation from prophecy and pattern” motif. Though Strauss does not neglect to cite and study obvious Old Testament quotations and allusions, he centers his work on Luke’s motif of positive proclamation of Jesus through fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy as well as typological patterns. Thus, Strauss employs a balanced, i.e., explicit and implicit, approach toward intertextual analysis.


---

Although I agree with Pao that the Isaian new exodus is the fundamental frameworking story in Luke-Acts—particularly in Acts—other motifs may rival its hermeneutical influence, such as the Davidic messianic fulfillment motif. Pao seems to have downplayed its significance in his presentation of the theme within the restoration of Israel, “The Rebuilding of the Davidic Kingdom.” In Isaiah, Davidic messianic fulfillment is related inextricably to νόμος. Isaiah advances the differentiated yet unified reality of the Davidic Messiah and νόμος as both the agent of the new exodus, and its goal, i.e., the faithful reciprocation to νόμος. The relationship between these efficient and final causalities, in intertextual analysis of Luke-Acts, requires further study.

A prior and superordinate methodological concern in intertextual analysis, however, is that we proceed in the most objective manner possible, and that first means identifying—in order—quotations, allusions, echoes, and then motifs or larger themes. Litwak presents criteria for identifying intertexts other than direct quotations; this is helpful, but still we are able to identify direct quotations and clear allusions more easily and assuredly than echoes and motifs. Thus, unless a particular study requires focus or emphasis upon an echo or motif, exegetes should give priority to direct quotation and clear allusion. Moreover, even focused concentration on a particular motif requires attention given to smaller, defined parts of the pattern that constitute the motif.

In light of these points and their relation to this study on Luke’s use of the Septuagintal νόμος in the Presentation narrative, I propose two methodological
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principles for antecedent intertextual analysis in general and in Luke-Acts in particular. First, we should look for direct quotations and, particularly with Luke-Acts, clear allusions: these often establish or validate the presence and formational design of a motif, such as Luke 2:32 validating the presence and formational effect of new exodus and Davidic messianic fulfillment motifs. Second, we should recognize that motifs may converge upon and inform other motifs, such as convergence of Davidic messianic fulfillment and the new exodus, or of the Sinai/Mosaic covenant and Zion/Davidic covenant.

The second methodological issue that emerges from this study is the hermeneutical presupposition of the view of Isaiah at the turn of the era, that one author—the Prophet Isaiah—wrote the Book of Isaiah. Most scholars gloss over this issue and perhaps acknowledge this presupposition implicitly in their exegesis that treats Isaian appropriation. However, other scholarship reflects an unawareness of, or unconcern with, the view of the first century A.D. believer—and of Jews prior to this—of a unified-narrative approach to interpreting and appropriating Isaiah. This scholarship attempts to understand appropriation of Isaiah at the turn of the century according to standard, contemporary assumptions of proto-Isaian, deutero-Isaian, and trito-Isaian categories, all of which were foreign to the mindset in the first century. Strauss, Pao, and Mallon rightly have abandoned this anachronism, but none of them have

---

addressed the issue at length or have discussed the influence the anachronism exerts on perceptions in contemporary biblical scholarship. Although Strauss’s, Pao’s, and Mallon’s hermeneutic do not require such a commentary, a discussion of this issue may contribute to enhanced exegesis, i.e., a better integration of the data, when this kind of anachronism may fail to see connections that clarify and enhance our understanding of first century interpretation of Isaiah.\footnote{See, for example, the following from three highly accomplished scholars: Brueggeman’s misplaced emphasis on “a community in trouble,” to the exclusion of direct reference to Jesus, in his analysis of Luke’s use of Isa 61:1-4 in Luke 4:18-19 (Brueggeman, \textit{Isaiah 40-66}, 214); Ehrman’s interpretation of the total dichotomization of the Isaian Servant of YHWH from God’s Messiah until Christian isogesis later in the first century A.D. (Ehrman, \textit{The New Testament}, 256); similarly, Ehrman assumes that first century and pre-first century interpretation of Isaiah disassociated the identity of the Servant of Isa 52-53 from a messianic understanding of the Servant throughout Isaiah—see Bart D. Ehrman, \textit{Jesus: Apocalyptic Prophet of the New Millenium} (Oxford: University Press, 1999), 235-236; Oscar Cullman, though cued by Ernst Lohmeyer about the “anointing” of the Spirit of the Servant of God, admits to a mutual influence in Judaism between the concepts of Messiah and a suffering Servant of God, but does not explore the narrative throughout Isaiah for an answer that helps explain this influence (Oscar Cullman, \textit{The Christology of the New Testament}, 55-60).}

Prophetic narrative sources and their accompanying stages were unthinkable to believers in the long history of biblical Israel. In the first century A.D., the tradition of belief in single authorship of Isaiah had long been established. The Book of Sirach, written in the early second century B.C., attests to this belief. Sirach 48:22-25 consists of contents that reflect an expanse throughout the two most distinct movements of the Isaian narrative (Isa 1-39 and Isa 40-66):

\begin{quote}
For Hezekiah did what was right and held fast to the paths of David, as ordered by the illustrious prophet Isaiah, who saw the truth in visions. In his lifetime he turned back the sun and prolonged the life of the king. By his powerful spirit he...
\end{quote}
looked into the future and consoled the mourners of Zion; he foretold what should be till the end of time, hidden things yet to be fulfilled.

The Qumran Scroll of the entire Book of Isaiah, sometimes known as the St. Mark’s Isaiah Scroll, dates to about 125 B.C. The Scroll reflects no break or indentation between chapters 39 and 40, and the manuscript is a copy as well. Taking the evidence of Sirach and the Isaian Scroll together, Young asserts that in the third century B.C., single Isaian authorship tradition was well established, and that the Book of Isaiah existed at that time in the same form we have today.

In addition to this evidence supporting the long-standing tradition of Isaian authorship, the first century presented no other name but Isaiah, son of Amoz, attached to this book. Moreover, although Isa 40-66—so delineated by modern convention—was one of the most common prophetic pieces appropriated and interpreted in the first century, no “second” or “third” Isaiah was ever identified. Of course, first century interpreters, like second century B.C. Sirach, also believed in the supernatural quality and predictive capacity of divinely ordained prophets. For all of these reasons, the first century interpreter, such as Luke, understandably viewed Isaiah as a unified prophetic piece, and understood key passages throughout it—such as on the Servant and the Davidic Messiah—related to each other and inspired by the same prophetic Spirit.

---

306 Joseph R. Rosenbloom, *The Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll: A Literary Analysis—A Comparison with the Masoretic Text and the Biblia Hebraica* (Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans Publishing, 1970), ix, xiii, 81, 83. Rosenbloom believes that the Dead Sea Isaiah Scroll is a popularization of the MT Book of Isaiah; it is an attempt, as a generally faithful copy, to simplify or make the MT version more understandable.

I propose, therefore, that intertextual exegesis concerning interpretation of Isaiah, from the vantage point of the turn of the era, should employ a unitive Isaian perspective. This perspective will facilitate identifying integrating data, and therefore may achieve results with greater precision and depth.

4. Results of this study

My thesis is that Luke’s use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope (Luke 2:22-35) highlights Jesus’ identity as the Messiah who will restore and fulfill Israel. In Chapter One, pp. 25-111, I asserted that Luke’s transitional use of νόμος in this pericope reflects the promise/fulfillment motif of Luke-Acts. This use of νόμος, particularly from the LXX of Isaiah, illustrates the movement of Israel within its history as God’s people of the exodus and Sinai who are en route through a new exodus. In this movement, Israel shifts from adherence to Mosaic legislation to adherence to the promised Davidic Messiah. In this shift, Israel must renew and intensify its fidelity to God’s direct revelation at Sinai.

Νόμος is a translation of Torah, literally meaning “direction” or “teaching.” Νόμος has extended meanings biblically and especially throughout post-Biblical history, and is closely associated with temple theology. Narratively in Exodus and Deuteronomy, νόμος first refers to commandments of love, YHWH’s “words,” revealed on Mount Sinai and spoken by YHWH himself. The prophets, including Isaiah, refer to νόμος in this way. Mosaic laws are distinguished from this and from each other
The second and historically most common narrative meaning of νόμος is the full body of laws of Moses given to the Israelites. The third and least common biblical meaning of νόμος in the Old Testament is the Pentateuch, or books of Moses.

On the surface of the text in the Presentation, νόμος reflects obedience to the full body of Mosaic legislation. Joseph and Mary are examples of this obedience: they fulfill two laws of Moses in the temple. The law concerning the first-born associates Jesus with the temple and further discloses his messianic identity. Simeon prophesies about Jesus and Mary during Joseph’s and Mary’s fulfillment of Mosaic law in the temple; Simeon’s righteousness anticipates the internal restoration of Israel through fidelity to YHWH’s “words,” established by the righteousness and teaching of the Davidic Messiah, foretold in Luke 2:32.

Luke allusively appropriates the Old Testament, and especially the LXX of Isaiah, to accentuate the narrative climax of this pericope (2:32): the Davidic Servant Messiah—the νόμος in person—will restore and fulfill Israel. However, prior to the climactic revelation, Luke 2:30-31 refers to the Davidic Messiah as salvation in person. Luke closely associates salvation and νόμος in the following verses of the pericope.

Luke 2:32, through the metaphor “light,” alludes to and echoes Servant of YHWH passages that identify the Servant as the Davidic Messiah and as νόμος—the words of YHWH, or the commandments of love, in person. This process of allusion and

---

308 We may readily assume that Isaiah affirmed implementation of and fidelity to Mosaic law—for there is no indication or reason to the contrary—although he did not use νόμος in this way. See, for example, pp. 56-58.
identification occurs in stages.\footnote{References to these stages are the following: stage one, pp. 63-64, 72-77; stage two, pp. 66-72; stage three, pp. 77-89, 97-98, 100, 129-130—see also pp. 137-142.} First, Luke identifies Jesus, the Davidic Messiah, as the Isaian Servant of YHWH. Luke’s identification of the Davidic Messiah as the Servant is consistent with the most plausible scholarly view that the Servant should be identified in some Isaian pericopes as corporate Israel, and in others as an individual person, i.e., Israel in person. In addition, Luke’s identification of the Davidic Messiah as the Servant corresponds to the interpretation that, within Isaiah, the Davidic Messiah is the individual Servant, Israel in person. Second, in Luke, the Servant Messiah is the glory of Israel. And third, three texts in Isaiah disclose “light” as νόμος or Torah: Isaiah presents the Servant Messiah as “light” or νόμος in person, and Luke presents Jesus—the Servant Messiah—as “light” or νόμος in person.

We can deduce in Isaiah that νόμος, of which light is a metaphor, is the inner reality of the divine glory which provides relevance to the temple.\footnote{See p. 98 concerning νόμος as the inner reality of the divine glory. Without the revelation of Torah of the divine glory, the temple would have nothing to enshrine. See also the discussion following this footnote marked above.} This relevance is all the more intelligible when we recognize the relationship of the temple to its archetype and prototype, Mount Sinai. Just as Mount Sinai enshrined YHWH’s glory and his words of the covenant, and provided the means by which Israelites could transcend themselves and approach YHWH whose throne resides above, so too the temple enshrines divine glory and its νόμος. Νόμος, or divine instruction, binds Israel to its covenant and saves YHWH’s people by delineating the meaning of faithful love among them, and by illuminating the path of the new exodus, into which the Gentiles also are
saved. Luke, in his New Testament perspective on the role and reality of νόμος, validates both the Moses/Sinai covenant and the Davidic/Zion covenant, and the relationship between them. Νόμος conceptually accommodates and merges other realities—such as divine glory and the temple—thereby synthesizing various traditions.

Luke 2:33-35, in presenting Simeon’s prophecies about Jesus and Mary, shows the fulfillment of Luke’s use of νόμος in the narrative. As the symbolic cornerstone of the temple, Jesus will fulfill the purpose of his consecration in the temple. Mary’s witness of the suffering and death of the consecrated firstborn anticipates the risen presence of νόμος—the symbolic cornerstone—in the temple.

Luke’s dual use of νόμος in the Presentation pericope reflects the movement of Israel into a new exodus. Likewise, throughout Luke-Acts, Luke’s use of νόμος again reflects the transition of Israel escaping from exile and journeying into a new exodus, in which the νόμος permanently restores the temple. The LXX of Isaiah slightly accentuates the saving power of νόμος as well as its power to execute justice; this reflects, or perhaps highlights, the intricate relationship and virtual identification between Torah and salvation in Septuagintal Isaiah.

In Chapter Two, pp. 112-131, we have seen how Luke appropriates the role of νόμος in the Isaian motif of Israel’s restoration and fulfillment to show that Jesus is the Servant Messiah who restores Israel and leads it to accomplish its mission of universal salvation. Isaiah depicts, in a converging unity, Judah’s deliverance from Babylon and Israel’s movement into its messianic, eschatological future as a new exodus. The overarching theme of the restoration is foundational for this new exodus. The complete
The process of the Isaian motif of Israel’s restoration is the following: 1) the redeeming purification from sin; 2) repentance; 3) the emergence of the νόμος/Servant Messiah; 4) the rebuilding of the Davidic kingdom; 5) the reconstitution of Israel; 6) the ingathering of the exiles; 7) the inclusion of outcasts; 8) the bestowal of the Spirit upon God’s people, and 9) the faithful reciprocation to the νόμος, the Servant Messiah. David Pao presents, persuasively but partially, the major themes of which the restoration consists; Pao discusses six themes, but omits the redeeming purification from sin, the emergence of the νόμος/Servant Messiah, and the faithful reciprocation to the νόμος, the Servant Messiah. The Isaian use of νόμος, understood within the context of the Davidic covenant—that the Davidic Messiah is νόμος in person—helps show us a comprehensive depiction of the restoration.

According to Isaiah, following the restoration, Israel attains fulfillment by instrumentally saving the Gentiles. In Luke 2:32, two facets of Simeon’s prophecy reflect the Isaian theme of the restoration and fulfillment of Israel: a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and the glory of Israel. These both are manifestations of νόμος: first νόμος glorifies the restored Israel, and then fulfills the status and purpose of Jerusalem/Israel as a glorious and saving beacon of light to the Gentiles. Within the formative messianic context of the Presentation pericope, Luke 2:32—in its allusion to Septuagintal νόμος—identifies Jesus as the Servant Messiah who will restore and fulfill Israel.

Chapter Three, pp. 132-154, investigates the influence of Septuagintal Isaian δικαιοσύνη on Luke’s appropriation of Septuagintal Isaian νόμος. Δικαιοσύνη in the LXX of Isaiah is the most common translation of ḥesed of the MT of Isaiah. The Isaian
translator adopted the standard classical Greek definition of “justice” for δικαιοσύνη and its cognate forms. Δικαιοσύνη refers to God’s justice as ruler and judge, and in his just actions for vindication and salvation or judgment and punishment. Δικαιοσύνη also refers to human justice toward God and each other. God, in his justice, is merciful to the repentant, including Gentile converts.

In five pericopes within the LXX of Isaiah, δικαιοσύνη and νόμος are contextually interdependent. God is just in enjoining and requiring his divine instruction. Israelites are just toward God and each other in obeying νόμος. Gentiles are highlighted for their response to νόμος. God will justly punish, confound, and shame idolatrous, unconverted Gentiles. Converted Gentiles are just ones: they obey νόμος, are sheltered from divine wrath, and participate in Israel’s life and mission by incorporation into the work of the just one, the Servant Messiah. God’s mercy toward the repentant and converted is an exercise of his justice, and God’s salvation is an act of restoring and providing justice. For example, restoring the full House of Israel is a saving act of God’s justice.

The Isaian translator uses this Greek connotation of justice in a biblical context. The word from which he translates δικαιοσύνη is צדק. This Hebrew word means “rightness,” and implies a standard according to which it is right. The ultimate biblical standard is God’s will, more concretely expressed as God’s word. In Isaiah, God’s word juxtaposes with Torah, the divine words of Sinai. In the Hebraic context of Torah, rightness or righteousness means loving faithfulness to Torah. The reality of צדק, then, comes from within and is expressed externally through obedience to Torah, God’s
standard. In its loving faithfulness, it includes justice; because it is interior and relational, it transcends justice. God’s righteousness is his faithfulness to his word, and therefore to his promises.

Luke does not appropriate Septuagintal Isaian δικαιοσύνη as it relates to νόμος in the LXX of Isaiah. The New Testament, at large, follows the MT understanding of righteousness as faithfulness to God’s covenantal will. Furthermore, at a key point in Luke’s infancy narrative, in addition to the Presentation pericope, δικαιοσύνη refers to covenantal faithfulness, not justice. However, in an apparent display of deft linguistic distinction, Luke applies a Septuagintal Isaian interpretation of a cognate of δικαιοσύνη in Luke 23:47.

Luke’s inversion of the Isaian order of salvation (Luke 2:32), however, indicates that he has appropriated the Septuagintal Isaian implication of the contextual interdependence between νόμος and δικαιοσύνη. In Septuagintal Isaiah, God exercises merciful justice toward the Gentiles, and faithful Gentiles engage in acting justly by renouncing idols, converting, and obeying the revelation of νόμος—the Servant Messiah. These acts of justice underscore Gentile salvation, their incorporation into the power and service of the Messiah, and their turn to the glory of Israel—the light radiating from Mount Zion. The LXX of Isaiah, particularly Chapters 49, and 59-60, also highlights the intimate and positive relationship between faithful, corporate, tribal Israel, and their light, the Servant Messiah. The accentuation of Gentile participation and salvation concomitantly highlights the service and salvation of a group subsumed
within the Gentile population—the dispersed Israelites—in their obedience to the light of νόμος and their return to the glory of the restoration of Israel at Mount Zion (e.g., Isa 2:5).

Building on this, and implied within it, Luke’s inverted order in Luke 2:32 also reflects the Isaian sequence of the culmination of the fulfillment of the Gentiles. The revelatory light of Torah reaches the Gentiles first; then the faithful among the Gentiles traverse to the source of light and see the glory of God—within which reigns the Davidic Servant Messiah—residing in the heart of Israel, the renewed Jerusalem, Mount Zion.
Appendix I

The Lukan Presentation Narrative (Luke 2:22-35)

22 When the days were completed for their purification according to the law of Moses, they took him up to Jerusalem to present him to the Lord, 23 just as it is written in the law of the Lord, “Every male that opens the womb shall be consecrated to the Lord,” 24 and to offer the sacrifice of “a pair of turtledoves or two young pigeons,” in accordance with the dictate in the law of the Lord. 25 Now there was a man in Jerusalem whose name was Simeon. This man was righteous and devout, awaiting the consolation of Israel, and the Holy Spirit was upon him. 26 It had been revealed to him by the holy Spirit that he should not see death before he had seen the Messiah of the Lord. 27 He came in the Spirit into the temple; and when the parents brought in the child Jesus to perform the custom of the law in regard to him, 28 he took him into his arms and blessed God, saying:

29 “Now, Master, you may let your servant go in peace, according to your word, 30 for my eyes have seen your salvation, 31 which you prepared in sight of all the peoples, 32 a light for revelation to the Gentiles, and glory for your people Israel.”

33 The child’s father and mother were amazed at what was said about him; 34 and Simeon blessed them and said to Mary his mother, “Behold, this child is destined for the fall and rise of many in Israel, and to be a sign that will be contradicted 35 (and you yourself a sword will pierce) so that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed.”
22 Καὶ ὅτε ἐπλήσθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ αὐτῶν κατὰ τὸν νόμον Μωϋσέως, ἀνήγαγον αὐτόν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα παραστῆσαι τῷ κυρίῳ, 23 καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίῳ ὅτι Πάν ἄρονεν διανοίγον μήτραν ἂγιον τῷ κυρίῳ χληθήσεται, 24 καὶ τοῦ δούναι θυσίαν κατὰ τὸ εἰρήμ. ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου, ἐζήγος τροφῶν ὑπὸ δύο νοσσοὺς περιστερῶν. 25 Καὶ ἤδειον ἁνθρώπους ἦν ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμ ὁ ὅνομα Συμεών καὶ ὁ ἁνθρώπους οὐτός δίκαιος καὶ εὐλαβής προσδεχόμενος παράκλησιν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, καὶ πνεῦμα ἦν ἄγιον ἐπ᾽ αὐτόν. 26 καὶ ἦν αὐτῷ κεχρηματισμένον ὑπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἀγίου μὴ ἰδεῖν θάνατον πρὶν [ἡ] ἀν ἰδ. τὸν Χριστόν κυρίῳ. 27 καὶ ἦλθεν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν· καὶ ἐν τῷ εἰσαγαγεὶν τοὺς γονεῖς τὸ παιδίον Ἰησοῦν τοῦ ποιήσαι αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸ εἰθεμένον τοῦ νόμου περὶ αὐτοῦ 28 καὶ αὐτὸς ἐδέξατο αὐτὸ εἰς τὰς ἄγιας καὶ εὐλόγησεν τὸν θεόν καὶ εἰπέν,

29 Νῦν ἀπολύεις τὸν δούλόν σου δέσποτα, κατὰ τὸ ὅμημα σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ· 30 ὅτι εἶδον οἱ ὀφθαλμοί μου τὸ σωτήριόν σου, 31 ὁ ἤτοιμας κατὰ πρόσωπον πάντων τῶν λαών, 32 φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἐθνῶν"311 καὶ δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ.

33 καὶ ἦν ὁ πατήρ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἡ μήτηρ θεματίσαντες ἐπὶ τοῖς λαλομένοις περὶ αὐτοῦ. 34 καὶ εὐλόγησεν αὐτοὺς Συμεών καὶ εἰπέν πρὸς Μαριάμ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ, ὃς ὅτε κεῖται εἰς πτέρωσιν καὶ ἀνάστασιν πολλῶν ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ καὶ εἰς σημεῖον ἀντιλέγομενον 35 καὶ σου [δὲ] αὐτῆς τὴν ψυχήν διελύσεται ὕμφασιν, ὅπως ἄν ἀποκαλυφθῶσιν ἐκ πολλῶν καρδιῶν διαλογισμοί.

Appendix II

Isaiah 51:1-8

1 Listen to me, you who pursue justice/righteousness (τὸ δίκαιον/צדק) who seek the Lord; look to the rock from which you were hewn, to the pit from which you were quarried;

2 look to Abraham, your father, and to Sarah, who gave you birth; when he was but one I called him, I blessed him and made him many.

3 Yes, the Lord shall comfort Zion (Καὶ σὲ νῦν παρακαλέσω, Σιων/כִּי נָתַתְךָ טוֹב) and have pity on all her ruins; her deserts shall be made like Eden; her wasteland like the garden of the Lord; joy and gladness shall be found in her, thanksgiving and the sound of song.

4 Be attentive to me, my people; my folk, give ear to me. For law shall go forth from my presence, (ὅτι νόμος παρ᾽ ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται/כי נחמ כי-ציון) and my judgment, as the light of the peoples.

5 I will make my justice/righteousness come speedily; my salvation shall go forth [as light—Codex Vaticanus] (ἐξελεύσεται ὡς φῶς τὸ σωτηρίόν μου/ישעי יצא) and my arm shall judge [bring justice to] the nations; [and on my arm the Gentiles shall trust] in me shall the coastlands hope, and my arm they shall await.
6 Raise your eyes to the heavens,
and look at the earth below;
though the heavens grow thin like smoke,
the earth wears out like a garment
and its inhabitants die like flies,
my salvation shall remain forever
and my justice/righteousness shall never be dismayed.

7 Hear me, you who know justice/righteousness,
you people who have my teaching (ὁ νόμος/תורתי)
at heart:
fear not the reproach of men,
be not dismayed at their revilings.

8 They shall be like a garment eaten by moths,
like wool consumed by grubs;
but my justice shall remain forever
and my salvation, for all generations.
Isaiah 2:1-5—English Translation and MT

1 This is what Isaiah, son of Amoz, saw concerning Judah and Jerusalem.
2 In days to come, the mountain of the Lord’s house
   Shall be established as the highest mountain
   and raised above the hills.

   All nations shall stream toward it;
3 many peoples shall come and say
   “Come, let us climb the Lord’s mountain,
   to the house of the God of Jacob,
   that he may instruct us of his ways,
   and we may walk in his paths.”
   For from Zion shall go forth instruction,
   and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem.

4 He shall judge between the nations,
   and impose terms on many peoples.
   They shall beat their swords into plowshares
   and their spears into pruning hooks;
   One nation shall not raise the sword against another,
   nor shall they train for war again.

5 O House of Jacob, come,
   let us walk in the light of the Lord.
הדבר אשר הזה испу́х ברארם צילוההוּ והרשות.

והיה באשר משם נגוּ ירוּי והר הינוהו.

בַּרְאָא הָרִים

והש卫浴הוּ.

וֹהֵר אֲלֵי צִילוֹנֵי:

הָלָל עָמִים בַּבֹּם תָּאוּר

לָב נָשְׁלָה אָנָדְרָירָהוּ

אָלָרִית אָלָה הָעֶק

וּוּרְבּ מַדְרָכֶיו

וְנָלָה בַּאֲרוֹמֹת

כָּנֶפֶן תַּאֲצָה תְוָה

וֹדָר הָוה מִוּרְשָׁלָם

הָשִׁפְסַקְוַבִּוַּנוֹם

וּלְהָכִים לְעָמִים רַבִּים

וּפָתַתְּ חָרְבֹּתָה לְאַלְדָּי

וּזְנוּרְתָה לְמָפָרְתָה

לָאָרִישָׁה גּוֹרָלָגָר חָרְב

וּלְכָּלִי לֶפָדָר מְלָכָה:

בִּית הָעֶק לְמָלֵכָה בָּאָרָי הוה.
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