

THE ANCHOR YALE BIBLE REFERENCE LIBRARY

KINSHIP BY COVENANT

*A Canonical Approach
to the Fulfillment of God's
Saving Promises*

SCOTT W. HAHN



YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS

New Haven & London

8

Davidic Covenant Fulfillment in Luke–Acts

In the previous chapter we noted the characteristics of the Davidic covenant and the associated constellation of elements which arise from synchronic analysis of Old Testament documents and can be seen persisting in the Second Temple literature. The purpose of the present chapter is to show how Luke identifies the restoration of the Davidic constellation with the person and work of Jesus Christ, who, in turn, bestows it upon his Apostles in order that they may maintain and rule over it after his ascension.

A key passage for Luke's theology of Davidic covenant restoration in Christ is the so-called Institution narrative of Luke 22. In this narrative we have the convergence of two themes of primary importance to the present study: the father-son relationship, and the role of covenant. This is seen most clearly in Jesus' words to the Apostles in Luke 22:28–30: "You are those who have continued with me in my trials; and I covenant to you, as my Father covenanted to me, a kingdom, that you may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom, and sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel." By the end of this chapter it will be evident how this passage ties the ministry of Christ in Luke to the ministry of the Apostles in Acts, and shows both to be the fulfillment of the Davidic covenant and restoration of the Davidic "constellation."

Davidic Kingdom Restoration in Luke

In moving from the Second Temple literature to the Gospels, there is a shift from expectation to the actualization of Davidic covenant fulfillment. For Luke, Jesus' kingdom is the kingdom of David, restored and transformed.¹ This becomes abundantly clear when we examine Luke for evidence of the eight elements of the Davidic covenant-kingdom constellation:²

1. *Jesus' kingdom is founded on a covenant.* Gabriel's description of Jesus to Mary in Luke 1:32–33 is taken point-for-point from the key Davidic covenant text, 2 Samuel 7:

He will be great	I will make for you a great name (2 Sam 7:9)
and will be called the Son of the Most High	I will raise up our [David's] offspring after you. . . . I will be his father, and he shall be my son (2 Sam 7:12–14)
and the Lord God will give to him the throne of his father David	I will raise up your offspring after you . . . and I will establish the throne of his kingdom for ever. (2 Sam 7:12–13)
and he will reign over the house of Jacob forever	Your throne shall be established for ever. (2 Sam 7:16)

Later, Jesus associates his kingship with a new covenant (Luke 22:20) and says a kingdom has been “covenanted” to him by the Father (22:29).³

2. *Jesus is the natural (not merely adopted) Son of God* (Luke 1:35), and the title is used of him throughout the Gospel.⁴

3. *Jesus is the Messiah* (2:11, 4:41, etc.),⁵ indeed, the “Lord's Christ” (2:26), a title only applied to kings in the OT (cf. 1 Sam 16:6; 24:6 LXX; etc.); and the “Christ of God” (9:20), a title only applied to David (2 Sam 23:1).⁶

4. *Jesus' royal mission is bound up with Jerusalem*, a point Luke makes perhaps more strongly than any other Gospel writer.⁷ For Luke, it is theologically important that the Word of God go forth *from Jerusalem* to the ends of the earth (Luke 24:47; Acts 1:8, cf. Isa 2:3). The Gospel *begins* in Jerusalem (Luke 1:5–23), the only two narratives of Jesus' childhood find him in Jerusalem (2:22–52), for most of the narrative he is traveling to Jerusalem (9:51–19:27), and the Gospel *ends* in Jerusalem (19:28–24:49), wherein the disciples are told to “remain” (24:49).

5. *Jesus' royal mission is bound up with the Temple.* The Gospel begins

there (1:5–23), Jesus' childhood is set there (2:22–52),⁸ for most of the Gospel he is traveling there (9:51–19:27), and the climax is reached when Jesus is teaching *from the Temple in Jerusalem* (19:45–21:38). In Acts the Temple remains the focus of the early Christian community (Acts 2:46).⁹

6. *Jesus intends to restore the unity of the twelve tribes of Israel.* The appointing of twelve Apostles is the most prominent sign of this intention (6:12–16), and he explicitly promises that they will judge “the twelve tribes of Israel” (22:30).¹⁰ But there are many other more subtle signs of Jesus' intent to reunify the kingdom, including the use of the terms “Israel” and “sons of Israel”—evoking the entire nation—rather than “Judea” or “Jews”;¹¹ the words of the angel that the good news of Jesus' birth is “for the entire people” (2:10) that is, the whole nation of Israel; and the presence of Anna, a representative descendant of the northern tribes (Asher), at the Presentation (2:36).¹²

7. *Jesus' kingship extends over all the nations.* Already in the infancy narratives, Simeon speaks of Jesus as “a light of revelation to the nations” (2:32). Luke traces his genealogy back to Adam, the father of all mankind (3:38). As precedent for his ministry, Jesus cites the healings of Gentiles performed by Elijah and Elisha (4:25–27), and he himself heals a the servant of a Roman (7:1–10), while praising his faith above that of Israel (7:9). He predicts that “men will come from east and west, and from north and south” to sit at table in the Kingdom of God (13:29). And finally, and most explicitly, Jesus teaches the disciples that “forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name *to all nations*, beginning from Jerusalem” (24:47).

8. *Jesus' reign is everlasting.* The angel Gabriel promises to Mary that Jesus “will reign over the house of Jacob *forever*, and of his kingdom there will be no end.”¹³ The everlasting reign of Christ is presumed in the rest of the Gospel, especially in passages where Jesus is the mediator of eternal life (18:18–30).

Thus, it can be seen that in Luke, all eight major characteristics of the Davidic monarchy are manifested in Jesus and his ministry. There is a coherence to the titles and attributes—“King,” “Christ,” “Son of God,” eternal reign—that Luke predicates of Jesus and his ministry: the common factor in all these is their typological origin in the figure of *David*. Indeed, more of Jesus' identity and role could be integrated into this Davidic typology. Jesus in Luke is clearly a *prophet*, for example, yet Luke considers David to have been a “prophet” (Acts 2:30a) through whom the Holy Spirit spoke (Acts 1:16). Luke's Christology therefore is not so composite as is sometimes imagined: the unifying factor is royal Davidic typology.¹⁴ The following additional evidence bolsters this position:

- Luke emphasizes that Jesus' legal father Joseph was "of the house of David" (Luke 1:27).¹⁵
- In the Benedictus, Zechariah begins by praising God for having "raised up a horn of salvation for us *in the house of his servant David*" (Luke 1:69), a reference to a royal Davidic psalm (Ps 132:17).¹⁶
- Jesus' birthplace is Bethlehem, called "the City of David" by both the narrator (Luke 2:4) and the angels (2:11). At the same time, Joseph's Davidic lineage is repeated for emphasis (2:4).
- Appropriately, the first witnesses to the birth of the Son of David, the great Shepherd King of Israel's memory, are shepherds (Luke 2:8–20), possibly alluding to Micah 5:1–3.¹⁷
- At Jesus' baptism, the divine voice utters over him, "You are my beloved Son," an adaptation of words from Psalm 2, the royal coronation hymn of the Davidic kings (Ps 2:7).¹⁸
- In Luke 3:23–28, Luke traces Jesus' genealogy through David.¹⁹
- In Luke 6:1–5, Jesus compares himself and his disciples to David and his band of men, and claims the same apparent freedom from cultic regulations that David enjoyed.²⁰
- At the Transfiguration, the divine voice again reiterates the royal coronation hymn (Ps 2:7): "This is my Son, my Chosen."²¹ The title "chosen" or "chosen one" is also an epithet of David (Ps 89:3).²²
- Jesus' statement in Luke 10:22, "All things have been delivered to me by my Father . . ." seems to recall the covenantal father-son relationship of God to the Davidic monarch: see Psalms 2:7–8, 8:4–8; 72:8; 89:25–27.

Moreover, Jesus' career as presented in the Gospel may be interpreted as a systematic effort to restore the kingdom of David.²³ The significance of the choice of twelve apostles has been mentioned above. It is also significant that, as Fitzmyer notes: "Once the ministry proper begins, the areas of Jesus' activity are defined as Galilee (4:14–9:50), Samaria (9:51–17:11), and Judea/Jerusalem (17:11–21:38)."²⁴ Jesus' ministry follows the geographical progression of the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel: the northern tribes in the region of Galilee were taken by Assyria in 733 BC, Samaria itself fell in 722 BC, and Judah and Jerusalem in 587 BC. During his roughly north-to-south itinerary in Luke, Jesus gathers disciples from all of these territories until, by the triumphal entry, they have become a "multitude" (19:37) forming the reunited kingdom of David *in nuce*.

Jesus' activity in Samaria, which Luke alone among the Synoptics records (see Luke 9:51–10:37; 17:11–19), is vital to Jesus' mission of reunifi-

cation. Luke describes Jesus ministering in Samaria (9:51–56; 17:11–19), and there is reason to believe that the Seventy were sent into this region (10:1–12) and that other parts of the Travel narrative took place there.²⁵ Luke apparently accepted the Samaritans' claim to be the remnant of the ten northern tribes, and their reunification with Judah was necessary to restore the Davidic kingdom:²⁶ "Luke's view of the Samaritans was . . . strongly influenced by Samaritan claims to be the true descendants of the northern tribes. . . . It was his concern for Israel's restoration that made Samaritans vital to his thesis. This restoration did not just entail the conversion of Jews alone but something altogether more grand: nothing less than a return to the unity that had once existed under David. Nothing less could be expected of the one [who] would be given the throne of his father David and . . . reign over the house of Jacob forever."²⁷

In sum, Jesus' kingship in Luke has all the characteristics of the Davidic monarchy as portrayed in the canonical texts. Moreover, Jesus' ministry can be interpreted as a mission to reunite the northern and southern tribes/kingdoms under the Davidic heir. In Luke, Jesus is the royal Son of David who journeys to the City of David to restore the kingdom of David in fulfillment of the covenant with David. This much is clear. It remains to be seen, however, what relationship exists between this Lukan Davidic Christology and the ecclesiology of Acts. The key figures in this relationship are the Apostles, who in their persons and ministry form the link between the person and ministry of Jesus and the age of the church.²⁸ It is now necessary to examine key passages at the end of Luke's Gospel and the beginning of Acts that show how the Davidic-messianic identity and mission of Luke's Jesus flow into and shape the identity and mission of the Twelve and the community they establish, the *ekklēsia*.

The Institution Narrative (Luke 22:14–30)

The Institution narrative (IN) is a key transitional text for linking the royal Davidic identity and mission of Christ with the early apostolic church as the restored Davidic kingdom. The IN serves to establish the Apostles as vice-regents of the Davidic kingdom (as we shall see below), empowering them to rule over the church in the opening chapters of Acts.

The full significance of the IN will be better grasped if two initial observations are made: First, in Luke, the IN and the other climactic events of the Passion Week are introduced by four pericopes highlighting Jesus' royal and specifically Davidic identity:

- While passing through Jericho, Jesus is twice hailed as the messianic “Son of David” by a blind beggar (Luke 19:35–39).²⁹
- While still in Jericho, Jesus relates a parable of a “nobleman” who goes into a far country to receive a “kingdom” (19:11–27), a transparent allegory of Jesus’ own royal status and imminent reception of the kingdom at his ascension.³⁰
- In the Triumphal Entry (19:28–40), Jesus rides into Jerusalem on a donkey in Solomon-like fashion (1 Kgs 1:32–40) and is hailed as “the *King* who comes in the name of the Lord!” (v. 38); allusions are made to Zechariah 9:9, 1 Kings 1:32–40 and Luke 1:14, all of which have a Davidic context.³¹
- The subsequent dispute between Jesus and the Jerusalem leaders (Luke 20:1–40) culminates in a question concerning how the Messiah can be both “David’s Son” and “David’s Lord” (20:41–44).

These four pericopes serve to reassert the royal Davidic Christology, so clearly enunciated in the Infancy narratives, as an introduction to the dramatic events of the Passion Week. The royal Davidic themes will be taken up and advanced particularly in the IN, as will be seen below.

Second, the IN is not the first or the last narrative in Luke which weds the imagery of *kingdom* with *table fellowship*. John Koenig observes: “It is a striking fact that a great number of images in Jesus’ talk about the kingdom have to do with eating and drinking. No other group of metaphors comes close to this predominance.”³² With respect to Luke–Acts, “accounts of eating and drinking take center stage and even become something of an organizing principle for Luke.”³³ Koenig draws on the work of E. LaVerdiere,³⁴ who has identified a substructure to Luke’s Gospel consisting of ten meal narratives, seven preceding the passion and two following it, with the IN at the strategic juncture.³⁵ The Last Supper is a literary Janus culminating the sequence of Jesus’ earthly meals but already strongly anticipating the table fellowship in his resurrected state (Luke 24:30, 43).³⁶

All ten Lukan meals may be read as foretastes or proleptic experiences of the messianic kingdom banquet (cf. Isa 25:6–8; Zech 8:7–8, 19–23) since the Messiah is present at them.³⁷ This is particularly evident in the meals that the Messiah himself hosts: the feeding of the five thousand (9:10–17), the Last Supper (22:7–38), and the meal at Emmaus (24:13–35). In only these three meals in Luke is bread (*arton*) said to be “broken” (*klaō* or *kataklaō*); the same expression will be used in Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; 27:35. Kingdom motifs distinguish these three meals:

- all five thousand are “satisfied” and twelve basketfuls remain (9:17), bespeaking the fullness of the twelve tribes of Israel under the Son of David (cf. 1 Kgs 4:20; 8:65–66);
- the Last Supper is characterized by the imminent coming of the kingdom;
- and the Emmaus sequence is initiated with the disciples’ remark: “We had hoped he was the one *to redeem Israel*,” that is, to restore the Davidic kingdom, as the Infancy narratives make clear (esp. 1:68–69).

Jesus’ practice of table fellowship was a Davidic trait. David extended *hesed* (covenant loyalty) through table fellowship to covenant partners (Mephibosheth, Jonathan’s son [2 Sam 9:1–13]; the sons of Barzillai [1 Kgs 2:7]). The generous meals for all Israel hosted by David and his royal sons (Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah) were treasured memories of Israelite tradition.³⁸ The Davidic psalms employ images of eating and drinking to celebrate God’s provision and the joy of communion with him,³⁹ and the prophets describe the restoration of David’s city (Zion; see Isa 23:6–8; Jer 31:12–14) and David’s covenant (Isa 55:1–5) with images of feasting. Strikingly, in Ezekiel the primary role of the eschatological Davidic “shepherd” is to “feed” Israel (Ezek 34:23). It is also important to note that table fellowship was a common means of covenant solemnization throughout the Old Testament (Gen 26:30; 31:46, 54; Exod 24:11; 2 Sam 3:12–13, 20–21).

LaVerdiere sees the first seven meals in Luke as anticipations of the Eucharist.⁴⁰ In favor of LaVerdiere’s approach is the fact that by the time Luke composed the Gospel, eucharistic practice would have been well established within his ecclesial community. Luke’s late-first-century Christian readership, conditioned by the regular celebration of the eucharistic liturgy, would have been inclined to see anticipations of their own liturgical experience in the descriptions of Jesus’ meals during his ministry. However, in many of the meal scenes recorded in Luke, it is difficult to discern any explicit links with eucharistic practice. It may be preferable, then, to understand the several Lukan narratives of Jesus’ table fellowship as generally related to the motif of the messianic banquet, and limit specifically eucharistic themes to the meals mentioned above—the feeding of the five thousand, Last Supper, and Emmaus—where Jesus “breaks bread.” The Last Supper is the most important in this regard.

Luke’s account of the Last Supper includes several unique features vis-à-vis Matthew and Mark,⁴¹ including the following:

1. Jesus' statement that he shall not eat until the Kingdom of God comes is repeated and placed at the beginning of the pericope rather than in the body;⁴²
2. the command "do this in remembrance of me" (v. 19);
3. the cup is specified as the new covenant;⁴³
4. the discussion of precedence among the disciples is placed here rather than earlier in Jesus' career;⁴⁴
5. the promise of "thrones" for the Apostles includes unique features and is located at the end of the IN (22:28–29; cf. Matt 19:28).

It is significant that *kingdom motifs* mark four of these five uniquely Lukan elements of the IN, and elements (3) and (5) have a strongly Davidic resonance. Luke, more than any other evangelist, wishes to stress the relationship between the Last Supper and the Kingdom of God. Each of these unique elements deserves consideration:

1. Whereas in Matthew and Mark Jesus makes the statement: "I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" after the distribution of the eucharistic elements (Matt 19:29, Mark 14:25), Luke records this statement before the supper (Luke 22:18) and adds the similar statement: "I shall not eat it [the Passover] until it is fulfilled in the Kingdom of God" among Jesus' introductory words before the meal (22:16). The placement of the prophecy at the beginning of the Supper account and its repetition:

1. emphasizes that the following meal is somehow related to the kingdom and its arrival,
2. implies that the arrival of the kingdom is imminent, and
3. links the kingdom with both "eating" and "drinking."

"Eating" and "drinking" in the kingdom will be mentioned again in v. 30, where the disciples are assured they will "eat and drink . . . in my kingdom." Thus, the statements in vv. 16 and 18 form an *inclusio* with v. 30 around the narrative of the Last Supper. Eating and drinking are prominent manifestations of the kingdom's presence. When later the risen Christ eats with the disciples, it indicates that the kingdom has indeed come.⁴⁵ F. X. Durrwell remarks: "St. Luke puts this text . . . before the institution of the Eucharist. . . . Luke realized that the meal in the joy of the Kingdom was beginning in the Last Supper. That is why he modified the text from Mark . . . to make it a prophecy of an immediate reality. . . . His Kingdom of God 'at once suggests the sphere in which the new paschal rite was to

unfold, that is, the church' [Benoit, "Recit," 388]. In giving us to understand that our Lord would eat and drink again in the Kingdom, he must have had in mind the meals of the risen Christ which he, alone of the Evangelists, lays such stress upon."⁴⁶

2. Luke's account of Jesus' words over the bread has both common and unique features. First, Luke shares the tradition of the radical identification of the messianic king with the eucharistic bread: "This is my body." The same point is made over the cup: "This cup . . . is the new covenant *in my blood*," that is, consisting of my blood. Second, Luke alone includes Jesus' command to repeat this meal "in remembrance" of him. It is this command that makes the pericope an Institution narrative. Without it, nothing is being instituted: it is only the account of Jesus' last meal before his death. But with the command to repeat the meal when Jesus is no longer visibly present, the pericope becomes the foundational story and theological explanation for the early church's continuing practice of "breaking bread" as recorded in Acts.⁴⁷

The meaning of Jesus' radical self-identification with the bread and wine was and is a mystery that can only be accepted on the basis of faith in the veracity of the speaker.⁴⁸ Various dogmatic formulations throughout church history have at times obscured as much as explicated this mystery. Nonetheless, certainly in Luke 22:19–20 Jesus is not using the bread and wine as illustrations which make clear his coming sacrifice—that is, as an object lesson or visual parable—since "far from helping of themselves to explain the death of the body and the shedding of blood, it is precisely the bread and wine which need explaining by means of the former."⁴⁹ Jesus' words are not so much an explanation or a teaching as a "speech act," a declaration that brings about what it expresses. Long before the formal development of speech act theory, Benoit observed: "He [Christ] does not merely state that the bread is his body; he decrees that this must come to pass, and that it has come to pass. His speech does not come after the event, it brings the event to pass."⁵⁰ What is implicit here at the Last Supper, Luke makes explicit in the Emmaus account, in which the visible presence of the Lord vanishes during the distribution of the pieces of bread (23:31), since, in light of 22:19, his presence is now identified with the bread. Thus the messianic king is "made known" to the disciples "in the breaking of bread" (24:35). Later, Luke links his and his reader's liturgical experience to Jesus' Last Supper by including himself among those who gather on the first day of the week to "break bread" (Acts 20:7). Through the IN and the Emmaus account, Luke's readers are to understand that the risen Christ is truly present in the bread they break together. Thus, where the Eucha-

rist is, there is the king; and it follows—where the king is, there is the kingdom.⁵¹

3. Luke alone of the Synoptic Gospels specifies the cup as the “new covenant in my blood” (Luke 22:20), which alters the most immediate OT reference from Exodus 24:6–8 (the Sinaitic Covenant) to Jeremiah 31:31.⁵² The new covenant of Jeremiah 31:31 is explicitly said to be *unlike* the broken covenant of Sinai (Jer 31:32). In the wider context of Jeremiah 30–33, it is clear that this new covenant involves not only a new level of intimacy with God (31:33–34) and the reunification of the divided (Davidic) kingdom (31:31, cf. 30:4), but also the restoration of the Davidic monarchy (30:9; 33:14–26) and covenant (33:19–21). Thus, the declaration of the New Covenant in Luke 22:20 points to the restored Davidic kingdom-covenant constellation as promised in the prophets rather than merely the memory of Sinai.⁵³ In fact, the new covenant is *not a complete novum*, it is *the renewal of the Davidic covenant*.⁵⁴ Moreover, by identifying the cup with the new covenant, Jesus marks this meal—the eucharistic “breaking of bread” that is to be continued “in remembrance” of him—as a covenant renewal meal for the new covenant, just as the Passover was the covenant renewal meal par excellence of the Mosaic covenant. Luke’s readers should understand that when they participate in the eucharistic cup, they reaffirm their place within the promised new covenant, which is in essence the renewed and transformed Davidic covenant.

4. Luke places the discussion of precedence among the disciples in the context of the Last Supper rather than elsewhere in the Gospel narrative⁵⁵ because the kingdom is about to be conferred upon them (22:28–29), and therefore they must understand the proper way to exercise its authority. In their parallels, Matthew and Mark speak of “rulers” (*hoi archontes*, *hoi dokountes archein*), but Luke highlights the kingdom motif by speaking of Gentile “kings” (*hoi basileis*) who “exercise lordship” (*kurieuousin*). Jesus is both King (*basileus*) and Lord (*kurios*)—more truly and with greater legitimacy than the Gentile kings—but his mode of exercising authority is radically different. The hierarchy of domination and pride characteristic of the kingdoms of this world will be replaced in the Kingdom of God by a hierarchy of service (22:26–27).⁵⁶ Significantly, the word used here for service, *diakonia*, frequently connotes waiting at table,⁵⁷ and v. 27 immediately confirms this sense. Jesus exercises his royal authority through *table service*, and the disciples will as well (v. 27). This reemphasizes the connection throughout this passage between the concepts of royal authority/kingdom and those of eating/drinking, and forms another link with v. 30a, in which the disciples “will eat and drink at my table.”

5. After correcting the disciples' misguided notions of the meaning of authority in his kingdom, Jesus assures them of their vice-regency in vv. 28–30. To the Apostles, who have shared with Jesus his trials, he says:

I assign to you,	<i>kagō diatithēmai humin</i>
as my Father assigned to me,	<i>kathōs dietheto moi ho patēr mou</i>
a kingdom,	<i>basileian,</i>
that you may eat and drink	<i>hina esthēte kai pinēte</i>
at my table	<i>epi tēs trapezēs mou</i>
in my kingdom,	<i>en tē basileia mou,</i>
and sit on thrones	<i>kai kathēsethe epi thronōn</i>
judging the twelve tribes	<i>tas dōdekaphulas krinontes</i>
of Israel. (vv. 29b–30)	<i>tou Israēl</i>

The usual English translations of the verb *diatithēmi*—“assign” RSV, “confer” NRSV—do not quite capture the sense of the word for Luke. Luke’s style, as all acknowledge, is heavily dependent on the LXX, in which the phrase *diatithesthai diathēkēn* is used almost 80 times as the equivalent of the Hebrew *kārat bērit*, “to make a covenant”—in fact, *diatithēmi* even without the noun *diathēkē* can denote covenant-making in the LXX.⁵⁸ The use of the corresponding noun *diathēkē* in the Jewish sense of “covenant” in v. 20, combined with the clear evocation of Davidic themes here, suggests that *diatithēmi* is employed in the sense: “to make a covenant.”⁵⁹ Thus, J. Priest comments: “The verb translated assign/assigned in the RSV . . . may evoke a covenantal frame of reference and imply that the messianic meal will be the seal of the New Covenant. A connection between meal and covenant is made in *T. Isaac* 8:5 and in some OT passages . . . I consider [this allusion] to be worthy of continued reflection.”⁶⁰ Nelson argues that *diatithēmi* cannot denote covenant-making here, since the object of the verb is *basileia*, and “to covenant involves the establishing of an oath or agreement, but for ‘kingship’ to be given we expect a different kind of action.”⁶¹ Nelson’s objection is removed, however, when the text is read in light of the Davidic precedent of granting a kingdom by covenant oath.⁶² Thus, a more precise, if awkward, translation of v. 29b would be, “I covenant to you a kingdom, as my Father covenanted one to me.”

The only kingdom established on the basis of a covenant in Scripture is the kingdom of David (see Ps 89:3–4, 28–37). Moreover, the use of father-son terminology in v. 29b evokes the father-son relationship of the LORD with the Son of David as reflected in 2 Samuel 7:14, Psalms 2:7, and 89:26–27. Significantly, in each of these three passages, father-son terminology is employed in the context of *God granting a kingdom to the Davidide* (cf. 2 Sam 7:13; Ps 2:6, 8; 89:25, 27). The meaning of Luke 22:29b becomes

clear: God has “covenanted” a kingdom to Jesus, since Jesus is the Son of David, the legal heir to David’s covenant and throne (see Luke 1:32–33). Now Jesus, through the “new covenant in [his] blood” (v. 20), is “covenanting” to the disciples that same kingdom of David.⁶³ This is not the promise of a conferral (future tense), but the *declaration of a conferral* (present tense), as Bock points out: “The present tense in this context means that they are joining the task now, not later. Jesus’ authority, given by the Father, is extended to the Eleven. They will mediate for him. Jesus rules and so will the Eleven. This emphasis on present authority fits Luke’s emphasis on the kingdom’s present form. The Eleven’s leadership extends Jesus’ mission, something Acts will detail. Before giving this authority, Jesus indicated that the form of leadership is service.”⁶⁴ This *present conferral* of the kingdom militates against those scholars who acknowledge a present kingdom in Luke–Acts, but limit it to the person and ministry of Christ. As Bock comments with respect to an earlier passage (Luke 11:20): “An appeal only to the presence of God’s kingly power in the person and message of Jesus misses the significance of this transfer of power to others and ignores the kingdom associations Jesus makes in explaining these activities.”⁶⁵

The purpose of the “covenanting” of the kingdom to the disciples is that they “may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.” Here it is apparent that the kingdom has not been removed *from* Jesus *to* the Apostles, because the kingdom remains “my [Jesus’] kingdom.”⁶⁶ Rather, the exercise of authority in the kingdom is being shared.⁶⁷

The significance of eating and drinking at Jesus’ table may be illuminated by 2 Samuel 9:1–13, in which David extended to Mephibosheth this covenantal and filial privilege of table fellowship as an expression of *hesed*. Also instructive is 1 Kings 2:7, where Solomon, having received the kingdom from his father, must show covenant loyalty, in turn, by extending table fellowship to the sons of Barzillai, who had stood by David in his trials.⁶⁸ In Luke 22:30 Jesus does the same for the Apostles: having received the kingdom by covenant, he shows covenant loyalty to those who continued with him in his trials (v. 28) by extending to them the filial, covenantal, and royal privilege of table fellowship. Thus, the promise of eating and drinking at Jesus’ table confirms the previous statement of “covenanting” the kingdom to the disciples.

Yet one cannot fail to note that the disciples are now—at the Last Supper—“eating and drinking at my [Jesus’] table.” The conclusion is inescapable that there exists some intentional correspondence between the eucharistic eating and drinking in the narrative present of Luke 22 and the eschatological eating and drinking promised in v. 30a.⁶⁹ In the next section

we shall see that in Acts the kingdom is portrayed as present already in the ministry of the Apostles and the growing *ekklēsia*. When the Apostles “break bread” in “remembrance” of Jesus in the post-Pentecost community (the church), it is an experience of the messianic banquet, with the messianic king present in body and blood. The Apostles’ eucharistic practice in the early church is, therefore, the fulfillment of Jesus’ promise that they will “eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.” As noted above, the celebration of the Eucharist manifests the kingdom. Kingdom and Eucharist are tightly bound: it is a *eucharistic kingdom*. That is why the promise of table fellowship at the messianic banquet (v 30a) is sandwiched between two promises of the grant of (vice)-royal authority (vv. 29b, 30b).

The link between the discussion of sitting/serving at table in v. 27 and the “eating and drinking” at table in v. 30a was noted above. In vv. 25–27, Jesus contrasted the manner of exercise of authority in his kingdom with that of Gentile kings. Unlike these kings, Jesus exercises his royal authority through *table service* (*diakonia*) and calls his disciples to do the same. In contrast to v. 27, no “sitting” at table is mentioned in v. 30a. Although the Apostles will “eat” and “drink” at Jesus’ table, they will not “sit” because they will be serving like their Lord. However, this table service is immediately juxtaposed with vice-royal authority: you will “sit on thrones” (v. 30b). This juxtaposition suggests a paradoxical equation of the two promises: it is precisely when the Apostles “eat” and “drink” at Jesus’ table in his kingdom, not sitting but serving, that they are in fact “sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” It follows that whenever the Apostles serve at table (*diakonia*) to host the eucharistic meal—fulfilling the command to “do this in remembrance of me”—they exercise Davidic royal authority in imitation of the servant-king, judging (*krinontes*) the twelve tribes. The administration of the Eucharist would at first glance not appear to be an act of “judging,” but Paul’s discussion of “eating and drinking judgment on oneself” (1 Cor 11:31) reflects a very early tradition of the judicial aspect of eucharistic participation (cf. 1 Cor 11:27–32; cf. 1 Cor 5:1–13, esp. vv. 4, 7–8).

We have seen the relationship between the juxtaposed promises of “eating and drinking in my kingdom” and “sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (v. 30a,b). Searching for the scriptural background of this concept of “thrones over the twelve tribes,” we find an allusion to the Davidic imagery of Psalm 122:3–5: “Jerusalem, built as a city which is bound firmly together, / To which the tribes go up, the tribes of the LORD . . . / There thrones for judgment were set, / The *thrones of the House of David*.” The connection between the two texts is firm, in light of the collocation

in each of the three elements: “tribes,” “thrones,” and “judgment.” Psalm 122:5b makes explicit the Davidic context of the promise of Luke 22:30b. The disciples, then, are promised a share in the exercise of authority of the Davidic monarchy over all twelve tribes. The disciples’ “appointment is an anticipation of the restoration of Israel . . . and [they] are commissioned to govern the renewed people of God.”⁷⁰ L. T. Johnson comments on the significance of Luke’s version of this dominical saying vis-à-vis Matthew’s version: “Luke decisively alters the reference point for this prediction . . . In Luke the saying points forward to the role that the apostles will have within the *restored Israel in the narrative of Acts*. . . . These followers [will] exercise effective rule within the people gathered by the power of the resurrected prophet (see e.g., Acts 5:1–11).”⁷¹ It is now possible to grasp the logical relationship between Luke 22:19–20 and 22:28–30. Jesus is the heir of the covenant with David, by virtue of which he is eternal king over Israel and the nations (Luke 1:32–33). In Luke 22:19–20 he enacts a *new* covenant between himself and the disciples, who share in the covenant meal. This new covenant is a renewal and extension of the covenant with David: in essence, the privileges of the Davidic covenant are being extended to the Apostles, as in Isaiah 55:3, “I will make with you an everlasting covenant; my steadfast, sure love for David.” By virtue of their sharing in the covenant established in vv. 19–20, the Apostles, like Christ, are now heirs of the kingdom of David (v. 29a). Because they are heirs, they have filial privileges: they may eat at the royal table (v. 30a) and sit on the thrones of the royal house, judging the twelve tribes (v. 30b). The Davidic traditions form the context for the logic of the entire transaction, and it is clear that the Apostles have become heirs of the kingdom and covenant of David. The ecclesiological ramifications are profound, since the twelve Apostles “are transitional figures who link the church with the ministry of Jesus (cf. [Acts] 1:1) . . . [and] provide an essential foundation for the church’s continuing faith and life.”⁷² If the foundation is Davidic, the edifice will be Davidic as well.

The Ecclesiological Significance of the Institution Narrative for Acts

In order to grasp the ecclesiological implications of the IN, it is necessary to venture a little way into Acts, where it can be seen that Jesus’ promise of inheritance and rulership of the Davidic kingdom is manifested in the apostle’s assumption of authority in the *ekklēsia*, and the promise of table

fellowship is fulfilled in postresurrection meals with Jesus and the continuing eucharistic practice.⁷³ Johnson remarks, “Luke must show how in fact the apostles carry on the prophetic power of Jesus in their deeds and words, and how they are to be leaders over this restored people, ‘judging the twelve tribes of Israel’ (Luke 22:30).”⁷⁴

The first three narratives of Acts—concerning Jesus’ last teaching prior to his ascension (Acts 1:1–11), the replacement of Judas (Acts 1:12–26), and the descent of the Spirit at Pentecost (Acts 2)—are crucial links in the chain binding Davidic Christology to kingdom ecclesiology.

Significantly, in the opening verses of Acts (1:3, 6), Jesus’ topic of discussion with the Apostles over forty days is the Kingdom of God.⁷⁵ “Kingdom” will remain a central theme throughout the book, which ends with Paul proclaiming the Kingdom of God in Rome (28:31).⁷⁶ Acts 1:4 makes the connection between the kingdom and eating and drinking (cf. Luke 22:30a)—that is, the messianic banquet—when it states that Jesus taught them over this forty-day period, “while taking salt” (*sunalizomenos*) with them, an idiom for “eating together.”⁷⁷

When the disciples ask Jesus, “Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?” (1:6), their query may refer to Jesus’ promise in Luke 22:30b that: “you will sit on thrones.” The Apostles are asking, “When will we receive the authority promised to us?” In response, Jesus discourages speculation about timing (v. 7), but does in fact describe the means by which the kingdom will be restored, namely, through the Spirit-inspired witness of the Apostles throughout the earth (v. 8).⁷⁸ Jesus’ geographical description of the spread of the gospel: “You shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth” is, on the one hand, a programmatic outline of the narrative of Acts, helping us to recognize that the whole book is about the spread of the kingdom (cf. Acts 28:31).⁷⁹ On the other hand, it is a Davidic map that reflects the theological geography of God’s covenant pledge concerning the extent of the Davidic empire. Jerusalem was David’s city (cf. 2 Sam 5:6–10), Judea his tribal land (2 Sam 5:5; 1 Kgs 12:21); Samaria represents (northern) Israel, David’s nation (1 Kgs 12:16); and “the ends of the earth” are the Gentiles (cf. Isa 49:6), David’s vassals (Pss 2:7–8; 72:8–12; 89:25–27).⁸⁰ The kingdom of David, encompassing Jerusalemites, Jews (i.e., Judeans), Israelites, and Gentiles, will be restored as the Apostles’ witness extends to “the ends of the earth” and the *ekklēsia* grows.⁸¹

But the Apostles in the narrative of Acts 1 do not yet realize the significance of Jesus’ words or understand his transformation of their expectation of a national, earthly kingdom to one that is international and, though

manifest on earth, essentially heavenly.⁸² *The Spirit must still be poured out for the Apostles to perceive the transformed kingdom.* Thus only after the disciples have received the power of the Holy Spirit will they become *martyres*, witnesses (Acts 1:8).

Between the promise of the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts 1:8) and Pentecost (2:1–4) Luke records the restoration of the circle of the Twelve by the replacement of Judas with Matthias. Here again there is a relationship to the promise of Luke 22:30b: “The election of [Matthias] is crucial if Jesus’ promise to establish the twelve on thrones governing the twelve tribes of Israel is to survive.”⁸³ Thus Neyrey comments: “Luke has given us in Acts a vivid picture of apostolic governance and leadership . . . which gives immediate realization to the commission in [Lk] 22:29–30. For example . . . the first act of the apostles in Acts is to replace Judas, thus signaling that the group’s membership must be complete, a completeness that is irrelevant unless Luke sees it as a fulfillment of Jesus’ remark that there should be *twelve* judges of the twelve tribes of Israel.”⁸⁴ Moreover, it is clear that for Luke, this reconstitution of the twelve was a necessary condition for the outpouring of the Spirit: “Acts 1.15–26, the replacement of Judas, is a story which both reaffirms the authority granted to the apostles in Luke 22 and demonstrates that the restoration of the twelve has to happen before the outpouring of the Spirit in Acts 2, ‘upon the house of Israel.’ Subsequently, we find Peter literally serving in his capacity of ‘judge’ over Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5.1–11), thus ‘confirming’ Lk 22.30.”⁸⁵ After the reconstitution of the Twelve, the event of Pentecost (Acts 2:1–42) marks: (1) the restoration in principle of Israel as Kingdom under the Son of David, and (2) the beginning of the Apostles’ vice-regency over that kingdom.

First, it is clear that Luke presents us in Acts 2 with the principal fulfillment of the promised restoration of Israel. Not only are all the Twelve (and presumably the 120) “all together in one place” (2:1)—thus representing the nucleus of the restored Israel—but they address their message to “Jews, devout men from every nation under heaven,” (v. 5) and Luke enumerates those nations (vv. 9–11). The Exile and Diaspora are reversed.⁸⁶

In response to the apostolic message there is a mass conversion as three thousand of these dispersed Jews enter the messianic community. In this event, the eschatological prophecies of Joel and other prophets are fulfilled and Israel restored—not definitively, as much growth of the *ekklēsia* remains, but nonetheless “fundamentally,” as Johnson points out: “Three thousand Jews in the city are baptized and enter the messianic community (2:41). Although Luke will be careful to note further such increments, this one is fundamental, for in it we find the realization of the restored people

of God within historic Judaism.”⁸⁷ However, we can be more precise than to say: “Israel is restored.” The restored Israel has a certain form and structure: not that of the confederated tribes at Sinai, but that of the twelve tribes within the *kingdom of David*.⁸⁸ Peter’s sermon stresses the Davidic royalty of Jesus Christ (cf. Acts 2:36).⁸⁹ He preaches to the assembled exiles of Israel that Jesus is the fulfillment of the covenant of David (v. 30)⁹⁰ and the fulfillment of David’s own prophecies (vv. 25–28; 34–35).⁹¹ He applies to Jesus the royal Davidic enthronement psalm (Ps 110), asserting that Jesus is now enthroned in heaven (“exalted at the right hand of God”) and has poured out the Spirit on the Apostles as the crowd has just witnessed (v. 33). Thus, Jesus is reigning *now* in heaven, and the results of his reign are being manifest *now* in events that the people may “see and hear” (v. 33).⁹² Peter and the Apostles, filled with the Spirit, have become “witnesses,” inasmuch as they now see the nature of Jesus’ kingdom and its present realization. When Peter’s hearers accept the fact that Jesus is the presently-enthroned Davidic king—and thus acknowledge his rightful reign over themselves—they are incorporated into the *ekklēsia* through baptism (2:41–42; cf. 4:32–5:11, esp. 5:11).⁹³ Not just Israel, but *David’s reign* over Israel has been established in principle.

It is important to note, however, that the Davidic kingdom is not only restored but transformed.⁹⁴ The Son of David is not now enthroned in the earthly Jerusalem, but in the heavenly city, “exalted at the right hand of God.” The kingdom has been transposed from earth to heaven, even though it continues to manifest itself on earth as the *ekklēsia*.⁹⁵ This *ecclesial* kingdom exists simultaneously on earth and in heaven. The king is enthroned in heaven, but the ministers (the Apostles) are active on earth. Meanwhile the heavenly king is united to his earthly officers and subjects by the Holy Spirit and, though it receives less emphasis, the eucharistic “breaking of bread.”

Second, the promise of apostolic vice-regency over the Davidic kingdom (Luke 22:30, Ps 122:5) begins at Pentecost, when the Apostles receive the “power” (*dynamis*) of the Holy Spirit, call a worldwide audience of Jews to repentance, and incorporate the respondents into the messianic community. Just as the outpouring of the Spirit is the perceptible sign of Jesus’ royal enthronement (Acts 1:33), the dispensation of the Spirit thereafter through the Apostles’ hands is a sign of their own enthronement as vice-regents.⁹⁶ The vice-regents are sharing in the king’s power to dispense the Spirit. The kingdom and Spirit are coextensive; it is a *pneumatic* kingdom.⁹⁷ One might also call it a *sacramental* kingdom: one must enter it through baptism, and the community of the baptized devotes itself “to the

apostles' teaching and fellowship, to *the breaking of bread* and the prayers." The eucharistic significance of the "breaking of bread" in Luke 9:16, 22:19, and 24:30 has been noted. The "breaking of bread" here in Acts 2:42, as well as 20:11 and 27:35, is no simple eating but eucharistic celebration and proleptic participation in the messianic banquet. In the continuing practice of "the breaking of bread" the Apostles experience the fulfillment of the promise "to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom" (Luke 22:30) and the whole eschatological community shares in the fulfillment with them.

In sum, Acts 1–2, the key introductory chapters of the book, have several links to the Institution narrative and describe the birth of the church as the restoration of the kingdom of David. The identification of the Davidic kingdom and the church is not limited to these two chapters, but occurs throughout Acts. For example, in James' concluding statements at the Jerusalem council (Acts 15), he confirms the decision to embrace Gentile converts by quoting Amos 9:11–12: "After this I will return, and I will rebuild the dwelling (*skēnē*) of David . . . that the rest of men may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles who are called by my name" (Acts 15:13–18). The "dwelling" or "tent" of David referred to by Amos (Amos 9:11) is the Davidic kingdom, which at its peak incorporated Edom (see Amos 9:12a) and other Gentile nations (Ammon, Moab, Aram, etc.) who may be "the nations who are called by my name" (Amos 9:12b).⁹⁸ James sees the fulfillment of Amos' prophecy—that is, the restoration of the Davidic *kingdom*—in the incorporation of Gentiles into the church as related by Simeon before the whole council.⁹⁹ No one has seen this more clearly than Pao: "The promise to rebuild and restore the Davidic kingdom is explicitly made at the point in the narrative of Acts that focuses on defining the people of God. The Amos quotation of Acts 15 shows that . . . the development of the early Christian community is also understood within the paradigm of the anticipation of the Davidic kingdom. The *christological* focus of the David tradition should be supplemented by an *ecclesiological* one [my emphasis]."¹⁰⁰

Davidic Kingdom but Not Covenant?

Since in this chapter the term "kingdom" has been predominant over the term "covenant," it may be helpful to review the reasons why Davidic *kingdom* fulfillment in Luke–Acts is relevant to our larger investigation of biblical *covenant* structures and relationships. This may be especially necessary in light of the claims of some scholars (e.g. Scot McKnight) who argue that

the historical Jesus—if not the Gospel authors—characterized his mission as “kingdom” but *not* as “covenant.”¹⁰¹

Let us review the fact, then, that the Davidic kingdom was theologically founded on a divine covenant, as emphasized numerous times above. Moreover, careful consideration of the Davidic covenant texts (2 Sam 7; Ps 89; 132; 2 Sam 23:2–7) confirms that the *content* of the Davidic covenant was a promise that David’s heir would reign over his *kingdom* forever. Therefore, when and if the Davidic heir reigns over his kingdom, it is de facto a fulfillment of the Davidic covenant. The Davidic kingdom by definition and essence cannot exist in some form that is separate from or irrelevant to the Davidic covenant, or for that matter, the other divine covenants of the Old Testament, since: (1) the Davidide was the “seed” of Abraham who as king both ruled and blessed the nations in fulfillment of the Abrahamic covenant (Gen 17:6); and (2) the Davidide was bound to uphold the torah of the Mosaic covenant (Deut 17:18–20; 1 Kgs 2:1–4).

Luke is aware of the covenant significance of Jesus’ restoration of the Davidic kingdom. While there are many proofs of this, the following is the most direct. Note what Luke records at the climax of Peter’s sermon at Pentecost: “Brethren, I may say to you confidently of the patriarch David that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day. Being therefore a prophet, and *knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him that he would set one of his descendants upon his throne*, he foresaw and spoke of the resurrection of the Christ” (Acts 2:29–31). Luke records Peter making a transparent reference to a key Davidic covenant psalm: “The LORD swore to David a sure oath from which he will not turn back: ‘One of the sons of your body I will set on your throne’ ” (Ps 132:11).

Was Luke aware of the virtual equivalence of “oath” and “covenant” as we have demonstrated above? Observe his juxtaposition of the concepts in the Benedictus (Luke 1:68–79).

to perform the mercy promised to our fathers,
and to remember *his holy covenant*,
the oath which he swore to our father Abraham (vv. 72–73a)

Here “the holy covenant” is explicated as “the oath . . . to our father Abraham.” Therefore Luke understood the relationship between “oath” and “covenant.” He also understood the relationship between the Abrahamic and Davidic covenants as discussed in Chapter 8, namely, that the two covenants are correlated, and that the latter is meant to fulfill the former.¹⁰² This is evident again from the Benedictus, where Zechariah first gives

thanks that: “God has raised up for us a horn of salvation out of the house of David,” another reference to Psalm 132 (v. 17: “There [i.e., in Zion] I will make a horn to sprout for David; I have prepared a lamp for my anointed”). Zechariah is clearly making reference, then, to Davidic covenant fulfillment. But this is also Abrahamic fulfillment, as we see just a little later in the Benedictus:

To remember his holy covenant, the oath which he swore to our father Abraham (Luke vv. 72b–73a)

We do not have space to develop it, but Abrahamic covenant fulfillment is also an important theme in Luke–Acts, and it is observable in the same places where Davidic covenant fulfillment is also stressed: the Infancy narratives and the apostolic preaching of Acts: Luke 1:54–55, 72–73; Acts 3:13, 25–26; 13:17, 26, 32–33.¹⁰³ A careful reading of Paul’s inaugural sermon in Acts, for example (Acts 13:16–41), reveals the same covenantal theology evident in the Benedictus: Jesus Christ has fulfilled both the promises to David and to Abraham.

Luke shows that the presence of the Davidic Kingdom in Christ’s person and the early Church was the fulfillment of the Davidic and Abrahamic covenants, but he did not need to stress the obvious on every page of his two-volume work. The connection between kingdom and covenant was a commonplace in Second Temple Judaism, with which Luke could assume his readership was familiar:

A *covenant* was also established with David . . . the heritage of the *king* is from son to son only. (Sir 45:25)

The Lord took away [David’s] sins, and exalted his power for ever; He gave him the *covenant of kings* and a throne of glory in Israel. (Sir 47:11)

A ruler shall [no]t depart from the tribe of Judah when Israel has dominion. [And] the one who sits on the throne of David [shall never] be cut off, because the “ruler’s staff” is the *covenant of the kingdom* [and the thousands of Israel are “the standards,” until the Righteous Messiah, the Branch of David, has come (Genesis 49:10). For to him and to his seed the *covenant of the kingdom of His people* has been given for the eternal generations. (4Q252 V 1–4)¹⁰⁴

Surely You love Israel more than all the other peoples; more narrowly, You chose the tribe of Judah. You have established Your covenant with David, *making him a princely shepherd* over Your people, that he sit before You upon the throne of Israel eternally. (4Q504 1–2 IV 4–8)¹⁰⁵

In Second Temple Judaism there could be no separation of the Davidic kingdom from the Davidic covenant. Again, this is strikingly reflected in Jesus' words to the Apostles at the Last Supper: "I covenant to you, as my father covenanted to me, a kingdom" (Luke 22:29).

Conclusion

If Jesus is the Davidic king, then his kingdom is the Davidic kingdom. That kingdom is present already, because it was conferred on the disciples at the Last Supper. Their rulership over Israel is manifested in their rulership over the *ekklēsia*. The *ekklēsia* is the incipient, growing kingdom of David, incorporating Jews, Israelites, and the nations, under the reign of Jesus the Davidic king, which is exercised through his Spirit-empowered apostolic vice-regents.¹⁰⁶

Nonetheless, while the Davidic kingdom finds historic fulfillment in the church, it also undergoes a typological transposition from the earthly to the heavenly sphere. The earthly Jerusalem and its Temple, despite Luke's genuine respect for them, cannot be the ultimate locus of eschatological fulfillment (cf. Acts 7:48–50; Luke 21:6). Peter makes clear that Christ's present rule is not from the earthly Jerusalem but from the heavenly (Acts 2:33a). Nonetheless, his reign expresses itself in the earthly realm by what can be "seen and heard" (Acts 2:33b). The renewed kingdom of David, of which the church is the manifestation, exists simultaneously in heaven and on earth, as its citizens move from one sphere to the other. Nonetheless, the whole kingdom (and the whole church) is united by the indwelling Holy Spirit and the celebration of the Eucharist, in which the king becomes present, the kingdom manifest, and the earthly citizens of the kingdom participate in the perpetual messianic banquet of the heavenly king. This messianic banquet is described by Christ in Luke as a new covenant (Luke 22:20), which is in fact the restoration and transformation of the covenant with David.

133. Pss. *Sol.* 17:35–38; 4Q174 I I, 1–5, 11; 4Q246 II, 5–9; 4Q252 V.

134. See Collins, *Scepter and Star*, 209.

135. For instance, I have bypassed most of the Chronicler's distinct treatment of David as royal cult organizer, basing my treatment primarily on 1–2 Samuel. For a useful treatment of the Chronicler's view of David and God's covenant with him, see W. Johnstone, "Guilt and Atonement: The Theme of 1 and 2 Chronicles," in *A Word in Season* (ed. J. D. Martin and P. R. Davies; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1986) 113–38. He observes: "Using the materials of Israel's past in a supra-historical way, the Chronicler expounds in narrative form the teaching of both law and prophets on the guilt of Israel and its destructive consequences. . . . As in the end of the day the 'Deuteronomistic School' found itself constrained to transcend its doctrine of covenant and await a final act of God himself . . . circumcising the heart of the people, . . . (Deut 30:6) . . . so the Chronicler . . . is forced to look beyond the limits of his theological category, not to the destruction of Israel . . . but to its restoration through an act of the free grace of God." (125). Johnstone shows how the restoration fits into the Chronicler's larger framework and program, which is based on his genealogical presentation in 1 Chr 1–9, of God's plan for the whole family of mankind: "Out of the broad mass of humanity, a single family has now been chosen; Israel is to realize on behalf of mankind what mankind as a whole cannot. . . . The ideal relationship between Israel and the world of the nations is portrayed in 1 Chron 14, where the gathering of all Israel to David (1 Chron 11–13) is crowned by the recognition and pacification of the nations of the world (1 Chron 14.17, yet another of the Chronicler's original statements)" (126–27).

136. Raymond E. Brown, "Communicating the Divine and Human in Scripture," *Origins* 22.1 (1992) 5–6, my emphasis.

Chapter 8

DAVIDIC COVENANT FULFILLMENT IN LUKE-ACTS

1. There has been increasing recognition of the importance of Davidic messianism in Luke. See M. L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995); D. Juel, review of M. L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts, Review of Biblical Literature* [<http://www.bookreviews.org>] (2000); D. Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995) 24–49, esp. 34: "The theme of Jesus' kingship extends throughout the Gospel where it is always as the Davidic King of Israel." See also D. L. Bock, "Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Luke's Use of the Old Testament for Christology and Mission," in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C. A. Evans and W. R. Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999) 280–307. "The fundamental category of Lukan Old Testament christology is a regal one. . . . Luke has kept the fundamental portrait of Jesus as the regal, Davidic hope in the forefront of almost every text" (*ibid.*, 293–94). M. E. Fuller (*The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Regathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke–Acts* [BZNTW 138; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2006] esp. 197–269) makes an important contribution in linking the concept of the Davidic Messiah in Luke to the theme of the restoration of Israel. An earlier piece is F. F. Bruce, "The Davidic Messiah in Luke–Acts," in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies* (Festschrift W. S. Lasor; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978) 7–17.

2. See D. Bock, *Luke 1:1–9:50* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994) 115; R. L. Brawley, *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech:*

Voices of Scripture in Luke–Acts (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995) 85–86; T. J. Lane, *Luke and the Gentile Mission: Gospel Anticipates Acts* (European University Studies, Series 23, Vol. 571; Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang, 1996) 157–63.

3. On the “covenanting” of the kingdom, see discussion of *diatithēmi* in Chapter 8, “The Institution Narrative (Luke 22:14–30).”

4. “The title Son of God is not only associated with the Davidic Messiah in Gabriel’s words to Mary but also in later passages of Luke–Acts, which serve as reminders of this special sense of Son of God. . . . The connection of divine sonship and kingship also appears in Jesus statement at the last supper that ‘my Father has conferred on me royal rule’ (Luke 22:29)” (R. C. Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke–Acts: A Literary Interpretation. Volume One: The Gospel According to Luke* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986], 25).

5. “The title Messiah, which appears here for the first time [2:11], should be interpreted in light of what has already been said to Mary and by Zechariah about salvation for the Jewish people through the reestablishment of the Davidic kingdom” (Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 38).

6. The title “Christ” is probably always intended in a Davidic sense in Luke. Cf. C. M. Tuckett “The Christology of Luke–Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 133–64: “In the Lukan writings, Luke seems to tie the Χριστός terminology very closely to Davidic and royal ideas . . . it would be hard if not impossible to divorce ideas of messiahship from Davidic/royal ideas” (147–48); Brian M. Nolan, *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979) 173: “‘Christ’ for first century Palestine meant the Messiah of the house of David: Jesus ‘the King!’; and Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 58: “There are a series of passages in Luke–Acts which suggest the close connection, or equivalence, of the titles ‘Son of God’ and ‘Messiah,’ or connect Jesus’ position as Son with kingship.”

7. J. A. Fitzmyer (*The Gospel According to Luke 1–9* [AYB 28; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981; reprint, New Haven: Yale University Press] 164–65) speaks of Luke’s “preoccupation with Jerusalem as the city of destiny for Jesus and the pivot of salvation for mankind. Luke establishes a special relationship between Jesus’ person and ministry and that city of David’s throne.” Similarly, D. P. Bechard, “The Theological Significance of Judea in Luke–Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 675–91: “Jerusalem . . . [is] the center-point around which the continuous story of this two-volume work revolves” (675).

8. On the importance of the Temple in Luke 1–2, see J. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997) 61–62: “The Jerusalem Temple features prominently in both volumes of this work . . . it is significant that mention should be made of the Temple so frequently, and that key episodes located elsewhere in Matthew and Mark should be located in the Temple in Luke.” Cf. N. H. Taylor, “Luke–Acts and the Temple,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999) 709–21, esp. 709.

9. On the importance of the Temple in Luke–Acts, see J. B. Chance, *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke–Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988); and A. C. Clark, “The Role of the Apostles,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 169–90, esp. 175–76.

10. On restoring unity see Fuller, *Restoration of Israel*, esp. 239–45.

11. See Ravens, *Luke*, 25: “Writers on Luke–Acts . . . use the word ‘Israel’ as if it were synonymous with ‘Jews’ . . . but . . . Luke, when using the term ‘Israel’, . . . leave[s] open the question of its membership.”

12. “[Luke’s] understanding of the restored Israel is rooted in the idea of one nation under a Davidic king, modeled on the nation before its division into two kingdoms. That these kingdoms should be reunited he would have found in the oracles of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosea, Ezekiel, and Zechariah” (Ravens, *Luke*, 105). “Without the return of the Samaritans there could be no restored Israel and without an Israel in the process of restoration there would be nothing for the Gentiles to enter” (idem, 106).

13. See Bock, *Luke*, 116–17.

14. Cf. D. L. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 262. Bock sees Luke’s Christology as unified around the concept of Davidic Messiah–Isaianic Servant. Further integration is possible in light of the contention of D. I. Block (“My Servant David: Ancient Israel’s Vision of the Messiah,” in *Israel’s Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* [ed. R. S. Hess and M. D. Carroll R.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2003] 17–56, esp. 49–56) and Strauss (*Davidic Messiah*, 292–98) that the Isaianic servant was a royal figure and even a Davidide, at least as first-century Jews would have read Isaiah. Thus, Davidic Messiah and Isaianic Servant may be one and the same.

15. Cf. Green, *Luke*, 84–85.

16. An allusion to Ps 132:17, where a horn sprouts up from David, is probably intended (Green, *Luke*, 116). Bock (*Luke*, 20, cf. 180) remarks, “Zechariah links spiritual promises and national promises to Davidic hope.” On other, more subtle Davidic allusions in the Benedictus, see S. Farris, *The Hymns of Luke’s Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning, and Significance* (JSNTSup 9; JSOT Press, 1985), 95–96.

17. Cf. Green, *Luke*, 130; Ravens, *Luke*, 42–43.

18. Cf. Green, *Luke*, 186; Bock, *Luke*, 341–43.

19. Bock (*Luke*, 357): “The mention of David is significant; . . . this connection puts Jesus in the regal line. . . . Luke does not elaborate here on the name . . . [but] the name itself would draw great attention from anyone who knew Israel’s history.” (*Luke*, 357) The pericope regarding the temptations of Jesus features a Davidic allusion in its second scene: “The devil produces a panorama of all the kingdoms of the world for Jesus. This evokes memories of Gabriel’s prediction that God would give Jesus the throne of his ancestor David to rule over an endless kingdom (Luke 1:32–33)—reverberations of the Davidic covenant” (Brawley, *Text to Text*, 20).

20. See Bock, *Luke*, 527; L. T. Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 1991) 101: “The comparison of Jesus and his disciples to David and his companions is provocative, and the first narrative echo of the angel’s promise to Mary that Jesus would inherit the ‘throne of his father David’ (1:32).”

21. Bock, *Luke*, 873–74.

22. Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 265–67.

23. Cf. Ravens, *Luke*, 20: “Luke firmly believed that God’s restoration was an ongoing process and one that will result in Israel having the unity it once possessed under David, prior to the separation into two kingdoms.”

24. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 165. Fitzmyer believes Luke’s geographical progression is certainly deliberate and theologically charged (166); while T. J. Lane says Luke shows Jesus “crossing Samaria theologically” on his way to Jerusalem (*Luke and the Gentile Mission*, 98, cf. 99–103; cf. Johnson, *Luke*, 170, 175). D. Ravens goes further, arguing

that the entire travel narrative presented by Luke takes place in Samaria, since the only two geographical references in it refer to Samaria (9:51, 17:11). It is too much to believe, however, that Luke meant for us to understand that Martha and Mary (10:38–41, cf. John 11:1, 12:1) lived in Samaria and Jesus frequently debated with Pharisees on Samaritan soil (Luke 11:37–54, 14:1–6). But Ravens is correct to point out that all references to the Samaritans occur in the Travel narrative, and the explicit geographical comments in the Gospel move from Galilee to Samaria to Jerusalem and environs, essentially the reverse of Acts 1:8.

25. Ravens and others point out that Jesus' injunction in Luke 10:8 to "eat what they set before you" makes best sense as an effort to assuage the disciples' scruples concerning the ritual cleanliness of food. But this would only be an issue if the disciples were traveling in non-Jewish territory, i.e., Samaria (Ravens, *Luke*, 82–83). Note that in the parallel in Matt 10:5–15, where the Twelve are sent into Jewish territory (Matt 10:5), this injunction does not occur. On the possible Samaritan provenance of other parts of the Travel narrative, see Ravens, *Luke*, 76–87.

26. "The inclusion of the Samaritans as the descendants of the northern tribes is, for Luke, an indispensable element in the restoration of Israel. . . . Luke himself hopes for the Davidic unity of Israel." (Ravens, *Luke*, 47) Later, in Acts, the success of Philip's Samaritan mission (Acts 8:4–8) "demonstrates that Jews and Samaritans are being brought together into the embryo of a reunited Israel, just as their forebears had been under King David nine centuries earlier" (idem, 70). For Jesus' ministry in Samaria in the Travel narrative, see Ravens, *Luke*, 72–87. On the Samaritans as part of Israel in Luke–Acts, see J. Jervell, *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke–Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1972) 113–32; and D. W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2 130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000) 127–129.

27. Ravens, *Luke*, 99. In addition to the Samaritan ministry, certain of Jesus' miracles and teachings reinforce the view that his mission was, in part, an effort to heal the divisions of Israel. For example, in ch. 6, Jesus heals a man with a withered hand (6:6–11)—immediately after a direct comparison of himself and his disciples with David and his entourage, and immediately before the choosing of the Twelve, a corporate symbol of restored Israel. Only Jeroboam I suffered a withered hand in the OT (1 Kgs 13:1–6): the very one responsible for permanently dividing the kingdom of David by establishing a rival heterodox cult (1 Kgs 12:25–33). Luke alone of the evangelists notes that it was the man's right hand, perhaps evoking Ps 137:5: "If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither!" Jeroboam "forgot" Jerusalem (1 Kgs 12:25–33) and so experienced the withering (and healing) of his hand (1 Kgs 13:1–6). Jesus' healing of the Jeroboam-like man in Luke 6:6–11 symbolizes his purpose to overcome the forces that divided David's kingdom. Later in the Gospel (10:30–37), Jesus tells a parable in which a Jew and a Samaritan finally come to recognize each other as "neighbors," which in the LXX often carries the connotation "kinsman" (e.g., Lev 19:18; cf. Exod 2:13, 32:27). The Jew/Samaritan division represents a divided kingdom, which Jesus mentions explicitly in Luke 11:14–23, asserting "every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and a divided house falls" (11:17), an oblique reference to the divided kingdom and house of David, which was not merely a political, but also a spiritual, issue (see 1 Kgs 12:25–33). The division of the kingdom of David—still painfully evident in Jesus' day—is a division of the Kingdom of God, which Jesus aims to heal by a ministry of "gathering" (11:23). The parable of the "Prodigal Son" (Luke 15:11–32) also refers, at least secondarily, to the division of the kingdom of David (Ravens, *Luke*, 102–3). The older son represents Judah; the younger, Ephraim, Judah's nephew—youngest of the tribal family and

head of the northern tribes. The younger son goes to a far-off country—i.e., exile—and wastes his inheritance on harlotry, the very sin the prophets accused Ephraim/Israel of committing (Jer 3:6; Hos 4:15; 5:3). The younger son's repentance and the elder's refusal of reconciliation may point to the success of the apostolic mission to Samaria (cf. Acts 8:4–25) in contrast to the hardened resistance of the Judean/Jerusalemite leadership (cf. Acts 8:1–3). Regardless, the father in the story is determined to reconcile both sons to himself and to each other.

28. See Clark, "Role of the Apostles," 169.

29. See Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 306–7.

30. See Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 307–11.

31. Cf. Zech 12:7–13:1; Luke 1:4, 11. See Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 311–17.

32. J. Koenig, *The Feast of the World's Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission* (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 2000) 15. See Luke 6:20; 9:10–17; 11:2; 13:28; 15:11–32; 22:18.

33. Koenig, *Feast*, 181. See also P. K. Nelson, *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24–30* (SBLDS 138; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994) 62. For an excellent study of all the meal scenes in Luke–Acts and their relationship to one another, see J. P. Heil, *The Meal Scenes in Luke–Acts: An Audience-Oriented Approach* (SBLMS 52; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1999).

34. See E. LaVerdiere, *Dining in the Kingdom of God: The Origins of the Eucharist According to Luke* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1994); idem, *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996); idem, *The Breaking of the Bread: The Development of the Eucharist According to Acts* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1998).

35. The ten meals in Luke are Levi's banquet (5:27–39); the feast at Simon the Pharisee's house (7:36–50); the feeding of the five thousand at Bethsaida (9:10–17); the meal at the home of Martha (10:38–42); dinner at the Pharisee's house (11:37–54); Sabbath dinner at yet another Pharisee's home (14:1–24); supper at the house of Zaccheus (19:1–10); the Last Supper (22:7–38); breaking of bread at Emmaus (24:13–35); and eating in the presence of the Apostles (24:41–43). See LaVerdiere, *Dining*, 12; and *Eucharist*, 82–83.

36. See discussion in Nelson, *Leadership*, 66–69, 73; and Heil, *Meal Scenes*, 196–97.

37. See Heil, *Meal Scenes*, 196.

38. See 2 Sam 6:19 (David); 1 Kgs 8:65–66 (Solomon); 2 Chr 30:21–26 (Hezekiah); 35:7–19 (Josiah).

39. Pss 16:5; 22:26; 23:5; 34:8, 10; 36:8; 63:5; 65:4; 132:15.

40. See discussion LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 79–95; and the measured, sympathetic critique by Koenig, *Feast*, 184–85.

41. "This is the part of the passion story Luke has most thoroughly reworked, i.e., the discourse in 22:24–37. . . . In this discourse the future role of the Twelve is decisive since they will exercise ruling authority just as Jesus has. Above all, the Twelve are specially related to Israel (v. 30)" (Jervell, *Luke*, 79).

42. Luke 22:16, 18, cf. Matt 36:29, Mark 14:25.

43. Luke 22:20, cf. Matt 26:28; Mark 14:24.

44. Luke 22:24–30; cf. Matt 20:24–28; Mark 10:41–45.

45. Cf. Luke 24:30, 42–43; Acts 1:4, 10:41.

46. F. X. Durrwell, *The Resurrection: A Biblical Study* (trans. R. Sheed; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960) 323.

47. Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; 27:35.

48. Cf. John 6:66–69. Thus P. Benoit (*Jesus and the Gospels* [New York: Seabury, 1973] 116) remarks, “How can bread and wine become the body and blood of the Lord? It is a mystery of faith; we believe it because we believe in the Word of the Lord.” Benoit’s entire discussion (112–17) is helpful.

49. Benoit, *Jesus*, 113.

50. Benoit, *Jesus*, 116.

51. Thus the writers of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* described the Eucharist as “the likeness of the body of the kingdom of Christ.” See *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac, Vol. 2: Chapters XI–XXVI* (trans. A. Vööbus; CSCO 408; *Scriptores Syri 180*; Louvain: Secretariat du CSCO, 1979) 243–44.

52. On the reference to the new covenant in Jeremiah, see D. L. Bock, “The Reign of the Lord Christ,” in *Dispensationalism, Israel, and the Church: A Search for Definition* (ed. C. A. Blaising and D. L. Bock; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992) 37–67, here 43. On the relationship of covenant and kingdom, cf. G. Ossom-Batsa: “Διάθήκη [covenant] and βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ [kingdom of God] are correlative terms: the διάθήκη [covenant] of Jesus is linked to the eschatological prediction through Jesus’ death. The διάθήκη [covenant] makes it possible for man to enter into the βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ [kingdom of God]” (*The Institution of the Eucharist in the Gospel of Mark: A Study of the Function of Mark 14,22–25 Within the Gospel Narrative* [European University Studies, Series 23, Vol. 727; Bern: Peter Lang, 2001], 159).

53. Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 43: “In Luke 22:20, as Jesus distributes the elements, he notes that the cup represents the new covenant in his blood, shed on behalf of his disciples. . . . In the Old Testament the fulfillment of the new covenant is tied to the inauguration of the kingdom (Jer 31–33; Ezek 36–37),” which is specifically Davidic: Jer 30:9, 33:14–26; Ezek 37:24–25.

54. The Davidic context is immediately confirmed in the next verse (v. 21) when Jesus alludes to a Psalm of David (Ps 41:9).

55. Luke 22:24–27; cf. Matt 20:24–28; Mark 10:41–45.

56. In the command, “Let the greatest among you become as the youngest,” do we not hear a faint echo of David himself, the youngest of eight brothers (1 Sam 16:10–11), who was serving his father in the fields when the prophet Samuel came to anoint him (1 Sam 16:11–12), and yet attained a “great name, like the name of the great ones of the earth” (2 Sam 7:9)?

57. Cf. BAGD, 184a def. 2.

58. See 1 Chr 19:19; 2 Chr 5:10; 7:18; Ezek 16:30; and discussion in Nelson, *Leadership*, 204. *Diatithēmi* and *diathēkē* often bear the sense “to make a testament” and “testament/will” respectively in secular Greek literature (BAGD, 189b def. 3; 183a def. 1), but not here (contra Jervell, *Luke*, 105 n. 24; and Nelson, *Leadership*, 204), as J. Nolland points out: “Though the verb can bear such a sense [i.e., “bequeath”], its parallel use in connection with God here hardly encourages us to move in such a direction” (*Luke 18:35–24:53* [WBC 35c; Dallas: Word, 1993] 1066). See the discussion in Louw & Nida, §34.43; I. H. Marshall, *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970) 814–15; J. Priest, “A Note on the Messianic Banquet,” in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J. H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 222–38.

59. See Louw & Nida, §34.43, and cf. Marshall, *Luke*, 814–15: “The language is that of a covenant or testamentary disposition, so that the saying has a decisive significance in the establishment of the new covenant.”

60. Priest, “A Note on the Messianic Banquet,” 222–38.

61. Nelson, *Leadership*, 204.

62. Cf. 2 Sam 23:5; Ps 89:3–4, 28–29, 34–37, 39; 110:1–4; 132:11–12.

63. The background of this conferral of the kingdom first upon Jesus and then upon the Apostles may include Dan 7:1–28, wherein “everlasting dominion . . . and . . . [a] kingdom that shall not be destroyed” are given first to the Son of Man (7:14) and then to the Saints of the Most High (vv. 18, 22, 27).

64. Bock, *Luke 9:51–24:53* (Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament 3B; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 1740. Cf. Pao, *Acts*, 124–25: “In Luke, however, the bestowal of authority takes place during the very speech of Jesus,” and idem, 126–27: “Israel is now to be defined restrictively in terms of a certain kind of relationship to Jesus . . . ancient Israelite tradition is claimed by the Lukan community . . . an implicit claim to the title ‘true Israel’ can be said to exist in the narrative of Acts.”

65. Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 41.

66. Therefore *diatithēmi* in this passage should not be taken in a testamentary sense.

67. See Green, *Luke*, 770.

68. See Nelson, *Leadership*, 59.

69. Ossom-Batsa, *Institution*, 146: “Some relationship is suggested between the gift of the body and the gift of the blood . . . and the eschatological banquet.” “Eucharist and the Kingdom of God are correlative terms and are inseparably united” (159).

70. Green, *Luke*, 770; Fitzmyer, *Luke X–XXIV*, 1419: “The apostles will thus become the rulers of reconstituted Israel, the reconstituted people of God.”

71. Johnson, *Luke*, 345–46, and 349: “First, Jesus bestows on them *basileia*: they are to ‘judge the twelve tribes of Israel,’ (22:30), an exercise of authority that Luke will show being fulfilled in the apostolic ministry of the Jerusalem Church (Acts 1–6).”

72. Clark, “Role of the Apostles,” 190.

73. On the important links between the end of Luke and beginning of Acts, the common Isaianic-restoration imagery behind Luke 24:49 and Acts 1:8 (e.g., Isa 43:10–12, 49:6), and the restoration of Israel around the twelve, see M. Turner, *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel’s Restoration and Witness in Luke–Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1996) 300–301. On the church as restored Israel in Acts, see *ibid.*, 418–22. On the fulfillment of the promise of vice-regency to the Apostles, see Strauss, *Messiah*, 25; Jervell, *Luke*, 94; and J. Neyrey, *The Passion According to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke’s Soteriology* (New York: Paulist, 1985) 26–28.

74. L. T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992) 71.

75. On the close link between the “kingdom” in Luke 22 and here in Acts 1:1–11, see Jervell, *Luke*, 81–82.

76. “The concept of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ [kingdom of God] . . . seems to give unity to the whole narrative of the Lucan two-volume work. . . . The whole theological project of Luke . . . [is] a narrative unit with the central theme of the *basileia* [kingdom] as its starting point” (A. del Agua, “The Lucan Narrative of the ‘Evangelization of the Kingdom of God’: A Contribution to the Unity of Luke–Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* [ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999] 639–62, here 639).

77. See LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 99 and Louw & Nida §23.13. BAGD acknowledges the idiomatic force of *synalizomenos* as “eating together,” but argues that this meaning does not fit the context of Acts 1:4 (BAGD, 783b). *Pace* BAGD, the meaning fits the context extremely well. Acts 10:41 makes explicit the implicit significance of Luke 24:43 and Acts 1:4. Cf. BAGD, 783b: “Ac 10:41 appears to echo 1:4.”

78. As argued by J. M. Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 70; Pao, *Acts*, 95 n. 143, 144; and Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 45.

79. Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis*, 73: “The verse is programmatic in its significance for the narrative structure. . . . That the mission will begin in Jerusalem alludes to the restored Zion of Isaiah (Isa 2.3).”

80. Cf. Pao, *Acts*, 95.

81. Cf. Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis*, 21, 71.

82. Johnson, *Acts*, 29: “Jesus shifts the focus from ‘knowledge’ to mission . . . [this is] the real answer to the question concerning the ‘restoration’ of the kingdom to Israel. Jesus’ answer contains a redefinition of ‘kingdom’ and therefore of the Christian understanding of Jesus as Messiah. . . . The ‘kingdom for Israel’ will mean for Luke, therefore, the restoration of Israel as a people of God.”

83. Brawley, *Text to Text*, 73.

84. Neyrey, *Passion*, 27–28; cf. R. I. Denova, *Things Accomplished Among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke–Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997) 70; J. A. Fitzmyer, “The Role of the Spirit in Luke–Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 165–84, esp. 182; and Pao, *Acts*, 124.

85. Denova, *Things Accomplished Among Us*, 70.

86. Denova, *Things Accomplished Among Us*, 138, cf. 169–75.

87. Johnson, *Acts*, 61.

88. See R. F. O’Toole, “Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost,” *JBL* 102 (1983) 245–58; and Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 47: “Although the term *kingdom* never appears in the entire chapter, the imagery of rule and the features of God’s covenants are present. In fact, the chapter is saturated with such images and allusions.”

89. Cf. Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 38.

90. See Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 49.

91. On the Davidic background of Peter’s sermon, see Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 38–39.

92. On the relationship of Luke 1:32–33 and Acts 2:24–31, see Lane, *Luke and the Gentile Mission*, 160.

93. See Fitzmyer, “Role of the Spirit,” 175–76; and Denova, *Things Accomplished Among Us*, 138 and 169–75.

94. F. Martin compares way in which the NT transforms the expectations of the OT in the very process of fulfilling them to Bernard Lonergan’s concept of “sublation,” although Martin prefers the term “transposition” (see discussion in F. Martin, “Some Directions in Catholic Biblical Theology,” in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* [ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 5; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004], 65–87, esp. 69–70).

95. So Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis*, 75.

96. Johnson, *Acts*, 29. Significantly, hereafter in Acts “it is made clear that the Spirit is given only when the Twelve are present, or a member of the Twelve, or one of their delegates is on the scene” (Fitzmyer, “Role of the Spirit,” 182).

97. Cf. Bock, “Reign of the Lord Christ,” 53: “Those who share the Spirit show the influence of God in the world and reflect his work on earth, both in his powerful transformation of them and in their love toward those around them. They are a kingdom alongside other kingdoms.”

98. J. Mauchline, “Implicit Signs of a Persistent Belief in the Davidic Empire,” *VT* 20 (1970), 287–303; and Polley, *Amos and the Davidic Empire*, 66–82.

99. See Strauss, *Messiah*, 190–92.

100. Pao, *Acts*, 138. Cf. Penney, *The Missionary Emphasis*, 74; D. Seccombe, “The New People of God,” in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I. H. Marshall and D. Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 350–72; R. Bauckham, “James and the Jerusalem Church,” in *The Book of Acts in Its First-Century Setting*. Vol. 4: *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 415–80, esp. 457; and Y. Miura, *David in Luke–Acts: His Portrayal in the Light of Early Judaism* (WUNT 2 232; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 140–98.

101. McKnight is only able to advance this thesis because he concerns himself with the “historical Jesus” rather than the Jesus presented in the Gospels. Specifically, he argues that Jesus’ references to “covenant” at the Last Supper were attributed to Jesus by the early Church, but were never spoken by him; see S. McKnight, *Jesus and His Death: Historiography, the Historical Jesus, and Atonement Theory* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2005) 308–10.

102. On the Abrahamic covenant in Luke, see Brawley, *Text to Text*, and idem, “Abrahamic Covenant Traditions and the Characterization of God in Luke–Acts,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999) 109–32.

103. On this see S. van den Eynde, “Children of the Promise: On the Διαθήκη–Promise to Abraham in Lk 1,72 and Acts 3,25,” in *The Unity of Luke–Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999) 470–82.

104. Translation from F. García Martínez and E. J. C. Tigchelaar, eds., *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98).

105. Translation from Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Dead Sea Scrolls*.

106. Cf. the conclusion of del Agua (“Lucan Narrative,” 661) on the Christological and ecclesiological implications of the “Kingdom of God” in Luke–Acts: “[In Luke–Acts] the Church constitutes the eschatological people of God. This should end the reticence of properly relating Kingdom and Church. The Kingdom of God or the divine plan of eschatological salvation is realized, though perhaps not exclusively, in the Church.”

Chapter 9

COVENANT, OATH, AND DIVINE SONSHIP IN GALATIANS 3–4

1. On the theological issues surrounding the relationship between the covenants, as well as various recent interpretive approaches (e.g. typology, promise and fulfillment, salvation history, continuity and discontinuity), see D. L. Baker, *Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of the Theological Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments* (2nd ed.; Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 1991); E. E. Ellis, *The Old Testament in Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); V. Poythress, *The Shadow of Christ in the Law of Moses* (Brentwood, TN: Wolgemuth & Hyatt, 1991); J. S. Feinberg, ed., *Continuity and Discontinuity: Perspectives on the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments* (Westchester, IL: Crossway, 1988); L. Goppelt, *TYPOS: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982); L. Sabourin, *The Bible and Christ: The Unity of the Two Testaments* (Staten Island: Alba House, 1980).

2. These issues are discussed in a number of recent commentaries, e.g., T. George, *Galatians* (Nashville: Broadman, 1994); J. Dunn, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1993); J. L. Martin, *Galatians* (AYB; New York: Doubleday,