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Introduction

Amid a heated and current debate among scholars regarding the so called ‘early Christianism’, our purpose is tackling a text (Acts 3:11-26) that has been regarded as a masterpiece of the most primitive kerygmatic preaching. The passage stands out because ‘this speech is one of the most christologically rich addresses in Acts, as Jesus is the Servant, the Holy and righteous One, the Author of life, the prophet like Moses, the Christ, and the seed of Abraham’. Needless to say that opinions are far from coinciding. Hengel, for instance, surmises that the redaction of Peter’s speeches should be put off in time, thereby it would be quite risky to expect attainable goals about the early traditions that are lying behind them. Consequently, when dealing with the issue of ‘atonement doctrine’ within the NT, Hengel gets rid of the speeches in Acts and disregards such a precious material. In other cases, the finding of a common pattern in the apostolic speeches in Acts brings authors as Dibelius to consider them as strongly reshaped and carrying no more the flavor of a primitive stage in the Church’s thinking. The missionary speeches would reflect ‘a type of Christian sermon customary in the author’s day (about A. D. 90)’. Obviously, Debelius realizes that there are ‘old-fashioned phrases in the kerygma’, for instance the παῖς θεοῦ in 3:13, however the dependence of older texts is a matter ‘that can only be raised and not answered’.

Our view is different and, in some extent, can be summarized in a two-fold thesis. Firstly, the reedition-criticism allows us to undertake an analysis grounded in objective

---

4 Ibidem, 166.
criteria that discloses several traces of a handed down tradition behind Act 3:12-26. The great Tradition of the church represents an earlier stage in the transmission of the Gospel, in fact, the Scripture can be understood as the first fruit of this tradition. Given that, the preliminary analysis of our study in ch. 1 will go over the vestiges of early Christian preaching that may be tracked in Peter’s 2nd speech. Secondly, the ideas provided by former traditions are bound up with Lukan additions. Therefore, redaction-criticism is expected to isolate the author’s overtones. Out of his own theological background, Luke’s nuances frame the received-material in a wider theological context, namely the overall ideas of Gospel-Acts. Moreover, Luke accomplishes his task of insertion in a highly respectful way, maintaining as much as possible not only the original Jewish flavor of the speeches, but even the wording. Once these two aims have been achieved, it is time to move the spotlight upon one of the most fascinating Christological titles we found within the NT: παῖς θεοῦ (Acts 3:13, 26). Cullman regards the ἐβδομάδα Υἱῷ as ‘the heart of New Testament Christology’. Since the title is just referred twice, but its meaning is not developed at length within the speech itself, the only way we have to render explicit its scope is focusing on the Lukan insertions that we have previously detected. These expansions show us what Luke intended to mean as resorting to this category.


6 ‘The Tradition here in question comes from the apostles and hands on what they received from Jesus’ teaching and example and what they learned from the Holy Spirit. The first generation of Christians did not yet have a written New Testament, and the New Testament itself demonstrates the process of living Tradition’ (CEC 883); an also the paragraph about the stages in Gospels composition in DV 19, which could be applied to the composition of Acts: ‘The sacred writers selected certain of the many traditions that had been handed on either orally or already in written form’ (DV 19, in D. P. Béchard [ed.], Scripture Documents. An Anthology of Official Catholic Teachings [Collegeville, MN 2002] 27-28). Alike remarks by Dodd highlights somewhat the importance of tradition: ‘The kerygma is primary, and it acted as a preservative of the tradition which conveyed the facts [...] From the very beginning the facts were preserved in memory and tradition as elements in the Gospel which the Church proclaimed’ (C. H. Dodd, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments [London – Edinburgh 1949] 56).


Doble, J. Jipp). The so-called ‘Davidic Psalms’, read in a Messianic prospective, are a good candidate for alternative connections. In these psalms, the title ‘servant’ occurs often enough as to suppose a more likely background for Acts 3:13, 26. After all, quotations from Psalms are the main locus which Luke restores to in search of scriptural-proofs in the speeches. Running away from one sided position, we are deeply persuaded that in Acts the vision of David as a prophet, especially in several scriptural-proofs adduced in Peter’s speeches, is pointing to a more complex imagery (M. Strauss). In short, ‘Servant’ and ‘Royal Messiah’ are not excluding motives and even the first book of the Psalter (Ps. 35-41) bears witness of a progressive merging of both figures within Jewish pre-Christian exegesis. We agree with G. Barbiero’s insight upon this neglected point\(^{10}\): the drawing on Isaianic motifs in the first book of the Psalter, more precisely, the ‘servant imagery’.

The second part of our study is more complex because of the lesser agreement between specialists. After having showed in a quick survey the major interpretations regarding the παῦς θεοῦ in the OT and Second Temple literature (ch. 3), the focus moves on the meaning this suffering has. In other words, which are the right conceptions, according to Peter-Luke in 3:11-26, to interpret Chris’s sufferings and death? The latter might be shaped borrowing the image of a persecuted just one who is vindicated by God. Or maybe it comes down to a martyr who testifies to his commitment and loyalty to God. Furthermore, the persecuted prophet might fit so well in the Lukan vision of Jesus which stresses the prophetic role he accomplishes. Many models may be suggested, but again a serious exegetical analysis based on the Lukan pattern of ‘announcement-fulfillment’ brings us to underline the atoning meaning of the Servant’s mission (ch. 4.2). Obviously, we are not alone standing for it. Since Jeremias published his timeless article about παῦς θεοῦ\(^{11}\), many scholars go along with the core points that he adduced (M. Hengel, J. Green, D. Moessner, O. Cullmann, L. Morris). Since Acts 3:11, 26 has been already demonstrated to belong to a former material taken over by Luke, it will allow us to take advantage of an alike layer of ‘Petrine material’ (e. g. 1Pe. 2:22) to sketch a full picture regarding the meaning of that suffering in our text (ch. 4.1)\(^{12}\).

This quick outline of our assignment is enough to show how a multi-methodological approach will be lastly requested. The first chapter looks for some traditional material on the basis of reduction criticism. The relationship of this layer

---

\(^{10}\) G. BARBIERO, *Il regno di JHWH e del suo Messia*. Salmi scelti dal primo libro del Salterio (Studia Biblica 7; Roma 2008) 389-392.


\(^{12}\) The proposal of harking back to other texts of the NT is not whimsical and is part of the 3rd rule displayed by Wilcox when it comes to track traditional material: ‘Objective comparison is possible between Acts and other New Testament writings’ (Wilcox, “A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts”, 222). As Wilcox himself recognizes, this position was defended by M. Kähler long ago in reference to ‘Petrine material’ (“Die Reden des Petrus”, *TStKr* 46 [1873] 516. Dodd came with an alike conclusion uttering that the ‘kerygma of Acts’ is so ancient as to be in the basis of the Gospel of Mark. He would have written his Gospel by taking advantage of a sort of kerygmatic summary similar to those which appear in the speeches of Acts. Cf. DODD, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*, 47-51.
with Isa. 53 can be only ascertain by taking advantage, in chapter two, of the tools provided by intertextual analysis. Historical research and the trendy studies on ‘reception history’ come to our aid in chapter three. Contemporary exegesis on Isa. 53 by the turn of era is an unavoidable stage to acquire full acquaintance with the exegetical devices at work in a genuine Jewish-Christian tradition in Acts 3. Finally, chapter 4 resort to what we call biblical theology. Obviously, the text is meant to convey certain ideas. Ideology, understood as a set of doctrinal items, constitutes the object of the question we pose: What is the soteriological value of Christ’s sufferings as a ‘Servant of God’ in Acts 3?

A foreword of warning is needed to keep us from jeopardizing the accuracy of this research: as we conclude in ch. 1, it is possible in many instances to get hints that disclose previous layers of tradition in Acts 3, but this fact does not allow us to sketch a hypothetical development of the dogma within the early church. Going straight to the point, Robinson did not hesitate in drawing the conclusion that Acts 3:12-26 conveys the most primitive Christology of all. The reason to support such an inference is that Jesus is not yet seen as the ‘Christ’ and the ‘Lord’ (as it is evident in Acts 2:36) but rather he is depicted as a mere ‘Prophet’ and ‘Servant’. We puzzle over how did he manage to draw such a conclusion. Certainly, it goes too far. Apart from plain connections between Acts 2 and 3 that suggest a common layer of genuine ‘Petrine material’, a dangerous bias is at work in Robison’s case. Every scholar runs the risk of constructing in his mind a well-performed line of the dogma’s growth and afterwards holding in this hypothetical timeline pieces of text according to their alleged development. Therefore, the texts that openly confess Christ as ‘Lord’ or ‘God’ should be labeled as late. It goes beyond the limits of our study, but Bauckham has convincingly proved in a thorough study that the highest Christology is actually the

13 We may detect in Acts iii, with reflections in Acts vii, an extremely primitive Christology, whose essence may be summed up in the proclamation: “We know who the Messiah will be”. It has not yet come to recognize the death and the exaltation of Jesus as being itself the act of God that inaugurates his kingdom and in virtue of which Jesus is revealed as Messiah’ (J. A. T. ROBINSON, “The Most Primitive Christology of All?” JThS 7 [1956] 188). So that, this Christology is labeled as ‘pre-Messianic’ and Robinson even calls the Christologies of Acts 2 and 3 two incompatible Christologies’ (ibidem, 177). The same position is hold by R. Fuller: ‘We cannot say that the earliest Palestinian Christology held that Jesus became the Messiah at his resurrection (Acts 2:36)’ (R. H. FULLER, The Foundations of New Testament Christology [New York 1966] 159). So that, the ‘prophet-Christology’ is for Fuller the closest construction to Jesus’ self-understanding and the best witness of the Kerygma of the earliest church. The Messiahship of Jesus was associated, at a first stage, only with his future coming in glory at the end of time, not with his resurrection.

most primitive Christology. Against the backdrop of Pauline hymns, this point turns out to be crystal-clear. Most of the hymns are regarded as traditionary material. However, they do reflect even a ‘higher Christology’ than the body of the letters itself. Likewise, C. Keener timely states as commenting Acts 3:13: ‘Modern reconstructions of what Christologies are most “primitive” also often depend on a modern view of the evolution of Christology in the early church that contradicts some of our explicit early evidence’. Hengel also makes a strong case that the early church’s Christology developed very quickly and does not rely on an alleged reconstruction of the development from lower to higher Christology.

The ‘step forward’ we are intended to prompt consists of moving back to Christ himself the understanding of his mission as a ‘Servant of God’ in accordance with Isaianic imagery. Commenting on the title of Servant, especially present in Mark’s predictions of the Passion along Jesus’ journey to Jerusalem (8:31; 9:12; 9:31; 10:33 and 10:45), R. Fuller asserts that they do not reflect Jesus’ self-understanding as Servant of God. He just parrots the critical view posed by Hooker. According to Fuller, the redemptive signification of Jesus’s death goes beyond the interpretation of the first ‘Palestinian community’, which only regarded the Passion-Resurrection as a ‘rejection-vindication’ event. In addition, he makes extensive this conclusion to the speech we are dealing with (Acts 3:12-26). The first community would have come up with the idea of atoning suffering very early, maybe during the first Passover commemoration (31 a. d.), within the liturgical context of the words upon the cup. So that the soteriological interpretation of the Passion in terms of vicarious offering would be assigned to the first ‘Palestinian Christianity’ and, even if quite early, it cannot be traced back to Christ himself.

Unfortunately, nothing is farther from truth. The original exegesis that Christians undertook by reading Isa. 53 in a way not corroborated before within 2nd temple literature (ch. 3.3) raises a strong objection. This brand-new reading is unaccountable without what we may call a Christ-exegete. Namely, he himself interpreted beforehand his passion by taking over the Isaianic motifs. So that, the atoning power

---

15 ‘The highest possible Christology – the inclusion of Jesus in the unique divine identity – was central to the faith of the early church even before any of the New Testament writing were written’, R. BAUCKHAM, Jesus and the God of Israel. God Crucified and Other Studies on the New Testament’s Christology of Divine Identity (Grand Rapids MI, 2008) 19.


21 ‘To ascribe everything to the primitive community is to interpret the servant text with unjustifiable shallowness and artificiality’ (L. S MUDGE, “The Servant Lord and His Servant People”, SJT 12 [1959] 120).
of Christ’s suffering for many – present also in the ‘paidology’\(^{22}\) of Acts 3:12-26 – is not a later development or ‘further outgrowth’\(^{23}\). As redaction-criticism will show, it is present in the ‘Petrine material’ within Acts and other places in the NT, setting up its origin not just in the first Jewish-Christian community right after Passover, but in Jesus’ self-consciousness about his person and mission.

\(^{22}\) As far as we have inquired, the term was coined by O. Cullman: ‘The Acts of the Apostles offers us the strongest proof of the fact that in the most ancient period of early Christianity there existed an explanation of the person and work of Jesus which we could characterize somewhat inaccurately as an \textit{ebed Yahweh} Christology, or more exactly as a \textit{Paidology}’ (\textsc{Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament}, 73).

\(^{23}\) \textit{Ibidem}, 173.
Chapter 1: Gathering Traditions

Vestiges of Early Christian Preaching in Acts 3:11-26

The speech we are about to tackle has been regarded as a crafted masterpiece of rhetoric. It displays, in a fresh way, all the elements that constitute the kerygmatic proclamation of the early church after the outpouring of the Spirit in Pentecost (Acts 2:1-4). Scholarship on Acts’ speeches has always engaged in an endless discussion about the presence of traditional motifs, namely former pieces of tradition, within the Lukan redaction. Two authors have triggered the ongoing discussions: M. Dibelius and U. Wilckens. Yet, a while earlier, H. Cadbury had already set out the critical basis for a distinction between Luke’s redaction and the former elements that he would have received through the channel of tradition, even though he does not.

24 Their major achievements were put forward in these classic essays: M. DIBELIUS, “Die Reden der Apostelgeschichte un die antike Geschichtsschreibund”, Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte (ed. E. GREEVEN) (Göttingen 1949); U. WILCKENS, Die Missionreden der Apostelgeschichte. Form- und traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1961). For a general evaluation on the different approaches that might be assumed regarding the presence of early kerygmatic samples in the speeches of Acts, i.e. Dibelius’ or Dodd’s position, here there is a concise summary: Cf. BAUCKHAM, “Kerygmatic Summaries in the Speeches of Acts”, 185-217; F. BOVON, Luke the Theologian. Thirty-Three Years of Research 1950-2005 (Waco, TX 2006) 151-179; J. CARRÓN, Jesús, el Mesías manifestado. Tradición literaria y trasfondo judío de Hch 3, 19-26 (SSNT 2; Madrid 1993) 35-40; also, the introductory remarks by Zehnle are useful to catch up with classical scholarship on Peter’s 1st and 2nd speech: Cf. Cf. R. F. ZEHNLE, Peter’s Pentecost Discourse. Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter’s Speeches of Acts 2 and 3 (SBL.MS 15; Nashville, NY 1971) 13-17.

dare to guarantee the ‘primitiveness’ of the speeches. In fact, all these scholars were reluctant to admit streams of early kerygmatic traditions flowing in the first chapters of Acts. They were strongly interested in not underplaying the role of Luke as a true author who projects an unified theological picture over the materials. Thus, in certain extent, the speeches in Acts at large were not consider mirroring more than a Lukan theology by the end of the 1st century 26. For Dibelius these speeches may have hidden traditional materials, but unfortunately, they are not detectable anymore because of the strong re-shaping that they have suffered. Indeed, a common scheme is at the base of every speech, which should be discerned as Luke’s: i. Short kerygmatic narrative (2:22-24; 3:13-15; 5:30-31; 10:36-42; 13:23-25); ii. Some scriptural proofs to validate the message (2:25-31; 3:22-26; 10:43; 13:32-37); iii. Exhortation to repentance (2:38; 3:17-20; 5:31; 10:42; 13:38-41) 27. In our opinion, even if the overall arrangement of every speech tends to follow this progression, scholars should account for the oddities and distinctive features that every piece conveys without getting rid of differences regarding style, grammar, wording and backdrop ideas. Besides, a shared arrangement in these speeches may be explained without resorting to Luke’s personal seal, ‘it might also reflect the content of a typical missionary speech by the leaders of the early church’ 28. Therefore, we must not take for granted that we are dealing with plain Lukan compositions.

Structure aside, other rhetorical device that might betray – according to many scholars – Lukan authorship rather than an exploitation of older sources is the ‘ethopoieia’. By this maneuver, an author composes a speech by paralleling the style, wording and character of another speaker. Thus, he imitates cultural background, social class or regional particularities of the addressee. The archaizing language could depict, in the current case, an earlier scenario 29. By this means, ancient authors used to show off their rhetorical capabilities. Even if this theory sounds tempting, it might well demonstrate the opposite, because we find harder to believe that Luke had access to an


archaizing style but not to previous sources, whether oral or written. Moreover, if Luke were behaving like the ancient rhetors did, one cannot account for many features of Peter’s speeches. One of them, the briefness of his discourses, a note that clearly departs from ancient literary practices\(^{30}\).

Despite a prevailing line in current scholarship which claims for a Lukan composition, some scholars share the opinion that Acts 3:11-26 conveys an outstanding summary of the primitive kerygmatic proclamation of Jerusalem’s Church. As D. Dunn claims: ‘Luke has been able to draw on some very old tradition in framing this sermon’\(^{31}\). This would require that the evidences to support such a hypothesis must be inferred from the unusual features that come to light in a thorough linguistic study of this text, otherwise any suggestion about its antiquity lacks a proper base\(^{32}\). Here we put forward some indications that reject a late date for Acts 3:13-26. Briefly summarized, these are the main clues within the text that confirm we are dealing with a piece of Jewish-Christian tradition handed down for a while before Lukan redaction.

(1) Firstly, Peter stresses that salvation is ‘primarily’ sent to Jews: ὅμιν πρὸτον (3:26a). They are ‘the first candidates for the reception of blessings promised to Abraham’\(^{33}\). When spreading the Gospel announcement, Paul also used to preach before to the Jews (Acts 13:14; 14:1; 17:1; 10, 17; 18:4, 19; 28:17). What really matters is that the foretold promises are now accomplished amid the chosen people (v. 18). The audience is called ‘sons of the prophets and the Covenant’ (ὅμειτο ἔστε οἱ νῦν τῶν προφητῶν καὶ τῆς διαθήκης, v. 25). Consequently, it is supposed that the addresses of an original catechesis would have been the heirs of the Old Covenant promises\(^{34}\), namely, Jews. Also, v. 13 starts out invoking ‘the God of our fathers’ (ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, v.13). The use of 1st person-possessive identifies the speaker as a member of the λαός. Moreover, the text in P\(^{74}\), κ and A is a direct quotation of Es. 3:6, 15 (LXX), which stands out as the major event in Israel’s history of salvation. It is convenient not to lose of sight Stephen’s speech, because Acts 7:32 invokes God taking over the same quotation. As long as the ‘convenantal language’ related to Abraham and Moses is so widespread in our text (quotations to Gen. 22:18 in v. 25 and Deut. 18:15-16 in vv. 22-23), we are compelled to surmise a backdrop of people acquainted with this terminology. Several instances of ‘convenantal language’ show up again in

\(^{30}\) Cf. Ibidem, 74.


\(^{32}\) Assuming objective guidelines is the only mean to keep us from performing a fanciful exegesis. The outcome of this study relies on the objective criteria we are handling to support a Jewish background in Acts 3:11-26. A list of these criteria is displayed in cf. WILCOX, “A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts”, 206-225; a well-balanced exposition of the results, cf. ZEHNLE, Peter’s Pentecost Discourse, 44-60.


\(^{34}\) The criterion at stake could be labeled as ‘appropriateness to a primitive Jewish-Christian setting’ (WILCOX, “A Foreword to the Study of the Speeches in Acts”, 221).
Acts 7:2-8, 17, emphasizing the value of Abraham as forerunner of the promises and creating, at the same time, a suspicious literary interplay between Acts 3 and 7. The whole history of Israel is the stage in which God accomplishes his plan of salvation, therefore, the threat of being ‘cut off from the people’, ἐξολοθρευθήσεται ἐκ τού λαοῦ (3:23) makes perfect sense in this context. The expression is fairly strong, because it threatens the people with nothing less than excommunication. It is, at turn, deeply rooted in the sanctions enacted in Lev. 23:29 (בְּקַרְכַּה וּמְשַׁפְּרָת), although in this case, the text is conflated with Deut. 18:15.

(2) Secondly, the use of seven Christological titles, some of them not referred very often in the NT but deeply rooted in OT. They all reflect an unmistakable ‘Jewish flavor’ which appeals for a critical interpretation35. The list of Christological epithets of our text runs thus:

- ὁ ἀγιος (3:14). Elsewhere in Lk. 4:34; Joh. 6:39, but no more occurrences in Acts.
- Χριστὸς αὐτοῦ (3:18)
- προφήτης (3:22)

The scanty presence of these titles elsewhere increases the likelihood of a special line of tradition behind them. For example, Jesus designed as ἀρχηγός only occurs here (3:15) and in the epistle to Hebrews (2:10). In classical Greek, in the realm of pagan mythology, the term is applicable to ‘heroes’ and it belongs to the semantic field of military language. In fact, it could be rendered as ‘captain’. In this context Jesus plays the role of eschatological leader. Perhaps, the title harks back to the idea of Moses as leader who brought Israel out of Egypt. Similarly, Jesus would be shaped as ‘new Moses’ who triggers a ‘new exodus’. Be that as it may, the most startling element is the appearance of ἀρχηγός only in two instances which are believed to convey Jewish Christian traditions39.

Likewise, the title ὁ δίκαιος is only used in a Jewish-Christian milieu: ‘it is a reasonable suggestion that the use of the term as an epithet for Jesus comes from

36 There are further references to the book of 1 Enoch (38:2; 46:3; 47:1-4; 53:6), cf. BARRET, Acts, 196; Brock adds Ps. Sol. 17:32 and concludes that the ‘Righteous One’ was a messianic description in Judaism’ (BOCK, Acts, 170).
37 Another occurrence is found in Early Patristic Literature, cf. 2Clem. 20:5.
38 Here as a Christological title: ‘Peter understands sperma Abraam, “offspring of Abraham”, in a twofold way: not just generically of all the Jewish people, but more specifically as a reference to an individual descendant of Abraham, the risen Christ’ (FITZMYER, The Acts of the Apostles, 291).
39 HURTADO, Lord Jesus Christ, 188-189.
biblical passages read christologically in early Jewish Christian circles, such as Isaiah 53:11 and Habakkuk 2:4. The striking fact is that this title is for the very first time in Judaism associated with παῖς in 1 Enoch (Similitudines), a contemporary work to Acts. There, an undoubtful messianic figure embodies several messianic titles as ‘Righteous One’ or ‘Elect’. Alike results are only detectable in this passage of Acts and, in lesser extent, in Wis. 2:12-18, where the title has not yet acquired a messianic nuance, but has only a collective meaning. The usage of ὁ δίκαιος not just as honorific title, but in a messianic way betrays a Jewish-Christian community well acquainted with traditional terminology. Grammatically noticeable is the use of the determinate article before δίκαιος, it advocates its titular status, not just as referring generally to a righteous person.

Especially important is the title παῖς θεοῦ. It only occurs again in 4: 25, 27, 30 (in 4:25 is predicated of David). According to Barret, this fact ‘suggests strongly that the speech material in Chs. 3 and 4 reached Luke by a special line of tradition’. Jeremiah also thinks in a similar way: ‘The fact that he does not use the formula outside the description of the community of Jerusalem in Acts 3 and 4 makes evident that he was aware of its archaic feature’. It is worth noticing the parallel use of παῖς θεοῦ in the prayer as a designation either for David (4:25) and for Jesus (4:27-30). Since the liturgical context embraces both cases, we would argue in favor of its antiquity. It is well known that the liturgical formulas tend to crystallize and endure better the passage of time. In fact, the formula kept alive in Apostolic Fathers’ literature, but was restricted to a liturgical setting. At any rate, the two questions that redaction-criticism is expected to answer were well posed by Cadbury: ‘Why is this term for Jesus limited in Acts and indeed practically in the NT to these occurrences? And what meaning or connotation does the term convey?’

(3) A third feature which advocates for the antiquity of this passage is the presence of ancient apocalyptic motifs in 3:20-21 related, in some cases, with intertestamentary literature. The inconsistency between particular aspects of the text and its larger context discloses an outer source for such materials. These verses have strong eschatological nuances easily noticeable because they are missing from most of early Christian sources.

---

40 Ibidem, 189.
42 BARRET, Acts, 189. We are inclined to think this tradition embraces the Petrine material in Acts (2-4). Other theories are prone to regard Acts 3:11-26 as an original ending of a former Christian tract whose first part would have been the judgment and stoning of Stephen (Acts 7). So that, the core of Acts 3 would have followed the Stephen’s suit. Even if we judge that this point is difficult to support, what arouses our interest is the fact that, in addition, H. Scobie links Acts 3 with the Samaritan mission of Philip in Acts 8, 5-25. Curious enough is that an alike Christian exegesis on Isa. 53 is at work in both cases (Acts 3 and 8). As we will see afterwards, between Acts 3 and 7 there are many communalities, but establishing the order of an earlier source seems to be overly risky. Cf. C. H. H. SCOBIE, “The Use of Source Material in the Speeches of Acts III and VII”, NTS 25 (1978-1979) 399-421.
- The ‘times of refreshing’ (καιροὶ ἀναψυχῆς, 3:20α). The concept ἀναψυχῆς is a hapax within NT, and only occurs once in LXX (Es. 8:11)\(^{45}\). It designates a time of partial fulfillment between the Resurrection and Parousia by which the eschatological completion is put in advance, i.e. here and now we check out ‘individual realizations’\(^{46}\) of the upcoming completion.

- The ‘times of universal restoration’ (ἀρχὴ χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων, 3:21α) is an unaccustomed terminology. Even if a parallel expression is found in Assumptio Mois is 1:10, 18; 1Enoch 45:4-5; 96:3 and 2 Esdr. 7:75, 91-95, the ultimate reference recalls the prophetic announcement of Elijah in Mal. 3:23 and Sirach 48:10\(^{47}\).

- When alluding to the second coming of Christ, it is God who will send his Son (ἀποστείλῃ τὸν προφετήσιμον, 3:20α). That is the accustomed language for referring the entrance of Jesus in this world through the Incarnation, but not for the Parousia\(^{48}\).

(4) The ‘prophet-like-Moses Christology’\(^ {49}\). After the so called ‘apocalyptic digression’, a rich corollary of Old Testament texts emerges in Acts 3:22-26. Jesus is described as a ‘prophet’ like Moses. The text-proof is immediately reported in a two-verse quotation from Deut. 18:15-18 (LXX)\(^{50}\) and Lv. 23:29. The astonishing point is that, within NT and early Christian literature up to 2\(^{nd}\) century, this passage is verbatim cited elsewhere only in Acts 7:37. In Robinson words, ‘chapter iii has affinities, not simply with the other Petrine speeches in Acts, but with the sermon of Stephen in

---

\(^{45}\) Cf. Carrón, Jesús, el Mesías manifestado, 83.

\(^{46}\) Barret, Acts, 205.

\(^{47}\) Such an allusion does not justify the presentation of Christ as mere prophet: ‘It would be unwise to base on this allusion an argument that Luke was presenting, or had in his source, an ‘Elijah-Moses Christology’, according to which Jesus was thought of as the forerunner of God’ (Ibidem, 206). The expression χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως has not been always well understood. About the theory of Apokatastasis, widespread by the 1\(^{st}\) century, cf. Fitzmyer, The Acts of the Apostles, 288-289.

\(^{48}\) Cf. Dunn, The Acts of the Apostles, 43. To prevent a misreading of the perfect participle προφετήσιμον (v. 20b), let us note that ‘appointed’ does not intend to mean that Jesus will become Messiah only in his final coming (Robinson and Fuller), as though he were not regarded as such during the present time in this ‘Palestinian formula’. As Barret points out, v. 18 have already proved that Christ suffers as a Messiah: ‘v. 20b refers to the sending as Messiah of Jesus, who is Messiah now’ (Barret, Acts, 205). It is clear that Luke’s standpoint goes further and considers Jesus to be Messiah from his birth (Lk 2:11), however Barret is right in posing the question whether this depiction if shared by the source of Acts 3:20. The amount of OT quotations and allusions at work in Acts 3:11-26 pushes us to an affirmative verdict. Luke’s source regarded Christ as fulfillment of the OT in his current state, previous to the Parousia. Acts 7:2-53, that seemingly belongs to the same source, witnesses Christ as center of the Salvation story. The full manifestation of Christ as Messiah-in-power at the end of times does not exclude his currently consideration as such.

\(^{49}\) On the prophetic role of Christ and Jewish expectation of a Prophetic Messiah in 2\(^{nd}\) Temple Literature, cf. J. D. G. Dunn, Christianity in the Making. I. Jesus Remembered (Grand Rapids, MI 2003), 655-666.

\(^{50}\) It is worth recalling in this regard the Greek version (LXX) and 4QTest7 – a collection of testimonia – because both depart from MT by adding the word ‘prophet’ in Deut. 18:19 (ὁ προφητής) and rendering more precise the Hebrew foretelling. It is not unthinkable to suggest a collection of testimonia available by the time of Early Church. Cf. Barret, Acts, 209-210.
chapter vii. These speeches are more deeply rooted in the theology of the Old Testament than any of the others\textsuperscript{51}. Moreover, if Christ is claimed to be δίκαιος (3:14) and ἄρχηγός (3:15), the same titles are predicated of Moses in 7:25, 31. This device of recalling OT crucial texts emphasizes the God-ordained purpose along salvation history which comes to realization in Christ: τὸ γεγραμμένον δὲ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἔμοι (Lk. 22:37a)\textsuperscript{52}. Indeed, a token of the richness of our text is an unaccustomed attributive participle not used anywhere in Acts to speak about the appointment of Jesus as Messiah: ‘the one appointed beforehand’ (τὸν προκεχειρισμένον, 3:20).

(5) Regarding the wording, some terms as ὀλοκληρία (‘wholeness’, v. 16a), understood as a material description of the miraculous action, is not used anywhere else in NT. Likewise, the verb ἄρνησι (‘to deny’, 3:13), referred to the denial of Jesus, only appears again in Luke-Acts to describe the rejection of Moses in Acts 7:35, in the Stephen’s defense speech. Here we have, by the way, another suggestive link between Acts 3 and 7, reading the fate of Jesus in terms of prophet-like-Moses Christology\textsuperscript{53}. The Semitic backdrop which betrays the source of the speech shows up again in v. 17a. The conjunction καὶ νῦν (‘now then’) introduces a consecutive phrase (BDF §442.8) and recalls the Hebrew הוהי or the Syriac-Aramaic ἡ ἀλήθεια. In 3:19, the verb used for expressing the grant of forgiveness is ἐξαλείφθηναι (‘cause to disappear by wiping’), scarcely attested even in early Christian literature (1 Clem 18:2; 2 Clem. 13:1). Much of the foregoing elements seem to be very primitive not only for the sake of lexicon, but, above all, because they were not taken over in later theological developments of Christian reflection. Even during the time in which Luke noted them down, they turned out to reflect and old-fashioned theology.

(6) Finally, it would be suitable to review the main reasons that urge us to take the title παῖς θεοῦ as an antique motive. As said above, Jeremiah has made the case for its archaic provenience\textsuperscript{54}, taking advantage of previous studies by Harnack and O’Neill\textsuperscript{55}. The reasons to support this thesis are five: i) The formula is exclusively used in passages that are dealing with the first steps of Jerusalem community (Acts 3 and 4).

\textsuperscript{51} ROBINSON, “The Most Primitive Christology of All?”, 186. Both texts share two important communalities: they start from ‘the God of the Patriarchs’, referring the covenant with Abraham (3:25; 7:7). In these cases, the promise is to be fulfilled in ‘his seed’ (3:25; 7:5). Zehnle too detects seven parallels between Acts 3 and 7, cf. ZEHNLE, Peter’s Pentecost Discourse, 76-77.


\textsuperscript{53} ZEHNLE, Peter’s Pentecost Discourse, 76.

\textsuperscript{54} The next arguments are mainly taken from Jeremias. Cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 395-403. A proof in behalf of its antiquity is required since some authors surmise that its rarity may be due to the fact that it would be modern rather than traditional. So that the title would not have caused any impact in NT writings because it might be dated by the end of 1\textsuperscript{st} century, cf. KEENER, Acts, II, 1079.

ii) From some occurrences in a context of prayer (Acts 4:25 and 4:27, 30 and Did. 9:2, 3; 10:2, 3) one may draw the conclusion that its origin is related with the cult. Now then, the liturgical language is one of the most resistant to the passage of time because it is made up with ‘fixed-phrases’ that do not change in the span of many years or even centuries. iii) If the voice heard in the Baptism of Jesus is related with Isa. 42:1 – as it is supposed by the majority of scholars – the term παῖς θεοῦ, at the forefront of the quotation of Isa. 42:1, could have been in Evangelists’ mind (Mk. 1:10-11; 9:7; Matt. 12:18; 17:5; Lk. 9:35; Joh. 1:34; 2Pe. 1:17). iv) The primitiveness of the designation may be traced back to the basis of Johannite theology. The representation of the Savior as a ‘lamb’ is unknown in Judaism (Joh. 1:29, 36). Now then, as it is well known, in Aramaic, talya’ (天空部落) means both lamb and servant. Moreover, the task that this lamb accomplishes is expressed by an attributive participle: ὁ αἰρόν τὸν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου (Joh. 1:29). If this text is recalling Isa. 53:12b ἤραμα τοῖς παιδαρίσιν πλέον (MT), the subject who governs the proposition in Isa. 53:11b could be ambiguously taken as ‘lamb’ or ‘Servant’ (talya’). v) Beyond the NT, παῖς θεοῦ occurs in a very short range of texts (only 11 times)56: Did. 9:2, 3; 10: 2, 3; IClem. 59:2-4; Mart. Polyc. 14:1-3; 20:2. In all these cases, the title is inside an ongoing prayer. The liturgical formula ‘διὰ Ησσοῦ τοῦ παιδὸς του’ appears over and over. The fact that, from 5th century onwards the use of παῖς disappears completely, underlines the Aramaic origin of the formula and concludes that this title was only alive in Palestinian circles.

So far, striking parallels with other sections of Acts have appeared, especially in relation with Stephen’s trial and death. But, how about the other Petrine discourses (2:14-39 and 4:8-12)? After all, the author has put these three pieces under the fatherhood of Peter. Does the intradietic authorship have to do with a real line of common tradition? Briefly, at least four parallels should be note57: the mention of Jesus’ resurrection (2:24; 3:15; 4:10); call to repentance (2:38a; 3:19; 4:11), grant of forgiveness (2:38b; 3:26; 4:11) and the apostles as witness (2:32; 3:15; 5:32)58. Honestly, the coincidences on the structure are not conclusive because other speeches


58 Both Keener and Borgman cleverly stress the fact that these three speeches reproduce also the last words of Jesus in Lk. 24:46-47. So that, Peter and the first Christians are carrying out the desire that Christ himself entrusted them in his last addressing. The connection between the last chapter of the Gospel and the speeches in Acts will turn out to be of paramount importance to assess the value of παῖς θεοῦ in connection with the Passion narrative (ch. 4.2), cf. KEENER, Acts, II, 1077; BORGMAN, The Way according to Luke, 277.
by Paul displays a similar layout⁵⁹. So that, this argument can be countered by similar patterns of composition. Nevertheless, the outline of Peter’s speech may be meaningful if accompanied, as we have already seen, by further proofs in wording and background ideas.

This quick survey aims to enable us to grasp the traditional elements which arise along the body of the speech. The wording and style of Peter’s 2nd speech convey quite a bit traditional material and non-Lukan expressions. Regarding the rhetorical purpose of this previous layer, our assessment would be that ‘the bulk of the message argues for Jesus’ identity and Israel’s proper response’⁶⁰. Certainly, what is at stake is the correct answer to a question that either the intradiegetic audience and extradiegetic reader pose: ‘Who is Jesus?’ Hence, the massive amount of Christological titles. Among them, ‘the controlling Christological title is “servant”, as indicated by the inclusion of 3:13 and 26⁶¹. Now, it is time to take a look at some aspects which may betray traces of Luke’s redaction. These insertions have to do with Luke’s rhetorical purpose, thereby he enhances the theology already conveyed by his source and settles it in a new frame.

**Traces of Lucan Redaction in Acts 3:11-26**

This paragraph assumes several methodological suppositions which may be suitable to set out at the beginning. As R. Stein recognizes, form critics have engaged on the text neglecting, in some extent, the general unity of every scriptural entity⁶², in this case, the book of Acts as a whole. That makes the case for Luke as a true author, even though he himself acknowledges to have picked up and gathered different pieces of tradition (Lk. 1:1-4). In short, Luke is not a mere collector or as Stein says, ‘scissors and paste man’. There is therefore no wonder in surmising that besides early traditions, ‘Luke also sometimes expands and improvises, drawing on the Gospel traditions in his own Gospel. This may well be the case, for example, with the specific details about the events leading to Jesus’ death in Acts 3:13, 14; 13:28⁶³. The foregoing statements should be taken into account specially when it comes to analyze Acts’ sweeping portrayal regarding the ‘Servant Suffering’. Even if our text is reflecting an old tradition handed down in Jewish-Christian communities, allowance for links with other passages in Acts is to be made if we want to engage in a deeper understanding regarding the significance of παῖς θεοῦ imagery in Lucan writings⁶⁴.

---


⁶⁰ KEENER, Acts, II, 1076.

⁶¹ Ibidem.

⁶² ‘They [form critics] overlooked the fact that these pearls of tradition were strung together in a particular manner and revealed a particular design” (STEIN, “What is Redaktionsgeschichte?”, 46).


⁶⁴ ‘Luke is a Configurer (ποιητής) of a pool of oral and written traditions […] By “arranging” a new narrative sequence different from a number of predecessors, Luke imparts a new cognitive and affective understanding of these happenings. His altered epistemological landscape provides its own
The first step in our critical analysis is a linguistic one. Both redaction and form criticism share a common introductory phase in their respective research: ‘Isolation of the tradition from the editorial redaction’⁶⁵. Thus, we catch up what is Lukan.

Easy to guess, the first verse of this passage (v. 11) is a Luke’s editorial link with the precedent miracle narrative (3:1-10). The setting is the Temple itself, its outer court: ἐπὶ τῇ στοὰ τῇ καλουμένῃ Σολωμῶντος (11b). The Salomon’s colonnade used to be the meeting place of the primitive church, as it is inferred from 5:12. Just started our passage, the apposition (τῇ στοὰ τῇ καλουμένη) surmises a Semitic linguistic substratum (cf. Rev. 3:12)⁶⁶. As far as we are concerned, this spot is highly significative due to the Lukan connection of Jesus’ death and the tearing of the Temple veil (Lk. 23:45b)⁶⁷. Either at the beginning (εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ κυρίου, Lk. 1:9b) and the end of his Gospel (ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ, Lk 24:53a), the Temple stands out as a religious center for the people. All the way through the Gospel, in many occasions, Jesus taught there (19:47-48; 20:1, 6, 9, 19, 26; 21:38)⁶⁸. Significative enough is the fact that the audience is called λαός (3:12, 23). This word is applied in Luke only to Israel, reaching 85 occurrences.

The next one, v. 12, is a Lukan redaction too, because it goes over an important Lukan topic: the healing is to be ascribed to God. The Apostles are only humans, not οἱ θεοὶ ὁμοιωθέντες ἀνθρώποις (v. 14:11). The grace comes down through them, but its origin is super-natural. They just work as channels by which a divine gift is flowing. Therefore, as at the beginning (v. 12), the same issue is set up at the very center of the proclamation (v.16), revealing again Luke’s redaction touches. Indeed, his main concern can be discerned in a double reference to ‘his name’, that is to say, the healing power at work proceeds from τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ (v. 16a) and the faith in him⁶⁹. From this concurrence of settings of significance’ (D. P. MOESSNER, Luke the Historian of Israel’s Legacy, Theologian of Israel’s Christ. A New Reading of the ‘Gospel Acts’ of Luke [BZNW 182; Berlin – Boston 2016] 315).

⁶⁵ STEIN, “What is Redaktionsgeschichte?”, 56. The following analysis has been performed in a close attention to the comments made by G. Barret and J. Fitzmyer on Lukan style. Cf. BARRETT, Acts, 186-214; FITZMYER, The Acts of the Apostles, 281-294. There are other scholars, instead, who tend to blur the characteristic features of every speech delivered in Acts: ‘We see that the missionary speeches of Peter and Paul are worded in the same way’ (JERVEL, “The future of the past”, 120). Such a conclusion, sometimes widespread, does not respect a careful analysis on the basis of Redaction-Criticism method and undervalue the original touches of Act 3:11-26.


⁶⁷ For our study is irrelevant to pinpoint the debated position of this colonnade. Two likely spots are proposed: inside or near the Beautiful Gate (which seems to be more probable) and the long open colonnade running along the eastern side of the Temple podium (D codex and Josephus: War 5.184; Ant. 15.396-401; 20.220). Several articles and studies are quoted in cf. BARRET, Acts, 191-192.

⁶⁸ Cf. KEENER, Acts, II, 1075.

⁶⁹ So that, the purpose of Peter’s intervention is ‘to correct a misunderstanding on the part of bystanders’ (FITZMYER, The Acts of the Apostles, 281). Even though the rhetorical red-line which keeps the reasoning tension is the onlooker’s misinterpretation, in terms of genre, Acts 3:11-26 is a Kerygmatic sermon, whose further purpose is repentance and conversion to Christ, changing life on account of God’s intervention by the suffering and risen Messiah.
the point of view of semantics, the addressing formula in v. 12a is baffling. The verb ἄποκρίνομαι means ‘to answer, reply’ and the LXX employs it in many instances to render ἀπάντησαι. Luke often uses it in aorist (ἀπεκρίνατο) for delivering a direct speech (Lk. 13:14; Acts 5:8; 10:46). In fact, the discourse is attempted to be an answer to people’s astonishment (ἐπιλήφθησαν θάμμους καὶ ἐκστάσεως, 3:10). Likewise, the introductory addressing ἀνδρεῖς Ἰσραηλίται is ‘perhaps marking the use of a fresh source’ because Luke writes it down at the beginning of other Petrine kerygmatic announcements, e. g. in 2:22 and ἀνδρεῖς ἄδελφοι in 1:16. Although the same reason may be argued to glimpse a Lukan addition too. The verb ἀπενίζω is quite characteristic of Lucan style. It occurs twelve times in Luke-Acts and only two elsewhere in NT (2Cor. 3:13,7). Its meaning is strong, ‘to fix one’s eyes on some object continually and intensely, to look straight at, to stare at, to keep one’s eyes fixed on’ (Louv-Nida). Saint Paul employed it to say that the people could not keep their eyes fixed on Moses when he went down from the Mountain due to the brightness of his face. Another feature that fits with Lukan style is the redundant article before a complementary infinitive (περιπατεῖσθαι τοῦ παρειματικοῦ ῥητορίου, 3:12b) which is actually unnecessary (BDF §392e). Finally, the words δυνάμει ἡ ἐνσέβεσθαι introduce a restriction. The term ἐνσέβεσθαι appears only in Pastoral letters (11 occurrences) and surprisingly four times in 2Peter (1:3; 1:6; 1:7; 3:11). As we will discuss, this is not the unique coincidence with Peter’s epistolary theology.

Since the bystanders are Jews who were praying at the Temple, it would be implausible to think that they believe Peter and John to be gods, rather this is the case of Lystra’s inhabitants (14:11). Yet, the audience could consider that the Apostles were a kind of charismatic Jews who were healing by the sake of their own piety and not because of Risen Christ. A carefully study of these two verses urges scholars to share Barret’s conclusion: ‘It is almost certainly a Lucan construction uniting a speech derived from a different source (and containing few Lucanisms) to a miracle story, which Luke found elsewhere’.

Although reasonable as hypothesis, we restrain from pushing too ahead this argument because no hint warrants that a preceding source did not contain a miracle narrative attached.

There are good reasons to consider v. 16 a Lukan rework on his source. This verse closes the first half of the speech (vv. 11-16) and is regarded as its focal point. It also underscores its chief purpose: Luke’s criticism against magical conceptions of religion. It is not the saying itself, in this case Jesus’ name that causes the miracle, but rather, the power of faith. Given this theological concern, Luke would have reinforced the verse by inserting ahead a further clarification: ἔπι τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὑπόματος ἀντίθετο (3:16a). First of all, the subject is ὁ θεός (v. 15) (BDF §485). Secondly, the repetition of ‘name’ (ονόμα) is, once more, so common in the whole of the first ten chapters of

70 Barrett, Acts, 193.
71 As Conzelmann indicates, the risk was double. In Hellenistic context, the presence of wondermaker was widespread and the miracle could be attributed to this kind of men. On the other hand, supposing a Jewish background, the miracle would be ascribed to the moral capabilities or piety of the performer (Cf. Barrett, Acts, 193).
72 Ibidem, 193.
Acts (2:21, 38; 5:28, 40, 41; 8:12, 16; 9:14, 15, 16, 21, 27, 28), that discloses, based on this recurring vocabulary, a Lukan authorship. Thirdly, we claim that the category of genitive (τοῦ ὁνόματος αὐτοῦ) is rightly interpreted as objective (BDF §163) while maintaining that other types of genitive can be argued. So that, τοῦ ὁνόματος αὐτοῦ would be pointing to the object of this faith, believe in Christ. More difficult is the function of the preposition διά in ἣ πίστις ἣ δι' αὐτοῦ (v. 16b), found again in 20:21. The two most likely senses are causal, ‘to express the agent’ (BDF §223, 2) or means, ‘to denote manner’ (BDF §223, 3)\(^\text{73}\).

Perusing v. 16, one gets the conviction that the Greek is ‘intolerably clumsy’\(^\text{74}\), particularly in ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ. It departs from the careful use of the language Luke makes. A possible explanation could be offered. Maybe it is a sample of a mistranslation from an Aramaic original text\(^\text{75}\). Therefore, ἐστερέωσεν τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, should be rendered as follows: ‘He [God] made him strong’. The expression ‘his name’ (Aramaic šǝmeh; emphatic state noun [šǝmeh + suffix 3ms] is quite alike to sǝmeh (emphatic state noun [šǝmeh + suffix 3ms], which means ‘his healing’. In an unpointed text, the difference is unnoticeable. Even if the theory makes perfect sense, in our opinion is doubtful. The verb στερεάω has already been used in v. 7, and now it seems to be a retaking. Seeking an Aramaic text is a daunting endeavor because we have no further argument to ascertain Luke’s use of that kind of source. The material that Luke has at hand might be a Greek account. Be that as it may, what is plainly convincing is that such a cumbersome text hides a former source and v. 16a reveals that we are dealing with a piece of material reworked by Luke.

Likewise, the attribution of Jesus’ verdict to ignorance (v. 17) gets along with Luke’s standpoint in his Passion narrative (Lk. 23:4, 14-15, 20, 22; Acts 2:23; 4:27; 10:39). Pilate is always exonerated and it points to Lukan editing\(^\text{76}\).

Along with the corrections in v. 16, Barret states that ‘the only other part of the speech that can with any confidence be assigned to Luke is the phrase παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν αὐτοῦ (v. 18b)’\(^\text{77}\). Undoubtedly, the same wording is found in Lk. 24:26, 46 and Acts 26:23. The notion of a Messiah who must suffer arises in Lk. 24:26, 46 and Acts 26:23. The notion of a Messiah who must suffer arises in Lk. 24:26, 46 and Acts 26:23. This insertion, strategically placed in v. 18, can be hardly overstated. Grasping the significance and value of Christ’s sufferings constitutes the purpose of this assignment and can be only achieved by a comparison between the Servant Christology taken over by Luke and his own ideas reflected in these additions. Since redaction-criticism ‘attempts to ascertain the unique view of the writer’\(^\text{78}\), the focus moves to ‘Luke’s

\(^{73}\) Cf. FITZMYER, Acts, 287.

\(^{74}\) BARRETT, Acts, 198.

\(^{75}\) Cf. C. C. TORREY, Composition and Date of Acts (London 1916) 14-16.


\(^{77}\) BARRETT, Acts, 189.

\(^{78}\) STEIN, “What is Redaktionsgeschichte?”, 48.
uniqueness in relation to their sources. Nonetheless, if this speech draws the attention of many scholars it is because all the rest seems to avoid the customary Lukan terminology, giving the impression that Luke is using a piece of tradition. Moreover, by checking out all the expansions that could be attributed to Luke’s hand, the pattern that emerges is the following: Luke does not only exploit an earlier source, what would be predictable, but he works out the material with extremely caution, trying to avoid any unwarranted interference with his own style. Even though in some instances, the resulting grammar seems to be awkward (v. 16). Therefore, at this point, we assume willingly Wilcox’s conclusion. If there are surviving clues that disclose the presence of an earlier source it is because of ‘certain reluctance on the part of the author of Acts to smooth out all the difficulties in his material. Luke frames the material in the wider context of his theology by means of some additions but he feels constraint in modifying the inherited written source. What urges us to accept this conclusion is that the patter of composition is similar in the case of the Gospel. Luke often changes the order of the events and arranges the facts narrated according to his own design. So that, the time-line is different in the three Synoptic Gospels. However, he is always respectful to the sayings of Jesus, which are not altered substantially. The wording hardly departs from the other Synoptics. We do not have any other records of speeches addressed by Peter or Paul to compare against, as is the case of the Synoptics, but why could this pattern not be the same in the case of Acts? The way in which Luke reworks his material in the Gospel shows that there are elements of the tradition ‘more resistant’ (sayings) than others (facts and timeline).

So far, the result of redaction-criticism analysis sheds light upon Acts 3:11-26. We are dealing with a former piece of tradition which embraces Acts 2 and 7 and it is to be attributed to the community of Jerusalem. The ideology, namely its christological approach, is consistent in these chapters. This source contained a report of the first steps of the Church and memories related to the Apostles. Luke drew on this written document and, while reshaping it, he was reluctant to alter greatly the phrasing. His interventions and touches can be, in some extent, isolated. Ascertaining the language

---

79 Ibidem, 53.
81 This argument relies also on the well-established supposition that we are dealing with the same author. Gospel-Acts is a two-volume work, consequently it would be difficult to account for existence of two different approaches about the treatment of the material, cf. Ibidem, 112-113.
82 Agreeing with Dodd, and against Hengel (cf. HENGEL, The Atonement, 34.) and Dibelius (cf. DIBELIUS, Studies in the Acts of Apostles, 165), who do not regard the text as old: ‘There is a good reason to suppose that the speeches attributed to Peter are based upon material which proceeded from the Aramaic-speaking Church at Jerusalem, and was substantially earlier that the period at which the book was written’ (DODD, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, 20).
84 Ruling out the theological bias of a progressive development of the Christology, held by Robinson (Cf. ROBINSON, “The Most Primitive Christology of All?”, 177-189) for a thoroughly response against Robison, see MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 166-169.
of this older document is chancy, although we basically agree with ‘three-stages-
theory’ by Wilkox. Before the mission to the gentiles was undertaken, the first records
would have been written in Aramaic or maybe conveyed orally (on account of the
Semitisms found). There is no means of finding out whether this source was written or
not. Shortly after, the coincidence in wording, style and theology between Acts 2-3-7
makes the case of a written Greek document, otherwise the stylistic and lexical
communalities would be hardly explained. Finally, Luke would have had access to this

A Distinctive Lukan Motif: παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ (3:18b)

Even if most scholars bring out the speech’s numerous, ancient and traditional motifs,
there are some touches that could be only ascribed to Lukan redaction. The well-known
formula ‘his Messiah must suffer’ is a Lukan gloss, elsewhere present in his writings.
One of his chief concerns is ‘to demonstrate that the new movement operating under
the name of Jesus was in full continuity with the Israel which had given it birth’. This
necessity fits well with the overarching pattern of promise-fulfillment that embraces
the historiographic work of Luke. Furthermore, just before starting the Passion
narrative, Jesus himself goes over this point by stating: τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί (Lk. 22:37a). Scholarship has discussed at length about the function of δεῖ as a
marker that shows a divine design at work. This verb occurs 40 times in Luke-Acts,
although 13 of them expresses a mere ethical commitment. The usage that bears more
theological weight is the 15 instances which serve as a ‘proof-from-prophecy’. Yet,
despite the role this verb plays, ‘analysis of δεῖ virtually ignores any passages in Luke-
Acts where the term does not occur but the idea is present’. It is the case, especially
in Acts, of many compounds verbs or substantives that convey a similar meaning:

resist the conclusion that the material here presented existed in some form in Aramaic before it was
incorporated in our Greek Acts’ (DODD, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, 20, n1); ‘The
very noticeable Semitic coloring of the first part of the book, remarked by all commentators, is simply
due to translation’ (TORREY, Composition and Date of Acts, 5).
87 ‘That “his Messiah would suffer” (3:18) is a Lucan insert into a statement about fulfillment, which
refers to what has just been proclaimed in the preceding verses’ (FITZMYER, The Acts of the Apostles,
282). Yet Fitzmyer widens the possibilities and confesses that such a formula may relate to a pre-
Lukan tradition as well.
89 ‘Luke alone comprehends Jesus’ anointed status as the total sum of all that stands written [...].
Every part of the scriptures points unreservedly, in its entirety and holistically, to a suffering anointed
one such that Luke’s overarching hermeneutic can be punctuated: the Christ must suffer and Jesus is
that (suffering) Christ’ (MOESSNER, Luke the Historian of Israel’s Legacy, 322). This is evident, for
God’s Providence” NT XXVI/2 (1984) 171. This article is of great utility if a blanket view of Luke’s
idea of providence is needed.
According to Cosgrove’s survey, there are eleven references to the necessity of Jesus’ passion in Luke-Acts. With δει: Lk. 9:22; 13:33; 17:25; 22:37; 24:7; 24:26-27; 24:44-46; Acts 17:3. With μελλειν: Lk. 9:31; 9:44; Acts 26:23. Among them, “four are explicitly linked to Scripture prophecy, with the result that the set of passion ‘musts’ as a whole is Scripturally grounded.” These are: Lk. 22:37; 24:26; 24:44; Acts 26:22-23. However, what is actually thought-provoking for this study is that whenever this pattern is stressed, frequently it is in reference to a suffering Messiah. Since the riddle of our text is the relation between the verb παθείν (‘suffer’, 3:18) and the necessity of God’s plan to be fulfilled, the table below, following a research by Moessner, the references have been narrowed down. These texts show a coincidence between ‘fulfillment-terminology’ and the verb παθείν. This link is to be ascribe to Luke’s theological concerns and, consequently, Luke’s redaction.

| Acts 3:18 | ο δε θεος α προκατηγειλεν δια στοματος παντων των προφητων παθειν των χριστων αυτου επιληψισαι ουτος. |
| Acts 17:3a | διανοηγον και παρατιθεμενος οτι των χριστων εδει παθειν και αναστηναι εκ νεκρων. |
| Acts 26:23 | ει παθητος ως χριστος ι ει πρωτος εξ αναστασεως νεκρων φως μελλει καταγελλειν τω τε ιερω και τοις θεον. |
| Lk 24:26 | ουχι ταυτα εδει παθειν των χριστων και εισελθειν εις την δοξαν αυτου. |
| Lk 24:46 | ουτος γεγρασεν παθειν των χριστων και αναστηναι εκ νεκρων της τριτη ιμερας. |

95 MOESSNER, Luke the Historian of Israel’s Legacy, 322. Reading carefully the sentences, it is evident how much Cosgrove is right in pointing that, besides δει, many other terms may convey the same intended meaning, thereby they enlarge our vocabulary for ‘divine Providence’s design’ in Luke’s narrative.
96 This is Robinson’s view as well, who points that the function of this insertion is ‘a parenthetic exegesis’ (ROBINSON, “The Most Primitive Christology of All?”, 183).
Focusing on the text under analysis, the so-called ‘fulfillment-pattern’ emerges in Acts 3:12-26 in several occasions. Above all, God is the main actor who rules and overpowers the history. He is throughout the subject of all the propositions related with interventions along the Salvation history. God (ὅ θεός) is linked with the following actions: ἐδοξασέν (v. 13); ἠγερεν (v.15); προκατήγγειλεν/ ἐπλήρωσεν (v. 18); ἀποστείλη (v. 20); ἐλάλησεν (v. 21); ἀναστήσει (v. 22); διέθετο (v. 25); ἀπέστειλεν (v. 26). Three are the most useful references in Acts 3:12-26 to ground the foreshadowing knowledge of God and his providential design.

Firstly, v. 18 uses two crucial verbs: ὁ δὲ θεός, ἃ προκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν αὐτῷς. The first verb is an indicative aorist from προκαταγγέλλειν, which stands for ‘announcing something before it happens, foretell’. Curious enough is the fact that is elsewhere used in Acts 7, a text who shares so many features with Peter 2nd speech, as we have seen above. In this case, the form chosen is an attributive participle: ἀπέκτειναν τοὺς προκαταγγειλαντας περὶ τῆς ἔλευσιως τοῦ δικαίου (Acts 7:52). However, in Acts 7 the participle refers not to the contents – what God has foretold (ὅ προκατήγγειλεν) – but to the subjects of the action: ‘the prophets’. They are mentioned in 7:52a as antecedent. The second verb spotlighted in 3:18b is πληρῶ. Its importance can be hardly overstated because from the outset it is marking a plain pattern along the Luke-Acts and defining the subject which the Gospel is all about (δύνησθι περὶ τῶν πεπληρωμένων, Lk. 1:1). Furthermore, in a turning point of Luke’s Gospel, just beginning his public ministry, Jesus uses the same verb: σήμερον πεπλήρωσεν ή γραφή αὕτη (Lk. 4:21). Two further elements that merit our attention are the object of this fulfillment and the means which this message was channeled by. The object of this fulfillment is παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ (3:18b), namely a suffering Messiah. According to Peter/Luke this suffering has been forecast, but let us pose a question that for now will remain unanswered, in which part of the Scripture has been predicted a Suffering Messiah? At first sight, such two concepts do not seem to be interwoven in the OT. In short, ‘attempts to identify where “it is written” have been unconvincing, likewise scholarly efforts to find the concept of a suffering Messiah in the Second Temple Jewish literature have proved fruitless’. Ironically, let us recognize that Luke does not help us a lot by giving any clue because this prediction has been uttered ‘by the mouth of all the prophets’ (διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, 3:18). A further reference, in v. 24, will not be more precise: πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται ἀπὸ Σαμουήλ καὶ τῶν καθεξής ὀσοὶ ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας. This holistic outlook on Scripture will prove to be right when dealing with a heated debate about the disjunctive between Davidic-Psalms’ or Isainanic Servant’s imagery as a source for Acts 3:13, 26. Luke seems to be more ‘wide-minded’ than modern exegetes, drawing on

97 For the reception history of Isa. 53, cf. ch. 3.1.
either royal or Isaianic motifs. Be this as it may, certain hints of the OT’s passages that might be behind Acts 3:12-26 can be tracked against the set of intertextual connections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Typology</th>
<th>References in Act 3:12-26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotations</td>
<td>3:13 (➔ Es. 3:6, 15; 7:32) 3:22 (➔ Deut. 18:15, 18; Lev. 23:29) 3:25 (➔ Gen. 22:18; 26:4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allusions</td>
<td>3:13 (➔ Isa. 52:13; 53:11) 3:25 (➔ Ps. Sal. 15:15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Echoes</td>
<td>3:25 (➔ Gen. 12:3; 18:18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondly, vv. 20-21 are part of the so called ‘apocalyptic section’. The meaning of these verses is not clear, but as far we are concerned, two notes appear regarding the pattern promise-fulfillment. Christ is called in a titular way, by means of another attributive participle, προκεχειρισμένον (‘appointed one’, 20b). Shortly after, the impersonal δεί (v. 21a) turns to govern all the sentence as an unmistakable marker of divine plan upon history.

Finally, a later reference to the prophets can be check out at v. 24a. Again, the holistic reading is preferred (πάντες δὲ οἱ προφήται) even though a proper name is supplied (Samuel). The verbs chosen are ‘they spoke and announced’ (ἐλάλησαν καὶ κατήγγειλαν, v. 24b), both them related with prophetic accomplishment. Summing up, the four instances of a ‘fulfillment-vocabulary (3:18, 20b, 21, 24) nuance all the speech with an overtone so characteristic. After all, the speech overture is a quotation of Es. 3:6, 15 in v. 13a, which stands as the departure point for the biblical image of God. As Barret notes, Peter ‘is bringing in no new religion’, but offering a new message which brings into completion the promises of the OT.

A last question remains still unanswered. Does Luke modify the theological ideas of his source by the addition of v. 18b? Is he twisting a previous text that does not speak about a ‘Suffering Messiah’? C. Moule labels this attempt with a funny term: ‘outcrop theory’. It consists in suggesting ‘an unlikely coupling of a reverence for ancient tradition with an arbitrary reversal of its meaning’. In other words, once proved the respectful approach of Luke to his source, why are we compelled to suspect that he turned upside down its handed down theology? Variation is not discrepancy and stressing special nuances does not cancel out what was received. Additionally, the idea and wording of παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ can be found elsewhere in other ‘Petrine material’ (1Pe 2:21; 4:1) outside of Lukan influence. This remarkable fact witnesses a former line of apostolic kerygma that indeed assumed the category of a suffering Messiah before Luke came with this idea in his work.

99 ‘Such a notion is not found in the Hebrew Scriptures, in fact, in the NT the idea is found exclusively in Lucan writings’ (FITZMYER, The Acts of the Apostles, 287).
100 BARRET, Acts, 194.
101 MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 168. Also, Barret shares this view: ‘This does not mean that Luke was covering up (intentionally or otherwise) a primitive text which did not speak of the suffering of the Messiah because it came from a period when it was not yet believed that Jesus had been the Messiah during his earthly life’ (BARRET, Acts, 202).
So far, we have checked out that, by many counts, Luke takes advantage of an old piece of tradition which was meant to display the kerygma (3:13-15) and call to repentance (3:19,26). This early source may be assigned to a Petrine circle in Jerusalem’s Community. The timely insertions made by Luke (vv. 11-12; 13b; 16a; 18b) are stressing two major points: i) The rhetorical arrangement of the speech. Peter addresses the crowd to set faith in Christ as the unique source of the healing power and, in the long run, to testify about God’s salvific intervention in Christ which demands repentance and conversion from our sins; ii) The unitary layout of salvation history. In Christ, all the promises made from old are now fulfilled.

Rhetorical and Logical Articulation of the Speech

It can be said that this speech is ‘mostly deliberative rhetoric, calling for a change in behavior (3:19; 26)’\(^{102}\). The general articulation of the speech has been masterfully displayed by M. Soards, whose headers we willingly accept\(^{103}\). Two addresses which identifies the audience as ‘men, Israelis’ (ἀνδρες Ἰσραηλιται) and ‘brothers’ (ἀδελφοι) split the discourse in two halves: 3:12b-16; 3:17-26. The narrative setting in which Luke places Peter’s intervention prompts, in or opinion, a double purpose. The first part accounts for bystanders’ misunderstanding. The healing history to which the speech is attached demands an explanation. Obviously, Luke’s hand carries more weight here. For instance, in v. 16. The second part seeks to boost people to conversion and it might be interpreted as the customary scope of Peter’s kerygmatic proclamations (Acts 5:31; 10:43). On account of the restrictions imposed by the issue we are dealing with, we will focus rather on the latter item and its connection with the kerygmatic section (Acts 3:13-15).

The speech starts by casing what we may be labeled as a ‘leading situational question’\(^{104}\). Its rhetorical function is to drawn onlookers’ attention by picking up the motif of the people’s gathering, the amazement caused by the healing miracle. Of course, this question triggers Peter’s kerygmatic intervention and set the bases for the clarification supplied by v. 16: the healing is to be attributed to τῇ πίστει τοῦ ὄνοματος αὐτοῦ (v. 16a).

The kerygma skillfully interweaves, by means of a *chiasmus*\(^{105}\), people’s rejection of Jesus (ὑμεῖς x2, vv. 13b-14) and God’s deliverance (ὁ θεός x2, vv. 13a, 15a). Similar rhetorical arrangement is found in Acts 2:23-24 where the contrasting actions of Jerusalem Jews and God govern the structure. What is specific of this kerygmatic section is that in Acts 2:23 and elsewhere (4:10; 10:39) the actions accomplished by Jews are set out first and then God vindicates (2:24). Here, however, Peter sets before

\(^{102}\) Keener, Acts, II, 1080.


\(^{104}\) Ibidem, 39.

the action of God glorifying his παίς (3:13a) and the rejection of Jews follows (13b-14a). Finally, as braking out the kerygma, God intervenes again in 3:15b.

The kerygmatic section actually constitutes the kernel of this first part. For Luke-Acts overall theology the Passion-Resurrection-Exaltation are bound together and can be read as unique phenomenon, i.e. Jesus’ Passover. In keeping with Soards, we consider vv. 15b-16 ‘confirmations of the Kerygma’ (vv.13-15). According to him, two confirmations are given: by the Apostles as witnesses (ἡμεῖς μάρτυρες ἑσμέν, v. 15b), and by the miracle, which stand by a confirmation of the power of Jesus (ἡ πίστις ἦ δι’ αὐτοῦ ἔδοξεν αὐτῷ τὴν ὀλοκληρίαν, v. 16). Also, Pentecost speech adduced a supernatural fact as confirmation for the truth of a catechetical addressing. The visible effects of the Holy Spirit uphold the truthfulness of the delivered message (2:33).

The second part of this speech seems to be just juxtaposed to the first half by a second salutation (ἀδελφοί), the same as in Acts 6:3 and 23:5. However, a careful analysis discovers the conjunction καὶ νῦν (‘and now’), which stands for causal/consecutive relationship with what precedes. It resembles the Hebrew פָּתַח and initiates a new movement within the speech. Soards defines the role the καὶ νῦν plays just as ‘rhetorical transition’. Yet, the range of occurrences allow us to deepen its syntactical value (4:29; 5:38; 7:34; 10:5; 13:11; 20:22, 25, 32; 22:16; 23:21; 26:6; 27:22). This particle summarizes what precedes and from it, a new action is started consequently. In our view, καὶ νῦν points straight to v. 19a and set up the requested consequence of the preceding kerygmatic proclamation: the conversion. Two imperatives in aorist urge the addresses to change life (μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε). After the first imperative, the causal particle οὖν also remarks that this change has to do with what precedes, the v. 18. There, we are said that the old-settled plan of God looks at παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν αὐτοῦ (v. 18b). This Lukan addition is retaken by οὖν, hence the causal connection between the Passion of Christ and the soteriology is, from the standpoint of our text, clear. Thus, Bock considers that this οὖν makes emerge the application of the speech.

After the ‘recognition of crowd’s ignorance’ (v. 17) and the ‘declaration of God’s work in Christ’ (v. 18), the call to conversion might be subdivided in three stages. First of all, an initial exhortation (v. 19a), followed by an eschatological motivation (v. 19b-21) and an Scriptural explanation (v. 22-25).

Firstly, the two-fold appeal to conversion (μετανοήσατε οὖν καὶ ἐπιστρέψατε, v. 19a) is accompanied by two final clauses introduced by εἰς (v. 19b) and ὅπως (v. 20a). The verbs just quoted may be regarded as an emphatic device to prompt the conversion because the same verb in Hebrew (תְּפִלֵה) encompasses both meanings. Curious enough

---

106 Cf. ZEHNLE, Peter’s Pentecost Discourse, 42.
107 SOARDS, The Speeches in Acts, 42. Conversely, Bock contend that that the second part begins in v. 19 because in vv. 17-18 ‘conceptually, Peter is still summarizing what took place and how things reached this point’ (BOCK, Acts, 173).
108 This connection between the first part, summarized by καὶ νῦν and the v. 19 is highlighted by BARRET, Acts, 201.
110 Cf. BARRET, Acts, 203.
is that the calling to repentance is placed in v. 19, in the middle of the speech, not just as the end, where customary in other kerygmatic speeches\textsuperscript{111}. Secondly, this motivation distills a strong eschatological character along vv. 20-21. It ends up referring to the prophets: διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰώνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν (v. 21b). By this means the divine plan on history, foretold of old, is brought up to its last stage or completion. Another interesting feature is that this allusion to the prophets is placed in the center of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} part and it is the second out of a total of three (διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν [v. 18a]; διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ’ αἰώνος αὐτοῦ προφητῶν [v. 21b]; πάντες δὲ οἱ προφήται ἀπὸ Σαμωῆλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς [v. 24a]). According to Barret, such a general view on the Scriptures might be hyperbolic. The words of R. Hiyya bar Abba in \textit{Berakoth} 34b are usually quoted in this regard: ‘All the prophets, all of them, prophesied only in regard to the days of the Messiah’\textsuperscript{112}. This saying uncovers a customary belief in early rabbinic exegesis that might well reflect Peter’s concerns.

Thirdly, the Scriptural explanations mostly plays probative role (v. 22-25). The quotations convey the negative consequences drawn from a rejection of this invitation to repentance, threat of excommunication from the people (vv. 22-23) and, at the same time, a hopeful message (vv. 24-25). By the quotation of Gen. 22:18 Israel becomes part of God’s plan to bring to salvation all the peoples. Again, not only the causal-consecutive particles unite both sections of the speech, also the item of ‘rejection’ (v. 23a) alludes to Passion’s events described in vv. 13b-14a. This extra-motivation for repentance endorsed by the Scripture makes of Acts 3:12-26 ‘the repentance speech \textit{par excellence}’ because ‘although other speeches also contain a call to repentance, this speech expands the call and gives it extensive support through reference to the positive and negative possibilities between which Peter’s audience must choose’\textsuperscript{113}.

The last verse (v. 26) closes the speech by recalling God’s purpose of bringing Israel to salvation. According to the previous quotation of Gen. 22, this salvation is depicted as ‘blessing’ (ἐὐλογοῦντα ύμᾶς). Now, the crucial point is that this blessing comes by the action of the Servant (παῖς θεοῦ). The repetition of the title creates an \textit{inclusion}\textsuperscript{114} with v. 13. Moreover, also the action of rising his servant is alluded again (ἀναστήσας ὁ θεός), as in the kerygmatic section (vv. 13b and 15b), thereby an arch is spanned to connect the blessing with the action performed by God and the Servant. Thus, kerygma and soteriology are grammatically and thematically linked. The consequence of God-Servant’s intervention is undoubtedly soteriological and the blessing of v. 26b stands for the conversion (ἀποστρέφειν ἐκαστὸν ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ύμῶν)\textsuperscript{115}. This is the

\textsuperscript{111} Cf. R. C. TANNEHILL, “The Functions of Peter’s Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts” \textit{NTS} 30 (1990), 400-414.
\textsuperscript{112} Cf. BARRET, \textit{Acts}, 202.
\textsuperscript{113} TANNEHILL, “The Functions of Peter’s Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts”, 406.
\textsuperscript{114} Modern rhetorical denomination calls it ‘extreme terms’, cf. MEYNET, \textit{Rhetorical Analysis}, 375.
\textsuperscript{115} What has just said will constitute one of the main proofs to support the atoning value of Servant’ imagery in the last chapter (ch. 4.1). A brilliant article by Moessner, even if he does not engage in rhetorics, comes up with a similar conclusion: ‘Although Luke does not articulate the effects of Jesus’ death in the atonement terminology of a Mark or Paul, the phrase “release/forgiveness of sins” (ἀφεσις τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν) is Luke’s characteristic formulation of the saving, atoning action of God, and
reason why we opt for the instrumental function of the phrase, namely ‘that blessing is entered into by turning from wickedness’\textsuperscript{116}. Regarding the heated polemic about the transitive or intransitive use of this statement, we go along with Barret and Bock and support the latter. Nevertheless, the two imperatives of v. 19 speak out of the risk of fixing an excluding choice.

Finally, leaded by Tannehill, it is profitable to our scope a brief rhetorical articulation of Acts 5 and 10. In the former, Peter addresses a new speech before the Sanhedrin. There also, he brings out God’s salvation offer through repentance. This salvation is understood as forgiveness of sins (5:31b) and stemming from a similar kerygmatic proclamation (5:30-31a). In this case, the purpose clause is introduced without conjunction, but with an infinitive in genitive, which conveys finality: δοῦναι μετάνοιαν τῷ Ἰσραήλ καὶ ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν (‘to give’, 5:31b). Acts 10 does not share the characteristics of a genuine ‘Petrine material’, it rather represents ‘a sketch of Luke’s own Gospel […] and it does differ significantly from the preceding mission speeches’\textsuperscript{117}. Therefore, it would be virtually out of this inquiry. Notwithstanding, this piece of rhetoric is pointing as well to the forgiveness (ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν λαβεῖν διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ, 10:43), by which the phrasing recalls Lk. 24:46-48, where Jesus commanded his Apostles to proclaim forgiveness of sins beginning by Jerusalem and moving forward to all the nations. Thus, these Peter’s speeches can be inserted too under the soteriological concerns of the final chapter of the Gospel.

Now our attention is going to focus on the title which, no by chance, brackets out the speech: παῖς θεοῦ (3:13, 26).

\textsuperscript{116} BOCK, \textit{Acts}, 181. Also, the analysis carried out by Bruce regards it as instrumental, not temporal. Cf. BRUCE, \textit{The Acts of the Apostles}, 146.

\textsuperscript{117} TANNEHILL, “The Functions of Peter’s Mission Speeches in the Narrative of Acts”, 410.
Chapter 2: A Debated Dependency


Even though Nestle-Aland 28th ed. alludes to Isa. 52:13; 53:11 in Acts 3:13, many commentators are reluctant to take it for granted. For instance, Barret declares: ‘V. 13 suggests a link with Isa. 52:13, but 4:25 makes it clear that *pāt* is not connected in any exclusive way with the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah. The word is in common use in the OT for those whom God employs in his service. Jesus is thus one whom God calls and uses; as such, he needs not be more than a prophet. Other passages, notably 4.25, 27, suggest that he was the new and greater David, that is, the Messiah’\(^{118}\). In addition, the special insistence in a ‘prophetic Christology’ (Acts 3:22-23) may suggest a view of Jesus as embodiment of the ‘prophet-like-Moses’ foretold in Deut. 18. This figure would supply a more fitting imagery to grasp the meaning of the ‘paidology’ in Acts 3:13, 26. Remarks like these make scholars doubtful about a hypothetical Isaianic allusion. Furthermore, whereas Acts 3:13,26 and 4:27, 30 refer the title to Jesus, Acts 4:25 ascribes it to David. Therefore, a number of researchers are not certain if its use should be derived from Isaiah or rather from the exegetical interpretation that the early Church accomplished on Davidic Psalms\(^ {119}\). However, there are strong reasons compelling us to keep this allusion as Isaianic. Before taking up the question, it is necessary to notice a methodological supposition\(^ {120}\). It will be proved in the case of

\(^{118}\) Barret, *Acts*, 189.

\(^{119}\) Authors who represent well this tendency are M. Hooker (1959, 1998); P. Doble (2006) or J. Jipp (2010).

\(^{120}\) Another methodological prevention is put forward by W. Farmer. The criterion usually followed for establishing literary connections is the ‘verbal similarity’. But there is another rule often overlooked, the ‘conceptual similarity’. Even if a given text does not parallel the wording of another, yet it can mirror the ideas of its inter-text. In other words, if a passage is drawing on Isa. 53, it could reproduce the same lexical devices or simply the same ideas without resorting to the wording. Cf. W.
Hooker’s criticism (cf. ch. 2.2) that the exegetical problem affecting many scholars is that they divide the evidences and deal with each one separately. The analysis of the data will prove Strauss to be right when stating that ‘although not all allusions carry equal weight, when viewed together and in the context of Luke-Acts as a whole, a convincing portrait of Jesus as the Isaianic servant is attained’121. In other words, there is no question that an isolated verse of Acts 3:13, even if containing the title παῖς θεοῦ, turns out to be insufficient to establish a solid dependency on Isa. 53. Even the surrounding context is not enough (Acts 3:13-26). Therefore, if Jesus is presented as the ‘Servant’ of Isa. 53 two further lines of research must be explored. The first one, in this chapter, is the portrayal of Jesus according to Luke. If the same author has composed a two-volume work, the presentation of Jesus along the Gospel, and especially in his Passion narrative will constitute an essential stage of our analysis. Thus, the subsequent points run progressively from Acts 3:13-26 to a wider frame. On the other hand, a second line of inquiry is to be undertaken in ch. 3.2. Since many traditional elements handed over in Jerusalem community have been taken up by Luke in Acts 3:13-26, the portrayal of Jesus as ‘Servant’ is not limited to a Lukan framework but to a tradition laying behind other texts in the NT. Let us go over the main hints that support the Isaianic background of our text in the context of the extant theology of Luke-Acts.

(1) The so-called ‘language of exaltation’122. Isa. 52:13 runs: ἵδον συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα. Matching with Acts 3:13 is not established only on the basis of one Christological title: τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ (= παῖς μου, Isa. 52:13a). Also, the verb ἐδόξασεν (= δοξασθήσεται, Isa. 52:13) recalls the 4th Servant Song. According to Acts 3:13b, the actions this Servant endures are two: ‘to be handed over’ (παραδίδωμι) and ‘to be rejected’ (ἀρνέομαι). About the former, Bock sates: ‘the idea of Jesus being given over or giving himself is in language that is like Isa. 53’123. More specifically, Isa. 53:12a (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ) provides a wealthy source for many scholars to confront124. The overwhelming quantity

---

124 Nestle-Aland’s list of Loci citati vel allegati quotes on Isa. 53:12: Matt. 26:28; 27:38; Mk. 14:49; 15:27; Lk. 11:22; 22:37; 23:34; Rom. 4:25; 1Cor. 15:3; Hebr. 9:28; 1Pe. 2:24. Considering a wider range of verses, for instance Isa. 53:10-11, more texts interrelated emerge: Matt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45; Lk. 22:19s; Acts 3:13; Rom. 5:19; Phi. 2:7; Mk. 14:24; Rom. 5:15; 1Joh. 3:5. Narrowing down our research, the idea of Jesus delivering himself (παραδίδωμι) appears in Lk. 9:44; 18:32; 22:4, 6, 21-22, 48; 23:25; 24:7, 20; Acts 21:11 and 1Cor. 11:23 (Cf. BOCK, Acts, 170). Early Christian Literature follows this trend: Did. 9:2-3; 1Clem. 59:2-4; Barn. 6:1; 9:2; Mart. Pol. 14:1; 20:2. As obvious, such a massive occurrence of exegetical material on only a couple of verses (Isa. 53:10-12) argues in favor of its importance as departure point of early Christian exegesis. And Luke is not aside from this stream.
of allusions in NT and later Christian tradition makes difficult to disregard the role of the 4th Servant Song, mainly Isa. 53:10-12, in early Christian exegesis.

(2) A further title shows up in Acts 3:14, τὸν ἄγιον καὶ δίκαιον. A crucial verse at the end of the 4th Song says: "[The Righteous one, my Servant] shall make many righteous" (Isa. 53:11b)\(^{125}\). The intertextual analysis confirms that the ‘Messiah’ (יהוסף) is said to be ‘Righteous’ (דייקוס) in some instances within the OT (2Sam. 23:3; Isa. 32.1; Zech. 9:9.)\(^{126}\). These two concepts seem to be associated in several occasions. Here, the occurrence of the title δίκαιος (דייקוס) in LXX and Acts 3 is related with ‘my servant’ (ןְעַבְדִי). Both terms are set in apposition. Wording aside, what constitutes a remarkable fact is that the Servant’s mission is rendered explicit: ‘[The Righteous one, my Servant] shall make many righteous’ (ץַדִיק נָעַבְדִי, Is 53:11b). His commitment consists in the justification of many. So that, the use of δίκαιος (Acts 3:14) in tandem with παῖς θεοῦ (Acts 3:13) argues in favor of this identification\(^{127}\). The pairing of ‘Servant’ and ‘Righteous’ is rightly understood as drawn from Isa. 53:11. The centurion’s confession at the feet of the cross (Lk. 23:47) picks up this term as well. The title δίκαιος – read just before a faith confession – should be considered not merely as referring to the innocence of Christ, but ‘an intentional allusion to the fate of Jesus as the Suffering Servant of Yahweh’\(^{128}\). By nailing down the occurrences of δίκαιος in Acts (3:14; 7:52; 22:14) it is possible to draw the conclusion that the term brings a messianic sense. Its titular usage is manifest on account of three further reasons: i. The definite article always occurs (ὁ δίκαιος); ii. An accompanying substantive is lacking; iii. The Ethiopic version of Enoch used ὁ δίκαιος as a messianic title by the same time (Hen. 38:2; 39:6; 46:3; 47:1, 4; 53:6; 71:14)\(^{129}\). Consequently, one is prone to accept that Enoch, as well as Acts 3:14, does not project its own, but recalls Isa. 53:11.

(3) Isa. 53:15a reads as follows: οὖν τὸ σώματα τοῦ θεοῦ πολλά (‘So he will startle many nations’). In another speech addressed by Peter, this ἔθνη is taken up from a quotation of Psalm 2: ἓνατι διαφώνασαν ἔθνη καὶ λαοὶ ἐμελέτησαν κενά; (‘Why did the

\(^{125}\) It is suitable, in this case, to copy from the MT, because LXX twists significantly the original Hebrew in its translation. Some theological bias that will be highlighted in ch. 3.1 pushed Christian writers to adopt, in the case of Isa. 53:10b-11, the Hebrew reading.

\(^{126}\) As Bruce notes, the OT remembers several times the ‘righteousness’ of the Lord’s Anointed, cf. BRUCE, The Book of Acts 81, n 29.


\(^{128}\) Ibidem, 20. A set of arguments to support the titular usage of δίκαιος as taken from Isa. 53 in Lk. 23:47 is displayed in cf. STRAUSS, The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts, 330-332. The title, by far, is intended to convey more than a political innocence: i) The centurion glorifies God as though a miracle action had happened; ii) Barrabas and the two lawbreakers remind us of the quotation of the farewell speech (Isa. 53:12); iii) Jesus is the ‘elect one’ in the cross (Lk. 23:35) and in Isa. 42:1. The connection between ἐκλέκτος and δίκαιος is present in both Luke and Isaiah; iv) the reference to the silence of Jesus (Lk. 23:9) can be traced back to Isa. 53:7. Moreover, Jesus’ meekness will be the motif quoted by Acts 8:32-33. Luke seems to be keenly aware of the fulfillment of this prophecy and uses abundantly this intertextual material.

\(^{129}\) Cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 360-361, n 248; and J. A. FITZMYER, The One Who is to Come (Grand Rapids, MI 2007) 83-88.
Gentiles rage, and the peoples plot in vain’, Acts 4:25). Shortly after, the ἐθνή is applied to Pontius Pilate (cf. Acts 4:27). Likewise, in Acts 3:13b, Peter accuses the onlookers (ὑμεῖς) of having ‘delivered over’ (παρεδώκατε) this παῖς θεοῦ to Pilate. Not just a likely echo of Isa. 53:15a may be beneath, besides the verb παραδίωμι appears several times in a strategical position in the 4th Servant Song (cf. Isa. 53:6, 12)\(^\text{130}\).

(4) The three previous arguments rest on the co-text that surrounds the title παῖς θεοῦ in Acts 3:12-26. Now, beyond our text, Luke-Acts as a whole sets out a convincing portrayal of Jesus as Suffering Servant. Two additional verbatim quotations from Isaiah’s Servant Songs appears in Luke\(^\text{131}\). In the case of Lk. 22:37, a citation of Isa. 53:12 (LXX): ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη. The text is not just reproduced, but reinforced by a clear overture which sets up the quote within a context of ‘fulfillment language’: τοῦτο τὸ γεγραμμένον δεῖ τελεσθῆναι ἐν ἐμοί (Lk. 22:37a). The verbs δεῖ and τελέω, as we saw above, are crucial in the realm of a messianic interpretation involving the Servant imagery. A further remark in 37b, after Isaiah’s quote, highlights the idea of pretext accomplishment of the scriptural predictions: τὸ περὶ ἐμοῦ τέλος ἔχει. So that a typological application to the Passion of Christ is manifest. Green is right in underscoring the narrative significance of this assertion. The text is set at the gate of the Passion, closing the farewell address. The long introductory formula and its climatic position in the farewell address may be well interpreted as ‘a general allusion to Jesus’ passion’\(^\text{132}\). In fact, the theme alluded to is pointing to the crucifixion of Jesus between two lawbreakers, whereby all the Passion is encompassed by this quote. Arranging the text in such a way, one may glimpse Luke’s purpose: The ‘Servant’ stands out as the category against which we are to interpret Luke’s Passion narrative\(^\text{133}\). A last remark is worth noting. Seemingly, the textual version of the OT referred to here is not the LXX but the MT\(^\text{134}\), hence the presence of an Isaianic motive brings us back, once again, to a former tradition in the Aramaic-speaking community. Otherwise, Luke’s default tendency is to draw from the Greek version.

(5) Remarkable enough is Acts 8:32-33. The quotation picks up Is 53:7-8 (LXX) and the query the Eunuch addresses is bringing out an unmistakably messianic reading of the text: περὶ τίνος ὁ προφήτης λέγει τοῦτο; (Act 8:34). The question posed points to a single individual who embodies the Servant’s mission. The description of the way in which the rite of the Baptism is carried out (Acts 8:12, 36, 38) witnesses the antiquity of this text\(^\text{135}\). As Strauss states, ‘there can be little doubt that Luke understands the


\(^{132}\) GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 20.


\(^{134}\) Regarding the Semitic character of some formulas, which seems to recall the Hebrew text, cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 411; 419, n. 433; 433.

\(^{135}\) Cf. Ibidem, 412.
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In his passion narrative, Luke takes advantage also of this figure and depicts Jesus uttering no word on his behalf (Lk. 23:9).

(6) Beyond the single passages related to the suffering, the overall portrait of Jesus in Luke’s Gospel fits into the Servant imagery. According to Luke, the Isaianic motif surpasses the Passion narrative and has far-reaching implications: ‘It is not the case that for Luke the preeminence of the Servant motif lies in the fact that the Servant suffers. Rather, it embraces the whole of Jesus’ work’¹³⁷. For instance, the prophecy of Simeon (Lk. 2:32a) speaks of φῶς εἰς ἀποκάλυψιν ἔθνων, referring to Isa. 42:6; 49:6; and the second half considers Jesus δόξαν λαοῦ σου Ἰσραήλ (Lk. 2:32b), which goes over Isa. 46:13. The question this passage is intended to answer is who is Jesus and what is the mission he is going to accomplish. If the given response is by phrasing Isaiah, there is little reason to reject a clear Jesus’ embodiment of Isaianic imagery to explain his identity and work from the beginning of the Gospel. Neglecting the ‘Birth Narratives’ makes us to lose sight of the right prospective in which all Luke-Acts must be read.

(7) Finally, inasmuch as the farewell speech (Lk. 22:37) introduces the Passion, the narrative program of Luke sets up, at the very outset of Jesus’ ministry in Nazareth (Lk. 4:18-19), another text borrowed from Isa. 61:1-2. The intended purpose is bracketing out Jesus’ whole ministry by modelling a ‘Servant-Christology’ and anticipating his rejection in the treatment that his neighbors offered him.

From the foregoing, we reach the conclusion already cast by J. Green: ‘Luke’s Christology focuses especially on the Isaianic Servant of Yahweh […] the Servant-theme makes up something of the substructure of Luke’s two-part narrative’¹³⁸. All in all, Isa. 53 and its wider context of Deutero-Isaiah passages (40-55) are a recurrently source of imagery for Luke-Acts. In our opinion, it is not reasonable to debunk this dependence either in the case of Luke or the sources beneath his narratives in the first chapters of Acts. In light of all the hints suggested along this paragraph, we contend that the title παῖς θεοῦ in Acts 3:13, 26 follows this exegetical resorting to Isa. 53. A comment by V. Taylor has become famous, ‘Luke depicts Jesus as the Servant of the Lord without using the name’¹³⁹. In keeping with this observation, it should be recognized that even the name appears in several cases. Where does it appear elsewhere in Luke-Acts? Jeremiah, in his outstanding article that is still consider by many a milestone in the history of exegesis, picks up the recurrences. What strikes, at first glance, is that the term is barely attested. If the allusions to Isa. 53, for instance, in the NT raise up to 46 intertextual references¹⁴⁰, the title παῖς θεοῦ only occurs 7 times, 5 of them in Luke-Acts¹⁴¹.

¹³⁷ GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 23.
¹³⁸ Ibidem, 19.
¹⁴¹ Cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 393.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Intertextual reference (NA²⁸)</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lk 1:54</td>
<td>Isa. 41:8-10 (LXX); Ps. Sal 12:6; 17:21</td>
<td>Israel (collective and liturgical style)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lk 1:69</td>
<td>1Chr. 17:4, 24; Ps. 18:1</td>
<td>David (liturgical style)¹⁴²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 3:13</td>
<td>Isa. 52:13; 53:11</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 3:26</td>
<td>Isa. 52:13; 53:11</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:25</td>
<td>1Chr. 17:4, 24; Ps. 18:1</td>
<td>David (liturgical style: prayer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:27</td>
<td>Isa. 52:13; 53:11</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:30</td>
<td>Isa. 52:13; 53:11</td>
<td>Jesus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Against all these evidences, a careful look at Acts 4:25 may raise an alternative counterthesis: ‘Luke reads the psalms also as the autobiographical speech of the suffering Davidic Messiah, now climactically embodied by Jesus himself’¹⁴³. Lately scholarship has become progressively aware of it. After all, it is the voice of David that is found in Psalms, so that David is the image Luke would bear in mind and not Isa. 53. Definitively, many psalms frame the Passion narratives in the Synoptics and are a constant source for textual-proofs regarding Jesus’ sufferings (Ps. 22:31; 38; 69; 109; 118; 146). Does this new approach topple the former assertions about an Isaianic dependency? This question requires a step further in our study and should not be solved by balancing the conclusion towards one side.

**An Alternative View: Davidic Kingship in Psalms**

It is readily noticeable that in the OT, the expression ‘my servant’ (עַבְדִי) is referred to any agent of God. This usage enters into the NT. For instance, Hooker focuses on the occurrences in the songs of Mary and Zacharias (Lk. 1:54, 69) which are imbued with a Jewish coloring. Likewise, the occurrences of παῖς θεοῦ in Acts are also found in the context of Christian prayer (4:25, 27, 30) or in Peter’s speech (3:13, 26). Consequently, Hooker is prone to accept its provenience from a ‘very early traditional material from Jerusalem’¹⁴⁴, but she doubts about the linkage with Isaiah: ‘The account of the beliefs of the early Christians which is given in the Acts of the Apostles does not suggest that the primitive community ever thought of Jesus as “the Servant” of Deutero-Isaiah’¹⁴⁵.

---

¹⁴² ‘The title of “Servant of God” is given to David only in prayers (except in later translations of the OT)’ (Ibidem, 345, n 184). The examples adduced are Lk. 1:60; Acts 4:25 and Did. 9:2 (eucharistic prayer upon the chalice). Curious enough is why later translations of the OT (Aquila, Simmaco and Thedothion) call David constantly doulos of God instead of pais of God. The fact that neither Christians will be called paides theou but douloi theou, reinforces the impression that the word had already at that time a titular range (cf. Ibidem, 394, n 342).


¹⁴⁵ Ibidem, 150.
Doing that, Hooker raised a milestone in the story of exegesis by ruling out Jeremias’ theory. According to Hooker, in Acts 3:13, the surrounding co-text may urge to formulate a hasty association with the Isaianic Servant, specially by twining παῖς (3:13, 26; 4:27, 30) and δίκαιος (3:14; 7:52; 22:14). This statement is not as innocuous as one might suppose because it has far-reaching consequences. For Hooker, the forgiveness of sins as effect of the atoning suffering of the Servant – absolutely present in Isaiah’s 4th song (Isa. 53:11b) – is lacking in Acts, where repentance-salvation would be produced as a consequence of the kerygmatic announcement itself (cf. Acts 3:14; 7:52 and 22:14).

The same holds for the titular use of δίκαιος in other parts of Luke-Acts, it should be understood as a mere moral virtue. For example, the title on the mouth of the centurion (Lk. 23:47) does mean nothing more than the innocence of Jesus, nor a hidden appeal to Isa. 53:11. Neither the references to the fulfillment of the Scripture (Acts 3:18; 13:27-29; 17:2-3; 26:22-23) lead us to conclude a reminder of the Isaianic figure of the Servant. In the case of the intertext behind Acts 3:18, what Peter argues in v. 18 is just that ‘all the prophets’ foretold it (διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, Acts 3:18), no reference to Isaiah is supposed. Moreover, Isaiah could have a relative value as a textual-proof, but nothing is meant to say about the significance of those sufferings.

A clear example of a Christian exegesis on Isa. 53 is provided by the dialogue between Philip and the Eunuch in Acts 8:32-35. Even here, Hooker underestimates the quote by saying that ‘it cannot be taken as evidence that this passage of scripture was central in the Christian preaching of the time’. Surprisingly, the only reason adduced is that, in the narrative setting the citation is put on lips of the Eunuch and not on the Christian preacher, Philip. In addition, the verses recalled go over the humiliation of the Servant (Is 53:7-8a), cutting off pointedly the vicarious value of the Servant’s mortification (Is 53:10-11). Therefore, the text aims to show ‘the necessity for Christ’s Passion, and not a theological exposition of its meaning’.

So far, the arguments do not seem to be persuasive. Hooker cleverly notes this point, so that she goes over the Pauline references too (Rom. 10:15; Rom. 15:21; 1Cor. 15:3; Phil. 2:5-11), the epistle of Hebrews (9:28) and 1Peter (1:10; 1:18; 2:21-25). She breaks up the evidence into small pieces in order to deal with each one separately. This maneuver turns out to be misleading because we are not dealing only with some particular vestiges in Acts 3, but with a whole tradition taken over by Luke and widespread elsewhere in other passages of the NT (cf. ch. 3.2). On the other hand, considering Acts 8:35, Hooker’s conclusion baffles many scholars: ‘The account does not suggest that Philip used the passage as a basis to preach that Jesus’ sufferings and

---

146 Cf. Ibidem, 111.
148 HOOKER, Jesus and the Servant, 114.
149 Cf. Ibidem, 116-123.
the forgiveness of sins were associated.\textsuperscript{150} Given that, the outcome her study yields is readily predictable: there was no primitive kerygma that gathered the two poles at debate, the suffering of Christ (coming from Isa. 53) and his atoning value for our sins. In her own words: ‘There is little evidence that the Servant-Christology held any important place in Christian thought of the New Testament period’\textsuperscript{151} Obviously, if data is disjointed, its capacity for demonstration fades and there is no wonder that, for Hooker, NT’s capability to recall Isa. 53 seems to be scanty and so dubious.

Needless to say, the criticism launched by Hooker does not overturn the dependency between Isa. 53:11 and Acts 3:13, 26. The thorough study by Jeremiah may be incomplete but one hardly can prove to be wrong. Nevertheless, such criticism has yielded a positive result. It has definitively boosted a new perspective to understand the exegetical devices started by early Church. Altogether with Isaiah, other volume that constitutes the core of the first Christian exegesis is the Book of Psalms.\textsuperscript{152} Quotations of them are not only available in Luke’s Passion narrative, but constitute a steadfast source for proof-texts in Peter’s speeches. This is the reason why we willingly accept the critics raised by P. Doble\textsuperscript{153} and J. Jipp\textsuperscript{154}

P. Doble rules out the ‘Isaianic Servant’ as controlling concept in Luke’s Passion; yet he puts forward a constructive criticism based in an insightful perception of the role that the Davidic model portrayed in Psalms played in the early exegetical developments of Acts. According to him, an inaccurate exegesis, embodied by J. Green\textsuperscript{155}, would have underplayed this role. Besides, some exegetes would not have posed the topmost question about the interpretation of 4\textsuperscript{th} Servant Song within the limits of ancient Judaism. For Doble, a plain messianic reading of Isa. 52-53 had never been carried out in Jewish 2\textsuperscript{nd} Temple literature. Hence, the concept of a suffering Messiah would turn out to be an oxymoron. In spite of this shortage of messianic interpretations on Isa. 53,\textsuperscript{156}

\textsuperscript{150} Ibidem, 127.
\textsuperscript{151} Ibidem, 128. Even though Hooker enlarges her argument and attempts to blot out that connection in early patristic literature, clear bridges are spanned at that time. For instance, Ep. Barn. 5:1, 13; 6:1: ‘It is indeed with this purpose in view that the Lord endured to surrender his body to destruction: we are to be sanctified by the remission of sins, that is, through the sprinkling of His blood’ (Ἑις τοῦτο γάρ ὑπέμεινεν ὁ κύριος παραδοθῆται τήν σάρκα εἰς καταφθοράν ἵνα τῇ ἀφέσει τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἀγνιθῶμεν ὁ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ραντίσματι αὐτοῦ τοῦ ἁματός, 5:1). And forward in the text, this declaration is followed by a verbatim quote of Isa. 42:6.
\textsuperscript{152} It is a worthwhile observation the fact that the best represented books among the Dead Sea Scrolls are Psalms (36), Deuteronomy (32) and Isaiah (21). The same set of books are the source of most of the intertextual references within the writing of the NT. This comparison discloses where the main exegetical concerns of the first century were focused. Survey by J. C. Vanderkam, The Dead Sea Scrolls Today (Grand Rapids, MI 2\textsuperscript{nd} 2010) 48.
Psalms would provide wealthier evidence for such research. Let us adduce several arguments to clarify this new perspective.

(1) Lk. 24:44 runs thus: δὲὶ πληρωθήναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσέως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοίς περὶ ἐμοῦ. The book of Psalms is explicitly listed as a witness of the Passion-Resurrection events. Just to get an idea of its prominent role, let us check out Lk 23:34-46. In this passage, the psalms ‘function as Luke’s premier intertext whereby the voice of David is transposed into the suffering Messiah’\(^{156}\). Here, an astonishing number of allusions may be numbered: Lk. 23:34b refers to Ps. 22:19; Lk. 23:35b to Ps. 22:8; Lk. 23:36 draws on Ps. 69:21, 35 and a further citation of Ps. 31:5 in Lk. 23:46. The concentration of verbatim quotes, wording and motifs taken from the psalms are not the only clues to balance their importance. Besides, Luke lays out his narrative by taking advantage of the so-called ‘royal psalms’ (Ps. 22, 69, 31, 38). This massive amount of literary interplay contrasts with the absence of any single quotation of Isaiah in Lk. 23-24; a powerful argument, indeed.

(2) In the narrative-line that spans between Lk. 20-Acts 13, psalms intertextuality reaches its peak in the Passion Narrative and Peter’s missionary speeches. Crucial allusions are made in Lk. 20:17 (cf. Ps. 117:22) and Lk. 20:41-44 (cf. Ps. 109:1). It is funny to observe how both texts pose a question that is answered by Peter through respective quotations of these same psalms in Acts 4:11 (Jesus is the rejected stone) and in Acts 2:32 (David ‘son’ can be properly called David ‘Lord’). Now, if the Passion and Peter’s preaching concentrate the major literary interplay, it means that the backdrop ideas of the latter – one of them the title παῦς θεοῦ – cannot be read aside from the Passion Narrative. A thought-out frame of theology, based on psalms 117 and 109, spans Luke’s two volumes\(^{157}\).

(3) Since the very outset, Jesus is depicted by Gabriel as the descendent of David (Lk. 1:27, 32). This consideration goes throughout Lukan composition (Acts 13:22-23, 32-33). Accordingly, Jesus is not an ordinary successor upon the throne, but the Messiah who brings to completion the promises, as the angel told the shepherds the night of his birth (Lk. 2:11). Embracing the two-volumes work, the theme appears again in a summary about Paul’s missionary commitment in Rome. In the two last verses of Acts, we are told that Paul tackles the Messiahship of Jesus in his public preaching (Acts 28:30-31). Hence, as it is easy to guess, royal messiahship ‘is Luke’s principal Christological category’\(^{158}\).

(4) The titles παῦς, δίκαιος and ἐκλεκτός, applied to Christ, might not stem from Isaiah. Rather they are predicated of David in Psalms (cf. Lk. 23:47 and Ps. 30:19). There, David is constantly portrayed as God’s ‘anointed’ and ‘chosen’. Consequently, why should we be compelled to resort to other models aside from Psalms? Jipp proposes Ps. 89 as plausible inter-text for clustering the three concepts (‘Servant’, \(^{156}\)JIPP, “Luke’s Scriptural Suffering Messiah”, 260. 


‘Righteous’ and ‘Elect one’). Even the verb ‘to exalt’ (89:20-21) and the passive participle ‘anointed’ appears here (89:21)\(^{159}\). A single text containing altogether these words should seem better ranked as a hypothetical backdrop for Lk. 23:47 and Acts 3:13-14.

(5) Before Mathias’ election, Peter uttered: ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, ἐδει πληρωθήναι τὴν γραφὴν ἣν προείπεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἄγιον διὰ στόματος Δαυίδ (Acts 1:16a). Such an assertion acquires a programmatic value for the exegesis engaged in the first chapters of Acts. Either the impersonal verb δεῖ or πληρῶ show how the pattern of prediction-fulfillment is at stake. Verb πληρωθήναι is an aorist passive denoting divine intervention (cf. BDF §130, 1; 159, 1). Right after, the first missionary speech provides us another wonderful example, Psalm 15:8-11. A foreword precedes the quotation: Δαυιδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν (2:25). Thus, the biography of David, reflected in psalms, is bound up with Jesus: ‘in each speech Luke’s weft is his interrelating Jesus’ and David’s stories\(^{160}\). In other words, Jesus is depicted ‘as God’s fulfilling a promised salvation-story focused on David’\(^{161}\). The strategies for achieving such a purpose are adaptation (cf. Acts 4:11 and Ps. 117:22), allusion (cf. Acts 4:24 and Ps. 145:6a) and appropriation (cf. Acts 4:25-26 and Ps. 2:1-2).

The foregoing reasoning seems to us, in all likelihood, true. Underpaying the role of Psalms in three Acts’ speeches (e. g. 2:14-36; 4:8-12; 13:16-41) is misleading and denotes a lack of awareness about the messianic tone that the Books of Psalms had been acquiring along the last phases of pre-Christian age\(^{162}\). Nevertheless, even though the intertextuality just observed works out, it should be noted that in Acts 3 there is no reference to Psalms, even a slightly echo. Given that, we should be wary of ascertaining that the title παῖς θεοῦ was drawn, in the case of Acts 3, from Psalms. Nestle-Aland 28th ed. barely posits in Acts 3:24-25 an addressing to Ps. Sal 17:15, an apocryphal book of the OT well estimated by that time and regarded as canonical in some codex of the Septuagint. Consequently, the criticisms raised by these authors do not challenge directly Acts 3 and its imagery unless by the fact that ‘paidology’ is questioned in related texts (Acts 4).

Secondly, the attempt that Double makes of linking the tradition behind 1Pe. 2:21-23 to Ps. 30 is, to say the least, uncertain\(^{163}\). The avoidance of a diachronic approach

\(^{159}\) Cf. Ibidem, 265.


\(^{162}\) Cf. SCHAPER, J., Eschatology in the Greek Psalter (WUNT 2/76; Tübingen 1995) 138-144; ‘The whole of the second century is witness to a continual development of the formulation of eschatological and messianic hopes, with the Greek Psalter as one of its main monuments’ (Ibidem, 160). About the linguistic devices whereby this interpretation is achieved, see PIETERSMA, “Messianism and the Greek Psalter: in search of the Messiah”, 49-75. Regarding the interpretation of Psalms as messianic in their reception history, S. E. GILLINGHAM, “The Messiah in the Psalms: A Question of Reception History and the Psalter”, King and Messiah in Israel and the Ancient Near East (ed. J. DAY) (JSOTsup 270; Sheffield 1998) 209-237.
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(at work in redaction-criticism method) leads to miss the Isaianic flavor in this special line of ‘Petrine materials’\textsuperscript{164} which mostly convey kerygmatic assertions.

Thirdly, keeping away from Isa. 53:11 entails far-reaching consequences because it is a matter of fact that the Servant’s suffering is displayed as redemptive within the OT only in this passage (cf. ch. 3.1)\textsuperscript{165}. To put it differently, what is finally at stake is the value of Christ’s suffering. In other words, is the death of Jesus merely ‘the crucifixion of a King’?\textsuperscript{166} Or, does Ps. 31:5 portray Jesus just as a ‘suffering righteous king’?\textsuperscript{167} Certainly it is, we are not to neglect this point. However, one wonders whether no further meaning is intended to be conveyed by Peter/Luke in Acts 3:12-26. Otherwise, how to explain certain traditions that are taking for granted an atonement meaning of Christ’s sufferings and death? As this line of scholarship at large, Jipp is also in trouble when it comes to account for Acts 8. He shakes off the problem too hastily without offering a convincing explanation\textsuperscript{168}.

Finally, one finds puzzling the fact that the term ‘Servant’ in the psalms alluded above is – except in a single case (Ps. 68:18) – always translated as δοῦλος (Ps. 18:12; 77:70; 88:4; 108:28; 131:10). Even if reasonable, the hypothesis of the exclusive literary interplay between Psalms and Acts has weak points difficult to solve.

Having made these brief remarks and agreeing with the general outline of Double’s and Jipp’s papers, the only judgement we do not share is his one-sided position. Does intertextuality of Act-Psalms really rule out a parallel linkage with Isa. 53? Why should these two options be mutually excluding? Sadly, Jipp pushes his argument too far by concluding that Isa. 53 is a mere ‘red herring’\textsuperscript{169} to explain the suffering portrayal of the Messiah.

Who is right? A Fusion of Concepts

The ongoing discussion is swinging between two focal points: whether the portrayal of Jesus as παῖς θεοῦ in Luke-Acts has been shaped against Isaianic background (J. Jeremias, V. Taylor, J. Green, M. Parsons) or stems from the so-called ‘royal psalms’

\textsuperscript{164} J. W. Jipp, who owes his basic insights to P. Double, acknowledges that their method is primarily literary. He brackets out redactional focusing to the detriment of other suitable outlooks that shed light upon Acts 3:13-26, cf. JIPP, “Luke’s Scriptural Suffering Messiah”, 256, n 8.

\textsuperscript{165} G. Barbiero, who is not suspect of underrating the value of psalms, openly acknowledges this limit of psalms’ imagery: ‘In Deutero-Isaiah is present also an atoning dimension for the guilt of the others (cf. Isa. 53:5), absent from the psalms of our collection [Ps. 1-41]’ (G. BARBIERO, Il regno di JHWH e del suo Messia. Salmi scelti dal primo libro del Salterio [Studia Biblica 7; Roma 2008] 305); ‘The closeness of Ps. 40 to the Songs of the Servant of JHWH allows a parallel with the atoning value of the Servant’s suffering (cf. Isa. 53:10). Yet in Isaiah, this kind of atoning is set as alternative regarding the cultic sacrifices’ (Ibidem, 356).


\textsuperscript{167} Ibidem, 262.

\textsuperscript{168} Believe or not, only a one-line response is adduced: ‘There are no explicit mentions of Jesus as παῖς or ἐκλεκτός in this account’ (Ibidem, 265-266).

\textsuperscript{169} Ibidem, 257.
Valentín Aparicio Lara

(P. Doble, J. Jipp). The thesis we would like to endorse is that a likely double reference to both figures should not be regarded as an excluding choice (C. Evans). Although this supposition does not entail any novelty, surprisingly it is not overly cited and scholarship tends to slip towards the extremes, whereby exegesis falls into a dialectical (useless!) debate. Since one of the main arguments to hold the Isaianic background is the connection between παῖς and δίκαιος in Acts 3:13170, which might resemble Isa. 53:11, the polemic touches directly the core of this study.

The solution may be faced in two different ways, inside the Book of Psalms (G. Barbiero171) or arguing that Luke’s suffering Messiah must be a fusion of the concept of the Davidic King and the Isaianic Suffering Servant (M. Strauss172). It has not been exploited enough the fact that in the first book of Psalter (Ps. 1-41) a curious exegesis is at work. The so-called ‘royal psalms’ use the category of ‘Servant’ referring to David. They describe him surrounded by persecution, humiliation and suffering, whereby Isa. 53 could have influenced the composition of this part of the Psalter. Certainly, every single psalm of this collection seems to have had a long run before it was written down, but the final compiler has projected his own theology by arranging the psalms in a peculiar way and touching up some notions. The final author, who has gathered the psalms into a collection, has featured and nuanced the wording in a coherent theological frame. Here the insights of G. Barbiero:

‘Ps. 22 and Ps. 40 represent a non-politic type of messianism, on the line of the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. Here, the only weapon with which the Messiah conquers peoples is that of telling them the salvation of which God has made him object (cf. 22, 23-32; 40, 4.10-11). Also, according to 19, 15 the “sword” with which the Messiah will strike peoples in the eschatological battle will be his word (“He will strike the earth with the rod of His mouth”, cf. Is 11,4)173.

What is at stake here is not just a Lukan conflation of both figures (King and Servant), but a reading that can be traced back to the Psalter itself and whose date could be pinned point by a ‘late social milieu, in Hellenistic times, close to the apocalyptic ambience of Zac. 9-14’174, the time in which most of the first collection was organized. The theological sway of the Deutero-Isaiah is everywhere at work in the first book of Psalter. So that, a dichotomy between Isaanian backdrop or motifs modelled out of the psalter is pointless because the final redaction of the Psalter itself was mostly nuanced by the Isaianic portrayal of the servant.

170 Cf. GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 19.
171 Cf. BARBIERO, Il regno di JHWH e del suo Messia, 73, 198, 250, 252, 305, 350, 365-366, 384, 390-391. The foregoing pages shows the exegetical connections between the first book of the Psalter and the Deutero-Isaiah. For instance: ‘Ps. 22 outlines an image of the Messiah radically diverse from that of Ps. 2 and the three royal psalms that precede it, close to the “suffering servant” of Deutero-Isaiah, anticipating the prospective of Ps. 40’ (Ibidem, 288).
173 BARBIERO, Il regno di JHWH e del suo Messia, 73.
174 Ibidem.
On the other hand, M. Strauss is on the right track when bringing closer the images of Luke’s suffering Messiah and the Davidic King echoed in the royal psalms. The thesis backed up can be summarized in a two-fold assertion in which the second statement limits the first one: i) ‘There is little doubt that Jesus is portrayed throughout Luke’s passion as a suffering righteous figure, a type well established in Judaism’; ii) however, ‘Luke moves beyond this general description to the more specific one of the Isaianic servant’.175

Several counter-argument are often thrown against an Isaianic backdrop. The first one is the shortage of quotations. Yet, Strauss is right in bringing out two different approaches regarding the OT among the hagiographa of the New. If Matthew fills his Gospel with citations whereby he recalls the completion of the OT, Luke departs from this pattern and rather resorts to allusions. Explicit references are reserved to the summaries (Lk. 3:4-6; 4:17-19; 13:34-35)176. Moreover, a key piece of information is provided from the passion predictions (Lk. 9:22, 43-45; 17:25; 18:31-32; 22:21-23; 24:6) whereby ‘the suffering role of the Christ becomes a prominent theme in Luke’s Gospel’177. The verb παραδίδωμι recalls Isa. 53:12c (LXX). The thesis is not arbitrary because Isa. 53:12b is quoted in an emphatic position in the farewell address, right before the beginning of the Passion (Lk. 22:37). So that, it would be extremely improbable that Luke had overlooked the subsequent phrase: διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη (Isa. 53:12c). Secondly, as we said above, in Acts 3:14 Peter speaks of Jesus as δίκαιος in association with παῖς (addressing to Isa. 53:11). Further occurrences of the verbs δοξάζω (Acts 3:13; recalling Isa. 52:13) and παραδίδωμι (v. 13; recalling Isa. 53:6, 12) point to a context modelled under the influence of Isa. 53.

At this point, we intend to go over a debated issue among scholars. When a text from the OT is quoted, is the author’s purpose to recall strictly the words penned or the wider context in which a given quotation appears? If the latter were proved the foregoing discussions would endorse the thesis whereby just strategical allusions to Isa. 53 are able to recall the overall portrayal of the Servant and his mission. The scholarship on early Judaism has strongly supported the view that by the 1st century the prevalent method was the well known gezerah shawa. Only single words were picked up out of context and set in parallelism as mutually referring. Generally, the only literary connection between them was rooted in wording and semantics. Two words with related stems may be taken as if they were enlightening each other by means of such an extrinsic relation.178. It is beyond doubt that this procedure was employed in rabbinic schools. Yet, the article by Jipp demonstrates that Luke uses the psalms in his Passion Narrative not just for the sake of a single verse but taking into account the

177 Ibidem, 333.
178 The method, laid out by Hilled, quickly became one of the main exegetical tools of early rabbinic movement. Cf. P. BASTA, Gezerah Shawah. Storia, forme e metodi dell’analoga biblica (SubB 26; Roma 2006) 13-28.
overall meaning of the Psalm\(^{179}\); for instance, the reversal of the prayer’s fate from ruin into salvation or the movement from persecution and death to triumph and life. Therefore, a brief quotation of a Psalm can evoke the inner movement of the Psalm mirroring this reversal. That said, and if the former exegesis is at work in the NT, suddenly two consequences are drawn:

(1) A single reference to \(\pi \alpha \zeta \theta \varepsilon \omega \delta\) in Acts 3:13, 26, bracketing out the speech must not be viewed as if no further significance were intended to convey. Since Isa. 53:12b colors the Passion and sets it up into a frame (Lk. 22:37) – there are few reasons to deny it – why not the ‘Servant of God’ imagery in Acts 3? It is enough what seems to be a small reference (Lk. 22:37; Acts 3:113, 26) to nuance all the passage, as long as this reference is placed in a strategic position from the point of view of rhetoric. It is reasonable to surmise that the title \(\pi \alpha \zeta \theta \varepsilon \omega \delta\) evokes the mission which this subject embodied. The title is not readily isolable from its co-text (Isa. 53).

(2) Lukan Christology becomes more unitary than one would suspect at first sight. If Luke does not interpret the prophecy atomistically, then ‘Luke would here be placing Jesus’ whole passion under the banner of the servant’\(^{180}\). Furthermore, in the wider context of Deutero-Isaiah (40-55) the so-called Servant Songs are inserted in the framework of an ‘eschatological new exodus’\(^{181}\). This larger setting would provide a fruitful source for hermeneutics. ‘When Isaiah is read as unity, the eschatological savior is at the same time Davidic king, suffering servant of Yahweh and eschatological prophet like Moses’\(^{182}\). So that, the portrayal of the Servant and the royal imagery of Davidic Psalms would conflate. Altogether they depict an integrated Christology, as we hope to have demonstrated. For the time being, we do not advance more about the prominence of these chapters (Isa. 40-55) in a fresh Christian exegesis (cf. ch. 3.3).

Bringing this chapter to a close, the conclusion is that the Christology takes up motifs either from the royal imagery of Psalms, which shapes the coming Messiah as Davidic King, and from the Suffering Servant of Isaiah. The allusions of Acts 3:13, 26 distill an unmistakable Isaianic flavor, and the use of \(\pi \alpha \zeta \theta \varepsilon \omega \delta\) in Acts 4:27, 30 is said

\(^{179}\) Cf. JIPP, “Luke’s Scriptural Suffering Messiah”, 263, 270. By means of a synecdoche, one verse encapsulates the whole psalm, so that the piece is read as being part of a bigger literary unity, not just as an unshaped amount of isolated parts.


\(^{181}\) R. Bauckham makes also the case for such prospective, cf. BAUCKHAM, Jesus and the God of Israel, 33-37. Strauss stresses a similar point in these terms: ‘While some have claimed that the Lukan travel narrative is a Christian midrash on the book of Deuteronomy and that Jesus is depicted throughout as the prophet like Moses leading a new exodus, I have suggested that the primary Old Testament model for Luke’s exodus motif is not the first exodus but the eschatological new exodus predicted in Isaiah and the prophets” (STRAUSS, The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts, 342).

\(^{182}\) STRAUSS, The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts, 336. In the birth narrative, Luke’s purpose is showing Jesus as Davidic descendent, while in his passion, the quotations of Isaiah in Lk. 22:37 and Acts 8:32-22 identify Jesus as the Servant. Consequently, the Christology of Luke is more inclusive than we would have suspected. It may be enough to notice that in Isaiah the ‘new exodus’ motif is linked to a restoration of Davidic throne (Isa. 11:1-9), the conversion of all nations (Isa. 11:10), and the gathering of the remnant in Sion (Isa. 11:11-12). The themes of ‘Royalty’ and ‘new exodus’ are brought together. In fact, the preaching of John the Baptist (Lk 3:4-5) is introduced by the ‘new exodus’ presaged by Isa. 40:3-5.
to come seemingly from a Davidic royal imagery. As Moule assesses, ‘they are not mutually incompatible nor incompatible with Christologies in other parts of the book’\textsuperscript{183}. One hardly can avoid the conclusion that ‘in both Luke and Isaiah, the eschatological deliverer may be viewed as the Davidic king who (like Moses) leads an eschatological new exodus of God’s people through suffering as the servant of Yahweh\textsuperscript{184}. In the eschatological salvation that Isaiah foreshadows, the agent of this deliverance is pointedly depicted as successor of David, Prophet and Servant. It is unnecessary to remark that the distinction of three Isaiahs or labeling of the Servant passages as ‘Servant Songs’ was strange to Luke. Read as a whole, the eschatological frame of the chapters of Isaiah alluded to by Luke allow us to reconstruct an integral King-Prophet-Servant Christology whereby we can flee from a fruitless polemic about the antithetical predominance of royal or Isaianic motifs. All them conflate in Deutero-Isaiah’s prospective on how the awaited salvation will be accomplished by God.

\textsuperscript{183} MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 169.
Chapter 3: Moving back to Early Times

Some Developments on Isa. 53 and the Atoning Meaning of Suffering

A lasting debate among scholars can be summarized posing this question: Is the concept of a Suffering Messiah an *oxymoron* – seemingly contradictory terms – for 2nd Temple Literature? Is it better understood as a hermeneutical innovation built by the early Church? The long survey on apocryphal literature attempting to get a clear idea about how Isa. 53 was understood has revealed to be somewhat daunting. Acts 3:18 speaks clearly about ‘what God forecasted by the mouth of all the prophets’ (ἀ προκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν). The object of this prediction is nothing less than ‘the passion of his Christ [Anointed one]’ (παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, Act 3:18b). Now, one wonders where in Scriptures is foreshadowed the Passion of a Messianic figure. Unfortunately, the answer is far from clear. Other NT references as 1 Cor. 15:13b (κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς) does not pinpoint a clearer inter-text which allows us to venture an answer. We are of the opinion that the ‘medium position’ set out by Hengel is the most reasonable. The Jewish interpretation of Isa. 53 is neither non-existent nor so evident as if it had constituted a clear and constant interpretation.

---


The following is a schematic review across the sources which afford samples of exegesis on Isa. 53. It is intended to track the development of this imagery in 2nd Temple Judaism.

(1) Septuagint translation. In Isa. 42:1 the passage is applied to Jacob and Israel and read collectively: Ἰακὼβ ὁ παῖς μου [...] Ἰσραήλ ὁ ἐκλεκτὸς μου. Even if scarcely hinted in modern scholarship, more attention should be paid to Isa. 53:10b-11. These two verses perhaps contain the clearest reference to the atoning meaning of suffering within the OT. The importance of this text for our inquiry is crucial because Acts 3:13, 26 alludes to it. Nevertheless, the translation the LXX carries out softens the MT and blurs the atoning message plainly expressed in Hebrew categories. The next chart shows it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Isa. 53</th>
<th>MT</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 10</td>
<td>וַיְזַדִּיק עֲמוֹדָן עַבְדָּךְ מְשַׁפֵּץ שָׁם נֵבֶלֶת</td>
<td>καὶ κύριος βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτὸν τῆς πληγῆς ἕαν δῶτε περὶ ἀμαρτίας ἡ ψυχή ὑμῶν ὥστε σπέρμα μακροβιον καὶ βούλεται κύριος ἀφελείν.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 11</td>
<td>מְשַׁפֵּץ שָׁם נֵבֶלֶת</td>
<td>ἀπὸ τοῦ πόνου τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτοῦ δείξαι αὐτῷ φάς καὶ πλάσαι τῇ συνέσει δικαιώσαι δίκαιον εὑ δουλεύοντα πολλοῖς καὶ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν αὐτὸς ἀνοίσει.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In v. 11b the differences are too strong to be disregarded. The subject of the Hebrew is the ‘servant’ (הָדָעֶם), but for the LXX is the Lord (κύριος), expressed in 10b. The action accomplished is rendered in one case with an imperfect Hifil (סַעֲפָא) and in Greek with


187 The ‘Servant’ is clearly identified with ‘Israel’, but not with the whole people, because the mission of the Servant is to gather Jacob and Israel (Isa. 49:5-6). If so, the LXX is thinking of a group within Israel: ‘the servant figure in ch. 50, then, appears to be in continuity with 49, a faithful, suffering Israel-within-Israel persecuted by the larger group’ (BEERS, The Followers of Jesus as the ‘Servant’, 56-57). Further confirmation is given by the intertextual connection between Isa. 52:13 (the Servant is ‘exalted’ [ὑψωθησαται] and ‘glorified’ [δοξασθησαται]) and Isa. 4:2, the same couple of verbs are applied here to ‘the remnant of Israel’ (τὸ καταλειψθὲν τοῦ Ἰσραήλ).

an aorist infinitive (δικαιῶσαι). This infinitive is the fourth of a list of complementary infinitives dependent on a verb of wanting (βούλομαι) whose subject is κύριος. The outcome of this comparison is puzzling. Whereas in the MT, ‘my Servant’, in apposition named ‘Righteous one’ (יְהוָה יְשֵׁי), brings about the justification of many; in LXX it is the Lord himself who justifies. Moreover, the Servant – now named δικαστήριον – occurs in accusative and works as a direct object of the verb δικαίοσαι. Thus, the justification affects ‘the servant’. Such a maneuver aims at downplaying the role of the Servant. The translator prefers to slide the version toward a more ‘theologically correct’ language whereby God’s unique supremacy in granting salvation is kept safe.

A second remarkable modification is carried out. It affects the relation between the Servant and a group of people called ‘the many’ (πολλοῖς). The LXX changes ‘my servant’ (Ἰησοῦς) into an attributive participle (δουλεύοντας), and adds the adverb ‘well’ (εὖ), giving birth to a new translation that alters the verse from ‘one who is God’s servant to one who serves the many well’\(^{189}\). Subsequently, the group called ‘the many’ are not justified by the Servant since the only task he brings about is a ‘good service’ on behalf of the many. All in all, if the Lord only justifies the Servant, LXX’s overtone moves towards an act of individual vindication rather than universal redemption. No wonder that his image is coherent with another Hellenistic book which will be composed slightly later in an Alexandrine milieu, the Wisdom of Salomon (cf. Wis. 2:10-5:23).

Thirdly, the v. 10b is rendered in plural through the 2\(^{nd}\) person of subjunctive aorist (δοῦτε). Thus, the sacrifice is offered not by the Servant, but by the sinners, by those who are bullying him. The Hebrew in contrast sees the sacrificial action as achieved by the Servant: ‘If He would render Himself for the sinners, he ’. Further rectifications soften the rawness of MT by exempting God as the cause of the Servant’s sufferings. Whereas the MT reads that the Lord’s will is the Servant to endure sufferings (‘The Lord was pleased to crush him’, v. 10a), the LXX depicts God as supporting him (‘The Lord wants to cleanse him of misfortune’, v. 10a). In sum, perusing the two versions, a different theological approach has emerged. The Greek version shifts the imagery to that of vindication\(^{190}\). This twist will be demonstrated to be at work in other instances in which a ‘politically correct’ language is preferred.

(2) The late canonical texts of Zech. 12:9-13:1 and 13:7-9 seem to be modelled in light of Isa 53. In Zech. 13:7b God ordains to ‘strike the shepherd’ (טוּלַד הַנְּשֵׁב) as in Isa 54:4b. It was customary in Ancient Near East to use the ‘shepherd’ as a metaphor for a king or ruler. It is maybe referring to a future Davidic King who will endure scorn and will face a violent death. A few connections link the fate of the shepherd and the Servant’s. For instance, nations and kings attend the grim spectacle described (as in Isa. 52:15). Besides, onlookers mourn (as in Isa. 53:1-6) and those who are near

\(^{189}\) SAAP, “The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53”, 175.

\(^{190}\) It should be added that although the atoning significant of Isa. 53:10-11 is softened in Greek, several references to the Servant in relation with the sins of ‘the many’ are provided by the rest of the chapter; Saap counts seven, Isa. 53: 4a, 5a, 6b, 8b, 12d, 12e, 12f. Therefore, Isa. 53 (LXX), ‘except for vv. 10-11, still carried many statements implying atonement that could be used when explaining the Christian gospel’ (Ibidem, 189).
acknowledge their guilt, although their repentance is not associated with any vicarious effect of the shepherd’s sorrows. The remarkable feature is that in both cases the savior figure is depicted as suffering. Hengel observes that the Greek version of Zechariah softens its rendering (for instance, Zech. 12:10). It is as though ancient pre-Christian interpreters were reluctant to admit the possibility of a suffering messianic redeemer\textsuperscript{191}. Nevertheless, even if an individual embodiment of the Isaianic Servant is supposed, the vicarious sense of his death is absent\textsuperscript{192}.

(3) The so-called \textit{Hymn of the Fathers} (Sirach 48:10), dated around the first quarter of the second century B. C.\textsuperscript{193}, describes the task of Elijah taking up Isa. 49:6 and conflating it with Mal. 4:6 (LXX). The Servant is expected ‘to raise up the survivors of Israel’ which resembles an Isaianic motif: τοῦ στήσα αὐτῷ φυλάξα Ισακόβ (Isa. 49:6). By this appropriation, Isa. 49 is applied to Elijah. Hence, a piece of Servant’s Songs acquires an individual interpretation embodied in a prophet\textsuperscript{194}. Moreover, it is a confirmation that, by the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century B. C., an interpretation of the whole book of Isaiah with strong eschatological nuances was carried out, because the mission of Elijah will immediately precede the final consummation or messianic era\textsuperscript{195}.

(4) The following step is marked by the book of Daniel (165-164 B. C.). Dan. 12:3 speaks about מַשְׁכִילִים (‘Those who lead many to righteousness’). The wording is strikingly close to Isa 53:11b (דְּשָׁרֶיהָ יְרַדְּבֵהוֹ). Also, Daniel’s language of exaltation reminds us Isa. 52:13 (שְׂדַרְיֹרְבֶּהוֹ מֵאֲחָא) because the ‘wise ones’ are said to have died, but their waited destiny is the resurrection (Dan. 12:2a).

On the other hand, there is a passage (Dan. 11:35) in which it is not totally clear if a reference to a vicarious dimension of suffering can be found out. It depends on how נָכָה (11:35) is understood, whether ‘among them’ or ‘through them’. Are the ‘wise ones’ (מַשְׁפָרֵי, 11:35a) offering themselves \textit{among} the many or \textit{on behalf} of the many? A question which we do not dare to answer. The Hebrew בָּהֶם may virtually take such a wide range of meanings that a clear response is beyond our limits. For Ginsberg in contrast, the collective interpretation is well settled\textsuperscript{196}. Further confirmation for this

\textsuperscript{191} Cf. HENGEL – BALEY, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in Pre-Christian Period”, 89.

\textsuperscript{192} ‘The overcoming of the audience’s guilt and sin at the end of the process, is not because of the vicarious suffering of the pierced one but because of their repentance’ (BEERS, \textit{The Followers of Jesus as the ‘Servant’}, 51).

\textsuperscript{193} For the dates, we stick to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} edition of the classical volume by Nickelsburg, cf. G. W. E. NICKELSBURG, \textit{Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah}. A Historical and Literary Introduction (Minneapolis 2005).

\textsuperscript{194} Cf. HENGEL – BALEY, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in Pre-Christian Period”, 83.

\textsuperscript{195} This eschatological interpretation, already at work in pre-Hasmonean time, will be extremely valuable for the NT developments (cf. ch. 3.3) because Isa. 53 will not be split from its wider theological context ( Isa. 40-55). This eschatological restoration is key to grasp the far-reaching echoes that the allusions to Isa. 53 conveys in the frame of Luke’s theology.

\textsuperscript{196} ‘Undoubtedly our author has identified the many of Isa. 52:13-53:12 with the masses in the time of the Antiochian religious persecution, and the Servant with the minority of steadfast anti-Hellenizers’ (H. L. GINSBERG, “The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant”, \textit{VT} 3 [1953], 402).
supposition would be the fact that the Danielic group of martyrs is called maškil, a more than likely borrowing from Isa. 52:13 (םְשֵׁלָה).

Out of this double reference to the Servant imagery, two conclusions may be drawn: i) ‘The common eschatological use of biblical texts in 2nd Temple period’ 197, because Daniel is jumping from the ongoing historical setting of persecution to the heavenly reward that the martyrs will receive. ii) By means of the loans just noted, ‘the author of Daniel is claiming (part of) the servant’s vocation’ 198.

(5) Prayer of Azariah (Dan. 3:40, LXX). This Greek addition to Daniel discloses the most developed use of atoning language in OT: οὗτο γενέσθω ἡμῶν ἢ θυσία ἐνώπιόν σου σήμερον καὶ ἔξιλάσαι ὁπισθέν σου (‘So let our sacrifice be in your sight today and may it make atonement before you’). This verse expresses the redemptive value of the self-offering for the sake of God without a shadow of doubt, although with no reference to Isa. 53. Here no allusion is intended to the ‘Servant Songs’. The reason why this text deserves to be listed is because for the first time a new conception of the value of martyrdom arises in a recognizable formulation.

(6) A quick flash of the same doctrine shows up in 2Macc. 7:37a: ἐγὼ δὲ καθάπερ οἱ ἄξιοι νομοὺ καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδομι περί τῶν πατρίδων νόμων ἐπικαλούμενος τὸν θεὸν ἔλεος ταχὺ τῷ ἑθνεὶ γενέσθαι. Here, the martyr offers his life (προδίδομι) ‘appealing to God to show mercy soon to our nation’. Therefore, he relies on the redemptive outcome of his death in benefit of his nation. The apocryphal book 4Macc. 6:28-29 (1st century A. D.) resembles this concept too in Eleazar’s plea: ἔλεος γενοῦ τῷ ἑθνεὶ σου ἁρκεσθεὶς τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν δίκη, καθάρσιον αὐτῶν ποίησον τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα καὶ ἀντίψυχον αὐτῶν λαβέ τὴν ἐμὴν ψυχήν (‘Be merciful to your people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction on their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my life as recompense for theirs’). Finally, 4 Macc. 17:22 labels Eleazar’s death as ‘atonning sacrifice’ (ὑλαστήριον). These two formulations of 4 Maccabees are definitively clear assertions on the sacrificial meaning of death, although they might have been written after the Christian era, by the end of the 1st century. 201

(7) Book of Wisdom (Wis. 2:10-5:23). Composed between 100 and 45 B. C. 202. The quoted section can be considered a parenetic piece inspired in Isa. 52:13-53. The notion of suffering is applied to a collective figure and the portrayal fits into the image of

---

197 Beers, The Followers of Jesus as the ‘Servant’, 55.
198 Ibidem, 55.
200 Such concept appears as well in the first formulations of the kerygma, now to evoke the sacrifice accomplished by Jesus which is said to be θεοστήριον for our sins (cf. Rom. 3:25).
201 Instead, Nickelsburg considers – according to the internal evidence of some passages conveying historical events – that the book was written around 20-54 A. C., Cf. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, 258.
202 Now, we clearly depart from Nickelsburg’s proposal of putting off the book and ascribing it to Caligula’s reign (37-41 A. D.) cf. Nickelsburg, Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah, 212.
persecuted righteous ones. In any case, even though scholars point out that their sorrows are not implemented with the notion of vicarious suffering, it is surprising how little attention is paid to Wis. 3:6. There, the martyrial death of the Righteous ones is accepted by God as an offering for themselves: ὡς ὁλοκάρπαμα θυσίας προσεδέξατο αὐτοὺς (‘as sacrificial [burning] offerings he took them’). This verse recalls Isa. 53:10 (MT), where the Servant’s life is an offering for transgressions:

καὶ ἔφρασεν τὸ κατέστρεψεν (‘you make his life an offering for sin’).

(8) Similitudes of Enoch (1En. 37-71). The text must be dated between the Parthian invasion (40 B.C.) and the Jewish War (66 B.C.). The opinion that it is not a corrupted text with Christian interpolations has gained weight. The Similitudes are to be related with the Jewish apocalyptical stream of the turn of era. Furthermore, in 1En. 71:14-27 the heavenly figure of ‘Son of man’ is finally identified with Enoch himself, so that the possibility of a Christian authorship fades.

The intertextual preponderance of 1En. 53:6 relies in the intertwining of two concepts that are also associated in Isa. 42:1, ‘Servant’ and ‘Elect One’. Additionally, in 1En. 38:2 the titles merged – for the first time in history – are ‘Servant’ and ‘Righteous One’, as it is the case of Isa. 53:11 and Acts 3:13-14. If some scholars argue that the Danielic ‘Son of man’ is to be understood as a collectivity, now this heavenly figure embodies finally the idea of an individual messiah. More coincidences between Isaiah and the Similitudes can be observed. For example, the ‘Son of Man’ is said to become ‘light to the gentiles’ (1En. 48:4). This attribute is applied exclusively to the ‘Servant of God’ in Isa. 42:6; 49:6. Furthermore, his existence is pre-temporal because his name predates the Creation (1En. 48:3), as the Isaianic Servant was destined to accomplish a messianic task before his birth (49:1). Consequently, the main improvement performed by Enochic literature is the integration of several figures from the OT into one individual. The ‘Son of Man’ of Dan. 7 loses its ambiguity and

204 BEERS, The Followers of Jesus as the ‘Servant’, 77. Much attention should be paid to this detail. The passion of the righteous ones only attains salvation for themselves, never for ‘the many’. For others, the persecuted righteous one acts just as a model, but does not provide further efficacy or strength (Cf. HENGEL, The Atonement, 42.). Would it be a suitable pattern for explaining the effects of Servant’s death according to Acts 3:26? For Peter, the Servant’s Passion brings to completion all the promises of the OT, embodied in the primordial blessing pronounced by God on Abraham (Gen. 22:18; 26:4). This implies that Peter is considering the events displayed in Acts 3:13-15 as conveying wider consequences than Wis. 2-3 sets out.
205 As noted above, the translation of this phrase is not exempt from difficulty. A twofold translation can be given if the verb is taken as 3fs (‘his soul’ would be the subject) or 2ms (‘God’ would be the subject). They would be ‘his soul makes an offering for guilt’ or ‘you [Lord] make his soul an offering for guilt’. In any case the atoning meaning of his death is clear, only the LXX overturns the sense and makes the ‘wicked ones’ the subject, whereby they are expected to offer a sacrifice if they want to be spared.
206 An extensive commentary on the set of Messianic ideas of the so-called ‘Similitudes’ of 1 Enoch, cf. FITZMYER, The One Who is to Come, 83-87; and cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 360-364.
is further defined as ‘Righteous One’ (1En. 38:2; 39:6; 46:3; 47:1, 4; 53:6; 71:14), ‘Elect One’ (1En. 39:6; 40:5; 45:4; 49:2; 51:3, 5; 52:6, 9; 53:6; 55:4; 61:5, 8, 10; 62:1; 48:6; 49:4)\textsuperscript{209}, and ‘Lord’s anointed’ (1En. 48:10; 52:4). Summing up, this figure who embodies all these titles turns out to be ‘an awaited agent of God for the deliverance of His people at the time of judgment’\textsuperscript{210}.

Regarding a hypothetical suffering that the ‘Son of man’ may take upon himself the text is ambiguous. It is impossible to ascertain in detail whether 1En. 47:1-4 speaks about the outpouring of the blood belonging to the ‘Righteous one’ or maybe it should be read in plural, the ‘Righteous ones’. Consciously or inadvertently, the text is not accurate and oscillates between an individual and collective interpretation. Although it is said that this blood is ‘avenged’ before the ‘Lord of the Spirits’, its vicarious capacity is far from clear\textsuperscript{211}. If so, 1 Enoch aligns with the general tendency of Jewish literature which avoids depicting its Messiah with the overtones of suffering. Rather, in the parables of Enoch the ‘Son of Man’ stands out for his power and dominion.

(9) 4Esd 7:28-29 (Late 1\textsuperscript{st} century A. D)\textsuperscript{212}. We stand before ‘the earliest extant evidence of Jewish belief in a dying Messiah’\textsuperscript{213}, although no hint is provided about the sense of this death in the context of self-offering. It seems as his sorrows were devoid of redemptive implications.

(10) The Testament of Benjamin 3:8 (around 2\textsuperscript{nd} century A. D.) supposedly parallels Isa. 53:5. The allusion is vague and cannot be set up. From the point of view of critica textus, the following passage must be treated with caution. The divergence between the Greek – maybe corrupted by Christian’s hand – and Armenian versions makes us choose for our analysis only the part that matches in both versions\textsuperscript{214}: ὁ θεομόρφος ὑπὲρ ἀνόμων παραδόθησεται καὶ ἀναμάρτητος ὑπὲρ ἁσβοῦν ἀποθανεῖται (‘because the

---

\textsuperscript{209} This high range of occurrences is interesting when it comes to interpreting the formula of Lk. 23:35. The rulers who scoffed Jesus at the feet of the cross gather in their saying the title ‘Messiah’ (Χριστός) and ‘Elect One’ (ἐκλεκτός). It seems to be a pre-Christian use of the term and not a Lukan invention, because the formula appears once elsewhere in NT (Lk. 9:35) and nowhere in Apostolic Fathers. This constitutes a further prove, on the one hand, to evaluate positively the resort to Enochic literature as a reliable source of early Jewish ideas. On the other hand, it indicates than Luke is respectful of his sources when using several Christological titles in a suitable context, a crucial point for the exegesis of Acts 3. He hands over faithfully the traditions. Remarkable enough is that the same explanation just given for the merging of ‘Messiah’ and ‘Elect One’ holds for ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, scarcely used in NT and rarely in Apostolic Fathers. Cf. Jeremias, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 365.

\textsuperscript{210} Fitzmyer, The One Who is to Come, 87.

\textsuperscript{211} ‘There is no room for vicarious suffering of this heavenly judge’ (Hengel – Baley, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in Pre-Christian Period”, 101).


\textsuperscript{213} Page, “The Suffering Servant between the Testaments”, 483.

unspotted one will be betrayed by lawless men, and the sinless one will die for impious men’, 3:8).

(11) Targum of Jonathan. Although the Targum flourished around the Tannaitic period, it can be read-back in 1st century. There is little reason to deny that it preserves pre-Christian traditions. In Isa 42:1; 43:10; 52:13; 53:10, the Servant is explicitly said to be the Messiah through an apposition: שבעה פשה (‘my Servant, the Messiah’). Nonetheless, a similar exegetical correction to LXX is inducing the text to a softer vision of the suffering. The subject who undergoes the described sorrows is not the Messiah anymore, but the ‘remnant of Israel’ who is to be purified (בשה פשה; 53:4, 10) or in other cases the Gentiles who must be punished (53:3, 7). It is not the Lord who offers his Messiah as a vicarious offering, but the people who bring sacrifices to clean up their sins (53:10). Inevitably, when it comes to face all this data, one wonders to what extent the concept of a Suffering Messiah was somehow unthinkable or scandalous to Jewish mentality.

The foregoing survey across Temple literature presents the main evidence regarding a concept of atoning suffering in connection with Isa. 53 (except for Dan. 3:40 and 2Macc. 7:37). By means of this analysis some conclusions emerge:

i) The sharp distinction by Jeremias between Hellenistic and Palestinian Judaism seems to be dated. According to him, the collective interpretation should be ascribed to the diaspora milieu, and the individual visions of the Servant were mostly present in Palestinian Judaism. It is enough to check out the presence of collective embodiment of Isa. 53 among Qumran interpreters to overturn this theory. Conversely, Jews from

215 For the several theories on the setting and dating of this composition, cf. B. C. CHILTON, The Aramaic Bible. XI. The Isaiah Targum. Introduction, Translation, Apparatus and Notes (ed. M. McNAMARA) (The Aramaic Bible; Wilmington, DE 1987), xxi-xxv. Chilton considers that the chapters of the Servant Songs ‘appear in their present orientation to reflect more the Tannaitic level of thinking’, namely 2nd century A. D. (Ibidem, xxiv). Now, this period, in turn, can be traced back: ‘Targum in its Tannaitic level reflects Jewish traditional thinking in the first century A. D.’ (Ibidem, xxvi). Thus, its importance to grasp a more complete portrayal of 1st century exegetical tendencies is beyond doubt. The same confidence on the reliability of Targumic literature is endorsed by FITZMYER, The One Who is to Come, 149; and JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεός’, 374.

216 The interpretation removes virtually every suggestion that the servant will suffer and, by ingenious readings and shifts of words, applies the suffering to the Messiah’s enemies or to Israel’ (JUEL, Messianic Exegesis, 124). This shift can be verified in Isa. 52:12 (the Messiah does not startle the nations, but scatters them); 53:2 (the beauty of the Messiah has incomparable radiance); 53:3 (not the Messiah, but the kingdoms of the earth will be as man of sorrows); 53:5 (the Messiah will build a new Sanctuary); 53:7 (the Gentiles will be slaughtered as a lamb, not the Servant); 53:8 (he is expected to drive out the Gentiles from the land of Israel). Cf. EVANS, “Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews and John”, 153-155.


218 They saw their own group as fulfilling the prophecy of Isa. 40:3. If the Servant is the agent of a ‘new exodus’ in Isaiah, the Qumran community are the forerunners of this new stage of completion that is about to irrupt in the history of salvation. The references in which this collective embodiment comes to the fore are: 1QS 5:6 and 8:1-7. Cf. BEERS, The Followers of Jesus as the ‘Servant’, 77.
the diaspora as Aquila and Theodotion leaned towards individual projections of Isa. 53.

ii) The concept of a ‘Suffering Messiah’ (Acts 3:13, 26) – based on Isa. 53 rather than the Psalms – is partially an oxymoron. A full portrayal of a suffering Messiah, as such, never came to the fore in Judaism. On the whole, only blurred traces of this idea could be tracked: ‘The expectation of an eschatological suffering savior figure connected with Isaiah 53 cannot therefore be proved to exist with absolute certainty and in a clearly outlined form in pre-Christian Judaism’219. The closest writings to NT’s setting are ‘Psalms of Solomon’ and ‘1 Enoch’. Both describe the Messiah as a political conqueror of the Davidic dynasty or as an eschatological judge who will vindicate the righteous ones220.

iii) Even though a scorned and derided Messiah is not awaited, the concept of the atoning value of suffering experienced a very different progress. Some doctrinal growth began to sprout. These fresh developments have nothing to do with the ‘theological outburst’ carried out by the NT. Nevertheless, texts as the ‘Prayer of Azariah’ or ‘2 Maccabees’ foreshadowed this looming stage. If so, a full denial of a redemptive meaning of suffering in pre-Christian Judaism cannot be endorsed, even if it was not widely attested in the short quantity of available sources from this period. Aside from Isa. 53, the Targums show how haggadic interpretations on Gen. 22 (the ‘āqēḏā of Isaac) boosted this development more than Isa. 53221.

iv) Even if reflections about the sufferings undergone for the sake of the Law (for instance, the ideology of martyrdom in Maccabees) have been detected, a couple of implications were not deeply envisioned by that time. The suffering could carry redemptive value, but – except in the uncertain case of Dan. 11:33-35 – not for the many. In most cases, sorrows and proofs were fruitful only for the subject who endures them (Dan. 3:40; Wis. 2:10-5:23). On the other hand, this suffering was never inserted as the central act of the Messianic task. Thinking about a priestly Messiah who offers

219 HENGEL – BALEY, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in Pre-Christian Period”, 140. Also, Fitzmyer is of this idea: ‘The idea of a suffering Messiah, is found nowhere in the Old Testament or in any Jewish literature prior to or contemporaneous with the New Testament. It is a Christian conception that goes beyond the Jewish messianic tradition’ (FITZMYER, The One Who is to Come, 142).

220 Psalms of Solomon is an eighteen-psalm collection composed around 1st century B. C. Some of them (17-18) envision a future kingly messiah. Now then, this king will lead a pious group ‘in a rebellion against the occupying forces, in the expulsion of foreign influence, and in the establishment of an independent Jewish state’ (R. B. WRIGHT, “Psalms of Solomon. A New Translation and Introduction”, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha II [ed. J. H. CHARLESWORTH] [Garden City, NY 1985] 639). So that, the messianic ideology of Psalms of Solomon is still far from the NT. The Messiah is thought an earthly ruler, the nations will serve him moved by fear, and he is by no means divine. He is expected to topple the usurper Hasmonean dynasty, devoid of all legitimacy. In the realm of lexical connections, it should be noted that Ps. Sal. 12:6 and 17:21 speak about Israel as a παις θεοῦ (cf. Lk. 1:54). Cf. A. PÍNERO SÁENZ, “Salmos de Salomón”, Apócrifos del Antiguo Testamento III (ed. A. DÍEZ MACCHO) (Madrid 1982) 19-20.

sacrifically his own life goes far beyond the limits of the literary corpus examined. The only extant example of a suffering Messiah is ‘Testament of Benjamin’ (§3:8), but one wonders to what extent this figure belonged to the main stream of Judaism.

v) The shortage of texts available that openly develops the idea of the atoning meaning of suffering and death emphasizes all the more the status of Isa. 53. It stands out from any other text in the OT on account of its clarity. The vicarious offering of life for the forgiveness of sins appears 10 times even in the more nuanced LXX version (Isa. 53: 4 [x2]; 5 [x2]; 6; 8; 11; 12 [x3]). Such a parallel range of references is foreign elsewhere in the OT.

**Connecting Dots within the New Testament**

Nine texts are listed in Nestle-Aland 28th ed. containing allusions to Isa. 53:10-11 (Matt. 20:28; Mk. 10:45; 14:24; Acts 3:13; Rom. 5:15, 19; Phil. 2:7; 1Joh 3:5a). If we open the references to the whole chapter 53, the number of instances increases up to the astonishing extent of 42 references. It is funny to think how the diachronic prospective bring us to a such a holistic view on the NT. Once an exegetical tradition of the early church has been detected behind Acts 3:13-26 (cf. ch. 1) and its relationship with Isa. 53 confirmed (cf. ch. 2), this previous core of kerygmatic elements is now sprouting in a wide range of texts which belong to the apostolic preaching. Even if dated for many, Dodd’s basic insight proves still to be right, pace Dibelius.

It would be extremely difficult to ascertain the value of Christ’s suffering as ‘Servant of God’ in Acts 3:13, 26 unless we examine all this material. In our text, we have no more than two words (παῖς θεοῦ) upon which rely to reconstruct plausible exegetical implications for them. How to ponder the extent of ‘paidology’ in Acts 3 if not from other kerygmatic assertions within the NT which have been drawn from Isa. 53? Hooker’s attempt for splitting the evidence by deconstructing every single text seems to us, at least, misleading.

(1) Let us start by tackling 1Peter 2:22-25. The similarities start as early as 1Pe. 2:7, where a quote of Ps. 118:22 is again used to express the rejection that Jesus experienced: ἡμῖν δὲ λίθος ἡμῶν ἐν τοῖς οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας (‘but for those who do not believe: the stone which the builders rejected, this became the very corner stone’). The same verse is applied to Christ by

---

222 We must not lose sight that authors as Barret, who has no truck with the theory we are endorsing, recognizes this link between ‘Petrine materials’: ‘The association of Jesus with the Servant is placed here on the lips of Peter (also at 3:26; cf. 4:27, 30) and there are allusions to Isa. 53 in 1Pe (2:22, 24, 25)’ (Barret, Acts, 194). For an introductory view on the matter, cf. M. Hengel, *Saint Peter. The underestimated Apostle* (Grand Rapids, MI 2006) 79-89; M. Bockmuehl, *Simon Peter in Scripture and Memory. The New Testament Apostle in the Early Church* (Grand Rapids, MI 2012) 125-141.

223 ‘In the first epistle of Peter the reader is aware of an atmosphere which seems in some respects nearer to that of the primitive Church, as we divine it behind the early chapter of Acts, than anything else in the New Testament […] it is a clear echo of the apostolic Preaching which lies behind Paul and the whole New Testament’ (Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments*, 44).
Peter in Acts 4:11, a passage that, by the way, incorporates the term παῖς three times (Acts 4:25, 27, 30).

Shortly before, in 1 Peter 1:11, a kind of general header appears. The hagiographer speaks of ‘the prophets’ (προφήται, 1Pe. 1:10) through whom the Spirit ‘witnessed beforehand’ (προμαρτυρόμενον, 1Pe. 1:11) about τὰ εἰς Χριστὸν παθήματα καὶ τὰς μετὰ ταῦτα δόξας. (‘the sufferings [destined, belonging] to Christ and the subsequent glory’). C. Evans is prone to see in this assertion a general reference to Isa. 53, which will be displayed in detail in the famous hymn of chapter two. The imagery of the 4th Servant’s Song is so strong that nothing less than five allusions and one quotation can be found in 1Pe. 2:22-25.

| 1Pe. 2:22-25 | Isa. 53 (LXX) - references
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὅς ἀμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν οὔδε εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ (v. 22).</td>
<td>καὶ δόσω τοὺς πονηροὺς ἀντὶ τῆς ταρηκ ἀυτοῦ καὶ τοὺς πλουσίους ἀντὶ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ὅτι ἄνομιαν ὦκ ἐποίησεν οὔδε εὐρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ (v. 9).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅς λοιδορούμενος οὐκ ἀντελοιώρει, πάσχων οὐκ ἠπείλει, παρεδίδου δὲ τῷ κρίνοντι δικαίως. (v. 23).</td>
<td>καὶ αὐτὸς διὰ τὸ κεκακώθαι οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγὴν ἡχθῃ καὶ ὡς ἁμνὸς ἔναντι τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ (v. 7).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ὅς τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἠμῶν αὐτὸς ἀνήγεγεν ἐν τῷ σώματι αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ξύλον, ἵνα τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἀπογνώμενοι τῇ δίκαιον ζήσωμεν, οὕτῳ τῷ μελώπι ἰάθητε (v. 24).</td>
<td>οὕτως τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἠμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἠμῶν ὄρνυται καὶ ἤμεις ἐλογισάμεθα αὐτὸν εἶναι ἐν πόνῳ καὶ ἐν πληγῇ καὶ ἐν κακώσει (v. 4).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>αὐτός δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἠμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκιστα διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἠμῶν παιδεία εἰρήνης ἠμῶν ἐπὶ αὐτὸν τῷ μελώπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἱάθημεν (v. 5).</td>
<td>αὐτὸς δὲ ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἠμῶν καὶ μεμαλάκιστα διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας ἠμῶν παιδεία εἰρήνης ἠμῶν ἐπὶ αὐτὸν τῷ μελώπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἱάθημεν (v. 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ἢτε γὰρ ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι, ἀλλὰ ἐπεστράφητε νῦν ἐπὶ τὸν ποιμήνα καὶ ἐπίσκοπον τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν (v. 25)</td>
<td>πάντες ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν ἀνθρώπος τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπιπλανηθή καὶ κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἠμῶν (v. 6).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the first verse of the hymn, v. 22, there is a verbatim quotation of Isa. 53 (LXX). The citation makes one lexical improvement, ἁμαρτίαν instead of ἁμομίαν. No need to

---

224 Cf. EVANS, “Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews and John”, 146.
225 This table merges into one scheme the suggestions by NA 28th ed. and C. Evans.
worry if we realize that ἀμαρτία also occurs in Isa. 53:4-6, 10-12. Thus, some sort of co-text corrections must be leaving their influence.

Verse 23 is reflecting the same ideas of Isa. 53:7. There, the Servant is reported to be quiet. Peter applies it to Christ because he did not revile in return when insulted. An important verb for the primitive kerygma is παρεδόθη (v. 23b). It is going to be part of most of early kerygmatic proclamations in the so-called ‘surrender formula’. Also, Acts 3:13 uses this form in 2nd plural person (παρεδόκασε). Peter accuses the leaders of have ‘delivered up’ Jesus to Pilate. The verb recalls the παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον (Isa. 53:12a) and διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη (Isa. 53:12b). Further occurrences of the verb come to light in Isa. 53:6.

In v. 24, the direct object ἀμαρτίας plus the verb ἀναφέρω (ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν αὐτός ἀνήγεγκεν) is an almost verbatim allusion to Isa. 53: αὐτός ἀμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνήγεγκεν, which does not depart too much from Isa. 53: 4: τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρετε. Finally, the second half of v. 24 focuses on the healing effect of his death: τῷ μόλωπι ἰάθητε (‘by his wounds you have been healed’). This consequence of the Servant’s self-sacrifice is also highlighted in Isa. 53:5 through the same wording: τῷ μόλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν.

The last verse of the hymn describes the situation in which the people were before the beneficial intervention: ὡς πρόβατα πλανώμενοι (‘you were straying like sheep’, v. 25). Once again, the author harks back to Isa. 53: ὡς πρόβατα ἐπλανήθημεν.

The depiction of Christ’s suffering is not praised in this hymn for its own sake, but out of its soteriological value. This remark will become a crucial point in ch. 4.1, when tackling the atoning meaning of the Servant’s suffering. We think this text does not mirror the so-called passio iusti, against Elliot’s opinion. Rather, the ‘hyper formula’ of v. 21 (Χριστὸς ἔπαθεν ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, ‘Christ suffered for you’) is moving the spotlight towards an interpretation of Jesus’ Passion in terms of atoning redemption. It takes over several motifs of Isa. 53, specially v. 4: περὶ ἡμῶν ὀξυνάται (‘he is pained for us’), whereby the soteriological consequences of the Servant’s task arise. Onwards,

---

226 Cf. Ibidem, 158. For the subsequent comments about the allusions, Evans’ inquiry provides a helpful guidance. Besides, a classic commentary, cf. J. H. ELLIOT, I Peter. A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary (AB 37B; New York 1964) 524-550. The linguistic indications by Elliot are useful, but we are at odds with his final balance, aligned with Hooker’s scholarship: ‘The notion of vicarious suffering found in 1 Perter does not appear in other NT texts that appeal to Isa. 53’ (Ibidem, 548).

227 These are the chief instances where this formula appears: 1 Cor. 15:3b-5 as a paradigmatic one, and more examples everywhere in NT: Matt. 20:28, 26:28, Mk. 10:45, 14:24; Lk. 22: 19-20, 1 Cor. 11:24, Gal. 1:4, 2:20; Rom. 4:25, 5:8, 8:32, Eph. 5:2, 25, Titus 2:14; 1 Tim. 2:6.

228 The verb ἀναφέρω introduces a subtle nuance because it can mean, as in LXX usually does, more than ‘carry, to bear’. It stands for ‘offering a sacrifice’, being the common rendering of παρεδόθη and ναφ ‘to make a smoky sacrifice, to offer by burning’. So that, in this case the atoning/sacrificial meaning of the formula is beyond doubt. Cf. M. WILLIAMS, The Doctrine of Salvation in the First Letter of Peter (MSSNTS 149; Cambridge 2011) 103.

229 Cf. ELLIOT, I Peter, 544.

230 The preposition διὰ in the next verse (Isa 53:5) conveys the same meaning as ὑπὲρ does here. This chapter of Isaiah uses both indistinctively, it is always rendered ‘on account of’. Thus, the Servant
the same epistle will recall 2:21 with a new ‘hyper formula’: Χριστός ἀπαξ περὶ ἁμαρτιῶν ἐπαθέν (‘Christ suffered once for sins’, 3:18). If these quotes, as part of what has been called ‘Petrine material’, are related with the ancient layer taken up by Luke in Acts 3:12-26, it would be unwise not to confer atoning meaning attached to the ‘paidology’ of Acts 3:13, 26.

The ongoing discussions about the inferences of Jesus’ suffering in 1 Peter is clarified by a brilliant exposition of Christ’s ransom in 1Pe. 1:18b-19: ἐλυτρώθητε ἐκ τῆς ματαίας ύμῶν ἀναστροφῆς πατροπαραδότου τιμίω αἴματί ὡς ἁμνὸν ἁμώμου καὶ ἀσπίλου Χριστοῦ (‘you were ransomed from the futile ways inherited from your forefathers with the precious blood of Christ, like that of a lamb without blemish or spot’). The word ἁμομοῦ (‘unblemished, blameless’) has in the LXX a clear sacrificial nuance, it belongs to the realm of sacrifices and the purity guarantees requested by Leviticus to offer a proper victim. The same holds for the verb λυτρῶ (‘to ransom’), which may recall the deliverance experienced in Egypt. Finally, the comparison of Christ with a lamb (ἁμνὸς) is exploiting a well-known idea of Isa. 53:7.

(2) Tracking the Semitic background of the ‘surrender formula’, Mk. 10:45 (=Matt. 20:28) stands out from the rest. The verse runs thus: καὶ γὰρ ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ άνθρώπου οὐκ ἠλθεν διακονηθείς ἀλλὰ διακονήσας καὶ δοθεν τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. Now, how is this formula related with the Petrine layer detected in Acts 3? Some points must be considered: i) The stereotyped form of this statement compared with some others (cf. Matt. 20:28, 26:28, Mk. 14:24; Lk. 22: 19-20, 1 Cor. 11:24, 15:3-5, Gal. 1:4, 2:20; Rom. 4:25, 5:8, 8:32, Eph. 5:2, 25, Titus 2:14; 1 Tim. 2:6.) reflects a sort of fixed and widespread language. ii) Just as in Acts 3:13, where the verb δίδομι also appears, in Mark, the reference to Isa. 53:12 may be noted in the phrase δοθεν τὴν ψυχήν αὐτοῦ. It is plausible to suppose that Mark is drawing on Isa. 53:12 (παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ) as it is evident in the case of 1Pe. 2:22-24. Moreover, if we turn to the Hebrew text of Isa. 53, the parallels are all the more startling in three points: to give ‘his life’ (ψυχή, 53:10); as a ‘guilt-offering’ (ψυχή, Isa 53:10) and for the sake of ‘many’ (ψυχή, 53:11). The saying seems to have been modelled out of Isaiah’s Semitic version. iii) ‘Fixed formulas’ that emerge in a large amount of texts throughout the NT are to be consider older because they are found in writings that often do not share the same theological concerns. If so, their inclusion is due to the time-honored tradition of a received text rather than an original creation of a given author.

1 was wounded on account (δία) of our iniquities (53:5a) or ‘crushed on account of (δία) our sins (53:5b). Cf. Ibidem, 547. Interesting is the fact that old kerygmatic formulations stemmed from Isa. 53 still preserve this δία, cf. Rom. 4:25: διὰ παρεδόθη διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡγέρθη διὰ τὴν δικαιώσεως ἡμῶν (‘who was handed over to death for our trespasses and was raised for our justification’).

231 Constraints of space do not allow to open a discussion about the term λυτρον. It does not appear in Isaiah, but occurs in Lev. 27:31 (ψυχή) and Prov. 6:35, 13:8 (ψυχή). It is related with a payment to ransom something at large: manumission of slaves (Lev. 19:20), delivery of tithes (Lev. 27:31), the redemption of a land (Lev. 25:24) and finally a ransom for live (Es. 21:29). Even the Levites are considered to be λυτρον in place of the firstborn of Israel (Num. 3:11-13). Cf. A. Y. Collins, Mark. A commentary (Minneapolis, MN 2017) 500-502. 232 Cf. Bentz, “Jesus and Isaiah 53”, 83-84.
So that, Dodd is not far from the truth when surmising that Mark composed his Gospel by taking advantage from an outline of the life of Jesus and a solid kerygmatic tradition still recognizable in Peter’s 2nd Speech in Acts\textsuperscript{233}.Furthermore, we hardly can agree more with Hengel: ‘It is striking that two writings which according to the tradition of the early church – in my view completely reliable – must be assigned to Petrine sphere of tradition, Mark and 1 Peter, stress the soteriological interpretation of the death of Jesus as an atoning death in a marked way, 1Peter by an explicit citation of Isa. 53 (2:17; 3:18; cf. 1:18), and Mark in two places (Mk. 10:45; 14:24) in an archaic Semitic linguistic form.’\textsuperscript{234} iv) The evidences speak out not just of a common kerygmatic tradition previous to the writing of any text in the NT, but to a man called Peter and his authority to the first generation of Christians\textsuperscript{235}.

What we have said on Mk. 10:45 can sound as a bizarre attempt to back Papias’ testimony (60-130 A. D.). Yet, in this assignment, the connection between ‘Petrine materials’ has been established on the basis of intertextual method. The point is not who wrote Mark or whether this author is related with Peter. Rather, what is unquestionable is that some kerygmatic assertions have not been the result of a resourceful author, but they stemmed from a tradition. Somehow, modern scholarship seems to be more engaged, in some extent, with this ‘Judean-Jewish-Christian’ background, loaded of traditional motifs, than the previous source-critics\textsuperscript{236}. Thus, the connection does not rest upon an outward testimony (Papias’), but on the fact that literary counter-arguments to reject this relation are not fully probative.

(3) 1Cor. 15:3 stands out as prominent example of kerygmatic summary: παρέδωκα γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐν πρώτοις, ὁ καὶ παρέλαβον, ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς. There is no need to claim the antiquity of this statement on the basis of intertextual connection, just because for Paul, it is part of a ‘παράδοσις’ (15:13a)\textsuperscript{237}.

\textsuperscript{233} Cf. DODD, The Apostolic Preaching and Its Developments, 44; a positive appraisal is provided by the allowance granted by Bauckham to this theory: ‘Dodd’s original contribution was to argue that Mark compiled his Gospel around an outline of the story of Jesus, which was an expanded version of the kind of kerygmatic summary that appears in the speeches of Acts’ (BAUCKHAM, “Kerygmatic Summaries in the Speeches of Acts”, 209).

\textsuperscript{234} HENGEL, The Atonement, 54. Also, Cullmann is convinced of an extant line of tradition connecting Peter and the Gospel of Mark, somewhat noticeable in the realm of a common ‘paidology’, cf. CULLMANN, The Christology of the New Testament, 73.

\textsuperscript{235} This ironical note goes straight to the point: ‘We can hardly doubt that Peter had a special theological authority within the first generation of earliest Christian history, and also in the Pauline missionary communities, even if today people sometimes talk about earliest Christianity as though Peter had never existed […] the Petrine kerygma, too, must have known and shared as its central content the atoning death of Jesus’ (HENGEL, The Atonement, 55). Likewise, Cullmann: ‘Are we not perhaps unjust to Peter when we place him in the shadow of Paul?’ (CULLMANN, The Christology of the New Testament, 74).


\textsuperscript{237} Cf. HENGEL, The Atonement, 37. This open declaration by Paul, that his formula has been handed over, is in stark contrast with the Hooker’s appraisal. She considers that the association between Jesus’ death and forgiveness is a projection of Paul’s own theology: ‘Association made between the
Given that the foundation of the Corinthian community may go back to 49 A. D., it would imply that by this early date, the formula was already appreciated as traditional. Astonishing, of course, since it means that this ‘παράδοσις’ belonged to the earliest community, just as the ‘paidology’ of Acts 3:13 does. Now then, where is this tradition pointing to? Obviously, to common exegetical concerns in the same setting in which the earlier source used by Luke in Acts 2-3-7 was handed down.

Finally, the assertion κατά τάς γραφάς pushes us into a riddle. Seemingly, the survey of ch. 3.1 sheds a daunting outcome. In which place of the Scripture are we told about a ‘dying Messiah’? Farmer puts the problem in these terms: ‘Nowhere else in the life and faith of Israel outside of Isaiah 53 do we find a reference to a savior figure who gives his life in a redemptive act that benefits the many’. Other interesting passages where Paul alludes to Isa. 53:6, 11 are Rom. 4:25 (‘[Jesus] delivered up on account of our trespasses and raised up for our justification’) and Rom. 5:19. In the latter, the Servant’s task, to make ‘the many’ righteous (cf. Isa. 53:5, 6, 8b, 10b, 11b, 12b) is applied to Christ. Other note worth references are Phil. 2:7 and Rom. 5:12. The atoning value of suffering is unmistakably visible there.

All in all, 1 Cor. 15:3 may be labeled as the ‘oldest Christian creed’ and it is not off-base to consider it a proper vestige of the traditional ‘paidology’. Therefore, ‘Paul is not the creator of the doctrine of the atoning death of Christ’, pace Hooker’s approach. In these passages, although Paul builds up his Christology with his own words, there is strong evidence that the idea behind them is to be related with a corpus of handed down traditions.

(4) In Hebrews 9:28 occurs a statement with which we are already acquainted: ὁ Χριστὸς ἀπας προσενεχθεὶς εἰς τὸ πολλῶν ἀνενεγκείν ἁμαρτίας (‘Christ, having been offered once to bear the sins of many’). It resembles Isa. 53:12b conflated with Isa. 53:4. In Johannine writings, rich literary connections are also playing a key role. The turning point of the narrative in the Gospel (Joh. 12:38) is built on Isa. 53:1 (verbatim quotation). Moreover, the recurring verbs δοξάζω (Joh. 12:23, 28 x3) and ὑψώω (Joh. 12:32, 12:24), in the context of Johannine theology, may rest upon Isa. 52:13. An alike exegetical maneuver in Rom. 10:16 confirms that the Johannine allusions have a traditional character. Other interesting references are the presentation of Jesus as ἠλασμός περὶ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (‘expiation for our sins’, 1 Joh. 2:2; 4:10). It is plausibly a reminder of Isa. 53:10.

dead and the forgiveness of sins was due to the particular significance which Paul himself attached to the event of the Passion; and forwards: ‘The association which is made here between Christ’s death and the forgiveness of sins is not found in the accounts of the kerygma in Acts’ (HOOKER, Jesus and the Servant, 119).

238 Brown defers the date up to 50-51, cf. R. E. BROWN, An Introduction to the New Testament (New York 1997) 512; but few scholars consider this date of Paul’s departure after having spent a year and a half there, cf. G. D. FEE, The First Epistle to the Corinthians (NICNT; Grand Rapids, MI 1987) 4.


240 For a detailed study of these intertextual connections, Cf. EVANS, “Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews and John”, 160-161.

All the connections noted above claim for an *overriding and widespread tradition that antedates any other text of the NT*. Part of this tradition belongs to the so-called ‘Petrine materials’, which would encompass Peter’s speeches in Acts, plus Acts 7, the hymn of 1Pe. 2 and, in our view, it may be well behind certain sayings in Mark (‘the surrender formula’ of Mk. 10:45)\(^{242}\).

The following assertions bring out the conclusions prompted by the formulas just analyzed\(^{243}\): i) As far as these formulas stress the core message that the early church drew from Isa. 53, they help us to appreciate the function that this ‘paidology’ accomplishes in Peter’s 2\(^{nd}\) speech. ii) The linkage of the precedent formulas with Isa. 53 is suggested by the word πολλοί in relationship with ὑπερ; by the reference to ‘κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς’ and the conceptual similarity\(^{244}\) with a figure who atones for the sins of ‘many’, nowhere else present in OT. iii) All these formulations appear in two of the context most resistant to eventual changes, namely, liturgical milieu (words of the Last supper in Mk. 14:24) and professions of faith (1Cor. 15:3). Therefore, their traditional character (‘παράδοσις’) guarantees their antiquity. iv) The wide range of variation in the use of the prepositions in the ‘surrender/dying formulas’ (ὑπερ + gen., περί + gen., διὰ + acc.) and wording in Greek are betraying the incidence of Hebrew. For example, the reflexive pronoun in the phrase δοθήναι τὴν ψυχήν (Mk. 10:45; Matt. 20:28; Joh. 10:11, 15, 17 [with τίθημι]; 1Joh. 3:16 [with τίθημι]) is roughly near to קם סך (cf. Isa. 53:10). The original Semitic flavor is echoing an early layer of traditional elements conveyed, in a first stage, in Aramaic. v) Finally, it cannot be backed up that the atoning doctrine constitutes a late theological development traceable in the last writings of the NT, i. e., 1 Peter or Hebrews; but it had no impact in the earliest traditions (for example, Peter’s speeches)\(^{245}\).

**A Genuine Jewish-Christian Christology Lying behind Acts 3**

Although there is little evidence for a Suffering Messiah imagery in Judaism, the NT, instead, counts 42 quotations or allusions on Isa. 53. An innovative exegesis seems to have been undertaken. Furthermore, this recurring exegesis on just one chapter is so

---

\(^{242}\) A timely inference in this regard is drawn by Bock: ‘There is no good reason to make the roots of this association late rather than in Jesus’s own usage. The tradition is too widely distributed across various early Christian sources to be late (Mark 10:45: 14:24; Luke 11:37; John 12:38; 1Pet. 2:22-24)’ (BOCK, *Acts*, 169). Certainly, Mudge’s insightful remark is valid. He urges to ‘shake off the quite unjustified critical assumption that everything may be traced to the early community and its intellectual difficulties’. Ironically, he adds ‘Jesus Himself may have had something to do’ (MUDGE, “The Servant Lord and His Servant People”, 118). Also, Jeremias strongly supports that Jesus saw his own fate as a Servant, cf. Cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 462-ff.

\(^{243}\) Part of this outcome can be found in cf. Ibidem, 420-422.

\(^{244}\) About the methodological use of the criteria of ‘verbal similarity’ and ‘conceptual similarity’, cf. FARMER, “Reflections on Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins”, 264.

\(^{245}\) ‘The primitive kerygma, as represented in Acts, makes no connection between the sufferings of Christ and the forgiveness of sins, although it speaks of both. This connection is found, however, in the New Testament epistles, whose writers clearly associated their experience of deliverance from sin with the Passion of their Lord’ (HOOKER, *Jesus and the Servant*, 138).
intensive that it is hardly explained on account of a ‘organic development’ of previous doctrines. Thus, a stark novelty transcends any other ‘theological conquest’ of the intertestamental period. Here we summarize the characteristics of this new approach.

(1) Isaiah was read in pre-NT time as a whole and in eschatological way. Single verses of Isaiah were not isolated from their context. Ancient exegesis was not so atomistic as oft-argued. For instance, at the beginning of Hellenistic period, allusions to Isaiah can be found in the prayer of Sirach 36 (Isa 60:22b; 47:8b; 47:10c; 41:26 48:16). The colophon in Sir. 63:22 is fashioned with a typical formula taken from Isaiah: γνώσοντα γάρ γιὰς οὰ κύριος θεὸς τῶν αἰῶνων (cf. Isa 40:28; 41:5, 9; 43:6; 45:22; 48:20; 49:6; 25:10; 62:11). So that, Hengel concludes: ‘as early as the beginning of the second century B. C. E., that is, still in the pre-Maccabean period, people were applying Isaiah’s whole work to the eschatological future'. A further argument is provided by the translation of Isaiah 63:22 is fashioned with a typical formula taken from Isaiah: γνώσοντα πάντες οὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὰ κύριος θεὸς τῶν αἰῶνων (cf. Isa 40:28; 41:5, 9; 43:6; 45:22; 48:20; 49:6; 25:10; 62:11). So that, Hengel concludes: ‘as early as the beginning of the second century B. C. E., that is, still in the pre-Maccabean period, people were applying Isaiah’s whole work to the eschatological future’. A further argument is provided by the translation of Isaiah 63:22 is fashioned with a typical formula taken from Isaiah: γνώσοντα πάντες οὰ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς οὰ κύριος θεὸς τῶν αἰῶνων (cf. Isa 40:28; 41:5, 9; 43:6; 45:22; 48:20; 49:6; 25:10; 62:11). So that, Hengel concludes: ‘as early as the beginning of the second century B. C. E., that is, still in the pre-Maccabean period, people were applying Isaiah’s whole work to the eschatological future'.

Interestingly, it coincides with the governing concept of Isaiah’s pesharim (4Q161) whereby Qumran community was aware of living in the ‘last days’ (יוֹםָי אָדָר). Other items from Qumran exegesis on Isaiah shows us that this book was read, before the NT takes shape, as an extant unity. H. Beers has convincingly proved that Deutero-Isaiah’s chapters shaped the Qumran’s ideology. The foundational document that displays the sect’s identity was the Community Rule. Isa. 40:3 is one, out of three biblical text, quoted there (1QS 8:12-16). The members of Qumran envisioned their own task as though they were paving in the desert the way of the Lord. Luke pikes up a similar motif when presenting the ministry of John the Baptist (Lk. 3:4). Therefore, the Servant allusions in Community Rule find their proper context in this universal restoration predicted by Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 40-55) which is also called ‘new exodus’. The ‘servant’ plays a crucial role as leader and agent of this restoration. Likewise, the Damascus Covenant, once again, quotes ‘consoling texts’ from Deutero-Isaiah (4Q176 and 4Q434 1:9). By this means, the eschatological transformation of Israel is being applied to themselves. Thus, ‘DSS claim at various points to fulfill the Isaianic New Exodus promises’, and, what is more important ‘Luke-Acts makes similar use of the New Exodus motif’. Since Servant’ passages are not separated chronologically from the composition of Isa. 40-55, they should be read accordingly, cf. R. E. Clements, “Isaiah 53 and the Restoration of Israel”, Jesus and the Suffering Servant. Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins (ed. W. H. Bellinger – W. R. Farmer) (Harrisburg, PN 1998) 40.

Hengel – Baley, “The Effective History of Isaiah 53 in Pre-Christian Period”, 84. More examples of 1st century literature follow this tendency. We have already seen the book of Enoch. It has no reluctance of bringing together titles as ‘light to the nations’ (Isa. 42:6), ‘hidden’ Messiah (Isa. 49:2), ‘Elect One’ (Isa. 52:6) or ‘Righteous One’ (Isa. 53:11). Even the reaction of people when they see the ‘Son of Man’ is the same that Isa. 52:14-15 describes. Consequently, many themes spread out in the entire book of Isaiah are picked up and aligned.


Ibidem, 63. In further occurrences it is possible to demonstrate as well how this New Exodus is accomplished. If the Servant is the leader of this restoration, for the time being Qumran community assumes the servant’s role (1QS 5:6, 8:7-5). In fact, the community must ‘atone for all those in Aaron...
If Qumran, a 1st century literary reference regarding the exegesis of Isa. 53, is opening its outlook to a whole consideration of the Servant as an agent of the ‘new exodus’, we would risk so much if we postulate an atomistic exegesis on Isa. 53 in the case of the early Christian communities, precisely those which produced text as Acts 3:12-26. Certainly, the concept of ‘new exodus’ does not appear within NT, but that category does not mean more than the *eschatological salvation event par excellence*\(^ {250}\). It will consist in the revelation of God’s glory to all the nations through the ministry of his Servant. Now, the NT is not alien to this concept of ‘eschatological salvation’, but deeply imbued with it. Again, the study of Bauckham makes the case for this holistic view:

‘What has not been recognized sufficiently is that, behind many of the New Testament texts, lies an integrated early Christian reading of these chapters [Isa. 40-55] as a connected whole. Allusions to the narrative of the Suffering Servant in chapter 53, for example, should not be read as though early Christian use of this one chapter alone can explain them, nor only in connection with the other servant passages in Deutero-Isaiah, but as integral to a reading of Isaiah 40-55 as a prophecy of the new exodus with leads to the salvation of the nations’\(^ {251}\).

Intertestamental sources aside, it is of paramount importance to grasp the unity of all these chapters from lexical sources (Isa. 40-55). Let us cast a last argument. The term παῖς θεοῦ (rendering וֹתֵד הַדָּוִד) only occurs 19 times in the entire work of Isaiah. Now, all these occurrences appear from chapter 41 up to 53 (41:8, 9; 42:1, 19 x2; 43:10; 44:1, 2, 21 x2, 26; 45:4; 48:20 [δοῦλος]; 49:3, 5 [δοῦλος] 6; 50:10; 52:13; 53:11 [δοῦλος])\(^ {252}\). It is surprising how all this survey does not overstep the limits of what modern scholarship has come to call ‘Deutero-Isaiah’. Jeremias raised awareness of this point by remembering the modern character of the label ‘Servant Songs’. Therefore, he prompted the scholars not to limit the study to chapter 53\(^ {253}\). And evidences of early Jewish interpretations on Isa. 53 have proved him to be right.

The examples multiply. The Messianic interpretation in Targum, read-back to the 1st century, discloses the same pattern. The role the Messiah accomplishes is wider than

---

\(^{250}\) ‘Isaiah’s depiction of eschatological salvation shows particular affinity with Luke’s eschatological and Christological presentations’ (Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts*, 334). For example, Jesus is David’s heir (Lk. 1:27, 32-33; cf. Isa. 7:14; 9:1-7; 11:1-10). He also is the ‘Anointed One’ who brings consolation – Deutero-Isaianic motif – to his people (Lk. 1:69-70,78-79; 2:4, 11:25-26, 30-32, 38; cf. Isa. 40:1; 42:6; 49:6; 52:9-10). As we have said, the public ministry of Jesus is preceded by what in Isaiah is the announcement of an eschatological salvation in a context of the new exodus (Lk. 3:4-5; Isa. 40:3-5). Finally, Jesus’ programmatic speech at Nazareth takes up an unforgettable passage of Isaiah (Lk. 4:17; cf. Isa. 61:1).


\(^{252}\) Cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 348-349.

suspected. ‘The messianic vindication which is at the heart of the meturgeman’s theology is also the animating hope of the Targum as a whole’\textsuperscript{254}. His task, which embraces ‘an astonishing range of activity’ is the restoration of Israel. The ‘Servant’ who will be identified in Isaiah with the Messiah (Isa. 42:1) is already presented in Isa. 16:5 seated on the throne of David. Interesting enough is that he embodies a liturgical dimension as well. Even if the Qumran community had championed the view of a priestly Messiah, the chief aim that the Messiah is expected to accomplish for Targum is the restoration of the Temple (53:5a). The Shekinah had departed from the sanctuary because of Israel’s guilt, but now it will return (6:3). The temple is not regarded in his material aspect. Instead, its eschatological dimension and renewal is claimed. Thus, the ‘Messianic perspective’ permeates as a whole the Targum of Isaiah and the ‘heir of David’ of Isa. 11 is not different from the ‘servant’ of Isa. 53.

So far, we have dealt with the context of the title παὰς θεοῦ (Isa. 40-55). Now, a word about its co-text (Isa. 52-53). A brilliant contribution by Evans, Wright and Betz deserves a careful observation\textsuperscript{255}. Evans makes the case for the inclusion of Isaiah 52:7-12 as introductory formula to the hymn of Isa. 53. The data support the claim that both 1QIsa\textsuperscript{a} col. 43 and MT (Codex Leningrad) add a marker sing with a blank space after Isa. 52:6; it is as though a section had finished. Early Christian exegesis corroborates this perception because Peter again (!) echoes Isa 52:7 in Acts 10:36, 43. In this speech pronounced in Cornelio’s home, Peter delivers the message εὐαγγελίζομεν ἢρην διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (‘preaching [good news] of peace by Jesus Christ’, Acts 10:36). Thus, an unifying reading of Isa. 52 and 53 is at work in the 1\textsuperscript{st} century A. D. because Peter is harking back to Isa. 52:7 as the introduction of the so-called 4\textsuperscript{th} Servant’s Song (Isa. 53). If anyone is not yet convinced, the Targum of Isaiah modifies Isa. 53:1 by inserting the Aramaic paraphrase ‘this, our good news’ (לִבְסוֹרְתַנָא), just to bridge the verse with the ‘good news’ mentioned earlier in Isa. 52:7\textsuperscript{256}. In all likelihood, also the Targum is embracing chapter 53 with the previous section, which begins in Isa. 52:7.

Perhaps, the foregoing remarks may be regarded as mere speculation. Has it anything to do with our text? Surprisingly, a lot of implications spring up. If the ‘good new’ (εὐαγγέλιον) of Isa. 52:7 summarizes all the work of Christ, it entails that N. Wright is right in postulating that the Greek title of this new section regards the Passion of Isa. 53 as the center of Jesus’ messianic endeavor. Servant’s Passion would become the core of the Gospel announced at the top of the section (Isa. 52:7). Christ’s chief purpose was to spread the εὐαγγέλιον, whose content was understood in 1\textsuperscript{st} century to be the Servant’s Passion set out along Isa. 53:1.

In sum, studies on textual criticism (1QIsa\textsuperscript{a}), Peter’s exegesis in Acts 10:36 and the Aramaic reading of the text confirm this linkage. Accordingly, Jesus’ atoning death comes to the fore and allowance for interpreting Christ’s ministry under diverse categories must be reconsidered. ‘In recent times, attempts have been made to see the

\textsuperscript{254} CHILTON, The Aramaic Bible. XI. The Isaiah Targum, xviii.


\textsuperscript{256} Cf. EVANS, “Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews and John”, 148.
The Value of Christ’s Sufferings as ‘Servant of God’ in Acts 3:11-26

death of Jesus not so much in traditional terms, as that of the suffering messianic servant of God; instead the widespread theme of the “righteous sufferer” has been used to interpret the passion of Jesus’ death not so much in traditional terms, as that of the suffering messianic servant of God; instead the widespread theme of the “righteous sufferer” has been used to interpret the passion of Jesus.

In our opinion, these categories turn to be inadequate for understanding Jesus’ passion because references to the 4th Servant Song in Acts 3:13, 26 must not be read out of their co-text (Isa. 53) and context (Isa. 40-55). Considering the instances of contemporary exegesis by that time Jesus it not a prophet who suffers the fate of a martyr. Thus, it is impossible to endorse Hooker’s hypothesis which does not bridge the use of the title παῖς θεοῦ with its immediate co-text, i. e. the plain atoning message conveyed by Isa. 53:10-11. Opposing arguments fail because, based on this data, the claim that Peter-Luke might have taken the title but not the ideas conveyed by it does not seem to be very credible.

(2) A second new feature of early Christian exegesis helps us to get full understanding of Acts 3. The collective interpretations of Isa. 53, widespread in Judaism (Isa. 53 in LXX; Dan. 11:33-35; Wis. 2:10-5:23), are narrowed down and finally embodied in a single individual: Jesus. In parallel, the atoning value of the martyrdom is applied not just to the martyr himself (Dan. 3:40; 2Mac. 7:37a; 4Macc. 6:28-29), but to ‘the many’, giving birth to a Suffering Messiah who atones for the sins of many. The innovative point is the merging of both concepts. On one hand, beyond the liturgical sacrifices stipulated by the Law, Judaism had actually arrived at a concept of restricted atoning suffering embodied by the martyrs. On the other, some messianic interpretations had been given to Isa. 53, but softening and, in some instances twisting, the rawest verses. Thus, two unconnected traditions were walking side by side. But the concept of a suffering Messiah who atones for the sins of many was not envisioned.

The announcement of Peter in Acts 3:13-26, even if exploiting a rich Jewish tradition, exceeded by far the common expectations among his audience.

(3) Early Christian exegesis, in essentials, is not an academic discipline. In other words, theological achievements were not an outcome yielded by aseptic intellectual reflections. On account of many liturgical witnesses, we may ascertain the cultic environment in which the title παῖς was used and conveyed. ‘The likelihood is that in Christian liturgical contexts, especially when under the influence of Jewish berakot,

---

257 HENGEL, The Atonement, 41.

258 The problem is that many scholars forget a fairly important point: we are not dealing with the suffering of a righteous one, but with the suffering of the Messiah; ‘the Messiah alone is the righteous and sinless one par excellence. His suffering therefore has irreplaceable and unique significance’ (Ibidem [Italics are mine]). This is the key for a true improvement in biblical exegesis.

259 Let us note how far this conception is from the widespread expectation of an earthly restoration of Davidic throne (politic messianism), whose plainest literary embodiment is the Psalms of Solomon. ‘There is more substance to the ideas concerning the Messiah in the Psalms of Solomon than in any other extant Jewish writing’ (WRIGHT, “Psalms of Solomon. A New Translation and Introduction”, 643). For Ps. Sol. 17, the Messiah is son of David, not a supernatural being. His task aims to gather all the Jews of the diaspora and to drive out the gentiles from Jerusalem. It is true that the pre-Christian work Testament of Benjamin (§3:8) sets out the idea of a Messiah who atone for many, but ‘this idea is not typical of the main stream of contemporary messianism. One can at best find faint traces of a suffering Messiah in Judaism’ (CULLMANN, The Christology of the New Testament, 55).
“thy Servant Jesus” was a common usage. Every time the term παῖς is applied to David in the NT, it occurs in prayers, either in Benedictus (Lk. 1:69) or in the community’s thanksgiving after the liberation of the Apostles (Acts 4:25). Jeremias too thought of the expression ‘David, your servant (παῖς)’ as a prayer formulation of late Judaism taken up by Christians. Later references in early patristic literature shows that the formula only survived as a liturgic one (Acts 4:27 [David], 30; Didache 9:2 [David] 3; 10:2, 3; 10:7 [only in Coptic version]; I Clement 59:2, 3, 4; Mart. Poly. 14:1, 3; 20:2; Barnabas 6:1; 9:2). Most of these examples reproduce the colophon ‘διὰ Ἱησοῦ τοῦ παῖδος σου’, following the old Palestinian parallel ‘διὰ Δαυίδ τοῦ παιδός σου’ (Acts 4:25). This data add weight to the thesis that ‘the designation of Jesus as Servant (of God) was alive in Palestinian Christianism’.

Nevertheless, the use of παῖς did not last longer. Short after the 100 A. D. the term παῖν started to be translated by δοῦλος. For example, Aquila and Theodotion recurrently resort to this designation. The reason behind this change may rest on the reluctance to the double meaning of παῖς, i. e. ‘servant’ or ‘son’. In fact, some precedents for an understanding of παῖς in terms of sonship had already appeared in Wis. 2:13. It is logic that early rabbinic movement might have regarded it as theologically risky. Curiously, alike procedure is noticeable in Apostolic Fathers because the title παῖς applied to Jesus was no longer held as customary in Christian liturgy. It was soon forced into the background. Perhaps, further generations of Christians, not overly acquainted with Jewish-Christian background came to consider this category as meaningless compared with more straightforward concepts as ‘Lord’ of ‘Son of God’. Insofar as παῖς survives only in this early layer of traditional materials preserved by Luke in Peter’s speeches, the NT itself is witness of this progressively vanishing.

(4) A final feature of the Christian exegesis is that the ‘servant’ category is also applied not just to Jesus, but to his disciples. That happens in a double way. Firstly, by applying the title itself to them (2Cor. 4:5); secondly, by presenting Christians entering into Jesus’ sufferings. Focusing on Acts, in an outstanding article, Moessner

---

260 MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 170. Classic scholarship, right after the studies of Harnack (cf. A. HARNACK, Die Belzeichnung Jesu als ‘Knecht Gottes’ und ihre Geschichte in der alten Kirche, SAB 28 [1926]) was keen on acknowledging ‘the liturgical character of the expression’ (CADBURY, “The Titles of Jesus in Acts”, 365). Choosing this direction, we depart from a line of scholarship that rather follows Burkitt’s theory. According to it, the origins of the ‘paidology’ are to be sought just in the translations techniques of LXX, whereby this term would come into Christology through Hellenistic Judaism. We have contended long enough about the unconvinving sharp distinction between Hellenistic and Palestine Judaism. This marked delimitation was a common place for exegetes during the first half of 20th century, but nowadays it seems to be dated and erroneous.

261 Cf. JEREMIAS, ‘παῖς θεοῦ’, 394.

262 Ibidem, 403.


264 ‘By the use of such terms, the messianic actions of Jesus are carried over dynamically into the life of the Church’ (MUDGE, “The Servant Lord and His Servant People”, 123).

265 ‘Acts, by identifying the Christ with the Suffering Servant, paves the way for Paul’s doctrine of the Church and the Christians entering not only into Christ’s glory but also into His sufferings (Rom. 8:17; Gal. 2:19-20; Phil. 3:10, Col. 1:24)” (J. E. MÉNARD, “Pais Theou as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts”, CBQ 19 [1957] 91).
The Value of Christ’s Sufferings as ‘Servant of God’ in Acts 3:11-26

compares the striking parallels between Peter, Stephen and Paul. They all ‘must suffer rejection like their Messiah, because that is the very manner in which the fulfillment of the messianic history takes place within the promised plan of God’ 266. By such a device, the Christological prospective is spread over the historical life of the Church (Acts 5:4; 9:15; 14:22).

The former points spotlight how early Christianism triggered an exegetical process with no precedent in pre-Christian times. Its newness is rooted not in the exegetical methods at stake, which we can surmise to be the same that contemporary Judaism used. Instead, the key element is Jesus’ Passover, now understood as the ‘pivotal point of Heilsgeschichte’ 267. We are not underrating the achievements of intertestamental literature, but the more one peruses and surveys its basic suppositions, the more one realizes how far is from the appliances that Peter does in his 2nd speech. In the long run, only an historical event constitutes the kernel of the kerygmatic proclamation (Acts 3:13-15). It is precisely this unique event the one which spreads its light back and forwards opening the meaning of the Scriptures. The wide range of quotations, allusions and echoes in Acts 3:12-26 is the extant proof that Peter has actually become a ‘text-breaker’ 268 on account of this unique event, the death and resurrection of Christ.

Chapter 4: ‘Christ must suffer’

Soteriological Value of Servant’s Suffering in ‘Petrine Materials’

The message conveyed by the so-called ‘paidology’, on account of the restrictions imposed by the method itself, is to be analyzed according to the two redactional layers previously detected: ‘Petrine material’ and Lucan reworking. In the main, the theology behind both levels is closely related. In other words, Luke is respectful not just to the phrasing of the old-fashioned style of his sources, but also regarding the theological overtones highlighted by Jewish Christian materials (cf. ch. 1.3).

Isa. 53:8-12 speaks out of the redemptive dimension of Servant Sufferings, but to what extent was this motif projected on Jesus’s own surrendering according to Acts? For many scholars, this connection would be found only in later writings: ‘There is no evidence that Jesus himself connected his death in particular with the forgiveness of sins. Although forgiveness is part of the gospel message – it is expressed in the whole ministry of Christ – it is only later, in the writings of Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in I Peter, that the association with his sufferings is made’269. It would be suitable to summarize the main arguments usually displayed to deny such a linkage in the case of Acts 3:12-26.

(1) The association between forgiveness of sins and the Passion of Christ is rightly interpreted as a Pauline theological development (1Cor. 15:3) and not a primitive tradition of a shared primitive kerygma (Acts 3)270. The death of Christ

269 HOOKER, Jesus and the Servant, 153. For a good summary of the chief points against the thesis we contend, see JONES, “The Title ‘Servant’ in Luke-Acts”, 148-165. This statement reproduces almost verbatim the conclusions drawn by Hooker: ‘We conclude that Jesus never explicitly referred to Deutero-Isaiah and that the Servant Songs became popular as a proof text only rather late in the church’s history’ (Ibidem, 153).
270 Also J. Dunn and L. Hurtado endorse a similar hypothesis: ‘This allusion to the famous Servant song of Is 52:13-53,12 is probably very early since it expresses only a theology of suffering and vindication (3.13-15), rather like that of the righteous παϊς (Wisd. 2:13) of Wisd. 2:12-20 and 5:1-5. Whereas other allusions to Is 53 in connection with Jesus’ suffering, while still early, use it to express a theology of atonement (cf. Mark 10:45; Rom. 4:24-25; 1Peter 2:22-25)’ (DUNN, The Acts of the...
interpreted as a sacrifice ‘for our sins’ would be virtually absent from the first developments of the dogma.

(2) Even if the NT quotes extensively from Isaiah 53, it never takes up the two clearest verses (Isa. 53: 10-11) for backing up the doctrine of the atonement\(^{271}\). In Acts 8, in order to avoid any atoning significance of Christ’s death, Luke would pointedly have cut off the quotation at the right point whereby he gets rid of Isa. 53: 10-11, an unmistakable support for soteriology in terms of vicarious suffering.

(3) The forgiveness of sins, in Acts 3: 19, 26, would be rather associated with the *preaching* of the kerygma itself\(^{272}\), not with an atoning efficacy of Christ’s sufferings as it would be suspected by the mention of παῖς θεοῦ in a titular way (3:13, 26) or by the brief summary of Passover events (3:13-15).

(4) The intended inner dynamic of Isa. 53 is just the pattern of humiliation-exaltation. Therefore, despite the reminiscence of Isa. 53, ‘the concept παῖς does not imply atonement through suffering, but expresses Luke’s exaltation Christology: it is an honorific title from a liturgical setting: *Did.* 9.2-3; *1Clem.* 59. 2-4; *Barn.* 6.1; 9.2; *Mart.* Pol. 14. 1; 20.2\(^{273}\). Likewise, Hooker: ‘The only ideas which are adopted from Isa. 52-53 are those of “delivering up” and of exaltation; no use is made of the two most distinctive characteristics of the third and fourth Songs, the nature of the Servant’s sufferings, and their atoning value’\(^{274}\).

(5) Peter backs up the events deployed in the kerygma (Acts 3:13-15) with what seems to be only a general reference to the Scriptures: ‘the mouth of all the prophets’ (Acts 3:18, 24), whereby the whole course of the OT is suggested\(^{275}\).

(6) Finally, the concept of παῖς θεοῦ would fit better in the setting of exegetical developments steaming from some ‘Davidic psalms’. The lavish intertextual connections with them along Peter’s speeches would confirm this hypothesis. Since we have already contended at length with this theory and it has been assessed in affirmative terms, we refer to ch. 2.3. Yet, it is not worthless to recall that no allusion is done in Acts 3:12-26 to any psalm, except to an uncertain echo of the apocryphal *Ps. Sol.* 15:15 in Acts 3:25.

---


\(^{272}\) ‘While the forgiveness of sins was proclaimed as part of the kerygma from the very beginning, it is not suggested that this forgiveness was dependent upon Christ’s death; rather it is announced as a general consequence of the whole kerygma and of repentance’ (HOOKER, *Jesus and the Servant*, 110).


\(^{274}\) *HOOKER, Jesus and the Servant*, 110.

\(^{275}\) Cf. *Ibidem*, 112.
The next counter arguments focus on the main exegetical points that Peter’s 2nd speech provides in order to support a connection of ‘paidology’ and soteriology understood in terms of Isa. 53. A fruitful result for our reflections depends, in few cases, on a textual interplay with other Peter’s speeches in Acts 2 (Pentecost); 5 (trial before the Sanhedrin) and 10 (missionary speech in Cornelio’s home).

(1) \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\) in Acts 3:13-26 is used as a title. The following remark by Cullmann is of paramount importance: ‘One gains the clear impression also in the next chapter (4.27, 30) that \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\) is used almost as a terminus technicus which has a tendency to become a proper name – as did happen in the case of “Christ” –. This confirms the existence of a very old Christology on the basis of which Jesus was called the ‘\(\epsilon\beta\epsilon\omicron\) Yahu\(w\)heh. This Christology later disappears, but it must extend back to the very earliest period of the Christian faith, since the author of Acts preserved its traces precisely in the first part of his book’\(^{276}\). To posit the titular use of \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omicron\) entails to outstrip the narrow limits of the most common intertextual figures, i. e., quotation, allusion and echo. In other words, a title has the power to signify a whole reality much more than a quotation does. A citation brings to the reader just one verse or concept; whereas a title, has the ability to recall a richer field of hints, it works like a header under which a wider range of texts may be encompassed. In this case, Servant’s Songs would constitute the natural background which may be recalled by the titular use of \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\). This is further confirmed by the fact that in Acts 4:27, \(\pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\) is taken up after a quotation of Psalm 2. This psalm depicts an overwhelming scenario, where the nations gather to struggle against the Lord and his Messiah. Now, if nearby verses explicitly identify this Messiah as \(\epsilon\pi\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \\alpha\gamma\gamma\nu\omicron\ \pi\alpha\iota\delta\omicron\ \sigma\omicron\ \Iota\sigma\omicron\sigma\omicron\nu\) (Act 4:27), there is little doubt that the term is used in a titular sense\(^{277}\). The equation Jesus = Servant, repeatedly disputed by Hooker, seems to be true\(^{278}\).

(2) It has been proved how the 1st century exegesis put Isa. 52:7 as header of the entire 4th Servant’s Song\(^{279}\). Peter’s speech to Cornelius supposes this connection in 10:36. There, in v. 36a (\(\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\omicron\nu\epsilon\iota\rho\iota\eta\nu\)), the text harks back to Isa. 52:7a (\(\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\omicron\nu\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\omicron\eta\ \epsilon\iota\rho\iota\nu\eta\zeta\)) before displaying the main events of Jesus’ life, especially the Passover. Later on, in v. 43, after having announced the kerygma, Peter connects the soteriology, understood as ‘forgiveness of sins’ (\(\alpha\upsilon\rho\sigma\epsilontau\ \upsilon\mu\alpha\rho\tau\iota\omicron\nu\)), with the action of believing (\(\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\)) in Jesus. Now, Isa. 52:7 was the original beginning of Servant’s passage, in which the Servant’s sufferings described in Isa. 53 are set under the category of ‘good news’, or the Greek \(\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\iota\nu\). So that, the forgiveness of sins would be well understood as a consequence of believing (\(\pi\sigma\tau\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\) in 10:43) the announcement displayed in Isa. 53. If Peter alludes to Isa. 52:7 – the beginning of the 4th Servant’s Song – and requests from his audience ‘to believe’ the ‘good news’ displayed in this section, this good news is noting but the atoning suffering of Christ.


\(^{277}\) Cf. Hurtado, Lord Jesus Christ, 192. Even recognizing its titular status, Hurtado does not draw the consequences that this use might entail.

\(^{278}\) Cf. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant, 150-151.

\(^{279}\) Cf. Evans, “Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews and John”, 147-149; Wright, “The Servant and Jesus”, 290-293.
clearly depicted in Isa. 53. Even if Peter-Luke bear in mind the more softened text of the LXX, there in ten occasions the suffering of the servant is portrayed in a clear redemptive way. Consequently, Hooker is not right in stating that the kerygma as a whole would produce the forgiveness of sins in Acts’ theology without any attached value to the death of Christ. Thus, earliest Christian exegesis, mirrored in Acts 3:12-26 as much as in Peter’s speech to Cornelio in Acts 10, must be rightly interpreted in the unitary way it was assessed by Dodd in the 30s. Both texts shed light on each other and disclose a similar idea on the atoning effects of Jesus’ death.

(3) The case of Acts 8 has recurrently been thrown against an association between Jesus’ death and the atoning significance of it. Luke does not quote Isa. 53:10-11. He actually stops citing at this point. However, there is no wonder that the NT, particularly Luke in Acts 8, when resorting to Isa. 53, he prefers not to quote verses 10-11. Hebrew text is more ‘Christian friendly’, but the Greek version, with which the Evangelist is acquainted, is not so prone to underline the atoning meaning of Christ’s death. Unfortunately, it represents a flawed translation of MT in several instances. Only a shortsighted comparison between versions would wonder about Luke’s reluctance of quoting this text. According to LXX, the servant does not justify anybody in v. 10-11. As it is the case in Targum too, ‘LXX translators had a theological bias against an unjust death of a righteous Servant of the Lord’ and accordingly they softened or changed the text (ch. 3.1).

(4) The two literary genres within the Bible most reluctant to allow changes are the liturgical formulas and the creeds. It is a common place among exegetes to regard 1Cor. 15:3 as a creed. Arguments for Pauline innovation in linking Jesus’ death and grant of forgiveness are far from convincing. Frist of all because the ‘for the sins of many’ was already expressed clearly in Isa. 53. That interpretation would have been available to anyone who read Isaiah’s MT. Secondly, because St. Paul is handing over

---

280 Cf. EVANS, “Isaiah 53 in the Letters of Peter, Paul, Hebrews and John”, 156.
281 A brief reminder of those features of LXX on vv. 10-11: i) The Lord is not portrayed as cause of the Servant’s sufferings (v. 10a). God does not ‘makes him suffer’ (καθαρίσαι αὐτόν), but ‘cleans him’ (βούλεται καθαρίσαι αὐτόν). ii) The offering for sins is not accomplished by the Servant (ὁ σώζοντας σώζεται) but for the 2nd person plural, i.e., the sinners (δότε περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἡ ψυχή ὑμῶν, v. 10b). iii) The Servant does not justify ‘the many’, but he is in turn vindicated. So, in the MT, ‘the righteous one, my servant, will justify the many’ becomes ‘[the Lord] vindicates the righteous one who serves well the many’. Cf. SAAP, “The LXX, 1QIsa, and MT Versions of Isaiah 53”, 173-176; 181-182.
282 Ibidem, 184.
283 Reading the Mishnah, one realizes how 1st century liturgical practices could not stand even a minimal rephrasing (cf. Ber. 5:3). Barely a changed word, whether consciously or inadvertently, was enough to invalidate the prayer and prompt the public correction of the addresser. Thus, the time-honored adage lex orandi (liturgy), lex credendi (creed) discloses not an enduring pattern of Christian dogma, but an extant rule of any religious phenomenon as modern phenomenology suggests. In fact, current scholarship (L. Hurtado) has recently discovered how devotion to Jesus in early Church becomes a fitting venue to tackle the knotty matter of Jewish Christian beliefs.
284 Surprisingly, only vague suppositions are adduced as probative arguments in behalf of Paul’s newfangled association of forgiveness and Jesus’ atoning death: ‘Paul placed greater emphasis on Jesus’ atoning death to explain how sinful Gentiles could be accepted fully by God’ (HURTADO, Lord Jesus Christ, 186).
a ‘παράδοσις’ that, without the statement of ‘for the sins of many’, does not make sense at all (!). Otherwise, he would be saying that ‘Christ has died according to the Scriptures’ and nothing more. The exegetical effort undertaken by the early Church must have sought to make sense of Jesus’ death, it hardly would have been satisfied with tackling the Passover as merely forecasted without accounting for its meaning.

Thirdly, in ch. 3.2, Pauline creed has been successfully related with Mk. 10:45. Now, this text of Mark is, in turn, retaken during the Last Supper whereby the saying is inserted in an undeniable liturgical context (Mk 14:24 = Matt. 26:26-28). Moreover, 1Cor. 15:3 is closely related with other texts that Paul himself sets under the label of ‘παράδοσις’, 1Cor. 11:23-25. Not by chance, in them we are dealing with the liturgy of the Eucharist which, in the main, expresses the meaning of Christ’s gesture of giving up his life. Consequently, 1Cor. 15:3 is related with liturgical traditions and, thereby, it makes use of binding formulas. If 1Cor. 13 is close to the liturgical context of 1Cor. 11, much more so Acts 3:13, 26. There are good reasons to regard the παίς θεοῦ as stemming from a liturgical milieu (ch. 3.3) and not deferring it in time.

(5) Acts 3:18, 26 grants the forgiveness of sins to those who repent. The spatial skip from the kerygmatic proclamation (3:13-15) to forgiveness (3:18, 28) might make us to think of a likely disconnection between both items. In that case, the forgiveness should be a consequence of the hearing of the kerygma itself but Crist’s death and resurrection would not carry redemptive value. It is puzzling how such off-base conclusion can be drawn. Above all, v. 16 has been elaborated by Luke, and v. 19 lays out a vocabulary far from Luke’s customary style. It entails that in a kerygmatic proclamation, the offer of forgiveness (v. 19) would have followed closely the climatic peak of the historical display of events (Acts 3:13-15). The merciful concession of grace is, therefore, a logical consequence of the Passover events set out shortly before. Moreover, as though this connection were not so manifest, v. 18 turns back to the passion once again. Luke inserts in v. 18b the well-known παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτῷ. Now, the calling for repentance is subsequently introduced in the v. 19 by means of the causal nexus οὖν (‘therefore, consequently’), what seems to be a further confirmation of the Passion which, in main, prompts the conversion.

The second statement in v. 26b is placed after two actions expressed with a circumstantial participle (ἀναστήσας, ‘having raised’) and a punctiliar aorist (ὑπέστησας, ‘he sent’). Both doings are performed by God. Insofar as the first circumstantial participle can assume the value of any adverbial clause, we believe that in this case it stands for a temporal one: ‘God, after having raised his παίς, sent him to bless you’. We contend that the action of blessing is preceded by the climatic intervention of God in the Paschal mystery of Christ, intended by the mention of παίς in a titular way. The startling fact is that the blessing consists in the forgiveness of sins (τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἐκαστὸν ἀπὸ τῶν πονηρῶν ὑμῶν, v. 26b); but this forgiveness is presented as a consequence of the ‘sending’ of ‘his servant’. In turn, an overriding

---

285 This is the main critic that frequently has been arisen against source-criticism. The hypothetical reconstruction of anonym and oral traditions before a written-stage in many cases was associated to a minimalist presence of interpretative traditions attached to the message, as if only mere ‘non-exegetized’ news were passed down.
action triggers the process, the resurrection of Jesus presented as a παίς (ἀναστήσας ὁ θεὸς τὸν παίδα αὐτοῦ, v. 26a).

Now, why are we driven to think that the exaltation of the παίς in v. 26a is twined with the Passion-death events? In every kerygmatic proclamation preserved in Acts, the Cross is not envisioned as a single event which might stand on its own. Rather, it is always encompassed with a two-fold or, in some instances, three-fold unique action: Passion-Resurrection-Exaltation. As long as the third element is not expressed for whatever reason, the climatic peak is set in the Resurrection, which logically cannot be isolated from Jesus’ rejection and death. Clear proof of this straightforward connection is provided by the same speech in vv. 13-15. Given that, claims for an unrelated presentation of Jesus’ death with the forgiveness of sins in early kerygmatic proclamations seem to be, at least, far from convincing.

(6) The thesis can be strengthened further by appealing to other texts by Peter that mirror Jewish Christian theology (Acts 2:38; 5:27-33; 10:43). In them, the offer of forgiveness of sins is granted through Jesus only on account of his death and resurrection. For instance, Peter and John will face a trial before the Council (Acts 5:27-33). This hardship will offer them a new occasion to address the chiefs of the people with a similar kerygmatic proclamation. Stunningly, the same pattern than in Acts 3: 19, 26 is at stake in Acts 5:30-31. Jesus’ ability to offer forgiveness is put in relationship with his Passover mystery. It is ‘because of his exaltation that the crucified Jesus is now ἀρχεγός and σωτήρ’ Once again, salvation is understood – as customary in Luke’s theology and Acts – as ‘forgiveness of sins’ (ἀφέσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Act 5:31b). Thus, three important points are inferred: i) Salvation is equivalent to forgiveness; ii) The means of salvation is the exaltation of the one who was ‘hanged on a tree’ (5:30); iii) Both assertions are linked in a causal inference, grammatically expressed by the articular infinitive in genitive, which stands for finality: ‘to grant repentance’ (δοῦναι μετάνοιαν, Act 5:31b). Again, the kerygma’s core, i. e. the passion and exaltation of Christ, is linked in a causal relationship with the forgiveness of sins. Thus, Peter’s speech in Acts 5 enhances the ideas already noted in Acts 3. All in all, it is a matter of fact that, beyond ‘Petrine materials’, also ‘Luke’s soteriology is based on Jesus’ exaltation, which with Jesus’ death, is wrapped up with the role of the Isaianic

286 About the tandem of crucifixion-exaltations in Luke, Cf. GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 11-12; Farmer too considers the importance of Isa. 53 for understanding not only the cross but the resurrection of Christ, cf. FARMER, “Reflections on Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins”, 276. The cross was not considered as distinctive motive on its own, but being part of the exaltation.

287 This is the argument of the article by Moessner in which every kerygmatic proclamation is reviewed. The history of Salvation can be understood as a plot. God has a plan (βουλή) whose center is Jesus’ death and resurrection. This necessity of accomplishment cannot be explained but associating it with soteriology. In the case of Acts 3, ‘what kind of God would “require” the merciless death of an innocent Jew by sadly “mistaken” Jews only to reveal that this rejection is in any case fundamentally superfluous to any consequences, except to the negative consequence that awaits Israel for its “ignorant” mistake?’ (MOESSNER, “The ‘Script’ of the Scriptures in Acts”, 220). Thus, the preordained plan has no other scope but the release of sins.

288 GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 8 (Italics are mine).

Servant’. 290 In fact, the exaltation of the Servant in both texts (ἐδόξασεν τὸν παίδα ἀντι Θεοῦν, 3:13; ὁ θεὸς ἄρχηγον καὶ σωτήρα ὑψωθεν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ, 5:31) is recalling again the ‘paidology’ of Isa. 52:13 (ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δόξασθε σφόδρα).

(7) The general allusion to ‘through the mouth of all the prophets’ (διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν, v. 18a) is afterwards reinforced by ‘all the prophets who spoke, from Samuel and those afterwards’ (καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφήται ἀπὸ Σαμωὴλ καὶ τῶν καθεξῆς, v. 24a). This blurred reference to the OT would rule out a more concrete allusion to Isa. 53. However, the object of the prediction in v. 18 is παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ. How many texts in OT do foreshadow a suffering Messiah (χριστός)? The inquiry of ch. 3.1 leaves a lot to be desired and only Isa. 53 can be posted in this regard. On the other hand, a rhetorical analysis can shed light on it. The two ‘πάντες’ (3:18, 24) are not far away from what a literary approach might call ‘hyperbole’ (rhetorical exaggeration). In addition, these verses coincide as well with the role that Peter is playing in Acts as ‘text-breaker’, hence a general reference to the Scripture seems to be convenient. Finally, Peter himself in Acts 10:43 parallels the phrasing and, once more, harks back to πάντες οἱ προφήται. Again, the reference is so imprecise that trying to pinpoint a specific quote is impossible. It sounds as though Peter was just engaged in underscoring how the Scriptures, taken as a whole, bear testimony of the entire ‘Christ-event’, rather than addressing Cornelius to a specific psalm or prophet. In sum, this overall reference to the Scripture cannot carry the weight that skeptical scholars pretend.

(8) Before bringing this paragraph to an end, one more remark. It is rhetorically worth noting the double location of the title, just at the outset (3:13) and at the end (3:26), bracketing out all the discourse. It could be understood as an intended rhetorical device in order to underscore the governing Christological category of the composition. As we have pointed out above, a title has a more powerful ability to parallel a whole context than a simple quotation or allusion. Long ago, discussions on the range of intended meaning of an allusion were started by Cadbury and Dodd. For the first one a quotation never recalls the surrounding co-text from which the note was taken just because the atomistic way in which Jewish exegesis was conducted.291 Conversely, Dodd regards allusions in a richer intertextual frame. Because the exegesis was not so atomistic as oft-stated, an allusion might recall a vast range of concepts or, in many instances, the nearby co-text.292 Lately, new exegetical approaches have stress the function of Deutero-Isaiah’s theology in the Gospel.293 The ‘new-exodus’, as eschatological event of salvation (cf. ch. 3.3) is at work within Luke-theology. Surprisingly, skeptical authors, even standing for this Isaiahic background (Isa. 40-55), deny that the title in Acts 3:13, 26 might evoke the atoning significance of the co-text of Isa. 53. In all likelihood, one cannot willingly endorse a reference to the salvation

290 GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 24.
293 It is puzzling how Hooker appreciates a holistic view of Deutero-Isaiah to take full advantage of what the image of the ‘Servant’ could mean, but suddenly she rules out the nearer co-text of ch. 53.
concept laid out in Deutero-Isaiah, but not to the atoning meaning present in the nearer co-text (Isa. 53) from which the title \( \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\; \theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\) is directly drawn.

From the foregoing, it cannot be ascertained that no connection ever existed in Acts 3 between Jesus’ atoning sufferings and the \( \pi\alpha\iota\varsigma\; \theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\). The kerygmatic announcement of the early church, masterfully put forward by Peter in Acts 3:12-26, is pursuing a soteriological aim: the release of sins. The speech is rhetorically split in two halves (vv. 12-16; 17-26), each one focuses on one of the two matters: Christology (vv. 12-16) and soteriology (vv.17-26). The calling to repentance is only given after a brief summary about the unique event of Jesus’ death–resurrection–exaltation. The entire earthly life of Jesus and his message come down to the events of his last week (vv. 13-15). Thus, if one would summarize Jesus’ mission, it would be enough to resort to the colophon of his life, namely, the Passover. Now then, how is the soteriology related with this unique event (death–resurrection–exaltation)? Astonishingly, two causal connections articulate the two halves of the speech (cf. ch. 1.4). The ‘Καὶ νῦν’ of v. 17a and the οὖν of v. 19a set in causal dependence both parts of the speech. In other words, one is urged to conversion ‘because of/on account of’ Jesus’ Passover. Absolutely meaningful is the causal conjunction καὶ νῦν, which in turn resembles the Hebrew הָעָתָה. It always occurs to introduce a statement which is logically connected by causal relationship with what precedes. Consequently, Jesus’s Passover, understood in terms of Isa. 53 would be, somewhat, at the base of the calling to conversion (soteriology). Neglecting such a binding does not help, in our opinion, to take full advantage of the message Peter is delivering. The proof that the Cross event was meaningful for this layer of materials taken up by Luke is the text’s rhetorical purpose, namely, the appeal to conversion. The Passover is everywhere bound to soteriology in the apostolic kerygma\textsuperscript{294}. They do not form two unrelated worlds and are to be maintained together.

**Soteriological Value of Servant’s Suffering in the Context of Lukan Theology**

From the outset, we bear in mind that Luke is not a ‘scissors and paste man’. This is the reason why redaction-criticism deals, in a second stage, with Lukan overtones in the speech. He has nuanced Acts 3:12-26 with his own theology: ‘Evangelists were not merely Sammler but individual theologians’\textsuperscript{295}. Their exegetical improvements can, therefore, be tracked and spotlighted: ‘Redaktionsgeschichte is the attempt to arrive at the third *Sitz im Leben*, i. e., it is the attempt to ascertain the unique theological purpose

\textsuperscript{294} This kerygma is always emphasizing ‘the scriptural “necessity” of the Messiah’s suffering as the God-ordained means by which Israel’s history of unrelenting sin is brought to a decisive “end” (τέλος) for the saving benefit of the whole world’ (MöESSNER, “The ‘Script’ of the Scriptures in Acts” 249).

\textsuperscript{295} STEIN, “What is Redaktionsgeschichte?”, 47.
or purposes, views, and emphases which the evangelists have imposed upon the materials available to them.\(^{296}\) We agreed in ch. 1 with Moule’s basic supposition about the respectful way in which Luke treats his sources, not just in the realm of literary faithfulness, but even regarding the ideology\(^{297}\). Consequently, even though a number of scholars consider that Luke excludes the ‘atonement theology’ from taking center stage in Gospel-Acts, the extant maintenance of παντὸς θεοῦ in Acts 3:13, 26 demonstrates that Luke does not depart from the theology of his sources, modelled in light of Isa. 53. Yet, this tradition now ‘receives definitive framework’\(^{298}\), namely, the overarching exegetical concerns of Luke-Acts. This wider context enriches and enhances the ideas already conveyed by the ancient layer.

Unfortunately, we are compelled to acknowledge, with L. Morris, that ‘it is true that forgiveness is not explicitly connected with the death of Jesus in this passage, but it is not possible to make sense out of Luke’s various statement on the matter apart from such connection’\(^{299}\). First and foremost, scholars must tackle Luke’s concept of soteriology\(^{300}\). Quite interesting is Morris’ approach, because the serious character of sin in Luke’s standpoint has been ‘utterly forsaken’. The requirement to repentance goes along with salvation understood as forgiveness. Every time that this offer is granted in Acts, the kerygmatic presentations of Jesus’ Passover precedes the offer (Acts 3:13-15; 5:30-32; 10:39-42). If so, it does not take a lot to recognize that ‘forgiveness depended upon Christ’s atoning work, and thus it is after the death and resurrection that it receives its fullest proclamation’\(^{301}\).

Secondly, Isa. 53 triggers a gripping dialogue between Philip and the Eunuch in Acts 8:26-40. As long as a full insight of the ‘paidology’ of Acts 3 is to be acquired, it is necessary to resort to Acts 8. In 8:35 it is said that Philip evangelizes him by an exegetical exposition of the Scriptures: ‘beginning from this Scripture he preached Jesus to him’ (ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης εὐθηνελίστατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν, 8:35). Parsons rightly points out, as intertextual echo, other passage of Luke in which Jesus himself plays the same role, Lk. 24:27: ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν. Is it possible to bring closer these texts? The quantity of textual-match (‘textual similarity’) is actually scanty. However, the action accomplished in both cases is the same (‘conceptual similarity’). Furthermore, the rhetorical function of those actions is akin and the recurrence of parallels between Luke-Acts are not unusual.

\(^{296}\) Ibidem, 53.

\(^{297}\) Cf. MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 168; also, Barret denies that Luke is putting upside down or covering up the theology conveyed in his sources. cf. BARRET, Acts, 202; a more explicit statement comes from Taylor: ‘Luke’s Christology is a Son-Servant Christology, but he does not impose this usage on his special source, which reflects a more primitive point of view. The evangelist left his sources as he found them, not modifying them by his distinctive teaching’ (TAYLOR, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 138).

\(^{298}\) Cf. MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 168; also, Barret denies that Luke is putting upside down or covering up the theology conveyed in his sources. cf. BARRET, Acts, 202; a more explicit statement comes from Taylor: ‘Luke’s Christology is a Son-Servant Christology, but he does not impose this usage on his special source, which reflects a more primitive point of view. The evangelist left his sources as he found them, not modifying them by his distinctive teaching’ (TAYLOR, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 138).

\(^{299}\) Cf. MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 168; also, Barret denies that Luke is putting upside down or covering up the theology conveyed in his sources. cf. BARRET, Acts, 202; a more explicit statement comes from Taylor: ‘Luke’s Christology is a Son-Servant Christology, but he does not impose this usage on his special source, which reflects a more primitive point of view. The evangelist left his sources as he found them, not modifying them by his distinctive teaching’ (TAYLOR, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 138).

\(^{300}\) STEIN, “What is Redaktionsgeschichte?”, 49.

\(^{301}\) Cf. MOULE, “The Christology of Acts”, 168; also, Barret denies that Luke is putting upside down or covering up the theology conveyed in his sources. cf. BARRET, Acts, 202; a more explicit statement comes from Taylor: ‘Luke’s Christology is a Son-Servant Christology, but he does not impose this usage on his special source, which reflects a more primitive point of view. The evangelist left his sources as he found them, not modifying them by his distinctive teaching’ (TAYLOR, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 138).

Besides, ‘the thematic coherence is likewise strong: Luke 24 is an amplification of the shorthand of Acts 8’\textsuperscript{303}. Yet, the striking point is that the content of both catechism is exactly the same: Jesus portrayed as suffering servant, plainly referred in a quotation of Isa. 53 in the case of Acts 8 and explicitly stated in Lk. 24:26: ὦθει ταῦτα ἐδει παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν καὶ εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ; (‘Was it not necessary for the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?’). Curiously, both παθεῖν and δόξα are the focal points of Peter’s kerygmatic address in Acts 3: 13-15, and even the Messiah’s Passion, too, appears in a Lukan addition in Acts 3:18 (παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν αὐτοῦ), whereby Acts 3 parallels Luke 24. The Apostles are portrayed in Acts 3 and 8 as passing down the same catechetical preaching they received from Jesus’ lips in Lk. 24. Luke’s crafted interpolations attempt to stress this connection. Hence, for interpreting the ‘paideia’ of Acts, it is mandatory to read again the last chapter of the Gospel.

Thirdly, the Passover (παθεῖν τὸν χριστόν, Lk. 24:26a) is arranged as a necessary step (ἐδει, Lk. 24:26a) according to the Scriptures (πάσαις ταῖς γραφαῖς, Lk. 24:27). How is it possible to void it of any meaning? The attempts of disjoining Passover and its atoning meaning are at pains when it comes to explaining this δεὶ and account for its function. Again, a little bit forward, in Lk. 24:44-47 a similar perception of the divine necessity of Christ’s sufferings is stressed. The parallels with Acts 3:12-26 are awesome and can be noted at several points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lk. 24:44b-48</th>
<th>Acts 3:12-26</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v. 44b: δεὶ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τά γεγραμμένα ἐν τῷ νόμῳ Μωϋσεως καὶ τοῖς προφήταις καὶ ψαλμοῖς περὶ ἐμου.</td>
<td>v. 18: ὦ δεὶ θεός, ἐποκατήγγειλεν διὰ στόματος πάντων τῶν προφητῶν παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, ἐπλήρωσεν οὕτως. v. 24: πάντες δεὶ ὁ προφήται + quotations from Gen.22:18; Es. 3:6; Lev. 23:29 and Deut 18:15, 18</td>
<td>- Verbs that have to do with the so-called ‘fulfilment language’ (δεὶ, πληροῦ, προσαγγέλω). - Reference to the Scriptures at large (τά γεγραμμένα, πάνων τῶν προφητῶν) or to the three parts, which stands for the whole body of writings as well (νόμῳ Μωϋσεως, προφήταις, ψαλμοῖς). In fact, Acts 3 contains cites from Torah, mentions to prophets and curiously no psalm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v. 46: καὶ ἔστεν αὐτοῖς ὅτι οὕτως γέγραπται παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν καὶ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.</td>
<td>v. 47a: καὶ κηρυχθῆναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὅνόματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν εἰς ἀφεσιν ἀμαρτιῶν</td>
<td>Appeal to conversion as consequence of the Passover event.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{303} Ibidem, 116.
This table highlights how Passover events have not happened by chance or are conveyed for their own sake. A settled purpose governs those events and the ensuing kerygmatic proclamation. Verse 47a runs thus: καὶ κηρυχθήναι ἐπὶ τῷ ὄνοματι αὐτοῦ μετάνοιαν (‘conversion’) εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν (‘forgiveness of sins’). Accordingly, ‘for Luke the divine necessity of Christ’s sufferings was both for the redemption of Israel (24:21) so that the Gentiles (ἐθνη, nations) might hear the good news of repentance and forgiveness of sins!’

Acts 3:19, 26b report the same purpose. Therefore, from the standpoint of the overall theology of Luke, going from the Gospel towards the Apostolic preaching in Acts 3, the atoning meaning of Jesus’ death, or whatever name we want to use for expressing this same effect, means nothing more but his soteriological value. The italics summarizes the key point, the equivalence of two concepts: soteriology and atonement. Establishing a breach between them would make us to miss the point, because Passover and its kerygmatic announcement are mean to clean the sins of many, that is to say, to bring salvation. In addition, the impressive force of these final verses of Luke’s Gospel rests upon δεῖ πληρωθῆναι πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα (Lk. 24:44). It is this necessity what must be accounted for. Moreover, because of the presence in Acts 3:18 of the same motive (προκατήγγειλεν, ἐπλήρωσεν), reworked by Luke through the addition of παθεῖν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτοῦ, both texts are disclosing an important feature of Luke’s point of view: the servant theology – understood as Jesus’ reference to the cross – embodies the nature and meaning of Jesus’ Messiaship.

A final remark must be done to protect the foregoing reasoning from an unstoppable counter-argument oft-cast: the Luke’s supposed undervaluation of Jesus’ atoning death in terms of explicit references. Beyond the structural connections just noted, unambiguous statements come down to Lk. 22:19-20 and Acts 20:28. How is it possible to respond? Above all, one should bear in mind that ‘Luke is not writing a treatise on soteriology but narrating the story of salvation [...] The emphasis falls on the fact that salvation has arrived in the person and work of Jesus rather than on the theological basis upon which Jesus saves’.

According to this remark, a few scholars have failed the prospective to approach to Lukan theology. Definitively, the meaning

---

305 Just to open the range of allusions to the surrounding text, the idea of the necessity of the Cross appears also in a Peter’s intervention closely related with our text and in a community prayer boosted by Peter as well: τοῦτον τῇ ὀρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνόσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδότον διὰ χειρὸς ἁνόμων προσπήξαντες ἄνειλατε (Acts 2:23); ποιήσαι δεσα ἡ χείρ σου καὶ ἡ βουλή σου προώρισεν γενέσθαι (Acts 4:28). More text that may be consulted are Acts 1:16; 17:3; 26:22; 28:23. They all reflect the ‘Christ-must-suffer’ pattern. Comments on them, cf. Morris, The Cross in the New Testament, 123.
Luke is attributing to the cross should be sought in the realm of narrative, not of the ‘carefully thought-out system of theology’ \(^{307}\). In other words, which is the climactic point of Lukán narrative in the Gospel? Much weight deserves the confession of the centurion at the cross: ο̣̣ ἄνθρωπος ο̣̣τ̣̣̣τος δίκαιος ἦν (Lk. 23:47). This assessment is not like any other acknowledgement in the Gospel, but a turning point \(^{308}\). The adjective δίκαιος is employed beyond its basic sense of ‘political innocence’ and acquires a messianic status \(^{309}\). Now, this titular use of δίκαιος is taken over in Acts 3:14, which associated with παῖς θεοῦ has parallel nowhere else except Isa. 53. Acts 3 is, therefore, turning back to the main point of the Gospel, Jesus’ death. Thus, the giving of forgiveness at the end of the speech (Acts 3:26) is again linked with the crucial moment of the Messiah’s ministry, his Passover.

Even those who argue for the Lukán portrayal of Jesus as a mere prophet must face the distinctiveness of the Messiah’s mission in Lk. 13:31-35. Absolutely, Jesus places himself under the category of prophet (‘for it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem’), but the verb τελεσθῆναι in v. 32 may indicate that beyond this, he ascribes to himself a special divine mission which consists in his death. The same verb in Lk. 12:50 is bound up with his redemptive death expressed in terms of ‘baptism’ (βάπτισμα δὲ ἔχω βαπτισθῆναι). These words entail that: i) Jesus’ death is not just ‘an epilogue’, but an indispensable part of his mission \(^{310}\); ii) his death, understood in Lk. 12:50 as ‘baptism’ is to be associated with the baptism granted by Peter in Acts 2:38 whose effect is nothing less that ‘forgiveness of sins’! (αὐτοθέτητο ἐκαστὸς ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ ὄνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ εἰς ἀφεσίν τῶν ἁμαρτίων ὑμῶν) \(^{311}\). Hence, Jesus’ death and his soteriological effects conferred in Baptism and kerygmatic preaching seem to be more bound together than suspected at first sight.

In addition, two important statements in Luke inform us that he was fully aware of the atonement doctrine or, what stands for the same, the soteriological meaning of Jesus’ death. The words upon the bread and the chalice (Lk. 22:19-20) explicitly

---


\(^{308}\) ‘Lukán’s account reaches its climax in the centurion’s confession and in the picture of the crowds beating their breasts when they saw what had happened’ (TAYLOR, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke, 137); and also, cf. R. E. BROWN, The Death of the Messiah. II. From Gethsemane to the Grave (New York 1994) 1163-1167.

\(^{309}\) ‘The use of δίκαιος in this text is an intentional allusion to the fate of Jesus as the Suffering Servant of Yahweh’ (GREEN, “The Death of Jesus, God’s Servant”, 20).


mentions the surrender of his body and blood ‘for you’ (ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν)\(^{312}\). A second clear assertion is made by Paul (Acts 20:28). There, S. Paul refers to the church as ‘purchased with his own blood’ (περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ ἱδίου). Summing up, only a short-sighted inquiry can contend that those passages already mentioned in this paragraph are few and carrying not too much weight. The issue of repentance and the subsequent forgiveness of sins is everywhere present in Luke, especially in the rest of Peter’s speeches (Acts 2:38; 5:31; 10:43)\(^{313}\). This overall look at Luke’s theology along his two volumes spotlights the overtones with which he improves the text of Acts 3:13-26, in such a way that the atoning meaning of Christ’s death – already present in early kerygmatic preaching – comes again to the fore. By his death, the lasting blessing of Acts 3:26 is granted.


\(^{313}\) ‘The idea that forgiveness comes through Christ and what He did for men in found continually. Luke saw the whole mission of Jesus as connected with putting right the situation caused by men’s sins’ (MORRIS, The Cross in the New Testament, 121).
A four-fold methodological approach along these chapters has allowed us to tackle one of the most controversial issues in 20th century exegesis, the παῖς θεοῦ imagery in Acts 3:12-26. Definitively, the importance of the so-called ‘paidology’ can be hardly underplayed. As Farmer assesses, ‘at stake for Christian faith is the nature of Jesus’ freely pouring out his life for God’s people as atoning sacrifice that comports or is congruent with the forgiveness of their sins’314. Consequently, we face the kernel of the connection between Christology and soteriology in Luke’s work.

In chapter 1, redaction-criticism provides an outstanding tool to peruse Acts 3:12-26. Under the sway of Hoocker’s scholarship, it is commonly held that ‘the Lukan contexts in which Servant imagery appears reflect the Christology of Luke’s own day – indeed, of Luke himself. They do not preserve from the earliest Christian community a separate and primitive Servant Christology’315. Nevertheless, unusual features of Peter’s kerygmatic speech, which do not match Luke’s wording, style and concerns, may be detected everywhere316. Altogether these features mirror vestiges of a Jewish-Christian source (ch. 1.1) taken up by Luke and reworked in some extent (ch. 1.2, 3). Particularly important is an uncommon title to refer Jesus, παῖς θεοῦ, which brackets out the speech as its governing category. Also, the rhetorical articulation of the discourse witnesses an unmistakable linkage between forgiveness of sins (soteriology) and kerygmatic creed (Christology) at the base of Acts 3:12-26 (ch. 1.4). Thus, the attempt of interpreting the Passover as empty of any atoning meaning has been repeatedly turned down along this study. Besides, through his narrative, Luke repeatedly places the emphasis on the divine necessity of the cross317. The patter of ‘prediction-fulfillment’ expressed by the verb δεῖ and other lexical devices strengthen

316 Cf. Zehnle, Peter’s Pentecost Discourse, 44-60.
our argument: ‘This means more than that God knew beforehand what would happen. He determined beforehand what would happen’\textsuperscript{318}. The history of salvation, as far as Luke envisions it, resembles a plot whose intended peak is the Passover and whose outcome turns out to be the release of sins\textsuperscript{319}.

Chapter 2 takes advantage of some trendy developments in the realm of intertextual analysis. Both Luke’s Passion-Narrative and Peter’s speeches concentrate the major quantity of literary interplay between narration and psalms allusions, e. g. in Acts 2:14-36 Peter echoes six psalms. Therefore, Psalter is to be considered the most resourceful hermeneutical key for the first Christian exegesis. In fact, ‘royal psalms’ had already been interpreted in eschatological way before the turning of era. The sufferings that David endured, vividly depicted through the Psalter, are now transferred to Jesus’ Passion by means of appropriation. Since quite a few ‘royal psalms’ drew on Deutero-Isaianic motifs, there are little reasons to present an excluding choice between Isaianic or Psalmic imagery as background against which interpreting the title παίς θεοῦ. Furthermore, the unparalleled role of Isa. 53 cannot be easily rejected because only in Isa. 53 ‘one man’s death is represented as a life given up for the sins of others’\textsuperscript{320}. Any other inter-text in OT is not better ranked to accomplish this function.

Chapter 3 focuses on the reception history of the 4\textsuperscript{th} Servant’s Song. Far from being a digression, this step supplies the right prospective to grasp full understanding of the earliest Jewish-Christian exegesis. Acts 3:12-26 witnesses a brand-new development: ‘The great originality of the Christology of Acts is that the appellation παίς θεοῦ becomes a messianic title […] Jesus died for His people as Messiah’\textsuperscript{321} (ch. 3.3). Moreover, beyond the co-text of Isa. 53, first Christian exegesis and Luke’s Gospel took up the wider context of Deutero-Isaiah (Isa. 40-55) to depict Jesus’ ministry. Such original hermeneutics on Isa. 53 go beyond 2\textsuperscript{nd} temple literature’s interpretations (ch. 3.1) which barely envisioned, on one hand, the martyrs’ sufferings as atonement for the sake of the people\textsuperscript{322}; and on the other hand, it never foresaw the concept of a suffering Messiah\textsuperscript{323}.

As redaction-criticism argues, in Acts 3:12-26, we are not dealing with single pieces of tradition (form-criticism) but with the theological conception of Luke in

\textsuperscript{318} MORRIS, \textit{The Cross in the New Testament}, 123.
\textsuperscript{320} FARMER, “Reflections on Isaiah 53 and Christian Origins”, 277.
\textsuperscript{321} MÉNARD, “\textit{Pais Theou} as Messianic Title in the Book of Acts”, 91.
\textsuperscript{322} Although the rabbinic traditions envision the value of the martyrs’ death, they never consider ‘the Messiah’s death as the atoning sacrifice’, so that ‘the New Testament writings are distinctive primarily by bringing in the person of Jesus and the universal efficacy of his sacrifice’ (KIM, “The Concept of Atonement in Early Rabbinic Thought and the New Testament Writings”, 126). ‘The New Testament concept of atonement is unique primarily because it has to do with Jesus Christ as the Son of God and the Messiah, and because of the extent of the atoning efficacy of his death’ (Ibidem, 135).
\textsuperscript{323} In ‘Dialogue with Trypho’, by Saint Justin (2\textsuperscript{nd} century A. D) we are informed about Trypho’s reticence to accept a Suffering Messiah. Obviously, Justin argues from Isa. 53, but his Jewish adversary is not persuaded: ‘We doubt whether the Christ should be so shamefully crucified’ (ST. JUSTIN MARTYR, \textit{Dialogue with Trypho} [ed. M. SLUSSER] [Selection of the Fathers of the Church 3; Washington 2003] 73 §89.1).
Gospel-Acts as an extant entity made up with a wide range of former traditions elsewhere present in the NT. Therefore, if those texts advocates for a tradition that appears also in Acts 3:12-26, allowance for their use as scriptural support for Jesus’ atoning death might be granted (ch. 3.2). Thus, our survey focuses on the so-called ‘surrender formula’, drawn on Isaiah 53 and well-represented in a redactional layer ascribed to Apostolic preaching. In fact, since most of these texts are rooted in pre-Pauline teachings that mirror primitive formulas, either creeds or liturgies, these characteristic milieus contend the antiquity of the materials conveyed in them.

Finally, in chapter 4, we argue against the attempt to put off in time the association between the Passover events (taken as whole: Passion-Resurrection-Exaltation) and the forgiveness of sins conveyed in the kerygmatic proclamation of Acts 3:12-26. A set of reasons are adduced to support the atoning comprehension of the Servant imagery already at work in Luke’s sources (ch. 4.1). A second movement is undertaken on account of redaction-criticism. Obviously, a full comprehension of the ideas beneath Acts 3 can be only reached by looking at the overall exegetical concerns of Luke-Acts. Certainly, a crafted discourse on the atoning meaning of Jesus’ death is lacking there, but soteriology – set out along the narrative arch – is deeply concerned about the release of sins. An actual prove is the narrative climatic peak in the Gospel which definitively points to the death of Crist in the cross and Centurion’s confession, modelled in turn by Isaianic imagery (Lk. 23:47). Our purpose has been to uncover this subtle (but real!) relationship. Just because the narrative creed (Acts 3:13-15) is chiefly concerned with Jesus’ Passover, it is important not to devoid his death- resurrection-exaltation of soteriological meaning. Other missionary speeches by Peter (Acts 2, 5, 10) show the same logical articulation.

If we were to answer what has been the overriding concern that has boosted this inquiry and the first outcome yielded by it, we would resort to this insightful remark by Hengel: ‘Why did the Messiah have to suffer? This assurance of forgiveness was hardly the result of a lengthy development bound up with theoretical scribal reflection, preceded by a primarily “non-soteriological” interpretation of the death of Jesus and his resurrection’. Sadly, as we pointed out in the first paragraph of this study, Hengel does not extend this statement to Acts 3:12-26. Nevertheless, we think to have offered compelling reasons from the standpoint of critical exegesis to justify the presence of such interpretation in Peter’s kerygmatic preaching. We feel relieved by the fact that we are not alone standing by this theory. A current line of scholarship which may open a ‘new perspective’ go along with our approach. Thus, the attempt just made could not be branded as mere parroting of Dodd’s principles. Although, updated and improved, they have been shown to be still valid.

325 HENGEL, The Atonement, 70 (Italics are mine).
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