

## Kingdom and Church in Luke-Acts

*From Davidic Christology to Kingdom Ecclesiology*

*Scott W. Hahn*

The past two decades have seen a flowering of scholarship on the use and significance of the Scriptures of Israel in the third gospel.<sup>1</sup> The premise of much of this scholarship has been succinctly expressed by Augustín del Agua: ‘the OT tradition ... is the hermeneutic reference of meaning sought by Luke in his narration’<sup>2</sup> and ‘the source par excellence for the narrative elaboration of his theological project.’<sup>3</sup> Among the many works on Luke and the Old Testament are some excellent studies of Luke’s treatment of Israelite covenantal traditions.<sup>4</sup> However, not all of these traditions have received equal attention: the Abrahamic and Mosaic covenants have been emphasized at the expense of the Davidic.<sup>5</sup> Moreover, despite the fact that, as Joel Green notes, ‘Luke’s use of the Scriptures is primarily ecclesiological rather than christological,’<sup>6</sup> the few studies written on Davidic covenant motifs in Luke-Acts – for example, Mark Strauss’ monograph *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts* – have focused on Christology.<sup>7</sup> The influence of the Davidic covenant traditions on Luke’s

<sup>1</sup> Important works on the OT background of Luke’s theological project include Moessner, *Lord*; Evans and Sanders, *Luke*; Kimball, *Exposition*; Brawley, *Text*; Denova, *Things*; Bock, *Proclamation*; and Evans and Stegner, *Gospels*.

<sup>2</sup> Del Agua, ‘Narrative,’ 643.

<sup>3</sup> Del Agua, ‘Narrative,’ 641.

<sup>4</sup> On the Abrahamic covenant in Luke, see Brawley, *Text*, and ‘Covenant,’ 109–32.

<sup>5</sup> For example, Brawley (*Text* and ‘Covenant’) makes astute observations concerning the Davidic covenant in Luke, but he foregrounds and emphasizes the Abrahamic, as does Van Den Eynde, ‘Children.’

<sup>6</sup> Green, ‘Learning Theological Interpretation,’ 57.

<sup>7</sup> See also Bock, *Proclamation*, esp. 55–90. An earlier piece is Bruce, ‘Messiah.’

ecclesiology remains largely unexplored.<sup>8</sup> This chapter will attempt to address that lacuna.

The work of Strauss and others has won some support for the view that royal Davidic messianism is a major christological category for Luke's Gospel.<sup>9</sup> Nonetheless, the conclusion has yet to be drawn that if Jesus is the Davidic king proclaiming a coming kingdom, that coming kingdom must be, in some sense, the *Davidic kingdom*. Perhaps the connection is not made because Luke calls the coming kingdom 'the kingdom of God' and not 'of David'; indeed, the precise phrase 'kingdom of God' is not found in the Old Testament. However, it is notable that the Chronicler twice employs a virtually synonymous phrase – 'the kingdom of Yahweh' – to describe the Davidic monarchy (1 Chr. 28:5; 2 Chr. 13:8; cf. 1 Chr. 17:14; 29:11–22). The Chronicler understood that the reign of the house of David was based on a divine covenant in which the son of David was also declared to be son of God (2 Sam. 7:14; Pss. 2:7; 89:27). Therefore, the kingdom of David was the manifestation of God's rule over the earth – that is, God's kingdom for Israel and the nations.<sup>10</sup>

Raymond Brown saw quite clearly the close relationship (indeed, identification) of the kingdom of God and the kingdom of David:

The story of David brings out all the strengths and weaknesses of the beginnings of the religious institution of the kingdom for the people of God ... The kingdom established by David was a political institution to be sure, but one with enormous religious attachments (priesthood, temple, sacrifice, prophecy) ... *It is the closest Old Testament parallel to the church* ... To help Christians make up their mind on how the Bible speaks to [whether the church is related to the kingdom of God], it would help if they knew about David and his kingdom, *which was also God's kingdom*.<sup>11</sup>

Building on Brown's insight into the relationship of the kingdom of God, the kingdom of David, and the church, this chapter will advance the thesis that the kingdom of David informs Luke's presentation of Jesus' kingship and kingdom, providing much of the content and meaning of these terms. Specifically,

<sup>8</sup> Pao notes: 'Strong emphasis on christological uses ... tends to overshadow concerns for the ecclesiological function ... of scriptural traditions in the Lukan writings' (*Acts*, 17).

<sup>9</sup> See Juel, 'Review' (of Strauss, *Messiah*); and Bock, 'Proclamation,' 293–94: 'the fundamental category of Lukan Old Testament christology is a regal one.'

<sup>10</sup> The Chronicler describes the worshipping assembly of this kingdom, most often led by the Davidic king himself, with the term מַלְכוּת, or, in the LXX, ἐκκλησία (e.g., 1 Chr. 13:2–4; 28:2–8; 29:1, 10, 20; 2 Chr. 1:3–5; 6:3–13; 7:8; 10:3; 20:5–14; 23:3; 29:23–30:25). Chronicles uses this term more frequently than any other part of the LXX and may provide the background for understanding Luke's deployment of ἐκκλησία in Acts.

<sup>11</sup> Brown, 'Communicating,' 5–6 (emphasis mine). Cf. Levenson, *Sinai*, 155–56.

the Davidic royal Christology of Luke's Gospel sets the stage for his development of a *Davidic kingdom ecclesiology* in Acts.<sup>12</sup> Inasmuch as Christians believe themselves still to be participating in the ecclesial reality whose birth is portrayed in Acts, my thesis implies that a Davidic kingdom-ecclesiology is still relevant for contemporary Christian theology.<sup>13</sup>

The argument will unfold as follows: first, the textual evidence for the growing recognition that Luke's Christology is fundamentally both *royal* and specifically *Davidic* will be reviewed. Second, in order to shed light on Luke's use of royal Davidic imagery, the canonical portrayal of the kingdom of David in the Old Testament will be explored. Third, it will be seen how all eight major characteristics of the Davidic kingdom in the Old Testament are present

<sup>12</sup> McKnight notes that 'the God of Jesus was the God of Israel, and the kingdom of Jesus was a kingdom for Israel' (*Vision*, 83). One may go further and say that the kingdom of Jesus is the kingdom of Israel, and the kingdom of Israel is the kingdom of *David*.

<sup>13</sup> While this study is not methodologically explicit, the attentive reader will recognize a strong affinity between the hermeneutic at work in what follows and the hermeneutical principles advocated by several contributors to the five previous volumes of this ongoing Scripture and Hermeneutics Series. I am engaged in a canonical analysis of the Bible's 'grand narrative,' within a confessional framework that is Catholic yet ecumenical, informed by speech-act theory as a means to grasp both God's covenantal declarations to his people in the Old and New Testaments and the perpetuation of those declarations in the church's eucharistic liturgy. The 'canonical' approach to biblical theology originated with Childs, *Biblical Theology in Crisis*, and is discussed recently by Bartholomew, 'Biblical Theology.' My approach is not identical to that of Childs, however. I understand 'canonical' as applied to biblical theology in three senses: (1) the subject of study is the *final*, or *canonical*, form of the text; (2) the texts are understood in light of their *canonical* context, as books within a bi-covenantal corpus; and (3) an underlying unity of the canon is presumed, such that all the texts of the canon are allowed to speak synchronically on a given subject. For advocacy of a 'narrative' or 'story' approach to biblical theology, see Bartholomew and Goheen, 'Story.' Such an approach is not limited to literary analysis of narrative texts, but rather seeks to situate the interpretation of all biblical texts within the larger biblical 'story' or 'metanarrative.' The criteria for specifically Catholic biblical exegesis are set forth by Vatican II (*Dei Verbum* 12; CCC §112–114): (1) the *content* and *unity* of Scripture; (2) the *living tradition* of the church (expressed primarily in the liturgy); and (3) the *analogy of faith* (for elaboration see Martin, 'Directions'). On speech-act theory, see Vanhoozer, 'Speech Acts.' I find Vanhoozer's treatment of 'discourse of the covenant' useful in describing the speech-acts by which God establishes relationships with humankind. Ultimately, three divine speech-acts are the focus of this chapter: the establishment of the covenant between God and David (2 Sam. 7); between Christ and the Apostles (Lk. 22:14–30); and between God and the church in the eucharistic 'breaking of the bread' (Acts 2:42; 20:7; 1 Cor. 11:23–26).

in Luke's portrayal of Jesus' person and mission. Fourth, in order to trace the connection between the Christology of Luke and the ecclesiology of Acts, Jesus' conferral of his Davidic kingdom upon the apostles in the Lukan Institution Narrative will be examined. Fifth, the promise of vice-regency over the Davidic kingdom given to the apostles in the Institution Narrative will be seen as fulfilled in their rule over the nascent ἐκκλησία in Acts. Thus, the ἐκκλησία of Acts is the restored kingdom of David, spreading to 'the ends of the earth.'

### Royal Davidic Christology in Luke

We have mentioned the significance of Strauss' recent work on Luke's royal Davidic messianism. Against scholars who assert that Luke's dominant christological category is Prophet, Lord, or Isaianic Servant, Strauss argues that Luke's royal Davidic Christology is primary and capable of integrating other messianic types – like that of Prophet – within it. **The following are the key texts in Luke from which Strauss and others have argued the importance of royal Davidic messianism:**<sup>14</sup>

- Luke emphasizes that Jesus' legal father Joseph was 'of the house of David' (Lk. 1:27).<sup>15</sup>
- At the annunciation, Gabriel describes Jesus to Mary (Lk. 1:32–33) in a thoroughly Davidic way, adapting the key Davidic covenant text (2 Sam. 7:1–17).<sup>16</sup>
- In the *Benedictus*, Zechariah begins by praising God for having 'raised up a horn of salvation for us in the house of his servant David' (Lk. 1:69), a reference to a royal Davidic psalm (Ps. 132:17).<sup>17</sup>
- Jesus' birthplace is Bethlehem, called 'the City of David' by both the narrator (2:4) and the angels (2:11). At the same time, Joseph's Davidic lineage is repeated for emphasis (2:4).
- Appropriately, the first witnesses to the birth of the Son of David, the great 'shepherd king' of Israel's memory, are shepherds (Lk. 2:8–20), possibly alluding to Micah 5:1–3.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>14</sup> See Bock, *Luke*, 115; Brawley, *Text*, 85–86; Lane, *Luke*, 157–63; Ravens, *Luke*, 24–49, esp. 34.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Green, *Luke*, 84–85.

<sup>16</sup> As demonstrated by Green, *Luke*, 85, 88; likewise Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 338.

<sup>17</sup> An allusion to Ps. 132:17, where a horn sprouts up from David, is probably intended (Green, *Luke*, 116). Cf. Bock, *Luke*, 20, 180. On other, more subtle, Davidic allusions in the *Benedictus*, see Farris, *Hymns*, 95–96.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Green, *Luke*, 130; Ravens, *Luke*, 42–43.

- At Jesus' baptism, the divine voice utters over him, 'Thou art my beloved Son,' an adaptation of words from Psalm 2, the royal coronation hymn of the Davidic kings (Ps. 2:7).<sup>19</sup>
- In Luke 3:23–28, Luke traces Jesus' genealogy through David.<sup>20</sup>
- In Luke 6:1–5, Jesus compares himself and his disciples to David and his band of men, and he claims the same apparent freedom from cultic regulations that David enjoyed.<sup>21</sup>
- At the transfiguration, the divine voice again reiterates the royal coronation hymn (Ps. 2:7): 'This is my Son, my Chosen.'<sup>22</sup> The title 'chosen,' or 'chosen one,' is also an epithet of David (Ps. 89:3).<sup>23</sup>
- Jesus' statement in Luke 10:22, 'All things have been delivered to me by my Father' seems to recall the covenantal father-son relationship of God to the Davidic monarch (see Pss. 2:7–8; 8:4–8; 72:8; 89:25–27).
- On entry into Jericho, Jesus is hailed twice by a blind man as 'Son of David' (Lk. 18:35–43), foreshadowing his royal entrance to Jerusalem.<sup>24</sup>
- Luke intentionally describes Jesus' triumphal entry (19:28–48) so as to correspond to Zechariah 9:9–10, which in turn uses images of Solomon's coronation procession to describe the coming of an eschatological king, almost certainly a Davidide (cf. Zech. 12:7–13:1).<sup>25</sup>
- At the Last Supper, Jesus speaks of a 'new covenant,' evoking Jeremiah 31:31 and the broader context (Jer. 30–33), which foresees a 'new covenant' uniting Israel and Judah under the Davidic monarchy.<sup>26</sup>
- The end of the Institution Narrative (Lk. 22:29–30) evokes several Davidic images: the conferring of a kingdom by covenant (Ps. 89:3–4); eating at the king's own table (2 Sam. 9:9–13); and ruling from thrones over the tribes of Israel (Ps. 122:3–5).
- In the Passion Narratives Davidic titles are used of Jesus with contempt, but nonetheless accurately: 'King of the Jews' (Lk. 23:37–38; cf. 2 Sam. 2:11) and 'Chosen One' (Lk. 23:35; cf. Ps. 89:3–4).
- At least three key passages in Acts also press Jesus' claims as the Davidic Messiah: (1) *Peter's* first recorded sermon, at Pentecost (Acts 2:14–36, esp. vv. 25–36); (2) *Paul's* first recorded sermon, at Pisidian Antioch (13:16–

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Green, *Luke*, 186; Bock, *Luke*, 341–43.

<sup>20</sup> On David in Lk. 3:23–28 see Bock, *Luke*, 357. The following temptation sequence features a Davidic allusion in its second scene. See Brawley, *Text*, 20.

<sup>21</sup> See Bock, *Luke*, 527; and Johnson, *Luke*, 101.

<sup>22</sup> Bock, *Luke*, 873–74.

<sup>23</sup> Strauss, *Messiah*, 265–67.

<sup>24</sup> Green, *Luke*, 663–65; Bock, *Luke*, 1507–12; Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1214.

<sup>25</sup> See Green, *Luke*, 683–88; and Bock, *Luke*, 1556–58, who point out the connections with Zech. 9:9 and 1 Kgs. 1:33 (the coronation of Solomon).

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Bock, 'Reign,' 43, 48–49.

41, esp. vv. 22–23, 33–37); and *James'* first and only recorded speech, at the Jerusalem council (15:13–21).<sup>27</sup>

It is not only the number, but also the placement, of these Davidic references that point to their significance. The heaviest concentrations of Davidic christological imagery occur in two places: (1) in the infancy narratives, which set the theological agenda for Luke's two-volume work and define terms used throughout – like 'Christ' and 'Son of God' – in explicitly Davidic categories; and (2) in the apostolic speeches of Acts, whose importance in explicating Luke's theology is widely recognized. Thus, the number and position of Davidic royal motifs make a *prima facie* case for the primacy in Luke of a royal Davidic Christology.

Yet it is not enough to make this observation without also ascertaining its significance: what exactly did it *mean* to Luke and his first-century audience – composed presumably of both Jews and Gentile converts familiar with the Scriptures of Israel – that Jesus was the messianic king of David's line? What features characterized the Davidic monarchy? What connotations did the Davidic monarchy carry for first-century believers steeped in Second Temple Judaism? To answer these questions, we must return to Luke's 'hermeneutic reference of meaning' – the Old Testament. For, as del Agua shows, 'Luke has elaborated his Christology and ecclesiology in the light of the Old Testament tradition of the *basileia*.'<sup>28</sup>

### The Shape of the Davidic Monarchy in the Old Testament

A first-century reader of Israel's Scriptures like Luke would have read all of them (the Law, Prophets, and Psalms; cf. Lk. 24:44) synchronically, as if speaking at the same time to the same reality. What is the shape of the Davidic kingdom that would appear from these Scriptures to such a reader? **When the texts are read together, an entire constellation of concepts, locations, and institutions that were intimately related to David, his legacy, and one another appears.**<sup>29</sup> At

<sup>27</sup> See Strauss, *Messiah*, 130–95.

<sup>28</sup> Del Agua, 'Narrative,' 645.

<sup>29</sup> It is here that our canonical methodology is quite evident. Traditional source-critical biblical scholarship would insist on seeing a variety of incompatible perspectives on the Davidic kingdom in the various biblical documents. To allow all of these documents to speak as with a common voice on a certain subject – i.e., the Davidic kingdom – is a quintessentially *canonical* move, presuming an underlying unity to the canon attributable to divine inspiration, human redaction, and/or the selectivity of the process of tradition.

the center of the constellation is David and/or the Son of David. Within the constellation, the following eight characteristics or elements have a claim to being the brightest stars:

- (1) The Davidic monarchy was *founded upon a divine covenant* (ברית MT, διαθήκη LXX), the only human kingdom of the Old Testament to enjoy such a privilege.<sup>30</sup>
- (2) The Davidic monarch was *the Son of God*. The filial relationship of the Davidide to God is expressed already in the foundational text of the Davidic covenant (2 Sam. 7:14), but it is also found in other Davidic texts.<sup>31</sup>
- (3) The Davidic monarch was *the ‘Christ,’ that is, the ‘Messiah’ or ‘Anointed One.’* The anointed status of the Davidic king was so integral to his identity that he is frequently referred to simply as ‘the anointed one,’ or ‘the Lord’s anointed.’<sup>32</sup>
- (4) The Davidic monarchy was inextricably bound to *Jerusalem, particularly Mt. Zion*, which was the personal possession of David and his heirs (2 Sam. 5:9), and would have had no significant role in Israelite history had not David made it his capital (cf. Josh. 15:63; Judg. 1:21; 19:10–12; 2 Sam. 5:6–12).<sup>33</sup>
- (5) The Davidic monarchy was inextricably bound to *the temple*. The building of the temple was central to the terms of the Davidic covenant from the very beginning, as can be seen from the wordplay on ‘house’ (‘temple’ or ‘dynasty’) in 2 Samuel 7:11–13.<sup>34</sup> Even after its destruction, the prophets remained firm in their conviction that YHWH would restore his temple to its former glory as an international place of worship.<sup>35</sup>
- (6) The Davidic monarch ruled over *all twelve tribes*. It was only under David and the son of David, Solomon, that both Judah and all the northern tribes

<sup>30</sup> The key text outlining the conditions and promises of this covenant is 2 Sam. 7:8–16 (see Gordon, *Samuel*, 71; Laato, ‘Psalm 132,’ 56), although the term ‘covenant’ only occurs elsewhere: e.g., 2 Sam. 23:5; 1 Kgs. 8:23–24; Ps. 89:3; 2 Chr. 13:5; 21:7; Sir. 45:25; Is. 55:3; Ezek. 34:25 LXX.

<sup>31</sup> E.g., Pss. 2:7; 89:26; 1 Chr. 17:13; 28:6. ‘The individual most often designated as “the son of God” in the Hebrew Bible is undoubtedly the Davidic king, or his eschatological counterpart’ (Collins, *Scepter*, 163).

<sup>32</sup> See 1 Sam. 16:13; 2 Sam. 19:21, 22:51; 23:1; 1 Kgs. 1:38–39; 2 Kgs. 11:12; 23:30; 2 Chr. 6:42; 23:11; Pss. 2:2; 18:50; 20:6; 28:8; 84:9; 89:20, 38, 51; 132:10, 17.

<sup>33</sup> See Japhet, ‘Sanctuary,’ 6; and Ishida, *Dynasties*, 118–19.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Kruse, ‘Covenant,’ 149. On the significance of Solomon’s temple building efforts, see Hurowitz, *House*; Mason, ‘Messiah,’ esp. 348, 362; Ishida, *Dynasties*, 145–47; and Swartley, *Traditions*, 154.

<sup>35</sup> Is. 2:1–4; 56:6–8; 60:3–16; 66:18–21; Jer. 33:11; Ezek. 40–44; Dan. 9:24–27; Joel 3:18; Hag. 2:1–9; Mic. 4:1–4; Zech. 6:12–14; 8:20–23; 14:16.

were united as one kingdom and freed from foreign oppression (2 Sam. 5:1–5; 1 Kgs. 4:1–19).<sup>36</sup> For this reason the Prophets associate the reunification of the northern tribes of Israel ('Ephraim') and the southern tribes of Judah with the restoration of the Davidic monarchy.<sup>37</sup>

- (7) The Davidic monarch ruled over an *international empire*. David and Solomon ruled not only over Israel but also the surrounding nations.<sup>38</sup> The Psalms theologically justify and celebrate this state of affairs,<sup>39</sup> and the Prophets envision its restoration.<sup>40</sup>
- (8) The Davidic monarchy was to be *everlasting*. One of the most prevalent emphases in the Psalms and Deuteronomistic history is that the Davidic dynasty will be eternal (2 Sam. 7:16; 23:5; Ps. 89:35–36). Not only the dynasty, but also the lifespan of the reigning monarch himself, was described as everlasting (Pss. 21:4; 72:5, 110:4).<sup>41</sup>

Thus, when read synchronically, the Old Testament – in the Prophets (both Former and Latter) and the Psalms – gives a composite picture of the Davidic monarchy in which the Son of David, anointed as Son of God by divine covenant, rules eternally from Jerusalem over all Israel and the nations, gathering them to worship at the temple. For theological interpretation, it is important to see each element of this composite picture not in isolation but in its relationship to the entire Davidic 'constellation.'

### ***Excursus: The Davidic Kingdom between Old and New Testaments***

This constellation of characteristics of the Davidic kingdom was not forgotten, and the hope of its restoration was not abandoned, in the years between the end of the exile and the coming of Christ.<sup>42</sup> Especially from the mid-second century B.C.E. to the late first century C.E., there is substantial witness to a general

<sup>36</sup> Abimelech's reign in Shechem was certainly only local (Judg. 9:1–57), and Saul never liberated Israel from Philistine vassalage (1 Sam. 14:52; 31:1–7).

<sup>37</sup> Is. 11:1–16; Jer. 30:1–9; Ezek. 37:15–28, etc.

<sup>38</sup> 2 Sam. 8:11–12; 10:19; 12:30; 1 Kgs. 3:1; 4:20–21; 10:15. See Meyers, 'Empire,' 181–97.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Pss. 2:8; 18:43, 47; 22:27; 47:1, 9; 72:8, 11; 66:8; 67:2–5; 86:9; 89:27; 96:7, 99:1, etc.

<sup>40</sup> Is. 2:3–4; 42:1–6; 49:1–7, 22–26; 51:4–6; 55:3–5; 56:3–8; 60:1–16; 66:18–19; Amos 9:11–12; Mic. 4:2–3; Zech. 14:16–19.

<sup>41</sup> For a discussion of the tension between these texts and others which imply that the Davidic covenant can be or has been broken, see Waltke, 'Phenomenon,' 123–40.

<sup>42</sup> It is true that between ca. 500 B.C.E. and ca. 200 B.C.E. extant witnesses to an expectation of the restoration of the kingdom of David are sparse, though not wholly lacking. However, there is very little documentation for *any* aspect of Israelite/Jewish



Jewish expectation of the restoration of the Davidic kingdom in the Pseudepigrapha and the Dead Sea Scrolls.<sup>43</sup> Many of these texts – especially *4 Ezra*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, and 4Q *Florilegium* (4Q174) – foresee the coming of an eschatological figure who is the Son of David,<sup>44</sup> and:

- (1) the recipient of the covenant of 2 Samuel 7,<sup>45</sup>
- (2) the Son of God,<sup>46</sup>
- (3) the ‘Messiah’ or ‘Anointed One,’<sup>47</sup>
- (4) who will reign in Zion,<sup>48</sup>
- (5) restore the temple,<sup>49</sup>
- (6) reunite the twelve tribes,<sup>50</sup>
- (7) and rule over all nations,<sup>51</sup>
- (8) for eternity.<sup>52</sup>

Thus, even without the witness of the New Testament, it would be possible to establish that among Jews of the first century C.E. there was a general expectation of the future restoration of the kingdom of David by a messianic figure.<sup>53</sup>

The anticipated restoration, however, was more of a *transformation* than a mere

---

history or religion in this time frame. For an assessment of the evidence see Laato, *Star*, 208–316; Horbury, *Jewish Messianism*, 36–63 and *Messianism among Jews and Christians*, 35–64; Collins, *Scepter*, 33.

<sup>43</sup> See Collins, *Scepter*, 12, 57, 67, 95, 209. The Dead Sea scrolls cited below may be found in García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *Scrolls*.

<sup>44</sup> *4 Ezra* 12:32; *Pss. Sol.* 17:4, 21; 4Q161 (4QpIsa<sup>a</sup>) 8 X, 17; 4Q252 (4QCommGen A) V, 1–3. Arguably, the ‘Son of God’ in 4Q246 (4QapocrDan ar), the ‘Son of Man’ in *1 Enoch*, and the ‘Messiah’ in *2 Baruch* are Davidic, since Davidic prophecies and characteristics are attributed to them. On 4Q246 see Collins, *Scepter*, 154–65, esp. 163–65. On Davidic messianic interpretations of the Son of Man in 4Q246, *4 Ezra*, and the NT, see Gese, *Essays*, 158.

<sup>45</sup> *Pss. Sol.* 17:4; 4Q174 (4QFlor) 1 I, 7–13; 4Q252 V, 1–5; cf. *Sir.* 45:25; 47:11; 4Q504 (4QDibHam<sup>a</sup>) 1–2 IV, 6–8; *T. Jud.* 22:3.

<sup>46</sup> *4 Ezra* 13:32, 52; 4Q246 (4QapocrDan ar) II, 1; 4Q369 (4QPrayer of Enosh) 1 II, 6; 4Q174 1 I, 11.

<sup>47</sup> *4 Ezra* 7:28; 12:32; *Pss. Sol.* 17:32; *2 Bar.* 70:10; 72:2; 4Q252 V, 3.

<sup>48</sup> *4 Ezra* 13:35–36; *Pss. Sol.* 17:22, 30; 4Q174 1 I, 12; 4Q504 1–2 IV, 3.

<sup>49</sup> *4 Ezra* 12:48 [implied]; 4Q504 1–2 IV, 12; *Sib. Or.* 5:420–27; *1 En.* 53:6.

<sup>50</sup> *4 Ezra* 13:39–48; *Pss. Sol.* 17:26–28; 31; 43–44; 4Q174 1 I, 13 (‘save Israel’); cf. *T. Jud.* 24:1–25:3; 1 QM V, 1; *Sir.* 36:11.

<sup>51</sup> *4 Ezra* 13:33, 37–38; *Pss. Sol.* 17:29–34; *Sib. Or.* 5:425–28; 4Q161 8–10 III, 21–22; 4Q246 II, 5–7.

<sup>52</sup> *Pss. Sol.* 17:35–38; 4Q174 1 I, 1–5, 11; 4Q246 II, 5–9; 4Q252 V, 4; *2 Bar.* 73:1; *1 En.* 49:1–2; cf. *1 Macc.* 2:57.

<sup>53</sup> See Collins, *Scepter*, 209; Ravens, *Luke*, 112; and Strauss, *Messiah*, 38–53.

**reimplementation.** That is, the restored kingdom was expected to exceed what was actually realized under David and Solomon. Thus, descriptions of the coming kingdom often include supernatural elements. To cite just one example, the messianic king of the *Psalms of Solomon* is immortal (17:35), sinless (17:36), and capable of repelling enemies without the use of military force (17:33), but by his words alone (17:36). The transcendent and supernatural elements of the kingdom here and in the rest of the Second Temple and Qumran literature have their roots in the ideal descriptions of the kingdom in the *Psalms* (Pss. 2:7–11; 72:5–8; 89:19–37) and *Prophets*, especially *Isaiah* (e.g., Is. 2:1–4; 11:4–9).

### Jesus and the Restoration of the Davidic Monarchy in Luke

Having examined the eight major characteristics of the Davidic monarchy in Israel's scriptural traditions, it is now possible to return to Luke and ask: Does the shape of Jesus' kingship as portrayed by Luke resemble that of David? It is possible to answer in the affirmative, since each of the eight characteristics also describes Jesus and his ministry:

- (1) God's *covenant* with David, as described in Nathan's oracle (2 Sam. 7:9–16), provides all the content of the angelic description of Jesus in Luke 1:32–33.<sup>54</sup> Later, Jesus associates his kingship with a 'new covenant' (22:20) and says that a kingdom has been 'covenanted' to him by the Father (22:29).<sup>55</sup>
- (2) Jesus is the *natural* (not merely adopted) *Son of God* (1:35), and the title is used of him throughout the gospel.<sup>56</sup>
- (3) It is abundantly clear that Jesus is the *Christ* (2:11, 4:41, etc.),<sup>57</sup> indeed, he is the 'Lord's Christ' (2:26), a title only applied to kings in the Old Testament (cf. 1 Sam. 16:6; 24:6 LXX, etc.), and the 'Christ of God' (Lk. 9:20), a title only applied to David (2 Sam. 23:1).<sup>58</sup>
- (4) Luke, more than any other gospel, emphasizes the priority of *Jerusalem*.<sup>59</sup> For Luke, it is theologically important that the word of God go forth *from Jerusalem* to the ends of the earth (Lk. 24:47; Acts 1:8; cf. Is. 2:3). The gospel begins in Jerusalem (1:5–23), the only two narratives from Jesus' childhood find him in Jerusalem (2:22–52), for most of the narrative he is

<sup>54</sup> As demonstrated by Green, *Luke*, 85, 88; likewise Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 338.

<sup>55</sup> On the 'covenanting' of the kingdom, see the discussion of *διατίθημι* in Lk. 22:29, below.

<sup>56</sup> See Tannehill, *Unity*, 25.

<sup>57</sup> See Tannehill, *Unity*, 38.

<sup>58</sup> The title 'Christ' is probably always intended in a Davidic sense in Luke. Cf. Tuckett 'Christology,' 133–64, esp. 147–48; Nolan, *Son*, 173; and Tannehill, *Unity*, 58.

<sup>59</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 164–65; Bechard, 'Significance,' 675–91.

- traveling to Jerusalem (9:51–19:27), and the gospel climaxes in Jerusalem (19:28–24:49), wherein the disciples are told to ‘remain’ (24:49).
- (5) What is true of Luke and Jerusalem is also true with regard to the *temple*. The gospel begins there (1:5–23), Jesus ‘childhood’ is set there (2:22–52),<sup>60</sup> for most of the gospel he is traveling there (9:51–19:27), and the climax is reached when Jesus is teaching *from the temple in Jerusalem* (19:45–21:38). In Acts, the temple remains the focus of the early Christian community (Acts 2:46).<sup>61</sup>
- (6) Luke’s Jesus shows by many signs that he intends to restore the *unity of the twelve tribes of Israel*. The appointing of twelve apostles is the most prominent sign of this intention (6:12–16), and he explicitly promises that they will judge ‘the twelve tribes of Israel’ (22:30). But there are many other more subtle signs of Jesus’ intent to reunify the kingdom, including the use of the terms ‘Israel’ and ‘sons of Israel’ – evoking the entire nation – rather than ‘Judea’ or ‘Jews’;<sup>62</sup> the words of the angel that the good news of Jesus’ birth is ‘for the entire people’ (2:10), that is the whole nation of Israel; the presence of Anna, a representative descendant of the northern tribes (Asher), at the presentation (2:36);<sup>63</sup> and the inclusion of the Samaritans in Jesus’ mission as representatives of the ten northern tribes.<sup>64</sup>
- (7) The extension of Jesus’ kingship *over all the nations* is anticipated throughout Luke. Already in the infancy narratives, Simeon speaks of Jesus as ‘a light of revelation to the nations’ (2:32). Luke traces his genealogy back to Adam, the father of all humankind (3:38). As precedent for his ministry Jesus cites Elijah and Elisha’s healings of Gentiles (4:25–27), and he himself heals the servant of a Roman (7:1–10), while praising his faith above that of Israel (7:9). He predicts that ‘men will come from east and west, and from north and south’ to sit at table in the kingdom of God (13:29), and finally and most explicitly, Jesus teaches the disciples that ‘forgiveness of sins should be preached in his name *to all nations*, beginning from Jerusalem’ (24:47).
- (8) The angel Gabriel promises to Mary that Jesus ‘will reign over the house of Jacob *forever*, and of his kingdom there will be *no end*.’<sup>65</sup> The everlasting reign of Christ is presumed in the rest of the gospel, especially in passages where Jesus is the mediator of eternal life (18:18–30).

<sup>60</sup> On the importance of the temple in Lk. 1–2, see Green, *Luke*, 61–62 and Taylor, ‘Luke–Acts,’ 709.

<sup>61</sup> On the importance of the temple in Luke–Acts generally, see Chance, *Jerusalem*; and Clark, ‘Role,’ esp. 175–76.

<sup>62</sup> See Ravens, *Luke*, 25.

<sup>63</sup> See Bauckham, ‘Anna.’

<sup>64</sup> Ravens, *Luke*, 105–106.

<sup>65</sup> See Bock, *Luke*, 116–17.

Thus it can be seen that all eight major characteristics of the Davidic monarchy are manifested in Jesus and his ministry. There is a coherence to the titles and attributes – for example, ‘King,’ ‘Christ,’ ‘Son of God,’ eternal reign – that Luke predicates of Jesus and his ministry: the common factor in all of these is their typological origin in the figure of *David*. Indeed, more of Jesus’ identity and role could be integrated into this Davidic typology. Jesus in Luke is clearly a prophet, for example, and Luke considers David to have been a ‘prophet’ (Acts 2:30a) through whom the Holy Spirit spoke (Acts 1:16). Luke’s Christology, therefore, is not so composite as is sometimes imagined: the unifying factor is royal Davidic typology.<sup>66</sup>

Moreover, Jesus’ career as presented in the gospel may be interpreted as a systematic effort to restore the kingdom of David.<sup>67</sup> The significance of the choice of twelve apostles has been mentioned above. It is also significant that, as Fitzmyer notes, ‘Once the ministry proper begins, the areas of Jesus’ activity are defined as Galilee (4:14–9:50), Samaria (9:51–17:11), and Judea/Jerusalem (17:11–21:38).’<sup>68</sup> Jesus’ ministry follows the geographical progression of the dissolution of the kingdom of Israel: the northern tribes in the region of Galilee were taken by Assyria in 733 B.C.E., Samaria itself fell in 722 B.C.E., and Judah and Jerusalem in 587 B.C.E. During his roughly north-to-south itinerary in Luke, Jesus gathers disciples from all of these territories until, by the triumphal entry, they have become a ‘multitude’ (19:37) forming the reunited kingdom of David *in nuce*.

Jesus’ activity in Samaria, which Luke alone among the synoptics records (cf. Lk. 9:51–10:37; 17:11–19), is vital to Jesus’ mission of reunification. Luke has Jesus minister in Samaria (9:51–56; 17:11–19), and there is reason to believe that the seventy were sent into this region (10:1–12) and that other parts of the travel narrative took place there.<sup>69</sup> Luke apparently accepted the Samaritans’ claim to be the remnant of the ten northern tribes, and their reunification with Judah was necessary to restore the Davidic kingdom.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Bock, *Proclamation*, 262. It may be possible to integrate the Royal-Davidic and Isaianic-Servant Christologies in Luke. See Block, ‘Servant,’ esp. 49–56, and Strauss, *Messiah*, 292–98, who argue for the Davidic character of the ‘Servant’ of Is. 40–66.

<sup>67</sup> Cf. Ravens, *Luke*, 20.

<sup>68</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 165–66. See also Lane, *Luke*, 98, cf. 99–103; cf. Johnson, *Luke*, 170, 175.

<sup>69</sup> See Ravens, *Luke*, 76–87. For example, the injunction ‘eat what they set before you’ (Lk. 10:8) may be meant to assuage scruples over food cleanliness in Samaritan territory (82–83; cf. Neyrey, *Passion*, 8).

<sup>70</sup> Ravens, *Luke*, 47, 70, 72–87, 99. Cf. Jervell, *Luke*, 113–32; and Pao, *Acts*, 127–29. In addition to the Samaritan ministry, three other Lukan pericopes may reinforce the view that his mission was, in part, an effort to heal the divisions of Israel. First, in Lk. 6, Jesus heals a man with a withered hand (6:6–11). In the OT only Jeroboam I

In sum, we have seen that Jesus' *kingship* in Luke has the salient characteristics of the Davidic monarchy as portrayed in the canonical texts. Moreover, Jesus' ministry can be interpreted as a mission to reunite the northern and southern tribes into one *kingdom* under the Davidic heir. In Luke, Jesus is the royal Son of David who journeys to the city of David to restore the kingdom of David. This much is clear. It remains to be seen, however, what relationship exists between this Lukan Davidic Christology and the ecclesiology of Acts. The key figures in this relationship are the apostles, who in their persons and ministry form the link between the person and ministry of Jesus and the age of the church.<sup>71</sup> It is now necessary to examine key texts at the end of Luke's Gospel and the beginning of Acts which show how the Davidic-messianic identity and mission of Luke's Jesus flow into and shape the identity and mission of the twelve and the community they establish, the ἐκκλησία.

### The Institution Narrative (Luke 22:14–30)

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

---

(1 Kgs. 13:1–6) suffered a withered hand – he who made the division of the kingdom of David permanent by establishing a rival heterodox cult (1 Kgs. 12:25–33). Luke notes that it was the man's *right hand*, thus making a clear allusion to Ps. 137:5: 'If I forget you, O Jerusalem, let my right hand wither!' Jeroboam had 'forgotten' Jerusalem (1 Kgs. 12:25–33). Jesus' healing of the Jeroboam-like man of Lk. 6:6–11 manifests his power to overcome the division of David's kingdom. Second, in Lk. 10:30–37, Jesus tells a parable of a Samaritan recognizing a Jew as 'neighbor' (πλησίον) or 'kinsman' (so in the LXX, cf. Lev. 19:18; Ex. 2:13, 32:27). The Jew/Samaritan division represents a divided kingdom, a topic Jesus addresses in Lk. 11:14–23, asserting that 'every kingdom divided against itself is laid waste, and a divided house falls' (11:17). The division of the *kingdom of David* and the *house of David* – still painfully evident in Jesus' day – is in view, which was not merely a political issue but also a spiritual issue (1 Kgs. 12:25–33). Fulfilling prophecy, Jesus will heal the division by a ministry of 'gathering' (Lk. 11:23). Third, the parable of the Prodigal Son (15:11–32) can also be understood as referring, in one sense, to the division of the kingdom of David (Bailey, *Jacob*, 156–201). The older son would represent Judah and the younger son Ephraim, head of the northern tribes. The younger son goes to a far-off country – i.e., exile – and wastes his inheritance on harlotry, the very sin the prophets accused Ephraim/Israel of committing (Jer. 3:6; Hos. 4:15; 5:3). Significantly, the father in the story is determined to reconcile *both* sons to himself and to each other.

<sup>71</sup> See Clark, 'Role,' 169 et passim.

The full significance of the *IN* will be better grasped if two initial observations are made. First, in Luke, the *IN* is preceded by four pericopes highlighting Jesus' royal and specifically Davidic identity (18:35–39; 19:11–27; 19:28–40; 20:1–40), which serve to reassert the royal Davidic Christology, so clearly enunciated in the infancy narratives, as an introduction to the dramatic events of the passion week.<sup>72</sup> The royal Davidic themes will be taken up and advanced particularly in the *IN*, as will be seen below.

Second, the *IN* is not the first, nor is it the last, Lukan narrative which weds the imagery of *kingdom* with *table fellowship*. The motif of eating and drinking is more prominent in Luke than in the other gospels, and an organizational scheme of ten meal narratives may be discerned in the gospel – seven preceding the passion and two following it, with the *IN* at the strategic juncture.<sup>73</sup> The Last Supper is a literary Janus, culminating the sequence of Jesus' earthly meals but already strongly anticipating the table fellowship in his resurrected state (Lk. 24:30, 43).<sup>74</sup>

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

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

<sup>72</sup> See Strauss, *Messiah*, 306–17.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. Lk. 6:20; 9:10–17; 11:2; 13:28; 15:11–32; 22:18. On the significance of meals in Luke see Koenig, *Feast*, esp. 15, 181; LaVerdiere, *Dining; Eucharist; and Breaking*; and Neyrey, *Passion*, 8–11. The ten meals in Luke are Levi's banquet (5:27–39); the feast at Simon the Pharisee's house (7:36–50); the feeding of the 5,000 at Bethsaida (9:10–17); the meal at the home of Martha (10:38–42); dinner at the Pharisee's house (11:37–54); Sabbath dinner at yet another Pharisee's home (14:1–24); supper at the house of Zacchaeus (19:1–10); the Last Supper (22:7–38); breaking of bread at Emmaus (24:13–35); and eating in the presence of the apostles (24:41–43). See LaVerdiere, *Dining*, 12; and *Eucharist*, 82–83.

<sup>74</sup> See the discussion in Nelson, *Leadership*, 66–69, 73.

Jesus' displays of table fellowship were a Davidic trait. David extended *hesed* (covenant loyalty) through table fellowship (2 Sam. 9:7, 10, 13; 1 Kgs. 2:7). The generous meals for all Israel hosted by David and his royal sons (Solomon, Hezekiah, and Josiah) were treasured memories of Israelite tradition.<sup>75</sup> The Davidic Psalms employ images of eating and drinking to celebrate God's provision and the joy of communion with him,<sup>76</sup> and the prophets describe the restoration of David's city (i.e., Zion; cf. Is. 25:6–8; Jer. 31:12–14) and David's covenant (Is. 55:1–5) with images of feasting. Strikingly, in Ezekiel the primary role of the eschatological Davidic 'shepherd' is to 'feed' Israel (Ezek. 34:23).

While some see the first seven meals in Luke as anticipations of the Eucharist,<sup>77</sup> specifically eucharistic themes seem to be clearest only with respect to the meals mentioned above – the feeding of the five thousand, the Last Supper, and Emmaus – where Jesus 'breaks bread.' Obviously the Last Supper is the most important in this regard.

Luke's account of the Last Supper includes several unique features vis-à-vis Matthew and Mark,<sup>78</sup> including the following: (1) the repetition of Jesus' statement that he 'will not eat until the kingdom of God comes' and its placement at the beginning of the pericope rather than in the body;<sup>79</sup> (2) the command 'do this in remembrance of me' (v. 19); (3) the specification of the cup as the 'new' covenant;<sup>80</sup> (4) the placement of the discussion of precedence among the disciples here rather than earlier in Jesus' career;<sup>81</sup> and (5) the inclusion of unique features in the promise of 'thrones' for the apostles and its location at the end of the *IN* (22:28–29; cf. Mt. 19:28). It is significant that *kingdom motifs* mark four of these five uniquely Lukan elements of the *IN*, and elements in the third and fifth have a strongly *Davidic* resonance. Luke, more than any other evangelist, wishes to stress the relationship between the Last Supper and the kingdom of God. Each of these unique elements deserves consideration:

- (1) Whereas in Matthew and Mark Jesus makes the statement 'I shall not drink again of the fruit of the vine until I drink it new in the kingdom of God' after the distribution of the eucharistic elements (Mt. 19:29; Mk. 14:25), Luke records this statement before the supper (Lk. 22:18) and adds the similar statement 'I shall not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God'

<sup>75</sup> See 2 Sam. 6:19 (David); 1 Kgs. 8:65–66 (Solomon); 1 Chr. 29:20–22 (David); 2 Chr. 30:21–26 (Hezekiah); 35:7–19 (Josiah).

<sup>76</sup> Pss. 16:5; 22:26; 23:5; 34:8, 10; 36:8; 63:5; 65:4; 132:15.

<sup>77</sup> See discussion in LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 79–95; and the measured, appreciative critique by Koenig, *Feast*, 184–85.

<sup>78</sup> Jervell, *Luke*, 79.

<sup>79</sup> Lk. 22:16, 18, cf. Mt. 36:29; Mk. 14:25.

<sup>80</sup> Lk. 22:20, cf. Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24.

<sup>81</sup> Lk. 22:24–30; cf. Mt. 20:24–28; Mk. 10:41–45.

among Jesus' introductory words before the meal (22:16). The placement of the prophecy at the beginning of the supper account and its repetition: (1) emphasize that the following meal is somehow related to the kingdom and its arrival; (2) imply that the arrival of the kingdom is imminent; and (3) link the kingdom with both 'eating' and 'drinking.'<sup>82</sup> 'Eating' and 'drinking' in the kingdom will be mentioned again in verse 30, where the disciples are assured that they will 'eat and drink ... in my kingdom.' Thus the statements in verses 16 and 18 form an *inclusio* with verse 30 around the narrative of the Last Supper. Eating and drinking are prominent manifestations of the kingdom's presence. When later the risen Christ eats with the disciples, it indicates that the kingdom has indeed come.<sup>83</sup> Durrwell comments:

St. Luke puts this text ... before the institution of the Eucharist ... Luke realized that the meal in the joy of the Kingdom was beginning in the Last Supper. That is why he modified the text from Mark ... to make it a prophecy of an immediate reality ... His Kingdom of God 'at once suggests the sphere in which the new paschal rite was to unfold, that is, the church' [Benoit, 'Recit,' 388]. In giving us to understand that our Lord would eat and drink again in the Kingdom, he must have had in mind the meals of the risen Christ which he, alone of the Evangelists, lays such stress upon.<sup>84</sup>

- (2) Luke's account of Jesus' words over the bread has both common and unique features. First, Luke shares the tradition of the radical identification of the messianic king with the eucharistic bread: 'This is my body.' The same point is made over the cup: 'this cup ... is the new covenant *in my blood*,' that is, consisting of my blood. Second, Luke alone includes Jesus' command to repeat this meal 'in remembrance' of him. It is this command which makes the pericope an *institution narrative*. Without it, nothing is being instituted: it is only the account of Jesus' last meal before his death. But with the command to repeat the meal when Jesus is no longer visibly present, the pericope becomes the foundational story and theological explanation for the early church's continuing practice of 'breaking bread' as recorded in Acts.<sup>85</sup>

The meaning of Jesus' radical self-identification with the bread and wine was, and is, a mystery that can only be accepted based on faith in the

<sup>82</sup> Cf. Neyrey, *Passion*, 12–15.

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Lk. 24:30, 42–43; Acts 1:4, 10:41, and discussion below. St. Bonaventure notes, 'The Glossa observes: "I will no longer celebrate the Mosaic Passover, until it is completed in the church, which is the kingdom of God, spiritually understood"' (Karris, *Works*, 2045).

<sup>84</sup> Durrwell, *Resurrection*, 323.

<sup>85</sup> Acts 2:42, 46; 20:7, 11; 27:35.



veracity of the speaker.<sup>86</sup> Various dogmatic formulations throughout church history have at times obscured as much as explicated this mystery. Nonetheless, certainly in Luke 22:19–20 Jesus is not using the bread and wine as illustrations which make clear his coming sacrifice – that is, as an object lesson or visual parable – since ‘far from helping of themselves to explain the death of the body and the shedding of blood, it is precisely the bread and wine which need explaining by means of the former.’<sup>87</sup> Jesus’ words are not so much an explanation or a teaching as a ‘speech-act’, a declaration that brings about what it expresses. Long before the formal development of speech-act theory, Benoit observed ‘He [Christ] does not merely state that the bread is his body; he decrees that this must come to pass, and that it has come to pass. His speech does not come after the event, it brings the event to pass.’<sup>88</sup> What is implicit here at the Last Supper, Luke makes explicit in the Emmaus account, in which the visible presence of the Lord vanishes during the distribution of the pieces (23:31), since, in light of 22:19, his presence is now identified with the bread. Thus the messianic king is ‘made known’ to the disciples ‘in the breaking of bread’ (24:35). Later, Luke links his and his reader’s liturgical experience to Jesus’ Last Supper by including himself among those who gather on the first day of the week to ‘break bread’ (Acts 20:7). **Through the *IN* and the Emmaus account, Luke’s readers are to understand that the risen Christ is truly present in the bread they break together. Thus, where the Eucharist is, there is the king; and it follows – where the king is, there is the kingdom. (Thus the writers of the *Didascalia Apostolorum* described the Eucharist as ‘the likeness of the body of the kingdom of Christ.’)<sup>89</sup>**

- (3) Luke alone of the synoptics specifies the cup as the ‘*new* covenant in my blood’ (22:20), which changes the most immediate Old Testament reference from Exodus 24:6–8 (the Sinaitic covenant) to Jeremiah 31:31.<sup>90</sup> The ‘new covenant’ of Jeremiah 31:31 is explicitly said to be *unlike* the broken covenant of Sinai (Jer. 31:32). In the wider context of Jeremiah 30–33, it is clear that this ‘new covenant’ involves not only a new level of intimacy with God (31:33–34) and the reunification of the divided (Davidic) kingdom (31:31, cf. 30:4 et passim), but *also the restoration of the Davidic monarchy* (30:9; 33:14–26) and *covenant* (33:19–21). Thus, the declaration

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Jn. 6:66–69. Thus Benoit remarks, ‘How can bread and wine become the body and blood of the Lord? It is a mystery of faith; we believe it because we believe in the Word of the Lord’ (*Jesus*, 116). Benoit’s entire discussion (pp. 112–17) is helpful.

<sup>87</sup> Benoit, *Jesus*, 113.

<sup>88</sup> Benoit, *Jesus*, 116.

<sup>89</sup> See Vööbus, *Didascalia*, 243–44.

<sup>90</sup> On the reference to the ‘new covenant’ in Jeremiah, see Bock, ‘Reign,’ 43. On the relationship of covenant and kingdom, cf. Ossom-Batsa, *Institution*, 159.

- of the 'new' covenant in Luke 22:20 points to the restored Davidic kingdom-covenant constellation as promised in the Prophets, rather than merely to the memory of Sinai.<sup>91</sup> In fact, the 'new' covenant is *not a complete novum*, it is *the renewal of the Davidic covenant*.<sup>92</sup> Moreover, by identifying the cup with the 'new' covenant, Jesus marks this meal – the eucharistic 'breaking of bread' that is to be continued 'in remembrance' of him – as a covenant-renewal meal for the new covenant, just as the Passover was the covenant-renewal meal par excellence of the Mosaic covenant. Luke's readers should understand that when they participate in the eucharistic cup, they reaffirm their place within the promised 'new covenant,' which is in essence the renewed and transformed Davidic covenant.
- (4) Luke places the discussion of precedence among the disciples in the context of the Last Supper (22:24–27) rather than elsewhere in the gospel narrative (cf. Mt. 20:24–28; Mk. 10:41–45) because the kingdom is about to be conferred upon them (vv. 28–29), and therefore they must understand the proper way to exercise its authority. In their parallels, Matthew and Mark speak of 'rulers' (οἱ ἄρχοντες, οἱ δοκοῦντες ἄρχειν), but Luke highlights the kingdom motif by speaking of Gentile 'kings' (οἱ βασιλεῖς) who 'exercise lordship' (κυριεύουσιν). Jesus is both King (βασιλεύς) and Lord (κύριος) – more truly and with greater legitimacy than the Gentile kings – but his mode of exercising authority is radically different. The hierarchy of domination and pride characteristic of the kingdoms of this world will be replaced in the kingdom of God by a hierarchy of service (22:26–27). Significantly, the word used here for service, διακονία, frequently connotes waiting at table,<sup>93</sup> and verse 27 immediately confirms this sense. Jesus exercises his royal authority through *table service*, and the disciples will as well (v. 27). This re-emphasizes the connection throughout this passage between the concepts of royal authority/kingdom and those of eating/drinking, and forms another link with verse 30a below, where the disciples 'will eat and drink at my table.'
- (5) After correcting the disciples' misguided notions of the meaning of authority in his kingdom, Jesus assures them of their vice-regency in verses 28–30. To the apostles, who have shared with Jesus in his trials, he says, *καὶ γὰρ διατίθειμαι ὑμῖν καθὼς διέθετό μοι ὁ πατήρ μου βασιλείαν* ('I assign to you, as my Father assigned to me, a kingdom', v. 29b, RSV). The usual English translations of the verb διατίθημι – 'assign' in RSV, 'confer' in NRSV – do not quite capture the sense of the word for Luke. Luke's style, as all ac-

<sup>91</sup> Cf. Bock, 'Reign,' 43.

<sup>92</sup> The Davidic context is immediately confirmed in the next verse (v. 21) when Jesus alludes to a psalm of David (Ps. 41:9).

<sup>93</sup> Cf. BAGD, 184a def. 2.

knowledge, is heavily dependent on the LXX, in which the phrase διατίθεσθαι διαθήκην is used almost 80 times as the equivalent of the Hebrew כָּתַבְתִּי בְרִית, ‘to make a covenant’ – in fact, διατίθημι even without the noun διαθήκη can denote covenant-making.<sup>94</sup> Since the nominal form διαθήκη with the meaning ‘covenant’ has just been employed in verse 20 above, the sense of ‘covenant-making’ would seem to accrue to the verb διατίθημι here.<sup>95</sup> A more precise, if awkward, translation of verse 29b would thus be ‘I covenant to you a kingdom, as my Father covenanted one to me.’<sup>96</sup>

The only kingdom established on the basis of a covenant in Scripture is the kingdom of David (cf. Ps. 89:3–4, 28–37). Moreover, the use of father-son terminology in verse 29b evokes the father-son relationship of the Lord with the Son of David as reflected in 2 Samuel 7:14, Psalm 2:7, and Psalm 89:26–27. Significantly, in each of these three passages, father-son terminology is employed in the context of God granting a kingdom to the Davidide (cf. 2 Sam. 7:13; Ps. 2:6, 8; 89:25, 27). The meaning of Luke 22:29b becomes clear: God has ‘covenanted’ a kingdom to Jesus, since Jesus is the Son of David, the legal heir to David’s covenant and throne (cf. 1:32–33). Now Jesus, through the ‘new covenant in [his] blood’ (v. 20), is ‘covenanting’ to the disciples that same kingdom of David. This is not the promise of a conferral (future tense), but the declaration of a conferral (present tense).<sup>97</sup> This present conferral of the kingdom militates against those scholars who acknowledge a present kingdom in Luke-Acts but limit it to the person and ministry of Christ. As Darrel Bock comments with respect to an earlier passage (Lk. 11:20), ‘An appeal only to the presence of God’s kingly power in the person and message of Jesus misses the significance of this transfer of power to others and ignores the kingdom associations Jesus makes in explaining these activities.’<sup>98</sup>

<sup>94</sup> Cf. 1 Chr. 19:19; 2 Chr. 5:10; 7:18; Ezek. 16:30; and the discussion in Nelson, *Leadership*, 204.

<sup>95</sup> Διατίθημι and διαθήκη often bear the sense ‘to make a testament’ and ‘testament/will’ respectively in secular Greek literature (BAGD, 189b def. 3; 183a def. 1), but not here (contra Jervell, *Luke*, 105, n. 24; and Nelson, *Leadership*, 204). As Nolland points out: ‘Though the verb can bear such a sense [i.e., ‘bequeath’], its parallel use in connection with God here hardly encourages us to move in such a direction’ (*Luke*, 1066). See the discussion in L&N, §34.43; Marshall, *Luke*, 814–15; Priest, ‘Banquet,’ 222–38.

<sup>96</sup> Cf. Becker, ‘Covenant,’ 369: ‘In Lk. 22:29 in the phrase *diatithemai* ... *basileian*, appoint a kingdom, ... exactly expresses the formula *diatithemai diathēkēn*. The new covenant and the kingdom of God are correlated concepts.’

<sup>97</sup> Bock, *Luke*, 1740. Cf. Pao, *Acts*, 124–27; Neyrey, *Passion*, 27–28.

<sup>98</sup> Bock, ‘Reign,’ 41.

The purpose of the ‘covenanting’ of the kingdom to the disciples is that they ‘may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.’ Here it is apparent that the kingdom has not been removed from Jesus to the apostles, because the kingdom remains ‘my [Jesus]’ kingdom.<sup>99</sup> Rather, the exercise of authority in the kingdom is being shared.<sup>100</sup>

In Luke 22:30, Jesus follows the example of his forefathers David and Solomon (cf. 1 Kgs. 2:7): having received the kingdom by covenant, he shows covenant loyalty to those who continued with him in his trials (v. 28) by extending to them the filial, covenantal, and royal privilege of table fellowship.<sup>101</sup> Thus, the promise of eating and drinking at Jesus’ table confirms the previous statement of ‘covenanting’ the kingdom to the disciples.

Yet one cannot fail to note that the disciples are now – at the Last Supper – ‘eating and drinking at my [Jesus]’ table.’ The conclusion is inescapable that there exists some intentional correspondence between the eucharistic eating and drinking in the narrative present of Luke 22 and the eschatological eating and drinking promised in verse 30a.<sup>102</sup> As we shall see below, in Acts the kingdom is portrayed as already present in the ministry of the apostles and the growing ἐκκλησία. When the apostles ‘break bread’ in ‘remembrance’ of Jesus in the post-Pentecost community (the church), it is an experience of the messianic banquet, with the messianic king present, as it were, in body and blood. The apostles’ eucharistic practice in the early church is, therefore, the fulfillment of Jesus’ promise here that they will ‘eat and drink at my table in my kingdom.’ As noted above, the celebration of the Eucharist manifests the kingdom. Kingdom and Eucharist are tightly bound: it is a *eucharistic kingdom*. That is why the promise of table fellowship at the messianic banquet (v. 30a) is sandwiched between two promises of the grant of (vice)-royal authority (vv. 29b, 30b).

The link between the discussion of sitting/serving at table in verse 27 and the ‘eating and drinking’ at table in verse 30a was noted above. In verses 25–27, Jesus contrasted the manner of exercise of authority in his kingdom with that of Gentile kings. Unlike these kings, Jesus exercises his royal authority through *table service* (διακονία) and calls his disciples to do the same. In contrast to verse 27, no ‘sitting’ at table is mentioned in verse 30a. Although the apostles will ‘eat’ and ‘drink’ at Jesus’ table, they will not ‘sit’ because they will be serving like their Lord. However, this table service is immediately juxtaposed with vice-royal authority: you will ‘sit on thrones ...’ (v. 30b).<sup>103</sup> Searching for the

<sup>99</sup> This is another indication that διατίθημι above should not be taken in a testamentary sense.

<sup>100</sup> See Green, *Luke*, 770.

<sup>101</sup> See Nelson, *Leadership*, 59.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Ossom-Batsa, *Institution*, 146, 159.

<sup>103</sup> This juxtaposition may suggest a paradoxical equation of the two promises: it is precisely when the apostles ‘eat’ and ‘drink’ at Jesus’ table in his kingdom, not sitting

scriptural background of this concept of ‘thrones over the twelve tribes,’ we find the Davidic imagery of Psalm 122:3–5:

Jerusalem, built as a city which is bound firmly together,  
 To which the tribes go up, the tribes of the Lord ...  
 There thrones for judgment were set,  
 The *thrones of the House of David*.

The connection between the two texts is firm, in light of the collocation in each of the three elements: ‘tribes,’ ‘thrones,’ and ‘judgment.’<sup>104</sup> Psalm 122:5b makes explicit the Davidic context of the promise of Luke 22:30b. The disciples, then, are promised a share in the exercise of authority of the Davidic monarchy over all twelve tribes. The disciples’ ‘appointment is an anticipation of the restoration of Israel ... and [they] are commissioned to govern the renewed people of God.’<sup>105</sup> L.T. Johnson comments on the significance of Luke’s version of this dominical saying vis-à-vis Matthew’s:

Luke decisively alters the reference point for this prediction ... In Luke the saying points forward to the role that the apostles will have within the *restored Israel in the narrative of Acts* ... These followers [will] exercise effective rule within the people gathered by the power of the resurrected prophet (see e.g., Acts 5:1–11).<sup>106</sup>

It is now possible to grasp the logical relationship between verses 19–20 and verses 28–30.

Jesus is the heir of the covenant with David, by virtue of which he is eternal king over Israel and the nations (Lk. 1:32–33). In Luke 22:19–20 he enacts a *new* covenant between himself and the disciples, who share in the covenant meal. This new covenant is a renewal and extension of the covenant with David: in essence, the privileges of the Davidic covenant are being extended to

---

but serving, that they are in fact ‘sitting on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.’ Alternately, the contrast between ‘eating and drinking at table’ and ‘sitting on thrones’ may be between realized and unrealized eschatology, the ‘already’ and ‘not yet,’ respectively. In either case, when the apostles serve at table (*διακονία*) to host the eucharistic meal – fulfilling the command to ‘do this in remembrance of me’ – they exercise Davidic royal authority in imitation of the servant-king, judging (*κρίνοντες*) the twelve tribes. The administration of the Eucharist would at first glance not appear to be an act of ‘judging,’ but Paul’s reference to ‘eating and drinking judgment on oneself’ (1 Cor. 11:31) reflects a very similar and early tradition of the judicial aspect of eucharistic participation (cf. 1 Cor. 11:27–32 and 1 Cor. 5:1–13, esp. vv. 4, 7–8).

<sup>104</sup> See Evans, ‘Thrones.’

<sup>105</sup> Green, *Luke*, 770; cf. Fitzmyer, *Luke*, 1419.

<sup>106</sup> Johnson, *Luke*, 345–46, 349.

the apostles, as in Isaiah 55:3, ‘I will make with you an everlasting covenant; my steadfast, sure love for David.’ By virtue of their sharing in the covenant established in verses 19–20, the apostles, like Christ, are now heirs of the kingdom of David (v. 29a). Because they are heirs, they have filial privileges: they may eat at the royal table (v. 30a) and sit on the thrones of the royal house, judging the twelve tribes (v. 30b). The Davidic traditions form the context for the logic of the entire transaction, and it is clear that the apostles have become heirs of the kingdom and covenant of David. The ecclesiological ramifications are profound, since the twelve apostles ‘are transitional figures who link the church with the ministry of Jesus (cf. [Acts] 1:1) ... [and] provide an essential foundation for the church’s continuing faith and life.’<sup>107</sup> If the foundation is Davidic, the edifice will be Davidic as well.

### The Ecclesiological Significance of the Institution Narrative in Acts

In order to grasp the ecclesiological implications of the *IN*, it is necessary to venture a little way into Acts, where it can be seen that Jesus’ promise of inheritance and rule of the Davidic kingdom is manifested in the apostle’s assumption of authority in the ἐκκλησία, and the promise of table fellowship is fulfilled in post-resurrection meals with Jesus and the continuing eucharistic practice.<sup>108</sup> Johnson remarks, ‘Luke must show how in fact the apostles carry on the prophetic power of Jesus in their deeds and words, and how they are to be leaders over this restored people, “judging the twelve tribes of Israel” (Luke 22:30).’<sup>109</sup>

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

Significantly, in the opening verses of Acts (1:3, 6), Jesus’ topic of discussion with the apostles over forty days is *the kingdom of God*.<sup>110</sup> ‘Kingdom’ will remain a central theme throughout the book, which ends with Paul proclaiming the

<sup>107</sup> Clark, ‘Role,’ 190.

<sup>108</sup> On the important links between the end of Luke and beginning of Acts, the common Isaianic-restoration imagery behind Lk. 24:49 and Acts 1:8 (e.g., Is. 43:10–12, 49:6), and the restoration of Israel around the twelve, see Turner, *Power*, 300–301. On the church as restored Israel in Acts, see Turner, *Power*, 418–22. On the fulfillment of the promise of vice-regency to the apostles see Strauss, *Messiah*, 25; Jervell, *Luke*, 94; and Neyrey, *Passion*, 26–28.

<sup>109</sup> Johnson, *Acts*, 71.

<sup>110</sup> On the close link between the ‘kingdom’ in Lk. 22 and here in Acts 1:1–11, see Jervell, *Luke*, 81–82.

kingdom of God in Rome (28:31).<sup>111</sup> Acts 1:4 makes the connection between the kingdom and eating and drinking (cf. Lk. 22:30a) – that is, the messianic banquet – when it states that Jesus taught them over this forty-day period ‘while taking salt’ (συναλιζόμενος) with them, an idiom for ‘eating together.’<sup>112</sup>

When the disciples ask Jesus, ‘Lord, will you at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?’ (1:6), their query may refer to Jesus’ promise in Luke 22:30b that ‘you will sit on thrones.’ The apostles are asking, ‘When will we receive the authority promised to us?’ In response, Jesus discourages speculation about *timing* (v. 7), but does in fact describe the *means* by which the kingdom will be restored, namely, through the Spirit-inspired witness of the apostles throughout the earth (v. 8).<sup>113</sup> Jesus’ geographical description of the spread of the gospel: ‘you shall be my witnesses in Jerusalem and in all Judea and Samaria and to the end of the earth’ is, on the one hand, a programmatic outline of the narrative of Acts, helping us to recognize that the whole book concerns the spread of the kingdom (cf. Acts 28:31).<sup>114</sup> On the other hand, it is a *Davidic map* that reflects the *theological geography* of God’s covenant pledge concerning the extent of the Davidic empire. Jerusalem was David’s city (cf. 2 Sam. 5:6–10), Judea his tribal land (2 Sam. 5:5; 1 Kgs. 12:21); Samaria represents (northern) Israel, David’s nation (1 Kgs. 12:16); and ‘the ends of the earth’ are the Gentiles (cf. Is. 49:6), David’s vassals (Pss. 2:7–8; 72:8–12; 89:25–27).<sup>115</sup> The kingdom of David, encompassing Jerusalem, Jews (i.e., Judeans), Israelites, and Gentiles, will be restored as the apostles’ witness extends to ‘the ends of the earth’ and the *ἐκκλησία* grows.<sup>116</sup>

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

<sup>111</sup> ‘The concept of βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ... seems to give unity to the whole narrative of the Lucan two-volume work ... The whole theological project of Luke ... [is] a narrative unit with the central theme of the *basileia* as its starting point’ (del Agua, ‘Narrative,’ 639).

<sup>112</sup> See LaVerdiere, *Eucharist*, 99 and L&N §23.13. BAGD acknowledges the idiomatic force of συναλιζόμενος as ‘eating together,’ but argues that this meaning does not fit the context of Acts 1:4 (BAGD, 783b). *Pace* BAGD, the meaning fits the context extremely well. Acts 10:41 makes explicit the implicit significance of Lk. 24:43 and Acts 1:4. Cf. BAGD, 783b: ‘Ac 10:41 appears to echo 1:4.’

<sup>113</sup> As argued by Penney, *Emphasis*, 70; Pao, *Acts*, 95, nn. 143, 144; and Bock, ‘Reign,’ 45.

<sup>114</sup> ‘The verse is programmatic in its significance for the narrative structure ... That the mission will begin in Jerusalem alludes to the restored Zion of Isaiah (Is. 2.3)’ (Penney, *Emphasis*, 73).

<sup>115</sup> Cf. Pao, *Acts*, 95.

<sup>116</sup> Cf. Penney, *Emphasis*, 21, 71.

earth, essentially heavenly.<sup>117</sup> *The Spirit must still be poured out for the apostles to perceive the transformed kingdom.* Thus only *after* the disciples have received the power of the Holy Spirit will they become *μάρτυρες*, or witnesses (Acts 1:8).

Between the promise of the outpouring of the Spirit (Acts 1:8) and Pentecost (2:1–4) Luke records the restoration of the circle of the twelve by the replacement of Judas with Matthias. Here again there is a relationship to the promise of Luke 22:30b: ‘the election of [Matthias] is crucial if Jesus’ promise to establish the twelve on thrones governing the twelve tribes of Israel is to survive.’<sup>118</sup> Thus Neyrey comments:

Luke has given us in Acts a vivid picture of apostolic governance and leadership ... which gives immediate realization to the commission in [Lk.] 22:29–30. For example ... the first act of the apostles in Acts is to replace Judas, thus signaling that the group’s membership must be complete, a completeness that is irrelevant unless Luke sees it as a fulfillment of Jesus’ remark that there should be *twelve* judges of the twelve tribes of Israel.<sup>119</sup>

After the reconstitution of the twelve, the event of Pentecost (Acts 2:1–42) marks: (1) the restoration in principle of Israel as kingdom under the Son of David; and (2) the beginning of the apostles’ vice-regency over that kingdom.

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

In response to the apostolic message there is a mass conversion as three thousand of these dispersed Jews enter the messianic community. In this event, the eschatological prophecies of Joel and other prophets are fulfilled and Israel restored – not definitively, as much growth of the *ἐκκλησία* remains, but nonetheless ‘fundamentally’, as Johnson points out:

Three thousand Jews in the city are baptized and enter the messianic community (2:41). Although Luke will be careful to note further such increments, this one is

<sup>117</sup> ‘Jesus shifts the focus from “knowledge” to mission ... [this is] the real answer to the question concerning the ‘restoration’ of the kingdom to Israel. Jesus’ answer contains a redefinition of “kingdom” and therefore of the Christian understanding of Jesus as Messiah ... The “kingdom for Israel” will mean for Luke, therefore, the restoration of Israel *as a people of God*’ (Johnson, *Acts*, 29).

<sup>118</sup> Brawley, *Text*, 73.

<sup>119</sup> Neyrey, *Passion*, 27–28; cf. Denova, *Things*, 70; Fitzmyer, ‘Role,’ esp. 182; and Pao, *Acts*, 124.

<sup>120</sup> Denova, *Things*, 138, cf. 169–75.



fundamental, for in it we find the realization of the restored people of God within historic Judaism.<sup>121</sup>

However, we can be more precise than to say ‘Israel is restored.’ The restored Israel has a certain form and structure: not that of the confederated tribes at Sinai, but that of the twelve tribes within the *kingdom of David*.<sup>122</sup> Peter’s sermon stresses the Davidic royalty of Jesus Christ (cf. 2:36).<sup>123</sup> He preaches to the assembled exiles of Israel that Jesus is the fulfillment of the covenant of David (v. 30)<sup>124</sup> and the fulfillment of David’s own prophecies (vv. 25–28; 34–35).<sup>125</sup> He applies to Jesus the royal Davidic enthronement psalm (Psalm 110), asserting that Jesus is now enthroned in heaven (‘exalted at the right hand of God’) and has poured out the Spirit on the apostles as the crowd has just witnessed (v. 33). Thus, Jesus is reigning *now* in heaven, and the results of his reign are being manifest *now* in events that the people may ‘see and hear’ (v. 33).<sup>126</sup> Peter and the apostles, filled with the Spirit, have become ‘witnesses,’ inasmuch as they now see the nature of Jesus’ kingdom and its present realization. When Peter’s hearers accept the fact that Jesus is the presently-enthroned Davidic king – and thus acknowledge his rightful reign over themselves – they are incorporated into the ἐκκλησία through baptism (2:41–42; cf. 4:32–5:11, esp. 5:11).<sup>127</sup> Not just Israel, but *David’s reign* over Israel, has been established in principle.

It is important to note, however, that the Davidic kingdom is not only restored but transformed.<sup>128</sup> The Son of David is not now enthroned in the earthly Jerusalem but in the heavenly, ‘exalted at the right hand of God.’ The kingdom has been transposed from earth to heaven, even though it continues to manifest itself on earth as the ἐκκλησία.<sup>129</sup> This *ecclesial* kingdom exists simultaneously on earth and in heaven. The king is enthroned in heaven, but the ministers (the apostles) are active on earth. Meanwhile the heavenly king is

<sup>121</sup> Johnson, *Acts*, 61.

<sup>122</sup> See O’Toole, ‘Acts 2:30,’ 245–58; and Bock, ‘Reign,’ 47: ‘Although the term *kingdom* never appears in the entire chapter, the imagery of rule and the features of God’s covenants are present. In fact, the chapter is saturated with such images and allusions.’

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Tannehill, *Unity*, 38.

<sup>124</sup> See Bock, ‘Reign,’ 49.

<sup>125</sup> On the Davidic background of Peter’s sermon, see Bock, ‘Reign,’ 38–39.

<sup>126</sup> On the relationship of Lk. 1:32–33 and Acts 2:24–31, see Lane, *Luke*, 160.

<sup>127</sup> See Fitzmyer, ‘Role,’ 175–76; and Denova, *Things*, 138 and 169–75.

<sup>128</sup> Francis Martin compares ways in which the NT transforms the expectations of the OT in the very process of fulfilling them to Bernard Lonergan’s concept of ‘sublation,’ although Martin prefers the term ‘transposition’ (see discussion in Martin, ‘Directions,’ 69–70).

<sup>129</sup> So Penney, *Emphasis*, 75.

united to his earthly officers and subjects by the Holy Spirit and, though it receives less emphasis, the eucharistic ‘breaking of bread.’

Second, the promise of apostolic vice-regency over the Davidic kingdom (Lk. 22:30; Ps. 122:5) begins at Pentecost, when the apostles receive the ‘power’ (δύναμις) of the Holy Spirit, call a worldwide audience of Jews to repentance, and incorporate the respondents into the messianic community. Just as the outpouring of the Spirit is the perceptible sign of Jesus’ royal enthronement (Acts 1:33), the dispensation of the Spirit thereafter through the apostle’s hands is a sign of their own enthronement as vice-regents.<sup>130</sup> The vice-regents are sharing in the king’s power to dispense the Spirit. The kingdom and Spirit are co-extensive; it is a *pneumatic* kingdom.<sup>131</sup> One might also call it a *sacramental* kingdom: one must enter it through baptism, and the community of the baptized devotes themselves ‘to the apostle’s teaching and fellowship, to the breaking of bread and the prayers.’ The eucharistic significance of the ‘breaking of bread’ in Luke 9:16, 22:19, and 24:30 has been noted. The ‘breaking of bread’ here in Acts 2:42, as well as 20:11 and 27:35, is no simple eating but eucharistic celebration and proleptic participation in the messianic banquet. In the continuing practice of ‘the breaking of bread’ the apostles experience the fulfillment of the promise ‘to eat and drink at my table in my kingdom’ (Lk. 22:30), and the whole eschatological community shares in the fulfillment with them.

In sum, Acts 1–2, the key introductory chapters of the book, have several links to the Institution Narrative and describe the birth of the church as the restoration of the kingdom of David. The identification of the Davidic kingdom and the church is not limited to these two chapters, but occurs throughout Acts. For example, in James’ concluding statements at the Jerusalem council (Acts 15), he confirms the decision to embrace Gentile converts by quoting Amos 9:11–12: ‘After this I will return, and I will rebuild the dwelling (*skēnē*) of David ... that the rest of men may seek the Lord, and all the Gentiles who are called by my name’ (Acts 15:13–18). The ‘dwelling’ or ‘tent’ of David referred to by Amos (Amos 9:11) is the Davidic kingdom, which at its peak incorporated Edom (cf. Amos 9:12a) and other Gentile nations (Ammon, Moab, Aram, etc.) who may be ‘the nations who are called by my name’ (Amos 9:12b).<sup>132</sup> James sees the fulfillment of Amos’ prophecy – that is, the restoration

<sup>130</sup> Johnson, *Acts*, 29. Significantly, hereafter in Acts ‘it is made clear that the Spirit is given only when the twelve are present, or a member of the twelve, or one of their delegates is on the scene’ (Fitzmyer, ‘Role,’ 182).

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Bock, ‘Reign,’ 53: ‘Those who share the Spirit show the influence of God in the world and reflect his work on earth, both in his powerful transformation of them and in their love toward those around them. They are a kingdom alongside other kingdoms.’

<sup>132</sup> Mauchline, ‘Signs’; and Polley, *Amos*, 66–82.

of the Davidic *kingdom* – in the incorporation of Gentiles into the *church* as related by ‘Simeon’ before the whole council.<sup>133</sup> No one has seen this more clearly than Pao:

The promise to rebuild and restore the Davidic kingdom is explicitly made at the point in the narrative of Acts that focuses on defining the people of God. The Amos quotation of Acts 15 shows that ... the development of the early Christian community is also understood within the paradigm of the anticipation of the Davidic kingdom. The *christological* focus of the David tradition should be supplemented by an *ecclesiological* one.<sup>134</sup>

## Conclusion

The work that has been done on royal Davidic messianism in Luke has been excellent, but its logic must be carried forward. If Jesus is the royal Son of David, this fact has not merely christological but also ecclesiological significance. If Jesus is the Davidic King, then his kingdom is the Davidic kingdom. That kingdom is present already, because it was conferred on the disciples at the Last Supper. Their rule over Israel is manifested in their rule over the *ἐκκλησία*. The *ἐκκλησία* is the incipient, growing kingdom of David, incorporating Jews, Israelites, and the nations, under the reign of Jesus the Davidic King, which is exercised through his Spirit-empowered apostolic vice-regents.<sup>135</sup>

Nonetheless, while the Davidic kingdom finds historic fulfillment in the church, it also undergoes a transposition from the earthly to the heavenly sphere. The earthly Jerusalem and its temple, despite Luke’s genuine respect for them, cannot be the ultimate locus of eschatological fulfillment (cf. Acts 7:48–50; Lk. 21:6). Peter makes clear that Christ’s present rule is not from the earthly Jerusalem but from the heavenly (Acts 2:33a). Nonetheless his reign expresses itself in the earthly realm by what can be ‘seen and heard’ (2:33b). **The renewed kingdom of David, of which the church is the visible manifestation, exists simultaneously in heaven and on earth, as its citizens move from one sphere to the other.** To quote Durrwell:

She [the Church] exists fully in two different periods of time ... she dwells in heaven but also journeys on earth. She does not exist somewhere between the two times, but actually in both simultaneously ... Thus the church bears the marks of two

<sup>133</sup> See Strauss, *Messiah*, 190–92.

<sup>134</sup> Pao, *Acts*, 138. Cf. also Penney, *Emphasis*, 74; Seccombe, ‘People’; and Bauckham, ‘James,’ esp. 457.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. del Agua, ‘Narrative,’ 661.

opposite states. She leads a mysterious, heavenly existence, and she is also a visible, empirical reality ... In her mysterious reality the church is indeed the Kingdom of God ... but as perceived by the senses, she is only its sign and instrument.<sup>136</sup>

Nonetheless, the whole kingdom (i.e., the whole church) is united by the indwelling Holy Spirit and the celebration of the Eucharist, in which the King becomes present, the kingdom manifest, and the earthly citizens of the kingdom participate in the perpetual messianic banquet of the heavenly King.

---

<sup>136</sup> Durrwell, *Resurrection*, 270.

## Bibliography

- del Agua, A., 'The Lucan Narrative of the "Evangelization of the Kingdom of God:" A Contribution to the Unity of Luke-Acts,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 639–62
- Bailey, K.E., *Jacob and the Prodigal: How Jesus Retold Israel's Story* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press, 2003)
- Bartholomew, C., 'Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation', in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 5; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 1–19
- Bartholomew, C., and M.W. Goheen, 'Story and Biblical Theology', in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 5; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan., 2004), 144–71
- Barton, S.C., 'The Unity of Humankind as a Theme in Biblical Theology', in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 5; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 233–58
- Bauckham, R., 'Anna of the Tribe of Asher (Luke 2:36–38),' *RB* 104 (1997), 161–91
- , 'James and the Jerusalem Church', in *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting. Volume 4: The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 415–80
- Bechard, D.P., 'The Theological Significance of Judea in Luke-Acts,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 675–91
- Becker, O., 'Covenant', in *NIDNTT* 1:365–76
- Benoit, P., 'Le Recit de la Cène dans Luc xxii, 15–20', *RB* 48 (1939), 357–93
- , *Jesus and the Gospel*, I (New York: Herder and Herder, 1973)
- Block, D.I., 'My Servant David: Ancient Israel's Vision of the Messiah,' in *Israel's Messiah in the Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. R.S. Hess and M.D. Carroll R.; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 2003), 17–56
- Bock, D.L., *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology* (JSNTSup 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997)
- , *Luke 1:1–9:50* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1994)
- , *Luke 9:51–24:53* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1996)
- , 'Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Luke's Use of the Old Testament for Christology and Mission,' in *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (ed. C.A. Evans and W.R. Stegner; JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 293–94
- , 'The Reign of the Lord Jesus,' in *Dispensationalism, Israel and the Church: The Search for Definition* (ed. C.A. Blaising and D.L. Bock; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1992), 37–67

- Brawley, R.L., 'Abrahamic Covenant Traditions and the Characterization of God in Luke-Acts,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 109–32
- , *Text to Text Pours Forth Speech: Voices of Scripture in Luke-Acts* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1995)
- Brown, R., S.S., 'Communicating the Divine and Human in Scripture,' *Origins* 22.1 (1992), 5–6
- Bruce, F.F., 'The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts,' in *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies: Festschrift W.S. Lasor* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978), 7–17
- Chance, J.B., *Jerusalem, the Temple, and the New Age in Luke-Acts* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988)
- Childs, B.S., *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1970)
- Clark, A.C., 'The Role of the Apostles,' in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I.H. Marshall and D. Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 169–90
- Collins, J.J., *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1995)
- Denova, R.I., *Things Accomplished among Us: Prophetic Tradition in the Structural Pattern of Luke-Acts* (JSNTSup 141; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997)
- Durrwell, F.X., *The Resurrection: A Biblical Study* (trans. R. Sheed; New York: Sheed and Ward, 1960)
- Evans, C.A., 'The Twelve Thrones of Israel: Scripture and Politics in Luke 22:24–30,' in *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (ed. C.A. Evans and J.A. Sanders; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993), 154–70
- Evans, C.A., and W.R. Stegner (eds.), *The Gospels and the Scriptures of Israel* (JSNTSup 104; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999)
- Evans, C.A., and J.A. Sanders (eds.), *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993)
- Van Den Eynde, S., 'Children of the Promise: On the Διαθήκη-Promise to Abraham in Lk. 1,72 and Acts 3,25,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 470–82
- Farris, S., *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance* (JSNTSup 9; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), 95–96
- Fitzmyer, J.A., 'The Role of the Spirit in Luke-Acts,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 165–84
- , *The Gospel According to Luke, I–IX* (AB 28; Garden City: Doubleday, 1981)
- , *The Gospel According to Luke, X–XXIV* (AB 28A; New York: Doubleday, 1985)
- García Martínez, F., and E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (2 vols.; Leiden: E.J. Brill/Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997–98)
- Gese, H., *Essays in Biblical Theology* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1981)
- Gordon, R.P., *1 & 2 Samuel* (Old Testament Guides; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984)
- Green, J.B., *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997)

- Horbury, W., *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press, 1998)
- , *Messianism among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (New York: T&T Clark, 2003)
- Hurowitz, V., *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup 115; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992)
- Ishida, T., *The Royal Dynasties in Ancient Israel: A Study on the Formation and Development of Royal-Dynastic Ideology* (New York: de Gruyter, 1977)
- Japhet, S., 'From the King's Sanctuary to the Chosen City,' in *Jerusalem: Its Sanctity and Centrality to Judaism, Christianity, and Islam* (ed. L.I. Levine; New York: Continuum, 1999), 3–15
- Jervell, J., *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Press, 1972)
- Johnson, L.T., *The Gospel of Luke* (SP 3; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991).
- , *The Acts of the Apostles* (SP 5; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1992).
- Juel, D., 'Review of Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*,' in *RBL*; 2000 online <http://www.bookreviews.org>
- Karris, R.J. (ed.), *The Works of St. Bonaventure*, VIII, Part 3: *Commentary on the Gospel of Luke Chapters 17–24* (St. Bonaventure, NY: Franciscan Institute, 2004)
- Kimball, C.A., *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1994)
- Koenig, J., *The Feast of the World's Redemption: Eucharistic Origins and Christian Mission* (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 2000)
- Kruse, H., 'David's Covenant,' *VT* 35 (1985), 139–64
- Laato, A., 'Psalm 132 and the Development of the Jerusalemite/Israelite Royal Ideology,' *CBQ* 54 (1992), 49–66
- , *A Star is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of Jewish Messianic Expectations* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995)
- Lane, T.J., *Luke and the Gentile Mission: Gospel Anticipates Acts* (Frankfurt am Mein: Peter Lang, 1996)
- LaVerdiere, E., *Dining in the Kingdom of God: The Origins of the Eucharist according to Luke* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1994)
- , *The Breaking of the Bread: The Development of the Eucharist according to Acts* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1998)
- , *The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1996)
- Levenson, J.D., *Sinai and Zion: An Entry into the Jewish Bible* (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1985)
- Marshall, I.H., *Luke: Historian and Theologian* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970)

- Martin, F., 'Some Directions in Catholic Biblical Theology', in *Out of Egypt: Biblical Theology and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 5; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2004), 65–87
- Mason, R., 'The Messiah in the Postexilic Old Testament Literature,' in *King and Messiah in the Ancient Near East: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day; JSOTSup 270; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 338–64
- Mauchline, J., 'Implicit Signs of a Persistent Belief in the Davidic Empire,' *VT* 20 (1970), 287–303
- McKnight, S., *A New Vision for Israel: The Teachings of Jesus in National Context* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999)
- Meyers, C., 'The Israelite Empire: In Defense of King Solomon,' in *Backgrounds for the Bible* (ed. P. O'Connor and D.N. Freedman; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 1987), 181–97
- Moessner, D.P., *Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1989)
- Nelson, P.K., *Leadership and Discipleship: A Study of Luke 22:24–30* (SBLDS 138; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1994)
- Neyrey, J., *The Passion according to Luke: A Redaction Study of Luke's Soteriology* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985)
- Nolan, B.M., *The Royal Son of God: The Christology of Matthew 1–2 in the Setting of the Gospel* (OBO 23; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1979)
- Nolland, J., *Luke 18:35–24:53* (WBC 35c; Dallas: Word, 1993)
- O'Toole, R.F., 'Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost,' *JBL* 102 (1983), 245–58
- Ossom-Batsa, G., *The Institution of the Eucharist in the Gospel of Mark: A Study of the Function of Mark 14,22–25 within the Gospel Narrative* (Bern: Peter Lang, 2001)
- Pao, D.W., *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2/130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000)
- Penney, J.M., *The Missionary Emphasis of Lukan Pneumatology* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997)
- Plantinga, A., 'Two (or More) Kinds of Scripture Scholarship', in *'Behind' the Text: History and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 4; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 19–57
- Polley, M.E., *Amos and the Davidic Empire: A Socio-Historical Approach* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989)
- Priest, J., 'A Note on the Messianic Banquet,' in *The Messiah: Developments in Earliest Judaism and Christianity* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 222–38
- Ravens, D., *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)
- Ratzinger, J., *Behold the Pierced One* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1986)



- Seccombe, D., 'The New People of God,' in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts* (ed. I.H. Marshall and D. Peterson; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 350–72
- Strauss, M.L., *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and Its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995)
- Swartley, W.M., *Israel's Scripture Traditions and the Synoptic Gospels: Story Shaping Story* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1994)
- Tannehill, R.C., *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation, I: The Gospel according to Luke* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986)
- Taylor, N.H., 'Luke-Acts and the Temple,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 709–21
- Tuckett, C.M., 'The Christology of Luke-Acts,' in *The Unity of Luke-Acts* (ed. J. Verheyden; BETL 142; Leuven: Peeters, 1999), 133–64
- Turner, M., *Power from on High: The Spirit in Israel's Restoration and Witness in Luke-Acts* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996).
- Vanhoozer, K.J., 'From Speech Acts to Scripture Acts: The Covenant of Discourse and the Discourse of Covenant,' in *After Pentecost: Language and Biblical Interpretation* (ed. C. Bartholomew et al.; SHS 2; Carlisle: Paternoster; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 1–49
- Vööbus, A. (ed. and trans.), *The Didascalia Apostolorum in Syriac, II: Chapters XI–XXVI* (CSCO 408; Scriptorum Syri 180; Louvain: Secretariat du CSCO, 1979)
- Waltke, B.K., 'The Phenomenon of Conditionality within Unconditional Covenants,' in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison* (ed. A. Gileadi; Grand Rapids: Baker Books, 1988), 123–40