

LUKE'S USE OF LXX ISAIAH IN ACTS

Rick Strelan, Brisbane, Australia

Introduction

It is well known that Luke, like many the other NT writers, wanted to claim that what he believed God had done through Jesus was consistent with the activity of God in Jewish Scriptures, and that, indeed, God's actions through Jesus were the fulfilment of those very scriptures. The death of the Christ, especially, was believed to be 'in accordance with the scriptures' (κατὰ τὰς γράφας, 1 Cor 15.3; compare Acts 17.2-3), or, as 'Moses and the prophets' had said (Luke 24.27,44; Acts 26.22; 28.23). A prophetic word is, by definition, a word that is capable of being fulfilled, and its veracity or otherwise depends on that fulfilment. Luke uses prophetic words as basic building blocks in his narrative construction.

Since interpretation of 'Moses and the prophets' provided many points of contention between Paul and other Jews in various local synagogues, according to Luke in Acts, we might expect that Isaiah played a significant role within those debates and discussions. Along with the Psalms, Isaiah is the most-cited Old Testament writing in early Christian literature. This is true not only of the canonical New Testament writings. A glance through Justin's *Dialogue* indicates that Isaiah is, along with Psalms, the major prophetic text discussed and cited in that dialogue. So close did Justin see the link between Isaiah and the Christian apostles that he could say, 'Isaiah speaks as if he were personating the apostles' (ὡς ἀπὸ προώπου τῶν ἀποστόλων, *Dial.* 42.2). It would also seem that Isaiah was important for the communities who wrote and used the texts found at Qumran, since some 20 copies of that prophet (second only to copies of the Psalms) have been found there. In addition, about 70 references to, or citations of, passages from Isaiah appear in the non-biblical Qumran texts, which include fragments of five 'commentaries' on Isaiah (4Q161-165). There is probably no argument that in many dialogues between Jews and Christians in the first centuries on interpretation of scriptures, Isaiah was at the very centre.

I would not want to give the impression that Luke draws on Isaiah more than the other New Testament writers do; or, that he draws on Isaiah far more than any other biblical text. Neither is in fact the case. Exodus and Psalms are cited directly or implicitly just as often in Acts. And Matthew and Revelation cite or allude to Isaiah at least as much as Luke does. I say this for the sake of perspective.

It has been known for some time that Luke-Acts is dependent on a Greek text of the Jewish Scriptures rather than on a Hebrew text. This Greek text is commonly called the Septuagint (LXX), but that term is becoming increasingly

problematic. Letting it stand for now, W. K. L. Clarke¹ has shown that 88% of the vocabulary of Acts is found in the LXX (a percentage slightly lower than the four Gospels; again, just to keep perspective). Of the 58 words found only in Lk-Acts in NT, 51 appear in the LXX. 'Luke uses a number of rare words which also occur in the LXX' (Clark 1922: 70). Of 69 characteristically Lukan words and phrases, 68 occur in the LXX (1922: 71). Such statistics would suggest that Acts is saturated with the vocabulary of the LXX.

The Texts

There are many complex questions to be confronted when dealing with the LXX. What we call the LXX is, of course, a constructed text, just as are the NT and MT texts. What is meant when we say that Luke follows the LXX rather than the MT, for example? Did he have a choice, and so preferred one to the other? It is impossible to say precisely what 'text/s' he knew. What is the relation between the LXX and the MT or any other Hebrew text, for that matter? What are the roles of the Aramaic Targumim, the Samaritan Pentateuch, the Dead Sea texts in efforts to trace textual histories? The tradition of categorizing texts into three recensions, families or groups – MT, LXX, and SP – is quite problematic in itself. These are all important and crucial questions and issues.²

The matter is also complicated by the fact that the LXX and the Aramaic Targum on Isaiah appear to have some important features in common, features not present in the MT. For example, Brockington has shown that the LXX Isaiah inserts the idea of salvation that is not explicit in the Hebrew text; the Aramaic Targum on Isaiah does the same. But there is no proof of borrowing or influence between the Targum and the LXX.³ Does the relation between Lukan writings and the Aramaic Targumim need to be reconsidered? There have been those who have suggested that Luke was familiar with an Aramaic text. Torrey⁴ argued that Luke knew Aramaic and that Acts 1-15 is Luke's translation of an Aramaic document written by a Jerusalem Christian. These suggestions have long been dismissed, but they might be worth a revisit, especially in the light of the DSS discoveries and of more advanced work in the Targumim.

¹ W.K.L. Clarke, 'The Use of the Septuagint in Acts', Foakes-Jackson & Lake (eds), *Beginnings* 2 (1922) 66-105.

² For the relation between 1QIs^a and LXX Isaiah, see J. Ziegler, 'Die Vorlage der Isaias-Septuaginta (LXX) und die erste Isaias-Rolle von Qumran (1QIsa)', *JBL* 78 (1959) 34-59; and A. van der Kooij, 'The Old Greek of Isaiah in Relation to the Qumran Texts of Isaiah: Some general comments', in, *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*. G. Brooke & B. Lindars (eds); Atlanta: Scholars Press (1990), 195-213.

³ L.H. Brockington, 'LXX and Targum', *ZAW* 66 (1954) 80-86.

⁴ 'The Composition and Date of Acts', *HTR* 1 (1916). Compare also M. Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*. 3rd edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

There would be no one who would seriously argue that Luke was working from a Hebrew text – it seems that his Greek is too closely imitative of the LXX.

This paper basically will ignore the Codex D text of Acts. The MT texts referred to in this paper are from the *Bible Works 5* computer program that uses the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (WTT) (4th edition), Rahlfs's 1935 LXX text, and the NA²⁷ text of the NT.

Luke's Use of LXX Isaiah

What does 'use' mean? The tendency is to examine those passages in Acts that are clear quotations from Isaiah. Much of that work has already been done, especially recently by Gerd Steyn in his work on the use of the LXX in the Petrine and Pauline speeches in Acts (1995). As Barrett said in his review of Steyn's work,⁵ it is also necessary and 'more interesting' to examine the Isaianic allusions, hints and paraphrases. We know that a reader can sense the influence of biblical texts in a NT writing, even though those texts are not directly cited, and even though exact words or phrases do not appear. The *Revelation* is a good example of this. And I suggest that Acts may be another example, better than is even acknowledged. Selwyn's theory that *Joshua* was used as a map for some missionary journeys in Acts⁶ may have little to support it, but at least it indicates the sense that Selwyn had about the use of the OT in Acts.

We know from Qumran texts, as well as from other NT writings, that Jewish interpreters used the scriptures in a variety of ways, including the conflation of passages from various writings and the techniques of midrash, peshet, allegory etc.⁷ Luke also uses some of these interpretive techniques in Luke-Acts. In the final analysis, Luke is not interested in the text or the person of Isaiah per se; he is more interested in 'prophetic words', and ultimately more interested in the source of prophecy, namely, God. The practice of conflating prophetic words is possible partly because Luke recognises that God is the common source of all prophetic words. It is also known that 'context', as it is understood as a modern literary category, was understood quite differently by Jewish and early Christian hermeneutes. As Miller says, 'context' for them meant 'the whole of Scripture and contemporary needs'.⁸

Possibly, it is worth asking whether Luke found the LXX in some ways more conducive to his arguments than any Hebrew texts he might have known or had

⁵ *JTS* 48 (1997) 194-196.

⁶ E. C. Selwyn, 'The Christian Prophets at Philippi', *The Expositor* (6th series) 4 (1901) 29-38.

⁷ See M. Gertner, 'Terms of Scriptural Interpretation: A study in Hebrew semantics', *BSOAS* 25 (1962) 1-27.

⁸ M. Miller, 'The Use of the Old Testament in the New Testament', in *JSJ* 2 (1971) pp. 29-82, here 66. Miller's article is still helpful on many issues relating to early Jewish and Christian interpretive techniques.

access to. Nearly a century later, some Jewish teachers did not accept the Greek translation, while the Christian apologist, Justin, almost seems to regard it as better than any Hebrew! Justin says,

But I am far from putting reliance in your teachers, who refuse to admit that the interpretation made by the seventy elders who were with Ptolemy of the Egyptians is a correct one; and they attempt to frame another. And I wish you to observe, that they have altogether taken away many Scriptures from the translations effected by those seventy elders who were with Ptolemy, and by which this very man who was crucified is proved to have been set forth expressly as God, and man, and as being crucified, and as dying; but since I am aware that this is denied by all of your nation, I do not address myself to these points, but I proceed to carry on my discussions by means of those passages which are still admitted by you. For you assent to those which I have brought before your attention, except that you contradict the statement, 'Behold, the virgin shall conceive,' and say it ought to be read, 'Behold, the young woman shall conceive.' And I promised to prove that the prophecy referred, not, as you were taught, to Hezekiah, but to this Christ of mine: and now I shall go to the proof... (*Dial.* 71.1).⁹

Generally, the rabbis were sceptical about vernacular translations. Of the LXX, they said that the day of its appearance was 'as intolerable for Israel as the day the golden calf was made'. According to *Meg. 9a*, Rabbi Judah said, 'When our teachers permitted Greek, they permitted it only for a scroll of the Torah', and it seems that he forbade the translation of the prophets into Greek. Do we have the beginnings of a debate over texts and translations already in the NT? Were some of the issues debated between Paul and other Jews, according to Acts, text-related and/or translation questions? When the Alexandrian Apollos was instructed 'more accurately' by Prisca and Aquila in Ephesus (18.26), did that include such issues?

This raises a related matter, Who is Luke? By that, I mean to ask what status or authority did Luke have? There is the assumption, both in popular thought as well as among some scholars, that Luke was a reporter, almost as if he were embedded in the mission party of Paul to report on those missions. Others, with possibly more sophistication, see Luke as a historian, and they point to Luke 1.1-4 as indicating this role. Of course, there have been those who suggest that Luke is first and foremost a theologian.¹⁰

I would like to suggest that Luke is much more than a reporter and a historian, and even more than a theologian (or is that is the highest compliment that can

⁹ Is this something like modern preachers using Mk 16:16 as a basis for their teaching; as a scholar, I think, 'That's not part of the earliest form of the Gospel!'

¹⁰ So Marshall can call his book: 'Luke: Historian and Theologian' (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans 1978).

be paid him?). There are signs in Luke-Acts that he sees himself as a teacher, if not also as a quasi-prophet; and that he regards himself as an interpreter of the prophetic word. Luke does not simply cite or recite the prophets, but he *interprets* them. To do that implies that he thought he had some status and authority in his own right. He might have identified with the title 'Teacher of Righteousness'; possibly, as a (Levite) *maskil*. Luke links the two dimensions of teaching and prophecy in Acts 13.1,¹¹ and in that same chapter, the conflict between the prophets, Saul and Barnabas, and the false prophet, Bar Jesus, appears to be over 'teaching' that involved the interpretation of 'the word of God'. Overall in Acts, the apostles are depicted as teachers, in the Jerusalem cycle of chapters 1-7 (4.2,18; 5.25,28,42), as also is Paul (15.35; 18.11; 21.21,28; 28.31). It is a link that is commonly made in the Aramaic Targum of Isaiah, if not in the LXX. The notion that Luke is a teacher is implied by James Sanders, who says, rather romantically, 'What an insistent teaching elder Luke must have been in the instructional life of his own congregation' (1993: 19).¹²

In general, there is little doubt that the *interpretation of the scriptures*, and especially of the prophetic word, is a big issue in Luke-Acts. Typical is Acts 17.2-3, in which Luke says that Paul 'debated' (διαλέξατο) with synagogue Jews in Thessalonica, 'from the scriptures' (ἀπὸ τῶν γράφων), 'explaining and proving' (διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος) that the Christ should suffer and rise. The language implies that it was interpretation that was debated. On that matter, the use of the verbs ζητέω and its cognates in Acts deserves closer attention.¹³

The import of all this is that Luke uses Isaiah (and the other prophets) in much the same way as do the Targumim. That is, he claims to articulate not only what Isaiah the prophet said, but what he meant to say, or even what he should have said. In fact, Luke does that not only with Isaiah, but also with the new prophets in Israel, Peter and Paul. When Luke constructs the addresses of Peter and Paul, he does so as an authoritative interpreter of their words and as a teacher of Theophilus. In brief, I suggest that Luke is far more proactive in his use of Isaiah (and other scriptures) than is often supposed.

All this raises the broader issue of the purpose and method of citing Isaiah (or other Scriptures) in Acts. *Why, how, and when* does Luke cite Isaiah, for example? Is it as proof text? Is it as polemic? Is it a claim about the Christian interpretation of scripture vis à vis other Jewish interpretations? More

¹¹ A reasonably ancient tradition that Lucius of Cyrene, one of the prophets and teachers along with Barnabas and Paul in Acts 13.1, is Luke, the author of Luke-Acts, is worth at least noting here (see Cadbury, 'Lucius of Cyrene', Foakes-Jackson & Lake, *Beginnings*, 5.489-495).

¹² 'Isaiah in Luke', in, *Luke and Scripture: The function of sacred tradition in Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993, pp. 14-25.

¹³ As Gertner notes, sometimes the interpretation could hang on the vowel used to read a consonantal text (1962: 1 n. 4).

importantly, who was authorised to use the scriptures in this way? And I am particularly interested in the question, Is Luke claiming something about himself as an interpreter of scripture?

It is worth keeping in mind that Isaiah is referred to by name in only two passages in Acts (8.28,30; 28.25), and in both cases he is also identified as 'the prophet'. Such an identification is made elsewhere (Jn 1.21; Mt. 1.22; Mt. 3.3, 4.14 etc), and not only of Isaiah (Luke uses it of Samuel in 13.20). Otherwise, in 7.48 for example, a citing of Isaiah is introduced simply with 'as the prophet says', without any naming of the prophet. Here, too, it appears that Luke is doing what the Targumist also does. The latter frequently inserts 'the prophet' or 'prophecy' into the text where it is absent in the MT (and in the LXX). There is no doubt that the point of the Targumist is that Isaiah per se is not significant; what is essential and central is the prophet, and the prophetic words, and that means that they can be - and are to be - brought as a new message to Israel. Luke thinks likewise.

Passages Showing Substantial Agreement between Acts and LXX Isaiah

There are four passages in Acts that are direct, substantial, quotations from Isaiah. Only one of them explicitly states that the passage quoted is from that particular prophet. There is a fifth passage that introduces words as spoken by God; some of those words seem to be from Isaiah.

I have arranged the passages in the order of their appearance in Acts.

1. Acts 7. 48-50

Stephen, in his speech to the Sanhedrin, has outlined briefly how God had instructed Moses to construct the Tabernacle 'according to the *topos* that he had seen' (7.44), and that Tabernacle was used in the land until Solomon built 'a house for him' (7.47). Stephen then argues that 'the Most High does not dwell in houses made with hands' (ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ὑψιστος ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ). Luke's use of the word χειροποιήτος echoes its usage in Isaiah, where the prophet always used the adjectival noun with reference to either the idols or the temples of the heathen (Isa 2.18; 10.11; 16.12; 19.1; 31.7; 46.6). It would seem that Stephen is being provocative in using that word of the temple in Jerusalem (compare its use also in Acts 17.24-25).

Stephen supports his argument with reference to Isa 66.1-2. The two passages read as follows,

Acts 7. 48-50

καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει,

ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος,

ἡ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου

ποιῶν οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι,

λέγει κύριος,

ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου;	ἢ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου· ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι;
οὐχὶ ἡ χεὶρ μου ἐποίησεν ταῦτα πάντα;	
LXX Isa 66. 1-2	ἢ ποῖος τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου;
οὕτως λέγει κύριος	πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου
ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος	

The MT reads,

כֹּה אָמַר יְהוָה הַשָּׁמַיִם כִּסְאִי וְהָאָרֶץ הַדָּם הַגִּלִּי
אֵיזָה בַּיִת אֲשֶׁר תִּבְנֶנּוּ לִי וְאֵיזָה מְקוֹם מְנוּחָתִי׃
וְאֵת־כָּל־אֱלֹהֵי יַדְי עֲשֵׂתָה וַיְהִי כָל־אֱלֹהֵי נְאֻם־יְהוָה וְאֵל־יְהוָה
אָבִישׁ אֶל־עֵינַי וְנִכְתְּרוּם וַחֲרַד עַל־דְּבָרָי׃

Some observations

The text of Acts largely agrees with that of the LXX, which, in turn, is not significantly different to the MT. However, besides the difference in introducing the saying, there are minor differences between Luke and the LXX. For example, the ποῖος τόπος of the LXX is expressed as τίς τόπος by Luke (although the D text follows the LXX), who also has the last statement in the form of a rhetorical question. It appears that the Targum of Isaiah does the same, 'All these things my might has made, did not all these things come to be?', says the Lord (66.2).¹⁴

Justin cites this passage, but writes, Ἡσαίας λέγει, Ποῖον οἶκον ὠκοδομήσατέ μοι; λέγει κύριος. ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος καὶ ἡ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου (*Dial.* 22.11). Barnabas (16.2), in criticism of the Temple, quotes Isaiah 66 (along with Isa 40.12), ὁ οὐρανός μοι θρόνος, ἢ δὲ γῆ ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν μου ποῖον οἶκον οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι, ἢ τίς τόπος τῆς καταπαύσεώς μου; which is exactly the same as the Lukan text.

In the Acts passage, Isaiah is not mentioned by name, but simply is referred to as 'the prophet'. In fact, whereas Isaiah introduces the saying as a word of the *Lord* (οὕτως λέγει κύριος - the standard LXX translation of the common

¹⁴ Is there something about the use of a question here that is significant? Questions demand answers, they can be rhetorical and make a point, and they seem to be used commonly in debate (compare Paul; Isaiah also frequently used questions).

Hebrew expression, *בְּפִי אֲנִי מְדַבֵּר*), Luke instead introduces it as a word of the *prophet* (καθὼς ὁ προφήτης λέγει). Only part way through the quote, does he insert, *λέγει κύριος*. The Lord speaks through the prophet.

This difference in structure, and the use of the word 'prophet' by Luke (rather than the name 'Isaiah'), might be intentional. The point is that Israel is against the *prophetic word*. Luke, through Stephen, is claiming that Christians are the true interpreters of the prophets vis à vis 'you stubborn people ... which of the prophets did not your fathers persecute?' (7.51-52). Earlier, Stephen had referred to God's promise of a prophet like Moses (7.37), to Israel's refusal to listen to Moses (7.39), and to God's abandonment of Israel, 'as it is written in the book of the prophets' (7.42). In other words, the context is that of Israel's attitude towards and response to the prophets. By referring to this word as a prophetic word, Luke reinforces that the prophets and Israel are at loggerheads, whereas Christian interpreters (Stephen, for example) and the prophets are in agreement. Christians expected followers to 'believe the prophets'; so Paul asks Agrippa, *πιστεύεις τὸς προφήταις*; (Acts 26.27).

Thornton has made the suggestion that Luke may have been familiar with the tradition reflected in an Aramaic midrash of uncertain date that Isaiah spoke these words against Manasseh, claiming that God was not pleased with the Temple. The midrash says that Isaiah was executed by Manasseh in response to his words against him. As Thornton claims, this helps explain the temple-prophet-martyrdom link and allows for a smooth transition between 7.50 and 7.52.¹⁵

It would seem that Christians saw Isaiah as an ally in their debates over the understanding of God's activity. The Targum of Isaiah underlines the prophetic word against Israel, and Israel's opposition to that word, more than the MT does (30.1,3,10,11; 58. 1-6).

It would seem that Isaiah is nearly always cited directly in Acts in a situation of conflict with some Jews, and so polemically. Here, too, the claim is that the temple made with hands is not where the Most High dwells, and Isaiah is cited as supporting that claim. Most scholars today agree that Isaiah was not attacking the temple. Luke, however, possibly understood Isaiah to be doing so, or – and this is the more likely – he uses Isaiah's words as an attack on the temple and attitudes towards it. Like the Targumist, he claims to know what Isaiah should have said, or at least what the prophet really meant to say.

2. Acts 8. 32-33

¹⁵ T.G.C. Thornton, 'Stephen's Use of Is. LXVI.1' in, *JTS* 25 (1974) 432-434.

Philip has been instructed by the Spirit to meet the carriage in which the Ethiopian eunuch is travelling. The eunuch is reading from the scriptures, and Philip asks him if he understands what he is reading. The eunuch says he needs someone to show him the [W?]ay (ὁδηγήσει), so Philip is invited to sit with him. The passage that the eunuch is reading is then given; it is introduced by ἡ δὲ περιλοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς ἣν ἀνεγίνωσκεν ἦν αὕτη·

Ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ἤχθη
καὶ ὡς ἀμυδὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείραντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος,
οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ.
Ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει [αὐτοῦ] ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἦρθη·
τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται;
ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ.

This is a direct quotation of **LXX Isa 53.7-8**,

ὡς πρόβατον ἐπὶ σφαγῆν ἤχθη
καὶ ὡς ἀμυδὸς ἐναντίον τοῦ κείροντος αὐτὸν ἄφωνος
οὕτως οὐκ ἀνοίγει τὸ στόμα αὐτοῦ
ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἦρθη
τὴν γενεὰν αὐτοῦ τίς διηγήσεται
ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ
[ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον]

The **MT** reads,

נָגַשׁ וְהוּא נִעְנָה וְלֹא יִפְתַּח־פִּיּוֹ בַּשָּׁה׃ לְטַבַּח יוֹבֵל וּכְרָחֵל
לְפָנַי גְּזוּיָה נֶאֱלָמָה וְלֹא יִפְתַּח פִּיּוֹ׃
מִעֲצָר וּמִמִּשְׁפָּט לְקַח וְאֶת־הַדּוֹרוֹ מִן־יְשׁוּחָח כִּי נִגְזַר מֵאֲרֶץ חַיִּים

Some observations

In this passage, the Greek texts in Acts and in LXX Isaiah are almost exactly the same, although the Isaiah text continues with an extra sentence (as does the MT). Cullmann suggests the final sentence in Isaiah is omitted by Luke because 'it is anti-climactic if αἴρειν, "taken up", is understood as referring to the exaltation' ('Acts', 1988: 68).

Some minor Acts mss read ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει αὐτοῦ. The κείροντος / κείραντος variant is found in mss of both LXX and Acts.

Both LXX Isaiah and Acts differ from the MT at 53.8. The MT (+ 1QIsa and Targ. Isa.) reads, 'from [out of, as a result of] distress/prison and judgment, he was taken away' (מִעֲצָר וּמִמִּשְׁפָּט לְקַח), while the LXX and Acts (and 1Clem 16.8) read, 'in humiliation, his judgment was taken away' (ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἦρθη). In addition, the Hebrew texts read, 'For he was cut off

from the land of the living' (פִּי נִזְרָה מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים); while LXX and Acts read, 'For his life is taken away from the earth' (ὅτι ἀίρεται ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ).

In LXX Isaiah, ταπεινώσις and its cognates are used over thirty times. Often, they describe the action of God in bringing down the proud (2.12), and in elevating the poor and those who have been humiliated (49.13). So its use here might be the result of exposition on the part of the Greek writers rather than the result of translation. The humility/humiliation motif is also found in the Thanksgiving Hymns of Qumran (1QH 5.13, 16, 18, 20-22; 14.3). It is also a motif that Luke adopted, especially in the hymns that mark the opening to his Gospel (Lk 1.48, 52). Luke has a Jesus who teaches that everyone who exalts himself will be humbled and the humble will be exalted (14.11; 18.14). He also sees Paul's ministry as marked by one who 'served the Lord with all humility' (Acts 20.19). Is it possible that here the Christians found the Greek text more helpful than the Hebrew? Jesus' humiliating death needed explanation – the Greek text of Isa. 53 went a little way towards providing an explanation. The addition of αὐτοῦ would support that. According to Clement of Rome, 'the holy spirit' said of Jesus that he came in 'humbleness of mind', and he then cites Isaiah 53 (1 Clem 16).

It is not clear whether the introductory words in Acts (ἡ περιοχὴ τῆς γραφῆς) refer to the passage of scripture that the eunuch was reading or to the wider content of the passage. I suspect that Luke intends the whole context and content of Isaiah 53-55, rather than simply that particular passage which is used as a starting point by Philip (8.35). Once again, the role of prophet as teacher (= interpreter of the prophet) in Acts can be seen, a role that the Targum of Isaiah also gives to the prophets.

Is it worth asking *why* it is this particular passage that is being read and interpreted? Is it because Isaiah is the prophet who indicates more than others a status and place for gentiles and for the scattered of Israel in the promises of God? Or, did it provide Luke with an opportunity to show how *he* interpreted this passage as referring to Jesus *vis à vis* the [current? common?] interpretation that said it referred to the prophet himself? And particularly, did it give him the opportunity to interpret this passage in the light of the suffering (not 'death', specifically) and resurrection of the Christ, the fundamental understanding of the Christ that Luke drew out of the Scriptures? Isaiah, with his 'suffering servant', provided a good source for Christians to explain and justify the suffering of their Christ. The fact that Luke does not continue the passage as Isaiah does allows the text to be read as referring to Jesus' suffering and exaltation.

In any case, Luke says that Philip used this passage as the starting point (ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ τῆς γραφῆς ταύτης) to speak of the good news of Jesus (εὐηγγελίσατο αὐτῷ τὸν Ἰησοῦν 8.35). 'Announcing good news' is an Isaianic

word (for example, Isa. 55.7; 60.6; 61.1). The suffering/death of Jesus (as the Isaianic suffering servant) is taken as the starting point of the good news about Jesus. In Lk 24.27, the appearing Jesus begins with Moses and the prophets to interpret in all the scriptures the things about himself, especially that 'the Christ should suffer these things and enter his glory' (24.26).

Besides this direct citing of Isaiah, there are a number of clues that suggest this eunuch episode is shaped, almost in midrashic style, by a reading of Isaiah. The eunuch is said to be from Ethiopia (the word is used twice in Acts 8.27). LXX Isaiah is not disinterested in Ethiopia. According to 11.11, God will ransom the remnant of his people from areas including Ethiopia (Hebrew, שׂוֹי; LXX, Αἰθιοψ). Later, he announces that the 'traders of Cush' (LXX ἐμπορία Αἰθιοπῶν) will submit to the anointed Cyrus, and acknowledge that there is no other God, but 'the God of Israel, the saviour' (45.14). And I will soon show that Isaiah's words about eunuchs are not insignificant in reading this episode.

Acts 8.26 sets the scene for Philip to meet the eunuch on 'a deserted road' (ἐπὶ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν καταβαίνουσαν ἀπὸ Ἱερουσαλὴμ εἰς Γάζαν, αὕτη ἐστὶν ἔρημος). It would appear that the description of the road as deserted is deliberate on Luke's part – he draws attention to it. An audience listening with Isaiah in their heads might expect the Lord now to do a new thing, since the scene Luke has created echoes LXX Isa. 33.8, ἐρημωθήσονται γὰρ αἱ τούτων ὁδοὶ πέπαιται ὁ φόβος τῶν ἐθνῶν καὶ ἡ πρὸς τούτους διαθήκη αἴρεται καὶ οὐ μὴ λογίσησθε αὐτοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

The eunuch and Philip find water along this road through the desert (8.36). This recalls LXX Isa. 43.19, ποιήσω ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ὁδὸν καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀνύδρῳ ποταμούς. The narrative in Acts says, ἦλθον ἐπὶ τι ὕδωρ. This is reminiscent of the prophetic invitation in LXX Isa 55.1, πορεύεσθε ἐφ' ὕδωρ. Some mss of Acts (P⁷⁴ 326 *pc*) in fact read τὸ ὕδωρ, which Barrett thinks 'does not make good sense and must have originated in a simple slip' ('Acts', 1994: 1. 432). But if an audience is listening with Isaiah 55.1 in its head, then the definite article might almost be expected. I would suggest, too, that if one so reads this episode, then questions as to what body of water this could possibly refer to become irrelevant (*pace* Barrett, 1.1994: 433 and Bruce 1988: 177; Cullmann 1988: 69, and others who can't help themselves from at least suggesting a known geographical location).

The eunuch's question, 'What prevents me (τί κωλύει με) from being baptized?' (8.37), is an allusion to Isa 43.5-6, ἐρῶ τῷ βορρᾶ ἄγε καὶ τῷ λιβί μὴ κώλυε ἄγε τοὺς υἱοὺς μου ἀπὸ γῆς πόρρωθεν καὶ τὰς θυγατέρας μου ἀπ' ἄκρων τῆς γῆς πάντας. Λιβί (dat. of λίψ) refers to the SW wind, and probably here means 'Africa'. Many Greeks and Romans envisaged Ethiopians as living right across Africa, from west to east.

Finally, there are other hints of Isaiah 55-56 in the eunuch story. The eunuch is obviously a wealthy man, being in charge 'of all the Candace's treasure' (8.27). Isa. 55 talks of spending money on what is not bread, 'your wages on what fails to satisfy' (55.2), and offers life as a free gift, and membership in the everlasting covenant among peoples that include 'a nation you never knew' (Isa. 55.4-5). In addition, Isa. 56.3,4 indicate that eunuchs, in particular, are not excluded from the covenant,

μη λεγέτω ὁ εὐνοῦχος ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι ξύλον ξηρόν
τάδε λέγει κύριος τοῖς εὐνούχοις ὅσοι ἂν φυλάζωνται τὰ σάββατά μου καὶ
ἐκλέξωνται ἃ ἐγὼ θέλω καὶ ἀντέχωνται τῆς διαθήκης μου

It would seem that this episode is a good example of how a prophetic text, like Isaiah, can shape the Acts narrative. There may be few direct quotations, but the influence and use of Isaiah can be distinctly recognised and traced.

3. Acts 13.34

Paul is preaching to Jews in Antioch of Pisidia, outlining God's actions in Israel's history and linking Jesus to that action. The good news promised to the fathers God fulfilled by raising Jesus from the dead, as Ps 2.7 had said. That Jesus was raised is also seen as a sign of the promise that 'I will give you the holy and sure [blessings] of David',

ὅτι δὲ ἀνέστησεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν μηκέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστρέφειν εἰς
διαφθοράν, οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι Δώσω ὑμῖν τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ τὰ πιστά.

The final phrase seems to be a direct reference to **Isa. 55.3**,

προσέχετε τοῖς ὠτίοις ὑμῶν καὶ ἐπακολουθήσατε ταῖς ὁδοῖς μου ἐπακούσατέ
μου καὶ ζήσεται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν καὶ διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκη
αἰώνιον τὰ ὅσια Δαυιδ τὰ πιστά

And the MT,

הַטּוֹ אֲזַנְכֶם וְלִכּוּ אֵלַי שְׁמָעוּ וְתַחֲיוּ נַפְשֵׁכֶם וְאַכְרַתְהָ לְכֶם
בְּרִית עוֹלָם חֲסֵדֵי דָוִד הַנְּאֻמִּים:

Some observations

The MT of Isa. 55.3 speaks of 'the sure mercies of David' (חֲסֵדֵי דָוִד הַנְּאֻמִּים). Luke agrees with the LXX with, 'the holy and sure things of David'.

The words οὕτως εἶρηκεν ὅτι introduce the words of God. This precise form of introducing a biblical passage is not used elsewhere in Acts (but compare 17.28, where the same verb is used of Greek poets; and 2.16; 13.40, where the verb is used of the prophets).

This quote is sandwiched between a quotation from Psa 2, which is introduced with ὡς καὶ ἐν τῷ ψαλμῷ γέγραπται τῷ δευτέρῳ (13.33), and one from Ps 16, which is introduced with διότι καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ λέγει (13.35). In addition, Paul then closes his speech with a warning from 'what has been said in the prophets' (τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις 13.40). It might be noted that when the three passages are cited one after another, the common speaker is said to be God.

In the second and third quote, the emphasis seems to be on what God has said (εἶρηκεν) rather than what is written in a text, as in the first. This could partly explain the addition of Δωσω ὑμῖν in Acts. Barrett thinks Δωσω ὑμῖν simply replaces διαθήσομαι ὑμῖν διαθήκην αἰώνιον of the LXX Isa 55.3 (1994: 1.647). That might be the case, but I doubt whether it is 'simply' that. Luke excised 'everlasting covenant' language elsewhere from a biblical passage he cites (compare 13.47). He uses the word 'covenant' only twice (3.25; and 7.8 in relation to circumcision). This contrasts with the use of Isa 55.3 in 1QS 4.22; 5.5f; 1QSb 1.2f; 2.25 where, in each case, it is precisely 'the everlasting [Davidic] covenant' that is important.

Others suggest that Δωσω ὑμῖν is 'attracted' by LXX Ps 15.10b, οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν, which is cited by Luke in the very next verse (13.35). So Bruce says that the rabbinical principle of *gezerah shawah*, in which the sense of two texts is linked to their sharing of a common term, is here being applied (1988: 260). Cullmann thinks Luke might have already found this verse combined with LXX Ps 15.10 (1988: 105). This may well be; but if one thinks of God as the speaker of all prophecy, then words and phrases can be taken from anywhere and combined to form one message.

Luke's Paul cites Isa 55.3 as an indication that God would raise his Son (referred to *via* Ps. 2 in 13.33) from the dead, and then he quotes LXX Ps 15.10 as evidence that he would not let him see corruption. But how does Isa 55.3 refer to a resurrection? Usually, this question is answered by linking the Isaiah words with those from Ps 2. So Bock, 'Looking back to Ps 2.7, the connection goes like this: the promise of the Son has come (Ps. 2.7), for God has raised him (Jesus) from the dead no longer to return to corruption (v 34a). Thus Isaiah says that the sure mercies of David will be given to all of you' (1987: 252).¹⁶ This is possible. There's another possibility, however, and that is that Luke wants to maintain the David link, hence the Isa 55.3d quote. But anyone knowing the Isaiah passage would know that 55.3d is preceded by 55.3b, which says, ζήσεται ἐν ἀγαθοῖς ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν. In other words, the 'holy and sure blessings of David' include that his ψυχὴ will live. Read this way, Isa 55.3 refers to Jesus' resurrection, and LXX Ps 15.10 to his incorruptible state.

¹⁶ D. Bock, *Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology*. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1987.

4. Acts 13.47

Here again, the context is one of dispute between Paul and other Jews over the interpretation of the Scriptures. Here too, Isaiah is cited against those Jews who reviled and opposed Paul and Barnabas and their interpretation of the word of God (13.44-45). The debate has moved out of the synagogue, where Paul has given a brief history of Israel and Jesus' place within it. He claims that the leaders and people of Jerusalem did not recognise Jesus 'nor understand the voices (τὰς φωνάς) of the prophets which are read every sabbath' (13.27). The point of conflict is the understanding and interpretation of the prophets, with the Christians claiming that the prophets speak against their opponents. The episode ends with a warning from Habakkuk 1.5 (13.41-43). On the next Sabbath, '*almost the whole city* gathered together to hear the word of the Lord' (13.44), thus allowing for gentiles to be involved. The Jews, however, are 'filled with jealousy' and contradict Paul, who in turn says that he is now turning to the gentiles because he has the command of the Lord, a command that is found in Isaiah 49.6.

Acts 13. 47

οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος· Τέθεικά σε εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

Isa. 49.6

καὶ εἶπέν μοι μέγα σοί ἐστιν τοῦ κληθῆναι σε παιδᾶ μου τοῦ στήσαι τὰς φυλάς Ἰακωβ καὶ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψαι ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς

The MT text reads,

וַיֹּאמֶר נְקַל מִהֵיִתָּהּ לִי עֲבֹד לְהִקְיִם אֶת־שִׁבְטֵי יַעֲקֹב (וּנְצִירֵי)
 [וּנְצִירֵי] יִשְׂרָאֵל לְהַשִּׁיב וּנְתַתִּידָּ לְאֹר גּוֹיִם לְהִיֹּת יְשׁוּעָתִי
 עַד־קֶצֶה הָאָרֶץ:

Some observations

The LXX has the additional attention marker ἰδοὺ (it is also used in Codex D of Acts). This suggests that Acts is closer to the MT than to the LXX. On the other hand, Luke has used the adverb in the previous sentence (13.46), and this might be intentional, as I note below.

Note the absence of LXX's εἰς διαθήκην γένους from Acts. This might also suggest that the Acts text is more in agreement with the MT than with the LXX; on the other hand, Luke elsewhere (13.34) has excised 'covenant' talk

from an Isaiah passage. Justin also omits the phrase in his citing of the Isaiah passage (*Dial.* 121.30). It does not necessarily mean that Luke 'used a more faithful LXX version than that which we have' (Barrett 1994. 1.657). The excision of covenant talk from the prophetic text is a sign of Luke's authority as an interpreter.

The LXX and Acts both use the construction εἰς σωτηρίαν vis à vis the MT which simply reads לְהַיִּיחַ יְשׁוּעָתִי.

The introductory formula used by Luke is οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος. The Lord here is Jesus. In LXX Isaiah, it is the Lord (κύριος) who 'formed me in the womb to be his servant', and who said (εἶπεν) this to the prophet (49.5). It is probably no accident that Luke omits what precedes the Isaiah quote, since it speaks of the servant raising up the tribes of Jacob and returning (ἐπιστρέψαι) the exiles of Israel (Isa 49.6a-b). Instead, Paul says, 'behold, we turn (στρεφόμεθα) to the gentiles' (13.46). Luke omits 'behold' (ἰδοῦ, which very often implies a surprising, unexpected action) when he introduces the direct Isaianic words. Instead, he uses it in Paul's statement, 'we are turning to the gentiles'. Paul is addressing 'the exiles of Israel', since they are in Pisidian Antioch, but they generally do not hear, so he picks up on the second part of Isaiah's hope, and turns to the gentiles. The surprising action, expressed by ἰδοῦ, is that Paul is leaving *even the exiles of Israel* and going to the gentiles.

The word of the Lord to the prophet is seen as a command to Paul. For Luke, Paul and Isaiah are complementary – both are servants of Yahweh, both have the command of the Lord, through both, the holy Spirit speaks (compare Acts 28.25). This is consistent with the notion that the Christians know the true interpretation of the prophets. If they know the true interpretations, it is reasonable to replace the historical prophet with the contemporary one; a word addressed to Isaiah is seen as a word addressed to Paul. This is similar to how the Qumran texts interpret the prophets as referring to their Teacher/s of Righteousness.

In the Acts passage, there is no explicit reference to Isaiah as the source for the scripture cited in Acts. I doubt this is incidental. Rather, by ignoring Isaiah as the source, Luke can make the original words be words of the Lord directed to Paul and Barnabas (οὕτως γὰρ ἐντέταλται ἡμῖν ὁ κύριος). They are true prophets - Paul is listed, as Saul, along with Barnabas among the prophets at Antioch (13.1), both met and opposed successfully the false prophet, bar Jesus (13.6-12), and Paul in the immediate context here, is invited to speak after the reading from 'the law and the prophets' (13.15). Once again, the link between prophet and teacher (= interpreter and expounder of scripture) is close.

It is not simply a matter that the Scripture has foretold that Paul and Barnabas go to the gentiles (*pace* Steyn 1995: 200), but rather that the Lord [Jesus] has commanded it, and to support that, Isaiah is cited. In other words, it is not prediction but 'interpretation', almost *peshet*-style. Words from the text can be taken into a new context and seen as direct commands from Jesus. By identifying Jesus as 'Lord' in Acts, Luke is being provocative to those Jews who rejected the Christian claims about Jesus. It is also a term used some 380 times in Isaiah.

Isaiah 49.6 is used also in Lk. 2.32, where Simeon uses it to speak of Jesus.

5. Acts 28.25-27

The last direct quotation of Isaiah in Acts is found in Paul's final words in Rome. Once again, the prophet Isaiah is cited in the context of exposition - discussions 'from morning till evening' - and of differences with other Jews over 'the law of Moses and the prophets' (28.23). Note the importance of teaching (= interpretation) in this context (28.23,31). It is similar to the importance given to it in the Targum on Isa 6.8, the very verse before this cited passage, "And I heard the voice of the Memra of the Lord which said, 'Whom shall I send to prophesy, and who will go to teach?'"

The session ends with the audience divided between those who were convinced and those who disbelieved. Paul then makes 'one statement' (ῥῆμα ἓν) in which he quotes Isaiah directly, explicitly indicating that 'Isaiah the prophet' is his source. He cites the words of Isaiah as the reason why 'this salvation of God has been sent to the gentiles' (28.28).

Acts 28.26-27 reads,

Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπὸν, Ἐκοῆ ἀκούσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε· ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν· μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν, καὶ ἰάσομαι αὐτούς.

LXX Is 6.9-10 reads,

καὶ εἶπεν πορεύθητι καὶ εἰπὸν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ
 ἀκοῆ ἀκούσατε καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε καὶ βλέποντες βλέψετε καὶ οὐ μὴ ἴδητε
 ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν αὐτῶν βαρέως
 ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμμυσαν μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς
 καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνῶσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ
 ἰάσομαι αὐτούς

The MT text reads,

וַיֹּאמֶר לָךְ וְאָמַרְתָּ לְעַם הַזֶּה שְׁמַעוּ שְׁמוֹעַ וְאֶל-תְּבִינוּ וּרְאוּ
 הָאֵז וְאֶל-תִּרְעוּ:
 הַשָּׁמַן לִב־הָעַם הַזֶּה וְאָזְנוֹ הַכֶּבֶד וְעֵינָיו הִשְׁעָ פֶּן-יִרְאֶה
 בְּעֵינָיו וּבְאָזְנוֹ יִשְׁמַע וּלְבָבוֹ יִבִּין וְשָׁב וּרְפָא לוֹ:

Some observations

Acts 28.26-27 is lacking in Codex D.

There do not appear to be any significant variations between Acts and the LXX. There are variations in the opening line, with the LXX saying, εἶπον τῷ λαῷ while Acts says, Πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπόν. The MT is more in line with LXX than with Acts. LXX Isa also includes αὐτῶν - not found in Acts (or in the Matthean version), although some mss do include it.

As Steyn notes, four MT imperatives are replaced with future active (ἀκούσετε and βλέψετε) and aorist active (ἤκουσαν ... ἐκάμυσαν) indicative forms, and one with an aorist passive (ἐπαχύνθη). The MT's Qal futures are subjunctives in Greek (οὐ μὴ συνῆτε ... οὐ μὴ ἴδῃτε). The LXX inserts γάρ (ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία). The word 'heart' is the object of the verb in MT, but it is the subject in LXX (1995: 223). Steyn also says that the LXX puts the blame more on the people; the severe picture of God in the MT is toned down; and the judgment is changed a little in the LXX with the possibilities of repentance still open (228)

The passage is also cited in Mt 13.10,

ἐπαχύνθη γὰρ ἡ καρδία τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου, καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν βαρέως ἤκουσαν καὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτῶν ἐκάμυσαν, μήποτε ἴδωσιν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὠσὶν ἀκούσωσιν καὶ τῇ καρδίᾳ συνώσιν καὶ ἐπιστρέψωσιν καὶ ἰάσωμαι αὐτούς.

This is exactly the same as Acts, except that Matthew picks Isaiah up at a different point. Scholars have noted that Matthew does not normally follow the LXX wording, so his doing so here might suggest that the passage was commonly known in this Greek form. The Isaiah passage is also used in Mk 4.12//Lk 8.10; Jn 12.40; Rom. 11.8.

Luke introduces the Isaiah passage with ὅτι καλῶς τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐλάλησεν διὰ Ἡσαΐου τοῦ προφήτου πρὸς τοὺς πατέρας ὑμῶν. This is the only occasion in Acts in which the Spirit is said to have spoken through a prophet. The concentration, then, is on what the Holy Spirit says through the prophet rather than on Isaiah himself. The prophetic word is a means whereby the Holy Spirit addresses the contemporary audience of Luke. This may not be to 'plainly' express divine inspiration (Barrett 1998: 2.1244), so much as to show

that those who reject the Christian interpretation are in fact rejecting not merely the prophet, but the Spirit (compare Stephen, who says 'your fathers' 'resisted the Spirit; Paul here also refers to 'your fathers', 28.25). It would seem that here Luke uses Isaiah polemically, as result of the failure of some Jews to agree with Paul in his interpretation of Scripture (28.23). The Holy Spirit is now on the side of Paul's understanding of the prophets, and not of those who are stiff necked and resist the Holy Spirit. Paul, like Isaiah, addresses the whole of Israel.

Steyn thinks that this passage 'merely supplies scriptural support' to justify the move away from Jews to gentiles (1995: 226). The way Luke expresses it suggests that it is not only, or even mostly, scriptural support that is being claimed so much as Spirit support. The Spirit is the one who gifts people with insight, wisdom and revelation; and so it is the Spirit who gives the gift of interpretation. In addition, the Spirit who spoke through the prophets is now speaking again through the prophets and teachers of the new Israel, and they might include Luke himself.

That the holy Spirit speaks through the prophets is how the Targum of Isaiah also talks. 'Who established the holy spirit in the mouths of all the prophets, is it not the Lord?', says Targ. Isa 40.13. 'Behold, my servant, ... I will put my holy spirit upon him, he will reveal my judgments to the peoples ...' (Targ. Isa. 42.1). The Spirit, generally, is also often associated with prophecy. So the Targum on Isa 61.1 reads, 'The prophet said, A spirit of prophecy before the Lord God is upon me'.

This is another example of how Luke portrays Isaiah and Paul as complementary witnesses.

In this same context, Paul announces to the disbelieving Jews of Rome that 'this salvation of God (τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ) has been sent to the gentiles' (28.28). The Greek phrase certainly echoes Isa 40.5, ὅψεται πάντα σὰρξ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ, and suggests again Luke's LXX language, since the expression is absent in the Hebrew texts (compare also Isa 60.6), and it is used in LXX almost exclusively among the prophetic texts.

Finally, it might be noted that Acts ends along similar lines to Isaiah, even though there are little to no similarities in vocabulary. Isaiah ends with Yahweh's promise that he will 'gather the nations', that he will send those who have been saved to the gentiles, and of some of them, 'I will make priests and levites' (Isa 66.18-19, 21), with the result that 'all mankind will come to bow down in my presence', but they will also see 'the corpses of men who have rebelled against me' (Isa 66.24).

II. Conflations of Isaiah with other Scriptures in Acts

1. Acts 3.13

This is an example of the conflation of texts or word strings from the Old Testament – reflecting a common Lukan stylistic feature. The passage reads,

ὁ θεὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ [ὁ θεὸς] Ἰσαὰκ καὶ [ὁ θεὸς] Ἰακώβ, ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν, **ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦν** ὃν ὑμεῖς μὲν παρεδώκατε καὶ ἠρνήσασθε κατὰ πρόσωπον Πιλάτου, κρίναντος ἐκείνου ἀπολύειν·

Peter is explaining his healing of the cripple. It is to be expected that he used biblical language. Acts 3.13a is clearly not from Isaiah, who never talks of God in these terms. It finds closer resonance with

Exod. 4.5, κύριος ὁ θεὸς τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν θεὸς Ἀβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαακ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακωβ.

Exod. 3.6, ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου θεὸς Ἀβρααμ καὶ θεὸς Ἰσαακ καὶ θεὸς Ἰακωβ.

But the phrase, **ἐδόξασεν τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ** possibly alludes to

Isa 52.13, ἰδοὺ συνήσει ὁ παῖς μου καὶ ὑψωθήσεται καὶ δοξασθήσεται σφόδρα.

The idea of the servant (παῖς) of God being glorified is quite common in Isaiah (41.8.9, 42.1; 43.10; 44.1,2,21 etc), as is the linking of exaltation and glorification (5.16; 6.1; 10.15; 33.10 etc).

'The God of our fathers' is the God of promise, and that promise has been kept in his servant/son, Jesus. Peter's address to the crowds in Jerusalem after healing the cripple, echoes these foundational motifs found in 'Moses and the prophets'. In proclamation, Luke often uses LXX words and phrases without identifying their source. It is much more in confrontation and dialogue that Luke will identify his biblical sources, and usually, he does so pointedly.

2. Acts 8.22-23

μετανόησον οὖν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας σου ταύτης καὶ δεήθητι τοῦ κυρίου, εἰ ἄρα ἀφεθήσεται σοι ἡ ἐπίνοια τῆς καρδίας σου, εἰς γὰρ χολὴν πικρίας καὶ σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας ὀρω σε ὄντα.

The context of this passage is that Peter is condemning Simon; and it appears he does so in biblical language. It is not unexpected that a leader such as Peter

would pronounce a curse on someone like Simon in biblical words to emphasise its severity.

The phrase **σύνδεσμον ἀδικίας** here in Acts 8.23 is found in **Isa. 58.6**, where the context is one of Isaiah's rebuke of Israel for her injustice despite fastings and ritual observances. I doubt that the Isaianic context is significant, although Simon's offer does appear to be a ritual one (8.18).

Jeremiah laments that no one 'repents of their wickedness' (**μετανοῶν ἀπὸ τῆς κακίας**, 8.6). And the phrase **εἰς χολὴν πικρίας** is found in LXX Deut 29.17 (compare also Lam 3.15). It is possible that **δεήθητι τοῦ κυρίου** echoes 1 Kgs 13.6 (**δεήθητι τοῦ προσώπου κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ σου**). The verb form **ἀφεθήσεται** is used repeatedly in Leviticus almost as a technical term. On the performance of certain atonement sacrifices, 'he shall be forgiven' (Lev. 4.20,26,31 etc).

So it appears that Luke uses a string of biblical phrases in Peter's rebuke of Simon. One of those phrases derives from Isaiah.

3. Acts 13. 22

The sources of the biblical passages used here are not identified. Again, the implication is that Luke is not interested in citing texts, but in claiming the authority of God. It is God, who raised David up as king, 'to whom he testified and said' (**ὃ καὶ εἶπεν μαρτυρήσας**),

εὔρον Δαυιδ τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί, ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου, ὃς ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου.

Paul is in the synagogue, where there has been a reading 'of the law and the prophets', and he is asked to speak a word of exhortation (**λόγος παρακλήσεως**) on the basis of that word. This allows Paul to get quickly to David, who is the direct link to Jesus. One might even expect a conflation of, or at least a reference to, biblical phrases in such an address. Acts 13.22 appears to be a conflation of

LXX Ps. 88.21, **εὔρον Δαυιδ τὸν δοῦλον μου.**

LXX 1 Sam. 13.14, **ζητήσῃ κύριος ἐαυτῷ ἄνθρωπον κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ.**

LXX Isa. 44.28, **ὃ λέγων Κύρω φρονεῖν καὶ πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου ποιήσει ὃ λέγων Ἱερουσαλημ οἰκοδομηθήσῃ καὶ τὸν οἶκον τὸν ἅγιόν μου θεμελιώσω.**

Clearly, the last clause in Isaiah refers to Cyrus, and that, when combined with the reference to David, reinforces the messianic claims Luke makes about Jesus in this passage. Clement of Rome also links LXX Ps 88.21 with 1 Sam 13.14 (1 Clem 18.1).

III. Word Strings in Common

There are other passages in which it is difficult to claim direct reference to Isaiah by Luke. In most cases, the common word strings and phrases may be explained other than by claiming allusion to Isaiah. Once again, I have arranged these in the order in which they appear in Acts

1. Acts 1.8 speaks of the holy spirit coming upon the disciples, enabling them to witness to the ends of the earth.

ἀλλὰ λήψεσθε δύναμιν ἐπελθόντος τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος ἐφ' ὑμᾶς καὶ ἔσεσθέ μου μάρτυρες ἔν τε Ἱερουσαλήμ καὶ [ἐν] πάσῃ τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ καὶ Σαμαρείᾳ καὶ ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

This echoes some Isaianic language, especially in LXX **Is 32.15**

ἕως ἂν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ὑμᾶς πνεῦμα ἅφ' ὑψηλοῦ καὶ ἔσται ἔρημος ὁ Χερμελ καὶ ὁ Χερμελ εἰς δρυμὸν λογισθήσεται

And when the phrase ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς is used in Isaiah, it nearly always is in the context of God's salvific, boundary-stretching action. So, in

Isa 48.20: γενέσθω τοῦτο ἀπαγγείλατε ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς

Isa 49.6, ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς ἐθνῶν τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς σωτηρίαν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς

Isa 62.11, ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἐποίησεν ἀκουστὸν ἕως ἑσχάτου τῆς γῆς.

The term 'holy spirit', so commonly used in Acts, is very rarely found in the canonical OT. However, Isaiah does use the term twice.

Is 63.10, αὐτοὶ δὲ ἠπεύθησαν καὶ παρώξυναν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ, and Isaiah asks, 'Where is he who placed his holy spirit (τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον) among Israel?' (**63.11**).

In both places, the Targ. Isa. interprets the 'holy spirit' as 'the Memra of his holy prophets'. This despite the fact that the Isaiah Targum tends to use 'holy spirit' where MT has 'Spirit' (for example, 42.1; 44.3).

2. Acts 2.39

ὑμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.

The phrase in bold might allude to **Isa. 57.18-19**,

τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτοῦ ἐώρακα καὶ ἰασάμην αὐτὸν καὶ παρεκάλεσα αὐτὸν καὶ ἔδωκα αὐτῷ παράκλησιν ἀληθινὴν εἰρήνην ἐπ' εἰρήνην **τοῖς μακρὰν** καὶ τοῖς ἐγγύς οὖσιν καὶ εἶπεν κύριος ἰάσομαι αὐτούς

Possibly, Luke's ἐπαγγελία (a word far more common in Luke and in Paul than in the LXX) is a summary of the Isaianic healing, comfort and peace expressed in this passage.

3. Acts 10.38

It is well known that Luke, in his Gospel (4.18), uses Isa 61 as paradigmatic for the ministry of Jesus. That passage seems to be echoed in Acts 10.38 where Jesus is described as one anointed (ἔχρισεν) by God with the holy spirit and with power. I have said already that the Targ. Isa. also uses 'holy spirit' in its translation of Isa 61.1.

Acts 10.38 goes on to speak of Jesus as going about 'doing good and healing those oppressed by the devil', activity closely related to that described in **Isa 61.1**,

Ἐχρισέν με εὐαγγελίσασθαι πτωχοῖς ἀπέσταλκέν με ἰάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ κηρύξαι αἰχμαλώτοις ἄφεσιν καὶ τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν.

It is a little surprising that there are no healings of the blind or deaf in Acts (apart from Paul himself). It would seem that those conditions are used only in reference to 'spiritual' blindness and deafness (Acts 26.18; 28.27), as they commonly are in Isaiah (6.10; 32.3; 35.5; 43.9).

In addition, in that same Acts passage, Peter describes the ministry of Jesus (and of early apostles) in Judaea: [ὑμεῖς οἴδατε] τὸν λόγον [ὄν] ἀπέστειλεν τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ **εὐαγγελιζόμενος εἰρήνην** διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, οὗτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος (Acts 10.36). This bears some resemblance to **Isa 52.7**,

ὡς ὥρα ἐπὶ τῶν ὁρέων ὡς πόδες **εὐαγγελιζομένου** ἀκοὴν **εἰρήνης** ὡς **εὐαγγελιζόμενος** ἀγαθὰ ὅτι ἀκουστήν ποιήσω τὴν σωτηρίαν σου λέγων Σιων βασιλεύσει σου ὁ θεός.

Luke appears to draw on the activity of the one anointed by the Spirit, according to Isa 61.1-2, as a way of summarising the activity of Jesus and his apostles.

4. Acts 13.10

The notions that Israel is to walk in straight paths, and that the time will come when the crooked will be made straight, are Isaianic.

Isa 40.3, φωνὴ βοῶντος ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ ἐτοιμάσατε τὴν ὁδὸν κυρίου **εὐθείας** ποιεῖτε τὰς τρίβους τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν.

Isa. 45.13, ἐγὼ ἤγειρα αὐτὸν μετὰ δικαιοσύνης βασιλέα καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ **εὐθεῖαι**.

It is an idea that Luke picks up. As is well known, Luke knows the Christians at Damascus as 'The Way'. I doubt it is co-incidental that Ananias lives in the street/district called 'Straight' (9.11) and that Paul ends up in his house and is baptised there. In addition, in Paul's confrontation with Bar Jesus over the interpretation of righteousness, the false prophet is accused of perverting 'the straight paths of the Lord',

ᾧ πλήρης παντὸς δόλου καὶ πάσης ῥαδιουργίας, υἱὲ διαβόλου, ἐχθρὲ πάσης δικαιοσύνης, οὐ παύση διαστρέφωιν τὰς ὁδοὺς [τοῦ] κυρίου **τὰς εὐθείας**;

This condemnation of Bar Jesus is part of Luke's claim that Paul is the 'straight' interpreter of the ways of the Lord, and those who oppose him are perverters of the path. According to Isaiah, the ideal person is one who πορευόμενος ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ λαλῶν εὐθεῖαν ὁδὸν (33.15). Bar Jesus, on the contrary, is a prophet who is full of deceit (δόλος). In the true servant of Yahweh, there is no deceit (Isa 53.9). Righteousness (δικαιοσύνη) is walking in the straight paths of the Lord, and is a common and important motif in Isaiah. As the Isaianic Lord says, ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι κύριος ὁ ἀγαπῶν δικαιοσύνην (61.3), and the hope is that ὄψονται ἔθνη τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου καὶ βασιλεῖς τὴν δόξαν σου (62.2).

The links in Acts between Paul and Isaiah as prophets of the Lord are quite strong. They both speak the same language.

5. Acts 18.9-10

Μὴ φοβοῦ, ἀλλὰ λάλει καὶ μὴ σιωπήσης, **διότι ἐγὼ εἰμι μετὰ σοῦ** καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐπιθήσεται σοὶ τοῦ κακῶσαί σε.

This echoes **Isa. 43.5**, **μὴ φοβοῦ ὅτι μετὰ σοῦ εἰμι** ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν ἄξω τὸ σπέρμα σου καὶ ἀπὸ δυσμῶν συνάξω σε, **Isa 58.11**, **καὶ ἔσται ὁ θεός σου μετὰ σοῦ** διὰ παντός, and **Is 41.10**, **μὴ φοβοῦ μετὰ σοῦ γάρ εἰμι** μὴ πλανῶ **ἐγὼ γάρ εἰμι ὁ θεός σου** ὁ ἐνισχύσας σε καὶ ἐβοήθησά σοι καὶ ἠσφαλισάμην σε τῇ δεξιᾷ τῇ δικαίᾳ μου

Of course, the idea that God is 'with' his servant is common (for example, Gen 26.24; and Jer 26.28). On the other hand, again noting the links Luke makes between the servants of God (Jesus, Peter, Paul) and the servant songs of Isaiah, one might be justified in saying Luke here is referring to the promises of Yahweh made in Isaiah.

Following this theme of God protecting his servants, I would draw attention to **Isa. 37.28**, *νῦν δὲ τὴν ἀνάπαυσίν σου καὶ τὴν ἔξοδόν σου καὶ τὴν εἴσοδόν σου ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι*. The expression 'going out and coming in' is used in the Pentateuch especially of Israel's leaders, and of their military leaders (almost as a technical term for their military exploits; Num 27.17; Deut 28.6; 31.2). It is also used to describe the whole life of a person, most well-known in LXX Psa 120.7-8, *κύριος φυλάξει σε ἀπὸ παντὸς κακοῦ φυλάξει τὴν ψυχὴν σου, κύριος φυλάξει τὴν εἴσοδόν σου καὶ τὴν ἔξοδόν σου*.

I do not have the space or time to develop this idea here, but it is interesting to note that Luke uses the phrase in reference to Jesus in Acts 1.21 (*ἐν παντὶ χρόνῳ ᾧ εἰσηλθεν καὶ ἐξηλθεν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς ὁ κύριος Ἰησοῦς*), where it seems to refer to his leadership – the preposition *ἐπί* might imply this). And while the exact phrase is not used, the two verbs (*εἰσηλθεν* and *ἐξηλθεν*) are commonly used in tandem with both Peter and Paul, and sometimes in a clear context of God's protection. This is best illustrated in Acts 14.19-20. Paul is stoned, left for dead, but (miraculously) gets up and goes in and then goes out as if nothing had happened (*λιθάσαντες τὸν Παῦλον ἔσυρον ἔξω τῆς πόλεως νομίζοντες αὐτὸν τεθνηκέναι. κυκλωσάντων δὲ τῶν μαθητῶν αὐτὸν ἀναστὰς εἰσηλθεν εἰς τὴν πόλιν. Καὶ τῇ ἐπαύριον ἐξηλθεν σὺν τῷ Βαρναβᾶ εἰς Δέρβην*). The Lord preserved his going out and coming in; or, to use the words of Isaiah, the Lord could say to Paul, *τὴν ἔξοδόν σου καὶ τὴν εἴσοδόν σου ἐγὼ ἐπίσταμαι*.

Along these lines, I have not read David Pao's book, 'Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus' (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2002), but its title suggests that Pao finds 'exodus' language and themes in both writings. That is not really surprising, since prophets very often call Israel back to her roots in God's mythological acts of creation and salvation. It might be worth comparing the use of *ἐκ/ἐξ* and their compound words in Isaiah and Acts. I know that in Acts 12, for example, the escape of Peter is told with the use of many such words. A very quick count reveals that Isaiah uses the preposition about 120 times and Acts about 85 times, and that the former uses *ἐκ/ἐξ* compound verb forms at least 150 times, while Acts uses them about 100 times. For what it's worth.

6. Signs and wonders (*σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα*) is a phrase commonly used in **Acts** (2.43; 4.30; 5.12; 6.8; 7.36; 14.3; 15.12). It is a phrase also found in Isaiah 8.18, and 20.3; but probably more significant is **Isa 11.12**, where God says that 'on that day', he will raise *σημεῖον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη*. This is possibly picked up by Luke in **Acts 15.12**, when the council at Jerusalem is glad to hear Paul's report that *ἐποίησεν ὁ θεὸς σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν δι' αὐτῶν*.

7. I have noted already that the call and mission of Paul and that of Isaiah resonate with each other. Both receive their commission in the Temple (Isa 6 and Acts 22). While verbal similarities between those two narratives are almost

non-existent, there are some faint resonances elsewhere. For example, in **Isa 66.19**,

καὶ καταλείψω ἐπ' αὐτῶν σημεῖα καὶ **ἐξαποστελῶ** ἐξ αὐτῶν σεσωσμένους **εἰς τὰ ἔθνη** εἰς Θαρσῖς καὶ Φουδ καὶ Λουδ καὶ Μοσοχ καὶ Θοβελ καὶ εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα καὶ εἰς τὰς νήσους τὰς πόρρω οἷ οὐκ ἀκηκόασίν μου τὸ ὄνομα οὐδὲ ἑωράκασιν τὴν δόξαν μου καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσίν μου τὴν δόξαν ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν.

In **Acts 22.2**, in Paul's temple commission, the Lord says to him, πορεύου, ὅτι ἐγὼ **εἰς ἔθνη** μακρὰν **ἐξαποστελῶ** σε.

8. There are a number of theological phrases used in Acts that also are found in Isaiah. Nearly all of these are certainly found elsewhere in Jewish literature, and I certainly would not wish to claim direct or explicit reference to Isaiah when Luke uses them in Acts. For example, both can refer to God as 'the living God'. So, in Isa 37.4 (compare also 37.17), the king of Assyria is accused of insulting 'the living God' (**θεὸν ζῶντα**). And in Acts 14.15, Paul addresses the Lystrans and calls them to turn to 'the living God' (**ἐπιστρέφειν ἐπὶ θεὸν ζῶντα**). What these passages have in common is that speakers use the phrase when addressing pagans.

A widely used circumlocution (and description) in Jewish literature is to refer to God as the **Most High**. So **Isa 57.15**, τὰδε λέγει κύριος **ὁ ὑψιστος** ὁ ἐν ὑψηλοῖς κατοικῶν τὸν αἰῶνα ἅγιος ἐν ἁγίοις ὄνομα αὐτῷ κύριος **ὑψιστος** ἐν ἁγίοις... It is an expression used by Stephen also in the context of where God lives, οὐχ **ὁ ὑψιστος** ἐν χειροποιήτοις κατοικεῖ (**Acts 7.48**). Given that Stephen in the same verse cites Isa 66.1-2, it is possible that Stephen is using LXX Isaianic language when he refers to God as 'the Most High'. The word ὑψιστος is also used by the Pythian prophetess (**Acts 16.7**).

Another term used to describe the activity of God that Isaiah and Acts have in common is the 'uplifted arm'. Isaiah says, κύριε **ὑψηλός σου ὁ βραχίων** (**26.11**), where it appears God's arm is lifted to act decisively. Isaiah also knows that the holy arm of God acts to offer salvation to the gentiles (**52.10**, καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὸν **βραχίονα αὐτοῦ τὸν ἅγιον** ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν ἔθνων καὶ ὄψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν σωτηρίαν τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ). According to **Acts 13.17**, God liberated Israel from Egypt **μετὰ βραχίονος ὑψηλοῦ**. The phrase naturally is more common in the Pentateuch, and it is more likely that Luke is recalling that literature rather than Isaiah, who only uses the phrase once.

9. Another hint of Isaiah being used in Acts is found in the idea of gentiles, in particular, turning to the Lord and being saved. A classic statement of this hope is found in **Isa 45.22**, ἐπιστρέψατε πρὸς με καὶ **σωθήσεσθε** οἱ ἀπ' ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς ἐγὼ εἰμι ὁ θεός καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος.

While there are few direct verbal parallels linking 'turning' and 'being saved', the concept is certainly present in Acts. The best example is probably that of the jailer at Philippi, to whom Paul says, Πίστευσον ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν καὶ **σωθήσῃ** σὺ καὶ ὁ οἶκός σου (Acts 16.31).

The concept of salvation and of God as savior is common to both Isaiah and to Luke in Acts. That this salvation is offered to gentiles is also a clear Isaianic expectation (**49.6**, ἰδοὺ τέθεικά σε εἰς διαθήκην γένους εἰς φῶς **ἔθνων** τοῦ εἶναί σε εἰς **σωτηρίαν** ἕως ἐσχάτου τῆς γῆς and **52.10**, καὶ ἀποκαλύψει κύριος τὸν βραχίονα αὐτοῦ τὸν ἅγιον ἐνώπιον πάντων τῶν **ἔθνων** καὶ ὄψονται πάντα τὰ ἄκρα τῆς γῆς τὴν **σωτηρίαν** τὴν παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ).

10. Acts 26.18

Paul here recounts his conversion/call experience in which the Lord says that he sends Paul to the gentiles, to 'open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light ...':

ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμούς αὐτῶν, τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι **ἀπὸ σκοτούς εἰς φῶς** καὶ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ Σατανᾶ **ἐπὶ τὸν θεόν**, τοῦ λαβεῖν αὐτοὺς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ **κλήρον** ἐν τοῖς ἡγιασμένοις πίστει τῇ εἰς ἐμέ.

Again, there are phrases in this verse that can be found in the OT. Isaiah says that Yahweh calls and creates his servant 'to open the eyes of the blind' and to lead out of prison those 'sitting in darkness' (**Isa 42.7**, **ἀνοίξαι ὀφθαλμούς τυφλῶν** ἐξαγαγεῖν ἐκ δεσμῶν δεδεμένους καὶ ἐξ οἴκου φυλακῆς καθημένους **ἐν σκότει**). Later, in the same chapter, Yahweh promises to turn darkness into light for the blind (**42.16**, ποιήσω αὐτοῖς **τὸ σκότος εἰς φῶς**). That God will provide a servant who will be εἰς φῶς ἔθνων is common to both Isaiah (49.6) and Acts (13.47), as we have already seen

Given that Luke uses this language for the call of Paul, and given that Isaiah uses similar language in his servant songs, it is likely that Luke has the Isaiah passages in mind. It might be noted at this point that Betz has made a case for understanding Paul's vision in the temple in Acts 22, told in relation to his call, as drawing on Isaiah's temple vision and call. In other words, Luke seems to link Paul's call with Isaiah.

We have already seen that Luke can take a word spoken to Isaiah as a word spoken by the Lord to Paul (13.47). And at the very end of Acts, Paul and Isaiah seem to be portrayed as complementary witnesses, and Paul takes a word of Isaiah and uses it as his own **ἐν ῥῆμα** (28.25-27).

While the noun **κλήρος**, used in this verse, is not very common in Isaiah, its cognates certainly are, with over twenty uses of them. Here, the gentiles are promised a κλήρος among the sanctified ones; this possibly resonates with **Isa**

54.3, where Yahweh promises Israel, τὸ σπέρμα σου ἔθνη κληρονομήσει, and with **Isa 63.17**, which speaks of τὰς φυλὰς τῆς κληρονομίας σου.

The idea of turning from Satan to God, while not used of gentiles in Isaiah, does reflect Isaianic language, since the prophet speaks of day when the remnant of Israel ἔσονται πεποιθότες ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ Ἰσραηλ τῆ ἀληθείᾳ (10.20).

Conclusions

It is well known that Luke in his double work draws quite heavily on Isaiah, not only in direct, explicit citation, but as the framework for understanding and interpreting the activity of Jesus and of his apostles and, importantly, as the framework for communicating that interpretation to Theophilus.

In this paper, I have drawn attention to the explicit quotations, but am conscious that many others have already done more detailed work on some of these passages. I have wanted to highlight the indirect references and the Isaianic 'air' that Luke appears to have breathed. I realise that this area too has not been fully explored. For example, comparing the understanding of God, of Israel, of eschatology in both Isaiah and Acts might prove valuable. I have also suggested that the role of Luke himself as teacher and interpreter needs to be taken seriously. And I have wanted to emphasise that the interpretation of Isaiah appears to have been at the centre of Jewish-Christian dialogues and debates in the first century, at least, of the Christian communities.