



University of  
St Andrews

*University of St Andrews*

*School of Divinity*

Submitted for the Degree of M.Litt. in Scripture and Theology  
October 2012

**ENSIGN FOR THE NATIONS:  
THE *HEILSGESCHICHTLICHER* PHASE OF  
MESSIANIC REUNIFICATION IN LUKE-ACTS**

**By**

James T. Mace

Id number 110014370

Date Submitted: 3 October 2012

I hereby certify that this dissertation, which is approximately 17086 words in length, has been composed by me, that it is the record of work carried out by me and that it has not been submitted in any previous application for a higher degree. This project was conducted by me at the University of St Andrews from January 2012 to October 2012 towards fulfilment of the requirements of the University of St Andrews for the degree of M.Litt. in Scripture and Theology under the supervision of Dr. Kelly R. Iverson.

Signature of Candidate:

## CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO MESSIANIC REUNIFICATION IN LUKE-ACTS . . . . .	1
HMR AND SCRIPTURALLY DEFINING THE MR PARADIGM . . . . .	2
<b>A Widespread and Well-Developed Prophetic Theme to Enlighten NT Interpretation</b>	2
Placing HMR in Scholarly Context	2
Thematic Treatment of MR Components	3
<b>Congruence of the Chronicler with the Prophets</b>	4
SAMARITANS AS PARTICIPANTS IN MR . . . . .	8
LUKE-ACTS READ WITH HMR . . . . .	10
<b>The Gospel of Luke: Preparing for MR</b>	14
The Loyal Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37)	14
The God-Praising Samaritan (Luke 17:11–19)	22
<b>The Book of Acts: Instituting MR</b>	29
Acts 1–8: Fulfilling MR	29
<i>Jesus in Acts 1—Commissioning MR</i>	29
<i>Peter in Acts 2—Inaugurating MR</i>	30
<i>Samaritans in Acts 8—Consummating MR</i>	32
Acts 10–15: Confirming MR	35
<i>Acts 10–11—Why the Crisis Only Now?</i>	35
<i>Paul in Acts 13—Seeing Isa 11:12 MR through Isa 49:6</i>	36
<i>James in Acts 15—Seeing Amos 9:11–12 MR</i>	38
CONCLUSIONS REGARDING HMR IN LUKE-ACTS . . . . .	42
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	43

## INTRODUCTION TO MESSIANIC REUNIFICATION IN LUKE-ACTS

“Behold, days are coming,” declares the LORD, “when I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of Judah”; “I will make them one nation in the land, on the mountains of Israel; and one king will be king for all of them; and they will no longer be two nations and no longer be divided into two kingdoms”; “And He will lift up a standard for the nations And assemble the banished ones of Israel, And will gather the dispersed of Judah From the four corners of the earth. <sup>13</sup> Then the jealousy of Ephraim will depart, And those who harass Judah will be cut off; Ephraim will not be jealous of Judah, And Judah will not harass Ephraim. <sup>14</sup> They will swoop down on the slopes of the Philistines on the west; Together they will plunder the sons of the east.” (Jer 31:31 NASB; Ezek 37:22; Isa 11:12–14a)

All OT scholars know of the prophetic theme of reunification of the divided kingdoms of north Israel and south Judah. Despite its prominence in passages cited by the NT, only a paucity of scholars take account of the theme but, even then, not in much depth. One exception is Brant Pitre, who identifies the Israel Jesus fails to reunite as still exiled in the east.<sup>1</sup>

I propose in the first division of the paper to synthesize a hermeneutical paradigm from the prophets, in line with a similar ideology in Chronicles, and then show Samaritans as likely candidates to inherit the reunification promise. In the second division, I will confirm that this hermeneutic plausibly reads Luke-Acts as indicating fulfillment of the prophesied messianic reunification of all Israel, both Judaeans and Samaritans, in a phase of *Heilsgeschichte* necessarily preceding incorporation of Gentiles.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brant Pitre, *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement* (WUNT 2/204; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

## HMR AND SCRIPTURALLY DEFINING THE MR PARADIGM

### **A Widespread and Well-Developed Prophetic Theme to Enlighten NT Interpretation**

#### Placing HMR in Scholarly Context

The OT predicts the Davidic Messiah will reunify the two divided Israelite groups; this is *messianic reunification* (MR). *The hermeneutic of messianic reunification* (HMR) is a means of reading Scripture while mindful of these prophecies. Emphasis on that aspect of the restoration of Israel manifesting the regathering of the twelve tribes is what we might call *twelve-tribism* (TT). As will be seen, *the hermeneutic of twelve-tribism* (HTT) insufficiently explains all the data, hence HMR is necessary.

Greenwood concluded this prediction is “perhaps the most conspicuous example in the [OT] of patently false prophecy.”<sup>2</sup> Conversely, OT scholar Stephen Ricks concludes:

It may be argued that the church or some historical or current political configuration may correspond to certain elements in this portrait. However, nothing past or present fully conforms to this vision. Its realization belongs to a “redeemed people” (to borrow R. K. Harrison’s remark on Jeremiah’s restoration vision) in the messianic age.<sup>3</sup>

I argue that the redeemed people reunited in the eschatological messianic kingdom have been seen in the Judaeans and Samaritans submitting to Messiah Jesus in Luke-Acts.

HMR contains elements of two positions, exemplified by N. T. Wright and Brant Pitre, and provides explanatory power that neither does. With the former we embrace the concept of

---

<sup>2</sup> David C. Greenwood, “On the Jewish Hope for a Restored Northern Kingdom,” ZAW 88 (1976), 384.

<sup>3</sup> S. D. Ricks, “The Prophetic Literality of Tribal Reconstruction,” in *Israel’s Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison* (ed. A. Gileadi; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988), 280. Most Classical Dispensationalist scholars locate fulfillment in the Zionist state in future: “No fulfillment has ever been recorded in history, and the future regathering of Israel will occur in the Millennium” (John F. Walvoord, *The Prophecy Knowledge Handbook* [Wheaton, Ill.: Victor, 1990], 187); J. D. Pentecost, *Things to Come: A Study in Biblical Eschatology* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1964), 409–11; David M. Levy, “Isaiah Sees Israel’s Future,” *Israel My Glory* 70, no. 2 (March/April 2012): 21. Other politically influential Dispensationalist writers correlate fulfillment of, e.g., Jer 30 and Ezek 37 with the 1948 establishment of the modern Zionist state (Hal Lindsey and C. C. Carlson, *The Late Great Planet Earth* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970], 42–54).

continuing spiritual exile though physically in the land<sup>4</sup> and with the latter the reunification of the northern kingdom with the south. HMR maintains that the remnant of both south and (*contra* Wright) north kingdoms were exiled within the land. And HMR maintains (*contra* Pitre) that it is not trans-Euphrates tribal remnants in Luke-Acts but Samaritans who embody the northerners to be reunited.

### Thematic Treatment of MR Components

MR is present in a wide variety of texts: biblical, Apocryphal, intertestamental, Philo, DSS, and rabbinic literature.<sup>5</sup> HMR draws common themes from analysis of numerous prophecies.<sup>6</sup> Of the dozens available, MR is especially prominent in Hos 1:10–11; Isa 11:10–16; Jer 3:6–18; 23:5–8; 30:3–11; 31:31–34; 33:6–7; Ezek 37:15–28; Zech 9:9–13. With not every prophecy containing every MR element, Ezek 37 is perhaps most paradigmatic. These clear MR prophecies feature prominently in NT writings and will be dealt with as they occur in Luke-Acts. A paradigm synthesized from this constellation of prophetic elements forms HMR.

1. A geographical element with reclamation of the land is significant.

---

<sup>4</sup> “The entire discussion takes place in connection with the recent contributions of E. P. Sanders, N. T. Wright, Craig Evans, Michael Knibb, James Scott, and a host of others, who have advocated the notion of a protracted exile in which many Israelites believed that the nation’s historically incurred divine judgment made manifest in the Assyrian and Babylonian exiles was still very much a reality in their lives, and in need of an urgent eschatological solution” (Thomas R. Wood, “The Regathering of the People of God: An Investigation into the New Testament’s Appropriation of the Old Testament Prophecies Concerning the Regathering of Israel” [Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2006], iii). The idea is found throughout Wright’s works, but see esp. *The New Testament and the People of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 1; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 268–72.

<sup>5</sup> Useful assemblies of scores of these occur in, e.g., Roy E. Ciampa, “The History of Redemption,” in *Central Themes in Biblical Theology: Mapping Unity in Diversity* (ed. S. J. Hafemann and P. R. House; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 271 n. 41; Robert T. Anderson and Terry Giles, *The Keepers: An Introduction to the History and Culture of the Samaritans* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002), 18–19; Michael E. Fuller, *The Restoration of Israel: Israel’s Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts* (BZNTW 138; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006), 13–14 n. 5; Scot McKnight, “Jesus and the Twelve,” *BBR* 11 (2001), 218–19; David E. Aune and Eric Stewart, “From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001), 159; James M. Scott, “‘And then all Israel will be saved’ (Rom 11:26),” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001), 519 n. 79, etc.

<sup>6</sup> Ricks delineates a basic pattern in MR prophecies: particular attention to the land; return of a remnant; reunification of southern and northern kingdoms/tribes (Judah and Israel/ Ephraim/Joseph) as under David and Solomon; a Davidic king ruling Yahweh’s people; renewal of central temple cultus; a new, everlasting covenant for a transformed Israel indwelt by the Spirit (Ricks, “Prophetic Literality,” 273–81).

2. All Israel is corporately resurrected with presence of the Spirit.
3. All Israel corporately inherits eternal life through entering into an everlasting covenant.
4. Yahweh forever dwells in his sanctuary in their midst.
5. A Son of David restores the united kingdom to its Davidic extent.
6. The Davidide reunifies two specific parties referencing both divided north and south kingdoms of Israel/Ephraim/Samaria/Joseph and of Judah. Stuart describes this prominent theme as “Reunification (restoration blessing type 8).”<sup>7</sup> HTT inadequately explains these dual portions of Israel. A nuancing of themes is in order. HTT has more to do with a Mosaic *new exodus* (and even of Joshua’s conquest; cf. McKnight “Jesus”), while MR has to do with the covenant of Davidic *kingship*, arguably of greater significance for NT interpretation and deserving of more emphasis.
7. HMR addresses the theme of removing enmity in exchange for amity between the two divided bodies of royal Israel, whereas HTT has no solely tribal regathering prophecies that mention enmity between any of the tribes that can allow it to show fulfillment apart from the distinct MR passages.
8. MR precedes all Israel’s incorporation of Gentile nations.
9. The remnant of faithful Israel is restored; the wicked are destroyed (Amos 5:15; 9:9–10).

### **Congruence of the Chronicler with the Prophets**

Despite scholarly slowness to see it, the Chronicler expressed an extraordinarily positive view towards the inhabitants of the north kingdom.<sup>8</sup> Essentially all interpreters formerly thought Chronicles was negative toward northerners, echoing in one accord Judaeen polemic, *par excellence* 2 Kgs 17:24–41 (examined further in the subsequent section on the Samaritans).

In sum, it is only in the modern period that Chronicles has been read for the very different historical and theological portrayal of Israel that it presents. From the ancient period through the middle of the twentieth century, Samuel–Kings provided the biblical version of that history, with Chronicles providing “supplementary” information. This, in turn,

---

<sup>7</sup> Douglas Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah* (WBC 31; Dallas: Word, 1987), 398.

<sup>8</sup> Several passages indicate continued hope for the return of the north to a common worship in Jerusalem; see Roddy L. Braun, “A Reconsideration of the Chronicler’s Attitude toward the North,” *JBL* 96 (1977), 59–62.

resulted in the substantial neglect of these books in rabbinic, patristic, medieval, and Reformation exegesis.<sup>9</sup>

But this one-sided, anti-northern polemic probably reflected exclusivist views of only a minority elitist faction, בני הגולה or *gōlāh* returnees from Babylon despising the remnant population in the land, views with which the Chronicler disagreed.<sup>10</sup> Riley well contrasts the different pictures given by the DtrH and Chronicles, which fits very well into the Near Eastern background of the third or fourth century B.C. (when Riley says Chronicles was probably composed) and seems to be influenced by that surrounding cultural context.<sup>11</sup>

So Chronicles has until recently been egregiously misunderstood. “The Chronicler envisions the people of God as individuals from every tribe of Israel who are willing to do God’s bidding.”<sup>12</sup> Amit and many others now “suggest that the Chronicler’s description was intended to present the Samaritans as descendants of the tribes of western Israel, most of whom were never exiled, and thus they are the brothers of the Judahites and an integral part of the Israelite nation.”<sup>13</sup>

This revolutionary sea-change has come largely due to modern sciences like archaeology that confirm the view of the Chronicler above that of the partisan Judaeans texts.

The Assyrian evidence sheds a positive light on the text in Chronicles, which is usually criticized as tendentious and historically unreliable, regarding the “remnant of Israel” who stayed on its land in the north, suggesting that in this case it might be to some extent trustworthy evidence that hints at the identity of most of the northern people. The Assyrian evidence, in fact, supports the second interpretation – namely, that the Chronicler did not seek to alienate the northern population, the Samaritans, but, on the contrary, wanted to bring them closer, because he thought that many of them were part of the people of Israel. The Chronicler is doing this not by declarative means, but by using indirect means such as plots, characters and more, in order to achieve his purpose – a

---

<sup>9</sup> Mark A. Throntveit, “Chronicles, Books of,” *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible* (ed. Kevin J. Vanhoozer et al.; London: SPCK, 2005), 110.

<sup>10</sup> Yigal Levin, “Who Was the Chronicler’s Audience? A Hint from His Genealogies,” *JBL* 122 (2003), 237–42.

<sup>11</sup> William Riley, *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History* (JSOTSup 160; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993).

<sup>12</sup> Paul R. House, *Old Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 536.

<sup>13</sup> Yairah Amit, “The Samaritans – Biblical Positions in the Service of Modern Politics,” in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies* (ed. M. Mor and F. V. Reiterer; Studia Samaritana/Studia Judaica 5/53; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 252.

historical depiction that emphasizes the continuity of the people of northern Israel, who are all Jacob's descendants, in their land, the Land of Israel.<sup>14</sup>

Indeed, a major theme and plot element of Chronicles is that *all Israel* is defined as the territories and inhabitants of both south and north together; “without the embers of the northern tribes, the people of Israel cannot be complete.”<sup>15</sup>

Moreover, there seem to be definitive links between prophetic MR and the Chronicler's ideology. Williamson asserts: “the Chronicler sought to bring forward into the historical arena of the reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah the prophetic hope for the reunification of all Israel.”<sup>16</sup> In the same way the problem of Isa 9:19–21 is addressed by the cure of 11:12–13, so it is in 2 Chr 28:8–15 that the Chronicler begins his solution to intra-Israelite strife through the loving unity of all Israel across social boundaries and false religious divisions.

In this story, Samaritans are piously observing covenant love toward Judaeans (i.e., obedience to the First and Second Great Commandments of Deut 6:5 and Lev 19:18, 1–2GC, the Dual Love Command) despite their mutual warring.<sup>17</sup> It references Samaritans inhabiting northern Israel who, from religious motives, help suffering Judaeans, which breaks the cycle of mutual hatred and evinces obedience to 1–2GC. We see victim-anointing with oil and transporting to Jericho by donkey, along with economic koinonia of clothing and feeding.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Amit, “Samaritans,” 254. Most scholars now agree that Chronicles is not intended as anti-Samaritan rhetoric; see Sarah Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (trans. A. Barber; Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum 9; Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997), 325–34.

<sup>15</sup> Japhet, *Ideology*, 324. For others who see *all Israel* as including northerners, cf. Williamson, *Israel*, 130–31; Throntveit, “Chronicles,” 111–12; Scott, “all Israel,” 499–500, et al.

<sup>16</sup> H. G. M. Williamson, *Israel in the Books of Chronicles* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 126. Cf. “The prophetic dream refused to bow totally to the intransigence of historical realities: it continued to surface in one form or another. The Chronicler, probably around 400 B.C., took seriously the prophetic ideal and tried to heal the breach among divided Yahwists in the land with a call to Judah to rediscover the principle of ‘all Israel’ and to welcome northerners to worship at the Jerusalem temple” (Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 20–48* [WBC 29; Dallas: Word, 1998], 196).

<sup>17</sup> Since 2 Kgs and 2 Chr are equally inspired, one can prioritize the latter's portrayal of northern Israelites as pious Yahwists, as Jesus did in adapting this for his Luke 10 example of loving MR enmity reversal, which we shall examine later. For the parallel between Luke 10 and 2 Chr 28 based on a common link to Deut 6:5, see F. Werner Monselewski, *Der barmherzige Samariter: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10, 25–37* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1967), 174.

<sup>18</sup> All these are paralleled in the Luke 10 Samaritan parable, through which Jesus, like the prophet Oded, seeks to further pan-Israelite unity. Some of the many scholars noting this connection include Peter R. Ackroyd, *I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah* (TBC; London: SCM, 1973), 177; Richard J. Coggins, *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 259; Raymond B. Dillard, 2



From the time king Ahaz of Judah is called “king of Israel” (2 Chr 28:19), kings of Judah thereafter seem to rule over all Israel. The Chronicler presents the northern inhabitants in the reigns of Hezekiah and Josiah as “Israel” joining with Judah (2 Chr 30:25; 35:18) culminating in unitive Passovers with their southern brethren (30:1–31:1; 35:1–19). Creating an upward trajectory, the latter Passover was even bigger and better than that of Hezekiah.<sup>19</sup> Northerners joined in cleansing all Israel from religious impurities (2 Chr 31:1; 34:33).

Furthermore, this proleptic royal reunification occurs not only near the end of 2 Chronicles but also of all Hebrew Scripture, as this (not Malachi) is the final book of the Judaeen biblical canon. So Jesus et al. would view their Scripture closing on a note of climactic eschatological expectancy in conformity with the MR paradigm which “orients its readers to the future. As such the Story is unfinished. The long, dark night of exile awaits a sequel—the dawning of a new light that will radiate to the ends of the earth.”<sup>20</sup>

Finally, one must remember that the post-exilic Chronicler and prophets knew of the presence of Samaritans (the remnant of Israel) occupying the land when writing favourably of northerners and their MR with Judaeans. Since, as we see next, there is no break in continuity between these Israelite Yahwists and those of Luke-Acts, it should not be unexpected to see the anticipated MR there.

---

*Chronicles* (WBC 15; Dallas: Word, 1987), 223; Martin J. Selman, *2 Chronicles* (TOTC 11; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994), 501; J. A. Thompson, *1, 2 Chronicles* (NAC 9; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 338; Leslie C. Allen, “1 & 2 Chronicles” (*NIB* 3; Nashville: Abingdon, 1999), 601; Steven S. Tuell, *First and Second Chronicles* (IBC; Louisville: John Knox, 2001), 209.

<sup>19</sup> Dillard, *2 Chronicles*, 291; D. A. Carson et al., eds., *New Bible Commentary* (4th ed.; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994), 2 Chr 35:1–19; Selman, *2 Chronicles*, 562.

<sup>20</sup> Stephen G. Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible* (New Studies in Biblical Theology 15; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2003), 227.

### SAMARITANS AS PARTICIPANTS IN MR

Samaritans are Israelites. This claim is not bizarre but entirely plausible. Many have wrongly assumed the Assyrian exile of north Israel was as bad as the Babylonian of southern Judah (which is even itself revealed by science to have been not as total as depicted in elitist *gôlāh* polemic). Evidence from archaeological surveys and excavations shows minority exile (e.g., COS 2.118D & E), little immigration, and cultural continuity.<sup>21</sup>

Modern discovery of four related letters dating 408–ca. 407 B.C. among Aramaic papyri from Elephantine (CAP 30–33) reveals not only that Samaritans continually used Yahwistic names but also that Egyptian Jewish (אִיְהוּדִים) temple-builders looked at Samaritans as fellow Israelites.<sup>22</sup>

The evidence re Samaritan origins would be incomplete without citing the interesting results of the genetic research being conducted among living Samaritans by experts who indicate not only that Samaritans are linked to Jews but also that they are descended directly from eighth-century B.C. Israelites. One study in the official journal of the Human Genome Variation Society explains the data thus: “the Samaritan M304 Y-chromosome lineages present a subgroup of the original Jewish Cohanim priesthood that did not go into exile when the Assyrians conquered the northern kingdom of Israel in 721 BC.”<sup>23</sup>

Samaritans self-designate as Ephraim/Joseph/Israel. And, despite their wrongful rejection of the Davidic royal covenant and centralized worship in Jerusalem, they observe necessary Israelite distinctives, e.g., circumcision, Sabbath, and Torah-keeping.

---

<sup>21</sup> See Gary N. Knoppers, “In Search of Post-exilic Israel: Samaria after the Fall of the Northern Kingdom,” in *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar* (ed. J. Day; JSOTSup 406; London: T&T Clark International, 2004), 150–80.

<sup>22</sup> A. Cowley, ed., *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 108–126. Cf. Knoppers, “Post-exilic Israel,” 172.

<sup>23</sup> See Peidong Shen et al., “Reconstruction of Patrilineages and Matrilineages of Samaritans and Other Israeli Populations from Y-Chromosome and Mitochondrial DNA Sequence Variation,” *Human Mutation* 24 (2004): 257–58.

In trying to determine if Samaritanism is a continuation of northern Israelite religion it must first be asked: Is there any evidence that at any time Samaritan Israelite religion, i.e. Yahwism in Samaria, was essentially different from Yahwism in Judea before the Hasmonean and Roman periods? Research has shown that the answer to this question is negative. There is every indication that northern Yahwism did not differ from southern Yahwism during the time of the united kingdom and the Achaemenid rule.<sup>24</sup>

When one discounts Judaeen polemic alleging syncretism and miscegenation,<sup>25</sup> other epigraphic, archaeological, and linguistic evidence shows essentially a continuity of Israelite Yahwists in their ancestral lands. Amit reasons:

Therefore, it teaches us to regard the different biblical texts I have quoted as tendentious sources which exaggerate whatever suits their purposes, and color the historical record accordingly. Thus, it strengthens the argument that the description in 2Kgs 17,24-41 and its supplements in Ezra 4 – both of which imply a comprehensive mass deportation – was a polemical one. Its purpose was to depict the Samaritans as aliens, as people who could not claim to be genetically part of Israel, and did not deserve to be included.<sup>26</sup>

There is no evidence of any break in continuity of these northern Israelites with first-century Samaritans<sup>27</sup> who joined with Judaeans in embracing Messiah Jesus, to which we now turn.

---

<sup>24</sup> Reinhard Pummer, “Samaritanism – A Jewish Sect or an Independent Form of Yahwism?,” in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies* (ed. M. Mor and F. V. Reiterer; Studia Samaritana/Studia Judaica 5/53; Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010), 8.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Ingrid Hjelm, “Brothers Fighting Brothers: Jewish and Samaritan Ethnocentrism in Tradition and History,” in *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition* (ed. T. L. Thompson; JSOTSup 381; London: T&T Clark International, 2003), 197–222.

<sup>26</sup> Amit, “Samaritans,” 254.

<sup>27</sup> See Ingrid Hjelm, “What Do Samaritans and Jews have in Common? Recent Trends in Samaritan Studies,” *CBR* 3 (2004): 9–59.

## LUKE-ACTS READ WITH HMR

The MR phase in the restoration of Israel schema is widely underappreciated in NT interpretation. In particular this misses appreciation of the OT Chronicler's ideology generally regarding MR and specifically regarding interpretation of the Loyal Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37). Concomitant with the MR paradigm, it is not until all Israel is reunited that focus on the Gentiles occurs.<sup>28</sup> Also in order is reassessment of the Samaritan question from the point of view of the acknowledged purpose of Lucan historiography as focused on Israel's identity.

Having in the first division of the paper established the hermeneutic of messianic reunification (HMR) from Scripture and shown the Samaritans can be considered as inheritors of northern Israelite status, I will now show the presence of the reunification theme in representative pericopae of Luke and up through Acts 15. This will show HMR's viability in a cumulative case cohering many parts with explanatory power clarifying meanings and revealing their relatedness.

Scholars debate over MR concepts. Some adherents of *twelve-tribism* (TT) objecting to MR apparently see focussing on the *tribal* aspect as sufficient to explain the theme of reunited *kingdoms*.<sup>29</sup> Pitre has work very helpful for MR with his view of the reunification of north and south Israel as necessary to understanding the mission of Jesus and the church. Unfortunately, he follows ancient Judaeen polemic in saying that these northern Israelite tribes are all still in exile

---

<sup>28</sup> In this I echo Jacob Jervell. According to Jervell, only after the full portion of Israel (found in Galilee, Judaea and Samaria) has been saved does the kingdom turn out toward other peoples. See esp. his second ch., "The Divided People of God: The Restoration of Israel and Salvation for the Gentiles," in *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts* (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 1972), 41–74. He then develops this throughout the book, e.g., 120.

<sup>29</sup> See the discussion in Richard Bauckham, "James and the Jerusalem Church," in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 419–22; Richard Bauckham, "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 72; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001), 470–72.

across the Euphrates in the east and utterly ignores the possibility Samaritans are Israelites.<sup>30</sup> In contrast, Ravens rigorously asserts that Luke intends to communicate an MR agenda with Samaritans as part of the restoration of Israel.<sup>31</sup> Likewise both Pao and Hahn see that Luke-Acts embraces MR of the two kingdoms of north (Samaritans) and south.<sup>32</sup>

Appreciation of Lukan themes contributes to reading with HMR. We saw pertinent aspects from the constellation of scriptural characteristics that construct HMR. With that hermeneutical lens, we can now recognize the MR paradigm through those features' appearing at many points throughout Luke-Acts, only a few of which will be examined in this brief paper.<sup>33</sup>

One might object that MR is not obvious to all readers. Wright counters charges of something's being unseen as equalling its absence by indicating useful principles.<sup>34</sup> Interpreters slow to see MR should remember: the saturation with Scripture in the author (and in some within the narrative, e.g., Jesus and the Torah experts); popular expectation and teaching of messianic fulfillment (vs. mere doctrine or ethics); an author's evocation of the larger covenant narrative; richness of meaning in the teaching beyond reader-competence. With this in mind, we will see HMR provide readings with explanatory and cohesive power.

The Lukan theme, his *promise-fulfillment* schema, desires to see Jesus also fulfilling MR, probably as an apologetic for the Messiahship of Jesus.<sup>35</sup> Gabriel's promise coheres with MR in saying king Jesus will have "the throne of his father David" (Luke 1:32), who ruled a united kingdom of Israel. And there are subsequent similar indications.

---

<sup>30</sup> Pitre, *Jesus, passim*. Conversely, I. Howard Marshall allows that "Luke may have regarded the Samaritans as 'The Lost Sheep of the House of Israel' rather than as Gentiles" (*Luke: Historian and Theologian* [Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1970], 140 n. 3).

<sup>31</sup> See esp. the extremely helpful third chapter, "The Role of the Samaritans and the Unity of Israel," pp. 72–106 in David Ravens, *Luke and the Restoration of Israel* (JSNTSup 119; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995)

<sup>32</sup> David W. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (WUNT 2/130; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 127–29. Scott W. Hahn, *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises* (AYBRL; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009), 220–21.

<sup>33</sup> A catena of scriptures paralleling HMR view of Luke-Acts appears in Scot McKnight, "Jesus and the Twelve," *BBR* 11 (2001), 18–19.

<sup>34</sup> N. T. Wright, "Israel's Scriptures in Paul's Narrative Theology," *Theology* 115 (2012): 325–28.

<sup>35</sup> For seeing the apologetic to Jews that Jesus is the Jewish Messiah, see Jacob Jervell, *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles* (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

At the transition from resurrection to ascension, Luke records that Jesus must fulfil all the OT messianic Scriptures (Luke 24:27, 44), the divine plan of which is seen in unity with current earthly events. We saw earlier in this paper the prevalence of scriptural and extra-canonical prophecies of messianic reunification of Israel. For Luke, faithful Samaritans were the best representatives of the northern remnant. Accordingly, HMR sees Luke-Acts as narrative theology of messianic fulfillment, which recognizes MR of all Israel as one of the prophetic themes which Jesus fulfils.

Another theme Luke asserts is that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah, beginning as early as 1:32; 2:11, etc.<sup>36</sup> That a central part of Jesus' mission was to restore Israel is widely recognized. But royalty has a different function than that of a Moses or Joshua, and interpreters must consider specifically Davidic covenant kingdom fulfillment to comprehend Jesus' activities.<sup>37</sup> Israel's *Heilsgeschichte* is formulated around past triumphs serving as precedents for the future.<sup>38</sup> So Jesus' recapitulating Davidic unification of north and south should not be expected until after he likewise had first been king over the south alone (2 Sam 5:5).<sup>39</sup> A related Lukan theme that meshes with MR is *table fellowship*,<sup>40</sup> wed with kingdom imagery in many Lukan narratives (incl. between Judaeans and Samaritans).

A third theme having several components in conformity with the MR paradigm is his ecclesiological focus on defining Israel using the OT conceptual framework. Jesus' larger restoration mission included a general reunion healing every wrongful social and religious division within all Israel. Luke is often called by such epithets as, *the gospel of the outcast* (suffering exclusion by elitists); Jesus' inclusion of marginalized Israelites, the bringing of good

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Mark L. Strauss, *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology* (JSNTSup 110; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995).

<sup>37</sup> See, e.g., Hahn's chapter, "Davidic Covenant Fulfillment in Luke-Acts," in his *Kinship*, 217–37.

<sup>38</sup> Michael E. Fuller, "The Tradition of Restoration: An Examination of the Motifs of Israel's Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts" (Ph.D. diss., Durham University, 2005), 121.

<sup>39</sup> Ravens also sees these Davidic stages significant (*Restoration*, 70). HMR enjoys this bipartite parallel, whereas *the hermeneutic of twelve-tribism* (HTT) fails to adequately account for MR prophecies since usually asserting all Israel was instantly reunited at Pentecost.

<sup>40</sup> Jesus' practice of table fellowship was a Davidic trait. David extended  $\text{ברית}$  or covenant loyalty through table fellowship to covenant partners (Hahn, *Kinship*, 223). Cf. Joel B. Green, "Narrative Criticism," in *Methods for Luke* (ed. J. B. Green; *Methods in Biblical Interpretation*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 104–105.

news to *the poor* (including ostracised Samaritans) dealt with messianic unity among Israel's variegated factions. The narrative occurs in the milieu of struggle among mutually exclusive sects for status as the Israel of God. Two of these, the warring Judaeans and Samaritan sects, Jesus was urging to become part of his messianic reunification of the remnants of the divided kingdom of Davidic Israel. This also exemplifies MR enmity reversal through 1–2 GC loving solidarity founded in mutual worship.

Luke also reflects the MR component of division/separation of Israelites and the doctrine of salvation of the remnant. While condemning of wrongful religious exclusion of marginalized Israelites, Jesus also brought godly division. For the reunification of the loyal remnant can only occur after they and those refusing messianic renewal have been separated from one another. Harvest winnowing precedes gathering wheat from all Israel into the barn. So both the rejection by Samaritans (Luke 9:51–56; Acts 8) and the faithfulness of Samaritans (Luke 10:33–35; 17:15–19; Acts 8; 15:3) are but a part of the same eschatological division of Israel that we see occurring in Judaea, etc.

Lukan theology of the land meshes with the MR paradigm. Luke gives more attention to geography than does any other gospel and relates it to his theology, with an extraordinary focus on Samaria to the relative neglect of Galilee (even though Israelites there had also survived the Assyrian exile).<sup>41</sup> Many NT scholars don't factor in the royal messianic hope with concomitant expectations for territorial restoration.<sup>42</sup> Yet this was spiritual. "Although Luke's understanding of Israel's restoration involves the Land as the geographical locus of this eschatological restoration, the author does not portray the Land, as some early Jewish writers do, as a nationalistic or political center."<sup>43</sup> Jesus follows a geographic trajectory, similar in some ways to, e.g., the strong Maccabean theology of the Land,<sup>44</sup> but cleanses the land with exorcisms in spiritual reclamation. In this he echoes his ancestor Josiah's purging all the land, including north

---

<sup>41</sup> Bauckham, "James," 470–71; Joseph A. Fitzmyer S.J., *The Gospel According to Luke 1–9* (AB 28; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), 165; Hahn, *Kinship*, 449–40 n.24; McKnight, "Jesus," 228–31.

<sup>42</sup> Alternately, see Joel Willitts in "Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel,'" *HTS Theological Studies* 63 (2007): 365–82. For his fuller treatment, see Joel Willitts, *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of "the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel"* (BZBW 147; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007).

<sup>43</sup> Fuller, "Restoration," 291.

<sup>44</sup> Fuller, "Restoration," 141–42.

Israel (2 Chr 34:33),<sup>45</sup> as preparation for repairing the temple and reinstating a Passover reuniting Israel and Judah (2 Chr 35:18). Recognition of this geographical aspect strengthens the case for HMR vis-à-vis those who advocate the sufficiency of symbolic gathering of tribes, as, e.g., does Bauckham opposing MR regarding Pentecost.<sup>46</sup>

Reflecting other MR paradigmatic components, Lukan restoration is related to resurrection and eternal covenant life. From its beginning in Simeon's "rise" (Luke 2:34), appears the theme of life and everlastingness, which we will examine in Luke 10 and Acts 2.

Lastly, Israel's incorporation of the nations as portrayed in Acts fits the MR paradigm. Furthermore, HMR may best explain the restored Israel's subsequently moving on mission to the nations. HTT may be inadequate for this: "Inclusion of Gentiles cannot be established on the basis of the number 'twelve'; nor does the term 'restoration' lead in that direction. Gentile inclusion must be established on the grounds of other evidence. 'Twelve' may be a claim on all Israel but not more than Israel."<sup>47</sup> With these factors in mind, let us move to examination of Lukan texts.

### **The Gospel of Luke: Preparing for MR**

#### The Loyal Samaritan (Luke 10:25–37)

"He came with a question: 'What must I do to inherit eternal life?' This was, of course, the question of the kingdom: what must I do to have a share in the age to come, to be among those who are vindicated when YHWH acts decisively and becomes king?"<sup>48</sup>

The first pericope with which we deal in reading with HMR is the parable of the inaptly-named *Good Samaritan*. HMR recognizes that this loyal Samaritan is both 1) treated as an Israelite and 2) used here to teach MR. The former point is developed by several scholars while

---

<sup>45</sup> Edward L. Curtis and Albert A. Madsen, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910), 511; Jacob M. Myers, *2 Chronicles* (AB 13; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965), 208.

<sup>46</sup> Bauckham, "Restoration," 470–74.

<sup>47</sup> McKnight, "Jesus," 212 n.31.

<sup>48</sup> N. T. Wright, *Jesus and the Victory of God* (Christian Origins and the Question of God 2; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996), 301.



the number maintaining both is but few.<sup>49</sup> So I focus on exploring MR-specific elements (e.g., the relatively unappreciated Chronicles connection) supporting this paper's cumulative case showing the viability of reading Luke-Acts with HMR.<sup>50</sup>

Before proceeding to address MR-specific elements, I broach a pair of salient evidences supporting the contention Luke views this Samaritan as an Israelite. The question in Luke 10:29, answered by the Samaritan parable, was to define the scope of Israel.<sup>51</sup> The definition of *πλησίον*, *neighbour*, in Lev 19:18 is fellow Israelite/covenant member.<sup>52</sup> This was still true in the postexilic period.<sup>53</sup> Jesus did not change torah (Luke 16:17).<sup>54</sup> So it should be understood as still that here.<sup>55</sup> Thus this Samaritan is used as an example of one who keeps torah. Since torah partly

---

<sup>49</sup> For NT Samaritans as Israelites of the northern kingdom reunified by Messiah with Judaeans Israelites, see the works by Jervell, Ravens, Pao, Pitre, and Hahn cited in the previous section. Also see, e.g., John Bowman, *Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism and Early Christianity* (trans. Alfred M. Johnson Jr.; Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 4; Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975), 61; Martina Böhm, *Samariten und die Samaritaner bei Lukas: Eine Studie zum religionshistorischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der lukanischen Samaritentexte und zu deren topographischer Verhaftung* (WUNT 2/111; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), *passim*; V. J. Samkuty, *The Samaritan Mission in Acts* (Library of New Testament Studies 328; London: T&T Clark, 2006), 115–16; Simon Buttica, *L'identité de l'Eglise dans les Actes des apôtres: De la restauration d'Israël à la conquête universelle* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010), 34–37, 171, 197–98, 205, 211–13; Love Sechrest, "Race Relations and the Parable of the 'Good' Samaritan" (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Atlanta, Ga., November 21, 2010), etc.

<sup>50</sup> I will not here duplicate development of some of the former point, with which I have dealt in my previous works, to which I refer the reader for fuller treatments, scholarly interactions, and source citations. See James T. Mace, "Jesus's Messianological Selbstverständnis: Fulfilling Prophesied Reunification of Israel into Loving Solidarity" (essay for DI5501, University of St. Andrews, 2012), 9–15; James T. Mace, "Building the Temple and Reuniting All Israel" (essay no. 2 for DI5429, University of St. Andrews, 2012), 2–13.

<sup>51</sup> *Contra* Bauckham, "Restoration," 488.

<sup>52</sup> Contextually defining *neighbour* (cf. HALOT 1254) from its parallelism with synonyms for fellow Israelites (in Lev 19:16, 17, 18), biblical (e.g., Jer 9:4) and intertestamental theologians recognized this understanding. Cf. Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22* (AB 3A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 1654; Walter Brueggemann, *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997), 599; BDAG 830; TDNT 6:314–15; Joseph A. Fitzmyer S.J., *The Gospel According to Luke 10-24* (AB 28A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1974), 878.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. Sir 17:11–14. F. C. Fensham, *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 17–18.

<sup>54</sup> One of many who thinks that "in 10:36 Jesus inverts the meaning of 'neighbour'" is Bruce W. Longenecker, "The Story of the Samaritan and the Innkeeper (Luke 10:30–35): A Study in Character Rehabilitation," *BibInt* 17 (2009): 423.

<sup>55</sup> Richard Bauckham acknowledges the Samaritan is an Israelite in "The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan: Jesus' Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses," *NTS* 44 (1998): 486–87, 488. See Böhm, *Samariten*, 259–60. Likewise, Buttica says use of *πλησίον* in 10:36 means Luke is fully including them in the chosen people (*L'identité*, 205).

functioned as Israel's covenant stipulations, only those under covenant can actually *keep torah*. So the parable endorses this Samaritan's torah obedience as an Israelite, which is in keeping with their claims.<sup>56</sup>

The genre of the parable indicates the Samaritan is an Israelite. Stern is one of many who recognize “the traditional triad of priest, Levite, and Israelite” as the template for Jesus' parable.<sup>57</sup> This well-known form assembled the trio expecting an Israelite in the final position where Jesus places this Samaritan.<sup>58</sup> Instead of assuming Jesus ignores covenant distinctions, it is best to conclude the Samaritan fills the role of Israelite because he *is* one. “The triad, priest–Levite–Samaritan, makes no sense if the Samaritan is regarded as a Gentile; but it does make sense if he is viewed as an unacceptable Jew, an individual from those despised, the sinners, within Israel. The Samaritan would then have the same status as the publican in Luke 18.”<sup>59</sup>

We soon see below that a 2 Chr 28 connection indicates even deeper theological significance than generic inclusion of marginalized Israelites is at play. For HMR exegesis shows that Jesus answered questions regarding messianic renewal, torah observance and the scope of Israel by exemplifying a northern Israelite.

The preparatory co-text of the pericope with its Samaritan setting informs an MR reading.<sup>60</sup> This is near the beginning of the lengthy *travel narrative* showing Messiah choosing to journey through Samaria instead of bypass it. It had started with expression of anti-Judaeen hatred by Samaritans (Luke 9:53), to which John retaliated, wanting to invoke fire to incinerate them.<sup>61</sup> But Jesus rebuked the cycle of enmity (9:55).

---

<sup>56</sup> Here Jesus is contrary to some rabbis conceding Samaritans scrupulously act according to torah but falsely since not Israelites.

<sup>57</sup> Frank Stern, *A Rabbi Looks at Jesus' Parables* (Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), 258. See A. J. Mattill Jr., “The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Halevy Reconsidered,” *Encounter* 33 (1972): 359–76; Shemaryahu Talmon, “Der ‘barmherzige Samariter’ — Ein guter Israelit?,” *Kirche und Israel* 16 (2001), 151–54.

<sup>58</sup> Michel Gourges, “The Priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan Revisited: A Critical Note on Luke 10:31–35,” *JBL* 117 (1998): 712–13; Isaac Kalimi, “Robbers on the Road to Jericho: Luke's Story of the Good Samaritan and Its Origin in Kings / Chronicles,” *ETL* 85 (2009): 53.

<sup>59</sup> Jervell, *Luke*, 128 n. 11.

<sup>60</sup> See Mace, *Selbstverständnis*, 9–10.

<sup>61</sup> Later we will examine John's participation in MR reclaiming Samaria with Peter (Acts 8).

Also, the Lukan theme of covenantal table fellowship here indicates MR. Ordering his heralds to “eat what is set before you” (Luke 10:8), Messiah mandates table fellowship with Samaritans. This command makes best sense as an effort to assuage the disciples’ scruples concerning the ritual cleanliness of food. But this would only be an issue if the disciples were traveling in non-Jewish territory, i.e., Samaria.<sup>62</sup>

Furthermore, HMR enlightens the superficially obscure desire of “many prophets and kings” (Luke 10:24) immediately introducing our pericope.<sup>63</sup> Significantly, this paean concludes service of the Twelve in messianic actions reclaiming the land and reunifying the kingdoms into renewed covenant.<sup>64</sup> Such an agenda coheres with MR in the *prophets*, and we saw Messiah’s ancestors, *kings* Hezekiah and Josiah, in 2 Chronicles labor to reunite northern Israel and southern Judah in common devotion to their mutual God. HMR reveals that Luke’s placing this reference to “prophets and kings” immediately prior to the Samaritan parable thematically coheres the two, with the former preparing for the latter.

In addition to the preparatory co-text, quickly subsequent co-text on the other side of the parable in 11:17 shows Messiah describe his currently divided kingdom, supporting the MR interpretation of the preceding pericope, to which we turn.<sup>65</sup>

HMR sees that, right from the beginning, the question regarding kingdom renewal (Luke 10:25) puts this entire pericope on an MR footing. The first question the νομικός asks re “eternal life,” ζῶην αἰώνιον, regards participating in the messianic restoration of Israel. This indicates return from exile into an eternally renewed, reunified Davidic kingdom with “everlasting covenant” (Ezek 16:60; 37:25–28; 43:7). This assists in interpreting the characterization of the

---

<sup>62</sup> See Ravens, *Luke*, 82–83; Hahn, *Kinship*, 450 n. 25. We will soon see congruence with the loyal Samaritan who “brought [a Judean] to an inn and took care of him” (Luke 10:34), which must have involved eating.

<sup>63</sup> See Mace, *Selbstverständnis*, 10–11. No commentator consulted of any period has a satisfying explanation of why Luke alone emphasizes *kings*.

<sup>64</sup> Cf. Scot McKnight: “The mission of the Twelve was an attempt to spread the message throughout the land and, if any vision was involved on the part of Jesus, then the hope was to gain the land and its people for the Kingdom of God. This evocational context emerged from the Jewish hope to restore the land, to reunify the tribes, and to reestablish the covenant” (“Jesus and the Twelve,” *BBR* 11 [2001], 230).

<sup>65</sup> “The Jew/Samaritan division represents a divided kingdom, which Jesus mentions explicitly in Luke 11:14–23, . . . an oblique reference to the divided kingdom and house of David” (Hahn, *Kinship*, 450 n. 27). We will later examine how this is declared repaired in the Acts 15:15–18 quotation of Amos 9:11–12.

certainly Judaeans νομικός as self-justifying (10:29). It is this kind of professional proponent of torah who is to blame for the various religious exclusions of many Israelites that prevent the solidarity restoration requires. In accord with the MR enmity-reversal paradigm, we see Jesus here undoing another disunity working against “the poor” (Luke 4:18), among whom we should remember to list Samaritans.<sup>66</sup> This hierarchical perversity is further specified in the practice of erroneously defining the second great commandment (2GC; Lev 19:18) to restrict definition of *neighbour* even more than did the Torah.<sup>67</sup>

So the attempt to self-justify is not coming from futuristic individualism but from contemporary corporatism in order to defend his party, who exercised great animosity toward Samaritans. Thus the selection of a Samaritan is made not merely for generic antipathy between humans but specifically for the particular enmity between fellow Israelites that is to be reversed by Jesus’ MR.

Relating to the Lukan geography theme vis-à-vis MR, the extremely unusual setting re Jericho is significant to the message. The Loyal Samaritan is the only parable to be geographically located (excepting the Pharisee and publican in Luke 18:10). This assists HMR both in recognizing intertestamental allusion to the 2 Chr 28:8–15 story and in hearing its echoing not only many verbal parallels but also the theme of covenant unity between north and south Israel.

For the parable links to the Chronicler’s (and prophets’) MR ideology through this OT story of love between north and south Israel which we examined in the section on Chronicles.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>66</sup> Many scholars see Jesus’ subversive intent but explain the target otherwise; cf., e.g., John D. Crossan, “Structuralist Analysis and the Parables of Jesus,” *Semeia 1 A Structuralist Approach to the Parables* (1974): 193. For the inclusion of Samaritans along with all the other outcasts of Israel, see Longenecker, “Innkeeper,” 422–47.

<sup>67</sup> E.g., the contemporary belief that 2GC love must only be exercised toward the devout (Sir 12:1–4), excluding rival sects like Samaritans.

<sup>68</sup> In addition to scholars cited earlier in the Chronicles section, others advocating this connection include Frank H. Wilkinson, “Oded: Proto-Type of the Good Samaritan,” *ExpTim* 69 (1957–58), 94; J. D. M. Derrett, “Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” *NTS* 11 (1964): 22–37; R. W. Funk, “The Old Testament in Parable: A Study of Luke 10:25–37,” *Enc* 26 (1965), 261; J. D. M. Derrett, *Law in the New Testament* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1970), 210; Braun, “Reconsideration,” 61 n. 12; I. H. Marshall, *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Carlisle: Paternoster, 1978), 445; F. S. Spencer, “2 Chronicles 28:5–15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan,” *WTJ* 46 (1984): 317–49; Geza Vermes, *The Religion of Jesus the Jew* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 110–111 n. 40; Charles A. Kimball, *Jesus’ Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke’s Gospel* (JSNTSup 94; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994), 130; Talmon, “Samaritan,” 150–51; Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 110; Sechrest, “Race Relations.”

Both stories evince similar themes of religiously motivated northern solidarity with the Judaeen enemy. Evans convincingly argued the hearer is intended to link the parable to 2 Chr 28, “the inspiration, perhaps even the template, upon which the Parable of the Good Samaritan is built. . . . It is hard to see how a first-cent. biblical scholar could not recognize the parallel,” upon which Richard Hays judged that Evans made a good case that is entirely plausible and meeting the tests of intertextuality.<sup>69</sup>

Kimball analyzes Jesus’ intertextuality, and the form of *yelammedenu*-like midrash on a halakhic question with “practices of linking texts and commentary by catchwords and illuminating Scripture with parables” seems feasible.<sup>70</sup>

Although many scholars note the re-contextualization of 2 Chr 28 as a paradigm for the example of the loyal Samaritan, only few, Spencer and Kalimi among them, much consider the theology/ideology of the Chronicler. Kalimi properly concludes that “the Chronicler perhaps shows his fundamental belief that despite all, the northern Israelites/Samaritans have a brotherhood relationship with Judeans . . . , and there is hope that in the future days they will be united to Judah.”<sup>71</sup> But then, failing to consider that Lukan Jesus had a similar intent, Kalimi instead focusses exclusively on showing Jerusalem’s religious leaders in a negative light.

Yet the parable further relates to the MR envisioned through both prophets and kings, which is why this historic account was revived. 2 Chr 28:15 was given as a proleptic depiction of MR prescribing amity vs. enmity. It exemplifies the very loving neighbourliness of loyal covenantal kinship between mutually warring Israelites that Luke here prescribes to cure the reciprocal animosity between Samaritans and Judaeans seen at the beginning of this travel narrative section.

Given the Chronicler’s unitive ideology paralleling MR prophecies, this parabolic statement is equivalent to Jesus’ citation of, e.g., Isa 11:13, with the meaning that Judaeans and Samaritans must unite in covenant love to participate in his messianic age. Thus the parable fits the clear MR paradigm of removal of enmity between Ephraim/Joseph/Israel (all Samaritan self-designators) and Judah. Where would MR be fulfilled if not in the two groups so self-

---

<sup>69</sup> Craig A. Evans, “Luke’s Good Samaritan and the Chronicler’s Good Samaritans” (paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL, Atlanta, Ga., November 20, 2010).

<sup>70</sup> Kimball, *Exposition*, 133.

<sup>71</sup> Kalimi, “Robbers,” 52.

designating? If ignoring Samaritans, HTT relegates perhaps the greatest 1<sup>st</sup>-cent. antipathy to little meaning and misses the theological goldmine HMR reveals. Just like the Samaritans of 2 Chr 28 ceased their enmity and dealt faithfully with their southern brethren, so we will examine later in Acts 8.

HMR reveals significance in that the Samaritan is ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔλεος μετὰ the Judaeans (Luke 10:37a). One may assess the story as an “example narrative” form of parable that asserts a theological point by depicting exemplary behaviour.<sup>72</sup> This behaviour (doing ἔλεος), recognized by the νομικός as the assertion of the story, will bring MR between Judaeans and Samaritans.

Traditional translations of the key word ἔλεος (BDAG 316) as *mercy* tend to obscure the covenantal aspect revealed by HMR. The operative concept of רַחֲמִים (LXX ἔλεος) is better understood to signify *covenant loyalty, faithfulness*, or faithful love towards a fellow Israelite, like רַחֲמִים in similar contexts.<sup>73</sup> Moreover, the larger phrase, a Semitism (BDF §206/3; BDAG 636), indicates faithful dealing toward Israelites by a covenant partner (cf. Luke 1:72).<sup>74</sup> The *doing* of ἔλεος echoes the identical participle in the first question regarding how to join the messianic age (10:25).

So some see the parable to explicate Hos 6:6,<sup>75</sup> calling for covenantal loyalty by both Ephraim and Judah, arguing its רַחֲמִים/ἔλεος equals רַחֲמִים of Lev 19:18.<sup>76</sup> And HMR sees this loving 2GC loyalty is required by both north and south for MR.

By using the Samaritan in the role of a neighbour, Jesus transcends the racial and religious boundaries and puts both the Jews and the Samaritans together as fellow Israelites. In doing so, he overturns the prejudices of the first-century Jews towards the

---

<sup>72</sup> Suggested by Jeffrey T. Tucker, “Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke: Perspectives on the Example Narratives” (Ph.D. dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1994), 521.

<sup>73</sup> “But the phrase surely means ‘to keep faith with’, ἔλεος expressing the idea of loyal behaviour in accordance with the covenant rather than mercy” (Marshall, *Luke*, 92).

<sup>74</sup> “ποιήσαι ἔλεος μετὰ is a Semitic expression reflecting the Hebrew עָם רַחֲמִים הָעַם (cf. . . . Lk. 10:37; Acts 24.17). In the present context it almost certainly means ‘to deal faithfully with’ rather than ‘to show mercy to’” (Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 101 n. 3).

<sup>75</sup> Cf. 1 Chr 19:2; Mic 6:8; Zech 7:9; *T. Naph.* 4.5.

<sup>76</sup> See the chapter on “The Parable of the Good Samaritan” in Derrett, *Law in the New Testament*, 208–27.

Samaritans and calls for a radical change that the Jews should treat the Samaritans as their own people.<sup>77</sup>

This understanding of 2GC coheres with the paradigmatic eschatological amity restoration of MR bringing reciprocal love among fellow Israelite *neighbours*. But Luke did not in this pericope provide an exhaustive definition of either all Israelites or all the wrongfully marginalized by self-justifying Judaeans; those are addressed severally elsewhere in Luke. HMR explains his focus on Samaritans as having more specific significance.

To sum up, HMR thus explains several of the aspects both found most puzzling to and even unseen by commentators, e.g., the unity of the pericope between νομικός and parable. Regarding the much-pondered verbal shift between the second question and Jesus' answering rhetorical question, many postulate that he ignores or somehow changes the second question in order to answer a different one, altering torah in the process. But another confirmation of HMR's explanatory power is that, far from doing as alleged, Jesus gives in this pericope two direct and correlated answers to the two questions within the scope of first-century expectations. Therefore the two questions are seen to narrow into defining the scope of the Second Great Commandment (2GC; Lev 19:18), which is still the scope of Israel. The debatable half of the first question's answer, to obey Torah's Dual Love Command (Luke 10:26–28), is reiterated in 10:37 with the command to observe 2GC mutual Israelite solidarity like the loyal Samaritan. HMR more subtly recognizes a specific teaching here that Judaeans and Samaritans must reunite with one another under God for both to participate in the messianic age, which Luke will show us in Acts 8.

One aid to HMR is found in the helpful shift in understanding toward seeing Scripture from a corporate vs. an individualistic perspective. This can be exemplified by N. T. Wright's quote about *eternal life*. When we see that the pericope as a whole is a statement about how Judaeans can come to participate in Jesus' messianic restoration of the kingdom to Israel (cf. Acts 1:6), then that hermeneutical lens assists in perceiving MR here.

Second, HMR reveals that one of the things Scripture foretells that Messiah would do in reuniting Israel would be to remove enmity and restore amity among various Israelite factions. Perhaps the most notable enmity in the land of Israel in the first century A.D. was the bitter animosity between Judaeans and Samaritans. Subversion of exclusivistic theology aligned with

---

<sup>77</sup> Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 114.

paradigmatic MR enmity reversal is seen here. So this does not redefine *Israel* but the Judean view insisting that they alone were all Israel. It redraws only a falsely exclusivist scope of Israel by saying faithful Samaritans are already a part. The sub-question of *love* between fellow Israelites is seen to be coherent and explanatory regarding this restoration of amity.

Third, MR here makes most sense of the connection to 2 Chr 28, an echo noted by many but not often explored to much extent. As we saw in the first division of this paper, the unitive ideology of Chronicles conforms to the MR paradigm found in the prophetic writings. So the major significance to Jesus' allusion to this episode from the history of warring Judaea and Samaria as an answer to the question of how Judaeans can participate in MR lies in the exemplification of loving covenant loyalty based on mutual devotion to Yahweh across the north-south divide by both the eighth-cent. B.C. Samaritans and the first-cent. A.D. Samaritan, whose inclusion with their southern brethren is essential to the fulfillment of MR.

In conclusion, HMR shows Jesus is teaching that for Judaeans to participate in his messianic age they must, like the exemplar evoking the covenant loyalty of 2 Chr 28:15, obey torah, perform covenant loyalty, do ἔλεος in embracing loving solidarity with all fellow Israelites, including Samaritans.

#### The God-Praising Samaritan (Luke 17:11–19)

Even this account, which many view as clinching the Gentile status of Samaritans, can be read with HMR to indicate otherwise. I will show this by linking the God-Praising Samaritan to the temple in Luke 19 and, via the bridge of Isa 56, to the MR of the Samaritans in Acts 8.

Many see here the influence of 2 Kgs 5:1–15, the cure of Naaman the Syrian,<sup>78</sup> which would seem to imply this Samaritan (termed ἀλλογενής) is not an Israelite. Nolland moderates: “It is probably reasonable to detect a modest amount of allusion to the Elisha narrative, without this . . . providing any interpretive key to the narrative.”<sup>79</sup> Others see this pericope rather unidimensionally as emphasis on the dynamic of gratitude.<sup>80</sup> Then why would Luke emphasize instead the Samaritan's glorifying or praising of God? Thus, as will be seen below, the passage

---

<sup>78</sup> E.g., Craddock, *Luke*, 203–204; Fitzmyer, *Luke 10–24*, 1149; Joel B. Green, *The Gospel of Luke* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 620.

<sup>79</sup> John Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34* (WBC 35B; Dallas: Word, 1993), 845.

<sup>80</sup> E.g., Nolland, *Luke 9:21–18:34*, 844.



coheres well with the MR paradigm of Lukan themes, and ἀλλογενής can plausibly be seen here not to indicate Lukan attribution of Gentile status.

Form-critically, I emphasize the strong case for this as a pronouncement story favourably contrasting a Samaritan vis-à-vis Jews.<sup>81</sup> While HMR indicates this is more pro-Samaritan than anti-Judaeans, some characterize this as anti-Semitic polemic (as with the contrast seen in the Loyal Samaritan),<sup>82</sup> but this falls flat as HMR reveals Samaritans are just as Semitic as Judaeans. Thematically, “Luke may be indicating the possibility that status reversal, so much a part of his presentation of salvation thus far in the Gospel, extends to the Samaritans as well.”<sup>83</sup>

Also, HMR sees the marginalized class of Samaritans here included in the category of “the poor,” Israelites to whom good news is preached (cf. 4:18–19, 27; 5:12–14; 7:22). The fact his identity is presented as a surprise late in the narrative is intended for greatest effect.

“Impressed by his behavior, Luke’s audience may have walked into a trap. Indeed, Luke has narrated this episode in a way that seems deliberately to challenge notions of the privileged position of the Jewish people within the redemptive economy of God. . . . In recounting his action thus, Luke indicates that the socio-religious divisions between Jew and Samaritan have been mediated in Jesus.”<sup>84</sup>

However, possibly the most difficult task for an HMR reading of Luke-Acts is to explain the NT *hapax legomenon*, ἀλλογενής used here, which is for some the single largest objection to the theory of Lukan MR.<sup>85</sup> Lexically, ἀλλογενής may well have been a Jewish coinage.<sup>86</sup> “The root sense of the word stresses genealogy rather than nationality, and its use here reminds the alert reader of the fact that Samaritans claimed to be children of Abraham (through the Joseph

---

<sup>81</sup> See the discussion in Fitzmyer, *Luke 10–24*, 1150–51.

<sup>82</sup> See comments in Fitzmyer, *Luke 10–24*, 885, 1152.

<sup>83</sup> Green, *Luke*, 622.

<sup>84</sup> Green, *Luke*, 620, 621.

<sup>85</sup> Both Joel Green and Jean-Noël Aletti, apparently burdening the root with great weight, have voiced objections to me over the Samaritan as a non-Gentile.

<sup>86</sup> James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930), 23.

tribe) every bit as much as the children of Judah did.”<sup>87</sup> It is used 47 times in the LXX, with a wide variety of meanings. Böhm reminds us of the nuance required because “Der Terminus ἄλλογενής ist in der LXX in seiner Bedeutung offenbar beweglich und färbt sich je nach der Situation, in der er gesprochen wird.”<sup>88</sup>

Most significant for us, it was often used of Israelites excluded from certain cultic practices or marginalized for religious reasons. Butticaz shows from some of these usages that ce terme n’est pas une designation technique des païens : il est employé pour qualifier le prosélyte en Es 56, 3.6, le profane par opposition au lévite en Nb 1, 51 [3:10, 38; 17:5; 18:4, 7] ou aux prêtres en Ex 29, 33; 30, 33 [Lev 22:10, 12, 13, 25], ou encore *les infidèles au sein même de la communauté d’Israël* en Mt 3, 19. Bref, sans être précisé par son contexte, le substantif ἄλλογενής signifie globalement « l’autre », « le marginal ».<sup>89</sup>

It is thus found in the famous Jerusalem temple inscription which forbade any ἄλλογενής from entering (BDAG 46). This had to do with racial purity (*TDNT* 1:266–67), an objection Judaeans alleged re Samaritans.

One must remember how determinative context is in defining usage, and Luke 17:18 is likely to be understood “from the perspective of a Jew” (*EDNT* 1:63). This has to do more with *foreign* as in *non-Judaeans* identity than does the more distancing term ἄλλόφυλος, which denotes crossing the Jewish-Gentile boundary (*NIDNTT* 1:683–85). Samaritans were not Judaeans but were circumcised and scrupulously kept the Torah, which even Jewish Sages admitted. On the other hand, when Luke does want to refer to a Gentile Yahwist, Cornelius, he uses the further-distancing word, ἄλλόφυλος (Acts 10:28).

Furthermore, Josephus relates that the Samaritans, habitually admitted in former days to the Jerusalem temple for participation in Israel’s religious festivals, only recently came to be excluded by formal edict in the early 1<sup>st</sup> cent. A.D. due to alleged acts of mischief bringing ritual impurity to the temple when they came up to Passover (Josephus, *Ant.* 18.29–30). This edict may well relate to the temple inscription. Thus it is plausible that ἄλλογενής in both Luke and temple

---

<sup>87</sup> Dennis Hamm, “What the Samaritan Leper Sees: The Narrative Christology of Luke 17:11–19,” *CBQ* 56 (1994): 285.

<sup>88</sup> Böhm, *Samarien*, 197. See pp. 194–203 for her extensive argument showing contextual Lukan usage indicates “outsider” without necessarily excluding Israelite status.

<sup>89</sup> Butticaz, *L’identité*, 207–208. Emphasis added.

appears linked to Judaeen exclusion of Samaritans, *who were not necessarily Gentiles*. We will see more on this later.

The fact that the ἀλλογενής is sent to the priests (Luke 17:14) is significant for an MR reading. On the one hand, it may not be important whether the Samaritan went either to Jewish or to Samaritan priests, thus implying both priesthoods were valid. But it seems likely Luke intends the Jerusalem temple to be in mind.

Fitzmyer, lacking HMR, thinks that “Bultmann . . . completely misses the point, as do others who follow him, when he queries, ‘What could a Samaritan want with Jewish priests?’”<sup>90</sup> But HMR shows us that the re-establishing of unity between Samaritans and Jews is not irrelevant.

Jervell finds it meaningful that Jesus sent the Samaritan to the temple along with the nine Jews. “From the story in Luke 17:11 ff. an uninformed reader might conclude that the Samaritan was a Gentile (v. 18). But then it remains unintelligible for the reader how Jesus could send this Gentile along with the nine Jews to the Temple in Jerusalem to perform the rites of purification.”<sup>91</sup>

Moreover, HMR can make perfect sense from this temple connection. Luke has connected the ἀλλογενής with the subsequent narrative related to well-known Judaeen exclusion of Samaritans from the temple.<sup>92</sup> When we see Jesus quote Isa 56:7 to condemn it (Luke 19:45–46), HMR reveals that condemnation anticipates ἀλλογενής inclusion. For Isa 56:7 is part of a messianic restoration passage (cf. 55:3–4 vis-à-vis 56:10–11) promising a coming time of exclusion-reversal bringing inclusion for the ἀλλογενής (56:3, 6) in unified Israelite worship. Another support for seeing this ἀλλογενής as an Israelite is that Luke omits from the quote the phrase “for all peoples,” which he surely would not have done were he focussing on Gentiles, and HMR clarifies what some see as obscurity in this omission.<sup>93</sup> In summation, HMR postulates

---

<sup>90</sup> Fitzmyer, *Luke 10–24*, 1151.

<sup>91</sup> Jervell, *Luke*, 116.

<sup>92</sup> The term may even be somewhat Samaritan-specific, for, as Bryan points out, proselytes and Gentile God-fearers were already allowed in the temple (Steven M. Bryan, *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration* [SNTSMS 117; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002], 222–23).

<sup>93</sup> E.g., Fitzmyer, *Luke 10–24*, 1261.

in this Isaianic reference a criticism of wrongful Judaeian exclusion of circumcised, Torah-keeping Samaritans from the temple.

The final HMR step for the God-Praising Samaritan is to cross the Isa 56 bridge to Samaria. Remembering the Samaritan ἀλλογενής of Luke 17:18, Luke, recording MR fulfillment in Acts 8 (examined in detail later), seemingly confirms this link between the Samaritans and Isa 56. For Isaiah prophesies inclusion of *two* excluded groups, ἀλλογενής and *eunuch*, and Luke conjoins the same two groups in the same order: Samaritans (Acts 8:5–25) before the eunuch (8:26–39).<sup>94</sup>

Consequently, in light of the God-Praising Samaritan, temple inscription, Isa 56, and Acts 8, how should we read Luke’s use of ἀλλογενής for this Luke 17 Samaritan? There are several major positions. First, might ἀλλογενής indicate “uncircumcised Gentile Yahwist”? Some say yes. Haarmann reads Isa 56 to address Gentiles who worship Israel’s God but who are not proselytes or converts. He sees that such postexilic texts “offer gentiles the opportunity to partake in the cultic worship of Yhwh without becoming a part of Israel themselves.”<sup>95</sup> But Luke uses this *hapax legomenon* in reference to the spiritually exemplary Samaritan, a circumcised Torah-keeper.

Or, second, might ἀλλογενής indicate circumcised proselytes to Judaism, truly full members of Israel but wrongly marginalized and excluded?<sup>96</sup> That may be, but the Mishnah already allowed proselytes into the temple (*m. Seqal.* 1:3 A–E). So why would Luke 19 condemn the temple for something of which they were not guilty?<sup>97</sup>

Third, the term does not necessarily denote non-Israelite status at all. In addition to uses we saw earlier from Buttica, ἀλλογενής could be used of fellow Israelites sojourning amongst

---

<sup>94</sup> For similar reasoning see Buttica, *L’identité*; Pao, *Acts*, 140–42.

<sup>95</sup> Volker Haarmann, “‘Their Burnt Offerings and Their Sacrifices Will Be Accepted on My Altar’ (Isa 56:7): Gentile Yhwh-Worshippers and Their Participation in the Cult of Israel,” in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (ed. R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle; Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), 168.

<sup>96</sup> Jervell posits: “a kind of proselytes, . . . in no context are they reckoned among ‘the nations’ as these are contrasted with Israel” (*Luke*, 124).

<sup>97</sup> If they did exclude proselytes under the rubric of ἀλλογενής, then it must be a small subset—perhaps limited to Samaritans?

different tribes of Israel. After the Assyrian conquest of the north kingdom, “There soon followed a massive upheaval in the population of the northern territories. Archaeological evidence suggests that there were many refugees who fled south into the Kingdom of Judah at this time.”<sup>98</sup> Kim asserts that the concept of גר, i.e., “stranger” or “resident alien” (cf. *HALOT* 1:200), was employed in the Book of the Covenant by Hezekiah’s scribes to legitimate the inclusion of refugees from the north after the Assyrian onslaught of 721 B.C. and even relates to those north Israelites attending the unitive Passover as seen in 2 Chr 30.<sup>99</sup> Similarly writes Crown: “Samaritans were living as resident aliens [גר] or refugees in Judah (2 Chron. 30:25) and the process of the intermingling of the fraternal nations was continuing. The archaeological evidence indicates that refugees from the north flooded south to the Judean hills. The strict separation of Judeans and Samaritans, which had been the situation, pertained no longer.”<sup>100</sup> A similar status may have obtained in Judaea for the Luke 17 Samaritan residing there.

A fourth position holds that the term is used imprecisely by Judaeans as a polemical denigration, yet Luke echoes their bigotry only to ironically contrast Samaritans favourably vis-à-vis Judaeans. In support of this, Meng shows how Judaeans came to use the term with fluidity, to a great extent determining the identity of foreigners and Israelites according to the social reality of animosity between groups, rather than to the often assumed categories of ethnicity such as strict adherence to blood ties and faith.<sup>101</sup> Related to this, Böhm shows the healed Samaritan leper is a *foreigner* to Judaeans to the extent that his religious practice is not affiliated with the Jerusalem cult.<sup>102</sup> Green remarks: “Jesus’ use of the term is thus ironic indeed, for he

---

<sup>98</sup> Daniel L. Smith-Christopher, “Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587-539 BCE),” in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (ed. J. M. Scott; JSJSup 56; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997), 13.

<sup>99</sup> Sung-Jae Kim, “The ‘Ger’ and the Identity of Ancient Israel: Socio-Literary Analysis and Deconstructive Interpretation” (Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1996), 92–93, 100, 116–17. Furthermore, Kim shows the *bene ha-gōlāh* hierarchy returning from the Babylonian exile classed even the “remainders” in Judah who never left the land in the same way.

<sup>100</sup> A. D. Crown, “Samaritan Judaism,” *The Encyclopedia of Judaism* (ed. Jacob Neusner, Alan J. Avery-Peck, and William S. Green; Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2000–2004), 5:2243.

<sup>101</sup> Zhenhua Meng, “A Study of the Groups in Persian Yehud” (Ph.D. diss., Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2008).

<sup>102</sup> Böhm, *Samarien*, 194–203.

observes how this normally ostracized person has behaved in a manner appropriate to the authentic children of Abraham.”<sup>103</sup>

However, it may well be that any irony at work has conscious theological motivation, and some possibilities cohere with MR. Immediately following the pericope of the God-Praising Samaritan, Jesus says the kingdom is now among them (Luke 17:20–21). A part of his restoration of the kingdom is reunification of Samaritans with Judaeans, replacing enmity with amity. Since antipathy for Samaritans may have engendered the slur, Jesus’ ironic shaming, rhetorically rebuking Judaeans’ use of ἀλλογενής for one more a pious Israelite than themselves, relates to the MR paradigmatic theme of enmity reversal.

My own MR view of the Lukan meaning is a synthesis of elements from these positions, mainly the latter two, truly non-Gentile status and an element of irony. Although Samaritans, from distant history comprised of both majority indigenous Israelite and some foreign proselyte blood, were a more genetically mixed people than puritanical Judaeans, they were all religiously fully Israelite (i.e., as much as were Judaeans, though all Israel was still in spiritual exile). Samaritans of the first cent. A.D. had been born into the covenant, circumcised as children, and observed Torah in a Yahwistic culture. So, for Luke, this Samaritan ἀλλογενής is neither a Gentile Yahwist nor a mere proselyte.

Luke uses ἀλλογενής here for a *Samaritan* who, Josephus records, was until only recently included in the temple but now excluded by the anti-Samaritan decree (probably reflected in the ἀλλογενής inscription). Therefore, when 17:18 directly addresses Judaeans using their term, ἀλλογενής, while it could partially refer to one from Ephraim or Manasseh sojourning in Judah, Luke likely emphasizes ironic reversal using a Judaeans term wrongly excluding fellow Israelites. Conforming to the Lukan theme of inclusion, this Samaritan exemplifies yet another messianic status reversal vis-à-vis Judaeans religious exclusion of several marginalized Israelite groups.

With this understanding of the Lukan ἀλλογενής, Samaritans still function within the HMR as representatives of the northern kingdom, even though their racial purity (never truly a divine requirement) was slightly tainted in the distant past. In contrast to the view of Samaritans as non-Israelites, Luke shows that they can either be viewed as comprised of all indigenous northern Israelites experiencing MR with Judaeans or, more subtly, be viewed as including a

---

<sup>103</sup> Green, *Luke*, 626.

portion that might by some still be classed as proselytes receiving the promise of Isa 56. Whichever is chosen, all loyal Samaritans now fulfil prophesied full inclusion among messianic Israel. In this way the God-Praising Samaritan is linked to the Isa 56 messianic restoration of Israel and, over this bridge, to the Samaritan MR seen in Acts 8.

### **The Book of Acts: Instituting MR**

#### Acts 1–8: Fulfilling MR

#### ***Jesus in Acts 1—Commissioning MR***

In accordance with the Lukan geographical emphasis (especially on Samaria), HMR reveals *heilsgeschichtliche* significance in Acts 1:8.<sup>104</sup> Even some who emphasize the tribal aspect allow its concurrence with MR:

The fact that Jesus commands his disciples to be witnesses for him in both Judea and Samaria might suggest that Luke believes that the eschatological hope of the reunification of Ephraim and Judah will be realized in the missionary activity of the early Christian church (cf. Isa 11:13). At the very least, it suggests the removal of a long-standing feud between those residing in Jerusalem and Judea and the inhabitants of the region of Samaria, an enmity that dates back to the divided kingdom.<sup>105</sup>

The disciples query when Jesus will be “restoring the kingdom to Israel” (Acts 1:6). Whereupon, in conformity to the MR paradigm, Jesus reveals it will be done by the return of the Spirit, followed by the presence of witnesses in all Israel before proceeding elsewhere: “you will receive power when the Holy Spirit has come upon you; and you shall be My witnesses both in Jerusalem, and in *all Judea and Samaria*, and even to the remotest part of the earth” (1:8; cf. 8:1). Although this is the centrifugal reflection mirror image of his ancestor Josiah’s centripetal royal ritual, Jesus articulates the same geographical dynamic seen in the Passover uniting “*all Judah and Israel* who were present, and the inhabitants of Jerusalem” (2 Chr 35:18).<sup>106</sup> Yet

---

<sup>104</sup> G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson comment: “the inclusion of Samaria within the Christian mission can be seen as an integral part of the restoration of Israel, which is forecast in 1:6–8 and is part of the Isaianic program” (*Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007], 572).

<sup>105</sup> Wood, “Regathering,” 659–60.

<sup>106</sup> The Chronicler altered 2 Kgs 23:22 (Myers, *2 Chronicles*, 213) in order to highlight the unity of the kingdom.

Jesus' mission is larger than 2 Chronicles, adding post-MR expansion beyond Israelites within the land. In accord with HMR, when we see Gentile inclusion after Acts 8, then MR must have already occurred. So Jesus here commissions MR in Judaea and Samaria before incorporation of non-Israelites.

### ***Peter in Acts 2—Inaugurating MR***

HMR sees Peter's sermon as declaring a larger stage in *Heilsgeschichte* not only addressing those present but also proleptically anticipating Samaritan inclusion in Acts 8. This becomes apparent when Acts 2 is linked with Ezek 37. From the Lukan promise-fulfillment framework (2:16, 23), Peter is addressing the resurrection and restoration of Israel.<sup>107</sup> Passages such as Ezek 37 and Ps 110 are thematically linked within first-century messianic expectations.<sup>108</sup> Peter explicitly cites the latter (2:34–35) while implicitly the former.

Having seen that Ezek 37 serves as a paradigm for MR hopes, Peter's sermon parallels its elements: the Spirit has come (2:17-18, 38); resurrection (2:24, 31-32); Davidic Messiah (2:29-30, 33-36); "the whole house of Israel" (2:36; *πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ*). In Ezek 37 comes the Spirit bringing resurrection so the Davidide can rule over a kingdom reunited from south and north (Judah and Joseph/Ephraim), "the whole house of Israel" (37:11; *πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ*). All Peter's elements are in a strongly explicit MR context, but MR is not listed as fulfilled, for the northerners have not yet been raised into messianic life. It is not yet the "restoration of all things" (Acts 3:21) but is the earnest of it, in which fulfillment of MR in Acts 8 Samaria has yet to play a part.

Peter's ending proclamation to "the whole house of Israel" (Acts 2:36) parallels the 1:8 formula of witness for the royal Messiah, "all Judea and Samaria." "The term 'house of Israel' is especially characteristic of Ezekiel, used far more often in Ezekiel than in other books of the OT."<sup>109</sup> Many of these prophesy the return from exile of reunified Israel, covenant restoration,

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. Bryan: "I turn first to the use of resurrection as a metaphor for Israel's coming restoration. The most obvious example of this is Ezekiel's vision of the valley of dry bones. The prophet, addressed as 'son of man', is told to prophesy over the bones which are identified as the 'whole house of Israel' (Ezek. 37.11). Resurrection is then made a metaphor of national renaissance" (*Jesus*, 104).

<sup>108</sup> William Horbury, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians: Twelve Biblical and Historical Studies* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 131. He also includes Isa 11 with these.

<sup>109</sup> Bauckham, "Restoration," 473 n. 79.



and unity in worship, e.g., Ezek 11:15; 20:40; 36:10, 22, 32; 39:12, 22–25; 43:7; 45:6, etc.<sup>110</sup>

Moreover, the *all Israel* concept was, as we saw, so important to the Chronicler's vision to include the north kingdom into a unified Davidic realm.

According to both Peter (Acts 2:33–36a) and Stephen<sup>111</sup> (7:55–56), the Spirit testifies to Jesus' messiahship. Therefore, since Peter's use of the term here relates both to the coming of the Spirit and to the Davidic Messiah who brings new life in the covenant, the part of Ezekiel to which he most likely links is ch. 37.<sup>112</sup> There we see the phrase כל בית ישראל used twice in vv. 11 and 16. This part of Ezekiel is most explicit re MR. "In Ezekiel 37, the term is associated with the reunification of the southern and northern tribes and their restoration to the land (37:15-22), as well as with the giving of God's Spirit to revive and restore his people (37:14; cf. 39:29) and with the rule of the new David (37:24-25)."<sup>113</sup>

Bauckham properly notes in Acts 2 the geographical component of restoration, Peter's use of the *all Israel* concept, and even its relation to the MR prophecy in Ezek 37, but then he changes the two reunited kingdoms of Ezek 37 into twelve tribes, arguing specifically against MR.<sup>114</sup> With the implicit presence of Jews from throughout the diaspora, a theoretical tribal regathering, Bauckham wants to see all Israel restored in Acts 2 with no need for any other work in Samaria.<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>110</sup> However, in order to speak of the north alone vis-à-vis "Judah," Ezekiel occasionally uses the phrase, "house of Israel," without the adjective "all" (Ezek 4:5; 9:9) and even once with it (37:16).

<sup>111</sup> If space allowed, we would explore association of Stephen with Samaritan concerns. See W. F. Albright and Abram Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background," appendix 5 to *The Acts of the Apostles*, by Johannes Munck (AB 31; Garden City: Doubleday, 1967), 285–300; W. H. Mare, "Acts 7: Jewish or Samaritan in Character?," *WTJ* 34 (1971): 1–21; Charles H. H. Scobie, "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity," *NTS* 19 (1973), 390–400, 414; E. Richard, "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence," *CBQ* 39 (1977): 190–208; Grant R. Shafer, "St. Stephen and the Samaritans: An Evaluation of and a Contribution to the Samaritanology of the New Testament (Especially Acts 7:2-53)" (Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1995); Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Acts of the Apostles* (AB 31; Garden City: Doubleday, 1998), 368, 380.

<sup>112</sup> The phrase is also used in Ezek 39:29 in relation to the giving of the Spirit.

<sup>113</sup> Bauckham, "Restoration," 473.

<sup>114</sup> Otherwise totally unnamed "tribes" are mentioned only once (37:19) due to their association with the emphasized nation/kingdom of Joseph/Ephraim/Israel.

<sup>115</sup> Bauckham, "Restoration," 470–74. Cf. Fuller: "In Acts 1-2, Luke *completes* his description of Israel's eschatological restoration. . . . Luke clearly indicates that the final stages of Israel's restoration are reaching their climax" (*Restoration*, 258).

But, as per the earlier discussion of Hos 1:10, restoration of all Israel cannot (*contra* HTT) have occurred in Acts 2 Jerusalem but must await completed renewal in Samaria. Like so many, he relegates restoration activity to practically non-monarchic tribalism without factoring significance to Davidic joining of the two divided kingdoms. Furthermore, lacking HMR, Bauckham missed noting the Chronicles connection, the MR nature related to the Joel prophecy (which we lack room to address), and the preliminary nature of Acts 2, the first half of a two-part agenda fulfilled in Acts 8 Samaria. Pointing forward, another sermon of Peter perhaps also linked to Ezek 37,<sup>116</sup> in which he recapitulates some points from Acts 2 follows in ch. 3. Thus, HMR reads both sermons featuring corporate renewal of Israel anticipating achievement of its second half in Acts 8.

### ***Samaritans in Acts 8—Consummating MR***

HMR can find significance in Luke’s locating Phillip’s mission εἰς [τὴν] πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας, in *Samaria*.<sup>117</sup> There was no city named Samaria in the first century, and Sebaste (built on its site) had a large Gentile population.<sup>118</sup> Is the name merely Luke’s imprecision, a puzzling accident of geography, or does Luke intend theological significance?<sup>119</sup> Hengel affirms that “Luke usually uses exact geographical information only when it is . . . significant for the narrative or for his theology.”<sup>120</sup>

HMR may clarify this difficulty, explaining selection of the name, “Samaria,” in order to fulfill prophetic requirement. Perhaps Luke chose not to specify an actual city since viewing

---

<sup>116</sup> Bauckham reasons: “if the word ἀνάψυξις is used in Acts 3:20 because of its connexion with ψυχή, the reference could be to the restoration of life to Israel through the gift of the Spirit, as depicted in Ezek 37:1-14 (cf. also Hos 6:2). In that case, Peter is putting in a different way what he said at Pentecost in Acts 2:38: if people repent and are forgiven, they will receive the Spirit, though in 3:20 the emphasis is probably more on the corporate revival of Israel as a people” (“Restoration,” 478).

<sup>117</sup> NA<sup>27</sup>/UBS<sup>4</sup> place τὴν in square brackets with a C-rating. See Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994), 311.

<sup>118</sup> Selecting the indefinite reading of the phrase, Böhm shows the mission is connected to Acts 1:6 and a part of the process of restoring the kingdom by going to another city of Samaria whose inhabitants claimed to be part of Israel (*Samarien*, 279–308).

<sup>119</sup> Interestingly, the 2 Chr 28 model for Luke’s Loyal Samaritan parable thrice located it in Samaria.

<sup>120</sup> Martin Hengel, “The Geography of Palestine in Acts,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (ed. R. Bauckham; The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 67.

linkage of north with south, “Judea and Samaria” (1:8; 8:1) was of primary importance. HMR is not assisted here by any quotation of the OT.<sup>121</sup> Yet the coming of the Spirit here as in Acts 2 links to MR prophecies.<sup>122</sup>

Unsurprisingly, Ezekiel, seen as paradigmatic for Acts 2, is where both “Samaria” and MR theology most converge. Preparatory for the MR in Ezek 37, both chs. 16 and 23 condemn the pair, Jerusalem and Samaria. Ezekiel 23 extensively portrays covenant-breaking Israel and Judah metaphorically as both adulterous wives of Yahweh guilty of political and spiritual harlotries. “Their names were Oholah the elder and Oholibah her sister. And they became Mine, and they bore sons and daughters. And as for their names, Samaria is Oholah and Jerusalem is Oholibah” (23:4). The post-587<sup>123</sup> ch. 16 followed this model in condemning adulterous Jerusalem, told she is worse than “your older sister . . . Samaria, who lives north of you” (16:46).

Development of Jerusalem and Samaria’s relationship continues until finally anticipating the MR of Ezek 37. Yahweh assures that, after exile, “Samaria with her daughters, will return to their former state, and you with your daughters will also return to your former state” (16:55); “I will remember My covenant with you in the days of your youth, and I will establish an everlasting covenant with you” (16:60).

Luke could easily link the MR of Ezek 37 to the reasons for their spiritual death by hearkening back to chapters 16 and 23. This may be why he selected “Samaria” as the name for locating MR. Luke’s intent then was to show that Ezek 37, which so many see in Acts 2, here receives its second half of MR fulfillment.

So, although lacking OT quotations, the incorporation of Samaria into Jesus’ messianic kingdom should be seen as an integral part of the restoration of Israel, forecast in 1:6–8.<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> Recall from the God-Praising Samaritan that Samaria’s conversion fulfills the first half of Isa 56:3–6, while Acts 8:26–39 fulfills the second.

<sup>122</sup> Some read Joel 2 also in Samaria and congruent with MR. Cf. Pitre, *Jesus*, 257–58, 290–91, 334; Samkutty, *Samaritan Mission*, 213–14.

<sup>123</sup> Leslie C. Allen, *Ezekiel 1–19* (WBC 28; Dallas: Word, 1998), 234.

<sup>124</sup> See Pao, *Acts*, 127–29; Ravens, *Restoration*, 72–106. Luke is not showing a preference for non-Israelites over Jews/Israelites (Joseph B. Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* [Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992], 62). Nor is it merely the case that “the winning over of these ‘heretics’ or ‘semi-Jews’ is the first step towards the mission to the Gentiles” (Hengel, “Geography,” 51). Some conclude that the mission to the Samaritans marks a trailblazing, not merely transitional, stage in the extension of the gospel to the ends of the earth (Franklin S. Spencer, “Philip the Evangelist in Lucan Perspective (Luke-Acts)” [Ph.D. diss., University of Durham, 1989]).

Proclaiming that “the Christ” (the Davidic king) had arrived (8:5) appealed to Samaritans awaiting a messianic figure (John 4:25) known as the *ta’eb*, or *restorer*. They embraced proclamation of the messianic kingdom, displaying paradigmatic MR enmity removal: “crowds with one accord were giving attention” (8:6) with “much rejoicing” (8:8).

Samaria is part of the Lukan messianic *signs* (σημεία) agenda (e.g., Acts 2:19, quoting Joel 2:30 MR). To a concentrated degree not seen since the first half of MR in Jerusalem, we see “signs” (twice), “many” exorcisms, “many” healings, and “great miracles” (8:5–13).<sup>125</sup>

Reflecting royal cleansing of the land preceding MR, Philip performs exorcisms as part of his Samaritan restoration into the united Davidic kingdom (Acts 8:5–8).<sup>126</sup>

HMR provides theological explanations for debated events, e.g., seeing Simon Magus as paralleling the condemned Judaeen leadership replaced by the Davidide. This reflects MR and Lukan themes to unite the remnant and divide from apostates.

Second, HMR explains why God withheld the Spirit until arrival of the delegation from the Jerusalem apostles (8:14–17). Peter and John<sup>127</sup> were required to legitimize and endorse the MR so that the Holy Spirit’s arrival would correspond to the south to facilitate Samaritan spiritual incorporation with the community of Judaeans who had received the Spirit in Jerusalem. It was necessary to explicitly link Samaritan rebirth to its Jerusalem precedent. This shows the rectitude of the Judaeen sect’s maintaining the Davidic covenant, rejected by northern Israelites ever since Jeroboam’s rebellion.<sup>128</sup>

The apostles continued spreading the MR, preaching in many Samaritan villages as they returned home (Acts 8:25). Reversing earlier hostility (cf. Luke 9:53), many villages of the

---

<sup>125</sup> Σημεία were given only to Israel; Gentiles mentioned in Acts 15:12 relate to the Diaspora synagogue (14:3).

<sup>126</sup> This activity continues the pattern established by Jesus in MR readings of Luke 8:26–39 and 10:17–24. The former is preparative reclamation of the former Israelite territory of the exorcised Garasene missionary, lost since the Assyrian conquest of 734 B.C., and the latter is Satan’s dethroning over Samaria found immediately preceding the pericope containing the loyal Samaritan. See Karen J. Wenell, “Jesus and Land: Constructions of Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism” (Ph.D. diss., University of Glasgow, 2004).

<sup>127</sup> John had wanted to incinerate Samaritans but later embraced a positive view of them in his Gospel.

<sup>128</sup> As Christ told the Samaritan, “salvation is from the Jews” (John 4:22).

Samaritans united in the messianic kingdom with Judaeans going to Jerusalem.<sup>129</sup> This shows MR finally accomplished. Further conforming to the MR paradigm, Samaritan conversion (reflected in the Acts 9:31 summary, “the church throughout all Judea and Galilee and Samaria”) is a phase of Israel’s restoration narratively preceding any Gentile inclusion.

#### Acts 10–15: Confirming MR

##### *Acts 10–11—Why the Crisis Only Now?*

Contrast between Cornelius and Samaritans both directly indicates their Israelite status and indirectly supports the HMR reading of Acts 8. “A comparison of Acts 8 with Acts 10-11 shows first of all that the Samaritans are not considered Gentiles. In several ways Luke shows what a decisive event it was when the gospel first reached the Gentiles (10-11).”<sup>130</sup>

Peter required an extraordinary divine mandate before violating Torah (Acts 10:10–16), but God needed no such measure before Philip’s Samaritan mission. Lexically, Luke designates Cornelius the non-Israelite by the more distant term, ἀλλόφυλος (Acts 10:28), contrasting with the Samaritan ἀλλογενής (Luke 17:18). The apostles’ strong criticism leveled against Peter’s contact with the uncircumcised, with Gentiles (11:1–3, 18), had no parallel regarding Samaritan inclusion.

“It is easy to see the function of Acts 10-11 in the work as a whole. Here the decisive step is taken in which the nations are included with Israel in the Christian mission. By placing the Samaritan mission in Chapter 8, that is, prior to the pericope on the Gentiles, Luke shows that the Samaritans were not considered Gentiles.”<sup>131</sup>

And, second, not only does Samaritan antecedence, which conforms to the MR paradigm, indicate Israelite status but it also corroborates that Acts 8 showed Samaritan MR with Judaeans. For the MR paradigm predicts reunited Israel’s only afterward approaching Gentiles.<sup>132</sup> Correlatively, HMR sees that Samaritans may even have been among “all the circumcised believers” (not *circumcised Judaeans*) who participated in this incorporation of the uncircumcised and were amazed at the spiritual change in covenant structure (Acts 10:45). This

---

<sup>129</sup> Although seeing overcoming of mutual hostility between Israelite Samaritans and Jews through Christ, Marshall lacks HMR to see fulfillment of, e.g., Isa 11:12–13 enmity reversal (I. Howard Marshall, *Acts* [TNTC 5; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1980], 162).

would reflect MR as reunified “all Judea and Samaria” (Acts 1:8; cf. 8:1) together swooped down on the west (e.g., Isa 11:13–14). We next see that this implicit logic coheres with Paul and James’ quotations of MR prophecies to this effect.

***Paul in Acts 13—Seeing Isa 11:12 MR through Isa 49:6***

Consistent with previous contrasts between Samaritans and Gentiles, the literary setting conceptually indicates the separate phase of Gentile inclusion following MR. Paul entered this discrete phase following the proleptic completion (perhaps begun with Cornelius) of the land’s renewal into messianic kingdom. In Acts 13, the mission was still to restore Diaspora Israel, but, with their rejection, an even more expanded phase continued as Paul announced acceptance of pious Gentiles even though *outside* the land.

In Acts 13:47 Paul quotes Isa 49:6, a clear restoration prophecy regarding all Israel. Regarding the newness of phase, Paul’s use of Isaiah may confirm previous MR. For Isa 49:6 is abridged: “Luke omits ‘as a covenant for a race’ and so eliminates all reference to the Jewish people.”<sup>133</sup> Yet the thematic parallel to Luke 2:32, where the Gentile enlightenment is associated with “the fall and rise of many in Israel” (2:34), makes a restoration context likely.

This excision indicates the quotation’s function here is not primarily restoration of Israel (in which some Antiochene Judaeans were refusing to participate) but instead the subsequent phase of Yahweh’s servant enlightening nations, paradigmatically requiring MR to have already occurred. Paul again mentions this newness of stage in Acts 14:16 implying that now a change has occurred, and in 17:30 he overtly teaches it.

<sup>130</sup> Jervell, *Luke*, 117. Cf. Jervell, *Theology of Acts*, 48.

<sup>131</sup> Jervell, *Luke*, 117–18.

<sup>132</sup> If space allowed, we would explore the likelihood Cornelius is to be understood as a גר, a non-indigenous resident Yahwist in Israel, regulation of which relates to the purity of the land. Thus, spiritual incorporation of Cornelius would still be a part of the further establishment of Israel’s complete, transformative restoration, which must include all those within the covenant structure, incl. its גרים. See Awabdy, “גר,” 33–34.

<sup>133</sup> Fitzmyer, *Acts*, 521. However, this phrase is not in the MT and perhaps wasn’t in Luke’s LXX.

Significantly, Isa 49:6 may be read more particularly as an MR passage. Sweeney argues such Isaianic pericopae specifically reflect Josiah's MR agenda.<sup>134</sup> If so, then the quotation would additionally cohere with the Chronicler's presentation of Josianic MR ideology (2 Chr 34–35). Aune and Stewart see that “an emphasis on the unity of Israel and Judah which existed in the days of David and Solomon is clearly implied in phrases like ‘the tribes of Jacob and the preserved of Israel’ (Isa 49:6-7),” which they then link with other Scripture “juxtaposing the names ‘Ephraim’ and ‘Judah’ (Isa 11:11-13), or alternately ‘Judah’ and ‘Joseph’ (Ezek 37:15-19).”<sup>135</sup>

Two ca. 1<sup>st</sup>-century B.C. works, the *Similitudes of Enoch* and the *Psalms of Solomon*, both linked concepts from Isa 49:6 to those in the strong MR passage of Isa 11 and informed the literary milieu within which Paul and Luke worked. Pitre points out that use in Acts of this Isaianic theme parallels the *Similitudes of Enoch*'s linkage to the forceful MR passage, Isa 11:12–13: “the Son of Man is to become ‘the light of the nations’ (*I En.* 48:2–4), a title which not only links him to the ingathering of the Gentiles but also directly alludes to the servant of Isaiah 49:6, whose task is to ‘raise up the tribes of Jacob and to restore the survivors of Israel’ so that salvation ‘may reach to the end of the earth’ (Isa 49:6; cf. 42:1; 11:10, 12).”<sup>136</sup> Luke places the Pauline proclamation of Ps 2:7 (Acts 13:33) in close proximity to Isa 49:6 (13:47). *Psalms of Solomon* 17:28 quotes Isa 49:6 regarding the agent of eschatological return, and Watts points out this “is to be a Davidic scion who is described in terms of Psalm 2 (cf. Ps 2:9 in *Pss. Sol.* 17:23) and Isaiah 11 (*Pss. Sol.* 17:36, 37).”<sup>137</sup> McKnight not only links Isa 49:6 together with Isa 11 but also notes that “at the foundation of this hope for restoration perhaps lies Amos 9:14,”<sup>138</sup> a passage to which James soon alludes (Acts 15:16–18).

Furthermore, some link this prophecy to the Ezek 37 MR passage. First, use of  $\sigma\tau\tilde{\eta}\sigma\alpha\iota$ , “to raise up” (Isa 49:6), conceptually parallels Ezekiel's corporate Israelite resurrection.

---

<sup>134</sup> Marvin A. Sweeney, “The Legacy of Josiah in Isaiah 40–55,” in *The Desert Will Bloom: Poetic Visions in Isaiah* (ed. A. J. Everson and H. C. P. Kim; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009), 109–29.

<sup>135</sup> Aune and Stewart, “Eschatological Restoration,” 159.

<sup>136</sup> Pitre, *Jesus*, 345.

<sup>137</sup> Rikki E. Watts, *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark* (rev. and updated ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000), 83. Cf. *OTP* 2:667–68. In addition, *Pss. Sol.* 17:32 quotes the MR passage Jer 23:5.

<sup>138</sup> McKnight, “Jesus,” 219.

“Second, God’s purpose in this resurrection is to work itself out through all the twelve tribes of Israel and not just through Judah, that tribe which had retained the leadership of the Davidic line; it was to embrace even those tribes who had seemingly lost their identity almost two hundred years before.”<sup>139</sup> Paul declares the new stage to Samaritan Israelites recently raised to embrace the Davidide (Acts 15:3) as we anticipate further confirmation of the *heilsgeschichtlicher* phase of MR that was necessary before subsequent Gentile expansion.

### ***James in Acts 15—Seeing Amos 9:11–12 MR***

In Acts 15:16–18 James quotes Amos 9:11–12. According to HTT, this is one of the prophecies of restoration of all Israel “which envision the Return from Exile as a restoration of all twelve tribes, including the ten tribes of the northern kingdom.”<sup>140</sup> But HMR can also read it to indicate Samaritan participation in MR. This Amos passage is pertinent to illustrate the relatively unappreciated paradigm that the ideal Davidic king ascends the throne, first ruling a reunited realm of all Israel (including Samaritans) before incorporation of Gentiles commences. This citation of Amos ties together several MR concerns, even showing Samaritan inclusion is Luke’s way of indicating yet another fulfilment of messianic prophecy verifying Jesus as Davidic Messiah. Strauss reads the rebuilding as restoration of the Davidic dynasty.<sup>141</sup> Such a rebuilding that includes the full Davidic constellation of the MR paradigm (e.g., Isa 11) makes the best sense.

Commentators recognize MR aspects in Amos 9:11. “Reunification (restoration blessing type 8; cf. Deut 30:3, 14) is associated frequently in the prophets with David, the great leader who had first truly united North and South (Hosea 3:5; Isa 9:7; Jer 33:17; Ezek 37:24). Thus in the restoration, a new David would shepherd Israel (Mic 5:26).”<sup>142</sup> Stuart identifies this Amos 9 restoration promise with others regarding the messianically reunited Israel of north and south (e.g., Isa. 11; Jer 33; Ezek 37; etc.). Like them, Amos expects reunification under a new David

---

<sup>139</sup> George A. F. Knight, *Servant Theology: A Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 40-55* (rev. and updated new ed.; ITC; Edinburgh: Handsel, 1984), 130.

<sup>140</sup> Pitre, *Jesus*, 37.

<sup>141</sup> Strauss, *Davidic Messiah*, 187–90.

<sup>142</sup> Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 398; cf. 293.



(9:11) and occupying the promised land (9:14–15). “Thus Amos, by no means uniquely, portrays Israel and Judah as awaiting the same general future by reason of their sameness under the divine covenant.”<sup>143</sup> “The restoration requires a united Israel under the rule of its long-standing dynasty (that of David). The returned people is called Israel, and the land includes not only the traditional territory of Israel but areas that belonged to Israel in the days of the united monarchy.”<sup>144</sup> Moreover, many conclude this passage is likely an exilic or post-exilic addition to Amos, in which case this would prophesy favourably regarding the land inhabited by Samaritan ancestors being part of the coming recovery of formerly subject territories within a reconstructed Davidic kingdom.<sup>145</sup>

The surrounding co-text of Amos 9 addresses Israel in various terms. Many say Amos uses “house of Israel” (9:9) and “My people Israel” (9:14) to mean all Israel, not just the north.<sup>146</sup> Yet it is possible the “house of Israel” of Amos 9 primarily refers to the north as necessary to MR. The entire mission of Amos was primarily as a Judaeen prophet against the north kingdom. The “house of Israel” (5:1, 5) parallels the northern “house of Joseph” with “Bethel” (5:6; cf. 5:15; 6:6). “My people Israel” and “the house of Isaac” are indisputably the north kingdom (7:15–16). “Carmel” (9:3) and “the sinful kingdom” (9:8) refer to the north, etc.

Yet many lacking HMR don’t appreciate Luke’s geographic element, deeming his inclusion of Samaria unnecessary and “arbitrary” as Paul, passing through there ministering on the way to the Jerusalem council, engenders paradigmatic enmity reversal when “bringing great joy to all the [non-Gentile] brethren” (Acts 15:3).<sup>147</sup> Rather than obscurity, we should see Luke presenting a reminder of Samaritan inclusion within *all Israel* preparatory to the upcoming Amos 9 quote.

---

<sup>143</sup> Stuart, *Hosea-Jonah*, 393.

<sup>144</sup> Francis I. Andersen and David N. Freedman, *Amos* (Anchor Bible 24A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 893.

<sup>145</sup> Robert Martin-Achard and S. P. Re’emi, *God’s People in Crisis: A Commentary on the Books of Amos and Lamentations* (International Theological Commentary; Edinburgh: Handsel, 1984), 66–69. Cf. James Limburg, *Hosea–Micah* (IBC; Atlanta: John Knox, 1988), 125–26.

<sup>146</sup> See exhaustive analysis in Andersen and Freedman, *Amos*, 98–139.

<sup>147</sup> Hengel, “Geography,” 67–68.

For understanding what defines the rebuilding of the tent of David, Luke provides the preceding narrative showing MR in Acts 2 and 8 before reaching out to the Gentiles. This contextual clue could indicate that the interpretation of “house of Israel” in Amos 9 taken here downplays Judaeen exclusivism and emphasizes inclusion of Samaritans. The Amos 9:11, 14 language of *raising up* or *rebuilding* the tabernacle of David to bring Israel back has MR undertones. It evokes strong MR prophecies similarly raising up a Davidic shepherd-king (Jer 23:4–8; 30:3–9; Ezek 34:22–24; cf. 37:24–25).<sup>148</sup> Dempster recognizes Amos 9:11 as an MR resurrection: “Amos describes the rebuilding of the fallen tabernacle of David, depicting a resurrection not only of the Davidic kingdom (the unity of the northern and southern kingdoms) but also of the Davidic house (Amos 9:11)”<sup>149</sup> Butticaz links the “tabernacle of David” language to Isa 16:5 and back to the MR passage of Isa 11. He points out that the only “autre occurrence vétérotestamentaire de l’expression σκηνή Δαβίδ” is in Isa 16:5. “Par ailleurs, Es 16, 5 s’inèrè avec Es 9, 6 et 11, 1-10 dans un ensemble de textes de l’Ancien Testament partageant une même idéologie royale centrée sur la figure davidique.”<sup>150</sup>

Even those who don’t see MR still see its phasic demarcations.<sup>151</sup> If Jesus recapitulates David in raising up his kingdom, then the two-part ascent, first only to the throne of Judah and then next to include Israel (2 Sam 5:5), prefigures the MR seen in Acts 2 and 8, Judaea and Samaria. Conforming to the MR paradigm, this raising up of reunited Israel (9:11) occurs prior to the mission to the nations (9:12).

So Strauss is right to emphasize the royal element (insignificant to HTT). And Jervell is correct to appreciate separate stages. A relationship of preceding purpose obtains; the rebuilding is *in order that* (ὅπως plus aorist; BDAG 718) Gentiles may be incorporated (Amos 9:12; Acts

---

<sup>148</sup> Although Pitre recognizes the same links, he follows the HTT path, not nuancing prophetic language of two reunited kingdoms but leveling it into twelve regathered tribes (*Jesus*, 460–63).

<sup>149</sup> Dempster, *Dominion and Dynasty*, 185.

<sup>150</sup> Butticaz, *L’identité*, 324–25.

<sup>151</sup> “Luke reports in the book of Acts how the gospel first came to Samaria and was not proclaimed to real pagans until after the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem” (Bowman, *Samaritan Problem*, 58); David L. Woodall, “Israel in the Book of Acts: The Foundation of Lukan Ecclesiology” (Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1998), 245–84.

15:17).<sup>152</sup> Yet few seem to simultaneously appreciate both non-Judaeen Israel and the MR function of the prophesied Messiah.

In conclusion, it was precisely the Davidic dynasty that was rejected by the north, and this must be reversed to have a Davidic kingdom “as in the days of old” (Amos 9:11). Butticaz highlights the cause-effect relationship between reconstruction of Israel before Gentile inclusion: “la conversion des païens ne flotte pas dans le vide, mais est reliée par un lien de cause à effet au redressement de la tente davidique. . . . Cette recomposition d’Israël serait toutefois le présupposé indispensable à l’ouverture de l’alliance aux nations.”<sup>153</sup> The rebuilding in Acts is completed prior to Gentile inclusion; we saw no Gentile inclusion until after Samaria had been reunited with the southerners; thus the narrative progression indicates the joining with Samaria was part of the royal rebuilding as per the MR paradigm.

---

<sup>152</sup> Thus the rebuilding is not the creation of the church (cf. Jervell, *Luke*, 51–54, 92–93).

<sup>153</sup> Butticaz, *L’identité*, 319–20.

## CONCLUSIONS REGARDING HMR IN LUKE-ACTS

Having first synthesized the hermeneutic of messianic reunification from the OT prophets, we saw that the happy wedding of true religion with modern archaeological and genetic sciences has helped loosen the age-long hegemony of supremacist Judaeon polemic, allowing both theological appropriation of pro-Israelite Chronicles in congruence with the prophetic MR vision and reassessment of Samaritan status as plausibly Israelite.

We then saw the cumulative case made for the viability of HMR to cohere the data and provide explanatory power in a reading of Luke-Acts. This reading has ramifications for theological construction based on the Second Great Commandment, for the people of God must love their fellow covenant members more like the loyal Samaritan loved his. It seems quite probable that the valuable OT MR theme has been neglected in NT interpretation, and more study should be done to further develop these concepts and verify their viability.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ackroyd, Peter R. *I and II Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah*. Torch Bible Commentaries. London: SCM, 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Biblical Interpretation of the Reigns of Ahaz and Hezekiah.” Pages 247–59 in *In the Shelter of Elyon: Essays on Ancient Palestinian Life and Literature in Honour of G.W. Ahlström*. Edited by W. Boyd Barrick and J. R. Spencer. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series 31. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “History and Theology in the Writings of the Chronicler.” *Concordia Theological Monthly* 38 (1967): 501–15.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “The Theology of the Chronicler.” *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 8 (1973): 101–16.
- Albertz, Rainer. *Israel in Exile: The History and Literature of the Sixth Century B.C.E.* Translated by David Green. Studies in Biblical Literature 3. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003.
- Albright, W. F., and Abram Spiro. “Stephen’s Samaritan Background.” Appendix 5 to *The Acts of the Apostles*, by Johannes Munck. Anchor Bible 31. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.
- Allen, Leslie C. “1 & 2 Chronicles.” Pages 299–659 in *The New Interpreter’s Bible* 3. Nashville: Abingdon, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ezekiel 1–19*. Word Biblical Commentary 28. Dallas: Word, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ezekiel 20–48*. Word Biblical Commentary 29. Dallas: Word, 1998.
- Amit, Yairah. “The Samaritans – Biblical Positions in the Service of Modern Politics.” Pages 247–66 in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies*. Edited by Menachem Mor and F. V. Reiterer. Studia Samaritana/Studia Judaica 5/53. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Andersen, Francis I. *Hosea*. Anchor Bible 24. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Andersen, Francis I., and David Noel Freedman. *Amos*. Anchor Bible 24A. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Anderson, Robert T., and Terry Giles. *The Keepers: An Introduction to the History and Culture of the Samaritans*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2002.

- Aune, David E., and Eric Stewart. "From the Idealized Past to the Imaginary Future: Eschatological Restoration in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature." Pages 147–77 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 72. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Awabdy, Mark A. "Green Eggs and Shawarma: Reinterpreting the Bible, Reforming Mission, with Leviticus' גר as a Test Case." *The Asbury Journal* 66 (2011): 31–45.
- Balz, Horst, and Gerhard Schneider, eds. *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament*. 3 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990–93.
- Barclay, John M. G., and John Philip McMurdo Sweet, eds. *Early Christian Thought in its Jewish Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Barrett, C. K. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*. 2 vols. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994–98.
- Bauckham, Richard. "James and the Jerusalem Church." Pages 415–80 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts." Pages 435–87 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 72. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Scrupulous Priest and the Good Samaritan: Jesus' Parabolic Interpretation of the Law of Moses." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1998): 475–89.
- Bauer, W. et al. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. 3d ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999.
- Beale, G. K., and D. A. Carson. *Commentary on the New Testament Use of the Old Testament*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007.
- Becking, Bob. "Do the Earliest Samaritan Inscriptions Already Indicate a Parting of the Ways?" Pages 213–22 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by Oded Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert Walter Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *Ezekiel*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 1990.
- Böhm, Martina. *Samaritanen und die Samaritaner bei Lukas: Eine Studie zum religionshistorischen und traditionsgeschichtlichen Hintergrund der lukanischen Samaritentexte und zu deren*

- topographischer Verhaftung*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 111. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Block, Daniel Isaac. *The Book of Ezekiel: Chapters 25-48*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Bonné-Tamir, B., M. Korostishevsky, A. J. Redd, Y. Pel-Or, M. E. Kaplan, and M. F. Hammer. "Maternal and Paternal Lineages of the Samaritan Isolate: Mutation Rates and Time to Most Recent Common Male Ancestor." *Annals of Human Genetics* 67 (2003): 153–64.
- Botterweck, G. Johannes, and Helmer Ringgren, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis. 11 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Bowman, John. "Ezekiel and the Zadokite Priesthood." *Transactions of the Glasgow University Oriental Society* 16 (1955–1956): 1–14.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Samaritan Problem: Studies in the Relationships of Samaritanism, Judaism and Early Christianity*. Translated by Alfred M. Johnson Jr. Pittsburgh Theological Monograph Series 4. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1975.
- Braun, Roddy L. *1 Chronicles*. Word Biblical Commentary 14. Dallas: Word, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Reconsideration of the Chronicler's Attitude toward the North." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 96 (1977): 59–62.
- Brown, Colin, ed. *The New International Dictionary of New Testament Theology*. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975–85.
- Brown, Francis, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996.
- Brueggemann, Walter. *Theology of the Old Testament: Testimony, Dispute, Advocacy*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1997.
- Bryan, Steven M. *Jesus and Israel's Traditions of Judgement and Restoration*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 117. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Butticaz, Simon. *L'identité de l'Eglise dans les Actes des apôtres: De la restauration d'Israel à la conquête universelle*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2010.
- Carson, D. A. et al., eds. *New Bible Commentary*. 4th ed. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994.
- Charles, Robert Henry, ed. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1983–85.

- Childs, Brevard S. *Biblical Theology of the Old and New Testaments: Theological Reflection on the Christian Bible*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Coggins, Richard J. *The First and Second Books of the Chronicles*. Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Samaritans and Jews: The Origins of Samaritanism Reconsidered*. Growing Points in Theology. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1975.
- Cowley, A. E., ed. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon, 1923.
- Craddock, Fred B. *Luke*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 1990.
- Crossan, John Dominic. "Structuralist Analysis and the Parables of Jesus." *A Structuralist Approach to the Parables, Semeia* 1 (1974): 192–221.
- Crown, Alan D. "Samaritan Judaism." Pages 2241–61 in vol. 5 of *The Encyclopedia of Judaism*. Edited by Jacob Neusner, Alan J. Avery-Peck, and William S. Green. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2000–2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Redating the Schism between the Judaeans and the Samaritans." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 82 (1991): 17–50.
- Curtis, Edward Lewis, and Albert Alonzo Madsen. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*. International Critical Commentary. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1910.
- Dar, Shimon. "Archaeological Aspects of Samaritan Research in Israel." Pages 189–98 in *Religious Diversity in Late Antiquity*. Edited by David Morton Gwynn and S. Bangert. Late Antique Archaeology 6. Brill, 2010.
- Dempster, Stephen G. *Dominion and Dynasty: A Theology of the Hebrew Bible*. New Studies in Biblical Theology 15. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2003.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Law in the New Testament: Fresh Light on the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *New Testament Studies* 11 (1964): 22–37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Law in the New Testament: The Parable of the Prodigal Son." *New Testament Studies* 14 (1967): 56–74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Parable of the Good Samaritan." Pages 208–27 in *Law in the New Testament*. London: Dartman, Longman & Todd, 1970.
- Dietrich, Walter. *The Early Monarchy in Israel: The Tenth Century B.C.E.* Translated by Joachim Vette. Biblical Encyclopedia 3. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2007.
- Dillard, Raymond B. *2 Chronicles*. Word Biblical Commentary 15. Dallas: Word, 1987.



- Elliger, K., and W. Rudolph, eds. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 4th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1990.
- Elliott, Mark Adam. *The Survivors of Israel: A Reconsideration of the Theology of Pre-Christian Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Enslin, Morton Scott. "Luke and the Samaritans." *The Harvard Theological Review* 36 (1943): 277–97.
- Eshel, Hanan. "The Governors of Samaria in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.E." Pages 223–34 in *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Edited by Oded Lipschits, G. N. Knoppers, and R. Albertz. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Esler, Philip Francis. *Community and Gospel in Luke-Acts: The Social and Political Motivations of Lucan Theology*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Evans, Craig A. "Luke's Good Samaritan and the Chronicler's Good Samaritans." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Atlanta, Ga. November 20, 2010.
- Fensham, F. Charles. *The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Finkelstein, Israel, and Neil Asher Silberman. "Temple and Dynasty: Hezekiah, the Remaking of Judah and the Rise of the Pan-Israelite Ideology." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 30 (2006): 259–85.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *The Acts of the Apostles*. Anchor Bible 31. Garden City: Doubleday, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel According to Luke*. 2 vols. Anchor Bible 28–28A. Garden City: Doubleday, 1974.
- Freedman, David Noel, ed. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Fuller, Michael E. *The Restoration of Israel: Israel's Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 138. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Tradition of Restoration: An Examination of the Motifs of Israel's Re-gathering and the Fate of the Nations in Early Jewish Literature and Luke-Acts." Ph.D. diss., Durham University, 2005.
- Funk, Robert Walter. "Old Testament in Parable: A Study of Luke 10:25-37." *Encounter* 26 (1965): 251–67.
- Garcia Martinez, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, eds. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition*. 2 vols. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997-98.

- Gill, David W. J. "Acts and Roman Policy in Judaea." Pages 15–26 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Gourges, Michel. "The Priest, the Levite, and the Samaritan Revisited: A Critical Note on Luke 10:31-35." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998): 709–13.
- Green, Joel B. *The Gospel of Luke*. New International Commentary on the New Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Narrative Criticism." Pages 74–112 in *Methods for Luke*. Edited by Joel B. Green. *Methods in Biblical Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Ezekiel 1–20*. Anchor Bible 22. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Greenwood, David C. "On the Jewish Hope for a Restored Northern Kingdom." *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 88 (1976): 376–85.
- Haarmann, Volker. "'Their Burnt Offerings and Their Sacrifices Will Be Accepted on My Altar' (Isa 56:7): Gentile Yhwh-Worshippers and Their Participation in the Cult of Israel." Pages 151–69 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by Reinhard Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 16. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.
- Hahn, Scott W. *Kinship by Covenant: A Canonical Approach to the Fulfillment of God's Saving Promises*. Anchor Yale Bible Reference Library. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Hallo, William W., ed. *The Context of Scripture*. 3 vols. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997-2002.
- Hamm, Dennis. "What the Samaritan Leper Sees: The Narrative Christology of Luke 17:11-19." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 56 (1994): 273–87.
- Hengel, Martin. "The Geography of Palestine in Acts." Pages 27–78 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ιουδαία in the Geographical List of Acts 2:9-11 and Syria as 'Greater Judea'." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 10 (2000): 161–80.
- Hjelm, Ingrid. "Brothers Fighting Brothers: Jewish and Samaritan Ethnocentrism in Tradition and History." Pages 197–222 in *Jerusalem in Ancient History and Tradition*. Edited by T. L. Thompson. *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series* 381. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jerusalem's Rise to Sovereignty: Zion and Gerizim in Competition*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 404. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Mt. Gerizim and Samaritans in Recent Research." Pages 25–44 in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies*. Edited by Menachem Mor and F. V. Reiterer. Studia Samaritana/Studia Judaica 5/53. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Samaritans and Early Judaism: A Literary Analysis*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 303. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "What Do Samaritans and Jews have in Common? Recent Trends in Samaritan Studies." *Currents in Biblical Research* 3 (2004): 9–59.
- Hooker, Paul R. *First and Second Chronicles*. Westminster Bible Companion. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- Horst, Pieter Willem van der. "Anti-Samaritan Propaganda in Early Judaism." Pages 134–50 in *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context: Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism & Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament 196. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006.
- Houston, Walter. "Was There a Social Crisis in the Eighth Century?" Pages 130–49 in *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John [Houston]Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 406. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Japhet, Sarah. *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought*. Translated by A. Barber. Beiträge zur Erforschung des Alten Testaments und des antiken Judentum 9. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 1997.
- Jenson, Robert W. *Ezekiel*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2009.
- Jervell, Jacob. *Luke and the People of God: A New Look at Luke-Acts*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 1972.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Theology of the Acts of the Apostles*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Josephus*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray et al. 10 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1926–65.
- Kalimi, Isaac. *An Ancient Israelite Historian: Studies in the Chronicler, His Time, Place and Writing*. Studia Semitica Neerlandica 46. Assen, The Netherlands: Royal Van Gorcum, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Reshaping of Ancient Israelite History in Chronicles*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2005.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Robbers on the Road to Jericho: Luke's Story of the Good Samaritan and Its Origin in Kings / Chronicles." *Ephemerides theologicae lovanienses* 85 (2009): 47–53.
- Kartveit, Magnar. *The Origin of the Samaritans*. Supplements to Vetus Testamentum 128. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2009.
- Kelle, B. E. *Hosea 2: Metaphor and Rhetoric in Historical Perspective*. Academia Biblica 20. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Kim, Sung-Jae. "The 'Ger' and the Identity of Ancient Israel: Socio-Literary Analysis and Deconstructive Interpretation." Th.D. diss., Graduate Theological Union, 1996.
- Kimball, Charles A. *Jesus' Exposition of the Old Testament in Luke's Gospel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 94. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1994.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey William Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964-76.
- Klutz, Todd. *The Exorcism Stories in Luke-Acts: A Sociostylistic Reading*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 129. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Knight, George Angus Fulton. *Servant Theology: A Commentary on the Book of Isaiah 40–55*. Rev. and updated new ed. International Theological Commentary. Edinburgh: Handsel, 1984.
- Knoppers, Gary N. "In Search of Post-exilic Israel: Samaria after the Fall of the Northern Kingdom." Pages 150–80 in *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 406. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Knoppers, Gary N., M. Patrick Graham, and Steven L. McKenzie, eds. *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 371. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.
- Koehler, Ludwig, and Walter Baumgartner. *The Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament*. Subsequently revised by Walter Baumgartner and Johann Jakob Stamm and edited by M. E. J. Richardson. Study Edition. 2 vols. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Lane, Nathan. "An Echo of Mercy: A Rereading of the Parable of the Good Samaritan." Pages 74–84 in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality. Volume 2: Exegetical Studies*. Edited by Craig A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias. Library of New Testament Studies 392. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Lavee, Moshe. "The Samaritan May be Included -- Another Look at the Samaritan in Talmudic Literature." Pages 147–74 in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies*. Edited by

- Menachem Mor and F. V. Reiterer. *Studia Samaritana/Studia Judaica* 5/53. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Leithart, Peter J. *1 & 2 Kings*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2006.
- Levin, Yigal. "Who Was the Chronicler's Audience? A Hint from His Genealogies." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 229–45.
- Levy, David M. "Isaiah Sees Israel's Future." *Israel My Glory* 70, no. 2 (March/April 2012): 20–21, 30.
- Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, and Roderick McKenzie. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised by Henry Stuart Jones. 9th rev. and enl. ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- Limburg, James. *Hosea-Micah*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Atlanta: John Knox, 1988.
- Lindsey, Hal, and C. C. Carlson. *The Late Great Planet Earth*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970.
- Linville, James Richard. *Israel in the Book of Kings: The Past As a Project of Social Identity*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement series 272. Sheffield : Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Lipschits, Oded, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz, eds. *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. "The Story of the Samaritan and the Innkeeper (Luke 10:30-35): A Study in Character Rehabilitation." *Biblical Interpretation* 17 (2009): 422–47.
- Mace, James T. "Building the Temple and Reuniting All Israel." Essay no. 2 for DI5429, University of St. Andrews, 2012.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus's Messianological Selbstverständnis: Fulfilling Prophesied Reunification of Israel into Loving Solidarity." Essay for DI5501, University of St. Andrews, 2012.
- Mare, W. Harold. "Acts 7: Jewish or Samaritan in Character?" *Westminster Theological Journal* 34 (1971): 1–21.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Acts*. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries 5. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. New International Greek Testament Commentary. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Luke: Historian and Theologian*. Milton Keynes: Paternoster, 1970.

- Martin-Achard, Robert, and S. P. Re'emi. *God's People in Crisis: A Commentary on the Books of Amos and Lamentations*. International Theological Commentary. Edinburgh: Handsel, 1984.
- Mattill Jr., A. J. "The Good Samaritan and the Purpose of Luke-Acts: Halevy Reconsidered." *Encounter* 33 (1972): 359–76.
- McKenzie, John L. *Second Isaiah*. Anchor Bible 20. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974.
- McKenzie, Steven L. *1–2 Chronicles*. Abingdon Old Testament Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 2004.
- McKnight, Scot. "Jesus and the Twelve." *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 11 (2001): 203–31.
- Meier, John P. *Companions and Competitors*. Vol. 3 of *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Samaritans: What Can Be Said?" *Biblica* 81 (2000): 202–32.
- Meng, Zhenhua. "A Study of the Groups in Persian Yehud." Ph.D. diss., Chinese University of Hong Kong, 2008.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2d ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1994.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus 17–22*. Anchor Bible 3A. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974.
- Miller, David M. "The Meaning of *Ioudaios* and its Relationship to Other Group Labels in Ancient 'Judaism'." *Currents in Biblical Research* 9 (2010): 98–126.
- Monselewski, Werner. *Der barmherzige Samariter: Eine auslegungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Lukas 10, 25-37*. Tiibingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1967.
- Moulton, James Hope, and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1930.
- Murphy, Larry Edwin. "The Concept of the Twelve in Luke-Acts as a Key to the Lukan Perspective on the Restoration of Israel." Ph.D. diss., Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 1988.
- Myers, Jacob M. *2 Chronicles*. Anchor Bible 13. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1965.
- Neusner, Jacob, trans. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.
- Nolland, John. *Luke 9:21--18:34*. Word Biblical Commentary 35B. Dallas: Word, 1993.

- Oswalt, John N. *The Book of Isaiah: Chapters 1–39*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.
- Pao, David W. *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 130. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Acts*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2005.
- Pentecost, J. Dwight. *Things to Come: A Study in Biblical Eschatology*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1964.
- Pitre, Brant. *Jesus, the Tribulation, and the End of the Exile: Restoration Eschatology and the Origin of the Atonement*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament. Second Series 204. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Plummer, Alfred. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. 5th ed. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark International, 1909.
- Pummer, Reinhard. “Antisamaritanische Polemik in jüdischen Schriften aus der intertestamentarischen Zeit.” *Biblische Zeitschrift* 26 (1982): 224–42.
- \_\_\_\_\_. “Samaritanism -- A Jewish Sect or an Independent Form of Yahwism?” Pages 1–24 in *Samaritans: Past and Present. Current Studies*. Edited by Menachem Mor and F. V. Reiterer. *Studia Samaritana/Studia Judaica* 5/53. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2010.
- Radner, Ephraim. *Leviticus*. Brazos Theological Commentary on the Bible. Grand Rapids: Brazos, 2008.
- Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. *Septuaginta, id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1996.
- Rajak, Tessa. “The Location of Cultures in Second Temple Palestine: The Evidence of Josephus.” Pages 1–14 in *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting*. Edited by Richard Bauckham. *The Book of Acts in Its First Century Setting* 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Ravens, David. *Luke and the Restoration of Israel*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 119. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Reimer, David J. “Jeremiah Before the Exile?” Pages 207–24 in *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 406. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- Richard, E. “Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 39 (1977): 190–208.

- Richardson, Peter. "Appendix C: The Sects of Judaism and 'True Israel.'" Pages 217–28 in *Israel in the Apostolic Church*. Peter Richardson. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 10. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.
- Ricks, S. D. "The Prophetic Literality of Tribal Reconstruction." Pages 273–81 in *Israel's Apostasy and Restoration: Essays in Honor of Roland K. Harrison*. Edited by Avraham Gileadi. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1988.
- Riley, William. *King and Cultus in Chronicles: Worship and the Reinterpretation of History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 160. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Samkutty, V. J. *The Samaritan Mission in Acts*. Library of New Testament Studies 328. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- Schmid, Konrad, and Odil Hannes Steck. "Restoration Expectations in the Prophetic Tradition of the Old Testament." Pages 41–81 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 72. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Scobie, Charles H. H. "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1973): 390-414.
- Scott, James M. "'And then all Israel will be saved' (Rom 11:26)." Pages 489–527 in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 72. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 56. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 72. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 2001.
- Sechrest, Love. "Race Relations and the Parable of the 'Good' Samaritan." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the SBL. Atlanta, Ga., November 21, 2010.
- Sellin, G. "Lukas als Gleichniserzähler: Die Erzählung vom barmherzigen Samariter (Lk. 10, 25-37)." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 65–66 (1974–1975): 166–89, 19–60.
- Selman, Martin J. *2 Chronicles*. Tyndale Old Testament Commentaries 11. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1994.
- Shafer, Grant Raymond. "St. Stephen and the Samaritans: An Evaluation of and a Contribution to the Samaritanology of the New Testament (Especially Acts 7:2-53)." Ph.D. diss., University of Michigan, 1995.



- Shen, Peidong, Tal Lavi, Toomas Kivisild, Vivian Chou, Deniz Sengun, Dov Gefel, Issac Shpirer, Eilon Woolf, Jossi Hillel, Marcus W. Feldman, and Peter J. Oefner. "Reconstruction of Patrilineages and Matrilineages of Samaritans and Other Israeli Populations from Y-Chromosome and Mitochondrial DNA Sequence Variation." *Human Mutation* 24 (2004): 248–60.
- Smith, Ralph L. *Micah--Malachi*. Word Biblical Commentary 32. Dallas: Word, 1998.
- Smith-Christopher, Daniel L. "Reassessing the Historical and Sociological Impact of the Babylonian Exile (597/587-539 BCE)." Pages 7–36 in *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives*. Edited by James M. Scott. Journal for the Study of Judaism: Supplement Series 56. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1997.
- Spencer, F. Scott. "2 Chronicles 28:5-15 and the Parable of the Good Samaritan." *Westminster Theological Journal* 46 (1984): 317–49.
- Stern, Frank. *A Rabbi Looks at Jesus' Parables*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006.
- Strauss, Mark L. *The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts: The Promise and its Fulfillment in Lukan Christology*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament: Supplement Series 110. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1995.
- Stuart, Douglas. *Hosea-Jonah*. Word Biblical Commentary 31. Dallas: Word, 1987.
- Sweeney, Marvin A. "The Legacy of Josiah in Isaiah 40-55." Pages 109–29 in *The Desert Will Bloom: Poetic Visions in Isaiah*. Edited by A. Joseph Everson and H. C. P. Kim. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2009.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu. "Der 'barmherzige Samariter' — Ein guter Israelit?" *Kirche und Israel* 16 (2001): 149–60.
- Thompson, J. A. *1, 2 Chronicles*. New American Commentary 9. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Book of Jeremiah*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.
- Throntveit, Mark A. "Chronicles, Books of." Pages 109–12 in *Dictionary for Theological Interpretation of the Bible*. Edited by Kevin J. Vanhoozer, Craig G. Bartholomew, Daniel J. Treier, and N. T. Wright. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2005.
- Tucker, Jeffrey Thomas. "Four Parables in the Gospel of Luke: Perspectives on the Example Narratives." Ph.D. diss., Vanderbilt University, 1994.
- Tuell, Steven Shawn. *First and Second Chronicles*. Interpretation: A Bible Commentary for Teaching and Preaching. Louisville: John Knox, 2001.

- Tyson, Joseph B. *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 1992.
- Van Selms, A. "Samaria." Pages 295–98 in vol. 4 of *International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*. Edited by G. W. Bromiley. 4 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979–1988.
- VanGemeren, Willem A., ed. *The New International Dictionary of Old Testament Theology and Exegesis*. 5 vols. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997.
- Vawter, Bruce, and Leslie J. Hoppe. *A New Heart: A Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel*. International Theological Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991.
- Vermes, Geza. *The Religion of Jesus the Jew*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.
- Walvoord, John F. *The Prophecy Knowledge Handbook*. Wheaton, Ill.: Victor Books, 1990.
- Watts, Rikki E. *Isaiah's New Exodus in Mark*. Rev. updated ed. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000.
- Wenell, Karen J. "Jesus and Land: Constructions of Sacred and Social Space in Second Temple Judaism." Ph.D. diss., University of Glasgow, 2004.
- Wilkinson, Frank H. "Oded: Proto-Type of the Good Samaritan." *The Expository Times* 69 (1957–58): 94.
- Willi, Thomas. "Chronicles, Books of." Pages 474–75 in vol. 1 of *The Encyclopedia of Christianity*. Edited by Erwin Fahlbusch and Geoffrey William Bromiley. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill, 1999.
- Williamson, H. G. M. *1 and 2 Chronicles*. New Century Bible Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- . *The Book Called Isaiah: Deutero-Isaiah's Role in Composition and Redaction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- . *Ezra, Nehemiah*. Word Biblical Commentary 16. Dallas: Word, 1985.
- . "The History of Israel - Or: Twos into One Won't Go." *The Expository Times* 119 (2007): 22–26.
- . "In Search of the Pre-exilic Isaiah." Pages 181–206 in *In Search of Pre-exilic Israel: Proceedings of the Oxford Old Testament Seminar*. Edited by John Day. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 406. London: T&T Clark International, 2004.
- . *Israel in the Books of Chronicles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977.
- . *Variations on a Theme: King, Messiah and Servant in the Book of Isaiah*. The Didsbury Lectures 1997. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1998.

Willitts, Joel. "Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of 'the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel'." *HTS Theological Studies* 63 (2007): 365–82.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Matthew's Messianic Shepherd-King: In Search of "the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel"*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche 147. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.

Wilson, Stephen G. *The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 23. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Luke and the Law*. Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 50. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Wood, Thomas R. "The Regathering of the People of God: An Investigation into the New Testament's Appropriation of the Old Testament Prophecies Concerning the Regathering of Israel." Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 2006.

Woodall, David L. "Israel in the Book of Acts: The Foundation of Lukan Ecclesiology." Ph.D. diss., Trinity Evangelical Divinity School, 1998.

Wright, N. T. "Israel's Scriptures in Paul's Narrative Theology." *Theology* 115 (2012): 323–29.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus and the Victory of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 2. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1996.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 3. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003.

Yonge, Charles D., trans. *The Works of Philo: Complete and Unabridged*. New updated ed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1995.

Zvi, Ehud Ben. "The Secession of the Northern Kingdom in Chronicles: Accepted 'Facts' and New Meanings." Pages 61–88 in *The Chronicler as Theologian: Essays in Honor of Ralph W. Klein*. Edited by Gary N. Knoppers, M. Patrick Graham, and Steven L. McKenzie. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament: Supplement Series 371. London: T&T Clark International, 2003.