

Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies



Volume 2, Number 1 (January 1999)

PRAISE FOR PROMISES FULFILLED:

A Study on the Significance of the Anna the Prophetess Pericope

Nelson P. Estrada

[[HTTP://www.aps.edu/ajps/99-1/99-1-n-estrada.htm](http://www.aps.edu/ajps/99-1/99-1-n-estrada.htm)]

I. Introduction

The concept of "continuity" between the Old and New Testaments is a complex issue. The complexity lies on how to understand the extent of the relationship of the two testaments. The numerous literature arguing for or against the theological unity and disunity of the Bible attest, not only to its meandering nature, but also to the tortuous attempts to find a solution to the problem.^{[1](#)}

While there are some who deny a clear connection between the OT and NT, the argument for continuity is gaining ground.^{[2](#)} The recommendation of Rudolf Bultmann for the theological discontinuity of the OT and NT did invite some supporters.^{[3](#)} However, both Bultmann and his followers have not truly posited a convincing argument as to debunk the idea of continuity from the perspective of the NT.^{[4](#)}

The "continuity" camp is a "battle-ground" in itself. The center of contention resides on methodology. Several methods have been proposed in an attempt to identify and define the theological unity of the Bible.^{[5](#)} Three of the most popular methods are typology, salvation history, and the promise-fulfillment scheme.^{[6](#)} Typology endeavors to find types of persons, institutions and events in the Old Testament, which serve as divine models leading to New Testament realities.^{[7](#)} Salvation history, on the other hand, relates the New Testament to the Old by showing the continuous pattern of God's plan of salvation. Oscar Cullmann, a staunch proponent of this method, sees the significance of Jesus' mission as the binding unity of the two testaments.^{[8](#)} The promise-fulfillment scheme, initiated by Zimmerli and von Rad, sees an eschatological aspect in both testaments.^{[9](#)} In simple terms, this approach views some of the promises in the OT as receiving its complete fulfillment in the NT, specifically in the person of Christ.

Among the three methods, the promise-fulfillment approach has the most proponents. This is evidenced by the many exegetes who agree that the NT writers saw the fulfillment of many OT promises in Jesus. This promise-fulfillment scheme is best understood, according to many commentators, in the Infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke.^{[10](#)}

The promise-fulfillment pattern in the Infancy narratives on Matthew and Luke differs from each other. Particularly interesting is Luke's employment of the pattern in chapters 1 and 2. While Matthew speaks of the fulfillment of the OT promises through "formula

quotations" (e.g., 1:22f; 2:5-6; 2:15; 2:17), Luke responds with hymns of praise. While Matthew emphasizes an apologetic intent in proving Jesus' messiahship, Luke instead focuses on hymns as the response to God's act of salvation. Thus, instead of just Matthew's promise-fulfillment, Luke has a pattern of promise-fulfillment-praise.

The promise-fulfillment-praise scheme is proposed by Stephen Farris in his published doctoral dissertation entitled *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives*.¹¹ Farris is to be commended when he demonstrated that the *Magnificat*, *Benedictus* and *Nunc Dimittis*¹² are the responses of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon to the fulfillment of the promises given to each of them. Farris argues that Luke has arranged three parallel episodes with the hymns as the climax of each.¹³

As much as Farris's parallel episodes are viable, his structural analysis is short sighted. Farris leaves out the pericope of Anna the Prophetess in Luke 2:36-38 because it does not have a corresponding climactic hymn which can serve as a response to the fulfillment of a promise. Since his promise-fulfillment-praise pattern requires a hymn of praise, he felt that it is best left out.

In this paper, I will attempt to demonstrate that the pericope of Anna the Prophetess fits the promise-fulfillment-praise very well. This can be seen through a modified parallel structure where the pericopes of Simeon and Anna are linked together by a common hymn, the *Nunc Dimittis*.

In order to prove this point, three aspects of study need to be established. First, it is essential that we understand the meaning of the promise-fulfillment method. A brief analysis of Matthew's Infancy narrative will best define this method. Second, a study of Luke's promise-fulfillment-praise pattern will be made including the analysis of the significance and function of the hymns in Luke's Birth stories. And finally, the issue of how the *Nunc Dimittis* may function as a common praise response for both the Simeon and Anna pericopes will be discussed.

II. State of Current Research

The research on the Infancy Narratives is enormous.¹⁴ In spite of the immensity of materials, several names stand out as having made significant contributions to the Infancy studies. Such names include John Drury who effectively demonstrated the importance of early Christian "historiography" in Luke and 1 and 2. Drury showed how Jewish "midrash" strongly influenced the composition of the Lucan Infancy narratives.¹⁵

The commentaries on Luke by Joseph Fitzmyer,¹⁶ I. Howard Marshall,¹⁷ and John Nolland¹⁸ present an exceptionally helpful verse-by-verse analysis of the subject. Raymond Martin's syntactical analysis of the grammar of the Birth stories can provide a good companion to these commentaries.¹⁹

The need for comparative studies between Luke and Matthew is inevitable. This is why the work of George M. Soares Prabhu is indispensable. Prabhu provides an excellent

method on how to understand the function of "formula quotations" in the Infancy narratives of Matthew.[20](#)

The most comprehensive study on the Infancy narratives is found in Raymond Brown's *The Birth of the Messiah*. The new updated edition practically covers all existing arguments posited about the subject. At the same time, Brown presents his own viable analysis.[21](#)

In spite of the overwhelming studies on the Infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke, no author has really made a serious analysis on the function of the hymns as a whole in Luke's Birth stories. Farris's perspective comes from an individual approach to the hymns. In turn, Farris failed to see the overall function of the three hymns in the Infancy narratives.

The Promise-Fulfillment Scheme in Matthew 1:18-2:23

Although our study is not focused on the book of Matthew, a brief look into Matthew's Infancy narratives is necessary. There is a need to understand how Matthew views the fulfillment of the OT promises in the person of Jesus. This can be done by answering the following questions: What are "formula quotations"? What is Matthew's main intent in his Infancy stories? We will start our study by defining the term "formula quotations."

3.1 What are Formula Quotations?

Formula quotations mark the difference between Matthew's Infancy narratives and that of Luke's. Though the promise-fulfillment method is clearly visible in the Infancy stories of Matthew and Luke, the two authors differ in their application of the method. The promise-fulfillment method in Matthew is highly characterized by formula quotations.[22](#)

Formula quotations are the "citing of OT passages as prophecies that have been fulfilled in given events in the life of Jesus."[23](#) Through formula quotations, Matthew reminds his readers that Jesus is the fulfillment of the prophecies in the OT.[24](#) While it is true that formula quotations are also found in the Synoptic Gospels,[25](#) the book of Matthew contains most of them (1:22f; 2:5f; 2:15; 2:17; 2:23 in the Infancy narratives; 4:14-16; 8:17; 12:17-21; 13:35; 21:4f; and 27:9f in the rest of the gospel).[26](#) Matthew also has a different usage among the four gospel writers. The following features characterize Matthean formula quotations:

First, is characterized by exegetes as being of "mixed type," leaning more towards the Hebrew text than the expected Septuagintal type. For example, in 2:15, Matthew's quotation of Hosea 11:1 is rendered *eks Aiguptou ekalesa ton huio mou* ("out of Egypt I called my son"). This is considerably different from the Septuagint's *eks Aiguptou metekalesa ta tekna autou* ("out of Egypt I called his children"), but very similar to the Masoretic text's *mimmisrayim qarati libeni*.[27](#)

Second, is Matthew's use of *pleroun* in the passive voice. *Pleroun* is a key word signaling a striking fulfillment formula. It appears particularly on passages making "assertions about the Scripture in general but not in formulas introducing specific OT texts."^{*} Moreover, their structure basically follows the pattern *hina (hopos) plerothe to rheten dia tou prophetou legontos* ("in order to fulfill what was said through the prophet...").

Finally, Matthew's formula quotations are immediately followed by a commentary. This commentary is not part of the author's narrative, but serves primarily to explain the fulfillment of a promise.²⁸ Thus, in 1:22, the author explains the meaning of the name "Immanuel." In 2:5, the author explains how the Magi were called secretly by Herod. In 2:17, Matthew includes the death of Herod and how an angel appeared in Joseph's dream. These commentaries, which were not originally part of the Infancy tradition, come consistently after the formula quotations.

3.2 What is Matthew's Intent in his Infancy Stories?

It is essential to know Matthew's intent in his Infancy narratives. This is needed in order to see its distinction from Luke's intent later. There are two views concerning Matthew's intention. The first one sees an exclusive Christological intent,²⁹ with Matthew's Infancy stories simply presenting a symbolic affirmation of the Christian kerygma. This view focuses on the overall function of the Infancy narratives, particularly its function and relation to the whole gospel. The aim of the author then is to present a theology rather than to defend one.

The other view, which is more common, emphasizes the apologetic intent. Matthew is keen in proving that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah for whom the people have been waiting. This can be seen in the accumulation of OT prophecies, a commentary function designed to enhance the fulfillment of the prophecy, and a number of modified formulaic phrases which were inserted by the author.³⁰

3.3 Summary

The promise-fulfillment method in the Infancy narratives of Matthew is primarily characterized by formula quotations. Formula quotations are direct quotations of OT promises. The fulfillment of which are connected to the person of Jesus. The method of promise-fulfillment is utilized by Matthew in order to emphasize to his readers that Jesus is the Davidic Messiah.

The Praise of the Prophetess Anna in Luke's Infancy Stories

After having briefly investigated how the promise-fulfillment pattern is employed by Matthew, we now turn to Luke's narrative. We have seen how Matthew uses "formula quotations" as a key device in proving the messiahship of Jesus. In Luke's Infancy narrative, formula quotations do not play a big part. Instead, the third evangelist uses the

hymns in a unique way to substantiate that Jesus is the Son of God. The hymns in Luke act as the responses of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon to the fulfillment of the promises. Thus, while Matthew has a promise-fulfillment pattern, Luke displays a promise-fulfillment-praise sequence.

This sequence can be seen as one analyzes the structural parallelism of the narratives of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon, with the hymns serving as the climax of each. However, this structure leaves out the pericope of Anna the Prophetess (2:36-38) since no hymn immediately follows. Thus, as Mary utters the *Magnificat*, Zechariah chants the *Benedictus*, and Simeon warbles the *Nunc Dimittis*. Anna the Prophetess, has no hymn to sing.

In this section, I will attempt to show that the pericope of Anna is very much a part of the structural parallelism. A modified structure will demonstrate that the *Nunc Dimittis* links the pericope of Simeon with the Anna pericope.

This argument will be pursued by answering the following questions. First, what is meant by the promise-fulfillment-praise scheme in Luke? How different is this sequence from Matthew? Second, what is the significance of the hymns in the Infancy narratives of Luke? Moreover, what role do they play in the whole Lucan gospel? And third, how should we understand the function of "Anna the prophetess" pericope? How does this pericope fit in the promise-fulfillment-praise scheme of Luke's Birth stories?

4.1 What is the Promise-Fulfillment-Praise Pattern in Luke?

The promise-fulfillment-praise sequence in Luke was proposed by Stephen Farris. Through what he calls "parallel episodes," Farris finds a uniformed sequence of events in the narratives of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon. He argues that an analysis of the "thought through strands of the narrative rather than the parallelism of the individual parts" is a progression which leads up to the hymns.³¹ Thus, we find the sequence.³²

	Zechariah	Mary	Simeon
Promise	That his wife would bear a son	She would conceive a special son	He would see the Messiah
Fulfillment	John's birth bears	Elizabeth's conception witness and	He sees Jesus blesses Mary
Praise	<i>Benedictus</i>	<i>Magnificat</i>	<i>Nunc Dimittis</i>

This chart indeed displays a striking pattern. The structural parallelism of the three events shows that the hymns serve as the climax of the promises.

As we have stated previously, the method of promise-fulfillment can be seen in the Infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke. The application of the method, however, differ with each author. The difference can be seen in the author's understanding of promise. Matthew literally quotes Old Testament passages as promises and finds their fulfillment in the person of Jesus. Matthew also uses "formula quotations" to show that prophecies about coming Messiah are already fulfilled in Christ.

The promise-fulfillment scheme in Luke is employed from a different perspective. The promise in Luke is part of the narrative itself. They are not quotation from the OT, rather, they are part of the story. Thus, the message to Zechariah concerning Elizabeth's conception of a son in spite of her age is a promise (1:13b). Also, the news to Mary that she would conceive the son of God is a promise (1:31-33). The promise to Simon that he would see the messiah before he dies (2:26) is part of the story and not a quotation from the OT. These three promises saw their respective fulfillment, and as a response, hymns of praise were uttered.

4.2 The Significance of the Hymns in the Infancy Narratives of Luke

It is essential for us to understand the significance and function of the hymns in general. To do this, we need to briefly discuss certain presuppositions. First, we must understand that the canticles were formed from OT models. This means that they were originally independent songs which were modified to serve the author's purpose. Second, that these songs, after their modifications, were inserted into an existing narrative. Third, that the songs were primarily salvific songs about the saving acts of God.

4.2.1 Parallels from OT Hymns

Several scholars believe that the hymns were composed in the manner of OT psalms. The attribution of pattern to the OT hymns is based on style and content. James W. Watts confirms this view by saying that "the position and contents of the *Magnificat* in particular show clearly the influence of Hanna's song (1 Sam 2:1-10)...."³³ Likewise, Brown concludes that the hymns in Luke were heavily influenced by the canticles from Jewish Christian *Anawim* ("poor").³⁴ Brown based his study from parallel hymns found in the Qumran caves. The Qumran community is a community of *Anawim*, and the hymns found in their caves share the style of Luke's hymns. Phrases as this indeed points to an *anawim* ideology.³⁵

*He has exalted those of low degree;
He has filled the hungry with good things,
and the rich He has sent empty away (1:52b-53).*

Likewise, the *Benedictus* yields an evidence of Jewish Christian tone. The phrase "who sat in the darkness and in the shadow of death" (1:79) points to the concern about the

"poor ones" in their community. Brown rejects the idea that the hymns were from a Gentile Christian community. The stress on Israel and David, together with the frequent mention of the phrase "our fathers" (91:54-56; 1:55, 72), substantiates his claim.[36](#)

4.2.2 Modified and Inserted Into the Narrative according to Luke's Agenda

The similarity of the canticles' style and language with Jewish Christian hymns show that they were modified to suit the author's intention.[37](#) The following are views on how the hymns were composed and inserted into the Infancy narratives: First is the suggestion that the hymns were composed by those who uttered them.[38](#) Thus, Mary composed the *Magnificat*, Zechariah for the *Benedictus*, and Simeon for the *Nunc Dimittis*. This view was dominant during the pre-critical era.[39](#) The second view argues that the hymns were composed simultaneously with the Infancy narrative. This view did not invite strong supporters since the hymns fit awkwardly into the narrative.[40](#) The third view believes that the hymns were composed by Luke himself and that they were inserted by him into an earlier Lucan narrative.[41](#) Finally, the fourth view completely eliminates the possibility of Luke composing the hymns. This view asserts that the hymns were pre-Lucan or non-Lucan and were simply adapted and inserted by the author.[42](#) Many find the fourth view as the most persuasive. One primary evidence is that the narrative flow will not be disrupted even if they hymn were omitted.[43](#)

4.2.3 The Hymns as Salvific Songs

If the hymns were composed independent from the narrative, what were they originally intended for? A study of the content and genre of the songs reveals that the hymns were of thanksgiving type of psalms focused on the saving acts of God.[44](#) Thus, there is a low tone of Christology among the hymns. Brown cites that even probably an "orthodox Jew" can recite the *Benedictus* with the exception of vv. 76-77.[45](#)

The modifications which Luke did reveals his intention. For example, the inclusion of vv. 76-77 in the *Benedictus* shows the author's desire for his readers to see not only the fulfillment of God's promise of salvation, but also the role of Jesus in carrying out God's plan.

*Now you, child, will be called a prophet of the Most High God.
You will go first before the Lord to prepare his people for his coming.
You will make his people know that they will be saved.
They will be saved by having their sins forgiven.*

Another example is Luke's modification of the *Benedictus*. Although scholars are divided on this view, they do agree that the two stories show great similarity, and that the author intends to show Jesus' superiority over John.[46](#)

To further emphasize the superiority of Jesus over John, Luke has the story of Simeon. This pericope shows the author's "tilt" in his parallelism. This tilt helps us see that Luke's

focus is not on John but on Jesus. The story of John the Baptist serves as one fulfillment story for the more important fulfillment story which is Jesus'.[47](#)

4.3 The Place of the Anna the Prophetess Pericope in Luke's Infancy Narratives

The structure of Farris leaves out the pericope of Anna the prophetess. The three parallel sequences show the respective stories of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon with the three hymns serving as the final of each in the promise-fulfillment-praise scheme.

The structural parallelism of the three indeed displays a parallel flow of sequences. However, Farris seemingly found no place in his structure for the pericope of the prophetess. In fact, the structure was too limited that the pericope of Anna can be eliminated without fracturing the said sequence. This is quite unfortunate since a careful study of the whole narrative shows that the Anna pericope is equally significant as the pericopes of Simeon, Mary, and Zechariah. We shall try to prove this point by first analyzing the pericope of the prophetess.

4.3.1 The Striking Similarities in the Pericopes of Simeon and Anna

The Revised Standard Version starts the pericope of Simeon in v. 22 of chapter 2. This kind of division presupposes that the text stating about required "purification according to the Law of Moses" (v. 22) is the beginning of the pericope of Simeon (v. 25). This division is not the case in the Greek text. The Nestle-Aland sees the pericope of the ritual concerning purification as independent pericope. While it is true that v. 27b confirms the role of Simeon in the purification rite, this does not necessarily require the reader to see vv. 22-24 as part of the Simeon pericope.

With the "purification" pericope (vv. 22-24) as distinct from the Simeon story, we can see a clearer scenario. The scene is the presentation of the infant Jesus in Jerusalem. In Jerusalem we find two characters who met the child. These two characters, when viewed from a parallel perspective, independent from the Mary and Zechariah stories, show striking similarities:

- a. Both were promptly introduced with the customary Greek imperfect *kai...en* (2:25; 2:36).[48](#)
- b. Both were pictured as faithful, devout, and were in the temple during the time of Jesus' presentation. Simeon was "righteous and devout" (v. 25) and Anna "did not depart from the temple, worshipping with fasting and prayer night and day" (v. 37b).
- c. Both were seen to be of old age. Simeon was told "that he should not see death before he had seen the Lord's Christ" (v. 26b) while Anna "was of great age...she was eighty-four" (vv. 36b, 37).
- d. Both held significant cultic offices. Simeon was possibly a priest serving in the temple, for only temple priests are task to do child presentations (v. 27), whereas Anna was called a prophetess (v. 36).

- e. Both were able to recognize the child.
- f. Both gave thanks and spoke of God's salvation upon seeing the child. Simeon "took him up in his arms and blessed God" (4:28), while Anna "coming up at that very hour, (she) gave thanks" (v. 38a).

The similarities we find between the characters of Simeon and Anna show a possible parallel structure of the two pericopes. These two characters, when placed side by side, will reveal that the *Nunc Dimittis* serves as its common link. Brown admits this view when he stated that the purpose of the parallel between Simeon and Anna is Luke's parallel reference to the Law and Prophets. Simeon was the representative of the Law, while Anna the representative of the prophets.⁴⁹ Thus, to presuppose that the story of the presentation of the child Jesus will not be disrupted, even if the pericope of Anna is eliminated, is unjustified.

Notice this alternative parallel structure for the Simeon and Anna pericopes:⁵⁰

	Simeon	Anna
Promise	of old age, would see the salvation of God through the messiah	of old age, would see the salvation of God through the messiah
Fulfillment	saw the messiah	saw the messiah
Praise		<i>Nunc Dimittis</i>

4.3.2 An Overall Alternative Structure

Can the *Nunc Dimittis* serve as a song of praise for the fulfillment of promises in the lives of Simeon and Anna? The answer to this question is seen on the same role which the *Magnificat* played for Mary and Elizabeth. Farris states, "...the promises concerning both children are first fulfilled as John hails from the womb itself the one who is to come. The *Magnificat* responds to the fulfillment of both sets of promises."⁵¹ Moreover, we also find some similarities with the characters of Mary and Elizabeth. First, both of them cannot conceive a child; Elizabeth was barren (1:7), while Mary was a virgin (1:34). Second, unlike the characters of Zechariah, Simeon, and Anna, both were chosen to conceive children with whom God would carry out his plan of salvation. John as the forerunner, Jesus as the Messiah.

From this, we find that there is a more plausible structural parallelism where all characters in the Infancy narratives of Luke fits into one whole picture. Notice how all the characters consistently fit into the promise-fulfillment-praise scheme:

Elizabeth	Mary	Zechariah	Simeon	Anna
Magnificat		Benedictus	Nunc Dimittis	

As we can see from this modified structure, the *Magnificat* serves as the praise response for both Mary and Elizabeth. The same is true for Simeon and Anna who shares the *Nunc Dimittis* as their single hymn. Zechariah has the *Benedictus* for himself.

Summary

In this study, we discussed that the promise-fulfillment method is best demonstrated in the Infancy narratives of Matthew and Luke. However, Luke's application of the promise-fulfillment method is different from Matthew's. While Matthew has the promise-fulfillment pattern, Luke has the promise-fulfillment-praise scheme.

The promise-fulfillment-praise scheme is proposed by Stephen Farris. Farris believes that the hymns serve as the praise responses of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon to the fulfillment of the respective promises they received. This conclusion is the result of Farris's use of structural parallelism. Through structural parallelism, the three episodes of Mary, Zechariah, and Simeon are placed in parallel to each other, with the hymns as the climax of each.

The structure of Farris leaves no room for the pericope of Anna the prophetess. Farris thinks that since the Anna pericope is not immediately followed by a hymn, the story does not fit the structure. We demonstrated, however, that the pericope of Anna fits in well with the structure. This is possible by seeing the *Nunc Dimittis* as a song that links the pericopes of Simeon and Anna together. Through the striking similarities seen in the characters of Simeon and Anna, we demonstrated that the Simeon pericope does not end after the hymn. Thus, the pericopes of Simeon and Anna form a continuous strand.

We also showed that the same structure is seen in the pericopes of Elizabeth and Mary. Many commentators agree that the *Magnificat* is a response to the fulfillment of both the promises to Mary and Elizabeth. The *Nunc Dimittis* fulfils the same function in the Simeon and Anna pericopes.

References

¹ Walter C. Kaiser, *The Uses of the Old Testament in the New* (Chicago: Moody, 1985), p. 1; cf. Lester J. Kuyper, "The Old Testament Used by the New Testament Writers," *Reformed Review* 21 (1967), p. 2.

² Otto Piper, "Unchanging Promises: Exodus in the New Testament," *Interpretation* 11 (1957), p. 14.

³ Gerhard F. Hasel, *Old Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate*, 4th ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991), pp. 173-74.

⁴ Hasel, *Old Testament Theology*, pp. 173-74.

⁵ Cf. Christopher Wright, "The Ethical Authority of the Old Testament: A Survey of Approach," *Tyndale Bulletin* 43 (1992), pp. 101-20.

⁶ Gerhard F. Hasel, *New Testament Theology: Basic Issues in the Current Debate* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), pp. 194-95.

⁷ Hasel, *New Testament Theology*, pp. 194-95.

⁸ Moody Smith, "The Use of the Old Testament in the New," in *The Use of the Old Testament in the New and Other Essays*, ed. James M. Efird (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1972), p. 23.

⁹ Hasel, *New Testament Theology*, p. 194.

¹⁰ C. H. Cave, "St. Matthew's Infancy Narrative," *New Testament Studies* 9 (1962-63), p. 382.

¹¹ Stephen Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning, and Significance* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985), p. 101.

¹² The terms *Magnificat*, *Benedictus*, and *Nunc Dimittis* are from the Latin Vulgate. Specifically, the *Magnificat* comes from the first word of the passage "*Magnifica anima mea Dominum*" (My soul magnifies the Lord...). Cf. Ralph Martin, "The Magnificat," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, ed. Geoffrey Bromiley, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986), III, p. 220.

¹³ Farris, *The Hymns*, p. 125.

¹⁴ Raymond Brown, "Gospel Infancy Narrative Research from 1976 to 1986," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 48 (1986), pp. 468-83; 660-80.

¹⁵ John Drury, *Tradition and Design: A Study in Early Christian Historiography* (London: Darton, Longmann & Todd, 1976), p. 45; R. T. France, "Scripture, Tradition, and History in the Infancy Narratives of Matthew," in *Gospel Perspectives: Studies in History and Tradition in the Four Gospels*, eds. R. T. France and David Wenham (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1983), II, p. 244.

¹⁶ Joseph Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke*, 2 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1985).

- ¹⁷ I. H. Marshall, *Commentary on Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978).
- ¹⁸ John Nolland, *Luke 1-9:20*, Word Biblical Commentary (Dallas: Word, 1989).
- ¹⁹ Raymond Martin, "Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek," *Vetus Testamentum* 10 (1960), pp. 295-310.
- ²⁰ George M. Soares Prabhu, *The Formula Quotations in the Infancy Narrative of Matthew: An Enquiry into the Tradition History of Mt. 1-2*, *Anacleta Biblica* 63 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976).
- ²¹ Raymond Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke*, new updated ed. (New York: Doubleday, 1993).
- ²² Prabhu, p. 18.
- ²³ Prabhu, p. 18.
- ²⁴ Barnabas Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic: The Doctrinal Significance of the Old Testament Quotations* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), p. 297.
- ²⁵ Prabhu, p. 19.
- ²⁶ Prabhu, p. 18.
- ²⁷ Prabhu, p. 59.
- ²⁸ Prabhu, p. 59.
- ²⁹ Prabhu, p. 16.
- ³⁰ Lindars, pp. 297-98; *Contra* Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, p. 97.
- ³¹ Farris, *The Hymns*, pp. 101-2.
- ³² Farris, *The Hymns*, pp. 101-2.
- ³³ James W. Watts, *Psalms and Story: Inset Hymns in Hebrew Narrative* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), p. 180.
- ³⁴ John Drury, *Tradition and Design in Luke's Gospel*, p. 52.
- ³⁵ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, pp. 350-51.
- ³⁶ Brown, p. 353.

³⁷ Watts, *Psalm and Story*, p. 179.

³⁸ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, p. 346.

³⁹ Brown, p. 347.

⁴⁰ Ralph Martin, "Magnificat," *The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia*, p. 220.

⁴¹ Martin, "Magnificat," p. 220.

⁴² Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, p. 346.

⁴³ Martin, "Magnificat," p. 220.

⁴⁴ Watts states that "the psalms' contents proclaim a general theme of the Gospel, that God is acting to save God's people," *Psalm and Story*, p. 180.

⁴⁵ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, p. 347.

⁴⁶ Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, p. 88.

⁴⁷ Farris, *The Hymns*, p. 102.

⁴⁸ Many commentators recognize the role of Anna as another witness to the messianic child. This recognition attests to the continuity of the pericope of Simeon to Anna. Cf. Marshall, *Commentary on Luke*, p. 123.

⁴⁹ Brown, *The Birth of the Messiah*, p. 688.

⁵⁰ I disagree with H. Sahlin, *Der Messias und des Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells, 1945), pp. 286-88, when he proposed that the *Benedictus* is the "missing" hymn for Anna.

⁵¹ Farris, *The Hymns*, p. 102.