

COMMENTARY
on the
NEW TESTAMENT USE
of the OLD TESTAMENT

COMMENTARY
on the
NEW TESTAMENT USE
of the OLD TESTAMENT

EDITED BY
G. K. BEALE *and* D. A. CARSON


Baker Academic
Grand Rapids, Michigan

 APOLLOS

© 2007 by G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson

Published by Baker Academic
a division of Baker Publishing Group
P.O. Box 6287, Grand Rapids, MI 49516-6287
www.bakeracademic.com

and Apollos
(an imprint of Inter-Varsity Press)
Norton Street
Nottingham NG7 3HR England
email: ivp@ivpbooks.com
website: www.ivpbooks.com

Printed in the United States of America

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—for example, electronic, photocopy, recording—without the prior written permission of the publisher. The only exception is brief quotations in printed reviews.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data is on file at the Library of Congress, Washington, DC.

ISBN 10: 0-8010-2693-5
ISBN 978-0-8010-2693-5

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

UK ISBN 978-1-84474-196-0

Unless otherwise indicated, Scripture quotations are the authors' translations.

Scripture quotations labeled ESV are from The Holy Bible, English Standard Version, copyright © 2001 by Crossway Bibles, a division of Good News Publishers. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled NASB are from the New American Standard Bible®, copyright © 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

Scripture quotations labeled NIV are from the HOLY BIBLE, NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®, NIV®. Copyright © 1973, 1978, 1984 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled NKJV are from the New King James Version. Copyright © 1982 by Thomas Nelson, Inc. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled NLT are from the *Holy Bible*, New Living Translation, copyright © 1996. Used by permission of Tyndale House Publishers, Inc., Wheaton, Illinois 60189. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled NRSV are from the New Revised Standard Version of the Bible, copyright © 1989, by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations labeled TNIV are from the HOLY BIBLE, TODAY'S NEW INTERNATIONAL VERSION®, TNIV®. Copyright © 2001, 2005 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
List of Contributors	ix
List of Abbreviations	xi
Introduction	xxiii
<i>G. K. Beale and D. A. Carson</i>	
Matthew 1	Philippians 835
<i>Craig L. Blomberg</i>	<i>Moisés Silva</i>
Mark 111	Colossians 841
<i>Rikk E. Watts</i>	<i>G. K. Beale</i>
Luke 251	1–2 Thessalonians 871
<i>David W. Pao and</i> <i>Eckhard J. Schnabel</i>	<i>Jeffrey A. D. Weima</i>
John 415	1–2 Timothy and Titus 891
<i>Andreas J. Köstenberger</i>	<i>Philip H. Towner</i>
Acts 513	Hebrews 919
<i>I. Howard Marshall</i>	<i>George H. Guthrie</i>
Romans 607	James 997
<i>Mark A. Seifrid</i>	<i>D. A. Carson</i>
1 Corinthians 695	1 Peter 1015
<i>Roy E. Ciampa and</i> <i>Brian S. Rosner</i>	<i>D. A. Carson</i>
2 Corinthians 753	2 Peter 1047
<i>Peter Balla</i>	<i>D. A. Carson</i>
Galatians 785	1–3 John 1063
<i>Moisés Silva</i>	<i>D. A. Carson</i>
Ephesians 813	Jude 1069
<i>Frank S. Thielman</i>	<i>D. A. Carson</i>
	Revelation 1081
	<i>G. K. Beale and</i> <i>Sean M. McDonough</i>

Index of Scripture and Other Ancient Writings	1163
--	------

INTRODUCTION

G. K. BEALE AND D. A. CARSON

It might be the part of wisdom to say what this book is not, so as to clarify what it is and how it works.

Nowhere does this volume survey contemporary debates over the use of the OT in the NT. The many subdisciplines that contribute to this enterprise have not been canvassed. For example, we do not systematically compare non-Christian Jewish exegetical methods with the exegetical methods on display in the NT. We do not review the ongoing debate between (a) those who argue that the NT writers usually respect the entire context of the OT texts they cite or to which they allude and (b) those who argue that the NT writers engage in a kind of “prooftexting” that takes OT passages out of their contexts so as to “prove” conclusions that belong to the commitments of NT Christians but not to the antecedent Scriptures they cite. We have not summarized the extraordinarily complex developments in the field of typology since Leonhard Goppelt wrote his 1939 book *Typos*. We could easily lengthen this list of important topics that have not been systematically addressed in this book.

One of the reasons we have not surveyed these topics is that all of them have been treated elsewhere. Though it might be useful to canvass them again, we decided that it was more urgent to put together a book in which all the contribu-

tors would be informed by such discussions but would focus their attention on the places where NT writers actually cite or allude to the OT. Understandably, even elegant discussions of one of the subdisciplines, discussions one finds in other works—comparisons between Jewish and Christian exegetical techniques, for instance, or studies in typology—inevitably utilize only a small percentage of the actual textual evidence. By contrast, what we have attempted is a reasonably comprehensive survey of all the textual evidence. Even a casual reader of this volume will quickly learn that each contributor brings to bear many of the contemporary studies as he works his way through his assigned corpus, so along the way many of the contributors make shrewd comments on particular techniques and hermeneutical discussions. Accordingly, contributors have been given liberty to determine how much introductory material to include (i.e., prior discussions of the use of the OT in their particular NT book). Nevertheless, the focus of each contributor is on the NT’s use of the OT. All OT citations in the NT are analyzed as well as all probable allusions. Admittedly there is debate about what constitutes an allusion. Consequently not every ostensible OT allusion that has ever been proposed will be studied but only those deemed to be probable allusions.

The editors have encouraged each contributor to keep in mind six separate questions where the NT cites or clearly alludes to the OT (though they have not insisted on this organization).

1. What is the NT context of the citation or allusion? In other words, without (yet) going into the details of the exegesis, the contributor seeks to establish the topic of discussion, the flow of thought, and, where relevant, the literary structure, genre, and rhetoric of the passage.

2. What is the OT context from which the quotation or allusion is drawn? Even at its simplest, this question demands as much care with respect to the OT as the first question demands of the study of the NT. Sometimes energy must be expended simply to demonstrate that a very brief phrase really does come from a particular OT passage, and from nowhere else. Yet sometimes this second question becomes even more complex. Under the assumption that Mark's Gospel picks up exodus themes (itself a disputed point), is it enough to go to the book of Exodus to examine those themes as they first unfold? Or are such OT exodus themes, as picked up by Mark, filtered through Isaiah? In that case, surely it is important to include reflection not only on the use of the OT in the NT but also on the use of the OT within the OT. Or again, how does the Genesis flood account (Gen. 6–9) get utilized in the rest of the OT and in earlier parts of the NT before it is picked up by 2 Peter? Sometimes a NT author may have in mind the earlier OT reference but may be interpreting it through the later OT development of that earlier text, and if the lens of that later text is not analyzed, then the NT use may seem strange or may not properly be understood.

3. How is the OT quotation or source handled in the literature of Second Temple Judaism or (more broadly yet) of early Judaism? The reasons for asking this question and the possible answers that might be advanced are many. It is not that either Jewish or Christian authorities judge, say, Jubilees or 4 Ezra to be as authoritative as Genesis or Isaiah. But attentiveness to these and many other important Jewish sources may provide several different kinds of help. (1) They may show us how the OT texts were understood by sources roughly contemporaneous with the NT. In a few cases, a trajectory of understanding can be traced out, whether the NT documents belong to that

trajectory or not. (2) They sometimes show that Jewish authorities were themselves divided as to how certain OT passages should be interpreted. Sometimes the difference is determined in part by literary genre: Wisdom literature does not handle some themes the way apocalyptic sources do, for instance. Wherever it is possible to trace out the reasoning, that reasoning reveals important insights into how the Scriptures were being read. (3) In some instances, the readings of early Judaism provide a foil for early Christian readings. The differences then demand hermeneutical and exegetical explanations; for instance, if two groups understand the same texts in decidedly different ways, what accounts for the differences in interpretation? Exegetical technique? Hermeneutical assumptions? Literary genres? Different opponents? Differing pastoral responsibilities? (4) Even where there is no direct literary dependence, sometimes the language of early Judaism provides close parallels to the language of the NT writers simply because of the chronological and cultural proximity. (5) In a handful of cases, NT writers apparently display direct dependence on sources belonging to early Judaism and their handling of the OT (e.g., Jude). What is to be inferred from such dependence?

4. What textual factors must be borne in mind as one seeks to understand a particular use of the OT? Is the NT citing the MT or the LXX or a Targum? Or is there a mixed citation, or perhaps dependence on memory or on some form of text that has not come down to us? Is there significance in tiny changes? Are there textual variants within the Hebrew tradition, within the tradition of the Greek OT, or within the Greek NT textual tradition? Do such variants have any direct bearing on our understanding of how the NT is citing or alluding to the OT?

5. Once this groundwork has been laid, it becomes important to try to understand how the NT is using or appealing to the OT. What is the nature of the connection as the NT writer sees it? Is this merely a connection of language? One of the editors had a father who was much given to communicating in brief biblical quotations. His mind was so steeped in Scripture that Scripture provided the linguistic patterns that were the first recourse of his speech. If one of his children was complaining about the weather, he would quietly

say (quoting, in those days, the KJV), “This is the day the LORD hath made; let us rejoice and be glad in it.” In fact, he knew his Bible well enough that he was fully aware that the original context was not talking about the weather and our response to it. He knew that the verse occurs in one of the crucial “rejected stone” passages, and the “day” over which the psalmist rejoices is the day when the “stone” is vindicated (Ps. 118:22–24; note v. 24 in the TNIV: “The LORD has done it this very day; let us rejoice today and be glad.”). Nevertheless the passage provided the verbal fodder for him to express what he wanted to say, and granted what the Bible does actually say elsewhere about God’s goodness and providence, he was accurately summarizing a biblical idea even though the biblical words he was citing did not, in their original context, articulate that idea. Are there instances, then, when the NT writers use biblical language simply because their minds are so steeped in Scripture that such verbal patterns provide the linguistic frameworks in which they think?

On the other hand, are there occasions when a NT writer uses an expression that crops up in many OT passages (such as, say, “day of the LORD,” especially common in the prophets), not thinking of any one OT text but nevertheless using the expression to reflect the rich mix of promised blessing and promised judgment that characterizes the particular instantiations of the OT occurrences? In this case, the NT writer may be very faithful to OT usage at the generic level, even while not thinking of any particular passage, that is, individual OT occurrences may envisage particular visitations by God, while the generic pattern combines judgment and blessing, and the NT use may pick up on the generic pattern while applying it to yet another visitation by God.

Alternatively, NT writers may be establishing some sort of analogy in order to draw a moral lesson. Just as the ancient Israelites were saved out of slavery in Egypt but most of the adult generation did not make it into the promised land because they did not persevere in faith and obedience, so believers contemporary with Paul and with the writer to the Hebrews need to persevere if they are to be saved at the last (1 Cor. 10:1–13; Heb. 3:7–19). But when is such a formal analogy better thought of as a typology, that is, a pattern

established by a succession of similar events over time?

Or again, is the NT writer claiming that some event or other is the fulfillment of an OT prophecy—a bold “this is what was spoken by the prophet” (e.g., Acts 2:16) sort of declaration? Soon, however, it becomes clear that the “fulfillment” category is remarkably flexible. An event may “fulfill” a specific verbal prediction, but in biblical usage an event may be said to “fulfill” not only a verbal prediction but also another event or, at least, a pattern of events. This is commonly labeled typological fulfillment. In that case, of course, a further question arises. Are the NT writers coming to their conclusion that this fulfillment has taken place to fulfill antecedent events simply out of their confidence in the sovereign God’s ordering of all things, such that he has established patterns that, rightly read, anticipate a recurrence of God’s actions? Or are they claiming, in some instances, that the OT texts themselves point forward in some way to the future?

More generally, do the NT writers appeal to the OT using exactly the same sorts of exegetical techniques and hermeneutical assumptions that their unconverted Jewish contemporaries display—one or more of the classic lists of mid-doth, the “rules” of interpretive procedure? The most common answer to this question is a decided “Yes,” but the affirmation fails to explain why the two sets of interpreters emerge with some very different readings. One must conclude that either the exegetical techniques and hermeneutical assumptions do not determine very much after all or else that there are additional factors that need careful probing if we are to explain why, say, Hillel and Paul read the Hebrew Scriptures (or their Greek translations) so differently.

6. To what theological use does the NT writer put the OT quotation or allusion? In one sense, this question is wrapped up in all the others, but it is worth asking separately as it highlights things that may otherwise be overlooked. For instance, it is very common for NT writers to apply an OT passage that refers to YHWH (commonly rendered “LORD” in English Bibles) to Jesus. This arises from the theological conviction that it is entirely appropriate to do so since, granted Jesus’ identity, what is predicated of God can be predicated no less of him. In other passages,

however, God sends the Messiah or the Davidic king, and Jesus himself is that Davidic king, thus establishing a distinction between God and Jesus. The subtleties of these diverse uses of OT texts meld with the complexities of NT Christology to constitute the essential building blocks of what would in time come to be called the doctrine of the Trinity. Other theological alignments abound, a few of which are mentioned below. Sometimes, more simply, it is worth drawing attention to the way a theological theme grounded in the citation of an OT text is aligned with a major theological theme in the NT that is treated on its own without reference to any OT text.

These, then, are the six questions that largely control the commentary in the following pages. Most of the contributors have handled these questions separately for each quotation and for the clearest allusions. Less obvious allusions have sometimes been treated in more generic discussions, though even here the answers to these six questions usually surface somewhere. Moreover, the editors have allowed adequate flexibility in presentation. Two or three contributors wrote in more discursive fashion, meaning they kept these questions in mind, but their presentations did not separate the questions and the answers they called forth.

Five further reflections may help to orientate the reader to this commentary.

First, one of the reasons for maintaining flexibility in approach is the astonishing variety of ways in which the various NT authors make reference to the OT. Matthew, for instance, is given to explicit quotations, sometimes with impressive formulaic introductions. By contrast, Colossians and Revelation avoid unambiguous and extensive citations but pack many, many OT allusions into their texts. Some NT writers return again and again to a handful of OT chapters; others make more expansive references. To this must be added the complications generated by NT books that are literarily dependent on other NT books or are, at very least, very similar to others (e.g., 2 Peter and Jude, the Synoptic Gospels, Ephesians and Colossians). The contributors have handled such diversity in a variety of ways.

Second, in addition to the obvious ease with which NT writers (as we have seen) apply to Jesus a variety of OT texts that refer to YHWH, so also

a number of other associations that are initially startling become commonplace with repetition. NT writers happily apply to the church, that is, to the new covenant people of God, many texts that originally referred to the Israelites, the old covenant people of God. In another mutation, Jesus himself becomes the eschatological locus of Israel—an identification sometimes effected by appealing to OT texts (e.g., “Out of Egypt I called my son,” Matt. 2:15; Hos. 11:1) and sometimes by symbol-laden events in Jesus’ life that call to mind antecedent events in the life of Israel, for example, Jesus being tempted in the wilderness for forty days and forty nights, Matt. 4/Luke 4, closely connected with Deut. 8 and the forty years of Israel’s wilderness wanderings. This example overlaps with another pregnant set of associations bound up with the “son” language that abounds in both Testaments. In fact, it is likely because of conceiving Jesus as representing true Israel that NT writers began to conceive of the church this way as well, since Christ corporately represents the church, and what he is in so many ways is likewise true of the church.

Third, one of the distinctive differences one sometimes finds between the way NT writers read the OT and the way that their non-Christian Jewish contemporaries read it is the salvation-historical grid that is often adopted by the former. Some kind of historical sequence under the providence of a sovereign God is necessary for almost any kind of typological hermeneutic, of course, but there is something more. In Galatians 3, for instance, Paul modifies the commonly accepted significance of the law by the simple expedient of locating it after the Abrahamic promise, which had already established the importance of justification by faith and which had already promised blessing to the Gentiles. Thus instead of asking an atemporal question such as, “How does one please God?” and replying, “By obeying the law,” Paul instead insists on reading the turning points of OT history in their chronological sequence and learning some interpretive lessons from that sequence. That sort of dependence on salvation history surfaces elsewhere in the NT (e.g., Rom. 4), and not only in Paul (e.g., Heb. 4:1–13; 7). Thus, eschatological fulfillment has begun with Christ’s first advent and will be consummated at his last coming. Ostensible parallels in Jewish literature preserve

(especially at Qumran) a sense of what might be called “inaugurated eschatology” (several texts insist that the Teacher of Righteousness brings in the last times), but that is something differentiable from this sense of historical sequencing within the Hebrew Scriptures being itself a crucial interpretive key to the faithful reading of those Scriptures.

Fourth, here and there within the pages of this commentary one finds brief discussion as to whether a NT writer is drawing out a teaching from the OT—i.e., basing the structure of his thought on the exegesis of the OT text—or appealing to an OT passage to confirm or justify what has in fact been established by the Christian’s experience of Christ and his death and resurrection. This distinction is a more nuanced one than what was mentioned earlier, viz., the distinction between those who think that the citations bring with them the OT context and those who think that the NT writers resort to proof-texting. For the evidence is really quite striking that the first disciples are not presented as those who instantly understood what the Lord Jesus was teaching them or as those who even anticipated all that he would say because of their own insightful interpretations of the Hebrew Scriptures. To the contrary, they are constantly presented as, on the one hand, being attached to Jesus yet, on the other, being very slow to come to terms with the fact that the promised messianic king would also be the Suffering Servant, the atoning lamb of God, that he would be crucified, rejected by so many of his own people, and would rise again utterly vindicated by God. Nevertheless, once they have come to accept this synthesis, they also insist, in the strongest terms, that this is what the OT Scriptures actually teach. They do not say, in effect, “Oh, if only you could experience Jesus Christ the way we do, you would then enjoy a different set of lenses that would enable you to read the Bible differently.” Rather, they keep trying to prove from the Scriptures themselves that this Jesus of Nazareth really does fulfill the ancient texts even while they are forced to acknowledge that they themselves did not read the biblical texts this way until after the resurrection, Pentecost, and the gradual increase in understanding that came to them, however mediated by the Spirit, as the result of the expansion of the church, not least in Gentile circles. This tension between what they

insist is actually there in the Scriptures and what they are forced to admit they did not see until fairly late in their experience forces them to think about the concept of “mystery”—revelation that is in some sense “there” in the Scriptures but hidden until the time of God-appointed disclosure.

In other words, the same gospel that is sometimes presented as that which has been prophesied and is now fulfilled is at other times presented as that which has been hidden and is now revealed. This running tension is a lot more common in the NT than might be indicated by the small number—twenty-seven or twenty-eight—of occurrences of the Greek word *mystērion*. Galatians and John, for example, are replete with the theological notion of “mystery” without the word “mystery” being present. Transparently, this complex issue is tightly bound up with the ways in which the NT writers actually quote or allude to the OT—in particular, what they think they are proving or establishing or confirming. Nowhere is there a hint that these writers are trying to diminish the authority of what we now refer to as the OT Scriptures. After a while the alert reader starts stumbling over many instances of this complex phenomenon and tries to synthesize the various pieces. A favorite illustration of some in explaining this phenomenon is the picture of a seed. An apple seed contains everything that will organically grow from it. No examination by the naked eye can distinguish what will grow from the seed, but once the seed has grown into the full apple tree, the eye can then see how the seed has been “fulfilled.” It is something like that with the way OT passages are developed in the NT. There are “organic links” to one degree or another, but those links may not have been clearly discernible to the eye of the OT author or reader. Accordingly, there is sometimes a creative development or extension of the meaning of the OT text that is still in some way anchored to that text. But it would take another sort of book to gather all the exegetical evidence gathered in this commentary and whip it into the kind of biblical-theological shape that might address these sorts of questions more acutely.

Fifth, contributors have been encouraged to deploy an eclectic grammatical-historical literary method in their attempts to relate the NT’s reading of the OT. But it would not be amiss

Introduction

to point out (1) that such an approach is fairly “traditional” or “classical”; (2) that such an approach overlaps substantially with some recent postcritical methods that tend to read OT books as whole literary units and that take seriously such concepts as canon, Scripture, and salvation history (concepts that would not be entirely alien to the authors of the NT), though it allows for more extratextual referentiality than do most

postcritical methods; and (3) that we sometimes need reminding that the NT authors would not have understood the OT in terms of any of the dominant historical-critical orthodoxies of the last century and a half.

Without further reflection, then, we devote this commentary to the study of the NT text as it quotes and alludes to the OT text.

ACTS

I. HOWARD MARSHALL

Introduction

“The influence, whether literary or theological, of the Old Testament upon the Lucan writings . . . is profound and pervasive” (Barrett 1988: 231). This is a verdict that probably nobody could dispute. An analytical count of the instances of the use of the OT in Acts is impossible because of the variety of types of usage and the difficulty of assigning uses to specific categories. However, we can gain some idea of the scale of the usage in Acts by observing that Steyn (1995: 26–31) lists twenty-five explicit quotations identified by the use of introductory formulas (actually twenty-seven, since two of these instances each cite two OT passages) and nine uses of direct phrases not introduced by formulas (cf. Longenecker 1999: 69–71). Alongside these there are a large number of uses of scriptural language, allusions, and uses of scriptural motifs.

Nevertheless, the relative distribution of the scriptural material in Acts is somewhat surprising. Formal citations are spread rather unevenly through the book, mainly in the first half. The texts that can be clearly identified as formal citations occur in chapters 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 13, 15, 23, 28; there are none in chapters 5, 6, 9–12, 14, 16–22, 24–27. The so-called speeches are naturally the main location for scriptural material in Acts, and all the quotations introduced by for-

mulas occur in speeches addressed to Jewish (or Jewish-Christian) audiences (Steyn 1995: 230); contrast the lack of direct citation in the speeches in Lystra and Athens. Allusions are found much more widely (but are still sparse in the second half of Acts), and they are not confined to the speeches; the narrator can also use Scripture and is influenced by its wording (e.g., the Elijah/Elisha reminiscences in 1:1–11). The scriptural references are thus concentrated in the first half of the book in preaching and defensive speeches to Jews and proselytes, but they are surprisingly absent from Paul’s defense speeches in the second half of Acts, even when these are directed to a predominantly Jewish audience.

As with the rest of the NT, the use of the OT in Acts has been the subject of extensive investigation in recent scholarship. Detailed listings and texts of the scriptural sources for citations employed by Luke are given in Archer and Chirichigno 1983. The textual sources used by Luke have been investigated at length in Clarke 1922; Holtz 1968. Introductory surveys of Luke’s usage can be found in Barrett 1988; Fitzmyer 1998; Hanson 1983: 78–89; Longenecker 1999: 63–87; Moyise 2001: 45–62; Schneider 1980–1982: 1:232–38. The history of scholarship is surveyed in Bovon 2006: 87–121, 525–31; Steyn 1995: 1–21. Particular attention has been focused on the OT background

to the Christology developed in Acts (Bock 1987; Rese 1969; Strauss 1995), but attention has begun to be directed also to the background to the ecclesiology (Dupont 1979, 1985; Pao 2000). Numerous studies examine specific passages and themes, including several significant contributions by Dupont. The most detailed recent study, but confined to the formal citations in the speeches of Peter and Paul, is Steyn 1995.

Luke's Perspective

We are fortunate that Luke has given us some insight into his approach. Two significant passages occur at the end of his Gospel. Jesus himself is represented as saying to the travelers to Emmaus,

How foolish you are, and how slow of heart to believe everything that the prophets have said! Did not the Christ have to suffer these things and then enter his glory? (Luke 24:25–26)

Then Luke relates that

beginning from Moses and all the prophets, he explained to them the things in all the Scriptures concerning himself. (Luke 24:27)

In the second passage we are told that Jesus

opened their minds so that they could understand the Scriptures. He told them, “Thus it is written: The Christ will suffer and rise from the dead on the third day, and repentance leading to the forgiveness of sins will be preached in his name to all nations, beginning from Jerusalem. You are witnesses of these things.” (Luke 24:45–48)

The effect of these two passages is to show that for Luke, the events in question were prescribed in Scripture and therefore necessarily had to take place, and that these events included not only the suffering and glorification of Jesus, but also the preaching to all nations. Luke’s agenda in Acts picks up these two stages in the divine program. He frequently draws attention to the conformity of the career of Jesus to Scripture and also to the way in which the preaching of the gospel to all nations—and the consequent creation of a church composed of believing Jews and Gentiles—was what God had foretold and foreordained. The use of Scripture in Acts tends to revolve round these two related foci.

In both cases the use of Scripture has what we may call a broadly apologetic or forensic function. The argument is directed largely toward Jews, and it rests on what could be taken as common ground: the Scriptures accepted both by Jews (who did not yet accept Jesus as the Christ) and by Christians (whether believing Jews or Gentiles). The use made of Scripture elsewhere in the NT confirms Luke’s picture of a constituency of Gentile Christians, many of whom had attended the synagogue (whether as proselytes or God-fearers), and others of whom had quickly accepted the Jewish Scriptures as their Scriptures. Both the identity of Jesus as the Christ and the admission of Gentiles to the people of God were contested issues, and the appeal to Scripture was central to the church’s apologetic and evangelism and also to the establishment and confirmation of its own identity. In Acts there are general references to such an appeal in 17:2–3, 11; 18:28; 28:23, and Paul’s activity in 9:22; 18:5 may be presumed to be the same. It is by appeal to the scriptural teaching about the Christ and then by showing that Jesus fits the picture that the conclusion can be drawn that he is the Christ (Albl 1999: 200–201).

At the same time, the appeal to Scripture serves to explain the significance of what is going on in Luke’s story. It shows how the events are to be understood as the continuing work of God in accordance with his promises in Scripture and thus form part of the unfinished story of his judgments and saving acts. The use of Scripture thus also has what has been termed a “hermeneutical” or, better, “explanatory” function.

Luke's Sources and Methods

The questions of where Luke got his scriptural materials and how he used them can be posed at more than one level.

The upper level is concerned with whether the use of Scripture in Acts is essentially the work of Luke himself as a creative writer or of the historical characters whose words he reports. Most of the scriptural material occurs in the speeches attributed to the various principal actors, and it is common to attribute their composition to Luke himself with little if any source material on which to base them (e.g., Barrett 1994–98; Soards 1994). Other scholars attribute a greater role to possible sources, whether these were accounts of actual

speeches given on the occasions described or were traditions of the kind of theology and preaching characteristic of the early missionaries (e.g., Bruce 1990; Larkin 1995; Witherington 1998).

The lower level is concerned with where Luke himself or his sources found the material that was used. Were the scriptural texts that were used taken from the Hebrew or the Greek texts of the OT (or possibly from other versions of the text, such as the version of the Pentateuch used by the Samaritan community)? And was there direct access to the texts or indirect access through such means as collections of *testimonia*? If versions of the Scriptures were directly used, were these reproduced from texts available to the writer (or the preacher), or were people reliant on memory?

But the question at this level is not simply about access to texts. There is, we may say, a tradition of how to understand and use the Scriptures from a Christian point of view. Where and when did this develop? No doubt it developed over time, but how much of it is due to Luke's own creativity, and how much is due to the scriptural activity of the early church? For example, is Peter's command of Scripture in Acts 1–2 credible within fifty days of the resurrection of Jesus?

Sources and Redaction

The question of sources (or tradition) and redaction (or creativity) is a tangled one. At one end of the spectrum we have the view that the account in Acts is fundamentally historical in the sense that it records events and teaching more or less exactly as things happened; the speeches in some cases may be abbreviated, but Luke is recording what Peter and the others said on the specific occasions that are described: "There is still no impediment to taking the speeches as containing in verbatim, précis or summary form the substance of what was said on the occasions cited" (Larkin 1995: 22–23). For upholders of this position, it is to be presumed that Luke got his information directly from people who were present at the time. At the opposite end of the spectrum we have the proposal that Luke is essentially a writer of fiction with very little regard for what actually happened, and it can be assumed that the speech material in particular is his own creation (Pervo 1987).

In between those views we find a variety of positions. Barrett, working as a critical historian

who submits the material to a rigorous analysis, concludes that Luke was not always well or fully informed on what happened and did the best that he could with the available sources; the speeches are basically his own work. So with respect to Acts 2 he comments, "No one will maintain that this speech contains the very words used by Peter on a specific occasion in the life of the earliest church" (Barrett 1994–1998: 131) (nevertheless, Barrett [1994–1998: 334–40] does hold that there is a "Hellenist" sermon behind Acts 7, although this is not the same thing as saying that the actual defense of Stephen was the basis).

Others would emphasize more strongly that Luke was well informed for the most part, and that the speeches rest on a combination of early Christian traditions of the apostolic message and his own desire to express "the sentiments proper to the occasion, expressed as I [the speaker] thought would be likely to express them, while at the same time I endeavoured, as nearly as I could, to give the general purport of what was actually said"; these are the words not of Luke, but of the classical Greek historian Thucydides (1.22.1), with whom he has sometimes been compared (Bruce 1990: 34–40). Whether Thucydides actually followed the policy that he delineated here is, to be sure, a matter of debate.

The evidence is equivocal. With regard to the use of Scripture, the strongest argument for assigning Luke the major role in the composition is the fact that the material exhibits a considerable unity in that the same texts are cited or alluded to in more than one speech or by more than one speaker, and it is arguable that this harmony reflects the mind of a single author. The well-founded proposal that an Isaianic "new exodus" motif runs throughout Acts (see below) speaks for authorial shaping rather than piecemeal development by different Christians. The picture of Abraham found in various different speeches is a unified one (Dahl 1968). In some cases it is arguable that the complexity of the use of the OT appears to reflect careful thought and perhaps a lengthy development rather than the off-the-cuff remarks of a person suddenly summoned to address an occasion (Peter's speeches are presented as though they were unrehearsed, ad hoc treatments). In one or two cases it is claimed that the point being made must depend upon the use of

a Greek version and could not have been made on the basis of the Hebrew MT (this point is made time and again with regard to James's use of Amos in Acts 15). There is some evidence for the use of *testimonia*, and if these were Christian compilations, they presumably took some time to be developed.

On the other side, stress must be placed on the fact that much of the material is not peculiar to Luke himself, but represents tendencies found elsewhere in early Christianity. There is material in common with Paul. The Isaianic motifs are shared with Mark and Paul. Although it must be admitted that the LXX on occasion is particularly congenial to the points being made, nevertheless in many cases the MT would still provide adequate support, and in other cases we certainly cannot rule out the use of a Greek version, particularly in a Hellenistic Jewish setting. In a number of cases it will be noted that Luke does not seem to recognize or draw out the implications in the texts that he cites, and this may mean that the material was originally framed by another hand.

In my opinion, the balance of probabilities tends to favor the kind of position proposed by Bruce (see Marshall 1980: 39–42; see further Witherington 1998: 46–49, 116–20). Justice must be done in recognizing both the use of source material by Luke and his own authorial shaping of the material, in which inevitably there is something of himself.

The Biblical Texts

Within Acts the main source for scriptural citation is the LXX rather than direct recourse to the Hebrew text. Following the research of Holtz, there is a consensus that the form of text used by Luke was close to that preserved for us in Codex Alexandrinus (A). Luke's variation from A is greatest in Psalms and to a lesser extent in the Pentateuch. Witherington (1998: 123–24, following Fitzmyer 1998: 304–6) identifies seven citations agreeing verbatim with the LXX, some fourteen in close agreement with the LXX, and two where there is little agreement with the LXX. The evidence suggests that Luke did not use the MT but on occasion may have used a Greek version other than the LXX or cited loosely from memory. Occasionally there are details that rest on extrabiblical sources (e.g., 13:21), and occa-

sionally Luke makes inferences from the text (e.g., 13:20). In a number of cases the citations are said to show an affinity to the Hebrew texts in the Dead Sea Scrolls (de Waard 1965: 78). What has been observed in the case of Acts is confirmed by the results of an examination of Luke's Gospel.

In any case, the citations from the LXX show numerous changes in wording. Holtz has claimed that where Luke is faithful to the LXX, this is evidence of his own activity, but where there are divergences, this indicates that he was using traditions; the weakness of this thesis and the failure to consider other explanations are explored by Bovon (2006: 110–14). Many of the divergences from the LXX are the result of working the citations into new syntactical contexts, but others entail modifications of content to bring out the significance that Luke saw in them. Rese (1969: 211–16) argues that Holtz has underestimated the extent and significance of these changes, but according to Bovon (2006: 116–17), Rese tends to exaggerate in the opposite direction.

Problems arise, as we have noted, where scholars have argued that a point made by Luke depends upon use of the LXX rather than the MT, especially where the LXX is probably to be deemed secondary to the MT in its wording. In some cases, it is argued, Luke is quoting speakers who probably were speaking Aramaic rather than Greek and are very unlikely to have based their arguments on a Greek translation of the Scriptures (this is frequently said about the speech attributed to James in 15:15–18, where, it is claimed, the point being made depends upon the Greek version, which [it is assumed] James himself would not have been using; however, see commentary on this passage below). Such cases will be noted as we proceed; at least in some examples it is arguable that essentially the same points could be established on the basis of the MT.

Controversy also surrounds the possible influence of the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Samaritan community had its own version of the Pentateuch, with a text that differs in points from the MT. Some scholars have argued for the influence of Samaritan theology and the Samaritan Pentateuch on Acts, specifically in Stephen's speech (Scharlemann 1968: 36–51; see the cautious discussion in Wilcox 1965). Opinion has continued to harden against this hypothesis that would include the use

of this text of the Pentateuch (in addition to the references in Marshall 1980: 133n2, see Coggins 1982; Schneider 1980–1982: 1:448–50). Equally difficult to assess is whether Luke or his sources show any affinities to the Targumim (see Wilcox 1965 and the detailed critique in Emerton 1968).

From all this it is clear that for the most part Luke has followed the LXX, making appropriate changes to accommodate the material in his narrative and to bring out its significance more clearly, but also that there is some evidence of use of other textual traditions, whether by Luke himself or by the sources that he is using.*

Luke's "Canon"

Certain books are used more than others, particularly so far as the citations are concerned: Psalms (10x) and to a much lesser extent Exodus (5x), Isaiah (3x), and the Minor Prophets (4x). There are no citations from the Historical Books, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the Writings (other than Psalms; hence the limitation in Luke 24:44 to “the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms” [not the Writings] is strictly correct). This fact led Holtz to the view that Luke had a limited collection of books at his disposal and was ignorant of some that he might have used. Holtz argued that Luke had access only to the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, and Psalms; he himself did not know the Pentateuch, although he could have taken over citations from his sources. In view of the virtual canonization of the OT as we know it by this time, this hypothesis was never a very likely one, and it is based on explicit citations without taking into account the wider field of allusions or echoes of Scripture and the usage in Luke’s Gospel (see Steyn 1995: 230; Albl 1999: 190–91). For example, the full significance of Isaiah for Acts (formally cited just three times) emerges only when allusions and motifs are taken into account. There are also the passages where Luke refers generally to the Scriptures without specifying which passages he may have had in mind, leaving us the puzzle of trying to identify them (Acts 3:18, 24; 17:2, 11; 18:24,

*Decisions are sometimes difficult to reach because of the textual variants in both the LXX and Acts. Scribes often assimilated the texts of sources and citations to one another. No attempt has been made in the commentary to record minor variants, which in any case seldom affect the sense.

28 [see also commentary on Acts 1:16 below]). In some places it has been suspected that a text may have influenced the composition, although it is not in Acts as we have it. See commentary on Acts 10:36 below, where there is a conjecture that Ps. 107:20 was originally in Peter’s speech; similarly, it has been claimed that Luke sometimes abbreviated the citations, presumably because his space was limited (Dupont 1979: 151–52; see further below).

In one or two places we may suspect the presence of allusions made by the speakers in the narrative that Luke himself may not have observed (see commentary on Acts 2:32–33 below, where this may be the case, especially since the allusion is not based on the LXX; the typological possibilities in Stephen’s speech in Acts 7 likewise do not seem to have been significant for Luke himself).

In any case, the wording and the formulation of the speeches strongly reflect the compositional skills of Luke himself, so that what he wrote was what he himself would have said in similar circumstances. Albl’s work would imply that Luke (or his sources) may have taken some OT material not directly from the LXX but had access to it indirectly through collections of *testimonia*; this perhaps would cohere with Holtz’s view that Luke used a limited set of OT books, but the latter does not stand or fall simply by this consideration.

An important fact confirmed by this analysis is that Jesus’ statement that the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings bear witness to him is substantiated by the evidence of Acts. Pao (2000) has indicated how Isaiah in particular has shaped the understanding of the early Christian movement in Acts; but alongside Isaiah, we should also note how much has been contributed by Psalms.

Testimonia

Early in the twentieth century the hypothesis of a collection (or collections) of scriptural texts (*testimonia*) that were used by early Christians was popular, particularly with British NT scholars, of whom the best-known is perhaps J. R. Harris. The theory could appeal to material in the early church, but first-century evidence was lacking. The theory apparently was laid to rest by C. H. Dodd (1952), who offered in its place the proposal that early Christians drew their scriptural texts from a set of selected OT passages to which

1:21

“Went in and went out” (cf. 9:28) is a septuagintalism for being active, often used of people in leadership roles (cf. Num. 27:17; Deut. 31:2; Josh. 24:11; 1 Sam. 18:16; 29:6; 2 Kings 19:27; Ps. 121:8 [120:8 LXX]; see Jervell 1998: 126–27).

1:25

Note a parallel in wording between Judas “turned aside from” (*parebē* with *apo*) and the use of the same verb in Deut. 9:16 (cf. 17:20), where the Israelites turned aside from the way that the Lord had commanded them; however, similar wording is found elsewhere (e.g., Exod. 32:8), indicating that we have nothing more than the use of biblical language.

1:26

Compare Prov. 16:33 for a recognition that God works through the casting of lots; there is no direct allusion to the assumption expressed here, although it clearly was the basis of the method chosen here. In any case, the point is made in the MT and not in the rather different rendering in the LXX. The casting of lots was a familiar OT procedure (Lev. 16:8; Num. 26:55), also used at Qumran (1QS V, 3; VI, 16).

Acts 2

In chapter 2, with its accounts of the descent of the Spirit upon the followers of Jesus, of Peter’s speech to the people followed by their response, and of the nascent life of the early church, we have a number of scriptural points to observe. The first is the background to the event in the Feast of Pentecost and then possible models for the disciples’ speaking in tongues. Second, Peter’s speech makes a deliberate appeal to Scripture to show that the events are a fulfillment of prophecy and therefore are to be understood as the consequences of the exaltation of the Messiah, who is to be identified with Jesus. At the same time, the question of an implicit juxtaposition of the giving of the law to Moses and the giving of the Spirit to Jesus arises.

2:1–13**2:1**

The occasion of the coming of the Spirit is the day of Pentecost, otherwise known as the Feast

of Weeks (Exod. 23:16; 34:22; Lev. 23:15–21; Num. 28:26; Deut. 16:9–12). In the OT this feast was simply a celebration of the wheat harvest. By this time, however, the festival was associated with the renewal of the covenant made with Noah and then with Moses (*Jub.* 6:17–18), and in second-century Judaism it was regarded as the day when the law was given at Sinai.

2:2

The association of the coming of the Spirit with a noise like a powerful wind and with tongues like fire is no doubt to be understood primarily in the light of the prophecy by John the Baptist (Luke 3:16), but at a secondary level the imagery used is reminiscent of the descriptions of theophanies in the OT. God’s coming is associated with mighty storms consisting of wind, thunder, and lightning (2 Sam. 22:16; Ps. 18:7–15; Ezek. 13:13). Denova (1997: 170) draws attention to the saving winds in Exod. 14:21; Num. 11:31, but these are more instrumental than revelatory. Fire accompanied the theophany at Sinai itself (Exod. 19:18). Johnson (1992: 46) argues for a Moses typology and holds that there is a deliberate allusion to the Sinai event. However, the imagery of “tongues” of fire is not found here in the OT (though cf. Isa. 5:24; 30:27–30; Beale 2005a: 84–87). The descent of the Spirit on the people and their consequent speech has a model in Num. 11:25, where the Lord came down in a cloud and took some of the Spirit that was on Moses and put it on seventy of the elders of Israel, causing them to prophesy. The common points are the reception of the Spirit and the subsequent verbal activity (“prophecy” is a term broad enough to include speaking in tongues). Whether Luke’s readers were meant to make the association is not clear, since there are no clear verbal echoes. But the passage does go on to express the longing that all of the Lord’s people would be prophets (Num. 11:29); it was understood in later Judaism as having an eschatological fulfillment and was linked with Joel, which was understood as its specific fulfillment (*Midr. Ps.* 14:6, cited in Evans 1993b: 187). “Filling” with the Spirit is mentioned with respect to Elisha in Sir. 48:12.

Another possible link is with Isa. 28:1–15, where there is an attack on priests and prophets who are intoxicated with wine and a prophecy that God will speak to his people with foreign lips and

strange tongues (Betz 1968, cited in Evans 1993c: 215n8; Jervell 1998: 134–35). There is a citation from this passage in Paul’s discussion of tongues in 1 Cor. 14:21 (Isa. 28:11), and the immediately following text about the precious cornerstone (Isa. 28:16) was also used by the early church. The verbal coincidences are noteworthy, but the thrust of the two passages is quite different.

2:5

The phrase “every nation under heaven” is paralleled in Deut. 2:25; 4:19. It is simply an example of biblical language. Similarly, “listen carefully” (*enōtizomai* [2:14]) uses a familiar LXX word for summoning the attention of the hearers (cf. Joel 1:2, perhaps an echo in light of the ensuing citation of Joel in Peter’s sermon to the crowd; see Evans 1993c: 216n11).

2:9–11

More than one sermon has been preached on the multiplication of mutually unintelligible languages at Babel (Gen. 11:1–9) being undone at Pentecost, but there is no hard evidence in the text for seeing this interpretative nuance in Luke’s story; the possibility of a verbal link in the use of the verb *syncheō* (2:6; cf. Gen. 11:7–9) is explored favorably by Barrett (1994–1998: 119): the crowd at Babel was confused by the multiplicity of languages, while the Pentecost crowd was confused by hearing their own languages. Nevertheless, the evidence is not strong. Even so, this may be a good example of how modern readers may helpfully read two narratives in the light of each other, even though there are no deliberate links from the later to the earlier.

The list of nations is unusual. It certainly is not derived from the OT, but it does stand in a line of “tables of the nations” exemplified in the OT (Gen. 10; 1 Chron. 1:1–2:2; cf. *Jub.* 8–9; 1QM II, 10–14; Josephus, *Ant.* 1.120–147; see Scott 1994: 527–30). P. S. Alexander (1992: 983) holds that the list here, though brief and selective, can be seen as an allusion to Gen. 10 if it is right to see in the Pentecost story a reversal of the confusion of languages reported in Gen. 11. Denova (1997: 173) and Pao (2000: 131) draw attention to Isa. 11:11, where the scattered exiles of Israel are to be brought home.

2:14–36

Peter’s sermon begins with a text that not only very conveniently provides the scriptural explanation of the strange behavior of the believers, but also offers a golden opportunity to develop the theme of Jesus Christ thanks to its linking of the outpouring of the Spirit with the theme of salvation for those who call on the name of the Lord. The sermon thus becomes essentially an explanation of who this “Lord” is. Having noted that Jesus was attested by God through mighty works (echoing Joel 2:30, cited in v. 19), and having mitigated the opposing impression given by his death by insisting that it fell within the plan of God, Peter describes how God raised Jesus from the dead because he could not be held by it. What happened is interpreted by reference to Ps. 16 which, it is argued, cannot apply to David himself because he died (and did not rise); but God had promised a future ruler as a descendant of David (Ps. 132), and so Ps. 16 applies to this ruler. Now Jesus had been raised from the dead, and the Spirit had been poured out by him. It follows that he has been exalted to God’s right hand, as prophesied in another psalm (Ps. 110), which again could not be applied to David himself. It follows also that Jesus is now the Lord who grants salvation to all who call upon him.

The argument from Scripture is not easy to follow. It demonstrates examples of so-called midrashic exegesis, with its catena of scriptural citations and allusions, the repetition of words from the citations in the accompanying exposition, and the use of changes in wording to bring out the significance the more clearly (e.g., 2:17, 30).

Bowker (1967–1968: 104–6) argues that this speech is “certainly” a proem homily with Joel 2:32 as the bridge text, Deut. 29:1–21 as the seder (reading from the Torah), and Isa. 63:9–19 as the haftarah (reading from the Prophets). The opening scriptural text is clear enough. Bowker finds allusions to Deut. 29 in 2:36 (call to all Israel to enter into the covenant [Deut. 29:10–11]) and in 2:39 (the covenant is with those present and absent [the unborn?] [Deut. 29:14]). The haftarah is identified on the grounds of linguistic parallels between Isa. 63:19 and Joel 2:32, and the use of “name” in 2:38 and Isa. 63:12 (not 63:13 [*pace* Bowker]), 16.

However, this explanation is less than convincing. One would expect the underlying texts to play some important role in a sermon that supposedly is based upon them, but there is not the faintest evidence that Isa. 63 in any way influenced the content of the sermon; at best it has some weak coincidences with Joel 2, which clearly is the decisive basis for the sermon. And equally there is no linguistic evidence that Deut. 29 has influenced the exposition. One might almost want to say that Peter had gone out of his way to disguise his sources!

2:17–21

Peter explains the events that have just been witnessed by the crowds by seeing in them the fulfillment of the prophecy in Joel 2:28–32 (3:1–5 LXX). The context of the prophecy is Joel's summons to the people to true repentance after they have been subjected to an invasion of locusts, a harbinger of worse things to come on "the day of the Lord." Yet the Lord promises to take pity on his people and to restore the land to its former prosperity. Then comes the prophecy of the outpouring of the Spirit as part of the events preceding the coming of the day of judgment. In the prophecy the coming of the Spirit is only a part of the event; it is accompanied by wonders in the sky and on the earth. And there will be the opportunity of deliverance for all who call on the name of the Lord before the judgment falls upon them. The judgment will be upon the nations that have oppressed God's people, whereas Israel will be saved. Within this set of events the outpouring of the Spirit will be upon "all people," and the effect will be that they will prophesy and see visions. The significance of this in its context is not immediately clear. The inspiration of prophets was a sign of the presence of the Spirit and thus of God's activity and presence with his people; visions were associated with prophecy, and here dreams are also included as the working of the Spirit.

The citation of the prophecy thus serves initially to explain the phenomenon of Spirit-possession and speaking in tongues, but the passage moves on to announce the closely related proclamation of salvation for those who call upon the Lord. This second theme becomes in fact the dominant one in Peter's speech with his identification of the risen and exalted Jesus as the Lord and Messiah through whom salvation is offered to his audi-

ence. Evans (1993c: 218–20) further notes how the prophecy foreshadows what happens later in Acts: the offer of salvation to all people (including Gentiles) and the consequent pouring out of the Spirit on all people (i.e., all who respond to the gospel), the performance of signs and wonders, the prophetic activity of women (21:9), and the experiencing of visions and dreams. Here and elsewhere in Acts "the prophetic Scripture is lived out in the experience of the believing community" (Evans 1993c: 221).

Rese's (1969: 46–55, 104) understanding of the citation as explaining what was happening by reference to Scripture and not in terms of fulfillment of a scriptural prediction is difficult to justify. When a passage of Scripture is explicitly in the future tense, announcing what God will do in the future, it is hard to understand the explanation of a contemporary event in terms of the passage as not conveying the implication that in this way a prophecy that was waiting to be fulfilled has now found its fulfillment (Bock 1987: 156–69).

2:17

The introduction to the citation "This is what was spoken by the prophet Joel" has been compared to the formula "Its interpretation refers to . . ." found in the pesharim in the Dead Sea Scrolls. But the formulations are quite different from each other, although their functions are similar: the goal is to identify some current event with something described in a prophecy. There is a dialectic here. On the one hand, the significance of a hitherto obscure prophecy (what is the prophet referring to?) is explained by seeing it fulfilled in a particular event. On the other hand, the significance of an event (what exactly is happening?) is illuminated by seeing it as the fulfillment of a prophecy. Thus the prophecy and the event shed light on one another. The assumption is that the correspondence between the scriptural description and the event will be self-evident or can be demonstrated fairly easily. Thus in the present case, if one rules out one possible explanation of the behavior of the disciples—drunkenness—by the reasonable argument that people normally do not become inebriated at that time of day, then the strange talk and exuberance can be seen to broadly match the description of prophecy in Joel; one would need to remember that in some cases prophecy

involved people acting in strange and even bizarre ways (1 Sam. 10:5–6, 10–13; 19:20–24).

As is common when a citation is made, some of the wording is repeated in the surrounding material. Evans (1993c: 216–17) claims that some twenty words in Luke’s narrative and the opening words of Peter’s speech occur in Joel (whether in the passage cited or elsewhere in the prophecy). Some of these may be coincidental, but others may be significant. Note the use of “pour out” (2:17, 33) and “Lord” (2:21, 36).

Luke’s wording in the citation is very close to the LXX, but there are a number of changes that Bock (1987: 156–87) and Turner (1996: 268–69) regard as pre-Lukan. Steyn (1995: 74–90) argues that a citation of such length probably was taken from a written text that differed in minor details from the LXX as we know it today and that Luke’s changes tend to be theological rather than stylistic.

**Joel 3:1–5 LXX [3:1–5 MT;
2:28–32 ET]**

^{3:1} *kai estai meta tauta kai*

*ekcheō apo tou pneumatos mou
epi pasan sarka,
kai prophēteusousin hoi huioi
hymōn
kai hai thygateres hymōn,*

*kai hoi presbyteroi hymōn
enygnia enygniasthēsontai
kai hoi neaniskoi hymōn
horaseis opsontai;*

^{3:2} *kai epi tous doulous
kai epi tas doulas
en tais hēmerais ekeinais
ekcheō apo tou pneumatos mou.*

^{3:3} *kai dōsō terata en tō ouranō*

*kai epi tēs gēs
haima kai pyr kai atmida kapnou;
^{3:4} ho hēlios metastraphēsetai eis
skotos
kai hē selēnē eis haima
prin elthein hēmeran kyriou
tēn megalēn kai epiphanē.*

^{3:5} *kai estai pas hos an epikalēsētai
to onoma kyriou sōthēsetai;
hoti en tō orei Siōn kai en Ierusalēm
estai anasōzomenos kathoti eipen
kyrios*

Acts 2:17–21

^{2:17} *kai estai en tais eschatais
hēmerais,
legei ho theos,*

*ekcheō apo tou pneumatos mou
epi pasan sarka,
kai prophēteusousin hoi huioi
hymōn
kai hai thygateres hymōn
kai hoi neaniskoi hymōn
horaseis opsontai
kai hoi presbyteroi hymōn
enygniois enygniasthēsontai;*

^{2:18} *kai ge epi tous doulous mou
kai epi tas doulas mou
en tais hēmerais ekeinais
ekcheō apo tou pneumatos mou,
kai prophēteusousin.*

^{2:19} *kai dōsō terata en tō ouranō
anō
kai sēmeia epi tēs gēs katō,
haima kai pyr kai atmida kapnou.
^{2:20} ho hēlios metastraphēsetai eis
skotos
kai hē selēnē eis haima,
prin elthein hēmeran kyriou
tēn megalēn kai epiphanē.*

^{2:21} *kai estai pas hos an epikalēsētai
to onoma kyriou sōthēsetai.*

**Joel 3:1–5 LXX [3:1–5 MT;
2:28–32 ET]**

*kai euangelizomenoi hous kyrios
proskēkētai.*

Acts 2:17–21

A major alteration is the replacement of the LXX’s “afterwards” (*meta tauta*) with the phrase “in the last days” (*en tais eschatais hēmerais* [cf. Isa. 2:2]) in all manuscripts except B 076 (C pc) sa^{mss}. It is easier to explain the reading of the minority of manuscripts as assimilation to the text of Joel (Bock 1987: 160–61; Metzger 1994: 256) than to account for a change from the original text of Acts by later scribes (Haenchen 1971: 179; Holtz 1968: 7–8; Rese 1969: 51–52). Haenchen holds that Luke did not think that the last days were inaugurated by the time of Pentecost and therefore would not have made the replacement. This, however, is a dubious understanding of Lukan theology, and in any case it is arguable that both versions of the text have reference to the last days before the coming of the day of the Lord. Probably the intention of the change is to emphasize that the events of Pentecost do belong to the activity of God in the last days: a new age has arrived.

The insertion of “God says” (*legei ho theos*) conforms to typical prophetic style (cf. 7:6; see Rese 1969: 48–49). Turner (1996: 277–78) notes how it strengthens the contrast between God pouring out the Spirit and the Messiah doing so, thus emphasizing the significant position of the latter in taking over the divine function.

The order of the clauses about the young men and the old men is inverted compared with Joel. Luke inserts “my” with male and female slaves, emphasizing their role as God’s agents rather than their social status. The effect is that the terms referring to literal slaves in Joel are now understood as a general description of God’s servants (Holtz 1968: 10). At the end of 2:18 Luke inserts “and they will prophesy”; this repetition of the words from 2:17 makes the effect of the Spirit on the Lord’s servants crystal clear. For Turner (1996: 270), this reinforces the presentation of the Spirit in Luke-Acts as the Spirit of prophecy.

2:18

Luke has *kai ge*, a reinforced form of Joel’s *kai* (“and”), which raises the question of whether he was familiar with a trend to translate Hebrew *wēgam* with *kai ge* and even with a hypothesized *kai ge* recension of the LXX (on this technical

problem, see Jobes and Silva 2000: 171–73, 284–87).

2:19–20

The contrast of “above” and “below” and the addition of “signs” is Lukan. The last part of the passage (Joel 2:32b [3:5b LXX]) is not included, but it is partly cited in 2:39 (see commentary on Acts 2:39 below).

These changes exemplify the practice of Luke and other NT authors in formal citations. They feel quite free to make minor alterations that bring out the significance of the original more fully, or are purely stylistic, or are necessitated by the new context (whether in content or style).

The citation of the prophecy, then, has the effect of showing that what is happening is a fulfillment of prophecy and of explaining its character in the light of this divinely inspired commentary.

First, it was clear to the NT authors that a great deal of prophecy previously had gone unfulfilled or was only partially fulfilled, but now they recognized events taking place that were its fulfillment. It may well be that in many cases this was regarded as a simple matter for observation: once you compared the prophetic forecast with the actual event, the correspondences were obvious. At the same time, they probably believed that they were inspired by the Spirit to declare authoritatively, “This is what was spoken by the prophet” (2:16).

Second, the result of the identification was to see the true nature of the event. The fact of a large group of people (2:4 should almost certainly be taken to mean that the 120 rather than just the twelve were affected) praising God in different languages, evidently under some constraint to do so, provided an example of what the OT can broadly describe as “prophecy.”

We should not expect a word-for-word fulfillment of every detail in the description. There will be dreams and visions later in Acts, but not necessarily confined to young and old respectively—early Christians could recognize poetry when they saw it! The reference to “women” chimes in with 1:14. Moessner (1998: 218–19) notes how the prophecy is fulfilled in the course of Acts.

But what about 2:19–20? Luke’s addition of “signs” is doubtless fulfilled in the healing and other miracles in Acts. “Wonders in the heaven above,” more closely defined as “blood and fire

and billows of smoke,” are more puzzling; the next two clauses about the sun and the moon are a still closer definition. The language is that associated with theophany, especially with the judgment on the day of the Lord, and therefore precursors of that day probably are meant. It may well be that Peter quoted these verses simply because he had to use the last verse in the passage and did not feel that he could leave anything out. So 2:19–20 may be future from Peter’s (and Luke’s, and our) point of view; a readership familiar with Luke 21:25–28 would have had no difficulty making the leap. It is true that in 2:22 “miracles, wonders, and signs” were done by Jesus, but these hardly fit “wonders in the heaven above.” Mention should be made of the hypothesis that the moon assumes a dull red color at the time of eclipse, and there was an eclipse visible in Jerusalem at Passover in AD 33, which is taken to be the year of the crucifixion (Humphreys and Waddington 1992). However, many scholars think that the crucifixion is more plausibly dated to AD 30, and the portents are more plausibly understood as direct precursors of the day of judgment.

A further point, however, is that the theophanic language is particularly associated with the description of the original giving of the law at Sinai, both in the OT and in later Jewish sources, including Philo, *Decalogue* 46 (see texts in Turner 1996: 283–84). So, although nothing is said at this juncture to point to a parallel with Sinai, and in fact the citation is from Joel with its future reference, there could be an implied secondary reference to what happened at Sinai, with the implication that God is now doing something similar but significantly different. The phenomena that accompanied the giving of the law now accompany the coming of the Spirit in the last days (Turner 1996: 279–89). Signs and wonders are especially associated with Moses and the exodus (Johnson 1992: 49–50). If so, this would be an example of OT language being used in a way that is evocative of another event when it is read in a wider context that recalls that event.

2:21

The final verse of the quotation was originally simply an offer of deliverance from the impending judgment. It retained this sense for Peter, but the reference to being “saved” broadened out in the early church to include all the present blessings ex-

perienced by those who were convinced that they would also be delivered from the final judgment and enter into the presence of God. From this passage developed the use of “call on” (*epikaleō*) as a term for seeking salvation; the same citation is made in Rom. 10:13, and the verb is found in Acts 9:14; 22:16; 1 Cor. 1:2; 2 Tim. 2:22; 1 Pet. 1:17. Interestingly, God “calls” (*kaleō*) people to salvation (e.g., Rom. 8:30), and people “call on” him to be saved. The full phrase used here, however, is “call on the name of the Lord” (cf. 9:14; 22:16; Rom. 10:13; 1 Cor. 1:2), which seems to be a Hebrew idiom that stresses the fact that this is not an unknown god, but rather the God whose character and reputation are known. In Joel (as elsewhere in the OT) “the Lord” is Yahweh. By 2:36, Peter has claimed that God has conferred the title “Lord” on Jesus (cf. 7:59; Rom. 10:12–14; 1 Cor. 1:2; but in 1 Pet. 1:17 it is the Father who is called upon).

It should not be overlooked that the verse constitutes an invitation and a promise of salvation to anyone who calls on the name of the Lord. Joel presumably was thinking only of Jews and tacitly excluded the Gentile nations (cf. Joel 3:1–2). Reese (1969: 50) and Turner (1996: 270) note that at this point Luke omits Joel 2:32b (3:5b LXX), which centers salvation on Jerusalem, although he cites the last few words in 2:39; Dupont (1979: 151) notes the literary skill evidenced in this way and concludes that the speech “is a product of conscious literary activity.” At this stage Peter may have had only Jews (and proselytes) in his sights, but Paul uses the text as a proof-text for the universality of the offer of salvation to Jews and Gentiles (Rom. 10:12–13). “God admits all men to himself without exception . . . since no man is excluded from calling upon God, the gate of salvation is set open to all”—a sentiment that one might be tempted to ascribe to some Arminian theologian, but, no, this is Calvin (1965–1966: 1:62), rightly taking Scripture in its plain sense.

Here it may be convenient to note that the language of the citation also influences the very end of Peter’s sermon (thus creating what is called an *inclusio*, whereby identical or similar material forms the framework for a passage). There, at 2:39, we find that the promise of the gospel is addressed to “all whom the Lord our God will call,” which reflects Joel 3:5b LXX: “For on Mount

Zion and Jerusalem will be one who is saved, as the Lord said, and those who preach good news to those whom the Lord has called.” Doubtless, one could interpret 2:21 in the light of 2:39 to imply a limitation of the opportunity of calling upon the Lord to those whom the Lord has called, but it is sounder to interpret 2:39 in the light of 2:21. Luke has turned Joel’s perfect “has called” (the MT has a present form, “is calling”) into a statement of future intent and generalized it. It is incredible that the sermon could possibly have ended with a limiting statement that would have caused the hearers to ask, “But am I among those whom God is calling?” especially in the light of the first part of 2:39.

But we have gotten ahead of ourselves. Although Peter’s citation has the immediate effect of offering an explanation of the odd behavior of the disciples in terms of the outpouring of the Spirit, it also has the very important function of drawing a link between this event and the offer of salvation to those who call on the name of the Lord (Reese 1969: 52–55). The next stage in Peter’s argument, therefore, will be to identify the Lord as Jesus, or rather, to show that Jesus is the Lord.

2:23

Behind this reference to God’s decreed plan and foreknowledge Allen (1970–1971) has traced the influence of the “decree” (*hōq*) made to David in Ps. 2:7, which is to be understood as a promise of what God will do. Allen argues that the same background lies behind 4:28; 10:42; 17:31, although, if this is the case, there is no evidence that the origin of the concept was in the mind of the author.

2:24–28

Having described the way in which God showed his approval of Jesus by giving him the ability to do mighty works and then deliberately let him be put to death, Peter states that God raised him from the dead. This simple statement (*anestēsen*) is then expanded by the phrase “freeing him from the agony of death”—literally, “by loosening the pangs of death” (*lysas tas ōdinas tou thanatou*). The word “pangs” normally refers literally to the pains of childbirth, which may seem to be a strange metaphor to use of death (even a death as painful as crucifixion), and the choice of verb also is unusual. There is a parallel phrase in Job

39:2 LXX: “Have you counted their months filled with bringing forth [i.e., until the time of gestation is complete], have you loosened their pangs?” The point seems to be that Job is unable to count up the days of gestation for mountain goats and then cause their birth pangs to start or act as midwife and bring their pangs to an end. The nineteenth-century scholar F. Field noted that the verb *lyō* can mean “to bring to an end.” So the metaphor as used by Peter would refer to God bringing the pains of death to an end, but he uses it because out of the death comes a kind of rebirth to life for Jesus. Rese (1969: 105–7) is skeptical of this explanation because in his view there is no evidence for the concept of a birth out of death and for a corresponding interpretation of resurrection.

Luke has used an expression that occurs in the LXX, but without reference to the particular passage where it occurs. He may have been guided to it by the use of *ōdines* in Ps. 17:5–6 LXX (18:4–5 ET [cf. 2 Sam. 22:6]). There the MT has “cords” (cf. NIV, NRSV); an unvocalized Hebrew *ḥbl* could have been read in the LXX as *ḥēbel* (“pang”) instead of as *ḥebel* (“cord, bond” [for this meaning, see 1QH^a XI, 28]). However, there is no need for the explanation given by some scholars that Luke was misled by this confusion, nor do we need the elaboration of this view by Lindars (1961: 39–40), that Ps. 18:4–5 has been reinterpreted in the light of Ps. 16:6 and then misunderstood by Luke. Barrett (1994–1998: 143–44) thinks that Luke followed Ps. 17:6 LXX (or Ps. 114:3 LXX [116:3 ET]), where, despite the use of “pangs,” the verbs are appropriate for “cords,” and this led Luke to use a verb appropriate for “cords.” Hanson (1980: 150–55) argues that Luke used verbs that are more appropriate to cords than to pangs, and this indicates that underlying the Greek is a Semitic source that conceived of Christ being delivered from the realm of death by God. Bock (1987: 171–72) argues for the use of a mixed metaphor, with the elements of pain and distress associated with death encircling the psalmist already present in the MT, and the idea of travail leading to birth not being present. The Greek word *ōdin* has a broader meaning of pain in general (Exod. 15:14; Deut. 2:25; Job 21:17), but the Hebrew *ḥēbel* is used only of travail.

In any case, Jesus could not be held captive by death for long. Why not? Peter answers by citing what David said about him. Again we have a lengthy quotation, from Ps. 16:8–11 (15:8–11 LXX), following the wording of the LXX precisely but omitting the last line of the psalm (“pleasures at your right hand forever”). But the LXX is not identical with the MT.

MT	LXX/Acts
I have set Yahweh before me continually;	I saw the Lord before me continually;
because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved.	because he is at my right hand, so that I may not be moved.
Therefore my heart was glad, and my glory rejoiced;	Therefore my heart was glad, and my tongue rejoiced;
also my flesh will rest in confidence.	also my flesh will dwell in hope.
For you will not abandon my soul to Sheol,	For you will not abandon my soul to Hades,
you will not give your holy one to see the pit/destruction.	nor will you give your holy one to see corruption.
You will show me the path of life;	You have made known to me paths of life;
there is fullness of joy with your face,	you will fill me with joy with your face,
pleasures at your right hand forever.	pleasures in your right hand forever.

In the MT Ps. 16 (15 LXX) is ascribed to David. It is a prayer for help from God (16:1) that is based upon David’s relationship with God and an affirmation of his commitment to God (16:2–6). This becomes a statement of praise to God and confidence in him (16:7–11), and it is this latter section that is cited here. The psalmist has placed Yahweh before himself; the LXX “I saw” (*proorōmēn*) is an interpretation of the Hebrew “I set.” The implication is that he continually trusts in God and obeys him. With a shift of metaphor, he declares that Yahweh is at *his* right hand, the place where a helper would be (cf. expressions about God giving help with his right hand). (More commonly we hear of sitting at the right hand of Yahweh; the thought of the privileges enjoyed by a person sitting at the right hand of a king is used in 16:11b, but is not in mind at this point.) Consequently, he can be confident that he will not be affected by any opposition. According to the usual interpretation, David here is speaking not in his own person, but rather as the Messiah, who refers to the help that God will give him (throughout his life and not simply in relation to his death [see Pesch 1986: 1:122]). A

different interpretation is offered by Moessner (1998: 223–29), who argues that the “Lord” who is at David’s right hand to help him in his distress is none other than the Messiah. On this view, the citation is of David speaking in his own person (see further commentary on Acts 2:27 below).

Such a person can be glad and rejoice (16:9). Here the MT has “my glory” (*kēbôdî*), a term that can be used for a person’s inner being (cf. Ps. 7:5: “me” [NIV], “my soul” [NRSV]); consequently, the suggestion that originally the very similar “my liver” (*kēbēdî*) may have stood here (cf. Lam. 2:11 MT; and see the LXX) is unnecessary. The NIV here follows the LXX’s “my tongue” (*hē glōssa mou*) without indicating that this differs from the MT. In poetic parallelism David then declares that his body (lit., “flesh”) will rest secure (note the change of tense). The Hebrew *lābetāḥ* is rendered “in hope” (*ep’elpidî*) in the LXX, but both forms may imply trust in Yahweh, who raises the dead (see Rese 1969: 56–57). David will not fear what can happen to him in the future.

By way of explication he adds that God will not abandon his life (*nepes̄*) to Sheol; he will not let his faithful one (i.e., the psalmist) experience corruption (*šāḥat*; this normally means “grave, pit,” but it also can have the abstract sense of “destruction”). Taken in its context, this need be no more than an expression of assurance that Yahweh will preserve him from dying, at least for the time being (the idea of never dying was not entertained). In the LXX “Sheol” is naturally rendered by *hadēs*, and *šāḥat* is rendered by *diaphthora*, “corruption” (Haenchen [1971: 182n1] unnecessarily claimed that the LXX misread Heb. *šāḥat* as *šihēt*). Hence it has been argued that whereas the MT refers only to deliverance from premature death, the LXX envisages deliverance from the corruption that follows death (Barrett 1994–1998: 147, following Benoit). Consequently, an interpretation in terms of resurrection is possible only on the basis of the LXX (and therefore could not have been made by Aramaic-speaking early believers [see Rese 1969: 57–58]). However, it may be fairer to say that this rendering simply made it marginally easier to interpret the psalm as referring to the actual destruction of the human body in the grave (see Bock 1987: 175–76).

Finally, Yahweh will make known to him a path that consists in life (16:11)—that is, fullness of life

and enjoyment (Bock [1987: 176–77] notes that the MT might be expected to mean the kind of life required by God that leads to eternal life). He will experience joy in the presence of Yahweh, and for the person at Yahweh’s right hand there are pleasures forever. (This final clause is not included in the citation in Acts; Rese [1969: 55–56] accounts for this by suggesting that the Holy Spirit is one of the “pleasures,” but it is poured out by Jesus rather than remaining at Yahweh’s right hand!) All of this, then, can be understood to refer to a long life in which the psalmist experiences the goodness of God.

But let us see how the psalm is understood here. Peter starts from the acknowledged facts: (1) David did indeed die; (2) David knew that one of his descendants would be enthroned by God because God had sworn that this would happen (there is a clear verbal allusion to Ps. 132:11–12; cf. 2 Sam. 7:12–16; Ps. 89:3–4, 35–37). The fact that David had prophetic knowledge (Acts 2:30a) presumably applies not to his knowledge about his descendant (2:30b), but rather to his own statement about the Messiah (2:31). Therefore, Ps. 16 seems to be understood as a statement by this descendant that is voiced by David. Since David could not be talking about himself in these verses (because he himself died and suffered corruption), he must have been speaking prophetically in the first person on behalf of somebody else. Following Goppelt (1982: 122–23), Rese (1979: 76) holds that the usage is not so much prophetic (promise and fulfillment) as typological in that in what David says he is stating a pattern that is true in the case of the Messiah (although it was not true of himself); the psalm thus provides the authoritative language for explaining the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus. But is it appropriate to use the term “typological” of a statement that was not true of the “type” himself?

An alternative explanation is that the psalm is being understood of David speaking of himself and saying that the Lord (= the Messiah) is there to help him (2:25); he lives in hope because God will not abandon his soul to death (2:27a) nor let his Holy One (= the Messiah) suffer corruption (2:27b). David suffers in solidarity with the Messiah and rests his hopes on him (Moessner 1998: 226). This attractive proposal faces some problems. There is the question whether

non-Greek-speaking Christians would have interpreted Yahweh as a reference to the Messiah (2:25): would this interpretation be possible only on the basis of the Greek text? And there is the difficulty that Hebrew poetic parallelism would strongly suggest that “my soul” and “your holy one” (2:27) must refer to the same person rather than to David and the Messiah respectively. Certainly by 2:31 it would seem that both parts of the verse are understood to refer to Jesus (as Moessner [1998: 228] agrees).

It is implicit in Peter’s argument that when Jesus was seen by his followers as raised from the dead, it was his actual physical body that had been raised (so that his tomb was left empty) and exempted from physical decay. That is to say, what the psalm said is seen to fit what was known about Jesus by actual observation: he came alive after dying, and his body evidently had not decayed.

For what purpose has Peter used this psalm? One result is to explain why it was impossible for Jesus to be held prisoner by death. Jesus had the promise of God that he would not let his faithful one decay in the grave. But the other result, and the more significant one, is to claim that if what happened to Jesus fits what David prophesied in the psalm, then Jesus must be the Messiah. Dupont (1979: 109) expresses the point precisely:

It is often asserted that Peter desires to prove that Jesus has really risen from the dead, but that is obviously inaccurate, for Peter presupposes the resurrection as a datum of faith. What Peter wishes to establish is rather the fact that Jesus, having really risen from the dead, is truly the Messiah of which the psalm speaks. . . . The resurrection owes its value as a sign precisely to the oracle of the psalm which announced that the Christ would rise.

The inevitable modern question is, Does this use of the psalm “work”? (1) So far as first-century people were concerned, the Davidic authorship of the psalm was unquestioned (cf. the psalm’s heading: “A Miktam of David”). (2) The psalm appears to say “You will not let me die,” but Peter takes it to mean something more like “You will not let me remain dead once I have died.” The psalm is thus understood to refer to a person, once dead, not being left in death and suffering the consequent decay of the body. In favor of this interpretation is the way that the last verse of the psalm appears

to refer to experiences in the presence of God that follow death, unless we take the reference to be a metaphorical one to the experience of joy in the period that follows deliverance from premature death. (3) The former interpretation of the psalm would be consistent with David’s own experience. Only the latter requires that it be applied to somebody else who was resurrected. (4) The promises of an enthroned descendant of David appear to refer to one of his immediate offspring, Solomon, rather than to a distant descendant or ruler (the Davidic descent of Jesus is not in fact brought into the discussion here). However, it is obvious that Solomon and all David’s subsequent descendants had died like David himself (2:29), so the argument about David’s descendants is in fact concerned with the continuation of his line beyond his immediate descendants, and therefore Peter’s interpretation in a wide sense in 2:30 is sufficiently plausible.

2:29

David is described as a “patriarch”; although the word *patriarchēs* is used in the LXX for the chief of a family or a tribe (1 Chron. 24:31) and is applied to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in 4 Macc. 7:19 (cf. Acts 7:8–9; Heb. 7:4; hence our familiar usage), it is not used elsewhere of David.

2:30

Here we have the only NT description of David as a “prophet,” but the motif occurs in 11Q5 XXVII, 11 (García Martínez 1996: 309); Philo, *Agriculture* 50, and his prophetic speech is mentioned in Acts 1:16; Mark 12:36.

The language in 2:30 is generally thought to be based on Ps. 132:11 (131:11 LXX), paraphrased to fit the context: “The LORD swore truth to David and will not revoke it, ‘I shall place [someone] from the fruit of your body on your throne.’”

Ps. 131:11 LXX [132:11
MT/ET]

*ōmosen kyrios tō David alētheian
kai ou mē athetēsei autēn
ek karpou tēs kollias sou
thēsomai epi ton thronon sou;*

Acts 2:30

*horkō ōmosen autō ho theos
ek karpou tēs osphyos autou
kathisai epi ton thronon autou,*

Where the psalm has simply *ōmosen* Luke adds the dative *horkō*, producing a Semitism (the noun is equivalent to the Heb. infinitive absolute) found in Exod. 13:19; Num. 30:3; Josh. 9:20; *T. Jud.*

22:3. The English “one of his descendants” paraphrases “from the fruit of his loins.” Where the LXX has *ek karpou tēs koīlias sou*, Luke has *ek karpou tēs osphrys autou*, using the more appropriate term for a male, *osphrys* (“loin”; used euphemistically, as in 2 Chron. 6:9), and changing to the third person. *Kathisai* is based on the next verse, Ps. 131:12 LXX. Rese (1969: 107–9) at first expresses doubt whether a specific source can be found and holds that there is a multiplicity of passages that have influenced Luke: Ps. 131:11 LXX; 2 Chron. 6:9–10; Ps. 88:4–5 LXX (89:3–4 ET); 2 Sam. 7:12; but in the end he agrees that Ps. 131 is the main source, with some influence from 2 Chron. 6. However, he notes that in 2 Chron. 6 the promise of a son for David is assumed to be fulfilled in Solomon. In Ps. 131 the reference is to David’s sons and grandsons sitting on the throne, but the promise is conditional on their obedience, and at a later stage a messianic reinterpretation took place. (Witherington [1998: 146] claims that this psalm was used at Qumran and cites 4Q174 1 I, 7–13; this seems to be a mistake.)

At this point there is an interesting reading in the Western Text of Acts yielding this result: “God had promised him that from the fruit of his heart according to the flesh he would raise the Messiah and seat him on his throne” (D*; other manuscripts, including the Majority Text, vary slightly). Black (1974: 121–23) defends this reading on the grounds of its good attestation (including 1739) and the consequent improvement to the syntax. It fits in with the Lukan use of *anistēmi* to refer to the raising up of Jesus from the dead, behind which may lie God’s promise to raise up a scion of David onto the stage of history in 2 Sam. 7:12; there is similar material in 13:22–37 and also in Rom. 1:3. Black has not gained any supporters (see the critique in Bovon 2006: 107–8).

2:31

David is credited with “seeing what was to come.” Thus the statement in the psalm is understood to be prophetic. But exactly what David foresaw is not stated. On the basis of this foreknowledge he spoke of the resurrection of “the Christ.” This is the first use of the term in Acts, and here it is clearly a title signifying “the future ruler in the line of David who will reign in the kingdom of God.” It is often said that although the concept of the Messiah/Christ is found in the OT, the

term itself is not found with this reference, and that this usage developed only later in Jewish literature. However, whereas the original reference in the relevant OT passages was to the reigning monarch (or an immediate successor), by the time the psalms were collected and effectively canonized (cf. Luke 24:44) the references in them were understood, where appropriate, as messianic (cf. Ps. 2:2; 18:50; 20:6; 28:8; 84:9; 89:38, 51; 105:15; 132:10, 17; see Mays 1994: 99–107). This is true of the Hebrew Psalter; it is all the more the case with the LXX version (Schaper 1995: 138–64). We can now see why it was appropriate to take Ps. 132:11–12 as a reference to the Messiah. The new element here, then, is not so much the recognition of the psalms as messianic as it is the claim that the fulfillment of the prophecy in Ps. 16 is resurrection. At this point the language of the citation is picked up and contextualized (third person instead of first person). An important verbal alteration in 2:31 is the replacement of “your Holy One” by “his flesh” (the parallelism of “soul” and “flesh” that could have resulted [cf. 2:27a/b] does not take place, since the former term is not repeated here). “Flesh” was used in the preceding verse of the psalm, so it is not an arbitrary insertion here, but it is the appropriate word for the human body in its character as corruptible material.

2:32–33

Having established what David said prophetically about the Messiah, Peter now repeats that God raised Jesus from the dead (cf. 2:24), a point that can be confirmed by the witness of the apostles.

This event is then understood as an exaltation by the right hand of God. The verb *hypsōō* is occasionally used for the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus (5:31; cf. John 3:14; 8:28; 12:32, 34; cf. *hyperhypsōō* in Phil. 2:9), and “the right hand of God” is a familiar OT expression for God acting in power. Dodd (1952: 99) proposed that behind the language here lies Ps. 117:16 LXX, “the right hand of the Lord has exalted me” (*dexia kyriou hypsōsen me* [= 118:16 MT, the text of which differs from the LXX]), and noted that the immediately following words are “I shall not die, but live.” On this view, “the right hand of God” is understood instrumentally as the means of resurrection. In view of the not infrequent use of this psalm by Jesus and his followers, this proposal

is quite plausible (see Brunson 2003; similarly, Dupont 1979: 124–26; Doble 2002a: 7).

However, Lindars (1961: 42–44) holds that the starting point for the phrase lay in the last clause of Ps. 15:11 LXX (not quoted by Peter), where “at [Gk. *en*] your right hand” expresses place. He then refers to Ps. 67:19 LXX (68:19 MT; 68:18 ET), *anebēs eis hypsos*, and finds here the source for the verb *hypōsen*. Then *tē dexia tou theou* is to be taken locatively, as in Ps. 109:1 LXX (110:1 MT/ET), *ek dexiōn mou*, cited in 2:35 (similarly, Dupont 1973: 224; Pesch 1986: 1:124; Strauss 1995: 140n2; Turner 1996: 275n20).

Yet another proposal is that Ps. 139:8–10 (138:8–10 LXX) is relevant. There David speaks about his inability to escape from God’s presence; whether he ascends (*anabainō*) to heaven or descends to Hades, God’s right hand will hold him (Doble 2002b: 20).

In assessing these alternative solutions, we may find it unnecessary to choose between them, since scholars admit that more than one influence may be present; the wording was such that listeners or readers would be reminded of several OT passages. Nevertheless, the question as to which source is primary is a proper one.

So far as “the right hand of God” is concerned, the instrumental understanding is preferable. Acts 5:31 is ambiguous; the phrase used there is different from the locative one from Ps. 15:11 LXX used here in 2:34; and it can be argued that the phrase summarizes the action of God in 2:32 (Barrett 1994–1998: 149).

If, as is probable, Ps. 67:19 LXX lies behind the next part of the verse, this is a strong argument for seeing it as influencing the earlier part also. However, it can also be argued that the use of Ps. 117:16 LXX is primary, and that this then gave a verbal link to Ps. 67.

The next part of the verse introduces a fresh thought: Jesus “has received from the Father the promised Holy Spirit and has poured out what you now see and hear.” “The promised Holy Spirit” is literally “the promise of the Holy Spirit” (so NRSV) and alludes back to Luke 24:49; “promise” is used for the content of the promise rather than (as more usually) for the action of promising. The reference to God as “the Father” echoes the same passage. But “has received” has another source.

Psalm 67:19 LXX (68:18 ET) states, “When you ascended on high, you took captivity captive, you received gifts [*domata*] among men [lit., ‘in a man’].” The psalm could be understood to refer to receiving gifts for men, and it was so understood in the Targum, where the words of the law were given to men: “You have ascended to heaven, that is, Moses the prophet; you have taken captivity captive, you have learnt the words of the Torah; you have given it as gifts to men” (cited in Lincoln 1990: 242–43). The verse is explicitly cited in Eph. 4:8, but with significant alterations: “he gave gifts to men.” In this connection it may be significant that later Peter refers to “the gift [*dōrea*] of the Holy Spirit” (2:38; cf. 8:20; 10:45; 11:17); was it the influence of the psalm that led to the use of the term “gift” for the Spirit?

The verb “received” is seen by several scholars as evidence for the influence of the psalm (Lindars 1961: 51–59; Dupont 1973). The reference in 2:34 to David not ascending is strong confirmation for this. In rabbinic Judaism the giving of the law was associated with Pentecost. Hence there is a possibility that the early Christians saw a parallel (or contrast) between the giving of the law and the giving of the Spirit and took over Ps. 68 (67 LXX), which was interpreted of the giving of the law, and freshly understood it of the giving of the Spirit, and that this understanding lies behind not only Eph. 4:8, but also the present passage in Acts. A further link with the psalm was detected by W. L. Knox, who observed that the Targum of Ps. 68:34 described how God “with his word [*memra*] gave with his voice the Spirit of prophecy to the prophets” (cited in Barrett 1994–1998: 149).

In my commentary (Marshall 1980: 78–79) I expressed some doubt as to whether Luke himself saw this allusion. A significant difficulty is that the allusion rests upon the Jewish tradition, deposited in the Targum, and that there is no indication of its presence in the LXX, the Scripture that Luke was using. Bock (1987: 181–83) thinks that there is no influence by the psalm at all, on the grounds that all the elements in the verse can be traced to Luke himself. The only word in common with the psalm is “received,” which Luke could not avoid using to describe the action between God and Jesus. Barrett (1994–1998: 149–50) thinks that the echoes are present but is doubtful that Luke’s readers, and perhaps even Luke himself, would

have picked them up. He notes, however, that if the allusion is present, it confirms the view that Jesus received the Spirit to confer on the church at his ascension, a different event from his own reception of the Spirit for his messianic ministry at his baptism (Luke 3:22; Acts 10:38). It remains possible that this exegesis of the psalm was known to Peter or to the tradition that Luke used, and that Luke therefore was influenced here by an interpretation that had become traditional in the church, although it was not reflected in his Scriptures (see Strauss 1995: 145–47). See further Beale 2005b: 69–72, who finds evidence here for understanding Pentecost as the descent of the latter-day temple of God's presence on his people.

The subsequent conferral of the Spirit is expressed by the verb “poured out” (*ekcheō*), which is derived from the quotation from Joel 3:1 LXX (2:28 ET) in 2:17.

2:34–35

Peter offers a further argument that it is indeed Jesus who ascended to heaven, not David, just as it was Jesus, not David, who was resurrected. Again the point is made by a citation of David's own words. The citation is the familiar Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX), quoted word-for-word from the LXX. As it stands, David himself said, “The Lord said to my lord: ‘Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies a footstool for your feet.’” There is scope for ambiguity in the LXX, which has to use one Greek word, *kyrios*, for the two Hebrew words *yhwh* (the Tetragrammaton, whose original pronunciation probably was “Yahweh,” and for which “Adonai” [“my Lord”] was substituted when the word was read aloud) and *'ādōn*. The former word refers to God, and the latter to the speaker's “lord.” The invitation to “sit” is addressed to David's lord, not to David himself, and the one greater than David could only be the Messiah. The Hebrew for “at my right hand” (*lîmîni*) is translated by a plural in the LXX (*ek dexiōn mou*) (see Rese 1969: 59).

(This understanding presupposes that David is the implied author of the psalm; a common modern view is that the psalm was composed by a subject of David or a later king and said what Yahweh had promised to the subject's lord.)

There must also be some uncertainty about the interpretation of the oracle from Yahweh con-

cerning the “lord.” Clearly the language about the footstool is metaphorical for the subjugation of enemies (cf. Josh. 10:24; 1 Kings 5:3; Isa. 51:23), and the language about sitting at God's right hand could also be metaphorical for being given the authority and power of God to overcome the enemies. But Peter takes the latter phrase literally of the Messiah's ascent to heaven to sit beside God. It is understood likewise elsewhere in the NT (Luke 20:42–44 pars.; 22:69 pars.; Acts 7:55–56; Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Heb. 1:3, 13; 8:1; 10:12–13; 12:2; 1 Pet. 3:22; see Hay 1973; for the use of Ps. 110:1 as a *testimonium* elsewhere in the NT, see Albl 1999: 216–36). The phrase “at my right hand” echoes the usage from Ps. 16 earlier in Peter's speech (2:25), and it might be cited as an example of the Jewish practice of *gezerah shavah*, the linking together of two citations by their use of common expressions (Longenecker 1999: 81).

2:36

Hence this conclusion can be drawn: “all the house of Israel” (an OT expression [e.g., 1 Sam. 7:2; Ezek. 37:11] used frequently in Jewish prayers) can know for sure that Jesus, who had been crucified, has been made Lord and Messiah by God (for the association of Messiah and Lord, see *Pss. Sol.* 17:32). The argument here is not simply that the oracle in Ps. 110 applies to Jesus, but also that the title “lord,” used in the psalm, must be applied to him; since it refers to a person of higher rank than David, it is a superlative title. The title “Messiah” is not actually used in any of the psalm citations, but we have seen that it is implicit in the context of some of these citations, notably Ps. 132:10 (131:10 LXX), which suggests to Dupont (1979: 150–53) that the author of the speech was taking note of the contexts. He concludes,

Whoever composed the form of the speeches which has been transmitted to us clearly had at his disposal written sources: either collections of scriptural citations, or else earlier written versions of the speeches which cited more explicitly and at greater length the scriptural texts on which the speakers based their comments and arguments.

This observation might count as evidence that the written speeches in Acts are summaries of fuller oral proclamations.

Does this statement mean that Jesus was “made” Lord and Messiah only when he was exalted or that the exaltation proved that he already held this status? Certainly for Luke himself Jesus was already the Lord and Messiah before his crucifixion, and in the psalm the invitation to sit beside God is addressed to one who is already David’s lord. Some think that Luke is recording an earlier tradition of how Christology was understood in the early church (Barrett 1994–1998: 151–52). But the force of the statement is more probably simply to contrast the attitude of those who crucified and rejected Jesus with God’s confirmation of his real status by raising him from death and exalting him to his right hand (Rowe 2007). His baptism in the Gospel corresponds to his heavenly installation in Acts, both of them preceded by his birth as Son of God to rule over the house of Jacob forever (Luke 1:32–33).

2:37–41

2:37

The description of the response of the hearers to the speech is expressed in language paralleled in Ps. 108:16 LXX (109:16 ET), *katanenygmenon tē kardia* (*katanyssomai*, “to be pierced, stabbed” [cf. Gen. 34:7]); although the psalm was quoted previously in 1:20, it is unlikely that this led to the use of this phrase (*pace* Wilcox 1965: 61).

2:39

The width of the invitation to repent and be baptized is emphasized by a return to Joel 2:32 (3:5 LXX). The “promise” is, of course, the promise of the gift of the Spirit (cf. 2:33) made by Joel. “For you and your children” echoes OT language (Gen. 9:9; 13:15; 17:7–10; cf. Ps. 18:50). “For all who are far off” picks up a phrase from Isa. 57:19 that is also used in Eph. 2:13–17. The vision certainly includes Jews in succeeding generations and worldwide. Although some want to confine the scope to Jews (Denova 1997: 169–75; Wall 2002: 68n129), Barrett (1994–1998: 156–57) holds that potentially the message is also to other races (cf. the echo in 22:21; see Clark 2001: 113), and this is rightly confirmed by Pao (2000: 230–31). This interpretation can be justified by reference to one rabbinic interpretation of Isa. 57:19 that interpreted it of proselytes (*Num. Rab.* 8:4, cited in Lincoln 1990: 147) and by the Christian in-

terpretation in Eph. 2:13–17. Then comes the phrase from Joel “for all whom the Lord our God will call.” Joel’s plain relative clause (*hous kyrios proskelētai*) is altered to an indefinite relative clause (*hosous an*) that implies indefinite extent and is plainly inclusive; true, the Lord may call only some, but no such implied horizon is in view, and the point of the clause is not to set limits, but rather to emphasize the gracious initiative of the Lord in announcing salvation. The omission of the latter part of Joel 2:32 LXX may also be significant as stressing the universalistic outlook here.

2:40

Peter urges his listeners, “Save yourselves from this corrupt generation.” The implication is that the people are sinful and stand under God’s judgment, but those who respond to Peter’s words will escape from the judgment that is coming upon them. The term “generation” (*genea*), usually in the form “this generation” (contrast Phil. 2:15) and sometimes with an adjective (Luke 9:41; 11:29), is a pejorative term for the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus and his followers that reflects OT usage (Deut. 32:5, 20; Ps. 78:8 [77:8 LXX]; 95:10 [94:10 LXX]). Wilcox (1965: 30) suggests that a specific text, Ps. 12:7 (11:8 LXX), is reflected: “You, LORD, will guard us and preserve us from this generation and forever.” However, the verb “save” is probably an echo of 2:21 (Barrett 1994–1998: 156), and the lack of verbal agreement with the psalm makes the hypothesis doubtful.

The use of “souls” (*psychai*) for “people” is common in Acts (e.g., 2:43; 7:14 [cf. Gen. 46:27 LXX]; 27:37; see also Rom. 13:1; 1 Pet. 3:20; cf. Acts 3:23) and reflects a septuagintalism for *nepesā*, although the idiom is also found in classical Greek (see *TDNT* 9:632).

On baptism in the name of Jesus, see commentary on Acts 3:6 below.

2:42–47

Any links with the OT in this section are confined to echoes in language. The “wonders and miraculous signs” performed by the apostles (2:43) echo the prophecy of Joel and the description of the activity of God through Jesus, thus implying that these occurrences also are wrought by God in fulfillment of prophecy and hence serve to ac-