

CHAPTER 4

PETER'S SECOND SPEECH (Acts 2:14-41)

1. THE BROADER CONTEXT AND BACKGROUND

This second Petrine speech has been discussed extensively in the past,¹ being viewed from different perspectives and with different purposes in mind. It is generally accepted as the most prominent and important speech in Ac, and has even been called "the foundation...for all the other speeches in Acts".²

There exists a definite parallel between this second speech of Peter (in Jerusalem) and the first speech of Paul (in Antioch) (Ac 13:16-41) — especially when one compares their theology and interpretation concerning David.³ It seems as if both accounts share a common christological focus point or perspective on this issue. Also interesting is the tendency for these two speeches to quote from both the *duodecim prophetae*⁴ and from the Pss.

Another parallel might be found in the structure of Luke's gospel on the one hand, and Ac on the other. Shortly after Jesus was anointed by the Spirit at his baptism (Lk 3:21-22), and sent by the Spirit to the desert to be tested (Lk 4:1-13, he delivered his "inaugural address" at the synagogue in Nazareth (Lk 4:14-30). In the same trend, Peter too delivered this speech after the "anointing" by the Spirit, setting the keynote for the rest of Ac.⁵

The composition of the second Petrine speech is probably the creative work of Luke himself,⁶ although he might have derived sections of the material from already

¹. See for instance, R.F. ZEHLE, *Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Interpretation in Peter's Speeches of Acts 2 and 3* (SBLMS 15), Nashville 1971; A. KERRIGAN, The 'Sensus Plenior' of Joel III, 1-5 in Act. II, 14-36, in: J. COPPENS, A. DESCAMPS & É. MASSAUX (eds), *Sacra Pagina. Miscellanea Biblica Congressus Interpretationis Catholici de re Biblica. Vol. II*, Paris 1959, 295-313.

². Cf. H.N. RIDDERBOS, *The Speeches of Peter in the Acts of the Apostles*, London 1962, 12.

³. R.F. O'TOOLE points to the following similarities: (a) the structure, common to all the missionary speeches in Ac; (b) the issue of salvation (Ac 2:21,40,47; 13:23,26,38-39,47); (c) the quoting of Ps 15(16) (Ac 2:25-32; 13:34-37); (d) the forgiveness of sins (Ac 2:38; 13:38); (e) the promises to David (Ac 2:24-36; 13:22-23,32-37); (f) kerygma about Jesus (Ac 2:21-38; 13:23-39,46-48); (g) the possibility that 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12-16 might form the background of Luke's resurrectional assertion in each passage where Luke also makes reference to Ps 88 (Ac 2:30; 13:22) (Acts 2:30 and the Davidic Covenant of Pentecost, in: *JBL* 102 (1983), 245-258, here, 253). Compare this with G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 264,n.6.

⁴. Ac 13:41 = Hab 1:5.

⁵. Cf. D.L. TIEDE: "Thus as the Isaiah prophecy in Luke 4 serves to articulate the program of the Spirit-anointed Jesus, so the direct citation of the Book of Joel identifies the new phase of the eschatological activity of God's Spirit which is being disclosed at Pentecost" (Acts 2:1-47, in: *Interpr* 33 (1979), 62-67, here 63).

⁶. With G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 53. Contrary to F.F. BRUCE, *The Speeches in the Acts*, London 1942, 8; *idem.*, *Speeches: Thirty Years After*, 53; T.F. GLASSON, *The Speeches in Acts and Thucydides*, in: *ET* 76 (1964-65), 165; J.H.E. HULL, *The Holy Spirit in the Acts of the Apostles*, Cleveland 1967, 70; W.W. GASQUE, *Speeches of Acts*, 232-250; as well as against A. KERRIGAN who has said: "...the speeches of Acts, though not *verbatim* reports of what the speakers said on the

existing source material.⁷

2. OVERVIEW OF THE TEXT OF THE SPEECH

It is important to get an overview of the structure of the speech itself in order to determine Luke's interpretation of his LXX material within the context of the speech. This might probably help to explain both the reason why Luke has used LXX material here, as well as the reasons for changing his source material in some instances, thereby revealing his purpose with this LXX source material and manifesting his hermeneutics.

14 Σταθεῖς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκά
ἐπήρην τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεφθέγγετο αὐτοῖς

Section I: Beginning of the last days and the JI-quotation

ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάντες,
τοῦτο ὑμῶν γνωστὸν ἔστω
καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου.
15 οὐ γὰρ ὡς ὑμεῖς ὑπολαμβάνετε οὗτοι μεθύουσι,
ἔστιν γὰρ ὥρα τρίτη τῆς ἡμέρας,
16 ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστω τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ
17
καὶ ἔσται
ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός,
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα,
καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν
καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὄρασεις ὄψονται
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίους ἐνυπνιασθήσονται

occasions in question, are faithful summaries containing the gist of the arguments used' (*Sensus Plenior*, 296). Even scholars as B. REICKE, who accepts the speech to be a pure historical fact, regards it as a Lukan creation: "Übrigens hat niemand die sicher ungeschriebene Rede stenographisch aufzeichnen können. Die angeführte Rede dürfte also vielmehr ein Werk des Berichterstatters oder des Lukas sein, indem sie die Situation dramatisieren sollte" (*Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde. Bemerkungen zu Apg. 1-7* (ATHANT 32), Zürich 1957, 39). So also I.H. MARSHALL: "We cannot prove that Luke has recorded verbatim what Peter said on this occasion, and in any case the speech recorded here is too brief to be a full account of what was said" (*Acts*, 72).

⁷. More than three decades ago, E. SCHWEIZER has already said about the speeches in Ac that "Ever since Martin Dibelius' essay about this subject, it has been more and more widely recognized that the speeches are basically *compositions by the author of Acts* who, to be sure, utilized different kinds of material for particular passages" (*Speeches*, 208). Cf. M. DIBELIUS, *The Speeches in Acts and Ancient Historiography*, in: H. GREEVEN (hrsg), *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, London 1956, 138-185. Followed also by E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 38-39; R.F. ZEHLE, *Pentecost Discourse*, 136; and U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 59. According to D.L. TIEDE, "The speech is a carefully crafted literary exemplar of early Christian mission preaching..." with the substance of the repeated appeals to the audience being "...consistently scriptural, further suggesting very careful work with literary resources which have been thoroughly integrated in the composition" (*Acts* 2, 64). So also G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 53.

Chapter 4: Second Petrine Speech

- 67 -

- 18 καί γε ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις μου
καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου
ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις
ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου,
καὶ προφητεύσουσιν.
- 19 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ὧν καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω,
αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ.
- 20 ὁ ἥλιος μεταστροφῆσεται εἰς σκότος
καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα,
πρὶν ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ.
- 21
καὶ ἔσται
πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.

Section II: The resurrection of Jesus and the quotation from Ps 15(16)

- 22 Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται,
ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους·
Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον,
ἄνδρα ἀποδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ
εἰς ὑμᾶς δυνάμει καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις
οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν
καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἴδατε,
- 23 τοῦτον τῇ ὠρισμένῃ βουλῇ καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκδοτὸν
διὰ χειρὸς ἀνόμων προσπήξαντες
ἀνεῖλατε,
- 24 ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν
λύσας τὰς ῥάβδους τοῦ θανάτου,
καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνατόν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.
- 25 Δαυὶδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν·
προρῶμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός,
ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἔστιν ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ.
- 26 διὰ τοῦτο
ἠύφρανήθη ἡ καρδία μου
καὶ ἠγαλλιάσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου,
ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλίπιδι,
- 27 ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄηνα
οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.
- 28 ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς,
πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου.

Section III: Jesus' exaltation and David (Quotation from Ps 109(110))

- 29 Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί,
ἐξὸν εἰπεῖν μετὰ παρησίας πρὸς ὑμᾶς
περὶ τοῦ πατριάρχου Δαυὶδ

- ὅτι καὶ ἐτελεύτησεν καὶ ἐτάφη,
καὶ τὸ μνήμα αὐτοῦ ἔστω ἐν ἡμῖν ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.
- 30 προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων
καὶ εἰδώς
ὅτι ὄρκῳ ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ
τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ,
- 31 προϊδῶν ἐλάλησεν
περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ
ὅτι οὐτε ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ᾄδην
οὔτε ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν.
- 32 τοῦτων τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ θεός,
σὺ πάντες ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν μάρτυρες·
- 33 τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς,
τὴν τε ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου
λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς,
ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο ὃ ὑμεῖς {καὶ} βλέπετε καὶ ἀκούετε.
- 34 οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς,
λέγει δὲ αὐτός·
Ἔειπεν [ὁ] κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου
κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου,
- 35 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
- 36 ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ
ὅτι καὶ κύριον αὐτῶν
καὶ χριστὸν
ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός,
τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε.

Section IV: Reaction of the hearers and reference to J1-quotation

- 37 Ἀκούσαντες δὲ
κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν
εἰπόν τε πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους·
τί ποιήσωμεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί;
- 38 Πέτρος δὲ πρὸς αὐτούς·
μετανοήσατε, [φησὶν]
καὶ βαπτισθῆτω ἕκαστος ὑμῶν
ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ
εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ὑμῶν,
καὶ λήψεσθε τὴν δωρεάν τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος.
- 39 ὑμῖν γὰρ ἔστιν ἡ ἐπαγγελία
καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν
καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν,
ἵσους ἂν προσκαλέσθαι κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν.
- 40 ἐτέροις τε λόγοις πλείωσιν διεμαρτύρατο

καὶ παρεκάλει αὐτοὺς λέγων·
σώθητε ἀπὸ τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς ταύτης.

41 οἱ μὲν οὖν

ἀποδεξάμενοι τὸν λόγον αὐτοῦ
ἐβαπτίσθησαν

καὶ προσετέθησαν ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ψυχαὶ ὡσεὶ τρισχίλια.

42 Ἦσαν δὲ προσκαρτεροῦντες τῇ διδασκίᾳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ, τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

2.1 Division of the First Petrine Speech

Peter's second speech is presented obviously by Luke as direct speech. The same elements are found at the beginning of the speech, as are found at the beginning of Peter's first speech:⁸ (a) The gesture of the speaker: "Peter then stood up with the eleven others" (Σταθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος σὺν τοῖς ἑνδεκά, V.14); (b) A verb of saying introducing the direct speech: "He 'lifted' his voice and said to them..". (ἐπῆρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεφθέγγετο⁹ αὐτοῖς, V.14); (c) Naming of the hearers at the beginning of the speech: "Jewish brothers and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem" ("Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάντες, V.14).

His hearers are addressed in this manner several times during the speech, indicating hereby simultaneously the change between the ending of the explicit quotations used in the different units, as well as the continuation of Peter's words.¹⁰ These phrases then also indicate the borders of the most prominent structural units of which the speech consists.¹¹

According to this feature, the speech can be divided into four main units:¹² (a) *section I* (Ac 2:14b-21) which deals with the eschatological (re-)interpretation of the quotation from Jl 2:28-32 (3:1-5); (b) *section II* (Ac 2:22-28) which deals with the resurrection of Jesus and the interpretation of Ps 15(16):8-11; (c) *section III* (Ac 2:29-36) which deals with Jesus' exaltation and the interpretation of a quotation from Ps 109(110):1 in this context; (d) *section IV* (Ac 2:37-41)¹³ refers to the reaction of the hearers and records the appeal to them to be converted, by way of reference to Jl 2:32 (3:5). Sections I and IV thus have some connection with each

⁸. Compare E. SCHWEIZER for an overview of the elements in the structure of the whole speech (*Zu den Reden*, 2,6-8).

⁹. This verb is taken up from V.4. It is to be found only once more in Ac 26:25 (G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 50).

¹⁰. See VV.22, 29 and 36.

¹¹. Cf. V.22 ("Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται); V.29 ("Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί); [V.36 (πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ)]. Also the response of his hearers is indicated in this manner: V.37 (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί).

¹². Compare also L. O'REILLY who has arrived at the same conclusion (*Word and Sign in the Acts of the Apostles. A Study in Lucan Theology* (AnGr 82), Rome 1987, 66. G. SCHNEIDER (*App I*, 263-264); G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 50; and H. VAN DE SANDT (The Fate of the Gentiles in Joel and Acts 2. An Intertextual Study, in: *ETHL* 66 (1990), 56-77, here 56) divides it in roughly the same way. W. DIETRICH has indicated that each one of the first three sections ends with a quotation from Scripture (*Petrusbild*, 200-201).

¹³. The speech ends at V.40 and not at V.36 as seen by D. MINGUEZ, *Pentecostés. Ensayo de Semiótica narrativa en Hch 2* (AnBib 75), Rome 1976, 64. Compare this with L. O'REILLY's legitimate criticism (*Word and Sign*, 64-66). See also A. WEISER, *App I*, 92-95.

other on the basis of their common reference to J1,¹⁴ while sections II and III are dealing exclusively with the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus (the christology) by way of reference to the Pss. The four main sections can now be examined individually.

3. SECTION I. ACTS 2:14b-21

Beginning of the last days & the quotation from J1 2:28-32 (3:1-5)

3.1 Composition of the section

Knowing that his hearers have assumed the disciples to be drunk, Peter uses a strong antithesis to emphasise the opposite.¹⁵ His construction is build up by a negation (οὐ γὰρ...οὔτοι μεθύουσιν) and a statement of the contrary as the positive (ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον). This τὸ εἰρημένον is described closer as being that, coming διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ, and even more closer by way of a parenthesis, as words coming directly from God (λέγει ὁ θεός). Presented in this manner, the indication is clear: something that was already foretold by the prophet (τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου), presented as the divine words of God, is happening at this moment (τοῦτό ἐστιν), i.e. an old prophecy is being fulfilled here.¹⁶ This implied moment is then seen here as "the last days" (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, V.17), or "those days" (ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις, V.18). The "great and glorious day of the κύριος" (ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, V.20), probably refers here not to the same moment in time. It seems as if the "last days/those days" would have preceded this "great and glorious day of the kurios" on the basis of the πρὶν ἐλθεῖν in V.20.

The first line and last line of the quotation itself, both begin with καὶ ἔσται (V.17, V.21). By way of this "and it will (shall) be", two major thoughts are emphasised. The first is that "...from the Spirit" (ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος) will be poured out", as well as that signs and wonders would be given, and the second is that all those who should call on the name of the κύριος, will be saved. There are alternative approaches to dividing and understanding the words in V.17. The καὶ προφητεύουσιν can be taken either with (a) πᾶσαν σάρκα, or (b) with οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, which represents the traditional viewpoint, and may be seen in most Bible translations. The *first alternative* would then take the οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν with the καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν as a coherent combination on its own. The meaning of this would be that it is "all 'flesh' (people) that will prophesy"; this is then explained and expanded in the description that

¹⁴. There is some kind of parallelism, according to G. SCHNEIDER, between the first (2:14b-21) and the fourth units (2:38-40): "Möglicherweise sind also 2,14b-21,38-40 ebenso wie 2,1-13 als lukanische Komposition zu bewerten. Es fragt sich, ob die Traditionsgrundlage der beiden 'inneren' Rede-Teile 2,22-28,29-36 anders zu beurteilen ist. Abgesehen von den situationsbezogenen Versen 32b,33, könnte der Schriftbeweis der beiden 'christologischen' Teile traditionell sein" (*Apg I*, 264).

¹⁵. Cf. G. SCHNEIDER: "Der Topos mit dem Mißverständnis der Hörer wird auch 3,12 und 14,15 als literarisches Mittel benutzt" (*Apg I*, 267). Also G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 50.

¹⁶. A. WEISER says: "Petrus weist den Vorwurf der Trunkenheit zurück und erklärt, daß das, was die Menge gesehen und gehört hat (vgl. Vers 33), die Erfüllung einer alten Prophetie ist" (*Apg I*, 91).

follows — that "their sons, and their daughters and their young men will see visions", and that "their elders will dream dreams". When *καὶ προφητεύουσιν* is taken with the *πᾶσαν σάρκα*, it is thus still implied that the sons and daughters would prophesy — being part of "all 'flesh'!". The *second alternative* would divide between the *οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν* on the one hand, and the *καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν* on the other hand. The meaning of this would then be that when (from) the Spirit is "poured out" on all "flesh", "their sons and their daughters will prophesy" and that "their young men will see visions".

In favor of the first alternative:

Strictly synchronically taken, without paying attention to any changes of this text against its source text, the first alternative could make good sense on the following grounds:

(a) The three prominent groups which are here the objects of the *ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου*, as well as the subjects of the *καὶ προφητεύουσιν*, are clearly indicated by *ἐπί*. These three *ἐπί*-sentences are encircled by the parallelistic unit (V.17, V.18), enclosing it thus in an inclusio:¹⁷ *ἐν ταῖς ... ἡμέραις* — *ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου* — *καὶ προφητεύουσιν*. This analogous and cohesive unit would then contradict the second alternative. *Καὶ προφητεύουσιν* would lack in this unit at the beginning when it is to be taken with the *οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν*.

(b) If it is preferable to take the *καὶ προφητεύουσιν* with the *οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν*, it would be reasonable to expect some kind of reading which places the verb of the sons and daughters at the end of that unit; something like the following: *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα* — *καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν προφητεύουσιν* — *καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται* — *καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίους ἐνυπνιασθήσονται*. Placing the verb after the subjects, as in the last two instances here, provides for a better fit into the parallelistic structure of the unit. This would, however, not be exclusively necessary.

In favour of the second alternative:

The following arguments could be brought in against the first alternative, and in favour of the second (traditional) alternative:

(a) The fact that the unit starts directly with *οἱ υἱοὶ* and without a prominent *καὶ* — as in the case of both the *οἱ νεανίσκοι* and the *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι*. But what then about the fact that the same incident is to be found also in V.19-20?¹⁸

(b) Also the fact that Luke might have moved the unit, *καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται*, from its fourth position (after the *πρεσβύτεροι*) to this third position. But this argument is based on diachronical grounds and not synchronical grounds! It might, nonetheless, be true of his source text. However, we are dealing at the moment with the synchronic text of Ac!

¹⁷ The place of *καὶ προφητεύουσιν* after *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα* in V.17, is due to the syntax of the sentence. *Ἐπί* refers here to the objects of the *ἐκχεῶ*.

¹⁸ Cf. the phrases (a) *αἶμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ* and (b) *ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος*. The latter especially correlates by presenting the two parallelistic units of *ὁ ἥλιος...καὶ ἡ σελήνη* in this combination, and not with an additional *καὶ* at its beginning — so also then here: *οἱ υἱοὶ...καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες*.

It must be noticed that both alternatives seem possible on a pure syntactical basis. The first alternative, however, fits in better with the correlating strong cohesive unit as paralleled in V.18. However, the only way by which a definite choice may be made against one, and in favour of the other, would be on a semantic basis with the broader context of Ac in mind.

The "darkening of the sun" (ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφῆσεται εἰς σκότος, V.20) and the "changing of the moon to blood", (καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, V.20) probably refer to the "wonders in heaven above" (τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω, V.19): on the basis of both the sun and the moon as "above" and "in heaven". The "blood, fire and clouds of smoke" (αἷμα καὶ πῦρ¹⁹ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ, V.19) are probably meant to be the "signs on earth below" (σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, V.19), according to its position in the sentence, i.e. following directly after those signs on earth.

3.2 The quoted text from J1 2:28-32 (3:1-5) (Ac 2:17-21)

This quotation from J1 2:28-32 (3:1-5)²⁰ in Ac 2, is probably the most discussed explicit quotation in Ac. It is therefore no wonder that *Haenchen* typified it, even during his time, as a "berühmtes Zitat!"²¹ One of several questions which arises here, is why Luke used such a long quotation.²² This confronts one with the issue of the relevance of this specific quotation, and of all the elements in the cited text from J1 2:30-32 (3:1-5). Were all these elements really necessary for his argumentation, i.e. for their function in the speech itself?²³ Another question concerns the textform which Luke could have used. His quotation does not correlate directly with our known versions of either the LXX or the MT, but differs on several points with both.²⁴ Were these changes already present in the source text used by Luke; or were

¹⁹. With regard to the witnessing power of heavenly fire, see W. SPEYER, Die Zeugungskraft des himmlischen Feuers in Antike und Urchristentum, in: *idem., Frühes Christentum im antiken Strahlungsfeld. Ausgewählte Aufsätze*, Tübingen 1989, 235-253. Reference is made explicitly to the angel Gabriel who testified about a son who will be born (249). "Die ältesten christlichen Schriften, in denen das Motiv vom zeugenden himmlischen Feuer begegnet, sind die Evangelien des Matthäus, Lukas und Johannes sowie die Apostelgeschichte. Abgesehen vom Wort des Johannes über die Feuer taufe Jesu und dem Ausspruch Jesu über die Feuer taufe ist das Motiv vom himmlischen Feuer in Berichten über eine übernatürliche Zeugung eingearbeitet: Taufe Jesu bei einer bestimmten Gruppe früherer Christen, Pfingsten als Taufstag der Apostel in der Apostelgeschichte und die Szenen der Verkündigung bei Lukas" (251).

²⁰. The beginning of the words "Ἀνδρες Ἰσραηλίται, marks the end of this quotation (G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 270).

²¹. E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 161.

²². Although this question will be answered later in this study, attention can be drawn here to the remark of O. BAUERNFEIND that this long citation from J1 was already used before Luke in connection with the warding off of accusations of drunkenness (*App*, 34). Against this view, E. HAENCHEN (*App*, 141) and M. RESE (*Motive*, 45-6) have already shown convincingly that this argument does not have any solid basis.

²³. M. RESE thought that the long form of this quotation could be understood within the purpose of the speech itself: "Das Zitat erklärt nicht nur die Erscheinung des Geistes, sondern es enthält die wesentlichen Aussagen, die in der Petrusrede entfaltet und dargelegt werden" (*Motive*, 46). RESE therefore includes it in his choice of citations for his christological study.

²⁴. It cannot be accepted *unqualified* that "...es (folgt) nicht dem hebräischen Bibeltext, sondern dem griechischen der LXX" (J. ROLOFF, *App*, 52). In the same direction, also A.W. ARGYLE, *The Theory of an Aramaic Source in Acts 2,14-40*, in: *JThS* 4 (1953), 213-214, here 214; C. SMITS, *Citaten II*, 180; H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 33; I.H. MARSHALL, *Luke- Historian and Theologian*, Exeter 1970,

they the result of his (or the redactor's) own interpretation, or do they represent both? In other words: Why did Luke choose this quotation specifically here,²⁵ in this specific textual form and this specific length?²⁶

3.2.1 Pre-Lucan occurrence of Jl 2:32 (3:5) in Rm 10:13²⁷

— πᾶς ὃς ἐὰν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται —

Jl 2:28 (3:5) was already used by Paul in Rm 10:13 in a christological manner²⁸ (as evidence that the Gentiles too could share salvation).²⁹ Luke is thus not the first to have made this connection with Jl, though he uses a longer unit, and uses it in his own way. No attempt will be made here to determine whether Luke knew any of the Pauline epistles. The fact remains that the christological-soteriological connection with Jl 2:28 (3:5) could have been familiar to Luke.³⁰

3.2.2 The introductory formula (Ac 2:16)

Among the interesting similarities between the speeches of Ac 2:14-41 (second Petrine) and 13:16-41 (first Pauline), is the introductory formula³¹ which is almost identical in both accounts where Luke quotes from the *duodecim prophetae*. The reference in this formula that the quotation comes from Jl might, however, be a later addition.³²

161; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 32; and H. RINGGREN, *Luke's Use*, 233. Although the text of Ac 2:17-21 might seem to be nearer to the LXX, it must be said clearly that it also definitely differs from the LXX on several points. A more qualified statement is to be found by B. REICKE, *Glaube und Leben*, 43; F. MUSSNER, "In den letzten Tagen" (Apg. 2,17a), in: *BZ* 5 (1961), 263-265, here 263; M. RESE, *Motive*, 46; B.M. NEWMAN & E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 42; and G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 50. Even nearer to the truth seems to be G.D. KILPATRICK when he typified this quotation from Jl as "anonymous" (*Some Quotations*, 82). He adds that this is also "true of the other quotations from the prophets listed above". These are Hab 1:5; Am 5:25-27; 9:11f and Is 66:1f.

²⁵ This is similar to M. RESE's "Bedeutung der Zitate" (*Motive*, 31).

²⁶ This issue could broadly be classified as the same as that which M. RESE understood under the "Form der Zitate" (*Motive*, 29).

²⁷ See also Ac 9:14,21; 22:16 and 1 Cor 1:2. It is assumed here that Luke must have known (at least some of) the Pauline epistles. G. LÜDEMANN points to 1 Cor 1:2 where Paul could name the Christians in general those "who call upon the Lord". He concludes that on the basis of this, it might be possible that Jl 2:32 could have been used already before 1 Cor 1:2 for the interpretation of the Jesus-*kyrigma* (*Christentum*, 53). See also M. RESE, *Motive*, 64, and R. BULTMANN, *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, (herausgegeben von O. MERK) (UTB 630), Tübingen 1984, 127f.

²⁸ Cf. also K. KLIESCH, *Das heilsgeschichtliche Credo in der Reden der Apostelgeschichte* (BBB 44), Bonn 1975, 251.n.18; and G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 53.

²⁹ Cf. also A. KERRIGAN, *Sensus Plenior*, 297.

³⁰ So also I.H. MARSHALL, *Acts*, 73. A. KERRIGAN has formulated it even clearer: "...the Christological interpretation of this text was familiar to circles other than Peter's" (*Sensus Plenior*, 297).

³¹ Ac 2:16 = ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωηλ. Ac 13:40 = βλέπετε οὖν μὴ ἐπέλθῃ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τοῖς προφήταις.

³² Cf. here the discussion by G.D. KILPATRICK, *Some quotations*, 94-5. But textual grounds for its omission here are too limited. So also B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 294. This "Genauigkeit der Stellenangabe" can thus not be used as an argument in favour of Luke's use of Scripture, as is done by K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127.

3.2.3 Determining and explaining the textual differences

In order to try and get some explanation for these differences, attention must be paid, in the first instance, to the texts themselves.

The reading of Codex W³³ is almost identical with that of the reconstructed LXX text found in the Göttingen edition of this particular unit. There are, however, also some striking differences to be found: (a) the insertion of γε between καί and ἐπί in J1 2:29 by the second hand, i.e. the first corrector of codex W,³⁴ and (b) the addition of κάτω in V.30. These aspects are discussed in greater detail below.

NT (NA26) Ac 2:17-21	LXX J1 2:28-32	CODEX W J1 2:28-32	MT J1 3:1-5
17 Καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἑσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὄρασεις ᾄψονται	28 Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα	28 Καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα	וְהָיָה 1 כִּי יִשְׁפַּח אֶת רוּחִי עַל כָּל בָּשָׂר וְנָבְאוּ בְנֵי בְנֵי וְבָנוֹתֵיכֶם
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίως ἐνυπνιασθήσονται·	ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνία ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὄρασεις ᾄψονται·	ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ οἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν, καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνία ἐνυπνιασθήσονται, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὄρασεις ᾄψονται·	וְנָבְאוּ זְקֵנֵיכֶם וְנָבְאוּ בְנֵי וְבָנוֹתֵיכֶם וְנָבְאוּ בְנֵי וְבָנוֹתֵיכֶם וְנָבְאוּ בְנֵי וְבָנוֹתֵיכֶם
18 καὶ γε ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου ἐν ταῖς	29 καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας ἐν ταῖς	29 καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας ἐν ταῖς	וְנָבְאוּ 2 עַל הַעֲבָדִים וְעַל הַאֲמָנוֹת

³³ H.A. SANDERS has already described the papyrus manuscript, Codex W (Washingtoniensis, 3rd cent. AD), with its history, paleography, characteristics and reprinted texts. He states that "in so old a manuscript as this papyrus one may safely assume freedom from the influence of Origen as well as from the later editions, and this assumption is supported by the examination of the text" (*The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection*, New York 1927, 25).

³⁴ This then has the same authority as the first hand (author), because this hand (first corrector) has corrected the readings on the basis of the same *Textortage*. This καὶ also appears prominently later in the text of J1 (3:4) of this codex W.



ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, καὶ προφητεύσουσιν. 19 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἅνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ. 20 ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα, πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. 21 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.	ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου. 30 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ. 31 ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. 32 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.	ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου. 30 καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω, αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ. 31 ὁ ἥλιος μεταστραφήσεται εἰς σκότος καὶ ἡ σελήνη εἰς αἷμα πρὶν ἔλθεῖν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ. 32 καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται.	םימי ההוא רוח :הרוח מני 3 מופתי משפ יבאי םפ תיה :פפ שפ 4 יהי של נס לפי יהי :פפ היה 5 כל יבאי שפ היה שפ!
---	---	---	--

NT Textual Variants³⁵

Codex D (Bezae Cantabrigiensis) reads (a) πάσας σάρκας and not πᾶσαν σάρκα, and (b) changes the pronoun ὑμῶν to αὐτῶν, while (c) omitting the last two occurrences of the pronoun completely (Ac 2:17).³⁶ It also omits the phrases (d) ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκεῖναις, (e) καὶ προφητεύσουσιν, (f) αἷμα καὶ πῦρ καὶ ἀτμίδια καπνοῦ (Ac 2:19), and (g) καὶ ἐπιφανῆ (Ac 2:20), supported by Codex X.³⁷ P⁷⁴ (Papyrus Bodmer XVII) reads (a) ἐν τες ἡμέραις and not ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις (Ac 2:18); (b) ἐλθεῖν τὴν ἡμέραν and not ἐλθεῖν ἡμέραν (Ac 2:20); and (c) πᾶς ὃς ἐάν and not πᾶς ὃς ἂν (Ac 2:21).

Previous studies of this quotation, although numerous, have not provided satisfactory explanations for all the textual changes between the Ac reading and that in existing manuscripts from the LXX.³⁷ One major step forward was the explicit

³⁵ See also the discussions of T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 6-9; and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 158-161.

³⁶ According to E. EPP (followed by R.P. MENZIES, *The Development of Early Christian Pneumatology, with special reference to Luke-Acts*, Sheffield 1991, 213), these readings reflect a theological tendency by D, which is characteristic of the Western text (*sic*), namely a heightening of the universalism of Luke (*The Theological Tendency of Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis in Acts*, Cambridge 1966, 66-70).

³⁷ One extreme explanation was presented by W.K.L. CLARKE in his comparison of the quotations in Ac with the LXX. He has simply typified the J1-quotation under the heading: "Free Versions of the LXX. in Acts" (*Use of the Septuagint*, 88). (So also the Hab-quotation of Ac 13:41). This was probably due to the trend of the day to talk too easily and categorically of "the LXX" without qualifying which textual traditions or recensions they are dealing with. The textual changes that CLARKE found between Ac and the LXX (TISCHENDORF's edition; *Use of the Septuagint*, 85,n.4) are thus seen by him to be the result primarily of a free quotation of the source text by Luke. As yet, unfortunately, insufficient work has been done attempting to trace at least some of the changes to variants in other textual traditions. But in support of the argument against a so-called "free quotation", cf. T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 13.

statement that this quotation is preserved in two forms, represented by codex B and by codex D.³⁸ Some attempts have been made to choose one or the other as representative of the authoritative tradition,³⁹ while others have thought such a choice to be impossible.⁴⁰ Comparing the two forms today, the best choice seems to be to prefer the text as found in the Alexandrian tradition (of which codex B is one representative), above the formerly wrongly called "western" text⁴¹ (represented here by codex D).⁴² However, despite such developments, major studies still fall short of a clear identification of the differences,⁴³ or they overlook the possibility of ascribing some of the changes to the hand of the Ac writer, and/or to the macro context from which the quoted texts were taken.⁴⁴ They even overlook all the alternatives supplied by the existing textual witnesses which could contribute to a better understanding on some of these changes.⁴⁵

Thus, the important question to be answered here is: are the changes between Ac and the writer's source text, (a) unknown to us today, or (b) Luke's own theological interpretation and/or stylistic preference, or (c) a combination of both? In order to attempt to give answers to these questions, all the different parallels and readings must be identified as accurately as possible; thereafter an attempt could be made to draw conclusions about which changes were due to the source text and

³⁸ Cf. J.H. ROPES, Detached Note on xiii.27-29, in: F.J. FOAKES JACKSON & K. LAKE (eds), *The Beginnings of Christianity, Part I: The Text of Acts, Vol. III*, London 1926, 261-265; L. CERFAUX, *Citations*, 47; E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 161; M. RESE, *Motive*, 47; H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 33; B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 295. The latter sums it up as follows: codex B "agrees almost exactly with the text of the Septuagint", while codex D "embodies a series of changes from the Septuagint, most of which make the quotation more suitable for the occasion". He suggests that there are two possibilities here: (a) the adaptation as represented in codex D could have been the work of the original author, while the agreement of the B text with the LXX might have been produced by an editor, or (b) the author could have "copied exactly, or nearly so, from his Septuagint", and the "Western reviser" (*sic*) of codex D was responsible for the modifications. In comparison with the general trend and characteristics of codex D, it seems more probably that the latter is to be preferred (B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 295).

³⁹ Cf. J.H. ROPES, *Note*, 16; L. CERFAUX, *Citations*, 47; and E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 161.

⁴⁰ Cf. K. LAKE and H.J. CADBURY, *The Beginnings of Christianity 1,4: The Acts of the Apostles*, London 1933, 21; M. RESE, *Motive*, 47.

⁴¹ K. ALAND and B. ALAND point this out clearly and said: "daß der Codex Bezae Cantabrigiensis trotz seines griechisch-lateinischen Textes nicht im Westen geschrieben worden ist, sondern entweder in Nordafrika oder Ägypten, steht nach den Untersuchungen der Paläographen fest" (*Der Text des Neuen Testaments*, Stuttgart 1989, 61).

⁴² K. ALAND and B. ALAND show convincingly that the changes as found in codex D "haben keinen Anspruch darauf, als Urtext zu gelten" (*Text des NT*, 60-61). Cf. also the remarks about codex D at the beginning of this thesis.

⁴³ Cf. here for example the overlooking of the insertion of $\gamma\epsilon$ in Ac 2:18 by M. RESE, *Motive*, 1969; and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 156-169; as well as the list of differences in H. RINGGREN, *Luke's Use*, 233; and G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 50.

⁴⁴ Cf. here for example the discussion below on $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\ \acute{\omicron}\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$ which was probably inserted due to Luke's knowledge of the broader context of J1, differently explained by M. RESE, *Motive*, 49; and E. HAENCHEN, *App*, 142.

⁴⁵ Cf. here for example the discussion below on the occurrence of $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega$ in Ac 2:19, which is also to be found in codex W.

(a) *Textual differences between MT and LXX*

The NT follows the reading of the LXX, against that of the MT, on two points:

- (i) The insertion of ἀπό before τοῦ πνεύματος.⁴⁷
- (ii) The "great and terrible day of the Lord" in the MT becomes "the great and manifest day" of the Lord in the LXX and Ac, because of a possible mistaken translation of אָרְרָב ("terrible") which the LXX derives from אָרְרָב in stead of אָרְרָב.⁴⁸

(b) *Textual differences between Ac and LXX*

The following 11 textual differences between the readings of Ac 2:17-21 and Jl 2:28-32 (3:1-5) have been identified: 8 *additions*: (1) λέγει ὁ θεός appears after ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in Ac 2:17; (2) γε between καί and ἐπί in Ac 2:18; (3) and (4) μου occurs two times in Ac 2:18 — after δούλους and after δούλας; (5) καὶ προφητεύουσιν is added after ἐκχεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματος μου at the end of Ac 2:18; (6) ἄνω appears after οὐρανῷ in Ac 2:19; (7) κάτω appears after τῆς γῆς in Ac 2:19; (8) σημεῖα is added between καί and ἐπί in Ac 2:19. Only 1 *substitution*: (9) μετὰ ταῦτα (LXX) is changed to ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in Ac 2:17. Also 1 *transposition*: (10) the phrase, καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται, was moved forwards from its position in the LXX at the end of the "list" (i.e. after the sons, daughters and old men), to its current position in Ac 2:17 between the sons and daughters on the one hand, and the old men on the other hand. There is also a single change of the *case* (11) when ἐνσπνία is changed in Ac 2:17 to ἐνσπνίους. Although no *omissions* are to be found, the question must be answered why the quotation ended at this specific point.

b.1 Additions:

[1] λέγει ὁ θεός⁴⁹ (Ac 2:17)

Looking at the NT, there is no reason to doubt the occurrence of this phrase in Ac, as it is represented by both the main textual witnesses on the one hand, as well as codex D on the other hand (taking the alternative of κύριος/ὁ θεός as a separate

⁴⁷. According to D.-A. KOCH (in personal discussion), the remark of G.L. ARCHER and G. CHIRICHIGNO that this is perhaps done in order to avoid the false impression that all of the third Person of the Trinity would be poured out into believers (*Quotations*, 149), is intolerable, because the Trinitarian dogma was not yet known and developed in the LXX.

⁴⁸. Cf. also É. HAENCHEN, *App*, 142; H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 34; G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 270, n.54; and H. RINGGREN, *Luke's Use*, 233.

⁴⁹. Some texts prefer the reading: λέγει κύριος (cf. for example Codex D). According to M. RESE this might be due to a resemblance to the other places in the NT where the insertion λέγει κύριος is found (*Motive*, 48). Another possibility, mentioned by G.D. KILPATRICK, is that the reading was later changed to ὁ θεός because it was ambiguous (meaning either God or Christ) and could have been easily misunderstood (An eclectic Study of the Text of Acts, in: J.N. BIRDSALL and R.W. THOMSON (eds), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*, Freiburg 1963, 65-66). R.P. MENZIES agrees with this, noting that "it is also possible that D has modified the original text to bring it into conformity with 2.43". He, nonetheless, finds that "the external evidence strongly favours ὁ θεός" (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 213). There is, however, no basis for this argument as B.M. METZGER has convincingly pointed out (*Textual Commentary*, 296). So also D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 158.342.

problem on its own). But turning to the OT, these words are not to be found at the relevant place in Jl 2:28 (3:1). It is also absent in the readings of codex W and of the MT at this specific point, and could therefore be seen as an addition by the hand of the author of Ac. Presented as a parenthesis, it was meant to be read at the very beginning of this long quotation. It could therefore also be seen as still being part of Luke's introduction (i.e. introductory formula) to his quotation.

A similar inserted λέγει κύριος is also to be found in other NT quotations.⁵⁰ Such insertions might have had the function of emphasizing the fact that the quoted words are coming (via the prophet) from God.⁵¹ Nevertheless, and without detracting from this as an explanation; a further explanation may lie in Luke's knowledge of the broader context of Jl.⁵² If this latter explanation is accepted, it might be inferred that Luke had seen and understood this quotation, quite rightly, as part of the long direct speech of God in Jl, and therefore had stressed the divine origin of the section from which he quoted. This broader context of Jl (i.e. that the quoted section came originally from the direct word of God) and the possibility that Luke knew of it, seems to have been overlooked in the past by some scholars.⁵³ On the basis of its being the *lectio difficilior*,⁵⁴ as well as on the basis of this knowledge of the broader context of Jl, the λέγει ὁ θεός-reading could be preferred above the λέγει κύριος-reading.

To conclude: It seems thus more probable that this phrase was an insertion made by the author of Ac, rather than a different reading found in his source text at this specific place. It could be seen as being part of the introductory formula,⁵⁵ and might have been inserted here because of the author's knowledge of the broader context of Jl in order to accentuate the divine origin of these words.⁵⁶

[2] (καὶ) γε⁵⁷ (Ac 2:18): When comparing the NT text with that of the LXX, it

⁵⁰ Ac 7:49; Rm 12:19 (= Heb 10:30f); 1 Cor 14:21; 2 Cor 6:16f. Except for cases where it indeed forms part of the OT reading, for example: Ac 15:17; Rm 14:11; Heb 8:8-12; 10:16; Rv 1:8. Cf. also D.-A. KOCH, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 246.

⁵¹ Cf. M. RESE who also thinks that the answer to the question about why this formula was included in the quotations, is to be found in the fact that "auf diese Weise Gott selbst als Sprecher bezeichnet werden soll" (*Motive*, 48-49). T. HOLTZ, too, says that "Diese Zufügung soll deutlich machen, daß es sich bei dem Zitat um Gottesrede handelt" (*Untersuchungen*, 6) and G.D. KILPATRICK typifies it as "divine authentication" (*Some Quotations*, 82), while D.L. BOCK too thinks in this direction when saying that "the point of the insertion serves to remind the reader of the divine origin of the text, and therefore, when applied to this event as its fulfillment, a note of divine sanction is added to the discussion" (*Proclamation*, 158). Compare also K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127; and R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 217.

⁵² Compare Ac 2:17 (λέγει ὁ θεός) with Jl 2:12 (καὶ νῦν λέγει κύριος ὁ θεός ὑμῶν). So also R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 217 — although he refers to Jl 2:27.

⁵³ Cf. E. HAENCHEN who has seen it to be "gegenüber der LXX" (*App*, 142).

⁵⁴ With M. RESE, *Motive*, 48.

⁵⁵ Cf. for example Jr 21:7 where a similar situation appears: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα — οὕτως λέγει κύριος — δώσω τὸν Σεδεκιαν...

⁵⁶ For more background on "the word of God", see for instance G. DELLING, *Wort Gottes und Verkündigung im Neuen Testament* (SBS 53), Stuttgart 1971; C.-P. MARZ, *Das Wort Gottes bei Lukas. Die lukanische Worttheologie als Frage an die neuere Lukasforschung* (Erfurter Theologische Schriften 11), Leipzig 1974.

⁵⁷ Cf. J. REIDER & N. TURNER, *An Index to Aquila* (V.T.S 12), Leiden 1966, 122. See also J. ZIEGLER on "Wechsel der Partikeln", where also in codex A of the 12P, Hos 5:7 reads καὶ γε, with the MT (*Duodecim Prophetarum* (Septuaginta Vetus Testamentum Graecum. Auctoritate Academiae Litterarum Göttingensis editum, Vol XIII), Göttingen 1984, 41). Note the interesting feature that the Greek column of Codex D reads here καὶ ἐν ἐπί and the Latin, "et ego super". D.C. PARKER suggests

seems as if Luke has inserted a *ye* here between the *kaí* and the *ἐνί*.⁵⁸ But if *Schneider* is right in saying that Luke "hat das steigernde *ye* kaum selbst eingefügt",⁵⁹ — and it is indeed generally accepted to be the case⁶⁰ — this might be the result of Luke's *Textvorlage* which could have already read it at the point in time when Luke used this section for his long quotation.⁶¹ It may also be significant that Luke used here a version which resembles (at least this specific shared characteristic of) the so-called *kaiye* version⁶² of the LXX.⁶³ In fact, codex W has shown textual proof of the existence of this reading at a relatively early stage among the rest of the textual witnesses. This leaves room for the possibility that the "addition" of *ye* could be seen as an "insertion" which the author of Ac might have found already in his

that the manuscript of Codex D has read originally ΕΓΩ, which was later (unsuccessfully?) changed to *ye* (*Codex Bezae. An Early Christian Manuscript and its Text*, Cambridge 1992, 152).

⁵⁸ The occurrence of *kai ye* is found only once more in the NT, in Ac 17:27 in the third speech of Paul, held in Athens. *Contra* R.P. MENZIES who categorically equates Luke's use of *ye* in general with the combination *kai ye*, by saying that "...*kai ye* is characteristic of Luke". He therefore regards it as redactional (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 219). Cf. also the textual notes in NA26 at Lk 19:42: codex W reads here *kai ye*.

⁵⁹ G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 268.

⁶⁰ See, for example, T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 10.

⁶¹ The Ac reading is supported by the following textual witnesses of the LXX: W^c X^c [A(106,26)-Q(544)-49(764)-198-233(710,410)-534] [36-LI(62,147)-LII(46,86,711)]. (Cf. the table in App. A). This provides strong support by the Alexandrian text-tradition. It is also on this evidence that W.K.L. CLARKE attributed this change of the Ac text to recensional causes (i.e. the fifth group of H.B. SWETE, *Use of the Septuagint*, 92-93). According to H.A. SANDERS this insertion of *ye* between *kai* and *ἐνί* is found elsewhere (among the witnesses of codex W) only in the hand of the first corrector as represented in MS 40, as well as in the Complutensian edition. This might explain that it was "derived from Aquila or Theodotion on the evidence of Syro-Hex, but also from the original Hebrew. A different connective is reported for Symmachus" (*Minor Prophets*, 27). SANDERS reckons, however, that if one considers the place which Theodotion's revision had held among the Christians, it would be "wiser to assume no indebtedness on the part of W than to refer these two or three cases, all doubtful, to his influence". He also considers that there is clear proof of the direct influence of the original Hebrew on W as well as of a sparing use of the translations of Symmachus and Aquila; these sources would then be sufficient to account for all of the peculiarities of W without having recourse to Theodotion as a source. SANDERS' view is opposed by W. GROSSOUW (*The Coptic Versions of the Minor Prophets. A contribution to the study of the Septuagint* (MBE 3), Rome 1938, 113) and J. ZIEGLER, *Duodecim Prophetarum*, 33-34). The last draws attention to the remarks of GROSSOUW, namely that "it is perhaps best expressed by stating that numerous 'Hebrew corrections' in Ach-Sa, unlike those of the Greek MSS, in which they are derived (in substance) from Theodotion via the Hexapla, were mainly taken from the translations of Aquila and Symmachus and from one or more other translations of which we have hardly any knowledge (quinta, sexta, septima?); similar cases are found in the closely allied Egyptian papyrus W. Direct dependence from the Hebrew remains very unlikely".

⁶² D. BARTHÉLEMY has identified the possible existence of a "Kaige"-version which seems to be on a par with Theodotion and proto-Theodotion. His results were based on the evidence of the Dead Sea scrolls which were found from 1947 onwards (*Les Devanciers d'Aquila* (VT.S 10), Leiden 1963). Unfortunately for the debate on this quotation, no preserved text from JI exists in the "Roll of the Minor Prophets" (S^hevXIIgr) on which BARTHÉLEMY based his theory. If the rest of this quotation had shown a closer resemblance to the Hebrew, there would be a stronger basis for supposing that this *kaige*-text might have been used here. This is not the case. The quotation in general could, on the contrary, even been typified as being nearer to the LXX than to the Hebrew. On this one point, however, *kai ye* is nearer to the Hebrew.

⁶³ G.D. KILPATRICK also thought that this could have been the case (*Some Quotations*, 82), although the quotation "as a whole...still remains remote from the M.T. at several points" (97).

source text, and thus as part of the *Textvorlage*.⁶⁴ Any attempt to pinpoint that text today would be speculative.

{3} and {4} μου (Two times in Ac 2:18)

There can be no doubt that this possessive pronoun is, in both instances, part of the Ac text, due to the fact that it is supported by all the main textual witnesses — including codex D!⁶⁵ Contrary to this, strong textcritical evidence *against* the addition of μου in Jl 2:29 (3:2) is to be found in,⁶⁶ among others, the papyrus codex W.⁶⁷ It is also lacking in the reading of the MT. This does not mean at all, however, that one must assume its omittance also from the *Vorlage* that Luke had in front of him.⁶⁸

The important issue is not to speculate whether this was already to be found in Luke's source text, or not, — but to realise that he reinterprets the δοῦλοι of Jl. They are not slaves here,⁶⁹ but Christians,⁷⁰ i.e. another group,⁷¹ and as representatives of this new social group, they are now servants and maids of God!⁷²

To conclude: It is difficult to be sure whether Luke simply adopted μου from his source text, or whether he added it himself, as part of his interpretation.⁷³ Textcriticism of the LXX text indicates that μου was not part of the LXX. Thus if

⁶⁴. So also K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127. For the *contra* argument see R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 200-221.

⁶⁵. *Contra* D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 159; as well as R.P. MENZIES, who states that "...D omits μου after δοῦλους and δούλας..." (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 213,n.2).

⁶⁶. *Contra* to K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127.

⁶⁷. Cf. J. ZIEGLER: δοῦλος W B-N^a-V AchSaP = M] + μου rel. According to him, the omission must be preferred: "Eine Reihe wichtiger Lesarten, die vielfach als ursprünglich in den Text aufgenommen werden können, wird nur von W B-X, manchmal auch von V und einigen abhängigen Minuskeln und sonstigen Zeugen überliefert" (*Duodecim Prophetiae*, 30). This omission of μου in the reading of the LXX is then one of them. Also H.A. SANDERS has said that there are only a few agreements between codex W on the one hand, and the few fragments of the true Old Latin text and citations from the earlier Church Fathers on the other hand. However, one of these agreements which is however noteworthy, is the support in favour of the omission of μου in Jl 2:29. This reading is thus supported by N^a V W Compl Ach OL^{Text} (*Minor Prophets*, 40). See also the work of D.-A. KOCH in connection with the occurrence of μου in Hab 2:4b and the relevant places where it is quoted in the NT. He has found that μου was scratched here in Hab 2:4b by the hand of the *second* corrector (third hand) in codex W. The second corrector has used another *Vorlage* than that which was used by the first hand and also by the first corrector (second hand) for his corrections. These readings of the second corrector (third hand) are therefore not as authoritative as the first two hands (Der Text von Hab 2,4b in der Septuaginta und im Neuen Testament, in: ZNW 76 (1985), 68-85). Here in Jl 2:29 μου is omitted by all the hands of codex W.

⁶⁸. Cf. the LXX textcritical witnesses in favour of this inclusion: B (only at δοῦλους) N^c [A(106,26)-Q(544)-49(764)-198-233(710,410)-534] [L(2,36,48,51,231,719,763)-L1(62,147)-L11(46,86,711)]. (See also the table in App. A). On the basis of the support of the Alexandrian group here again, W.K.L. CLARKE sees the inclusion of μου as being due to recensional causes (H.B. SWETE's fifth group) (*Use of the Septuagint*, 93-95). Also G. SCHNEIDER states that it could not be excluded, "daß das μου schon im LXX-Text des Lukas stand" (*App I*, 268). D.L. BOCK seems to indicate agreement when saying that although "Haenchen suggests that these additions of μου make the servant's relationship to God clearer", "this relationship seems implied already in the OT texts" (*Proclamation*, 159).

⁶⁹. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 268; and R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 218.

⁷⁰. T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 10.

⁷¹. H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 34. Against the viewpoint of E. HAENCHEN that we are not dealing here with a new group (*App*, 142).

⁷². Cf. also J. ROLOFF, *App*, 53; and G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 50.

⁷³So also D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 162.

Luke used the LXX, the assumption must be that he added μου as part of his interpretation of the text.

[5] καὶ προφητεῶσσι (Ac 2:18)

Although most scholars agree that these words are omitted in the LXX, there is substantial disagreement when they come to deal with the question of its occurrence in most of the NT textual witnesses on Ac.⁷⁴ The textual situation related to this phrase has been discussed in detail recently, and it was proposed that these words be excluded from Ac.⁷⁵ A proposal for the omission of this phrase in Ac is nothing new.⁷⁶ However, when the textcritical data are compared, it is clear that witnesses supporting the inclusion of these words in Ac definitely outweigh those who are against it, and there is no reason to query the readings of P⁷⁴ & A and B — especially not when found in this combination.⁷⁷ Assuming then that καὶ προφητεῶσσι was not part of Luke's source text,⁷⁸ it then follows that it was added by Luke himself.⁷⁹ It therefore differs from the LXX reading and was thus probably the result of Luke's reinterpretation of his source text.⁸⁰ Prophecy is now not only, as before, limited to individual prophets, but has become a sign for all who believe in Christ,⁸¹ especially then the δούλοι μου!

⁷⁴. The problem is that it is indeed difficult to determine if this was the result of a pre-Lukan change or the work of the compiler of Ac (G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg 1*, 268-9). E. HAENCHEN (*Apg*, 142) and T. HOLTZ (*Untersuchungen*, 11) have even thought it to be a "Schreibfehler".

⁷⁵. Cf. P.R. RODGERS (Acts 2:18. καὶ προφητεῶσσι, in: *JThS* 38 (1987), 95-97, here 95). His argument develops in the following way: "The addition is supported by the vast majority of manuscripts (P⁷⁴ & A B C E etc.) and the omission is attested in only a few witnesses (D it^d P Tertullian, Rebaptism, Priscillian)". The fact that Priscillian, Bishop of Avila from 381-5, omitted this phrase in his quotation of Ac 2:18 (*Tract* 1:59, CSEL 18.32) attests, according to Rodgers, "to its absence at least in the manuscript tradition known to him, a tradition which includes elements of both B and D types, but also displays independence from both types of text" (*Acts* 2, 96-7). His conclusion is that "these considerations...suggest that the original text of Acts is not presented by either B or D, but by an earlier form of text of which these two types represent revision or corruption" (*Acts* 2, 97). Contrary to this viewpoint, T. HOLTZ (following G.D. KILPATRICK, *Eclectic Study*, 66), had already argued two decades earlier that the omission this phrase in D it, etc. "...ist nachträgliche Angleichung an die LXX" (*Untersuchungen*, 11).

⁷⁶. Also according to A.F.J. KLIJN, these words must be rejected (*In Search*, 103-110). He rejects them on the grounds that, in his view, D agrees with the LXX (G.D. KILPATRICK, *Some Quotations*, 96). Against this, G.D. KILPATRICK has argued that "...there is no reason for thinking that D and the LXX are right automatically when they agree, however rarely this happens. Other things being equal, the text which diverges from the LXX seems more likely to be right" (97).

⁷⁷ So also J.J. KILGALLEN, The Unity of Peter's Pentecost Speech, in: *BiTod* 82 (1976), 650-656, here 652.

⁷⁸. Its inclusion among the witnesses of the LXX is limited to a section of the Lucian group: 36-LII(46,86,711)-49(613). Cf. also the table at App. A.

⁷⁹. Cf. also R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 221; and K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127. The latter uses Ac 19:6 as support for his argument, but admits that this is controversial. T. HOLTZ, for instance, does not regard this as possible, but opts for dittography, "...als ein Versehen...". (*Untersuchungen*, 12). And even before him, already E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 142. This makes sense, but will remain difficult, however, to determine if it was Luke or an earlier writer.

⁸⁰. According to W.K.L. CLARKE, the repetition of these words here "makes the prophecy more appropriate to the events". He prefers then to see the addition as being due to "a desire to adapt a prophetic context to the circumstances under which it was thought to have been fulfilled" (*Use of the Septuagint*, 93-94), i.e. H.B. SWETE's third group. G. SCHNEIDER says that its repetition here gives "Jedenfalls...dem προφητεῶσσι als Geistwirkung ein sachliches Schwergewicht" (*Apg 1*, 269).

⁸¹. So W. DIETRICH, *Petrusbild*, 202 — although he wanted to limit it still only to Jews. Cf. also D.L. BOCK: "The insertion serves to underscore that these Spirit-anointed people, as well as Peter himself, speak the Word of God. As such the insertion is a theological addition..." (*Proclamation*, 162).

[6] and [7] ἄνω ... (κάτω) (Ac 2:19)

Codex D, as well as all the main textual witnesses, support the inclusion of these words in the Ac text. It seems, however, as if they are lacking in "the" LXX. Although the single word, κάτω, was thought to be a "conscious addition" by Luke,⁸² it is found in codex W⁸³ as part of the text! Some reading(s) which include this word, might then have already existed in one or more of the several versions of the LXX that were circulating during this time. The possibility is then by no means excluded that this could have been part of the source text that Luke might have had at his disposal.⁸⁴ When looking to the rest of the parallelistic phrase, it is noteworthy that it is only here in the NT that the combination of ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω is to be found with ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω. When one compares the occurrences of the phrase ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ ... ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω in Is,⁸⁵ and bearing in mind that Is was one of the prophets best known by Luke, the possibility cannot be excluded that he consciously changed⁸⁶ the reading of his source text at this point to correlate with an already known phraseological combination from the OT — in its Greek form.⁸⁷ Another possibility might be traced to Luke's preference for strong contrasts.⁸⁸ That this could have been the manner in which it found its way is, however, not so important. Significant is the fact that this is not found in either the LXX or the Hebrew texts of Jl, and therefore could be treated as a conscious addition by Luke.⁸⁹

To conclude: It seems possible that Luke could have made these changes, (or at least that of the addition of ἄνω⁹⁰), and that the changes were probably due to his interpretation of his text.⁹¹

⁸² So G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq I*, 269. Also M. RESE, *Motive*, 52-53; and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 162.

⁸³ As well as with an accompanying minuscule, 407, and support from the Lucianic group: 22^c-36-*LII*(46,86^mg,711)-49(764,613). See table in App. A. According to T. HOLTZ, the occurrence of κάτω in W-407 is probably a sign therefore, that the text, which is read in our LXX editions, "...erst das Produkt einer Angleichung an den MT ist und ursprünglich anders aussah..." (*Untersuchungen*, 13).

⁸⁴ H.A. SANDERS states that "in so old a manuscript as this papyrus one may safely assume freedom from the influence of Origen as well as from the later editions, and this assumption is supported by the examination of the text" (*Minor Prophets*, 25). This seems also to be true about influence from the text of Ac.

⁸⁵ Cf. for example Is 8:21 and 37:31 which are exact parallels. 'Εν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω alone is also to be found in Is 7:3; 7:11(Th) — here in connection with σμῆναι; 34:10; 36:2. (About κάτω also in the OT: Ex 20:4; Dt 4:39; 5:8; Job 2:11; 15:19; 3 Ki(1 Ki) 8:23; Ec 3:21; 5:1; Is 5:30; 8:22; 51:6; Jr 38(31):37). L. O'REILLY disagrees on probable influence from Is (*Word and Sign*, 165).

⁸⁶ Cf. also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq I*, 269.

⁸⁷ Being part of Ex 20 (V.4), it was indeed a well known phrase.

⁸⁸ So L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 165. He points to the following passages: Lk 2:14; 10:15,18,19; 12:56; 21:25; Ac 4:24; 10:11,12; etc. According to R. MORGENTHAUER, Luke has then found this stylistic feature in the LXX and has used it here to accentuate the existing contrast (*Die lukanische Geschichtsschreibung als Zeugnis, Bd. I* (ATHANT 14), Zürich 1949, 30-32).

⁸⁹ Cf. T. HOLTZ: "Lukas wird in den Text eingegriffen haben, aber es ist nicht ausgemacht, daß der LXX-Text so ohne Aufforderung dazu war, wie er heute erscheint" (*Untersuchungen*, 13).

⁹⁰ Supported among the LXX textual witnesses only by X^c and a section of the Lucianic group: 22^c-36-*LII*(46,86,711)-49(764,613)-407. Cf. also the table at App. A.

⁹¹ This does not mean at all that this quotation has to be typified as "free citation" (as W.K.L. CLARKE has seen it and categorized it within the first group of possible causes mentioned by SWETE) (*Use of the Septuagint*, 93).

[8] σημεῖα (Ac 2:19)

The inclusion of σημεῖα in the text of Ac, against that of the LXX, is supported by the main textual witnesses, including codex D. This NT inclusion has already, quite rightly, been identified as a conscious addition by Luke.⁹² Less clear is Luke's reason for making the addition: was it because of the context of what follows immediately hereafter in the speech (V.22),⁹³ or did it arise from Luke's knowledge of the LXX or any other tradition (oral or written).

It should be noted here that this combination of τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα was a common expression during the time of Luke.⁹⁴ It would have been well known in the LXX.⁹⁵ One has to distinguish here, however, between τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα which were done by Jesus,⁹⁶ τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα which were done later by the apostles,⁹⁷ and τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα as cosmic signs⁹⁸ (i.e. part of apocalyptic language, and referring to events in nature due to occur just before the "great and glorious day of the Lord", before his second coming). All three alternatives are presented in Ac 2. It is clear that V.22 refers to signs and wonders performed by *Jesus*. Later in Ac it

⁹². Cf. K. LAKE & H.J. CADBURY, *Beginnings* IV, 23; E. HAENCHEN, *App*, 142.149; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 124; T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 12; D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 162-163; G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 269; K.H. RENGSTORF, s.v. σημεῖον, κ.τ.λ., in: *TDNT* VII, 240-241. With regard to the latter, L. O'REILLY finds the theological motivation for the distinction between σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα and τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα in Ac "...less than convincing" (*Word and Sign*, 165). Its inclusion among the witnesses of the LXX, does not convince: N^c-V 22^c-36-L11(46,86,711)-49(764,613). Compare also the table in App. A.

⁹³. So seen by T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 13; M. RESE (*Motive*, 49). According to the latter, this first occurrence (here within the quotation), was inserted as a link with the second occurrence later in the speech. C. SMITS also sees it in this way. He says: "Petrus geeft na het citaat een beschrijving van Jesus' daden die gebaseerd is op de woorden van Joël over wondertekenen" (*Citaten II*, 180). Cf. also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 33; O. BAUERNFEIND, *App*, 45; K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127. But here it probably refers *not* (as Ac 2:22) to those done by the historical Jesus. So also F. MUSSNER, *Letzten Tagen*, 264; B. REICKE, *Glaube und Leben*, 43; and L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 164.

⁹⁴. Cf. however, L. O'REILLY who points to the fact that it is here in Ac 2:19 "...something of an exception to the general rule..." (*Word and Sign*, 163-164).

⁹⁵. Cf. Ex 7:3 and Ps 104(105):27 and also the following in the LXX = Dt 13:1,2; 28:46; 34:11; 2Ezr 19(Nch 9):10; Ps 134(135):9; Wisd 8:8; 10:16; 1s 8:18; 20:3; Jr 39:(32):20,21; Dn 6:28(Th). Note, however, that it is always used in the combination order σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα, except in Wisd 10:16. It is also re-used from the LXX in the NT in texts such as Ac 7:36, for example. See also the comments of C. BREYTENBACH on this expression in his discussion on Mk 13:22. He typifies it as "im Neuen Testament fast eine feste Formel" and as "ein Biblizismus", referring also (except the instances above) to Ac 4:43; 7:36; [15:2 - which ought to be 15:12]; Jn 4:48; 2 Th 2:9 and Heb 2:4 (*Nachfolge und Zukunftserwartung nach Markus. Eine methodenkritische Studie* (ATHANT 71), Zürich 1984, 295-296).

⁹⁶. So, for example, G. STÄHLIN, *App*, 42-45; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 33; G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 51.

⁹⁷. F. STOLZ has drawn attention to the frequency of the latter: "Zumist bezeichnet der Ausdruck σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα in der Apostelgeschichte aber die Machttaten im Leben der Gemeinde erfahrene Wirksamkeit des erhöhten Christus". He referred to Ac 2:34; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 14:3; 15:12 (Zeichen und Wunder. Die prophetische Legitimation und ihre Geschichte, in: *ZThK* 69 (1972), 125-144, here 143). With regard to the background of "signs and wonders" in Ac, L. O'REILLY has pointed out that "...it is not surprising therefore that it is in a prophetic setting that the origin of 'signs and wonders' is to be found", and "As was the case in the neighbouring religions, so too in Israel, the man of God who did not possess an institutional standing had to provide a sign, often in the form of a prediction, whose fulfillment would show that his word could be trusted as coming from God" (*Word and Sign*, 173). See also A. WEISER, *App I*, 92; and E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 161.

⁹⁸. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 269; D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 167; J. KREMER, *Pfingsbericht*, 172-174.

becomes clear that there was already at that time a living idiom that the *apostles* did τέρατα καὶ σημεῖα.⁹⁹ V.43 refers to those of the apostles. In the quotation itself, however, reference is made to the cosmic signs of Jesus' parusia. Jesus' very own prophecy as spelled out in Lk 21:25-28 may be at the back of Luke's mind at this point. When this whole quotation is interpreted in an eschatological manner, indicating here the beginning of "the last days", the "signs and wonders" referred to may be those which are to follow later during the time of the apostles, just before the coming of Christ.¹⁰⁰ Another explanation for the addition of σημεῖα might thus be that it could have been the result of this living idiom, and serving as an eschatological pointer to the things which would follow in the era of the apostles. Luke might thus be introducing these future cosmic events as events of the eschaton. Both occurrences in this second speech of Peter (VV.19,22), as well as the one in V.43, would then be better explained from this perspective, i.e. that this phrase was already part of the tradition, and that it points here to the future. This is more satisfactory than to try to explain the first occurrence (V.19) as being dependent on the second occurrence in V.22. Thus, the "signs and wonders" referred to in V.19 are apocalyptic, those in V.22 are those performed by Jesus, and those in V.43 are those of the disciples.

b.2 Substitution:

[9] μετὰ ταῦτα (LXX) --> ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις,¹⁰¹ (Ac 2:17)

⁹⁹. Compare the following: Ac 2:43; 4:30; 5:12; 6:8; 14:3; 15:12; Rm 15:19; 2 Cor 12:12. (See Ac 7:36). According to R.P. MENZIES, it should be noted that the phrase occurs in introductory (Ac 5:12; 6:8) and summary statements (Ac 2:43; 14:3; 15:12), which are generally recognized as Lukan (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 221). L. O'REILLY says that "...the 'signs and wonders' of the last days are the miracles of the apostles which accompany the preaching of the word. The prophetic Spirit of Pentecost confers not only the power to preach the word of God but also the power to do 'signs and wonders' like those of Jesus and those of Moses" (*Word and Sign*, 166). Compare Mk 16:15-17 with Ac. The risen Jesus sent the eleven disciples "into all the world" (πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα, V.15; cf. Ac 1:8; 28:26-28) to "preach the gospel" (κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, V.15; cf. Ac 2:14-40; 8:5; 9:20; 10:37,42; 18:9; 19:13,20; 20:25; 28:31) so that "he who believes and is baptized will be saved" (ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται, V.16; cf. Ac 1:5; 2:38,41; 8:12,13,16,36,38; 9:18; 10:47-48, 11:16; 16:15,33; 18:8; 19:3-5; 20:21; 22:16). A list of *signis* is then presented which "will accompany those who believe" (σημεῖα δὲ πιστεύσασιν ταῦτα παρεκολουθήσει, V.17; cf. Ac 2:43; 4:16,22,30; 5:12; 6:8; 8:6,13; 14:3; 15:12), and which will be manifested "in Jesus' name" (ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι μου, V.17; cf. Ac 2:21,38; 3:6; 3:16; 4:7,10,12,17-18,30; 5:28,40-41; 8:12,16; 9:14-16,21,27-28; 10:43,48; 15:14,17,26; 16:18; 19:5,13,17; 21:13; 22:16; 26:9). These *signis* in Mk are: the casting out of demons (cf. Ac 19:11), "speaking in new tongues" (cf. Ac 2:3-4,11; 10:46; 19:6), picking up serpents (cf. Ac 28:3-6), they will not die when drinking poison, ill persons will be healed (cf. Ac 3:1-10; 14:8-11; 19:11; 28:8-9). Comparison with the context of the rest of Ac, reveals many similarities! When comparing the reconstructed text readings of Ac and LXX, they seem to be the nearest to codex A — which also included this, normally accepted to be a later dated, unit in Mk.

¹⁰⁰. See Lk 21:25: καὶ σημεῖα ἐν ἡλίῳ καὶ σελήνῃ καὶ ἀστροῖς, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς...

¹⁰¹. In favour of this substitution in Ac are: X A D E I P S 462 vg syr Iren Hil Mac Chrys Aug *al.* Against it: B 076 cop^{sa} Cyr (Jer). Scholars as E. HAENCHEN (*Schriftzitate*, 162,166; *App.* 142); E. SCHWEIZER, (s.v. πνεῦμα, in: *TDNT* VI, 332-431) and T. HOLTZ (*Untersuchungen*, 7-8) choose the reading of B here (which reads μετὰ ταῦτα) because it suits the Lukan understanding of the church much better — that it does not have any eschatological quality: "keine Naherwartung". Others, as I.H. MARSHALL, *Luke*, 161; H. CONZELMANN, *App.* 34; (contrary to his viewpoint in *Die Mitte der Zeit. Studien zur Theologie des Lukas* (BHT 17), Tübingen 1964, 87); M. RESE, *Motive*, 51-52; F. MUSSNER, *Letzten Tagen*, 263-5; B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 295; and K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 251,n.18, have argued convincingly for the contrary view. According to B.M. METZGER, the

Luke has changed the *μετὰ ταῦτα*, which the LXX has taken from the Hebrew, to *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*.¹⁰² It seems likely that this change was not due to Luke's *Vorlage*, but was a conscious substitution by the NT author, possibly an intentional adoption of an existing traditional formula.¹⁰³

Ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις itself is a phrase which is typical of both Luke and the LXX. It could not be seen as being only typical of the *koine* at this time, otherwise it must have manifested itself also heavily in other NT documents. It may therefore be seen as indicating that Luke had substantial knowledge of the LXX. It is possible then that Luke's use of the phrase springs from his knowledge of the context of J1 itself.¹⁰⁴ A comparison of Ac 2:17 (*ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*) with J1 1:2 (*ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ὑμῶν ἢ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*), where a similar phrase occurs twice, bears this suggestion out. There is an obvious link between Luke's use of the phrase, and that of J1, except that the latter lacks *ἐσχάταις*. However, once the link has been accepted, the problem of the occurrence of *ἐσχάταις* still remains. Noteworthy then, is this additional *ἐσχάταις* which refers to the "last days",¹⁰⁵ and therefore pinpoints this as referring to eschatological expectation.¹⁰⁶ A second

texts that support the reading of *μετὰ ταῦτα*, represent "the work of an Alexandrian corrector who brought the quotation in Acts into strict conformity with the prevailing text of the Septuagint" (*Textual Commentary*, 295). So also D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 160-161; and R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 213.

^{102.} According to B.M. NEWMAN and E.A. NIDA, this "is a typical Jewish expression used to describe the time of the Messianic age in which God would fully accomplish those promises that he had made to his people. It was taken over by the first Christians and applied to the period which began when Jesus came into the world, especially from the time of his resurrection onward. It is quite significant that these words are not in the Hebrew or Greek texts of Joel but supplied by Peter" (*Translator's Handbook*, 43).

^{103.} E. PLÜMACHER saw this as the taking on of a traditional formula (*Acta Forschung I*, 11). So also E. GRÄSSER, *Die Parusieerwartung in der Apostelgeschichte*, in: J. KREMER (éd), *Les Actes des Apôtres. Traditions, rédaction, théologie* (ETHL 48), Gembloux/Leuven 1979, 99-127, here 119; D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 161; and R.P. MENZIES who, however, does not agree that it comes from one tradition, but attributes it directly to the hand of Luke himself (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 217).

^{104.} This could then strengthen the possibility that he has also inserted *λέγει ὁ θεός*, again on the same basis of his knowledge of the broader context of J1. If he knew this broader context, both additions are explained on their own.

^{105.} Cf. also in the NT: Jn 6:39,40,44,54; 7:37; 11:24; 12:48; 2 Tm 3:1; Heb 1:2; Ja 5:3; 2 Pt 3:3. And in the LXX: Gn 49:1; Nm 24:14; Dt 4:30; 8:16; 31:29; 32:20; Jos 24:27; Neh 8:18; Pr 31:25; Hs 3:5; Mi 4:1; Is 2:2; Jr 23:20; 25:18(49:39); 37(30):24; Ezk 38:16; Dn 2:28,45; 10:14; 11:20; Dn 2:28(Th); 10:14(Th).

^{106.} So also implied by I.H. MARSHALL: "Peter regards Joel's prophecy as applying to the last days, and claims that his hearers are now living in the last days. God's final act of salvation has begun to take place" (*Acts*, 73). E. HAENCHEN's viewpoint (*Schriftstudie*, 162), that this phrase is a secondary emendation, cannot be supported. HAENCHEN's view subsequently received support from T. HOLTZ, with his categorical statement that this cannot be seen as Lukan eschatology, as the time of the outpouring of the Spirit is not yet the endtime (*Untersuchungen*, 7). A re-evaluation and more careful formulation of the issue is needed. Except for scholars such as F. MUSSNER (*Letzten Tagen*, 263-265); J. KREMER (*Pfingstbericht*, 171); and R.P. MENZIES (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 215) who have rejected the above viewpoint of E. HAENCHEN, also A. KERRIGAN has said long ago for instance that "in the New Testament the expression *ἐσχάτος* is rarely used to describe time". According to him, (for Peter) the *Last Times* constitute here "a wide period extending from the appearance of Jesus to the moment when salvation will be definitely revealed" (*Sensus Plenior*, 299-300). An even more useful formulation of Lukan eschatology is to be found in the summary of G. SCHNEIDER'S viewpoint of the "Parusieerwartung" by Luke: "...an der Parusieerwartung hält Lk vielmehr 'energisch' fest (lediglich die Terminfrage lehnt er ab) und empfiehlt eine 'Stetsbereitschaft im Blick auf das Ende' (142), zumal mit der Zeit der Kirche 'die Endzeit angebrochen ist' (137); mit Hinweis auf die gegen LXX und hebräischen Text erfolgte Änderung des Joelzitates in Apg 2,17" (summarized by E. PLÜMACHER, *Acta-Forschung I*, 11). E. PLÜMACHER himself, however, wants to see the *ἐσχάταις*

possibility is that it might have been used by Luke from the "eschatological introduction" of Is.¹⁰⁷ Problematic to explain when this alternative is chosen, is the rest of the quotation which follows directly hereafter. It might therefore be taken as some kind of a "combined quotation", but syntactically the καὶ ἔσται of Ac 2:17 is nearer to the reading of *It* than to that of Isaiah (ὅτι ἔσται). A third possibility is that μετὰ ταῦτα was simply seen as some kind of synonym to ἔσχατος itself.¹⁰⁸ The whole inserted phrase could then be an explanatory substitution by Luke for that found in his *Vortage*.

It is difficult to choose one of the three possibilities mentioned above. One thing, however, becomes vividly clear when these are compared: Luke's inserted phrase resembles a motif which seems to be found linked with the style of the prophetic literature — eschatological expectation. This is supported either by the phrase ἐν ταῖς (ἐσχάταις) ἡμέραις or by the synonomous usage of ἔσχατος and μετὰ ταῦτα.

To conclude: This phrase might have been deliberately changed by Luke. There is no such reading to be found in either the LXX or the MT. He has changed this to provide for his interpretation of the quoted section in terms of his understanding of eschatology.¹⁰⁹

b.3 Transposition:

[10] καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὁράσεις ὄψονται (Ac 2:17)

This phrase is found in the LXX after the πρεσβύτεροι. The order in the LXX is thus: υἱοί - θυγατέρες - πρεσβύτεροι - νεανίσκοι. This order is changed in Ac to: υἱοί - θυγατέρες - νεανίσκοι - πρεσβύτεροι. While there is no textcritical support to be found among the LXX witnesses for the order as it is in Ac, it might be assumed here that it was probably moved by Luke himself¹¹⁰ in order to place the young men directly after the sons and daughters and before the elders, presenting a better (logical) hierarchical structure.¹¹¹

ἡμέραι to be the same as the καιροὶ ἐθνῶν (Lk 21:24): "die letzte Epoche vor der Parusie" (*Acta-Forschung I*, 38).

¹⁰⁷. Compare Is 2:2 ("Ὅτι ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις...") with Ac 2:17 (καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις...). This was already suggested by W.K.L. CLARKE who thought that it might have come from Is 2:2, and saw it as an example of "the fusing together of passages drawn from different contexts" — according to H.B. SWETE's fourth group (*Use of the Septuagint*, 93-94), as well as by C. SMITS who has said: "De beginwoorden van het uitgebreide citaat zijn wel door Lucas overgenomen uit een eschatologische inleiding van Isaias (2.2)" (*Chaten II*, 180). Cf. also F.F. BRUCE, *Acts*, 61,n.62.

¹⁰⁸. Cf. Is 44:6: "Ἐγὼ πρῶτος καὶ ἐγὼ μετὰ ταῦτα, πλὴν ἐμοῦ οὐκ ἔστι θεός. Also Hs 3:5: καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα...ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν ἡμερῶν. Cf. further Dn 2:29(Th); 2:45(Th).

¹⁰⁹. So also D.L. BOCK: "...the alteration suggests that a turning point has taken place in salvation history. This alteration has a clear theological motive. With the pouring out of the Spirit the movement towards the eschatological Day of the Lord is declared to have begun" (*Proclamation*, 161).

¹¹⁰. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 268; R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 218; and others. Even codex D supports the transposition in Ac. But there is no single textcritical witness of the LXX that supports this transposition. Cf. to the table in App. A.

¹¹¹. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 268; R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 218; D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 162; and G. LÜDEMANN who calls it "eine sachliche Verbesserung" (*Christentum*, 50). H. RINGGREN jumps too easily to the conclusion that this reversed order in Ac is "an indication of quoting from memory" (*Luke's Use*, 233). To prove that Luke has quoted here from memory is about as impossible as it is to prove that he has actually cited here directly from a written source. T. HOLTZ suggests that this could have been the result of "Versehen", "...es ist

b.4 Case change:

[11] ἐνσπνία → ἐνσπνίους (Ac 2:17)

One finds in Ac the dative ἐνσπνίους — a *hapax legomenon*¹¹² — instead of the accusative ἐνσπνία of the LXX, of which the latter seems to be a better translation of the Hebrew, beside the fact that ἐνσπνιάζομαι normally takes the accusative.¹¹³ This does not lead to any change in meaning, however. It also contributes to a better parallel structure, agreeing with the ending of ὁράσεις of the previous unit. There exists some possibility that this reading could have been due to Luke's *Vortage*.¹¹⁴

b.5 Quotation-ending:

Although there are no omissions to be found within the quoted section itself, it must be asked why the quotation was ended at this specific point, and why the material following directly afterwards was excluded.¹¹⁵ Some scholars suggest that this was done so that the salvation would be seen as applying *not* exclusively to the Jews.¹¹⁶ The specific sentence would then be excluded here in order to modify, reinterpret, and to relate the quotation with the new given context. The rest of it is, however, not left out. In V.39 we find the remaining elements woven implicitly into the discourse.¹¹⁷ It seems then as if Luke found it important to interrupt his quotation here in order to avoid any misunderstanding that it was meant for the Jews alone. The portion of the quotation thus interrupted is then represented, in a modified form, later in the discourse. In addition, it must be said that the christological kerygma forms the centre of the speech itself. Luke thus quotes this section up to

unwahrscheinlich, daß sie auf Grund bewußter Überlegung erfolgte" (*Untersuchungen*, 12).

¹¹² The following word, ἐνσπνισθήσονται, is to be found only once more in the NT, in Jude 8.

¹¹³ Cf. T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 9; R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 218; and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 162.

¹¹⁴ So also K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127; and T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 10. The Ac reading finds support among the following LXX witnesses: N^c-V A(106,26)-Q(544)-49(764)-198-233(710,410)-534. See the table in App. A. It is thus strongly supported by the Alexandrian tradition. W.K.L. CLARKE then has preferred to see this change as being due to the fact that "the quotations in Acts show the usual New Testament tendency in that they follow the A text of the LXX, as against the B", and therefore more being due to recensional causes (i.e. the 5th group of H.B. SWETE) (*Use of the Septuagint*, 95). According to R.P. MENZIES, however, the dative was presumably preferred here by the redactor (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 218).

¹¹⁵ The rest of J1 2:32(3:5) reads as follows: ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιών καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ ἔσται ἀνασπνιάζομενος, καθὼς εἶπε κύριος, καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, οὗς κύριος προσκέκληται. M. RESE (*Motive*, 50) mentions that this notification was done already by A. LOISY (*Les Actes des Apôtres*, Paris 1920, 201).

¹¹⁶ Cf. for example M. RESE: "Bewußt wird durch die Kürzung des Zitats die Einschränkung der Verheißung von Joel 3 auf die Juden vermieden" (*Motive*, 50). In the same direction also J. DUPONT, *Études*, 393-419; A. KERRIGAN, *Sensus Plenior*, 311; and G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 51.

¹¹⁷ Cf. here J. ROLOFF: "Der hier zunächst weggelassene Schluß der Joelstelle (Joel 3,5b) wird später bei der Entfaltung dieses Umkehrrufs (V.39) noch eine Rolle spielen" (*App.*, 53). So also H. CONZELMANN, *App.*, 35; A. KERRIGAN, *Sensus Plenior*, 311; H. VAN DE SANDT, *Fate of the Gentiles*, 70. The latter has drawn attention also to Ac 13:2 and 16:10.

the point where he could link this κύριος (V.21) with Jesus of Nazareth who was made both κύριος and χριστός (V.36).

3.2.4 Method of quotation

A similarity to the way in which the quotation (quoted texts) was used in the context of the *first Petrine speech*, can be detected here. In the first Petrine speech, (a) the theme of Judas' death is discussed (1:16-20a); (b) the discussion ends with the first part of an explicit quotation (first quoted text, 1:20b-c) which is connected with this theme, thus indicating that the Scripture here quoted has been fulfilled. Luke exploits the change of theme which occurs in the quotation; the need for the election of a new witness is a consequence of the death of Judas. (c) Thus Luke uses the second part of the same quotation (second quoted text, 1:20d) to point forwards to something which now needs to be fulfilled, i.e. the election of another faithful witness in the place of Judas. (d) This election is then discussed as the next theme (1:21-22).

In this *second Petrine speech*, a similar pattern appears: (a) the theme of the happenings surrounding the "coming" of the Spirit and the reaction of the apostles (2:1-13) is taken up (2:14-17) and (b) explained by way of the connection with the first part of the quotation (2:17-18); this part of the quotation rounds off the theme, and implies that the Scripture here quoted has now been fulfilled. (c) The second part of the same quotation (2:19-20) is used to point forwards, to those things which have yet to be fulfilled, i.e. the wonders and signs, the cosmic events involving the sun and the moon, and the coming of the great and glorious day of the Lord.¹¹⁸ Also, of course, that everybody who calls on the Name of the κύριος during this time, would be saved (2:21). (d) The κύριος (Jesus of Nazareth), his death, resurrection and exaltation (with the use of additional quotations), as well as salvation in his Name, is explained in the rest of the speech (2:22-40).

This can be presented schematically as follows:

<i>First Petrine speech</i>	<i>Second Petrine speech</i>
(a) Theme: Judas (1:16-20a)	(a) Theme: Spirit, reaction (2:14-17)
(b) Quoted text [1] (1:20b-c)	(b) Quoted section [1] (2:17-18)
= Fulfilled	= Now beginning to be fulfilled
(c) Quoted text [2] (1:20d)	(c) Quoted section [2] (2:19-20/21)
= Yet unfulfilled	= Yet unfulfilled
(d) Theme: elect witness (1:21-2)	(d) Theme (κύριος, salvation) (2:22-40)

In the section of the prophetic speech of Jesus, as recorded in Lk 21:25-27 (par. Mk 13:21-27; Mt 24:23-31), Luke has omitted the explicit quotations from Is 13:10 (Mk 13:24; Mt 24:29a) and Is 34:4 (Mk 13:25; Mt 24:29b) situated between the σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (Mk 13:22; Mt 24:24) and the quotation from Dn 7:13 (Mk 13:26; Mt 24:30). The reference to σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα is not to be found in Luke's gospel, but the quotation from Dn 7:13 is, however, included. Does Luke, in Ac 2, replace the

¹¹⁸ Cf. also H. CONZELMANN, *Apk.* 34, and G. LÜDEMANN: "Auf die Charakterisierung der Kirche als durch den Geist bestimmt (V.17-18) folgt V.19-20 der Übergang von der Gegenwart 'zur apokalyptischen Zukunft, was der Darstellung von Lc 21 entspricht' (*Christentum*, 51).

quotations from Is 13:10 and 34:4 with the quotation from Jl 3:1-5(2:28-32)?¹¹⁹

3.2.5 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke

The second Petrine speech with its quotations, is presented not only as an explanation of the incorrect interpretation of what has happened (2:1-13),¹²⁰ but also as an opportunity for *apostolic kerygma*.¹²¹

[1] The fact that Luke has inserted the phrase, λέγει ὁ θεός, in a parenthesis at the beginning of his quotation, clearly emphasizes the *divine authority* with which he means to invest this quotation: these are the direct words of God! Peter and the others are authoritative witnesses to this, and therefore the "δούλοι μου" of God, who are experiencing the miracle of the "outpouring" of the (power of) the Holy Spirit.

[2] Although this long Jl-quotation has tended, in the past, to be interpreted by scholars in a christological way,¹²² the question must now be asked whether Luke did not tend, in fact, towards a more *eschatological* understanding of this text.¹²³ His

¹¹⁹Cf. for instance F.F. BRUCE who suggests on a similar issue that it seems to be "...a practice attested several times in Luke-Acts: Luke will omit altogether, or pass over lightly, a Synoptic theme from the appropriate context of his Gospel in order to introduce it later, in an appropriate context in Acts" (*Paul's Use*, 77).

¹²⁰ So also, for example, M. DIBELIUS, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles*, New York 1956, 138-185; E. SCHWEIZER, *Speeches*, 208-216; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 32-56; I.H. MARSHALL, *Acts*, 73; K. KLIESCH, *Credo*, 127; C.A. EVANS, The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon, in: *ZNW* 74 (1983), 148-150, here 148; H. VAN DE SANDT, *Fate of the Gentiles*, 56; and R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 213-228. The latter even talked about "Peter's *pesher* of the Joel citation for Luke's pneumatology", finding the link between this first-century Judaistic method of biblical exegesis in the "this is that"-formula of Ac 2:16 (214). See also Ac 3:12 and 14:15.

¹²¹ U. WILCKENS has formulated it: "Rein formal gesehen, erweist sich also das Joel-Zitat als bewußt gesetzte und geschickt gewählte Klammer zwischen Situation und Predigt, besonders zwischen Situation und Jesuskerygma, das nun unmittelbar eingeführt werden kann (2,22-24)" (*Missionsreden*, 34).

¹²² Cf. for example D.J. LAFFERTY, Acts 2:14-36: A study in Christology, in: *DunR* 6 (1966), 235-253; M. RESE, *Motive*, and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*.

¹²³ C. SMITS was thinking in this direction when he drew attention to the "strengthening of the eschatological trend of this quotation here by way of the change in the introductory words. He hereby understands it as that the apostles seen themselves here as the new Israel of the last days" (*Citaten II*, 180). So also J.T. CARROLL, The Uses of Scripture in Acts, in: *SBL Sem Papers* 126/29 (1990), 512-528, here 520; and B. REICKE, who held this viewpoint, the latter by typifying the Jl-quotation as an "eschatologische Weissagung" (*Glaube und Leben*, 42). F. MUSSNER has agreed with B. REICKE and divided this quotation into four sections: (a) the outpouring of the Spirit upon all flesh during the last days, of which the major result is the prophetic speech of those who have received the Spirit, (b) cosmic signs proclaim the "day of the Lord", (c) then comes the "day of the Lord" itself, (d) the person who calls in due time on the Name of the Lord, could be saved. F. MUSSNER goes on to say: "Von der Verheißung des Propheten haben sich nach der Pfingstpredigt des Petrus die ersten beiden Punkte (a und b) schon erfüllt und zwar im Pfingstereignis selbst und in der Glossolalie der Apostel. Was noch aussteht, ist 'der groß und offenbare Tag des Herrn' ...christlich gesprochen: die Parusie Jesu". He therefore does not agree with others on this point, as U. WILCKENS who does not accept the eschatological character of the outpouring of the Spirit, while he has linked the cosmic signs for "the day of the Lord", with the "mighty deeds, wonders and signs" of the historical Jesus (Ac 2:22) (*Letzten Tagen*, 264). G. LÜDEMANN has followed U. WILCKENS in his interpretation: "Man sollte nicht bestreiten, daß der 'apokalyptische Teil' des Joel-Zitats bereits auf den christologisch-kerugmatischen Teil (V.22b-24) überleitet. Die Ausdrücke *semeia* (dem LXX-Text hinzugefügt) und *terata* werden ja

conscious change of μετὰ ταῦτα το ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις must be seen here as an important indicator in this direction.¹²⁴ The conscious presentation and inclusion of the second part of the quotation — and its climax in the phrase: πρὶν ἔλθειν ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ — also strengthens the case for this eschatological understanding.¹²⁵ In this second part of the quotation, the remaining two events (the wonders and signs, and the salvation in the Name of the κύριος via the work of the apostles), have not yet taken place at this moment when Peter describes them in his speech.¹²⁶ These are events which must follow the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost.¹²⁷ Therefore, for Luke, the second part of the quotation points to the (immediate?) future,¹²⁸ while the first part is seen as having been fulfilled by recent events.¹²⁹

dort (V.22b) bewußt aufgenommen" (*Christentum*, 51). Contra D.L. TIEDE, who finds the purpose of the JI-quotation in the fact that it is used "...for the entire episode to document the fulfillment of the eschatological prophecies in the events of Pentecost..." (*Acts* 2, 64) [my emphasis, GJS].

¹²⁴. So also C. SMITS, *Citäten II*, 180; and J.H.E. HULL who reckoned that "after these things," which to a Hellenist, or certainly to a Hellenist unfamiliar with the Jewish Scriptures, would have a less 'final' ring" (*Holy Spirit*, 73). Also R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 216; and G. SCHNEIDER, who says: "Es geht, so will Lukas verdeutlichen, eine Verheißung Gottes für die Endzeit in Erfüllung" (*Apg I*, 268).

¹²⁵. Compare this with the eschatological "day of Yahweh" in the OT prophetic literature (e.g. Is 13:9-10, 24:21-23 and the darkening of the sun and moon). If this is the case, then one cannot agree with J.W. BOWKER (*Speckes*, 96-111) nor with E.E. ELLIS (*Midraschartige Züge in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte*, in: ZNW 62 (1971), 94-104) that we are dealing here with "midraschartiger Auslegung;" nor with A. WEISER (*Apg I*, 91) who agrees with them when saying that "Diesen Teil des Joelzitates bezieht Lukas...auf das vorausgegangene Geschehen und deutet es". This would be true only of the first part (event) of the quotation, i.e. that they would receive the Holy Spirit and prophesy (prophetism from the Holy Spirit?). Cf. also A. KERRIGAN: "...the outpouring of the Spirit and the cosmic cataclysms could be regarded as events which precede the coming of Yahweh's day" (*Sensus Plenior*, 308).

¹²⁶. Cf. the remark of A. WEISER: "Lukas will mit seiner Änderung des Joel-Textes aber nicht etwa sagen, daß nun das Ende eintrete; sondern für ihn ist die ganze Zeit seit Jesu Wirken bereits 'Endzeit' deren Ende aber unberechenbar bleibt" (*Apg I*, 92). This is true in general of Luke's understanding of the endtime. When he quotes this section from JI, he understands it in terms of further stages which follow after the coming of Christ, in this same *eschaton*. So also R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 216; and A.J. MATTILL: "In Acts the *eschaton* was thought of as one great divine event, consisting of the advent of the Messiah, his works and teaching, his death, resurrection, exaltation, the gift of the Spirit, and the parousia" (*Luke and the Last Things. A perspective for the understanding of Lukan thought*, Dillsboro 1979, 49).

¹²⁷. F. MUSSNER is therefore right in saying: "Die Zeit zwischen der ersten Geistausgießung auf die Apostel und dem Tag der Parusie ist demnach der große Kairos, der Israel zur Bekehrung noch gelassen wird" (*Letzten Tagen*, 264). On Luke's use of καιρός, cf. Lk 1:20; 4:13; 8:13; 12:42,56; 13:1; 18:30; 19:44; 20:10; 21:8,24,36; Ac 1:7; 3:20; 7:20; 12:1; 13:11; 14:17; 17:26; 19:23; 24:25.

¹²⁸. This aspect has caused scholars such as J.T. CARROLL to see this second Petrine speech as "a programmatic passage that sets the agenda for the rest of the story" (*Uses of Scripture*, 520). He is following R.F. ZEHLE, *Pentecost Discourse*. So also A. KERRIGAN, *Sensus Plenior*, 298; W. DIETRICH, *Petrusbild*, 197; H. VAN DE SANDT, *Fate of the Gentiles*, 57. The latter says: "Joel 3,1-5 is in fact significant for the whole of Acts. It is the guiding text of the book and outlines the programme that is realized in the next chapters of the narrative".

¹²⁹. So also perceived by J.T. CARROLL when he says: "This passage from the prophet not only interprets the signs of the Holy Spirit's activity at Pentecost (2:1-13), but also proleptically depicts the Spirit-impelled mission..." (*Uses of Scripture*, 522). Cf. also F. MUSSNER, *Letzten Tagen*, 264. Contrary to L. O'REILLY, who reckons that "The Joel prophecy as Luke found it suited his purpose remarkably well but not perfectly", (165); he goes on to say that the addition of σημεῖα "...was a deliberate modification by Luke in order to dilute the apocalyptic imagery and inject a reference to salvation history into the context. Once this was done the transition to the story of Jesus and his salvific miracles

[3] Strong emphasis is laid on "prophecy"¹³⁰ with Luke's addition of *καὶ προφητεύσουσιν* in V.18. The addition of this *καὶ προφητεύσουσιν* after *ἐκχεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου*¹³¹ in Ac 2:18 resembles the occurrence of this same phrase in V.17. With this addition, the combination of *πνεύματος* with *προφητεύσουσιν* in this context, becomes emphatically clear.¹³² It must also be remembered that in the preceding part of Ac, attention was already drawn implicitly to this combination through the mentioning of the following: (a) The disciples would receive power (*δύναμις*) when the Holy Spirit came unto them,¹³³ and they would be witnesses (Ac 1:8);¹³⁴ (b) They received "tongues" which looked like fire in Ac 2:3;¹³⁵ and after the Holy Spirit had "filled" them all (*καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν πάντες πνεύματος ἁγίου*), they started to talk in different "tongues" (*ἤρξαντο λαλεῖν ἑτέρας γλώσσας*) in Ac 2:4.¹³⁶

was smoothed out and a perfect link established between the scripture quotation and the rest of the speech" (*Word and Sign*, 166). Also against E. HAENCHEN who has said: "Die kosmischen Zeichen des Endes konnte Lukas mit der Predigtsituation freilich nicht unmittelbar verbinden..." (*App*, 149). The distinction between the first half of the quoted text which points to the past events, and the second half which points to the events to follow, should be clearly noted.

¹³⁰. Cf. also E. HAENCHEN: "Die Joëlstelle hat freilich nicht von diesem", (that is the "Erscheinung des eskatologischen Geistes". *GJS*) "sondern von der Prophetie gesprochen" (*App*, 149). So also I.H. MARSHALL: "What was happening was to be seen as the fulfilment of a prophecy by *Joel*, and here Peter proceeded to cite the relevant passage..." (*Acts*, 73); and R.P. MENZIES: "The corollary is that the disciples, as recipients of the gift, are not inebriated men — they are eschatological prophets proclaiming the word of God" (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 221). Also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 268.

¹³¹. For a combination of "spirit" and "prophecy" in the OT, compare: Nm 11:29; 12:6-8; 2 Kz 23:2(LXX); Is 11:2; 40:13; 42:1; 59:19, 23; 61:1; (63:10,11,14); Jl 2:28-32[=3:1-5LXX]; Hs 9:7; (Hg 2:5). See also Rv 1:4; 4:5; 5:6.

¹³². A. KERRIGAN (following E. SCHWEIZER, s.v. *πνεῦμα*, in: *TDNT VI*, 332-451), has said: "...for Luke the Spirit is essentially the Spirit of prophecy" (*Sensus Plenior*, 304). Cf. also U. WILCKENS: "Im Zusammenhang der Predigt wird diese Weissagung als jetzt und hier erfüllt, — das Wort *προφητεύειν* also sicherlich dem verbreiteten urchristlichen Sprachgebrauch entsprechend als Weise pneumatischer Verkündigung verstanden" (*Missionsreden*, 32).

¹³³. Cf. W. SPEYER: "Der Heilige Geist ist seinem Wesen nach Kraft, Dynamis" (*Zeugungskraft*, 246).

¹³⁴. This refers back to Lk 24:49.

¹³⁵. It is extremely important here to notice that it was not "fire-tongues" (flames), or fire which looked like tongues — as it is formulated for example by C.A. EVANS, *Prophetic Setting*, 148; also L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 28-29; as well as in some Bible translations: NEB (1979); TEV (1981); GNB (1982); NAB (1985); DLB (1982). When this was meant, the Greek would have had *φλόξ* (as in other places in the NT where fire-tongues (flames) were meant: Ac 7:30; 2 Th 1:8; Rv 1:14; 2:18; 19:12) and not *γλώσσα* (as here in Ac 2:3 and Ja 3:6). It is explicitly stated that it was "tongues" which looked like fire (*γλώσσα ὡσεὶ πυρὸς*). So rightly translated by the KJV (1977); RSV (1988); OAB (1971). Cf. also A. KERRIGAN: Luke "is at pains to tell us that the Spirit manifested himself in the form of *γλώσσα* which were in the act of being distributed (*διαμεριζόμεναι*) to each person present in the cenacle" (Ac 2:3) (*Sensus Plenior*, 302); and so also correctly described by J.J. KILGALLAN as "visible tongues as of flame" (*Pentecost Speech*, 623).

¹³⁶. According to I.H. MARSHALL, "tongues could be broadly described as a kind of prophecy" (*Acts*, 73). Cf. also here to M.D. GOULDER (*Type and History in Luke-Acts*, London 1964, 184) and R.F. O'TOOLE (*Davidic Covenant*, 246) who points to the similarity with Philo who talked about "speech like flames of fire" (*De Dec*. 33-35, 46-49). R.F. O'TOOLE, however, rightly points out that its "...influence on the mainstream of Judaism and on Luke cannot be easily determined" (246).

This combination is a motif which is found frequently in Lk-Ac.¹³⁷ The fact that it is stated here in the quotation that "from the Spirit" would be "poured out", could not be overlooked — although this change (against the Hebrew) was made already in the translation of the LXX. It could have been understood by Luke to be "something else", another object (other than the Spirit himself) that would be poured out from the Spirit. If he has understood it that it would be the Spirit himself,¹³⁸ he would have changed the reading also here, as he has changed it at other places, to suit his purpose. He must have accepted it with the inclusion of ἀπό at this point, because he has understood it in a certain sense without it being strange or unusual to him. This object ("power", Ac 1:8) with which the Spirit "filled" them, was probably understood by Luke in this quotation as being the "gift" (δωρεάν)¹³⁹ of prophecy (Ac 2:17,18).¹⁴⁰ A new dispensation has come, where all will share in this gift, not only prophets, kings and priests (as during OT times),¹⁴¹ and "without distinction of age, sex, or social standing".¹⁴² The υἱοὶ and the θυγατέρες will prophesy (both sexes);¹⁴³ also the νεανίσκοι and the πρεσβύτεροι are involved (old and young, all ages); and even the slaves (from the lowest social standing). But at this point Luke brings in a new meaning with his addition of μου: It is now not meant to be a social class, but those who belong to God.¹⁴⁴

[4] More difficult to determine is the question about what Luke might have understood by the "wonders in heaven above" and the "signs on earth below".¹⁴⁵ Some have thought the former to be the coming of the Holy Spirit, and the latter to

¹³⁷. For a combination of "Spirit" and (prophetic) "speech", or preaching, by Luke, cf. for example, Lk 1:41-42; 1:67; Ac 1:8; 1:16-17; 2:4; 2:14; 2:17,18; (4:8); 4:31; 6:10; 7:55-56; (8:29-30); 11:15; 11:27-28; 13:9-11; 15:28; 16:6; 19:6; 21:10-11; 26:25.

¹³⁸. Cf. B.M. NEWMAN and E.A. NIDA "what Peter means by the use of this phrase is obvious: God will let all people share in his Spirit" (*Translator's Handbook*, 43). This is an unsatisfactory explanation for the existence of ἀπό in this connection.

¹³⁹. Cf. Ac 2:38; 8:20; 10:45; 11:17.

¹⁴⁰. G.W. HAWTHORNE then finds a link between "early Christian prophets" and their interpretation of OT Scripture: "Perhaps the Old Testament was a key catalyst for their prophetic insight and utterances (cf. Ac chaps. 2 and 15)" (*The Role of Christian Prophets in the Gospel Tradition*, in: G.F. HAWTHORNE & O. BETZ (eds), *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids 1987, 119-133, here 126). Compare this with A. KERRIGAN: "In the Old Testament the Spirit, generally speaking, is regarded as extraordinary divine power that enables one to do unwonted things" (*Sensus Plenior*, 303). Also R.P. MENZIES draws attention to the fact that "...this emphasis on the gift of the Spirit as the source of prophetic inspiration is characteristic of Luke" (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 221).

¹⁴¹. So also I.H. MARSHALL, *Acts*, 73.

¹⁴². A. KERRIGAN, *Sensus Plenior*, 295; also 305-306.

¹⁴³. Cf. Ac 21:9 about the four daughters of Philip, who have the gift of prophecy.

¹⁴⁴. According to A. KERRIGAN, "the members of the church at Jerusalem, who, as we know, had been given the Spirit, style themselves οἱ δοῦλοι σου when addressing God in prayer" (Ac 4:29). He also refers to the fact that the pythoness described Paul and his companions as δούλοι τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου (Ac 16:17) (*Sensus Plenior*, 306). R.P. MENZIES says that "The motive for such redactional activity was undoubtedly a desire to emphasize that the disciples of Jesus, as recipients of the Spirit of prophecy, are indeed members of this community", i.e. "the eschatological community of salvation" (*Early Christian Pneumatology*, 219).

¹⁴⁵. Wrongly translated here in Ac 2:19 in the NAB (1985) as "tekens bo in die lug en wonders onder op die aarde" ("signs in heaven" and "wonders on earth"), but correctly translated in Ac 2:22. The TEV (1981) has also wrongly translated "wonders on earth" (Ac 2:19).

be the speaking in different languages;¹⁴⁶ others suggest that the former might refer to the darkening of the sun, and the latter to the tearing of the curtain in the temple during Jesus' crucifixion.¹⁴⁷ Others again, have interpreted the first as cosmic happenings which would characterize the end of the world, while the second would be the gift of tongues and the healing miracles in the rest of Ac.¹⁴⁸ When interpreting this quotation in an eschatological manner, however, and bearing in mind the difference between the ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις (2:17) and the ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ (2:20), we must differentiate between the two moments in time. Within the first moment (in the ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις) would follow the ability to prophesy through the gift of power given by the Spirit, which marks the beginning of these last days. According to Luke, this had just taken place at Pentecost. This would then be followed by the "wonders and signs". If the disciples have now received power from the Holy Spirit to prophesy, it can be expected that signs and wonders would follow.¹⁴⁹ The darkening of the sun, and the moon becoming like blood, might be events that were expected later in this eschaton.¹⁵⁰ The principal purpose of ἄνω and κάτω is "thus not to distinguish between two spheres of divine intervention (heaven and earth), but rather to emphasize the universal character of the 'signs and wonders' — they are portents that cannot be overlooked".¹⁵¹

[5] The only part of the quotation that may have christological (soteriological) significance, is the last sentence (καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται). This is the same unit already used by Paul in Rm 10:13. It forms the third major event to take place in "these last days". In JI, κύριος referred to Yahweh. This is now reinterpreted via the existing Greek translation (LXX) to mean Jesus (and not Yahweh).¹⁵²

¹⁴⁶ So J. ROLOFF, *App*, 53. Also J.J. KILGALLEN argued in the same direction: "Though the exact signs and wonders of Joel are not found in the description of the Christian Pentecost, the generic idea of disruptions in nature seems to provide a link between the two descriptions; Luke presents us with such signs as a sound as of a violent wind, visible tongues as of flame, a noise which attracts so many Jews from all over the city. Thus the Joel quotation continues to describe the Pentecost event..." (*Unity of Pentecost Speech*, 652-3). This explanation cannot be accepted, as this is clearly apocalyptic language. So also A. KERRIGAN, *Sensus Plenior*, 307.

¹⁴⁷ So M. RESE who finds a possible parallel between the darkening of the sun in Lk (who is the only evangelist who adds τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπούτος: Lk 23:45), and the quotation from JI in Ac (*Motive*, 54). Against this viewpoint: I.H. MARSHALL, *Acts*, 74.

¹⁴⁸ So, for instance, I.H. MARSHALL, *Acts*, 74.

¹⁴⁹ F. STOLZ has drawn attention to the relation between δυνάμις and σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα. According to him, the phrase σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα is sometimes complemented by δυνάμις: "...in Röm 15,19 sind die Begriffe δυνάμις, πνεῦμα, σημεῖα und τέρατα einander zugeordnet; in 2Kor 12,12 sowie Hebr 2,4 stehen σημεῖα, τέρατα und δυνάμις völlig parallel". He continues by saying that the normal expression for the experience of a wonder was δυνάμις; which was interpreted in "OT language" (sic) by σημεῖα καὶ τέρατα (*Zeichen und Wunder*, 145).

¹⁵⁰ In the same direction also B. REICKE, *Glaube und Leben*, 43; and I.H. MARSHALL, *Acts*, 73. [Compare here the striking parallels between Ac and Rv (especially Rv 8-9) in terms of references to blood, fire, smoke, and the darkening of the sun and the moon]. L. O'REILLY is therefore right in saying that "...the immediate reference here is to apocalyptic signs rather than to miracles or events of salvation history" (*Word and Sign*, 163).

¹⁵¹ So R.P. MENZIES, *Early Christian Pneumatology*, 222-223.

¹⁵² Cf. also I.H. MARSHALL: "...if Peter were citing the text in Hebrew, the reference would be clearly to Yahweh, and therefore an application to Jesus would be clear only to readers or hearers of the text in Greek" (*Acts*, 74). So also H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 35; and D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 164. See also the interesting contribution of J.A. FITZMYER, *The Semitic Background of the New Testament Kyrios-Title*, in: *idem*, *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Essays* (SBLMS 25), Missoula 1979,

To summarise: Luke has used this quotation from Jl in an eschatological way in order to emphasise three major points, i.e. (a) that they would receive (power from) the Spirit and prophesy (prophetism from the Spirit), — that which has just taken place, and therefore pointing backwards — (b) that wonders and signs would follow, and (c) that those who call on the Name of the κύριος, would be saved. These things would follow in "the last days", but before "the great and glorious day of the κύριος". The last point thus incorporates the christological kerygma within the eschatology.

3.3 Possible broader knowledge of Jl (and LXX) in the rest of the section (Language, Style and OT-motifs)

There exist some indicators in the speech which probably point to a wider knowledge of Jl by the quoter, than the section which he quoted.¹⁵³ To determine if these were indeed the result of conscious imitation of "the LXX", is very difficult. These indicators might especially be traced to the influence of certain well known phrases, motifs, or formulations of belief which were current during Luke's time. The parallels are nonetheless interesting, and attention could be paid to the following:

[i] The phrase, "Ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάντες"¹⁵⁴ (Ac 2:14¹⁵⁵), might resemble Jl 1:2 (...οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, καὶ...πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν). This type of expression is, however, not unknown to the prophetic literature in general.¹⁵⁶ Is the usage in Ac then some kind of imitation of the style of the prophetic literature?¹⁵⁷ The fact that the vocative-forms are used heavily in Ac,¹⁵⁸ and that the double salutations are not found elsewhere in the NT,¹⁵⁹ might support this suggestion.

[ii] The words, καὶ ἐνωπίασθε (Ac 2:14), of which the last is a *hapax legomenon*,

115-142.

¹⁵³ C.A. EVANS has said that "...the setting that Luke has created for Peter's sermon is laced throughout with language taken from Joel" (*Prophetic Setting*, 149). He lists 20 words in Luke's narrative and in Peter's opening remarks which may be traced to Jl. H. VAN DE SANDT has identified intertextual relations and functions between Jl and Ac 8:1-13; 11:19; 13:1-3 and 16:6-10 (*Fate of the Gentiles*, 58). Cf. also C. GHIDELLI, Le citazioni dell' Antico Testamento nel cap.2 degli Atti, in: *Il Messianismo* (ASB 18), Brescia 1966, 285-305.

¹⁵⁴ Cf. also Ac 1:19; 2:5; 4:16; 13:27; [Lk 24:18].

¹⁵⁵ Cf. also V.22.

¹⁵⁶ Cf. Is 41:1; 42:18; 43:1; 44:1; 46:12; 47:8; 48:1,12(x2); 49:1; 50:4,5,10; 51:1,4,7,21; 66:5; also Is 1:2; Jr 8:6; and even Gn 4:23; Jdg 5:3; Job 32:11.

¹⁵⁷ Cf. also E. HAENCHEN (*Apg*, 141) and E. PLÜMACHER (*Lukas*, 42) who points to this as a heavily used *parallelismus membrorum* of the LXX, referring to Jr 19:3 for example. Also typified as a "LXX-Formel" by R. PESCH (*Apg I*, 119). Also interesting are the parallels in Rv 13:8 (καὶ προσκυνησουσιν αὐτὸν πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, οὐ οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἁγίου) and Rv 17:8 (καὶ θαυμάσθησονται οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὧν οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα ἐπὶ τὸ βιβλίον τῆς ζωῆς ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου).

¹⁵⁸ Cf. Ac 1:11; 2:22; 3:12; 5:35; 13:16; 17:22; 19:35; 21:28 (ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι), and 1:16; 2:29,37; 7:2; 13:15,26,38; 15:7,13; 22:1; 23:1,6; 28:17 (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί).

¹⁵⁹ Cf. also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg I*, 267.

can both be found also in Jl 1:2, as well as abundantly in the rest of the LXX.¹⁶⁰ [iii] The words, [ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλῖται] ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους (Ac 2:22), are reminiscent of those at the beginning of Jl: Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα (Jl 1:2). But again, these are commonly used in the prophetic literature.¹⁶¹ The expression is also used several times more in this second Petrine speech: 2:14; 2:22; [2:37]; 2:33. The fact that this expression is typical of OT style, but less typical of Jewish-hellenistic literature, might support the suggestion that it could have found its way into Ac via the author's knowledge of the OT literature (in its Greek form).¹⁶²

[iv] There seems to be a similarity in content between the words of Ac 2:22 (... οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεὸς ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, καθὼς αὐτοὶ οἶδατε) and those of Jl 2:27 (καὶ ἐπιγνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐν μεσῶ τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐγὼ εἶμι). However, it is quite probable that this was a faith formula, a common expression¹⁶³ at the time of Luke, and therefore not necessarily derived from Jl or the prophetic literature.

Except for these parallels, things are even more difficult with the following expressions. They are normally typified by scholars as "Septuagintisms", but can also be found represented to a certain extent in other ancient literature around these times. Examples are the following: (a) ἐπῆρεν τὴν φωνήν (Ac 2:14);¹⁶⁴ Although seen as being a "Septuagintism",¹⁶⁵ it could also have been a fixed expression from these ancient times;¹⁶⁶ (b) [τοῦτο ὑμῶν] γνωστὸν ἔστω (Ac 2:14);¹⁶⁷ Also seen as known via the LXX;¹⁶⁸ (c) προγνώσει (Ac 2:23);¹⁶⁹ (d) διὰ χειρὸς (Ac 2:23);¹⁷⁰ Thought to be a "Septuagintism",¹⁷¹ it is however also to be found several times in this exact form in the hellenistic Greek around the 1st century BC to the 1st century AD.¹⁷²

3.4 Conclusions

1. That (at least one phrase of) the quotation might already have been known in the tradition of the early church at the time when Luke wrote Ac, is possible. The fact

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Job 32:11 = [ἐνωτίσασθε] τὰ ῥήματά μου. (See also Barn 9:3 in the combination with τὰ ῥήματα). In the rest of the LXX, also: Gn 4:23; Nm 23:18; Jdg 5:3; 34:16; 37:14; Ps 5:2; Jl 1:2; Is 1:2; 28:23; Jr 8:6; et.al. C. SMITS especially draws attention to the occurrence of ἐνωτίσασθε at the beginning of Is (1:2), on which he also bases his argument that Is 1:2 and Jl 2:28-32 (3:1-5) are combined (*Citaten II*, 180). See also BL-DBR §123(2), 67; E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 141; E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 42; and G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg I*, 267.

¹⁶¹ Compare this ἀκούσατε with the general trend in the prophetic literature: Is 41:1; 42:18; 43:1; 44:1; 46:12; 47:8; 48:1,12(x2); 49:1; 50:4,5,10; 51:1,4,7,21; 66:5; also Is 1:2; Jr 8:6 and Gn 4:23; Jdg 5:3; 9:7; Job 32:11 and Jdth 14:1.

¹⁶² So also B. REICKE: "Es dürfte sich dennoch hier um eine bewusste Anpassung an das Alte Testament handeln" (*Glaube und Leben*, 41-42).

¹⁶³ The ἐν μέσῳ-phrase is also used in Lk 22:32; Ac 17:22 and 27:21.

¹⁶⁴ Cf. Jdg 2:4; 9:7; Ruth 1:9,14; 2 Ki 13:36(LXX); Ps 92:3. Cf. also Lk 11:27; Ac 14:11; 22:22.

¹⁶⁵ So E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 141; E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 41; and R. PESCH, *Apg I*, 119.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. Dem 18:291 (ca. 4th cent BC); ApolRh 5:33 (ca. 3rd cent. BC); Char 5:7:10 (ca. 1st-2nd cent. AD); Philostr vi (ca. 3rd cent. AD).

¹⁶⁷ Cf. also Ac 4:10; 13:38; 28:28; — Job 32:11(LXX). γνωστὸν ἔστω = cf. Ex 33:16; 1Ezr 6:8; 2Ezr 4:12; Wisd 16:28; Is 19:21; Ezk 36:32.

¹⁶⁸ So, for example, E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 41.

¹⁶⁹ Only found 2x in NT: Ac 2:23 and 1 Pt 1:2. Also only found 2x in LXX: Jdth 9:6 and 11:19.

¹⁷⁰ Also in Ac 5:12; 7:25; 11:30; 14:3; 15:23; 19:11; Mk 6:2. In the MT it is also used in the singular: 171. Cf. in the LXX: Gn 30:35; 2 Chr 35:4,6; Jdth 13:14; Wisd 12:6; Ezk 27:21; 30:10; 1Mac 5:62.

¹⁷¹ So E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 143; and E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*, 42.

¹⁷² Cf. for example: Barn 16:7; DionHalIoc 4; PluMor ForRom 318; Am 767; Au 813.

that it had been used, in a shorter form, by Paul in Rm 10:12f strengthens this possibility.¹⁷³ There has been a tendency to use evidence such as this in support of the theory of a *testimonium* which could have been the source of such quotations. There is not enough evidence, specifically here in Ac, to support this theory.¹⁷⁴

2. It also seems possible that Luke himself has used a version of the 12P which was known to him. The length of the quotation supports this supposition.¹⁷⁵ He appears to quote from this written source, which seems to have differed in minor details from the readings which are known today. It was probably a LXX text (as becomes clear from the similarities between the LXX and NT, against the Hebrew), but it seems, on some points, to be nearer still to the Hebrew.

3. In addition, Luke has consciously changed his source text in several places to accommodate for his own understanding and interpretation¹⁷⁶ of the text. In general, these changes were made on theological rather than stylistic grounds, and probably in order to emphasize an eschatological viewpoint.¹⁷⁷

4. The quoted section ends strategically and emphatically with the soteriological statement of salvation in the name of the κύριος.¹⁷⁸ The difference between the

¹⁷³. Against D.L. BOCK who cites the "mixture of changes" as evidence for the rooting of the quotation in the tradition (*Proclamation*, 163). He explains "the incongruity of the LXX version with the Acts 2 context" by way of "the possible presence of an older tradition" (160) and says later that "nowhere does Luke present a quotation from the OT with so many changes from the LXX" and the "mixture of changes suggests that Luke is not responsible for this quotation as a whole unit" (163).

¹⁷⁴. The matter was already referred to at the beginning of this study; it will suffice here to quote D.-A. KOCH who argues in particular against C.H. DODD's "bible of the early church" in his discussion of this passage in Rm 10:13: "...daß Paulus Joel 3:5a nur deswegen habe zitieren können, weil ihm Joel 2-4 insgesamt als Teil einer 'bible of the early church' bereits in besonderer Weise vorgegeben war, ist eine willkürliche Hypothese, die zusätzlich neue Fragen aufwirft. Denn wenn Joel 2-4 ein Text war, den die frühe Kirche sich bereits z.ZL des Paulus bewußt angeeignet hatte (und zwar in seinem gesamten Umfang), dann bleibt es unverständlich, warum erst in Act 2,17-21 die Ankündigung des Geistes aus Joel 3,1ff aufgegriffen wird, während bei Paulus — auch in 1 Kor 2,10ff und Gal 3,1ff — dieser Text überhaupt keine Rolle spielt" (*Schrift als Zeuge*, 225).

¹⁷⁵. B. REICKE holds the quotation to be part of a long "exordium" within an early Christian homily (42), which he saw fundamentally as a "Missions- oder Bekehrungspredigt" (*Glaube und Leben*, 44). Although this hypothesis cannot easily be proved, his observation deserves attention, namely that this quotation is not explained later in the context, and has thus to speak for itself - substantiating therefore the differences between Ac and LXX. The latter was also suggested by D.-A. KOCH in personal discussion, i.e. that long quotations seem to be meant self-explanatory.

¹⁷⁶. M. RESE is right when he typifies this quotation as "*hermeneutischer Schriftverwendung*", "...denn die Schrift ist hier nicht Mittel des Beweises, sondern Mittel der Interpretation" (*Motive*, 38). The same trend is also to be found in the other citations from the minor prophets (Hab 1:5; Am 5:25-29 and 9:11f).

¹⁷⁷. So also B. REICKE (*Glaube und Leben*, 42). One must disagree with C. SMITS (and others) that these changes that were made by Luke are not important at all: "Het eigenlijke citaat is volgens de Septuagint, ofschoon er veranderingen zijn aangebracht: weglatingen, toevocingen, omwisselingen van verzen. Zakelijk zijn deze van weinig belang" (*Citaten II*, 180).

¹⁷⁸. G. SCHNEIDER has said: "Lukas hat den Joeltext bis zu den Stichwort *σαθήσεται* zitiert, weil ihm — im Anschluß an diese göttliche Zusage — an der Bedingung für die einsige Rettung gelegen ist, dem Anrufen des Namen des Herren" (*Apk I*, 270). And D.L. TIEDE states: "...the author does not stop with a pneumatological or christological discourse... Just when the sweeping christological conclusions are reached (2:22-23,33,36), the soteriological goal of the chapter is disclosed..." (*Acts 2*, 64).

meaning of this unit in J1 itself,¹⁷⁹ and its reinterpretation in Ac,¹⁸⁰ is obvious. This is in line with Luke's understanding of the continuity of the salvation history.¹⁸¹

5. An implied note of universalism is also to be found in the quotation. It cannot be assumed that Ac 2 as a whole was addressed exclusively to Jews,¹⁸² or that a conflict exists between the list in Ac 2 and the beginning of the speech.¹⁸³ The universalistic character is valid and typical for the whole speech.

4. SECTION II: ACTS 2:22-28

Jesus' resurrection & the quotation from Ps 15(16):8-11

In Ac, the most comprehensive link between the resurrection of Jesus and the Scripture comes in Ac 2:24-31 and Ac 13:34-37.¹⁸⁴ The theme of Jesus' resurrection from death, mentioned in Lk 20:27-40, was already linked with the theme of the Son of David (Lk 20:41-44) which follows immediately thereafter.

4.1 Composition of the section

This next section starts in approximately the same way as the first. After the hearers are addressed ("Ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται, V.22), their attention is drawn to the importance of the words which will follow (ἀκούσατε¹⁸⁵ τοὺς λόγους τούτους,

¹⁷⁹. Cf. A. WEISER: "Das Prophetenwort Joels verheißt die Rettung der Jahwegläubigen aus den Schrecknissen des Tages Jahwes, von denen sie indessen nicht verschont bleiben. Sie werden 'durch die Endnot hindurchgerettet'" (*App I*, 121).

¹⁸⁰. Cf. C. SMITS (*Citation II*, 183) and G. SCHNEIDER, who said: "Demgegenüber denkt App 2, 40b an eine schon durch die Taufe ermöglichte Rettung 'aus diesem verkehrten Geschlecht' (vgl. V 47 σωζόμενοι, ferner 15,11) und die Parusie bringt nach Lk 21,28 die ἀπολύτρωσις der Christusgläubigen" (*App I*, 270).

¹⁸¹. A. WEISER has pointed out that one of the fundamental points in the Lukan theology is to be found in his understanding of this continuation of salvation history (*App I*, 82).

¹⁸². Against G.D. KILPATRICK: "So we may conclude that the maker of the quotation wished in his reshaping of its text to stress the note of universalism in contrast to the writer of Ac 2 who consistently confines himself to Israel" (*Some Quotations*, 82). In dialogue with D-A. KOCH, he has pointed this out clearly; there are simply too many references in Ac 2 which indicate that this could not have been directed to Jews only. One such indicator is the list of hearers mentioned in VV.5-13. Another is the point at which the quotation from J1 ends; in order to exclude any possible misunderstanding that the salvation was meant exclusively for the Jews, the rest of V.32 was left out. (Cf. the viewpoint of M.RESE (*Motive*, 50) about this in the discussion above). H. VAN DE SANDT supports this with two additional references: (a) "the outpouring upon 'all flesh'" (Ac 2:17 = J1 3:1), and (b) "whoever calls" (Ac 2:21 = J1 3:5a). All these are confirmed by Ac 2:39 (*Fate of the Gentiles*, 70). So also J.H.E. HULL, *Holy Spirit*, 73.

¹⁸³. So B. REICKE, who presumed that the persons addressed as "Jews and inhabitants of Jerusalem", must be *only* Jews (*Glaube und Leben*, 39). This supposed conflict evaporates if one assumes, from the broader context, that those referred to as "inhabitants of Jerusalem", include those named earlier in the list of nations, or, if one follows B. NOACK, that the increase in the numbers of the early Christian community in this speech, is due to diaspora Jews, "...who, in many respects, differed from the orthodox Jews of Palestine" (*The day of Pentecost in Jubilees, Qumran, and Acts*, in: *ASTI* 1 (1962), 73-95, here 93).

¹⁸⁴. So also G. DELLING, *Die Jesusgeschichte in der Verkündigung nach Acta*, in: *NTS* 19 (1972/73), 373-389, here 374.

¹⁸⁵. Compare V.37: ἀκούσατες δὲ κατενόησαν τὴν καρδίαν. Also Ac 13:16. G. KITTEL said on the background of ἀκούω: "The hearing of man represents correspondence to the revelation of the Word, and in biblical religion it is thus the essential form in which this divine revelation is appropriated" (216). This comes especially to the foreground in the OT when (a) the prophets proclaim God's Word,

V.22). A whole new theme is introduced here: *The kerygma of the events concerning Jesus of Nazareth*,¹⁸⁶ or "the story of Jesus".¹⁸⁷ This is taken up from the end of the J1-quotation where reference was made to the fact that whoever calls on the Name of the κύριος, would be saved. The rest of the speech is used to convince the hearers (readers) that Jesus of Nazareth is this κύριος.¹⁸⁸ The importance of the issue at stake is emphasized by the prominent position of Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραῖον (V.22), placed first in the unit itself, and also first in the sentence. The rest of this section consists of smaller units referring back to this Jesus: ἀνδρα (V.22), τοῦτον (V.23), ὄν (V.24), and αὐτον (V.25). The last reference is linked with a quotation from David. Also prominent here is the role of God, who takes the initiative and remains the Subject.¹⁸⁹ This man, Jesus, was made known to them "by God" (ἀποδοδειγμένον ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ) in V.22, and it is God who has done the powerful things, wonders and signs¹⁹⁰ through Jesus (οἷς ἐποίησεν δι' αὐτοῦ ὁ θεός, V.22).¹⁹¹ It was according to the will and pre-knowledge of God that Jesus was given into the hands of the lawless (τῇ ἄρισμένῃ βουλῇ¹⁹² καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ

(b) Scripture was read aloud and being heard, and (c) during the *Schema* ("Hear, O Israel"), as a daily confession (s.v. ἄκουα, in *TDNT* I, 218-219).

¹⁸⁶. According to C.H. COSGROVE, *Ac* 2:23-4 "the Lukan kerygmatic history, in its narrow sense, is expressed in a nutshell: 'Jesus of Nazareth - attested - delivered up - crucified and killed - raised'" (*Divine ΔΕΙ*, 184).

¹⁸⁷. So popularly called by some scholars: cf. for example J.J. KILGALLEN, *Pentecost Speech*, 650-656; and L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 91.

¹⁸⁸. Cf. also E.E. ELLIS, *Midrascharige Züge*, 99-101; and H. VAN DE SANDT, *Fate of the Gentiles*, 56. The latter talks about the J1 quotation "...as starting point for extensive commentary" (*Ac* 2:22-40). B. REICKE reckons that in the section of *Ac* 2:22-39 within this second Petrine speech, three basic elements are to be found: (a) thesis, (b) arguments, and (c) conclusion. He identifies these elements in all the so-called "missionary" speeches (*Glaube und Leben*, 44). This seems to be somewhat forced and one could ask, for instance, why *Ac* 2:14-21 is not also taken into account here.

¹⁸⁹. So also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 34; and O. GLOMBITZA, *Der Schluß der Petrusrede Acta 2:36-40*, in: *ZNW* 52 (1961), 115-118, here 116-117. This was also emphasized in the J1-quotation with Luke's insertion of the words: λέγει ὁ θεός (*Ac* 2:17). Cf. also W. DIETRICH: "Jede der im zweiten Abschnitt aufgezählten Phasen nennt Gott als Handelnden; in V.22-24 wird θεός viermal als Subjekt des Geschehens erwähnt. Diese Häufung läßt deutlich werden, daß die christologischen Aussagen theologisch orientiert sind" (*Petrusbild*, 203). It is interesting that U. BUSSE has indicated that the *theocentric priority* is also an amazing phenomenon in the Lukan interpretation of Jesus' wonders as encountered in Luke's gospel (*Die Wunder des Propheten Jesus* (fzB 24), Stuttgart 1977, 475).

¹⁹⁰. Cf. G. LÜDEMANN: "Die Nennung der *dynamis, terata* und *semeia* bezieht sich auf das Evangelium zurück. Dort sind die Wunderbeweise des Propheten Jesus konstitutiv für die Christologie" (*Christentum*, 51). Also H. CONZELMANN: "Es sind in der Darstellung *Lc* 4,16ff. wie in der weiteren Erzählung die *Taten*, welche die Erfüllung der Schrift demonstrieren" (*Mitte der Zeit*, 178). See also U. BUSSE, *Wunder*, 475.

¹⁹¹. F. STOLZ is therefore right in saying: "Nicht die Fähigkeit, außerordentliche Wunder zu tun, legitimiert also Jesus, sondern die Verankerung dieser Wunder in der von Gott veranstalteten, bereits im Alten Testament angebahnten und vorausbestimmten Heilsgeschichte" (*Zeichen und Wunder*, 143).

¹⁹². Compare also *Lk* 7:30; *Ac* 4:28; 5:38-39; 13:36 and 20:27 where Luke speaks of God's βουλή. F.J. MATERA, suggests Luke has made "it clear that the Jerusalemites paradoxically fulfilled God's definite plan (ἄρισμένη βουλή) and foreknowledge" (Responsibility for the death of Jesus according to the Acts of the Apostles, in: *JST* 39, 77-93, here 79). According to G. SCHRENK, βουλή is mostly used of the divine counsel. "This counsel is predetermined and inflexible. Both phrases emphasise the resolute and inviolable determinateness of the decree" (s.v. βουλή, in: *TDNT* I, 635). J.R. WILCH says: "Lukas verbindet das Leiden des Christus immer mit dem göttlich veranlaßten 'Muß' oder mit einem Schriftbeweis, um diese überragende Tatsache herauszustellen". He refers to *Ac* 3:18; 17:3; 26:23; *Lk* 17:25; 24:7,26f,44,46 (Jüdische Schuld am Tode Jesu — Antijudaismus in der Apostelgeschichte?, in:

ἐκδοτον, V.23), and God himself has resurrected Jesus from death (ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν) in V.24.¹⁹³

There may be some implied antithetic parallelisms between V.23 and V.24:

V.23a = God has handed Jesus over

V.24a = God has resurrected Jesus

V.23b = Jesus was crucified by the hand(s) of the lawless

V.24b = Jesus was released from the "bands" of death

V.23c = Jesus was killed¹⁹⁴ by these lawless people

V.24c = Death does not have power over him

Interesting in the next unit, which consists of the quoted text (Ac 2:25-28), is the emphatic role of praise here (V.26-27): "My heart is glad" (ἠψφράνθη ἡ καρδία μου) and "my tongue is extremely joyful" (ἠγαλλιάσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου), and "my 'flesh' dwells in hope" (ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι) — all because (ὅτι) "neither my spirit would be left behind in *hades*" (οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ᾗδην), "nor would your pious one be given over to see decay" (οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὁσίον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν). He therefore now knows "the ways of life" (ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς). All this is the result of the fact that the person (David) always sees "the κύριος in front of him" (προορώμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιον μου, V.25), because he is "at his right hand so that he will not shiver" (ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἐστιν ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ, V.25). The whole situation is summarised by way of the concluding sentence, which at the same time forms an *inclusio* with the first sentence of the quotation, i.e. he is "filled with joy" before the presence of the κύριος; πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου (V.28).

The whole quotation is thus taken here as an announcement made by David about him (εἰς αὐτόν, V.25), about this Jesus of Nazareth (V.22).

4.2 The quoted text from *Ps 15(16):8-11* (Ac 2:25-28)

After focusing on Jesus' resurrection from death and the fact that death does not have any hold on him, Luke refers to this next quotation. The same pattern occurs in Ac 13:33-35, where the same quotation appears again, although in a shorter form.

4.2.1 *Intra-textual occurrence in Ac 13:35*

οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὁσίον σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν: This quotation is used in exactly the same context, namely that of Jesus being resurrected from death, such that death no

W. HAUBECK and M. BACHMAN (hrsg), *Wort in der Zeit. Neutestamentliche Studien. Festgabe für Karl Heinrich Rengstorff zum 75. Geburtstag*, Leiden 1980, 236-249, here 238). Also H. CONZELMANN (*Mitte der Zeit*, 141-144), and G. LÜDEMANN (*Christentum*, 52) point to the fact that "Die Passion erfolgt, luk. Theologie gemäß, nach Gottes Plan".

¹⁹³. Compare F.J. MATERA: "...these statements are set in the context of a formula which contrasts the action of human beings with the action of God; the Jews crucified and killed Jesus, but God raised him up" (*Responsibility*, 78). J.R. WILCH formulates it well: "von Gott gewollt, von Menschen verschuldet" (*Jüdische Schuld*, 238). It is outside the scope of this investigation to discuss the debate in scholarship that it was "the Jews" who were guilty of the death of Jesus — an impression which might be given in Ac 2:22f,36; 3:15; 4:10; 5:30; 7:52; 10:39; and 13:28. The debate can be followed in F.J. MATERA, *Responsibility*, 77-93; J.R. WILCH, *Jüdische Schuld*, 236-249; and others.

¹⁹⁴. Cf. Ac 26:10 where the same verb is used: ἀναπέω.

longer has any hold on him. It will be discussed in more detail as part of the exposition of the quotations in Ac 13.

4.2.2 The introductory formula (Ac 2:25)

Although the words, Δαυιδ γὰρ λέγει εἰς αὐτόν (V.25), form the introductory formula for this explicit quotation,¹⁹⁵ the connecting role of V.24 (ὃν ὁ θεὸς ἀνέστησεν λύσας τὰς ῥάβδους τοῦ θανάτου, καθότι οὐκ ἦν δυνατόν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτόν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ)¹⁹⁶ should not be ignored. The substantiating role of γὰρ should also be noted¹⁹⁷ — functioning as a link between the introductory formula and its quoted text on the one hand, and the immediately preceding context on the other hand.

4.2.3 Determining and explaining the textual differences

NT (NA26)	LXX	MT
Ac 2:25-28	Ps 15:8-11	Ps 16:8-11
25 προοράμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός, ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἔστιν ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ.	8 προοράμην τὸν κύριον ἐνώπιόν μου διὰ παντός, ὅτι ἐκ δεξιῶν μου ἔστιν ἵνα μὴ σαλευθῶ.	8 שְׁנִיתִי יְהוָה לְנֶגְדִי חָסִיד כִּי מִיְמִינִי כַל־מַחְסֵי:
26 διὰ τοῦτο ἠὲ φράνθη ἡ καρδία μου καὶ ἠγαλλώσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.	9 διὰ τοῦτο ἠὲ φράνθη ἡ καρδία μου, καὶ ἠγαλλώσατο ἡ γλῶσσά μου, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ἡ σὰρξ μου κατασκηνώσει ἐπ' ἐλπίδι.	9 לִכְן מִשֶׁ לִכְּי וְנִגַּל כְּבוֹרִי אֶזְכָּרֶנּוּ בְּפִי יְשׁוּבִן לְכַטֵּף:
27 ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.	10 ὅτι οὐκ ἐγκαταλείψεις τὴν ψυχὴν μου εἰς ἄδην οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὄσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθοράν.	10 כִּי לֹא־תַעֲזֹב נַפְשִׁי לְשָׁחַל לֹא־תִתֵּן חַסְדִּי לְרֵאוֹת שָׁחַח:
28 ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς, πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου,	11 ἐγνώρισάς μοι ὁδοὺς ζωῆς, πληρώσεις με εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ προσώπου σου,	תּוֹרֵי עֲנִי אֲכַח חַיִּים שִׂנְעֵ תְּחַח חֵן חַח בְּנִיחֵ

¹⁹⁵ R.F. O'TOOLE says that "Luke was convinced that David wrote all the psalms" (*Davidic Covenant*, 245). Cf. also Ac 13:33-37 and Lk 20:42f which refer to David as author of the Pss (C.K. BARRETT, *Luke/Acts*, 238). According to W.C. KAISER, the actual title of Ps 15(16) "designates David either as the author ('from David') or the one praised in the psalm ('to David')" (223). KAISER chooses the second alternative: "David says with reference to (eis) him," rather than 'concerning (peri) him' (which would have meant that the total reference was of the Messiah alone)" (*The Promise to David in Psalm 16 and Its Application in Acts 2:25-33 and 13:32-37*, in: *JETS* 23 (1980), 219-229, here 228).

¹⁹⁶ Compare also Ps 17(18):6; Ps 114(116):3; 2 Ki(Sm) 22:6.

¹⁹⁷ Cf. M. RESE: "Irgendwie begründet (γὰρ; V.25!) das Zitat irgendetwas aus dem vorangehenden Text, und offensichtlich wird die Zitierung in den anschließenden Versen 29-31 gerechtfertigt"

ζωῆς, πληρώσεις με
εὐφροσύνης μετὰ τοῦ
προσώπου σου.

In V.26 of the NT reading we find the alternative reading μου ἡ καρδία (N* B Clem)¹⁹⁸ instead of ἡ καρδία μου (P⁷⁴ N^c A C D E Ψ 0123 M) as accepted here in NA26.¹⁹⁹ The alternative reading is probably to be understood as "a more artificial order which may have been introduced by Alexandrian scribes in order to provide a chiasmic contrast with the following ἡ γλῶσσά μου".²⁰⁰ Codex D differs on three minor points: It reads (a) ἐφ' ἐλπιδι instead of ἐπ' ἐλπίδι (Ac 2:26); (b) ἐγκαταλείψεις and not ἐγκαταλείψεις (Ac 2:27); (c) γνώρισες and not ἐγνώρισες (Ac 2:28) — all of which might have been the result of hearing-errors during the rewriting process of the manuscript at later stages.

(a) *Textual differences between MT and LXX*²⁰¹

The following are the most important changes which appear in a comparison between the translation of the LXX, on the one hand, and the MT on the other hand. These changes in the reading of the LXX, resemble the reading followed by Luke, and could be taken as evidence that Luke has used here a version of the LXX, rather than a version based on the known MT. The points of difference are:

[1] The LXX (Ps 15:8) reads προωρόμην instead of the יְהוָה of the MT (Ps 16:8). This results in a minor difference: According to the MT, "Yahweh is always 'kept before'" David. But according to the LXX (and Ac 2:25), David "always 'sees' the Lord before him".²⁰² Attention has already been drawn to the fact that this translation stands out because nowhere else is the phrase translated in this way.²⁰³

The following are four possible explanations for προωρόσθαι in V.2a:²⁰⁴ (a) It has the same meaning as in the Hebrew text; (b) it could have been caused by the frequent expressions "the face of God seen" or

(*Funktion*, 73). So also R.F. OTOOLE: "Luke cites David and Psalm 15 in Acts 2:25 which should be considered with Acts 2:24 because V.25 begins with an explanatory 'for (γάρ)'" (*Davidic Covenant*, 255).

¹⁹⁸ In the old text editions of B.F. WESTCOTT and F.J.A. HORT (*The New Testament in the Original Greek*, Cambridge/London 1890), A. MERK (*Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine*, 8. Editio, Roma 1957) and E. NESTLE (*Novum Testamentum Graece*, 25. Auflage, Stuttgart 1963) this was thought to be the most acceptable reading.

¹⁹⁹ Also thought to be the best reading by L. CERFAUX, *Citations*, 44; and E. HAENCHEN, *Schriftzitate*, 154, although they have used reconstructed NT text editions which have read and accepted μου ἡ καρδία. T. HOLTZ (*Untersuchungen*, 48) and J. DUPONT (*L'interprétation*, 361) on the other hand, have agreed with this and taken it as an additional difference between the readings of Ac and the LXX.

²⁰⁰ B.M. METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 299.

²⁰¹ It is not the purpose to try and give possible solutions to each of these instances where the LXX differs from the MT, as the main focus of the thesis is on the differences between the LXX and Ac. Only those instances (if any) where Ac disagrees with the LXX and agrees with the MT, will be discussed more comprehensively.

²⁰² Cf. also D.L. BOCK who thinks this to be "natural stylistic strengthening of the Semitic language" (*Proclamation*, 172).

²⁰³ The only other occurrence in 1Ezr 5:63 (οἱ προεωρακότες τῶν...οἴκου) is found exclusively in the reading of codex A. Codex B translates it as: ἐωρακότες. It was thus found to be "...sicher sekundär und daher zu Recht in der Handausgabe von Rahlf's in den Appar verewiesen" (A. SCHMITT, Ps 16,8-11 als Zeugnis der Auferstehung in der Apg, in: *BZ* 17 (1973), 229-248, here 233). The other *loci*

"God seen" in the OT literature: (c) an interpretation with a Graeco-Hellenistic spirit might have been present; according to the Greeks, in a religious situation "seeing" has absolute priority over "believing" or "hearing"; (d) the most probable explanation, however, might still be found in the context. VV.9-11 of the LXX talks about the belief in resurrection and immortality. These futuristic perspectives are stressed by προοράσθαι.

[2] The $\text{D}\text{I}\text{N}\text{X}-\text{L}\text{X}$ ("I will not stumble") of the MT (Ps 16:8), is changed or translated by the LXX (Ps 15:8) to $\text{I}\text{N}\text{A}\ \mu\eta\ \sigma\alpha\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\theta\omega$ ("so that I will not tremble") — which is again followed by the reading of Ac 2:25.

[3] "My glory" ($\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$) in Ps 16:9 (MT) is translated as "my tongue" ($\eta\ \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\omicron\upsilon$) in Ps 15:9 (LXX), followed by Ac.²⁰⁵

[4] According to Ps 15:9b (LXX) "my body²⁰⁶ will also dwell in hope".²⁰⁷ This translation already permits the meaning of V.10b ("you will also not let your holy one see decay") to be connected with the bodily resurrection from death.²⁰⁸ At the time when the LXX came into being, the belief in the resurrection was thriving. It is thus not surprising to find traces of it here.²⁰⁹ The LXX then, appears at this point the better candidate for adoption by Luke in Ac.²¹⁰

It is a different case with the MT. Here, the last verse is not connected with the hope of resurrection; rather, the person who was praying hoped for Yahweh's help

mentioned by SCHMITT where it is translated by other equivalents, are the following: Ps 20(21):6 ($\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\epsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota$); Ps 88(89):20 ($\tau\iota\theta\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$); Ps 118(119):30 ($\sigma\upsilon\kappa\ \epsilon\pi\iota\lambda\alpha\upsilon\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$).

²⁰⁴ Cf. A. SCHMITT, *Ps 16*, 233-4.

²⁰⁵ In contradiction of the viewpoint of E. HAENCHEN, i.e. that the LXX translated the Hebrew "ganz frei" here (*Apf.* 144), A. SCHMITT proposes a better alternative, namely, that this translation may have been influenced by the several places in the Pss where the announcement of joy is done by way of "the mouth", "tongue" or "lips". He says: "Die LXX hatte hier die gleichen Schwierigkeiten, wie sie jeder moderne Übersetzer an dieser Stelle empfindet. Daher ist es keineswegs notwendig, für die LXX in Ps 16,9a eine vom MT abweichende Vorlage zu rekonstruieren" (*Ps 16*, 235). The best explanation, however, seems to be that of M. RESE, who chose to follow VON RAD in his argument that $\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$ is virtually synonymous with $\text{L}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$ or $\text{D}\text{I}\text{I}\text{I}$, and that the LXX has not understood the MT and has therefore translated it totally differently (*Motive*, 56). Nevertheless, the fact is that the NT follows here the reading of the LXX against that of the MT.

²⁰⁶ A. SCHMITT says of this noun: "Das Nomen *basar* umschreibt hier in Übereinstimmung mit der alttestamentlichen Anthropologie den Menschen in seiner Gesamtheit. Vom griechischen Begriff $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi$ läßt sich das Gleiche nicht aussagen, vielmehr wird damit ein Teilaspekt des Menschen angesprochen." "Die $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ wird wenig später in V.10a angesprochen; *naepaes* vertritt in V.10a die Stelle eines Personalpronomens, aber die griechische Version $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$, eingebettet in den vorliegenden Kontext, eröffnet eine neue Verstehensmöglichkeit im Sinne der griechischen Anthropologie" (*Ps 16*, 235). Although this might be true about the semantic fields of these words, one must be careful not to read too much into these words here. Both $\sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi$ and $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ probably already had their parallels in the Hebrew source text, and it might be that the translator simply used known translation equivalents of the LXX at this point.

²⁰⁷ See also Jdg 18:7; Ps 4:9; Pr 1:33; Ezk 28:26; 34:28; Hs 2:20(18); Zph 2:15 (3:1). These are also translated in the same manner: by $\epsilon\pi'$ / $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \epsilon\lambda\pi\iota\delta\iota$.

²⁰⁸ According to R. PESCH, "... die Wiedergabe von 'Grube' mit 'Verderben' = 'Verwesung' (LXX) erfolgt im Horizont solcher Neudeutung...des hebr. Textes, der im Sinne der gewachsenen Auferstehungshoffnung gelesen wurde" (*Apf I*, 122). PESCH thinks it is also important that Ps 15(16):8b supplied a "Stichwortverbindung" with Ps 109(110):1.

²⁰⁹ So also A. SCHMITT (*Ps 16*, 237-8). Cf. also Is 26:19; Dn 12:2; 2Mac 7:9-14; 12:43f; 14:46; PssSol 3:11f.

²¹⁰ So A. SCHMITT: "Mit der Wendung $\epsilon\tau\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \eta\ \sigma\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\kappa\eta\mu\omega\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\pi'$ $\epsilon\lambda\pi\iota\delta\iota$ wird eine neue Dimension in diesem Psalm durch die griechische Übersetzung eröffnet." "Somit kann aus V.9b gefolgert werden, daß hier eine eschatologische Perspektive erkennbar wird, indem sich der Glaube an die Auferstehung ausspricht" (*Ps 16*, 237).

against the acute danger of death.²¹¹ The Hebrew would thus be translated: "my flesh also dwells in *security*...you do not let your pious one see *sheol*".²¹²

[5] The rendering of ΠΠΨ ("pit") (Ps 16:10 MT), probably from ΠΓΨ ("grave"), as διαφθορά ("decay, deterioration, corruption")²¹³ in the LXX raises the question of whether the ΠΠΨ was read by the LXX (Ps 15:10) as if it were ΠΓΨ, (from ΠΠΨ, "decay"), and therefore rendered διαφθορά.²¹⁴ However, as became clear from the occurrences in the LXX, both Hebrew words (ΠΠΨ and ΠΓΨ) were translated as διαφθορά. Also it seems that ΠΠΨ is almost exclusively translated as διαφθορά in the *Pss*, while in the *prophetic literature* διαφθορά is the characteristic translation of ΠΠΨ. This may support the argument, when one bears in mind that different books were probably translated by different translators; this would also explain the trend in the rest of the *Pss*.

What is significant is that Ac 2:27 follows the LXX reading at this point and (changed consciously or unconsciously by the LXX translator(s) of the *Pss*), Luke made it "... central to Peter's application of the verse to Christ's body, which did not decay in the grave"²¹⁵ — therefore emphasizing his physical resurrection. This connection with the bodily raising from death was thus only possible from the existing Greek translation(s), while in the Hebrew it is clearly excluded.²¹⁶

[6] The translation of *sheol* as ᾠδης must be seen on the one hand as nothing more than a mere translation equivalent,²¹⁷ but on the other hand one also has to take cognizance of the semantic significance behind this term. In the post-exilic era *sheol*

²¹¹. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg 1*, 273.

²¹². The proposed translation is that of H.W. BOERS, Psalm 16 and the historical origin of the Christian faith, in: *ZAW* 60 (1969), 105-110, here 106.

²¹³. Also translated in the same way in Job 33:28,31; Ps 9:15 LXX; Ps 29(30):9; Ps 34(35):7; Ps 54(55):23; Ezk 19:4,8. Διαφθορά seems to be a well known word, used already by Aesch, *Hdt* (cf. W. BAUER, s.v. διαφθορά); the LXX; Philo *Migr.Abr* 17; L.A. 3:162-8); Jos 4p II 259, and also later by *ChrysOr* XIV 152-153).

²¹⁴. So E. HAENCHEN, *Apg*, 144; M. RESE, *Motive*, 57; G.L. ARCHER and G. CHIRICHIGNO, *Quotations*, 63. Translated in this way in Hs 13:9; Zph 3:6; Jr 13:14; 15:3. According to D.L. BOCK, referring to the work of R.E. MURPHY, ("Shachat" in the Qumran Literature, in: *Bib* 39 (1958), 60-66) "...the meaning corruption seems to have turned up at Qumran in Semitic texts of the first century, though it is to be questioned whether a different root origin is to be sought for the word". Texts cited by MURPHY are: 1QM 3:9,26-7; 1QS 9:16-17; 10:19-20; 11:13; and especially 1QS 4:11-14. According to these texts, it "would be possible that a Semitic reader would have understood ΠΠΨ in terms of physical corruption in association with Gehenna. He maintained this understanding would be independent of the LXX." "If Murphy is correct, no mistranslation has occurred and no alteration of the MT has taken place; but instead the word conceptually has been concretized as time passed" (*Proclamation*, 175). Another possibility was presented by A. SCHMITT — building on the work of J. ZIEGLER (*Der textkritische Wert der Septuaginta des Buches Job* (MiscBib 2), Rome 1934, 280f) — namely that one has to bear in mind that the LXX frequently translates "Konkreta" as "Abstrakta". "Ein solcher Fall könnte nun auch hier vorliegen, indem nämlich für das Konkretum *sahat* ('Grab') das Abstraktum διαφθορά ('Vernichtung') in die griechische Version eingebracht wurde" (*Ps 16*, 238). See also the comments on this word in the discussion of the quotation from Ps 2:7 in Ac 13.

²¹⁵. So G.L. ARCHER & G. CHIRICHIGNO, *Quotations*, 63.

²¹⁶. Cf. also M. RESE: "Hier scheint die griechische Übersetzung ganz eindeutig Voraussetzung für ein christologisches Verständnis von Ps 16,10 zu sein; es sei denn, man könnte zeigen, daß auch schon im Hebräischen oder Aramäischen nicht vom Grab, sondern von der Verwesung gesprochen wird" (*Motive*, 57).

²¹⁷. So rightly, D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 173.

was understood in its Jewish concept, as a place of punishment where the dead were kept for a time. It was now in this post-exilic era no longer the eternal lot of *all* who died, but the souls of the righteous were thought to go immediately to heaven.²¹⁸

It would be speculative to assume here *another source* for the second reference to this Ps (Ac 2:31) purely on the scanty evidence of the alternative reading (ἄδου = A C D E Ψ M) in the second reference.²¹⁹ Not only is there authoritative support for the ἄδου-reading, but this second reference has to be seen within the broader context as part of the commentary on the long quotation which preceded it. Even when it is assumed that the ἄδου-reading is to be preferred, one must bear in mind that V.31 forms part of the commentary. It does not have to be a direct quotation, it could be a reference to what was said previously!

[7] "The life well pleasing to God" (MT) to "the way of life" ὁδοῦς ζωῆς (LXX). According to the MT, it is a life to which God responds, while the LXX translation sees it as "a good life which ends in eternal life".²²⁰

(b) Textual differences between Ac and LXX

Ac 2:25-28 consists of an explicit quotation, taken from Ps 15(16):8-11,²²¹ and which seems to be almost identical in both the current reconstructed readings of the NT and LXX texts.²²² The reading of Ac 2:25-28 agrees exactly with that of Ps 15:8-11 (LXX), except for προορώμην²²³ instead of προωρώμην.²²⁴ It is otherwise identical and no additions, omissions, substitutions, transpositions or any other changes of Ac, in comparison with the text of the LXX, are to be found. The only other issue that deserves a remark here, is the question of why Luke has ended his quotation at this

²¹⁸ Cf. H.W. BOERS, *Ps 16*, 107-8; A. SCHMITT, *Ps 16*, 238; and R. PESCH, *Apg I*, 122. The best explanation for this Greek word in the new context of Ac, is summed up by the remarks of H. CONZELMANN: "Lk meint aber: 'im Hades, nämlich im Tode, lassen'; 'Für die Vorstellung einer Hadesfahrt ist die Stelle nicht auszuwerten; Lk kennt diese Vorstellung nicht, und ein vorlukanischer Sinn ist nicht zu erschließen" (*Apg*, 35). Also J. ROLOFF who considers that *hades* here refers not to the place of the dead souls, but "vielmehr Verkörperung der Todesmacht im Sinne von V.24" (*Apg*, 57). Cf. also PssSol 2:7.

²¹⁹ This alternative was suggested by T. HOLTZ (*Untersuchungen*, 50) who finds the alternative reading to be supportive of his argument that this second reference is to be traced back to *another source* than the one used for the longer quotation of the same Ps in Ac 2:25-28. He reckons that X B 81 *al* (or a common earlier text from which these derived) have modified V.31 according to V.27. This train of reasoning is in keeping with, and provides support for HOLTZ's thesis that Luke made use of "bereits vorgegebenen Testimonien" — especially when his quoted text differs from our known (reconstructed) LXX text. At places where both the LXX text and Luke's text agree (as in VV. 25-28) he presumes that Luke himself gets it from his LXX and not from testimonia.

²²⁰ D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 176.

²²¹ The introduction with the words Ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, marks the end of the quotation. So also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apg I*, 270-271.

²²² So also T. HOLTZ: "...in fast völliger Übereinstimmung mit der LXX" (*Untersuchungen*, 48).

²²³ Supported among the LXX textual witnesses by B-X U L^{pa} U Z A-1219-55. Cf. also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 49, n.4.

²²⁴ The morphological difference between -ο- and -ω- was not a major issue during these times and both were used interchangeably. See also T. HOLTZ: "Der Frage kann aber überhaupt nur geringes Gewicht beigemessen werden, da mindestens zur Zeit des Lukas bereits nicht mehr sorgfältig zwischen ο und ω geschieden wurde" (*Untersuchungen*, 49).

specific point.²²⁵ This might have been due either to the adjustment to the context, or to shortening it due to theological *apriori*. The latter seems to be a better choice.²²⁶

4.2.4 Method of quotation

Although some scholars have identified a "Pescher-Technik" here,²²⁷ the opposite case has been satisfactorily proved.²²⁸

The combination of the themes of Jesus' resurrection and being the son of David, was already found in Lk 20:27-44. That is now continued here in this second Petrine speech. *How* Luke came to this quoted text, is unclear, but there seems to be no doubt *that* it is to be traced back to the hand of Luke himself, especially with regard to the fact that it is to be found nowhere else than in Ac. It is also clear that this text is quoted from a LXX version, rather than from those of the Hebrew. The substantial differences between the readings of the MT and that of the LXX makes this clear. The bridging function of the LXX between the Hebrew Jewish Scriptures and early Christianity, is evident here.

The headings of the two previous quoted Pss in Ac 1 have read εἰς τὸ τέλος. Interesting is that Ps 15(16) ends with this *Leitmotiv*: εἰς τέλος. The citing of the quotation itself, as well as this eschatological dimension,²²⁹ serve the goal of being explanatory to the fact of Jesus' resurrection (by God) from death. This interpretation was only possible by way of the LXX-reading of the quotation.²³⁰

4.2.5 Interpretation of the quotation by Luke²³¹

Attention has already been drawn to the fact that Luke has made use of several presuppositions (which he did not explicitly state) when taking this quotation from the Pss and reinterpreting it in his text.²³² After explicitly quoting the text, he

²²⁵ Cf. M. RESE: "...so ist es etwas merkwürdig, daß Ps 16(15),11c: τερνότητες ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος nicht mütiziert wird" (*Funktion*, 73).

²²⁶ So M. RESE: "Um den Fehlschluß zu vermeiden, daß der Geist für immer in der 'Rechten Gottes' ist, streicht er Ps 16,11c und bringt in v 33 die nach seiner Meinung richtige Darstellung des Sachverhaltes: Jesus ist zur Rechten Gottes, und er gießt den Geist aus" (*Motive*, 55-56).

²²⁷ So, for example, E.E. ELLIS, *Midrascharige Züge*, 97. He draws attention to the repetitions of δεξιός (VV.25,33); ὄνος (VV.27,31); σάπξ (VV.26,31) and ἰδεῖν διαφθορᾶν (VV.27,31).

²²⁸ According to M. RESE, a formal reference to repetitions is not a valid argument for a "Pescher-Technik" (*Funktion*, 73-74).

²²⁹ Cf. A. SCHMITT: "Bezüglich der LXX-Version von Ps 16,8-11 ergibt sich, daß die LXX eine eschatologische Interpretation vorgenommen hat. Es kann nicht nachdrücklich genug festgestellt werden, daß dieses Ergebnis nur aufgrund des Kontextes gewonnen wurde." "Erst durch den Kontext wird das Glaubensverständnis der letzten Jahrhunderte v. Chr. erkennbar, das darin kulminiert, daß Auferstehung und ewiges Leben in den Mittelpunkt religiösen Denkens rücken" (*Ps 16*, 242-243).

²³⁰ So also G. SCHNEIDER: "Die vier Doppelverse des Zitats konnten in der LXX-Fassung auf Jesu Auferstehung bezogen werden...weil diese den ursprünglichen Sinn des Psalms bereits umgedeutet hatte, und zwar in Richtung auf eine 'eschatologische Interpretation'" (*Apk I*, 272-273).

²³¹ See W.C. KAISER for a possible interpretation of Ps 15(16) itself (*Promise to David*, 222-227).

²³² So J. ROLOFF: "Bei der Übertragung des Psalms auf Jesus und seine Auferweckung geht Lukas nun allerdings von einer Reihe nicht deutlich ausgesprochener Voraussetzungen aus: 1. Der Psalm spricht von einer leiblichen Auferweckung aus dem Tode. In der Tat war das bereits die Meinung des pharisäischen Judentums. - 2. Sein Verfasser war der König David, der in ihm als Prophet (V.30) spricht. - 3. Jesus ist Davids Sohn, er gehört 'nach dem Fleische' (Röm 1,3) dem davidischen

presents an explanation or exposition of this quoted text. He made it vividly clear that these words were only "prophesied" (προφήτης οὖν ὑπάρχων)²³³ by David (πατριάρχου²³⁴ Δαυίδ), who had died long before, and could not therefore be the subject of the prophecy himself.²³⁵ Instead, it was the resurrection of Christ (ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ)²³⁶ which was seen in advance (προϊδών) by David.²³⁷ Although the words are quoted as the words of David, they are reinterpreted in terms of Christ — thus *christological*.²³⁸ The κύριος to which J1 3 has referred (and by who's name will be saved all those who call on it), is interpreted by Luke as the same κύριος in Ps 15:8 (LXX) — which was the LXX translation of "Yahweh" in Ps 16:8 (MT). Here in Ac 2:25 this translation also helps conveniently to make the

Geschlecht an. David konnte also in Ich-Aussagen, die nicht auf seine individuelle Person begrenzt waren, sondern, antikem jüdischem Denken entsprechend, kollektiv seine gesamte Nachkommenschaft umfaßten, von der Auferstehung Jesu sprechen" (*Apg*, 57).

²³³. Cf. Ac 1:16; Heb 11:32 and Barn 12:10, which take a similar approach, also seeing David as a prophet. See also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 35. According to B.M. NEWMAN and E.A. NIDA "prophet" is to be understood in this context as "one who sees and foretells the future" (*Translator's Handbook*, 54). "Der Psalm müsse also prophetisch gemeint sein" (B. REICKE, *Glaube und Leben*, 48).

²³⁴. In the NT to be found only here, as well as in Ac 7:8,9 and Heb 7:4. According to G. SCHNEIDER, "handelt (es) sich um einen LXX-Ausdruck, der verschiedene hebräische Äquivalente wiedergibt: 1 Chr 24,31; 27,22; 2 Chr 19,8; 23,20; 26,12; 4 Makk 7,19; 16,25 (stets pluralisch), s. auch TestAbr A 20; ApkEsr 30,25. David wird Apg 2,29 offensichtlich wegen seiner messianischen Stammvaterschaft (V 30) 'Patriarch' genannt" (*Apg I*, 274). B.M. NEWMAN and E.A. NIDA see it as "an honorary title applied to David, the king of Israel" (*Translator's Handbook*, 53).

²³⁵. Cf. 3 Ki(1 Ki) 2:10; JosAm 392-394; 249; JosBJ 1:61. J. ROLOFF says: "Dies läßt nur die Wahl zwischen zwei Möglichkeiten: Entweder hat David unwahr geredet, oder er hat nicht von sich selbst gesprochen!" (*Apg*, 58).

²³⁶ So also M. RESE, *Funktion*, 74.

²³⁷. Cf. A. WEISER: "Der Kerngedanke der Beweisführung ist folgender: David hatte in diesem Psalm vorhergesagt, daß Gott seinen Heiligen nicht der Verwesung preisgeben wird; nun aber ist ja allen das Grab Davids bekannt, und alle wissen, daß er verwest ist; also kann sich die Prophetie nicht auf ihn selbst bezogen haben, sondern sie meint den, der nach der Natanweissagung aus Davids Lenden hervorgehen, die Davidsherrschaft antreten und sie für immer behalten wird" (*Apg I*, 93). So also R.F. O'TOOLE: "Luke interprets Psalm 15 in the light of God's promise to David which he cites in Acts 2:30" (*Davidic Covenant*, 255). The author refers also to O. BETZ, *The Kerygma of Luke*, in: *Interpr* 22 (1968), 139-141; C. BURGER, *Jesus als Davidsson: Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Göttingen 1970, 135,138-139; J. DUPONT, *L'interprétation des Psaumes dans les Actes des Apôtres*, in: *idem*, *Études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LeDiv 45), Paris 1967, 283-307; *ibid.*, *L'utilisation*, 312-3; D.M. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand. Psalm 110 in Early Christianity* (SBL MS 18), Nashville 1973, 115; D.L. JONES, *The Title Kyrios in Luke Acts*, in: G.W. MACRAE (ed), *SBL Seminar Papers* 110/2, Missoula 1974, 85-101, here 92-93; B. PAPA, *Atti degli Apostoli*, Bologna 1981, 85-86; M. RESE, *Motiv*, 107-109; G. VOSS, *Durch die Rechte Gottes erhöht, hat er den Geist ausgegossen* (Apg 2:33); *Pfingstgeschehen und Pfingstbotschaft nach Apostelgeschichte Kap.2*, in: *BiKi* 21 (1966), 45-47, here 46; A. WEISER, *Die Pfingstpredigt des Lukas*, *BiLe* 14 (1973), 1-12, here 4; R.F. ZEHLE, *Pentecost Speech*, 27-28.

²³⁸. So also J.W. DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, 168-172; H. BRAUN, *Zur Terminologie*, 536; B. REICKE, *Glaube und Leben*, 47; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 35; and B.M. NEWMANN and E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 53. For W.C. KAISER, this is a "messianic use" of this Ps (*Promise to David*, 219-229). According to D. JUEL, the "messianic" interpretation of Ps 15(16) "...is probably not a surviving fragment of a primitive argument at all", as B. LINDARS, for example, has thought, "...but the end-product of a complex interpretive process and indicative of an approach to exegesis typical of Luke-Acts and later Christian writings, shared probably by no other NT author" (*Use of Ps 16*, 546).

switch to the person under discussion, Jesus (of Nazareth, V.22),²³⁹ who was made both κύριος and χριστός (V.36).²⁴⁰ But V.25 (Ps 15(16):8) also implies that *God* is always with Jesus -- even on the cross. It is therefore no wonder that the call of Mk 15:34 was omitted by Lk!²⁴¹ The role of God thus remains prominent. Everything that has happened to Jesus, was the result of God's plan and due to his will -- up to the point where God could resurrect Jesus from death and exalt him to his right hand.²⁴²

The content of the previously mentioned V.27 is repeated in V.31.²⁴³ This verse seems to be of prominent importance for Luke when he refers to Christ's resurrection, as it is found again in Paul's first speech, in Ac 13:35. To end his discussion on this matter, Luke refers again to Jesus being resurrected from death by God (V.32), and thus encircles this citation in the form of an *inclusio*, combined with V.24.

It is important to note that if Luke has used a Hebrew text here (or a parallel Aramaic version), it would be impossible for him to link his quotation with Jesus' resurrection and to interpret it in this way. He has used the LXX version, which contained material which could be interpreted in connection with Jesus' resurrection.²⁴⁴ Such possibilities were not to be found in the Hebrew.

The LXX quotation from Ps 15(16):8-11 in Ac 2:25-28, thus substantiates and interprets the remarks which are made in Ac 2:22-24; David formulates the words of the Messiah before the Messiah is even born. The function of this quoted text at this specific place, is to provide Scriptural authority for the events of Jesus' life, his death and resurrection. Proof and interpretation are thus taking place simultaneously, but this is not proof from prophecy, within the scheme of promise and fulfillment. It would be better to talk here of a typological use of Scripture.²⁴⁵

4.3 Possible broader knowledge of Ps 15(16) in the rest of the section (Language, Style and OT-motifs)

The following might be possible pointers to a broader knowledge by Luke of Ps 15(16) and the LXX in general: (a) Στηλογραφία τῷ Δαυίδ: The heading of Ps 15(16). Luke knew that this Ps is ascribed to David; (b) καθότι (Ac 2:24)²⁴⁶; (c) [λύσας] τὰς ᾠδῖνας τοῦ θανάτου (Ac 2:24).

²³⁹ Cf. also M. RESE who has said that "...das Zitat dient als Beweis für V.23f, wahrscheinlich auch für V.22" (*Funktion*, 74).

²⁴⁰ According to L. O'REILLY, "the title *kyrios* carries in itself the nuance of divinity because of its use in the LXX as the name of Yahweh" and it therefore "tends to identify Christ with God" (*Word and Sign*, 98).

²⁴¹ See also E. HAENCHEN, *App*, 144; and M. RESE, *Funktion*, 74.

²⁴² Cf. W. DIETRICH: "Der zweite Teil der Rede (V.22-28) bringt ein Bekenntnis zu Jesus mit der Bestimmung, daß Leben, Tod und Auferstehung Jesu unter dem Willen Gottes standen" (*Petrusbild*, 203).

²⁴³ So also G. LÜDEMANN, *Christentum*, 52.

²⁴⁴ In the same direction: H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 35; and M. RESE, *Motive*, 56. Contrary to the viewpoint of J.W. DOEVE, *Jewish Hermeneutics*, Assen 1954, 168.

²⁴⁵ Cf. M. RESE, *Funktion*, 76; and W. DIETRICH, *Petrusbild*, 203.

²⁴⁶ καθότι is found in the NT only in Lk-Ac: Lk 1:7; 19:9; Ac 2:24,45; 4:35; 17:31. G. SCHNEIDER said about its occurrence here, that it "...zeigt an, daß das Auferstehungsgeschehen der Erwartung des Psalms (V 27) entspricht und ihm gemäß erfolgte" (*App I*, 272).

Regarding the latter, one has to take cognizance here of the problem about the differences between the readings of the LXX and the MT. The problem itself has already been clearly formulated: "*Pains of death* is a phrase which comes from the Greek text of the Old Testament and which literally means 'birth pangs of death'; so the meaning of the phrase is that of 'bringing the pangs to an end' or 'doing away with the pain'. The Hebrew text has 'bonds of death', but Luke quotes the Greek..".²⁴⁷ Several explanations to the problem have, in the past, been suggested:

According to Plümacher, [λύσας] τὰς ὀδύνας τοῦ θανάτου²⁴⁸ is the result of unconscious influence, i.e. via other sources — possibly from the liturgical language in this speech.²⁴⁹

[1] Clarke's explanation, i.e. that we are dealing here with a conflation of both ὀδύνας θανάτου and the reading of Job 39:2 (ἠρίθμησας δὲ μήνας αὐτῶν πλήρεις τοκετοῦ αὐτῶν, ὀδύνας δὲ αὐτῶν ἔλυσας)²⁵⁰ does not fit into the thesis assumed in this study, namely that Luke had at his disposal only the book-roles of the Torah, the Prophets and the Pss. The only comparison that might exist between these two texts, is that this phrase was probably already a fixed expression at his time. Although Wilcox was against this (traditional) solution on the basis of the eschatological context of both Ac and the Qumran passage 1QH 3:28 (which is in fact a quotation of Ps 17(18):5),²⁵¹ Richard has convincingly argued for the contrary.²⁵²

[2] The viewpoint of Boers,²⁵³ following that of Lindars,²⁵⁴ that Ac 2:24 is a comment on Ps 15(16):6, is irrelevant when one deals here with the LXX version. Boers has stated clearly that "this can be recognized only in the Hebrew versions of the Psalms, because it is the same Hebrew word מַלְחָמָה that was translated in the LXX with ὀδύνας = 'pangs' in Ps 18(17):5a, and with σχοινία = 'ropes, lines' in Ps 16(15):6". Agreeing with Schmitt against this view of Boers, it must be said that "Die Behauptung, daß in V.24 durch die Vorschaltung des Partizips λύσας eine Bezugnahme auf Ps 16,6 erfolgt, läßt sich nicht erweisen. Ps 16,6 kann daher nicht als ein Kommentar bezeichnet werden, der die 'Wehen des Todes' unter ein positives Vorzeichen stellt".²⁵⁵

[3] Another possibility was presented by Haenchen,²⁵⁶ Conzelmann,²⁵⁷ Weiser,²⁵⁸ Schneider,²⁵⁹ and Roloff,²⁶⁰ namely that this might be a wrong translation made by the translators of the LXX in 2 Ki(Sm) 22:6, Ps 17(18):5f and 114(116):3 which read לַבְּרִית "Geburtswehe"(pains of birth), instead

²⁴⁷ So B.M. NEWMAN and E.A. NIDA, *Translator's Handbook*, 49. Note also their remarks in connection with translating these phrases.

²⁴⁸ This exact phrase is also to be found in PolEp 1:2.

²⁴⁹ Cf. E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas*.

²⁵⁰ W.K.L. CLARKE, *Use of the Septuagint*, 97.

²⁵¹ Cf. E. RICHARD, *OT in Acts*, 339.

²⁵² He reckons that the passages of Ps 17(18):5; Job 39:2 and Ps 114(116):3 "...and other texts concerned with the image of a woman giving birth, were commonly employed in the eschatological and apocalyptic literature of the late OT and NT periods" (E. RICHARD, *OT in Acts*, 339).

²⁵³ H.W. BOERS, *Psalms 16*, 108.

²⁵⁴ B. LINDARS, *NT Apologetic*, 39.

²⁵⁵ A. SCHMITT, *Ps 16*, 245.

²⁵⁶ E. HAENCHEN, *App*, 143.

²⁵⁷ H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 35.

²⁵⁸ A. WEISER, *App I*, 92.

²⁵⁹ G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 272.

²⁶⁰ J. ROLOFF, *App*, 56.

of קָלַח "Strick",²⁶¹ Bock agrees with the passages, but thought it to be due to word-play on these texts.²⁶²

[4] *Schneider*, however, also asks the rhetorical question about this change: "...oder handelt es sich nicht eher um eine bewußte Änderung zum Abstrakten?"²⁶³ *Schmitt* thought this indeed to be the case.²⁶⁴ This seems to be the most convincing explanation.

5. SECTION III. ACTS 2:29-36

Jesus' exaltation & the quotation from Ps 109(110):1

5.1 Composition of the section

What follows here in this section, is nothing else than an exposition of the preceding information. As with the beginning of the first two sections, also this section begins with Peter addressing the hearers directly (ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί), and thereafter focusing on the role of the words which are to follow (ἐξόν²⁶⁵ εἶπεν μετὰ παρησιας πρὸς ὑμᾶς). The issue at stake here, is one "about David" (περὶ...Δαβίδ),²⁶⁶ "the patriarch".²⁶⁷ What follows, is Luke's interpretation of the quoted Ps text. The words of the quotation from Ps 15(16):8-11 are explained in terms of the role that David has played. David is used here as a contrasting example with regard to the resurrection of Jesus. The attention of the hearers is drawn to the contrast between the words of David, and what actually happened to him; the appropriateness of these words becomes clear only when they are applied to Jesus. This then indicates that these words which were spoken by David, did not refer to himself, but to this Jesus (τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν, VV.32,36),²⁶⁸ whom God has made Christ (χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, V.36), and then specifically to the issue "about the resurrection of Christ" (περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ):²⁶⁹

(a) David had died (ἐτελεύτησεν), was buried (ἐτάφη), and his grave still stood as a memorial (τὸ μνημα αὐτοῦ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν ἄχρι τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης) (V.29). Christ, however, was resurrected (ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ), not left behind in *hades* (οὔτε ἐγκατελείφθη εἰς ᾄδην), and his flesh did not see decay²⁷⁰ (οὔτε ἡ

²⁶¹. "Der hebr. Text stellt in den zwei zitierten Fällen die Unterwelt bzw. den Tod als Jäger dar, der mit Fangstricken dem Menschen nachstellt. Die LXX umging durch ihre Version diese bildhafte Konkretisierung" (A. SCHMITT, *Ps 16*, 244-5).

²⁶². D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 171-172.

²⁶³. G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 272.

²⁶⁴. "Man kann nämlich häufig in der LXX beobachten, daß anstelle eines Konkretums ein Abstraktum gesetzt wird" (A. SCHMITT, *Ps 16*, 244).

²⁶⁵. ἐξόν = ἐξεστίν (BL-DBR §353,5; E. HAENCHEN, *App*, 145).

²⁶⁶. Cf. to Ac 1:16 where the theme was "about Judas" (περὶ Ἰούδα).

²⁶⁷. R.F. O'TOOLE refers to Ac 7:8-9 and suggests that David was seen as a patriarch on the same level as the twelve patriarchs (*Davidic Covenant*, 252).

²⁶⁸. Note the similarity in structure between V.36 and V.22: τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν...όν. So also noticed by U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 36.

²⁶⁹. "David ist doch nicht in den Himmel aufgestiegen; also muß sich dieses Wort auf den Messias beziehen" (A. WEISER, *App I*, 93-4). So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 276.

²⁷⁰. Or "corruption" (RSV).

σάρξ αὐτοῦ εἶδεν διαφθοράν) (V.31) — referring thus back to the words of Ps 15(16):10 which were quoted in the section above (VV.22-28).

(b) David did not ascend into heaven (οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς) (V.34),²⁷¹ in contrast to Jesus who was resurrected by God (τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ θεός, V.32), and exalted to the right hand of God himself (τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν²⁷² τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψώθεις, V.33)²⁷³ — from where he received the τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ("the promise of the Holy Spirit") from the Father (λαβὼν παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς),²⁷⁴ which he has "poured out" (ἐξέχεεν τοῦτο).²⁷⁵ This idea was probably well known during Luke's time.²⁷⁶ The fact and position of the exalted Christ is substantiated in the words of David himself, referring here to Ps 109(110):1, i.e. that "the Lord has said to his lord" that he must sit at his right hand, until he has surrendered his enemies under his feet.²⁷⁷

David could therefore be typified as "being a prophet"²⁷⁸ (προφήτης οὖν, V.30) who had foreknowledge of these things (καὶ εἰδὼς ὅτι..., V.30),²⁷⁹ and who, foreseeing it (προϊδὼν), speaks in advance of the resurrection of Christ²⁸⁰ (ἐλάλησεν περὶ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ, V.31).

²⁷¹. Cf. H. CONZELMANN who says that this is "...ein jüdischer Topos...der von den Christen zur Apologetik benützt wird" (*App.* 35). He refers to Rm 10:6f.

²⁷². E. HAENCHEN points out that the transition from the resurrection to the exaltation, is made here "unvermerklich" with this οὖν (*App.* 145).

²⁷³. The term ὑψωθῆναι is only used here with regard to Jesus' ascension (H. BRAUN, *Zur Terminologie*, 533). Note the clear differentiation between Jesus' resurrection, ascension and exaltation.

So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 275.

²⁷⁴. Compare here Lk 24:49 where Jesus says to his disciples: καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πατρὸς μου ἐφ' ὑμῶν.

²⁷⁵. There are two clear references in Ac 2:33 to the J1 quotation (Ac 2:17,18): ἐκχέω (pour out) and τοῦ πνεύματος (Spirit). So also R.F. O'TOOLE, *Davidic Covenant*, 256; H.J. CADBURY, *Speeches*, 409; B. LINDARS, *NT Apologetic*, 43-54; G. LOHFINK, *Himmelfahrt Jesu*, 229. A. KERRIGAN has pointed out that "...the action which is predicted of Yahweh in the oracle of Joel (ἐκχεῶ in the LXX, Joel, III,1a) is predicted here of Jesus (ἐξέχεεν, V.33)" (*Sensus Plenior*, 297). So also U. WILCKENS (*Missionsreden*, 35) and H. CONZELMANN (*App.* 35), who said that the dative should be understood here as locative; as well as H. VAN DE SANDT, *Fate of the Gentiles*, 56. Compare also these instances in Ac with Is 57:16: πνεῦμα γὰρ παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐξελεύσεται...

²⁷⁶. Cf. Rm 1:4 and 1 Tm 3:16. So also E. HAENCHEN, *App.* 146.

²⁷⁷. "In der Schriftauslegung, die Petrus vorträgt, ist der 'Sohn Davids' also als 'Sohn Gottes' und 'Menschensohn' begriffen, dem der Platz auf Gottes Thron...zugedacht ist" (R. PESCH, *App I*, 123). See also A. KERRIGAN: "Peter, quoting Ps CX,1, implies that Christ's exaltation at God's right hand includes the defeat of his enemies (Act., II,33-34), who, as Act X,38 indicates, are the Devil and his minions" (*Sensus Plenior*, 308). Compare this with the eschatological (apocalyptic) section in the J1 quotation. However, I do not share KERRIGAN's view that this implies "...the struggle against Satan and his allies in which Jesus was engaged" (308; my emphasis, *GJS*).

²⁷⁸. Compare Lk 20:42; Ac 1:16; 2:30; 4:25. Cf. also Barn 12:10 where Ps 109(110) is also quoted: οὗτος προφητεύει Δαυεὶδ. According to J.A. FITZMYER, the "identification of David as a prophet naturally continues later in the Christian tradition and becomes a standard epithet, being inspired no doubt, in part at least, by Acts 2:30. It is not unknown in later Jewish tradition as well" (David, "Being therefore a Prophet..." (Acts 2:30), in: *CBQ* 34 (1972), 352-359, here 333).

²⁷⁹. E. HAENCHEN said: "dem Propheten gibt Gott den Blick in die Zukunft" (*App.* 145).

²⁸⁰. According to Luke, David could only have known that the "one of his descendants which will sit upon his throne", is the Messiah (the Christ, in Greek). The reference is therefore to "the resurrection of the Christ" (V.31) and not to that of Jesus, which could not have been known by David. (Compare this with God who has resurrected Jesus in V.32).

It is important that it is still God who remains the Subject of all that is happening: It is *God* who has promised ("had sworn with an oath", ὅτι ὄρκω ἔμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός)²⁸¹ that one of David's descendants would sit upon his throne (V.30), it is *God* who has resurrected Jesus (τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ θεός, V.32), it is at *God's* right hand that Jesus sits, and from "the Father" (παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς) that he has received the "promise of the Spirit — it is therefore *God* who has made Jesus both κύριος and χριστός (V.36).²⁸² The message is thus clear: God has done all these things with Jesus and made him, this Jesus whom they have crucified (τοῦτον τὸν Ἰησοῦν ὃν ὑμεῖς ἐσταυρώσατε, V.36),²⁸³ a ruler (κύριος) and a saviour (χριστός).²⁸⁴ And this must be noted well by the whole of Israel (ἀσφαλῶς οὖν γινωσκέτω πᾶς οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ,²⁸⁵ V.36).

The message itself is thus also divine, and could have been known only through God who has revealed it himself. The promise of the Holy Spirit (τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου)²⁸⁶ was now received by the exalted Jesus at the right hand of God, transferred from the Father himself.

5.2 The quotation from Ps 109(110):1 (Ac 2:34-35)

Just as the reference to Jesus' resurrection from death has triggered Luke to quote from the Pss, so also here, the reference to Jesus' exaltation leads him to quote again from the Pss (109:1).²⁸⁷

Ps 109(110) is probably the text most used in early Christianity in connection with Jesus' exaltation²⁸⁸ — though other texts were also used.²⁸⁹ It is no wonder that this quotation is found so often in the NT literature.²⁹⁰ Of all the quotations

²⁸¹ Cf. also M. RESE, *Motive*, 107-108; and R.F. O'TOOLE, *Davidic Covenant*, 249.

²⁸² Cf. C.A.J. PILLAI: "From the beginning, in the apostolic experience, witness and composition, there is a clear interpretation of the meaning of the resurrection event as a living mystery. The core of this mystery is that God has intervened decisively in history to raise up Jesus of Nazareth as Christ and Lord" (The Two Aspects of the Resurrection, in: E.A. LIVINGSTONE (ed), *Studia Evangelica* VI (TU 112), Berlin 1973, 417-428, here 424).

²⁸³ About the relation here between V.36b and V.23, cf. to U. WILCKENS: "...die Formulierung des Satzes (erweckt), besonders durch seine Einleitung, den Eindruck, daß die Aussage zugleich als theologische Zusammenfassung der ganzen Predigt gemeint ist, welches Verständnis sich auch durch den ausdrücklichen Rückbezug in 2.36b auf 2.23 nahelegt" (*Missionstreden*, 36). This applies then not only to Jesus' exaltation only, but to the whole of the preceding Jesus-kerygma.

²⁸⁴ Of interest here is the suggestion of O. GLOMBITZA that the first "Credo-Formel" ('Ἰησοῦς χριστός κύριος) could be found here in the exact reversed order! "Offenbar sollte V.36 als Höhepunkt und Ziel der Ausführungen angesehen werden" (*Schluß der Petrusrede*, 116).

²⁸⁵ According to E. HAENCHEN, οἶκος Ἰσραὴλ is a "LXX-Wendung" (*App*, 146).

²⁸⁶ An epexegetical genitive, with the meaning: "das im Geist bestehende Verheißungsgut" (G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 275.n.113).

²⁸⁷ Some believe that Ps 68:19 lies behind this quotation. (Cf. for example, B. LINDARS, *NT Apologetic*, 43-44; J. DUPONT, Ascension du Christ et don de l'Esprit d'après Actes 2.33, in: B. LINDARS & S.S. SMALLEY (eds), *Christ and Spirit in the New Testament*, 219-228, Cambridge 1973). D.L. BOCK has argued convincingly against their textual reconstruction (*Proclamation*, 181-183).

²⁸⁸ J. ROLOFF talks about "den klassischen Schriftbeweis für die Erhöhung Jesu" (*App*, 59).

²⁸⁹ So P.G.R. DE VILLIERS, *Jesus nassen opstanding en wederkoms*, D.Th.-Thesis, Stellenbosch 1976, 141; and A. WEISER, *App I*, 94.

²⁹⁰ Compare Mt 22:44; Mk 12:36; Lk 20:42-43; Ac 2:34-35; 1 Cor 15:25; Heb 1:13. Cf. also the context of Mt 26:64; Mk 14:62; 16:19; Lk 22:69; Ac 5:31; 7:55,56; Rm 8:34; Eph 1:20; Col 3:1; Heb 1:3; 8:1; 10:12; 12:2; 1 Pt 3:22. It was on the basis of this quotation that Jesus was crucified. He was seen as a blasphemer when he claimed for himself the place of judge at the right hand of God. Interesting is also

and references used in the NT, this one from Ps 109(110) is then one of those used most frequently.²⁹¹

5.2.1 Other occurrences

This Ps was already used by Jesus himself in a combined quotation in Mk 14:62²⁹² (Ps 109(110):1 and Dn 7:13), with its parallels in Lk 22:69 and Mt 26:64.

Apart from its occurrence in Lk 20:42-43 and here in Ac 2:34-35, this explicit quotation is also to be found in Mt 22:44; Mc 12:36; 1 Cor 15:25²⁹³ and Heb 1:13 (in addition to numerous other references to it in the rest of the NT). In all places where it is explicitly quoted, it agrees with the LXX, except that some read ὑποπόδιον, and others who read ὑποκάτω. The ὑποπόδιον-reading of the LXX is to be found in Lk 2:43,²⁹⁴ as well as in Ac 2:35 and in Heb 1:13.

Mk 12:36²⁹⁵ and Mt 22:44²⁹⁶ follow the ὑποκάτω-reading. But the connection between Mt-Mc + Ps 8:7 on the one hand, and 1 Cor 15:25, Eph 1:20-22, Heb 1:13/2:8 + Ps 8:7 on the other hand, should also be noted clearly.²⁹⁷

the linking of this citation with Ps 8:7 in 1 Cor 15:25, Eph 1:20-22 and in Heb 1:13: 2:6.

²⁹¹ So also P.G.R. DE VILLIERS, *Jesus*, 141; D.-A. KOCH, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 19; M. HENGEL, *Ps 110 und die Erhöhung des Auferstandenen zur Rechten Gottes*, in: C. BREYTENBACH & H. PAULSEN (hrsg), *Anfänge der Christologie. Festschrift für Ferdinand Hahn zum 65. Geburtstag*, Göttingen 1991, 43-73, here 43.

²⁹² P.G.R. DE VILLIERS has indicated that Mk 14:62 is a prophecy of Jesus during his trial, in which Jesus connects the Son of Man title and the Kurios title, knowing its messianic meaning from apocalypticism (Dn 7:13f) (166). The most important aspect of this expression in Mk 14:62 is that it indicates explicitly how Jesus used Ps 109(110) in order to describe his future glorification by God after his earthly life. It is thus understandable why this Ps (and especially the sessio motif), occupies such an important place in the NT. The apostles have taken over in their kerygma of Jesus, the fulfillment of Ps 109(110), which was previously predicted by Jesus himself (*Jesus*, 168). See also M. HENGEL, *Ps 110*, 59-61.

²⁹³ See D.-A. KOCH, *Schrift als Zeuge*, 19f.244f and M. HENGEL, *Ps 110*, 51f for a discussion on this.

²⁹⁴ Codex D, supported by the majority of old Latin witnesses, reads here ὑποκάτω. Codex D probably changed the reading in Lk to be on a par with those of Mt and Mk. So also T. HOLTZ, *Untersuchungen*, 51. Although this quotation in Lk is not part of his SLk, he has probably changed it here due to his knowledge of the LXX, or a tradition which was nearer to the LXX (Compare also G.J. STEYN, *LXX-invloed*, 124).

²⁹⁵ The ὑποκάτω reading is supported by B D W 28 sy^s co, and against it the ὑποπόδιον reading is supported by X A L Θ Ψ 092 b ¹13 M lat sy^p.h. T. HOLTZ considers K. STENDAHL's suggestion (*The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament*, Philadelphia 1968, 78), i.e. that the ὑποκάτω may have found its way via Ps 8:7 in Mt and Mk, to be a possible solution to this problem (*Untersuchungen*, 51). So also D.M. HAY, *Glorify*, 35; and D.-A. KOCH. The latter has argued: "Von Mk 12,36 an ist zwar eine Beeinflussung von Ψ 109,1 durch Ψ 8,7 festzustellen (ὑποκάτω anstelle von ὑποπόδιον; ebenso Mt 22,44), doch wird auch in Ψ 109,1 an keiner Stelle bloßes ὑπό verwendet" (*Schrift als Zeuge*, 140).

²⁹⁶ The ὑποκάτω reading is here supported by X B D L Z Γ Θ ¹13 892 al it sa ho. Against this, the ὑποπόδιον reading is supported by W 0138.0161 ¹1 M lat mae.

²⁹⁷ D.-A. KOCH says: "Zwar wird besonders für Ψ 8,7 (und zwar in Verbindung mit Ψ 109,1) häufig eine bereits traditionelle christologische Interpretation angenommen, für die neben 1 Kor 15,25.27 auf Eph 1,20.22 und Hebr 1,13; 2,6-8 verwiesen wird" (*Schrift als Zeuge*, 244). See also C. BREYTENBACH, *Grundzüge markinischer Gottessohn-Christologie*, in: C. BREYTENBACH & H. PAULSEN (hrsg), *Anfänge der Christologie*, Göttingen 1991, 169-184, here 181-182.

Interesting is the fact that he quoted it (Ps 109(110):1-3) "within the series of quotations devoted to Christ's career" directly from LXX manuscripts.²⁹⁸ This might be an indication that the early Christians probably knew the quotations, but when they used it in their documents, they quote it directly from their written LXX documents.

5.2.2 *The introductory formula (Ac 2:34)*

The following words serve as an introductory formula: οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, λέγει δὲ αὐτός.²⁹⁹ Attention has already been drawn to the fact that the explanatory γὰρ demonstrates that Luke uses V.34 and its citation from Ps 109(110) to explain Ac 2:33.³⁰⁰

5.2.3 *Determining and explaining the textual differences*

NT (NA26) Ac 2:34-35	NT (NA26) Lk 20:42-43	NT (NA26) Heb 1:13	LXX Ps 109:1
Εἶπεν [ὁ] κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, 35 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.	εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, 43 ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.	κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.	Εἶπεν ὁ κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου.
NT (NA26) Mk 12:36	NT (NA26) Mt 22:44	MT Ps 110:1	
εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου.	εἶπεν κύριος τῷ κυρίῳ μου· κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου, ἕως ἂν θῶ τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν σου.	הַיְהוָה יָשִׁב לְיָמֵי יְהוָה עַד-אֲשֶׁר אָכַד אֶת-הַיְהוָה לְכַבְּדוֹ:	

²⁹⁸ O. SKARSAUNE, *Proof from Prophecy. A Study in Justin Martyr's Proof-Text Tradition: Text-Type, Provenance, Theological Profile* (NTS 56), Leiden 1987, 425.

²⁹⁹ Cf Jewish topos of not climbing down, also found in Rm 10:6.

³⁰⁰ See R.F. O'TOOLE, *Davidic Covenant*, 256; and also G. SCHNEIDER, *Apq I*, 275,n.117.

(a) *Textual differences between the MT and LXX*

Although there are no major differences between the readings of the LXX and the MT,³⁰¹ it should be noted that the LXX version was in Luke's mind. Without it, the difference between κύριος (Yahweh) and κύριος μου (Christ) in the interpretation of the quotation would not have been possible.³⁰²

(b) *Textual differences between Ac and the LXX*

There are no additions, omissions, substitutions or transpositions in Ac in comparison with the LXX. One minor instance of uncertainty in determining the Ac reading is however to be found in the question about the inclusion or exclusion of the article ὁ before κύριος in Ac 2:34.³⁰³ Lk-Ac follows the reading of the LXX which reads ὑποπόδιον³⁰⁴ instead of ὑποκάτω.

5.2.4 Method of quotation

This quoted text is used as substantiation for the ascension of Christ, which was long ago already foreseen by David.³⁰⁵ The quotation was probably already well known during Luke's time in combination with Jesus' ascension. The chances may therefore be good that Luke might have got this quotation from the tradition. The ὑποπόδιον-reading confirmed that the same texttradition was used in both Lk and Heb. This is in agreement with earlier observations that Luke followed a texttradition which was the closest to that as found in the Alexandrian type.³⁰⁶

³⁰¹ M. HENGEL has recently pointed out that "Die LXX bringt eine wörtliche Übersetzung des hebräischen Textes" (*Ps 110*, 44). D.M. HAY (*Glorie*, 35), and M. RESE (*Funktion*, 59-61), have indicated that there might be two minor divergences from the LXX: (a) εἶπεν κύριος (supported only by R) against εἶπεν ὁ κύριος. According to T. HOLTZ, the occurrence of the article is, in the majority of manuscripts, a secondary influence from the circulating LXX text, not known to the totality of NT literature at this specific point (*Untersuchungen*, 53). The issue of articles is, however, extremely complicated, and articles were used inconsequentially. According to K. ALAND (in personal discussion, Münster, Aug 1991), it would be almost impossible to determine if that article is really authentic at a specific instance or not. The second (b): while all the quotations of Ps 110:1b agree with the LXX in reading ἐκ δεξιῶν, "a large proportion of the allusions to it have constructions with δεξιῶν" (D.M. HAY, *Glorie*, 35). These divergences are, nonetheless, not directly relevant for our purposes here.

³⁰² So also H. CONZELMANN, *App*, 35-36; and G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 276.

³⁰³ The article is omitted by X^a B^a D NA25, and included by P⁷⁴ X^c A B² C E Ψ M NA26. In the LXX manuscripts it is only omitted by the main witness "R" of the formerly so-called "Western text". According to T. HOLTZ this omission could be due to the influence of the NT text, and if so, it is possible that we are dealing here with the authoritative reading. "In jedem Falle aber dürfte die Annahme wohl begründet sein, daß im 1./2. Jahrhundert ein Text der LXX existiert hat, der das ὁ nicht kannte" (*Untersuchungen*, 52-53). According to C. BREYTENBACH, on the parallel passage in Mk, B and D ("die besseren Zeugen") have κύριος without the article, which might be a pointer to the literal translation of "Yahweh" which occurs without an article in the Hebrew (*Grundzüge*, 181).

³⁰⁴ Cf. also the other places in the LXX where ὑποπόδιον is to be found: Ps 98:5, Is 66:1 and La 2:1 — all of which are translations of the Hebrew דָּרָגָה, as is the case here in Ps 109(110):1.

³⁰⁵ According to E. HAENCHEN, this quotation proofed *indirectly* the expression "exalted to the right hand of God" (*App*, 146).

³⁰⁶ Cf. Ch 1, as well as 5.2.1 of this study.

It should also be noted that if Luke did get this quotation from the tradition, he knew it to be a "Ps of David". This is clear from his argumentation that *David* had not ascended into heaven, but that *he* said (οὐ γὰρ Δαυὶδ ἀνέβη εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, λέγει δὲ αὐτός, V.34). The other alternative may be that Luke knew this from the broader context from which the quoted text is drawn.

It is clear that this quoted text (Ps 109(110):1) should be taken together with the previous one from Ps 15(16):8-11. Both of them confirm that the words which were "prophesied" by David, were fulfilled in what had happened to Jesus after his death, i.e. his resurrection and exaltation. The κύριος-motif plays an important role in combining these quoted texts.

5.2.5 Interpretation of the quoted text by Luke³⁰⁷

There seems to be sufficient evidence that Luke is arguing here from the Davidic promise (2 Ki(Sm) 7:12-16).³⁰⁸ Alternatively, some scholars suggest, however, that Ac 2:33 should be understood in the light of Ps 67(68):19a.³⁰⁹ According to this latter viewpoint, Jesus is understood here as "the new Moses". Just as Moses received the Law, so Jesus ascended to his Father to receive the Spirit, which he now gives to this group as a "new Law".³¹⁰ This is, however, doubtful and "...even an allusion of the Psalm is in doubt".³¹¹ A better choice seems to be Ps 88(89). It explicitly reports God's covenant with David, fits best the context of the second Petrine speech as a whole, and is employed elsewhere in Lk-Ac.³¹² The resurrection

³⁰⁷. C. SMITS has already drawn attention to the exegetes' recognition of the difficulties of "Peter's interpretation" of this quotation in the past. But this has led them also to apply "... alle spitsvondige distincties over de zin van de heilige Schrift op dit geval..." (*Citaten II*, 182).

³⁰⁸. G. SCHNEIDER (*App I*, 274); and R.F. O'TOOLE (*Davidic Covenant*, 245-258) have convincingly argued in this direction.

³⁰⁹. Cf. for example: H.J. CADBURY, *Speeches*, 408-9; J. DUPONT, *L'interprétation*, 368-9; *ibid.*, *Ascension*, 222-228, here 226-227; *idem.*, *La Nouvelle Pentecôte* (Ac 2,1-11), in: *Nouvelles études sur les Actes des Apôtres* (LeDiv 118), Paris 1984, 139f; W.L. KNOX, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Cambridge 1948, 84-86; G. KRETSCHMAR, *Himmelfahrt und Pfingsten*, *ZKG* 66 (1954-55), 209-253; B. LINDARS, *NT Apologetic*, 43-44,50-59,73,253,284; O. BETZ, *Kerygma*, 144; L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 26. The latter not only cites specifically the Targum's rendering of Ps 67(68):19, but even talks about a "...growing consensus" in recent years that Ac 2:33 should be explained as alluding to Ps 67(68):19! [Including references from R.F. O'TOOLE, *Davidic Covenant*, 247; and L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 26].

³¹⁰. For a more extensive summary of this viewpoint (especially as represented in B. LINDARS, *NT Apologetic*, 43-44), see D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 181-183. See also L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 26-27. According to the latter: "The Jewish feast of Pentecost was understood, at least in some circles in N.T. times, as commemorating the giving of the Law at Sinai. This understanding of the feast is the background to the Christian Pentecost and it suggests that the latter is to be interpreted as the outpouring of the Spirit and the word of God. The community of the early chapters of Ac resembles in many respects the eschatological assembly of Israel at Sinai of the Jewish expectation. This new people is constituted by the outpouring of the Spirit which creates out of the assembled disciples a community of prophets. The source of the Spirit is Jesus, the new Moses of the last times" (*Word and Sign*, 27-28).

³¹¹. So with D.L. BOCK, *Proclamation*, 183. The value of the argument is to be found in its possible links with Eph 4:8, rather than with Ac 2:33.

³¹². So R.F. O'TOOLE (*Davidic Covenant*, 249). Compare the following references (verses in brackets refer to Ps 88(89)): Lk 1:50 (V.2); 1:51 (V.11); 2:26 (V.49); 21:25 (V.10); Ac 2:30 (V.4); Ac 13:22 (V.21).

of Jesus was then probably seen as the realization of the Davidic promise.³¹³ David is thus, for Luke, the primary recipient of God's promise.³¹⁴

With regard to the content of the quoted text itself, three motifs stand out here: Jesus at the right hand of God, the submission of the enemy, and the κύριος title. (a) The motif of Jesus in the honoured position at God's right hand, was already implicitly mentioned in the previous quoted text (Ps 15(16):8) at Ac 2:25,³¹⁵ and again in V.33, before being substantiated by the next quoted text itself (VV.34-35). This image is the dominant theme which stands out when Ps 109(110) is quoted.³¹⁶ The other two also receive some emphasis, but never function independently.³¹⁷

(b) The motif of the submission of the enemy should be seen in combination with the fact that God made Jesus χριστός (V.36). He was given the status of a conqueror and a saviour by God. It was promised, at the beginning of Luke's first work, to Mary that Jesus will get the "throne of David", that he will be "great" and will be called "the son of the Most High" (Lk 1:32: οὗτος ἔσται μέγας καὶ υἱὸς ὑψίστου κληθήσεται καὶ δώσει αὐτῷ κύριος ὁ θεὸς τὸν θρόνον Δαυὶδ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ). Jesus reigns now, seated directly next to God himself, over all that exists, including all his enemies. They are (literally in the world concept of the first century) *under* his feet. The same motif can also be found later in Ac (10:38).

(c) The section ends on a climactic note with the reference to Jesus being made κύριος (V.36),³¹⁸ thus picking up again the motif of the κύριος title which has threaded its way through the second Petrine speech. In VV.20,21,25 and V.34 (2x) references to κύριος are to be found, and all of them are part of the quoted texts! The J1 quotation ends with the "great and manifest day of the κύριος" (V.20), adding that "whoever calls on the name of the κύριος will be saved" (V.21).³¹⁹ The first Ps quotation in this speech (Ps 15(16)), indicates that "the κύριος is seen always before him, for he is at his right hand" (V.25), thus pointing out that he (αὐτόν, V.25), Jesus

³¹³. So R.F. O'TOOLE: "The amount of space that Luke dedicates to this Davidic promise leaves no doubt that he views it as the promise which best accounts for the central Christian belief, Jesus' resurrection" (*Davidic Covenant*, 253-254).

³¹⁴. So R.F. O'TOOLE, *Davidic Covenant*, 257.

³¹⁵. Although D. JUEL (*Use of Ps 76*, 546) is of the opinion that there might be a possibility that Luke introduced Ps 109(110) here specifically on the basis of the last line of Ps 15(16) ("in thy presence there is fulness of joy; in thy right hand are pleasures for evermore"), one could ask why it should have been the last line, when the quoted section itself provides sufficient evidence for a possible link? Compare the ἐκ δεξιῶν μου in V.25 (Ps 15(16):8) and V.34 (Ps 109(110):1).

³¹⁶. According to R.F. O'TOOLE, "exalted" should be interpreted in terms of David (Ps 88), and, consequently, Luke continues his image of the king sitting on the Davidic throne. Luke's use of 'at the right hand (τῆ δεξιᾷ)' confirms this interpretation..." "The throne image continues, and δεξιᾷ should be understood as locative" (not instrumental) (*Davidic Covenant*, 256). So also G. SCHNEIDER, *App I*, 275-276.

³¹⁷. So P.G.R. DE VILLIERS, *Jesus*, 142.

³¹⁸. Cf. Ac 7:35. See also W. DIETRICH: "Die wesentliche sachlichen Punkte der Petrusrede — der christologische Aspekt, die theologische Seite und der Bezug auf die jüdische Volk — werden im Schlussvers (36) zusammengefaßt" (*Petrusbild*, 209).

³¹⁹. Cf. also A. KERRIGAN who says about the connection between Ac 2:21 (J1 2:32(3:5)) and Ac 2:36, that "...the Lord whose name must be invoked is none other than Jesus of Nazareth" (*Scensus Plenior*, 296-297).

of Nazareth (Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραίου, V.22), was resurrected by God (ὁ ὁ θεός ἀνέστησεν, V.24),³²⁰ because it was impossible for death to hold him (οὐκ ἦν δυνατὸν κρατεῖσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, V.24),³²¹ in contrast with David who has died (V.29). This is the first explicit link between Jesus of Nazareth and the κύριος of Luke's quoted text. The second Ps quotation in this speech (Ps 109(110)), indicates that "the κύριος" (God) "has said to his" (David's) "κύριος" (now identified with Jesus),³²² "to sit at his" (God's) "right hand" (V.34). This can only be understood after the δεξιῶν of the first Ps quotation is picked up (V.25), and read with the δεξιῶν in Luke's commentary on this quotation (V.33), that it was again God who had also exalted (θεοῦ ὑψωθείς, V.33) this Jesus whom he had resurrected (τοῦτου τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀνέστησεν ὁ θεός, V.33). The final result is now made explicitly clear by Luke, indicating that Ἰησοῦν τὸν Ναζωραίου (V.22), was made κύριος by God himself (ἐποίησεν ὁ θεός, V.36).³²³ The Jewish Scriptures, in their Greek form, are thus used here to help in the identification and substantiation of Jesus of Nazareth as the κύριος (Lord) and the χριστός (Messiah).³²⁴ In this then, the LXX has played a major role, as κύριος was not only the translation for "master", but of the tetragram itself, the very holy and respectful name of Yahweh, which was even protected by one of the ten commandments. This is the name that the LXX translates as κύριος, making it easy, when Luke proclaims that God has made Jesus κύριος, to identify both Yahweh and Jesus of Nazareth with this same name.³²⁵ The implication is that, in sharing the name, Jesus shares also the divinity of Yahweh.³²⁶

The messianic interpretation of the Ps 109(110) seems to be controversial, as the rabbinic literature of the NT era explains it in a *non messianic* manner.³²⁷ On the other hand, the contemporaries of Jesus were probably aware of the messianic

³²⁰ L. O'REILLY says: "If the risen Jesus is identified with the *kyrios* of Joel 3,5 it indicates that in him this prophecy finds its perfect fulfillment" (*Word and Sign*, 98).

³²¹ Cf. W. DIETRICH: "Der Schluß des zweiten Teils mit seinem Psalmzitat (V.24-28) leitet zu einem speziellen Problem über, das im dritten Abschnitt (V.29-35) zur zentralen Frage wird. Es geht um das Schicksal Jesu nach seinem Tode" (*Petrusbild*, 206).

³²² Cf. D. JUEL: "The speech demonstrates that there is more than one *kyrios*. Jesus is shown to be the second *kyrios*, referred to in Ps 110:1" (*Use of Ps 16*, 544). According to E. HAENCHEN, this could only refer to the "Messiah" (*App*, 146).

³²³ So also J.J. KILGALLEN: "Verse 36, then, is only the logical conclusion to the argument begun in verse 22" (*Pentecost Speech*, 651).

³²⁴ So also J.J. KILGALLEN, *Unity of Pentecost Speech*, 652.

³²⁵ According to L. O'REILLY, "The essential point about the name of Yahweh or of any other name for that matter was that it was understood as somehow representing the person. It contained the essential secret of a person's identity and therefore one knew the person only when one knew his name. The name of Yahweh was a special case however because it was the means by which Israel was able to make contact with its transcendent and invisible God" (94). "In the context of Acts the function of the name of Yahweh fulfilled by Jesus as Lord is especially that of eschatological saviour (2,21-36)" (*Word and Sign*, 98).

³²⁶ L. O'REILLY is therefore right in saying that, "This identification of Jesus with the name of Yahweh may have played an important role in the expression of the faith of the early Christians in Jesus' divinity" (*Word and Sign*, 98). So also A.M. BESNARD, *Le Mystère du Nom. Quiconque invoquera le nom du Seigneur sera sauvé. Joel 3,5 (LeDiv 35)*, Paris 1962, 154.

³²⁷ Cf. O. LINTON, "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Ps CX, in: *NTS* 7 (1961), 258-262, here 260; and P.G.R. DE VILLIERS, *Jesus*, 146,147.

meaning of the Ps.³²⁸ as might be detected in the discussion between Jesus and his opponents about the son of David.³²⁹ Ps 109(110) was interpreted messianically for the first time during the time of Rabbi Chama ben Chaninah (ca. 260 AD) and Rabbi El'azar (270 AD).³³⁰ According to STR-BILL, however, Rabbi Ismael (ca. 100-135 AD) — a serious opponent of the Christians and a contemporary of the gospel writers — was responsible for the earliest datable non messianic interpretation (by applying it to Abraham). What is indisputable is that here in Ac the Ps is indeed interpreted in a messianic manner.³³¹

The LXX reading makes it clear that both the speaker (ὁ κύριος) and the addressee (τῷ κυρίῳ) are indicated by exactly the same title (name): κύριος.³³² God remains the Subject by giving the most honourable position in the universe to Christ. The latter could therefore also be called with the very same name as God himself. All this points to the "subordination of Christ" (V.33).³³³

To summarize: Luke uses the second Petrine speech to remind the people that they know about the "wonders and signs which God has done in their midst through Jesus of Nazareth" (V.22). Evidence from the Scriptures (VV.25-28, 34-35) is now used to explain to them that the resurrection and exaltation of the Christ was already foretold by "the patriarch" (V.29) David himself — who was a prophet (V.30), knowing God's oath (V.30), and foreseeing the resurrection of the Christ (V.31), and his ascension (V.34). The Scriptures testify thus to God's "definite plan and foreknowledge" (τῇ ὀρισμένη βουλή καὶ προγνώσει τοῦ θεοῦ, V.23), when David is quoted (VV.25,34) with regard to Jesus' resurrection (VV.25-28) and his exaltation (VV.34-35). In addition to the evidence of the Scriptures and the "prophecy" of David, Peter and the rest are first hand eyewitnesses of Jesus' resurrection (V.32).³³⁴

³²⁸ Cf. STR-BILL, *Kommentar IV J*, 452.

³²⁹ P.G.R. DE VILLIERS, *Jesus*, 146-7.

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, 147-8.

³³¹ So also D.L. TIEDE: "...the citations from Psalm 16 (vs. 25-28) and Psalm 110 (vs. 34-35) are adduced to substantiate the messianic and christological claims made on behalf of the crucified Jesus as resurrected and exalted Christ and Lord" (*Acts* 2, 64); and O. GLOMBITZA: "Alle diese Zitate sind messianisch ausgelegt worden, um im Schriftbeweis verwendet werden zu können" (*Schluss der Petrusrede*, 118). If it is accepted that the "OT" is interpreted messianically at this point, then it follows that: "Petrus legte das AT dahin aus, daß er auf den Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Κύριος als den σωτήρ hinwies, der von τῆς γενεᾶς τῆς σκολιᾶς errettet, von dem Geschlecht, das gegen Gottes Handeln Jesum kreuzigte" (118). He (Luke) interpreted the Scriptures then christological to the Christ congregation, with his contemporaries (118). F.F. BRUCE makes it clear that Jesus did not use this language of himself, but that Paul (Rm 1:3) and the apostles used it of him (The Davidic Messiah in Luke-Acts, in: G.A. TUTTLE (ed), *Biblical and Near Eastern Studies. Essays in Honor of William Sanford LaSor*, Grand Rapids 1978, 7-17, here 7). Luke is probably emphasizing some words from an early Christian confession (8,11). Compare Luke's nativity narrative with those of Mk and Mt (*Davidic Messiah*, 7-9).

³³² So also G. SCHNEIDER: "Die Argumentation ist nur aufgrund des LXX-Textes möglich." "Nur die LXX 'ermöglicht die Unterscheidung von κύριος = Gott und κύριος = Christus" (*Apg J*, 276).

³³³ Cf. also H. CONZELMANN, *Apg*, 35. He refers to Ac 5:31. Also G. SCHNEIDER on the basis of ὑψωθείς and τῇ δεξιᾷ τοῦ θεοῦ (*Apg I*, 275).

³³⁴ Cf. W. DIETRICH: "Die Begrenzung der Zeugenschaft auf den nachösterlichen Christus wird im Blick auf 5,30-32 deutlicher: das Zeugnis der Apostel beschränkt sich darum auf das εἶπεω Ἰησοῦν und auf das ὑψοῦν τῇ δεξιᾷ αὐτοῦ (=θεοῦ), weil die Umkehr der Juden an die Auferstehung Jesu gebunden ist" (*Petrusbild*, 208).

5.3 Possible broader LXX knowledge in the rest of the section (Language, Style and OT-motifs)

ὅτι ὄρκω ὤμοσεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεὸς ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς ὀσφύος αὐτοῦ καθίσει ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον αὐτοῦ (Ac 2:30): This might be a brief reflection of the saying by Nathan in 2 Ki(Sm) 7:12-13. God's promise to David is also to be found in Is 55:3 and Ps 131(132):11:³³⁵ ὤμοσεν κύριος τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀλήθειαν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσῃ αὐτήν· Ἐκ καρποῦ τῆς κοιλίας σου θήσομαι ἐπὶ τὸν θρόνον σου. See also Ps 88(89):4.

6. SECTION IV: ACTS 2:37-41

Reaction of the hearers & appeal to conversion and baptism by way of reference to JI 2:32 (LXX)

6.1 Composition of the section

The hearers have listened and have taken notice of these words (ἀκούσαντες³³⁶ δὲ κατενύγησαν τὴν καρδίαν, V.37).³³⁷ These hearers are part of the audience who was addressed as those who have crucified Jesus (VV.23,36).³³⁸ They want to know what to do now (τί τε πρὸς τὸν Πέτρον καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀποστόλους· τί ποιήσωμεν, ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί·, V.37). Two things are stated:³³⁹ (a) *repentance* (μετανοήσατε.³⁴⁰ V.38) and (b) *baptism* (βαπτισθήτω, V.38)³⁴¹ in the name of

³³⁵ Also H. CONZELMANN, *App.* 35.

³³⁶ Compare also V.22: ἀκούσατε τοὺς λόγους τούτους. This appeal to listen in V.22 is followed in V.37 by the reaction of those who have indeed listened to these words. L. O'REILLY has already drawn attention to "...the word as call in Acts" and "...its similarity to the prophetic word in the Old Testament". The admonition to hear is a constant feature of the prophetic writings... (*Word and Sign*, 108. See also 109-110).

³³⁷ V.37 probably only serves a compositional purpose in the speech. Cf. also M. DIBELIUS, *Formgeschichte*, 15; E. HAENCHEN, *App.* 146; U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 37.

³³⁸ Cf. also U. WILCKENS, *Missionsreden*, 37.

³³⁹ The appeal to hear could also be included, V.22 (cf. L. O'REILLY, *Word and Sign*, 107). O. GLOMBITZA recognizes the role of καὶ here which divides the contents into three parts, indicating a sequential (though not rigid) order (*Schluss der Petrusrede*, 117). See also A. KERRIGAN: "...the reception of the Spirit follows baptism. The story of Cornelius, however, shows that baptism can follow the reception of the Spirit and that the gift of the Spirit in no way dispenses with the necessity of receiving baptism (*Act*, X,44ff)" (*Sensus Plenior*, 305).

³⁴⁰ This verb is to be found frequently in the Lukan writings and "the Scriptures" (OT), especially in the preaching of the prophets. "The LXX rarely employs the verb *Metanoō* in the prophets where *epistrephomai* normally translates the Hebrew *šūb*." According to O'REILLY then, the biblical background shows that the cry "repent" means not simply a call to change one's mind (as a literal translation of the Greek might suggest), to feel sorrow, or even to repent of a particular action "...it implies a complete change in one's life, a radical reorientation of one's whole existence" (*Word and Sign*, 111). Just as the prophets, the Baptist, and Jesus himself, so Peter too continues within this tradition of repentance. For him, it is the rejection of Judaism and acceptance of Christianity.

³⁴¹ Compare this phrase in Ac 2:38 with Lk 3:3 which states with regard to the ministry of John the Baptist: κηρύσσω βαπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν. Cf. also Lk 24:47 and Ac 5:31. Compare all this, however, with C.D. OSBURN, *The Third Person Imperative in Acts 2:38*, in: *RQ* 26 (1983), 81-84. According to OSBURN, referring to the work of J. GLAZE (*The Septuagintal Use of the Third Person Imperative*, unpublished MA thesis, Harding Graduate School of Religion 1979), "...the third person singular imperative does function idiomatically in concert with a second person plural imperative so as to allow the speaker addressing a group to address members of that group individually" (C.D. OSBURN, *Third person Imperative*, 83). In addition to several examples from the

Jesus Christ³⁴² (ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ).³⁴³ The result of this is that they will receive "the gift of the Holy Spirit" (καὶ λήψετε τὴν δωρεάν³⁴⁴ τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος, V.38).³⁴⁵ This "gift" is "the promise" (ἡ ἐπαγγελία, V.39)³⁴⁶ — according to the γάρ ἐστιν (V.39) — and is meant for the Jews, or "Israelites"³⁴⁷ (ὕμιν, V.39), their children (καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν, V.39), and all those who are far (πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακρὰν, V.39); i.e. all those who the Lord their God will call to him.

Hereafter the appeal³⁴⁸ to conversion follows again: σῴθητε...(V.40). Those who have accepted Peter's word (i.e. the appeal made by the apostle), are then baptised (ἐβαπτίσθησαν, V.41). This correlates with Peter's answer to the question of his hearers in V.38, that they must repent and be baptised.³⁴⁹

6.2 Reference to Jl 2:32(3:5)³⁵⁰

In Ac 2:21, the long quotation ends with Jl 2:32(3:5). The remaining section of Jl 2:32(3:5) is not quoted in Ac 2:21, but is now referred to here in Ac 2:39. The result of Peter's speech as a whole, is then that the promise quoted in Ac 2:21, and appealed to again in Ac 2:39, begins to be fulfilled. It was stated in the quoted text from Jl that in the last days (ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, V.17), those who will call on the name of the κύριος will be saved (ὅς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται, V.21). Peter tells them now that what God has promised is for them,

LXX, there is also evidence in apocryphal literature and the Apostolic Fathers. Therefore, "In accord with customary idiomatic usage, the function of the third person imperative βαπτισθήτω in Acts 2:38 is to underscore emphatically in distributive fashion the necessity of each one of the hearers participating in baptism as part of conversion" (84). So also W. DIETRICH, according to whom the first two parts of the sentence should be taken together because of their imperative character (*Petrushild*, 213).

³⁴² According to E. HAENCHEN, Luke is using the valid practice for baptism in his congregation: The name "Jesus Christ" was spoken over the person who was being baptized. "Damit tritt der Getaufte unter die Macht Jesu, mit der Folge, dass ihm seine Sünden vergeben werden und der 'den hl. Geist empfängt'" (*App.*, 147).

³⁴³ Codex D includes here κύριος. This makes only explicit what is already implicit. So also D. JUEL, *Use of Ps 16*, 545.

³⁴⁴ Cf. Ac 8:20; 10:45; and 11:17.

³⁴⁵ Cf. W. DIETRICH: "Die erste Vershälfte umschreibt mit ihren beiden Aufforderungen die Bedingung für den Empfang des heiligen Geistes. Der zweite Versteil enthält dementsprechend eine Zusage, die insofern eine Besonderheit zeigt, als Petrus den Geistempfang unter den Aspekt der δωρεά stellt" (*Petrushild*, 214). Cf. also H. CONZELMANN (*Mitte der Zeit*, 215) and G. LÜDEMANN (*Christentum*, 52), the latter who points out that "Die Antwort des Petrus enthält die luk. Sicht darüber, wie man Christ wird, nämlich durch Buße, Taufe zur Vergebung der Sünden und Verleihung des Heiligen Geistes".

³⁴⁶ Cf. Lk 24:49 and Ac 1:4.

³⁴⁷ Cf. V.14b (ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι) and V.22 (ἄνδρες Ἰσραηλίται).

³⁴⁸ L. O'REILLY talks about the word which is used here in the sense of "a challenge" or "an invitation" (*Word and Sign*, 107), while A. KERRIGAN talks about "a special divine call..." (*Sensus Plenior*, 310); and O. GLOMBITZA about a "Bußvermahnung" (*Schluß der Petrusrede*, 116).

³⁴⁹ Cf. U. WILCKENS: "Nachdem der kerygmatische Teil der Predigt sachlich die *Schuld* der Angeredeten erwiesen hat, folgt nun als Schlußteil der Ruf zu Umkehr, Vergebung der Sünden und Heilsempfang; und erst in diesem Heilsruf findet die Predigt ihr eigentliches Ziel im Zusammenhang der geschilderten Situation" (*Missionsreden*, 37).

³⁵⁰ See H. VAN DE SANDT for the "intertextual relations" between Ac 2:39b and Is 57:19 (*Fate of the Gentiles*, 70-71).

their children, and all those who are far off (ἡ ἐπαγγελία καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς εἰς μακράν, V.39) — those who will be called by the κύριος their God (ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσεται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν, V.39). Note the similarities between the J1 quotation (VV.17-18,21) and VV. 38-41: (a) οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν...αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν...οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν...οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν (V.17) —> ὑμῖν γὰρ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπαγγελία...τοῖς τέκνοις ὑμῶν...κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν (V.39); (b) τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου (V.21) —> ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (V.38);³⁵¹ (c) σωθήσεται (V.21) —> εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν (V.38),³⁵² σώθητε (V.40);³⁵³ (d) ὅς ἂν ἐπικαλέσεται...κυρίου (V.21) —> ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσεται κύριος (V.39);³⁵⁴ (e) ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις (V.18) —> ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (V.41).

7. THE ROLE OF THE LXX IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE SPEECH

The three quoted texts in the second Petrine speech were probably taken from the LXX. Although the last phrase in the J1-quotation and the third quoted text were already known by Luke's time, the only way in which the long quoted section from J1 2(3) and that of Ps 15(16) could be sufficiently explained, is to accept that Luke made use of the scrolls of the 12P and the Pss.

The *Stichwort*, or keyword, which plays a prominent role here in combining the three quoted texts, is "κύριος", one of the prominent names which are given to Jesus of Nazareth, who was made (confirmed to be) κύριος by God himself (V.36). Therefore, all those who call on the name of the κύριος will be saved (J1-quotation). He is that κύριος who is seated at the right hand of God — an indication that death does not have any hold on him. He was resurrected and exalted (Ps 15(16) and Ps 109(110)), and it is from that exalted position where he receives the promise of the Spirit from the Father, which he "pours out". This is Luke's explanation for what happened at Pentecost day.

These passages are thus used in order to prove that they could only apply to Jesus of Nazareth, as "the prophet" David himself died and was buried. The Scriptures are therefore authoritative witnesses in Luke's proving of his argument.

8. A SUMMARY OF THE MESSAGE OF THE SECOND PETRINE SPEECH

It is the beginning of "the last days". The prophet Joel has already prophesied that (a) "from the spirit of God" would be poured out on "all flesh" and (b) that they would prophesy. Also (c) "signs and wonders" would be given, and (d) all those who

³⁵¹. Note the fundamental assumption underlying the thought that the name of the κύριος in J1 2:32(3:5), is indeed the Name of Jesus Christ (V.38)!

³⁵². Remember that it is only God who could forgive sins! Calling on the name of the κύριος in J1, means calling Yahweh to save them. The use of the same quoted text in the appeal to the listeners to be baptized in the name of Jesus (which will lead to the forgiveness of sins) indicates that the name of Jesus has been elevated to the same level as the name of Yahweh.

³⁵³. So also G. LÜDEMANN: "Der Schlußbappell V.40b...knüpft mit *sothete* an das letzte Wort des Joelzitates (*sothesetai*) an (V.21)" (*Christentum*, 53).

³⁵⁴. According to H. VAN DE SANDT, "Luke alters ὅς...προσκέκληται (Joel 3,5d) in the restrictive ὅδους ἂν προσκαλέσεται: not all Gentiles are called" (*Fate of the Gentiles*, 73).

would call on the name of the κύριος would be saved. These things would happen before the great and glorious day of the κύριος.

Jesus was made known by God by way of the "signs and wonders" which he had done in their midst. God had, however, already decided to hand this Jesus over to the lawless people, who had then crucified him. But God thereafter had resurrected him from death and saved his body from decay — as foretold in the words of David, that he saw the Lord at his right hand and that the pious one of the Lord would not see decay. David could not have referred to himself, because he had died, was buried and his memorial stood as proof of this. Being therefore a prophet, David knew that God would put one of his descendants on his throne. It is thus Jesus who sits at God's right hand. It is from this place that he receives the (power of the) Spirit from the Father, which he pours out. This is the event which the listeners have just experienced; what they have seen and heard. Thus: God has made this Jesus, whom they had crucified, both Ruler and Saviour.

They must now be converted and baptised in order to receive this gift of the Spirit,³⁵⁵ which is the gospel, and which is meant for the Jews, their children and all those who are far off; i.e. all those whom God would call to him.

³⁵⁵ Cf. W. DIETRICH who refers to Ac 8:19-20; 10:45 and 11:16-17 with regard to the combination of πνεῦμα ἁγίου and δωρεά. According to him, this particular combination has been overlooked by previous scholars; he finds it significant that each of these three references is found at the stations for the exposition of Christianity — and found nowhere else! (*Petrusbild*, 214-216). See also D.L. TIEDE: "Thus the gift of repentance (cf. Acts 5:31; 11:18) and the baptism which is effective for the forgiveness of sins are offered in the name or by the agency of the exalted Jesus and received by the power of the Spirit which has been bestowed. This is the crucial significance of the gift of the Holy Spirit" (*Acts* 2, 65).