

## Luke's Alteration of Joel 3.1–5 in Acts 2.17–21\*

C. M. BLUMHOFER

*Duke University, Graduate Program in Religion, Durham, NC 27708, USA.*

*Email: [chris.blumhofer@duke.edu](mailto:chris.blumhofer@duke.edu)*

**This article examines the alterations that Luke makes to his citation of Joel 3.1–5 in Acts 2.17–21. It argues that Luke has chosen various Scriptural co-texts to shape the meaning of Joel's prophecy as it applies to the early church. Thus, the various changes that Luke makes to Joel's prophecy reflect Luke's theological vision for the way in which Israel's eschatological restoration is occurring within the community of the early church.**

**Keywords:** Acts, Luke, Joel, Israel, restoration, intertextuality

Peter's Pentecost sermon in Acts 2.14–40 employs three quotations from the Old Testament: Joel 3.1–5 (Acts 2.17–21), Psalm 15.8–11 (Acts 2.25–8) and Psalm 109.1 (Acts 2.34–5).<sup>1</sup> The Psalms citations very closely reproduce the Septuagint, but the citation from Joel with which the apostle begins his sermon is presented with several alterations.<sup>2</sup> Among other changes, Luke adds a new introductory phrase ('And it will be in the last days ...'), repeats a statement ('and they will prophesy'), inverts word order (making 'young men' now precede 'old men') and appends possessive pronouns ('my males slaves and my female slaves'). These changes are particularly striking in light of Luke's nearly verbatim quotation of the Psalms. Why does Luke reproduce the Psalms so faithfully but introduce changes in the Joel citation?

It will not suffice to claim that Luke had received a text of Joel with these changes already in it. Indeed, the changes in Luke's version are otherwise absent in the Greek and Hebrew textual traditions of Joel

\* I am very grateful to Dr Richard B. Hays and Dr C. Kavin Rowe for their comments on an earlier draft of this article.

1 In this article, citations of Scripture follow the versification of the Rahlfs–Hanhart LXX (=MT for Joel).

2 For a helpful study of the Psalms texts in particular, see D. P. Moessner, 'Two Lords 'at the Right Hand'? The Psalms and an Intertextual Reading of Peter's Speech (Acts 2.14–36)', *Literary Studies in Luke-Acts: Essays in Honor of Joseph B. Tyson* (ed. R. P. Thompson and T. E. Phillips; Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1998) 215–32.

3.1–5.<sup>3</sup> And other references to this passage in early Jewish literature maintain a very stable text for Joel 3.1–5.<sup>4</sup> Steven Runge has observed the lack of a textual basis for the changes in Luke's quotation of Joel and has argued that one important function of Luke's additions is that they guide the reader through Joel's text, clarifying ambiguous structures and emphasising key ideas.<sup>5</sup> Thus, on both text-critical and redaction-critical grounds, the additions to Joel are almost certainly the result of Luke's editorial hand.<sup>6</sup>

The history of interpretation has often dealt quickly with the changes Luke makes to his citation of Joel. If they mention the changes at all, interpreters usually limit their comments to the observation that Luke's additions function to close the gap that exists between the Old Testament prophecy and its New Testament fulfilment.<sup>7</sup> Such observations are true, but almost without exception

- 3 On the relatively secure texts of Joel 3.1–5, see Joseph Ziegler's volume in the Göttingen LXX (J. Ziegler, ed., *Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum*, vol. XIII: *Duodecim Prophetae* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943) 235–6), and cf. also Origen's text in the Hexapla (PG 16.3.2953). The presence at Qumran of fragments of Joel (2.8–10, 10–23; 4.6–21) also demonstrates the stability of the text of Joel in general, although the lack of a witness for our particular passage renders this demonstration suggestive but nothing more than that. For the Qumran manuscripts and a critical apparatus, see E. Ulrich *et al.*, *Qumran Cave 4: The Prophets* (DJD XV; Oxford: Clarendon, 1997) 243–6. James Crenshaw (*Joel: A New Translation and Commentary* (AB 24C; New York: Doubleday, 1995) 53–4) suggests that the kinds of parallelism present in the text of Joel enabled the high level of consistency that text critics find in the manuscript tradition.
- 4 Cf. here the Targum on Joel (3rd–4th c.), which makes two noticeable, though still rather conservative, changes: 'I will pour out my *Holy Spirit*' (3.1) and '*everyone who prays* in the name of the LORD shall be delivered' (3.5). Quoted from K. J. Cathcart and R. P. Gordo, *The Targum of the Minor Prophets* (ArBib 14; Wilmington, DE: Michael Glazier, Inc, 1989) 71. Although the Targum makes only slight changes to the text of Joel, the overall *Tendenz* of the changes it makes emphasises penitence as capable of restoring relationship with God. On this and other critical issues, see P. V. M. Flesher and B. Chilton, *The Targums: A Critical Introduction* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2011) 199–200, 225–6.
- 5 S. E. Runge, 'Joel 2:28–32a in Acts 2:17–21: The Discourse and Text-Critical Implications of Variation from the LXX', *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality*, vol. III: *Exegetical Studies* (ed. C. A. Evans and H. D. Zacharias; New York: T&T Clark, 2009) 103–13.
- 6 The most significant alternative readings in both Joel 3.1–5 and Acts 2.17–21 reflect efforts to bring the two passages more closely in line with one another. This position, the current consensus, is well presented in L. T. Johnson, *Septuagintal Midrash in the Speeches in Acts* (Marquette, WI: Marquette University Press, 2002) 20–2.
- 7 Interpreters who note the changes but do not give them sustained attention include E. Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1971) 179; H. Conzelmann, *Acts of the Apostles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 18–21; R. Pervo, *Acts* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008) 76–80. Pervo notes the changes, but limits their significance to style. Also in this vein, Dodd describes them as 'a few not very important variations [on the LXX]'. C. H. Dodd, *According to the Scriptures* (London: Nisbett & Co, 1952) 47.  
 Descriptions of how Luke's changes resonate with the narrative and theology of Luke-Acts can be found in C. K. Barrett, *Acts*, vol. 1 (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1994) 135–8; F. F. Bruce,

they fail to articulate the fullness of the theological vision that accompanies Luke's rewording of Joel's prophecy in Acts 2.17–21. The aim of this study is to illuminate the deeper logic that unites each of Luke's editorial moves. Luke's changes to Joel 3.1–5 are held together by a single hermeneutical commitment: the belief that God's eschatological restoration of Israel has begun in the community gathered by Jesus Christ and that the effects of that restoration extend to the nations. Methodologically, Luke's hermeneutic is expressed in multiple citations of Scripture that shape Joel's prophecy to correspond more closely to its fulfilment in the early church. That is, in his quotation of Joel 3.1–5 Luke draws in 'co-texts' and 'secondary citations' from across Israel's Scripture and thus reshapes the meaning of Joel's prophecy by freighting it with significant images of Israel's restoration.<sup>8</sup> In this article, I will consider Luke's hermeneutic and how it is expressed in three steps: (1) I will present the importance of Joel's prophecy for the broader setting of Acts 2; (2) I will explain the Old Testament images that are invoked by the changes Luke makes to Joel's prophecy; and (3) I will consider how the results of the foregoing study display Luke's understanding of the way in which the Law of Moses, the prophets and the Psalms bear witness to Jesus and also how Luke uses the Old Testament more broadly.

### 1. Joel in the Narrative of Acts 2

The prophecy of Joel exercised a powerful effect on the early Christian imagination. In his outline of 'the Bible of the early church', C. H. Dodd identifies the New Testament's image of an eschatological trumpet call signalling God's coming judgement as well as the employment of the verb κηρῦσσειν with an

---

*The Acts of the Apostles* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 59–62; J. Fitzmyer, *Acts of the Apostles* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1997) 248–53; L. T. Johnson, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Sacra Pagina; Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1992) 48–56; D. Marguerat, *Les Actes des apôtres (1–12)* (CNT; Genève: Labor et Fides, 2007) 84–90; B. Witherington III, *The Acts of the Apostles: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998) 142–43; K. D. Litwack, *Echoes of Scripture in Luke-Acts: Telling the History of God's People Intertextually* (JSNTSup 282; London: T&T Clark, 2005) esp. 155–79; and Moessner, 'Two Lords at the Right Hand?' 218–20. It should be noted that Johnson's commentary (pp. 49–50) offers a reading of 'signs and wonders' (Acts 2.19) that is exceptionally sensitive to the Mosaic background. See also Johnson, *Septuagintal Midrash*, 22.

<sup>8</sup> Several of these images of restoration would lie close at hand for any reader of the Jewish Bible – for instance, the close alignment of the outpoured Spirit in Joel 3.1 with Isa 32.15 (the forsaken state of Israel will last 'until the Spirit is poured on us from above ...') and Ezek 39.29 ('I will never hide my face from them, when I pour out my Spirit upon the house of Israel') (cf. Crenshaw, *Joel*, 163–72). In light of such intertextual connections, Luke need not be considered the source of all of the images of restoration, but, as I will show below, Luke does add to, heighten and reshape Joel's vision of restoration.

eschatological inflection as appropriations of Joel's oracles.<sup>9</sup> Dodd's arguments add particular insight with regard to Acts 2.1–15. In those verses, Luke describes a scene that easily evokes the imagery of Joel: The Twelve are gathered in Jerusalem in obedience to the command of the Lord Jesus when they experience the outpouring of God's Spirit (2.1–4). The basic outline – Israel gathering in Jerusalem to wait upon God's restoration – corresponds broadly to the outline of Joel 2.12–3.5. As the narrative of Acts progresses, Luke depicts Peter as drawing closer to Joel by assuming a prophetic stance (standing, raising his voice and uttering: σταθείς ... ἐπήρεν τὴν φωνὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεφθέγγετο αὐτοῖς, 2.14)<sup>10</sup> and by putting words on the apostle's lips that, when taken together, echo the words of Joel:<sup>11</sup>

Ἀκούσατε δὴ ταῦτα, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι,  
καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε, πάντες οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὴν γῆν.

Therefore, hear these things, elders,  
and pay attention, all who live in the land. (Joel 1.2)

ἄνδρες Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ κατοικοῦντες Ἱερουσαλὴμ πάντες,  
τοῦτο ὑμῖν γνωστὸν ἔστω καὶ ἐνωτίσασθε τὰ ῥήματά μου.

Men of Judea and all who live in Jerusalem,  
let this be known to you and pay attention to my words. (Acts 2.14)

After this introduction, Luke makes explicit in 2.16–21 what had been implicit in vv. 1–15: the sacred assembly and the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit that Joel foresaw are decisively fulfilled in the lives of Jesus' followers. On a structural level, the return to Joel at the end of Peter's sermon (2.38–9; cf. Joel 3.5) provides a bookend to this scene in Acts 2. On a literary and theological level, the return to Joel at the end of Peter's sermon signals that Joel provides an important frame of

9 Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 62–4. On the trumpet call, cf. Joel 2.1, 15 with 1 Cor 15.52; 1 Thess 4.16; Rev 1.10; 4.1; 8.7, 8, 10, 12; 9.1, 13; 10.7. On κηρύσσειν, see Joel 1.14; 2.1, 15; 4.9. Dodd's argument is convincing provided one does not press it beyond its modest claims. Uses of similar terminology in Zech 9.9, 14 suggest that the imagery of two or more OT authors may have been combined in the process of shaping the imaginations of the first Christians. The circulation of the 'Book of the Twelve' as a single work during the first century, and perhaps earlier, further supports this possibility. On the 'Book of the Twelve' as a distinct corpus during this period, see F. Watson, *Paul and the Hermeneutics of Faith* (New York: T&T Clark, 2004) 80–8.

10 In this essay, citations of the NT are drawn from NA<sup>27</sup> and citations of the LXX are from Rahlfs–Hanhart. On the text-critical reasoning here, see above (nn. 2, 3). Translations are my own.

11 On these parallels, see C. Evans, 'The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon', *Luke and Scripture: The Function of Sacred Tradition in Luke-Acts* (C. A. Evans and J. Sanders, Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993) 212–18. See also J. Strazicich, *Joel's Use of Scripture and the Scripture's Use of Joel* (Leiden: Brill, 2007) 275–7.

reference for the events of Acts 2.<sup>12</sup> The sacred assembly (ἐκκλησία, Joel 2.16) that the prophet called for has been recognised by God as the assembly of those who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus.

These echoes of Joel in Acts 2 are particularly difficult to ignore in light of the quotation of Joel 3.1–5. When considered alongside the explicit citation of Joel – one of the longest quotations of the Old Testament in the New – these echoes suggest that Luke has quietly and intentionally evoked a correspondence between this Old Testament prophecy and the Day of Pentecost in Acts. Upon closer examination, however, Luke has also introduced a measure of dissonance between his use of Joel and the original sense of the text by making selective alterations to Joel's prophecy. Our task now will be to examine these alterations before turning to a consideration of their significance.

## 2. The Alterations to Joel 3.1–5 in Acts 2.17–21

*Change 1 – Acts 2.17, 'and it will be in the last days' (καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις)*

Luke sets up his readers for Joel's prophecy plainly enough. Denying the charge of drunkenness, Luke records Peter declaring that something far more profound is taking place: 'No, but this is what was spoken through the prophet Joel' (ἀλλὰ τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ, Acts 2.16). Strikingly, however, the opening words of the prophecy that Peter quotes do not match anything in Joel. Instead of 'and after these things, I will indeed pour out my Spirit' (καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα καὶ ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, Joel 3.1), Peter says, 'and it will happen in the last days, says God, [that] I will pour out my Spirit ...' (καὶ ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, λέγει ὁ θεός, ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου, Acts 2.17). Luke has replaced the time referent that Joel employed ('after these things') and substituted it with a reference to 'the last days'.

Most immediately, this substitution serves to expand the eschatological timeframe of Joel's prophecy. The 'after these things' of Joel 3.1 implies a progression of events in which Israel (1) turns back to God, (2) receives the restoration God has promised, including the outpouring of God's Spirit, and these events are then followed (3) by God's judgement of the nations.<sup>13</sup> Luke, by contrast, offers a more expansive timeframe described as 'the last days'. Such a change fits the

<sup>12</sup> My way of putting the point here is indebted to Marguerat, *Les Actes des apôtres*, 86.

<sup>13</sup> The verses immediately following Joel 3.5 demonstrate the essentially linear progression from repentance to restoration to judgement. After the assembly of people has repented, God says through the prophet, 'Therefore, behold! In those days and at that time, when I bring back the captives of Judah and Jerusalem, I will gather all the nations and bring them down to the valley of Jehoshaphat, and there I will enter into judgement on them' (Joel 4.1–2).

eschatology of Acts, which presents the Spirit-anointed community as living in anticipation of the universal restoration that Jesus will enact upon his return (Acts 1.7–11; 3.20). ‘The last days’ are a distinct period of time *before* God’s judgement comes upon the nations. During these days, repentance is a live option for all whom God has called (2.39).<sup>14</sup>

Beyond observing what Luke most immediately gains by altering Joel’s prophecy, it must also be noted that the change Luke makes to Joel’s oracle does more than simply shift the eschatological timeframe – it also decisively shifts the vision of who participates in God’s restoration. The words with which Luke begins his quotation of Joel occur in the LXX at only one point: Isaiah 2.2. Isaiah’s vision is a stirring description of what will happen in the last days (ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, Isa 2.2). In that era, all of the nations will gather at Mt Zion, and the word of the Lord will go out from Jerusalem (καὶ λόγος κυρίου ἐξ Ἰερουσαλημ, 2.3). In those days, God’s judgement will bring peace. The nations will stream to Jerusalem, and they ‘shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks’ (2.3–4). Luke has imported a vivid description of the eschaton by drawing these words from Isaiah into Acts 2.17. He has also juxtaposed two different visions of the end times.

Unlike Isaiah, the prophecy of Joel offers good news only to Israel. It is one of the few places in the MT or LXX in which a reference to ‘all flesh’ is limited in meaning to ‘all *Israelite* flesh’.<sup>15</sup> Joel sees God’s restoration coming to his people – ‘the children of Zion’ (Joel 2.23) – and he envisions God returning upon the nations the humiliation to which they subjected Israel.<sup>16</sup> The judgement that Joel envisions includes a battle between the nations and the Lord. ‘Proclaim this among the nations’, says God, ‘Let all the soldiers draw near, let them come up. Beat your *plowshares into swords* and your *pruning hooks into spears*’ (4.9–10). The end-time visions of Joel and Isaiah could hardly contrast more starkly in terms of Israel and the nations. What is the reader to make of the dissonance that occurs when Luke appends the opening words of Isaiah 2.2 to the oracle of Joel 3.1–5?

A helpful strategy for addressing this question can be drawn from Bruce Fisk’s observations about intertextuality in Pseudo-Philo. Fisk, following the works of

14 Haenchen reads against ‘in the last days’ and opts for ‘after these things’. The textual evidence for this is weak (B 076 C sa<sup>mss</sup>). But the decision-maker for Haenchen is not textual – it is Lukan theology: ‘The last days do not begin as soon as the Spirit has been outpoured!’ (Haenchen, *Acts*, 179; see also id., ‘Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte’, *ZTK* 51 (1954) 162). In an early response to Haenchen that anticipated the current consensus, Franz Mußner argued that the theology of Luke-Acts does, in fact, fit with the conviction of the church living within ‘the last days’ (F. Mußner, ‘In den letzten Tagen (Apg 2,17a)’, *BZ* 5 (1961) 263–5).

15 For a similar view, see Zech 12.10 and cf. Crenshaw, *Joel*, 165.

16 Note, for example, God’s judgement on the nations in Joel 4.4–8: those that sold the people of Judah and Jerusalem into slavery will now be sold by God into slavery.

Fishbane, Boyarin and Hays, reminds his readers of the way in which a brief textual citation or allusion, when juxtaposed to another text, can serve as the generative force for determining the meaning of the passage as a whole. Such generative force emerges when one attends to the 'unstated (or suppressed) points of resonance between the two texts'.<sup>17</sup> The pairing of one text (in our case Joel 3.1) with one or more 'co-texts' (here Isa 2.2) may evince a hermeneutical strategy on the part of the author.<sup>18</sup> For instance, in Pseudo-Philo's retelling of Israel at the Red Sea, multiple intertextual allusions to Genesis demonstrate the way in which the escape from Egypt was prefigured in creation.<sup>19</sup> Through such pairings, the shorter 'secondary citations' of Scripture have a controlling influence on the primary texts; thus, 'biblical allusion *functions as exegesis*'.<sup>20</sup>

If these methodological insights guide our reading of Acts 2.17, two observations follow. First, Luke has reoriented Joel's prophecy by placing at its head the citation of Isa 2.2. Isaiah's vision of the last days differs markedly from Joel's, particularly in the way that Isaiah's sense of eschatological time consists of a period of 'last days' in which the nations come to worship the Lord. Joel's 'after these things' does not imply such a period of time. In fact in Joel, since salvation is reserved strictly for Israel while the nations are punished, there is no need for a window of time in which the Gentiles turn to God. In contrast to Joel, the Isaianic opening that Acts 2.17 employs suggests that Luke wants his readers to think about eschatology and the scope of salvation in terms of Isaiah. All of this comports well with Luke's theology: the outpouring of the Spirit represents the continuing ministry of Jesus through his disciples. The Spirit-filled disciples bear witness to the life of Jesus, which has inaugurated a reign of peace and a proclamation of Good News that extend to the nations (Luke 1.79; 2.14; 4.18–27; Acts 1.8). Ever so subtly, this alteration to Joel 3.1 in Acts 2.17 sets up a move that Luke will make a few chapters later, when the believers in Judea will realise – in agreement with Isaiah's vision of the end times – that 'God has given even to the Gentiles the repentance that leads to life' (11.18). All of this is to say that Luke's narrative itself confirms the significance of the shift into Isaiah's language at the beginning of the quotation of Joel.

Second, this reorientation at the beginning of Joel's prophecy alerts the reader to pay attention to other ways in which Acts 2.17–21 may reorient any presumptions about the meaning of Joel 3.1–5. It is as if Luke has begun to play a familiar

17 R. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989) 20.

18 B. Fisk, *Do You Not Remember? Scripture, Story and Exegesis in the Rewritten Bible of Pseudo-Philo* (JSPSup 37; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001) 98–101.

19 Fisk, *Do You Not Remember?*, 207–17. Cf. e.g. LAB 15.5–6: 'And I commanded the sea, and when the abyss was divided before them, walls of water stood forth. And there was never anything like this event since the day I said, "Let the waters under the heaven be gathered together into one place", until this, day' (trans. D. H. Harrington, *OTP* II.323; emphasis added).

20 Fisk, *Do You Not Remember?*, 21. Emphasis original.



song with an unexpected chord: he draws his audience in and heightens their sensitivity to subsequent alterations. The discord we hear is rich in hermeneutical significance. After all, it was not necessary for Luke to begin his quotation of Joel with any time referent, and yet he drew on Isaiah. In the narrative, Peter is responding to a charge that those who are speaking in other languages are intoxicated. Simply beginning with ‘This is what was spoken by the prophet Joel: “I will pour out my Spirit ...” (τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ εἰρημένον διὰ τοῦ προφήτου Ἰωήλ. ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου) would have sufficed as a refutation to those deriding the followers of Jesus. Luke has intentionally included this change to Joel’s prophecy because more is happening in the citation of Joel 3.1–5 than the refutation of a crowd. Luke is strategically reorienting Joel’s image of restoration in order to bring it in line with the restoration he knows: the one that God has enacted through Jesus Christ that extends to all the nations. Luke’s subsequent alterations to Joel 3.1–5, and particularly the ways in which he employs secondary citations within his quotation of Joel 3, open up further ways in which he understands the prophecy before him in terms of its meaning for the early church.

*Change 2 – Acts 2.17, 18, ‘and they will prophesy’ (καὶ προφητεύσουσιν)*

Luke breaks again from the original wording of Joel with the addition of ‘and they will prophesy’ (καὶ προφητεύσουσιν) in Acts 2.18. In context, this addition reinforces the primacy of prophecy as a sign of God’s restoration in the last days. This alteration to Joel’s oracle looks both backward and forward.

Looking back, Luke is laying emphasis on an image of fulfilment that is already embedded in Joel’s prophecy: the record of the elders of Israel prophesying when the Spirit rested on them in Num 11.24–30. In Numbers, Joshua observes that the spirit of prophecy has moved beyond the tent of meeting and onto those in the Israelite camp. Troubled by this democratisation of the Spirit, Joshua calls on Moses to put an end to the prophesying, but Moses rebukes him, ‘Would that all of the Lord’s people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit on them!’ (11.29). Joel evokes this image in his oracle of God pouring out the Spirit on all (Israelite) flesh. Joel’s description of the restored Israel corresponds to the day that Moses hoped would come.

A fuller attention to this background in Numbers 11 may suggest further implications for the appropriation and reinforcement of this image in Acts 2.17–18. Luke begins his second volume by narrating the reconstitution of the Twelve with the inclusion of Matthias (Acts 1.12–26). The reader who is familiar with Luke 22.28–30 will recall that the Twelve are depicted as leaders and judges of Israel.<sup>21</sup> Thus, when the Spirit comes on the disciples of Jesus on

21 An extended discussion of this point can be found in D. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2000) 123–9.



the Day of Pentecost, Luke has in mind the outpouring of the Spirit *upon Israel*.<sup>22</sup> In Acts 2, Moses' words – 'Would that all of the Lord's people were prophets, and that the Lord would put his Spirit on them!' – are finding fulfilment in the restoration of Israel that Jesus initiated among his followers. Luke has appropriated the image embedded in Joel's prophecy: the day Moses hoped would come has arrived in the Spirit's anointing of the Twelve and those gathered with them.

Looking ahead, the added stress on prophecy that Luke places on his citation of Joel 3.2 reinforces the criterion by which the early church will recognise who is included in God's eschatological restoration. The full effect of this will not become clear until Peter's sermon in Cornelius' house (Acts 10.44–8). But when that scene arrives, and Peter is summoned to explain his preaching among the Gentiles, *it will be prophecy* that stands as incontrovertible evidence that the Gentiles have been welcomed into the people of God (11.1–18).<sup>23</sup> As with the quotation of Isaiah, so also here: Luke's addition of καὶ προφητεύουσιν to his citation of Joel 3.2 provides his audience with another hermeneutical tool to recognise the early church as the fulfilment of God's eschatological restoration of Israel.

*Change 3 – Acts 2.17, 'all flesh' (πᾶσαν σάρκα)*

Although it does not reflect a concrete alteration to Joel 3.1, it will be useful at this point to consider the reorientation of meaning that takes place with the phrase 'all flesh' (πᾶσαν σάρκα) in Acts 2.17. As noted above, the 'all flesh' of Joel's prophecy has traditionally been understood as referring to Jewish flesh. This is not the case in the setting Luke gives to the phrase. In Acts 2.17, πᾶσαν σάρκα looks forward to the outpouring of the Spirit upon the Gentiles (Acts 10–11), while also anticipating the apostles' recognition that people from πάντα τὰ ἔθνη have a place in the restoration that God is enacting (Acts 15.17). In addition to anticipating these developments in the narrative of Acts, the reference to 'all flesh' also looks back and draws a fuller, universal meaning from Luke 3.6. In that passage, John the Baptist announces his mission through the words of Isaiah 40.3–5. Uniquely among the Gospels, Luke records John going beyond Isaiah 40.3 and including in his announcement that 'all flesh (πᾶσα σάρξ) will see the

22 Here, Dietrich RUSAM's observation regarding the necessity of the reconstitution of the Twelve (i.e. Israel) as a *precondition* for Pentecost is helpful: 'Ebenso dient die Nachwahl des Matthias zum zwölften Apostel der Vorbereitung auf Pfingsten ... Nur wegen der Geistverleihung an Pfingsten in Jerusalem musste die Zwölfzahl der Apostel wieder hergestellt werden ... Pfingsten ist für Lukas ein einmaliges Ereignis, und nur für Pfingsten war die Anwesenheit aller zwölf Apostel in Jerusalem als Zeichen für den Anspruch Jesu auf ganz Israel nötig' (Dietrich RUSAM, *Das Alte Testament bei Lukas* (BZNTW 112; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2003) 287–8).

23 Prophecy in the first century CE had a particular construal, as the narrative of Acts suggests (visions, dreams, signs etc.) and as Rebecca GRAY has helpfully described in her study of Josephus (*Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993)).

salvation of God' (Luke 3.6; cf. Isa 40.5). Thus, when Peter utters the phrase *πάσαν σάρκα* – and when he does so in a narrative setting that is, as with Luke 3, charged with the significance of baptism (Acts 1.5–8; 2.38) – the words of Joel remain the same but are resignified within the context of Lukan (and Isaianic) theology. A universal meaning that lay strangely dormant in Joel's prophecy begins to rise to prominence in its setting in Acts. This meaning will not become explicit until Peter is called to Caesarea and the implications of the Spirit coming on all flesh will be seen to include Gentile flesh, but Luke lays the groundwork here.<sup>24</sup>

*Change 4 – 'and even upon my male slaves and upon my female slaves' (καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου)*

Luke continues to interpret Joel's prophecy as finding fulfilment among those who believe in Jesus Christ as he further adapts Joel 3.2 in Acts 2.18. Joel's original prophecy spoke of male and female slaves in straightforward terms (καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας). In Luke's writings, however, slaves nearly always enter the narrative in contexts of discipleship.<sup>25</sup> Thus, when Luke contributes the intensifying καὶ γὰρ as well as the possessive pronoun μου, he draws his reader's attention to a new understanding of slavery in service to the Lord.

If we can assume continuity with the uses of δούλος/η in the Gospel of Luke and later in Acts, then 'my slaves' in Acts 2.18 suggests men and women who serve God such as Mary (Luke 1.38), Simeon (2.29), the disciples gathered in Jerusalem (Acts 4.29), and Paul and Barnabas (16.17). It is men and women who recognise the lordship of Jesus that Luke envisions as receiving God's Spirit.<sup>26</sup>

Additionally, Luke creates rich intertextual relationships between the disciples and Israelites in Scripture by casting the slaves in Acts 2.18 as God's possession. In the Old Testament, God rarely claims people as 'my servants'. Two usages stand out. First, God uses this title when addressing the prophets of Israel.<sup>27</sup> Frequently

24 Robert Tannehill (*The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation*, vol. II (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990) 29–33) helpfully describes how the promise of Joel is 'realized progressively' throughout Acts. Marguerat (*Les Actes des apôtres*, 89), following John Calvin, makes a similar observation about the extension of the meaning of 'all flesh' in commenting on the phrase *πᾶς ὄς* in Acts 2.21.

25 See Luke 2.29; 12.37, 43–7; 14.17–23; 17.7–10; 19.13–22; 20.10–11. Uses of these terms outside a context of discipleship might include Luke 7.2, 8, 10; 15.22; 22.50.

26 This is helpfully noted in S. D. Buttica, *L'identité de l'Église dans les Actes des apôtres: de la restauration d'Israël à la conquête universelle* (BZNW 174; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2011) 106.

27 Cf. 2 Kings 9.7; 17.13; Jer 7.25; 26.5; 29.19; 35.15; 44.4; Ezek 38.17; Zech 1.6. It is important to note that my argument here attends to the claim of a group of people as 'my servants'. The singular phrase ('my servant') in its various Greek and Hebrew forms of expression is a more common designation for individuals such as David, Moses, Joshua, and others. See e.g. Acts 4.25.

in this usage, the prophets are spoken of as the messengers through whom God calls Israel to repentance. Not coincidentally, this is precisely the role of the believers in Acts 2.38; 3.19; 8.22 (where repentance is proclaimed to the Jews) and 17.30; 26.20 (to the Gentiles). Luke is suggesting that the anointed, prophesying followers of Jesus stand in the same line as these Old Testament figures.

The second context in the Old Testament in which God claims people as 'my servants' is in reference to all of Israel, and specifically with regard to the year of Jubilee.<sup>28</sup> In that context, God's assertion that the Israelites are 'my servants' is used as the reason why the people of Israel must cancel the debts of others and release their slaves. God has redeemed Israel; therefore, the social order of the nation is to reflect that redemption. On the basis of an intertextual link such as this, we can recognise the social implications of Luke's alteration to Joel's prophecy. God's appropriation of male and female slaves as 'my male slaves and my female slaves' reminds the church that those who participate in the restoration of Israel are to reflect their redemption in the ordering of their common life. The intensifying *καί γε* ('even' or 'indeed') that Luke also adds would bring emphasis to this meaning.<sup>29</sup> Men and women with the status of slaves are specifically claimed as God's possession, thereby undermining the claim that, in the church, slaves can be the possession of human owners.<sup>30</sup>

Related to the reordering of society in the restored Israel, perhaps we can suggest at this point another explanation for Luke's changes to Joel 3.1-2. It is widely noted that Luke transposes the order of the people who experience the outpouring of the Spirit, placing young men before old men:

Joel 3.1-2	Acts 2.17-18
οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν,	οἱ υἱοὶ ὑμῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν
καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια ἐνυπνιασθήσονται,	καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται
καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις ὄψονται.	καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνυπνίους ἐνυπνιασθήσονται.
καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας	καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους μου καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς δούλας μου

Few interpreters offer a theological rationale for Luke's inversion of these lines, and perhaps this represents an appropriate cautiousness. But if Luke is drawing connections between Joel's prophecy and the social dimensions of its fulfilment

28 Lev 25.42, 55. Note that 'My servants' also appears in Isa 65.7-15, a text rich in imagery of restoration. The Jubilee imagery also evokes Luke 4.18-19.

29 See also Runge, 'Joel 2:28-32a in Acts 2:17-21', 107-9.

30 A similar conclusion (not noting the OT background) is arrived at by means of a Bakhtinian carnivalesque reading in Strazicich, *Joel's Use of Scripture*, 281-2.

in the restoration of Israel under Jesus, then perhaps readers can consider a theological explanation for the way Luke changes Joel's order. A passing reference in John Chrysostom's homilies on Acts offers guidance in this direction.

Chrysostom takes note of Luke's changes in Joel's original ordering and cites Psalm 44.17: 'In the place of fathers, your sons have been given [to you]'; and Mal 3.23: 'He shall turn the hearts of the fathers to the children.'<sup>31</sup> It is likely that Chrysostom's citation of these passages is made on the basis of an eschatological reversal described in both, in which sons are privileged over fathers. Luke has already emphasised John the Baptist's role in turning fathers to their sons in Luke 1.17. If we take the reasoning of this fourth-century archbishop as a guide, then we might tentatively suggest that Chrysostom is tracking with the logic of this transposition: Luke's placement of young men over old is a sign that the reversals of the new age, once spoken of by the angel who announced John's birth, are now realised in the church. Chrysostom only makes passing reference to this possibility, and his hesitancy to make much of it should be a caution for us. Taken together with the change that renders slaves as God's possession, however, Chrysostom's ideas offer a suggestive theological rationale for Luke's placement of young men before elders.

*Change 5 - Acts 2.19, 'wonders and signs' (καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ ἄνω καὶ σημεῖα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς κάτω)*

The penultimate vision in Joel's oracle describes wonders in heaven and on earth (καὶ δώσω τέρατα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, Joel 3.3). The wonders (blood, fire and pillars of smoke) are eschatological, and they foreshadow the coming judgement. Luke's appropriation of this verse leaves much of this meaning in place, but Luke also shifts the meaning of Joel's words into a new theological space with the addition of the word 'signs' (σημεῖα). Functioning together, σημεῖα and τέρατα indicate the character of the eschatological vision to which Luke wants his readers to be alert.

Looking ahead in the narrative of Acts, the signs and wonders spoken of here find their fulfilment in the gathered community and its leaders.<sup>32</sup> As Jesus was attested by God through deeds of power, wonders and signs (δυνάμεις καὶ τέρασι καὶ σημείοις, Acts 2.22) so also his presence through signs and wonders will continue to be manifest in the community that invokes his name (4.30). Signs and wonders serve as reminders of the eschatological space in

<sup>31</sup> Cf. John Chrysostom, 'Homily v on Acts ii.14', *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, vol. xi (ed. P. Schaff; repr. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1969) 33. I have altered the translations given by Chrysostom away from Schaff in consultation with the Greek in *Comm. in Acta Apostolorum*, PG LX.52.

<sup>32</sup> Acts 2.40; 4.30; 5.12; 6.8; 14.3; 15.12; Philip (8.6, 13) is credited with signs but not wonders. See also Marguerat, *Les Actes des apôtres*, 88–9.

which the church lives, and they also function proleptically, pointing ahead to the 'great and glorious day of the Lord' (ἡμέραν κυρίου τὴν μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῆ, 2.20) towards which Acts looks (3.20–1).

While looking ahead in Acts, the word pairing that Luke creates by combining τέρατα with σημεῖα also resounds with meaning from the past: God's deliverance of Israel from Egypt. Nearly all of the twenty-three occurrences of this word pair in the LXX refer to the Exodus, specifically the way in which the Lord delivered Israel and established that nation as a people through signs and wonders.<sup>33</sup> Here, as he will do elsewhere in Acts, Luke is invoking this tradition and claiming that the signs and wonders God will perform among those who believe in Jesus are continuous with the signs and wonders by which God delivered Israel from slavery.<sup>34</sup> In Luke's understanding, God's eschatological restoration of Israel through Jesus recalls this initial deliverance, and just like in the Exodus, signs and wonders will be visible to the people of God and to the watching world as indicators of God's special claim on the identity of those who call upon the Lord. Inherent in the appropriation of this image, however, is also the reminder that inasmuch as signs and wonders foreshadow restoration, they also point to judgement on those who oppose God's deliverance. The bold claim that is made by Luke's use of Exodus imagery in this place further aligns the church with the people of God. Luke has appropriated a (arguably *the*) foundational image of Israel's identity and aligned it with the community gathered by Jesus.

*Change 6 – Acts 2.21, 'and everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved' (καὶ ἔσται πᾶς ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου σωθήσεται)*

Similar to the change Luke created in his use of the phrase 'all flesh' (v. 17), Acts 2.21 corresponds exactly with the LXX text of Joel 3.5a, but its meaning in Acts is profoundly different. For someone who knows Joel's oracle in full, Luke's stopping point is conspicuous: it leaves off Joel's closing statement that salvation will be restricted to Jerusalem.<sup>35</sup> In light of the way that Acts 2 is quietly

33 Cf. Exod 7.3, 9; 11.9; Deut 4.34; 6.22; 7.19; 11.3; 13.2; 26.8; 28.46; 29.2; 34.11; Esther 10.9; Ps 77.43; 104.27; 134.9; Wis 8.8; 10.16; Isa 8.18; 20.3; Jer 39.20; Bar 2.11; Dan 4.37.

34 Cf. Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 163–4.

35 Also note how Luke comes back to Joel 3.5 at Acts 2.39. Joel 3.5 reads: καὶ ἔσται πᾶς, ὃς ἂν ἐπικαλέσῃται τὸ ὄνομα κυρίου, σωθήσεται. ὅτι ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σιων καὶ ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ ἔσται ἀνασωζόμενος, καθότι εἶπεν κύριος, καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι, οὓς κύριος προσκέκληται. Luke echoes this closing phrase of Joel 3.5 in his climactic call to repentance in Acts 2.39, ὅσους ἂν προσκαλέσῃται κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν. The metalepsis here is noteworthy: by quoting the beginning and alluding to the end of Joel 3.5, Luke conspicuously omits the aspects of Joel 3.5 that limit salvation to Jerusalem. For observations along these lines, see Buttica, *L'identité de l'Église*, 116; Marguerat, *Les Actes des apôtres*, 89–90.

preparing the reader for the mission to the Gentiles, this stopping point should be seen as charged with meaning.

Even more suggestive than what Luke omits, however, is what he leaves the same. The divine name in Joel by which salvation comes is κύριος, that is, Yahweh. The reader who follows Peter's sermon to Acts 2.36, however, discovers that the name of the Lord by which salvation comes in Acts is κύριος Ἰησοῦς. This is a seismic shift theologically, but also one that bears witness to the faith and experience of the early church. It is also crucial to note the continuity that Luke envisions between the Lord in Joel and the Lord in Acts. Luke has prompted his reader at the outset of his quotation of Joel to be mindful that God is the speaker of this prophecy (λέγει ὁ θεός, Acts 2.17, another Lukan addition).<sup>36</sup> The one who first spoke the words 'Everyone who calls on the name of the Lord will be saved' through Joel is the one who speaks again through Peter. God is the one who witnesses to Jesus' lordship, and the identities of both God and Jesus are bound up in the single word 'Lord'.<sup>37</sup>

### 3. Assessing the Changes: The Integrity of Joel 3.1–5 and Luke's Hermeneutics

For Luke, the outpouring of the Spirit is the evidence that the Father has resurrected Jesus, exalted him to his right hand, and made him Lord (Acts 2.32–4). It is this same conviction that stands behind the various alterations we have observed throughout Luke's quotation of Joel 3.1–5 in Acts 2.17–21. The outpouring of the Spirit authenticates Jesus' role as Messiah and Lord, signals the eschatological time and restores the people of Israel – and, through Israel, the nations – to relationship with Jesus Christ, who is Lord of all (οὐτός ἐστιν πάντων κύριος, 10.36). The various secondary citations that Luke employs bear witness to the new order that is established through the resurrection of Jesus from the dead and that awaits completion upon his return.

As much as Luke was writing under the conviction that the restoration Joel foresaw was being fulfilled among the followers of Jesus, it remains worthwhile to consider how Luke's reorientation of Joel 3.1–5 leaves the integrity of Joel's oracle intact. Questions arise particularly because of the dissimilarities of the salvation they envision: Joel restricts salvation to empirical Israel; Luke, reading Joel through the lens of Isaiah (cf. 2.2 and 40.5), expands the scope of salvation to the nations. Is this still the prophecy of Joel? Or at the hand of Luke have the words

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Runge, 'Joel 2:28–32a in Acts 2:17–21', 105–7.

<sup>37</sup> For an extended treatment of the significance of this move, see also C. K. Rowe, 'Romans 10:13: What Is the Name of the Lord?', *HBT* 22 (2000) 135–73; and for a treatment of this language in Luke and its theological implications, see id., *Early Narrative Christology: The Lord in the Gospel of Luke* (BZNW 139; Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter, 2006).

remained basically the same but their meaning been violated by this use in a new context?

There is no denying that Luke subverts the meaning of 'all flesh' away from the standard reading of Joel 3.1.<sup>38</sup> With this shift in reference, Luke offers a strong revision of Joel's prophecy. But from within the theology of Acts, it is possible to consider Luke's citation as an attempt to extend Joel's meaning in light of eschatological realities. This is because the fundamental difference between Joel 3 and Acts 2 is to be found in God's action to begin the restoration of Israel but not to usher it in with it the final judgement. Thus, Luke uses Joel's words ('all flesh' = empirical Israel) but in so doing sets them in a context in which they now correspond to his (and Isaiah's) conviction that through the restoration of Israel God's salvation will extend to all people. It is *through* the restoration of Israel, not instead of it, that 'all flesh' receives salvation (and the outpoured Spirit). David Pao's attention to the Isaianic 'new Exodus' theme in Acts supports this view: "This kind of universalism is developed not through the abolition of the particularistic understanding of election but primarily through the extension of the universal sovereignty of the *God of Israel*."<sup>39</sup>

A second major change by Luke's hand occurs when Joel's vision of the nations standing in judgement is placed (metaleptically) in conversation with Isaiah's vision of the nations streaming to Jerusalem. In assessing the dissonance that this creates, it important to bear in mind that Luke does not reject the image of an eschatological judgement – a number of Lukan passages correct that misperception. Luke's view of judgement is shaped by Jesus' advents, however, and so Luke adds a nuance to Joel's oracle that reflects his Christological understanding of the end times. The Parable of the Ten Pounds (Luke 19.11–27) illustrates this well, and perhaps the opening words of that parable can illuminate why Luke opts to place Isa 2.2 at the head of his quotation of Joel: "[Jesus] told them a parable, because he was near to Jerusalem, and they thought that the kingdom of God was about to appear immediately. So he said, "A nobleman went to a distant country to get royal power for himself and then return ..."' (Luke 19.11).

Luke narrates here Jesus' ascension to the throne of David. And, importantly in Jesus' parable, judgement *follows* the return of the nobleman from the distant country. The time before the return of the king is not characterised by judgement. Luke reflects this conviction in Acts. The disciples await the restoration of the kingdom (1.6), but Jesus tells them that its fulfilment is still in the future (1.7).

38 A similar move occurs in Romans 10 with the reorientation of  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  to include not only Israel but all who believe in Jesus. Cf. Rowe, 'What Is the Name of the Lord?', 154–6.

39 Pao, *Acts and the Isaianic New Exodus*, 57 (emphasis added). I see Luke's universalism primarily as an extension of Isaiah's, and thus I hesitate to identify that universalism with an imperial ideology of universal domination such as the one identified in the recent, and very interesting, work of Buttica (L'identité de l'Église, 52–3, 97–8).



While the full restoration (and therefore judgement) awaits the return of Jesus, the beginnings of the restoration of Israel are taking place among the followers of Jesus, through whom God is inviting ‘all the nations’ to enter into the house of – that is, under the rule of – David (τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυίδ; 15.16–17).<sup>40</sup> The judgement Joel envisioned of the nations standing before God is not denied by the invocation of Isaiah’s vision of the nations streaming to Jerusalem. Importantly, however, that judgement is forestalled and the time for repentance extended. Joel’s eschatological vision is thus set within the framework of Luke’s theology. The arrival of the last days signals for Luke the beginning of the restoration of Israel, and it also signals the beginning of a mission to the wider world. At least for a time, mission and eschatology coincide.<sup>41</sup> Lest an early Christian reader of Joel misconstrue the scope of salvation or timing of God’s judgement, Luke calls upon Isaiah’s understanding of ‘the last days’ and his vision for ‘all flesh’ in order to account for the character of the time in which the church exists.

Taken together, Luke’s alterations to Joel 3.1–5 cohere around a particular hermeneutic by which Luke is shaping Joel’s oracle even as he quotes it. His hermeneutic is the belief that the eschatological restoration of Israel has begun in the community constituted by Jesus Christ. Luke resignifies Joel’s prophecy so that it corresponds with Isaiah’s vision of that eschatological restoration extending to the nations. Brief secondary citations are the method by which Luke creates this correspondence. Multiple allusions to other Old Testament texts that envision God’s deliverance and lordship over of Israel come together in Luke’s citation of Joel’s prophecy. The end result is rich: Joel’s voice leads a chorus of witnesses to Israel’s restoration. The voices are those of Isaiah (Isa 2.2; 40.5), Moses (Num 11.29), the many prophets and leaders of Israel who looked upon God’s ‘signs and wonders’ and, perhaps, also Malachi (Mal 3.23) as well as the psalmist (Ps 44.17; cf. also Pss 15, 109). Through Luke’s use of secondary citations, the voices of these witnesses come alongside that of Joel’s and guide the application of his words to the church. We should note in particular the range of voices Luke calls on: Moses, prophets, psalmist. Luke’s citation of Joel thus exemplifies in one brief citation Jesus’ words to his disciples: ‘Everything written about me in the Law

40 This connection of Luke 19 with Acts 15 builds on the argument of Craig Hill: ‘[T]he rebuilding of David’s “hut” (*skenē*) is a reference to the reestablishment of the Davidic dynasty, in line with the promise of II Samuel 7:16: “Your house and your kingdom shall be sure forever before me; your throne shall be established forever.” Because Jesus has taken the Davidic throne, James argues, the Gentile mission foreseen in Amos 9:11–12 ... may now commence.’ C. Hill, ‘Restoring the Kingdom to Israel: Luke-Acts and Christian Supersessionism’, *A Shadow of Glory: Reading the New Testament after the Holocaust* (ed. T. Linafelt; New York: Routledge, 2002) 196–7.

41 The way in which mission and eschatology co-exist for Luke is helpfully noted by Buttica, *L’identité de l’Église*, 85.

of Moses, the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled' (Luke 24.44).<sup>42</sup> As Luke arranges them, all of these voices bear witness to Jesus and the realities that he ushers in.

On the interpretation offered here, the method by which Luke reads Scripture in Acts 2.17-21 is consistent with his use of Scripture more broadly. This is on display a few verses below the passage we have been considering when Luke interprets Ps 15.8-11 as a messianic prophecy in light of Ps 109.1 (Acts 2.25-35). Commenting on this passage, Luke Timothy Johnson writes that the intertextual relationship by which Luke reads these Psalms 'organizes a complex set of textual details [in this case, two Psalms that look beyond David for their fulfilment] into a form of argument shaped by association'.<sup>43</sup> We can further specify Johnson's conclusions in light of what we have already gleaned from Bruce Fisk's work: that in the latter half of Acts 2, as we saw in the opening verses of Peter's sermon, it is secondary citations that do the hermeneutical heavy-lifting and reorient the longer, primary texts.

Taking these methodological observations further, the inaugural sermon of Jesus that Luke records (Luke 4.16-30) evinces a method for reading Scripture closely analogous to the one we have seen in Acts 2.17-21. In Luke 4, Jesus proclaims the words of Isa 61.1-2, but he embeds in that quotation a reference to Isa 58.6. The effect that is created by this pairing of text and co-text is the creation of a metaleptic link between Isaiah's description of Israel being restored (61.1-2) and another Isaianic oracle in which Israel's rightly ordered worship ushers in a second Exodus (58.1-14).<sup>44</sup> The result for those who pick up on the relationship established by the intertextual connection is a window into the character of Jesus: he is the one who will both restore and deliver Israel.

Much like the quotations of Isaiah in Luke 4, the intertextual allusions and echoes that Luke embeds within his quotation of Joel 3.1-5 move by quickly. Most modern readers of the New Testament are, by and large, comfortable passing over Luke's changes to Joel's prophecy without attending to the ways in which the alterations resonate across Scripture. But for the interpreter with ears

42 Cf. here Joseph Fitzmyer: '[Luke] gives no specific references to the *Torah* or the *Nebi'im* and the modern reader will look in vain for the passages in the Old Testament to which the Lucan Christ refers ...' (here citing Luke 24.27, but see also 24.44). J. Fitzmyer, *The Gospel according to Luke x-xxiv: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (AB 28; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1985) 1558.

43 Johnson, *Septuagintal Midrash*, 40.

44 On Luke's use of Scripture more generally, see R. B. Hays, *Reading Backward: Figural Christology and the Fourfold Gospel Witness* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2014) 55-74, 99-100. On the specific use of Isa 58 as a co-text within Isa 61, see id., 'The Liberation of Israel in Luke-Acts: Intertextual Narration as Countercultural Practice', *Reading the Bible Intertextually* (ed. R. B. Hays, S. Alkier and L. A. Huizenga; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2009) 101-16, esp. 107-8.

to hear, Luke's citation of Joel offers insight into how Luke conceives of the church as participating in the restoration of Israel. On the broader level of the relationship between the Old Testament and the New, Luke's use of Joel in Acts 2.17–21 also exemplifies the way in which the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead had opened the evangelist's mind to a new understanding Israel's Scripture.<sup>45</sup>

45 For more on this point, see G. E. Sterling, 'Luke as a Reader of the LXX', *Biblical Interpretation in Early Christian Gospels*, volume III: *The Gospel of Luke* (ed. Thomas R. Hatina; LNTS 376; London: T&T Clark, 2010) 161–79, esp. 174.