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ABSTRACT

This study focuses on the OT citations and major allusions in Luke-Acts, in order to evaluate the conclusion of Traugott Holtz (Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas) that Luke was only familiar with the LXX of the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms, whereas for the Pentateuch and historical books of the OT was dependent on other sources such as testimonia. In so doing, the study aims to ascertain the extent of Luke’s familiarity with the LXX, to determine where and how Luke employs sources other than the LXX, to ascertain whether Luke’s LXX mss may have been Hebraicizing, and to understand how Luke’s redactional activity affects the final form of the citations.

The study concludes that Luke demonstrates knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch, but while Luke tends to use the LXX directly, at times he does use sources other than the OT either because he wished to be faithful to a source which he held in high regard, or because the version of the OT material in his source was particularly applicable to the context in which he placed the OT reference. The ms of the LXX Minor Prophets which Luke used was likely Hebraicizing, but there is little significant evidence that he was using a Hebraicizing LXX ms for any other OT book. Finally, Lukan redaction is evident in all OT material both in altering the passages in such a way that his christological or apologetic interpretation is embedded in them, and in altering them stylistically (even to the point of summarizing or simply alluding to them) to fit the context of his narrative. The latter is most evident in the references to the Pentateuch
which tend to be embedded in the Lukan narrative, and in which there is less material amenable to christological or apologetic interpretation.
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INTRODUCTION

About the year 140 a man walked the streets of Rome preaching a novel form, for its time, of the Christian Gospel. His name was Marcion and his Gospel was a thoroughgoing attempt to sever Christianity from its Jewish roots. For Marcion, the Old Testament was not authoritative, and, in fact, was to be rejected as teaching things contrary to the Gospel of the New Testament. Similarly, as the documents of the NT seem to presuppose continuity between the New and Old Testaments, Marcion concluded that these documents had been considerably corrupted by Judaizers. The Gospel accounts of Jesus' life were so corrupt, in his view, that of the four accounts, only that of Luke (and an expurgated form at that) was authoritative.¹

Much more recently a group of Christians in North America have come to a similar position. Victor Paul Wierwille, the founder of The Way International, has stated that the OT and NT are separate documents and that the Gospels are in fact part of the OT. The NT, and thus the part of the Bible that applies to modern Christians, actually begins with the book of Acts.²


The interesting thing about these two groups of Christians greatly separated in space and time is not only the desire to have a Christianity wholly separate from the Jewish religion (a desire which may or may not contain overtones of anti-Semitism), but that both groups, while rejecting much of the NT as inapplicable or non-authoritative, accept as authoritative for their non-Jewish-derived Christianity the work, in whole or in part, of Luke-Acts. This is interesting as the author of Luke-Acts is the one writer in the NT of whose Gentile origin we are quite certain. Marcion apparently perceived a certain non-Jewishness to the tone of the Gospel of Luke, which led him to accept that Gospel above the others. Similarly, while the Gospels record the ministry of Jesus in a Jewish context, Acts portrays the Gospel being finally directed away from the Jews and preached to the Gentiles. Thus it may have appeared to Marcion (and perhaps to The Way International) that Acts portrayed the beginning of Gentile Christianity, which to him was real Christianity.

Of course the dependence of Luke-Acts on the OT would have been a stumbling block to Marcion's acceptance, and he was accused of "mutilating" the Gospel of Luke, possibly, as has been argued, expunging from it what he termed Judaistic corruptions. Unfortunately we have little evidence for the text of Marcion's Gospel of Luke, and his

---

3See Chadwick, 40.


5E.g., Irenaeus, Haer. 3.14.3; see also Tertullian, Adv. Marc. 4.5.5-6.

6E.g., Chadwick, 40.
opponents among the Church Fathers do not present us with a list of omissions. For the modern reader, however, Luke-Acts, even without the so-called Marcionite exclusions, still holds a certain interest as a primarily Gentile work. This attitude is admirably expressed in James Michener's novel The Covenant by a probably fictitious nineteenth century scholar:

The Book of Acts is significant for two reasons. It was written by the same hand that gave us the Gospel according to St. Luke, and that unknown author is extremely important because he is probably the only non-Jew to have composed any part of our Bible. All the other authors were rabbis like Jesus and St. Paul, or ordinary laymen like St. Matthew, the tax collector. In Acts we receive the first message about our church from a person like ourselves.9

The significance of this statement can be found in the last sentence. The author indicates his thoroughgoing view of Christianity as a Gentile religion by the words "our church" and the characterization of Luke as a "person like ourselves." The implication seems clear: Luke-Acts reflects "our" religion better than any other NT book, and hence is more thoroughly "Christian."

---

7Hoffmann, 117. The question of the relationship of Marcion's Gospel to Luke-Acts is a complicated one, involving questions of dating and composition of Luke-Acts, and both Knox (110-113) and Hoffmann (133-134) argue that, rather than Marcion deleting elements from the canonical Gospel and the Acts, these were added later in reaction to Marcion's use of these documents.

8As Michener, in writing fiction, does not footnote his sources, it is difficult to conclude with any certainty whether he is quoting an actual 19th century theological writing, or whether he is simply creating a fictitious document which reflects the attitude indicated.


10On the perceived "gentileness" of Christianity and the attempt by the Church to deny its Jewish heritage, see R. R. Ruethe, Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism (New York: Seabury, 1974) 218-219; for this tendency in the early Christian centuries see also T. Callan, Forgetting the Root: The Emergence of Christianity from Judaism (New York: Paulist, 1986) 73-105.
While Marcion and others may have wanted to expunge from the NT any trace of a relation to the Old, the historic position of the Christian Church has been characterized as regarding the Old and New Testaments as complementary revelation, the NT being the goal of the Old.\(^{11}\) Scholarship too has envisioned a close relationship between the Testaments with the New owing a great deal to the Old. Thus when David Strauss rocked the Victorian world with his \textit{Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet} (ET--The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined) he indicated the vast debt the NT writers had to the OT.\(^{12}\) This trend has continued in scholarship\(^{13}\) and for Luke-Acts as well it has been recognized that the OT holds a considerable place in the author's work.\(^{14}\)

NT authors, including Luke, were motivated, as stated admirably by C. H. Dodd, by the conviction that

the Christian Gospel could not be adequately or convincingly set forth unless the communication of facts about Jesus (\(\tau\dot{o}\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sigma\omicron\upsilon\iota\)) was

\(^{11}\) F. F. Bruce, \textit{The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes} (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968) 12-13. While the position of the church through the centuries regarding the OT has been more complex than Bruce intimates, and has developed in different directions at times, Bruce's description generally generally fits the prevailing opinions (see D. L. Baker, \textit{Two Testaments, One Bible: A Study of Some Modern Solutions to the Theological Problem of the Relationship Between the Old and New Testaments} [Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity, 1976] 43-87). There have certainly been influential writers who have questioned the importance of the OT for the NT (e.g. Schleiermacher [Baker, 56], Delitzsch and Harnack [Baker 79-80]), but the general trend has been to a very high view of the OT.


\(^{13}\) A full treatment of scholarly approaches to the relationship of the OT and NT can be found in Baker. The only real challenge to the indebtedness of the NT to the OT comes from the existential view of Bultmann, which can hardly be considered a thoroughgoing attempt to expunge the OT from Christianity (Baker, 157-171).

supported by references to the Old Testament which gave significance to the facts.\(^\text{15}\)

That Luke is operating within these parameters has been argued by a number of scholars. Paul Schubert, for example, concluded that for Luke the OT provides a "proof from prophecy" for demonstrating that Jesus is the Christ.\(^\text{16}\) H. J. Cadbury argued that the fulfilment of the OT is a central motif in Luke's historical work.\(^\text{17}\) Similarly, Eduard Lohse has concluded that Luke constructs his scheme of salvation history with an eye on the OT, showing the life of Jesus and the history of the early church as a succession of events occurring in fulfilment of OT prophecy.\(^\text{18}\) Hans Conzelman, in his monumental Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (ET--The Theology of St. Luke),\(^\text{19}\) has not only concurred that Luke uses the promise and fulfilment motif in his depiction of Jesus and the Church,\(^\text{20}\) but has also suggested that Luke constructs a scheme of salvation history in which the Church exists as the heir of Israel, and that God's work in history, which began with Israel and climaxed in Jesus, continues in the


Thus, it appears that modern scholarship has largely refuted any attempts by modern Marcions to remove from Luke-Acts suggestions of OT influence.

There does, however, appear to be one complication in the researches of modern scholarship into Luke’s knowledge and use of the OT. Between 1916 and 1920 two volumes were published by Rendell Harris called, simply, Testimonies. In these volumes Harris concluded that there existed a collection of testimonia, or proof texts, circulating in the early Christian communities, which the NT writers used in an already compiled form to demonstrate that Christ was the longed-for Messiah, and that the Church was God’s work in the new age. If Harris was right, then the direct dependence of the NT writers on the OT, and the continuity which this dependence presupposes, is called in question. For, if proof texts were all that were needed, then the NT writers may only have been acting in a propagandistic manner, and not really reflecting on the meaning of the OT at all.

In 1952, C. H. Dodd appeared to have put this theory of proof-texts firmly to rest with the publication of his seminal work According to the Scriptures. In this book Dodd concluded that the use of the OT by NT writers was a creative enterprise in which, rather than simply drawing on proof texts, they actively interpreted the OT in the light of the Jesus event and their own presuppositions. But the theory of testimonia has

---

21Ibid, 16.

22R. Harris, Testimonies (London: Cambridge University, 1916, 1920); see Dodd, Scriptures, 23-25.

23See n. 15 above.

24Dodd, Scriptures, 18.
reappeared more recently in a work that has been termed the most important study on the
text of the OT in Luke in the last twenty years. This book, Untersuchungen über die
alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas by Traugott Holtz, brings the hypothesis of Rendell
Harris back to life.

Generally speaking, most scholars would agree that Luke's Bible, as that of most
early Christians, was the LXX. Holtz (and others, as we shall see in the next
chapter), however, points out that the Lukan citations evince characteristics which in
many cases point to another conclusion. He agrees that the only OT text which Luke
knew and used was that of the LXX. But he goes on to say that Luke had first-hand
familiarity only with the LXX text of the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms, and did
not know the LXX of the Pentateuch and historical books. Rather, the citations from
these books in Luke's writings depart from the LXX text and thus betray the use of
traditional material which Luke received in the way of testimonia. This sounds very
much like Rendell Harris.

The purpose of the present study is to re-examine Holtz's work and expand upon
it somewhat in order to consider more fully Luke's use of the OT, and whether or not

26Holtz, Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas (TU, 104; Berlin: Akademie, 1968).
28Holtz, 166.
the evidence supports the conclusion that Luke did not have first-hand familiarity with great portions of the LXX. As suggested in the foregoing paragraphs, on this question hang the twin issues of Luke's creativity in his use of Scripture and of his regard for the OT. These considerations make the question an important one for Lukan studies. But before we begin to attempt an answer to this question it would be well to review the state of scholarship in dealing with the text of Luke's Bible.

---

Holtz's conclusion that "Lukas den Pentateuch nicht gekannt hat" (170) assumes far too much certainty in what can be determined about ancient writers (or any writer, for that matter). We simply cannot know how much an author actually "knows" from his writings. All we can determine with any certainty is what he has shown awareness of, or used, in his work.
CHAPTER ONE

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A good deal of scholarly work has been done on the text of Luke’s OT.¹ Logically, the debate can be divided into three areas of interest. First of all, there are the OT citations in Luke-Acts. This area is of crucial importance since it is on the basis of the study of citations that Holtz arrived at his conclusions. Secondly, the claim has been made by a number of scholars that Luke bases his narrative on OT accounts, which he imitates. If this could be proved, then the evidence for Luke’s extensive knowledge of the OT would be greatly augmented. Finally, there is the question of Luke’s Greek and its influence by either Semitic sources or the LXX. Although a thoroughgoing investigation of the grammatical evidence presented in this area goes well beyond the scope of the present study, the question of Luke’s Greek affects all areas of research into the nature of Luke’s OT.

¹D. I. Bock (Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology [JSNTS, 12; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987] 26-27) notes that with all the work that has been done, the issues have not been decided with any great certainty.
A. The Study of the Lukan Citations

As we have already noted, the popular view among scholars appears to be that Luke uses the LXX when he cites the OT. We will begin our discussion with H. B. Swete. Swete concluded that the writers of the Synoptic Gospels favoured the LXX and that variations from the LXX text as we know it can be explained as loose citations of the LXX or citations from memory, the substitution of a gloss for the precise citation, adaptations of the passages to the context, fusing together of passages from different contexts, and perhaps recensional and translational variations. For Acts, Swete concluded that all OT quotations come from the LXX exclusively, occur only in speeches, and sometimes show evidence of conflation and loose citation (of the LXX) or citation from memory. W. K. L. Clarke arrived at similar conclusions regarding Acts. He ascribed several deviations from the LXX to "free citation," a number of others to the adaptation of the passage to the context, a considerable amount to the fusing of OT passages, and some to recensional variations, as did Swete. He also concluded that the Acts citations tended to follow the A text of the LXX rather than the B. He only found one instance, however, of a possible gloss made by the writer ("the change of ἐαυτοῖς to προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς in vii.43"), and regarding Acts 3:25, where the quotation appears closer to the Hebrew of Gen. 22:18 than to the LXX, he suggested that the quotation was

---


3Ibid, 398-399.

likely influenced by the LXX of Gen. 12:3 or Ps. 21:28.\(^5\) More recently, Martin Rese, in his work on Lukan christology (\textit{Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas}), specifically in the section of this work dedicated to a critique of Holtz, has suggested that the preeminent reasons for deviation from the LXX in Luke-Acts are freedom of citation and theological concerns.\(^6\) We can, then, place Rese firmly in the camp of Swete and Clarke and those who hold for Luke’s exclusive allegiance to the text of the LXX.

The calm waters of Luke’s septuagintal citations were stirred, however, by some scholars who saw the evidence pointing in a very different direction. Max Wilcox examined the citations and certain biblical allusions in Acts which seemed to him to indicate "some degree of community with, or dependence upon, a tradition or traditions external to the Septuagint as we now have it."\(^7\) He found evidence connecting the Acts material to two such traditions. First of all, he notes indication of a "community of tradition" between certain quotations and the Targums.\(^8\) Secondly, he mentions two passages (Acts 7:16 and 8:32) which seem to presuppose a textual tradition close to the MT.\(^9\) He concludes that since Luke usually used the LXX for citations, when his

\(^5\)Clarke, 93-95.

\(^6\)M. Rese, \textit{Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas} (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969) 173, 208-209.


\(^9\)Ibid, 30-31.
citations diverge from the latter it is probable that he used some other source or sources. But while the divergences from the LXX sometimes point to non-LXX sources (e.g. MT or Targums), these citations do not consistently follow the same tradition or even one such tradition in all details. Thus, he concludes, we do not so much have an "immediate use" of a Hebrew or Aramaic original, but rather a "mediate use" of sources incorporating the extra-septuagintal elements in question." His final conclusion is that Luke apparently has used source material which came to him in a relatively fixed form in Greek but which contained unrevised elements of a non-LXX tradition. For Wilcox, then, Luke used the LXX and other sources in Greek which show evidence of underlying Hebrew or Aramaic traditions.

While Wilcox's scholarly treatment appears fairly conclusive at first glance, and some scholars consider his study to be methodologically sound, other scholars have faulted his reasoning at several points. J. A. Emerton, for example, calls Wilcox's arguments "uncertain, and sometimes fallacious," and Earl Richard argues that "in not one single instance is his evidence persuasive." This hornets' nest of criticism, which

10Ibid, 51.
11Ibid, 52-53.
12Ibid, 54.
13See Bock, 21.
Wilcox appears to have stirred, is worth a brief examination. Emerton considers that of the seventeen examples of textual tradition differing from the LXX given by Wilcox, seven are very questionable as they are not explicit citations and it is therefore difficult to determine their precise textual form. In the remaining examples, Emerton notes that while there are a number of disagreements with the LXX, normally in choice of words or word order, "a striking agreement usually remains." He is convinced that for most of the minor differences the usual explanations of free citation, adaptation to context, assimilation of texts to other texts, combining of texts etc., would suffice to explain most of the difficulties; he notes as well the possibility that the LXX text used by Luke may have itself undergone some Hebraicizing revision. Richard faults Wilcox on three counts: he "consistently overlooks the LXX's rich proto-history and manuscript tradition, ignores the Syriac tradition, and virtually eliminates all redactional considerations from his study." Thus Richard appeals to theological motivations and Luke's creativity to account for many deviations from the LXX, and in other cases demonstrates that there is ample evidence in the LXX textual tradition to account for the differences. These points are well taken and need to be examined more closely in
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17Emerton, 284.
20E.g., ibid, 338.
21E.g., ibid, 333-336.
determining the text of Luke’s Bible. The question of the textual tradition of the LXX is an important one, and we will return to it shortly, but first we should examine the work of Traugott Holtz.

What Wilcox suggests tentatively as a possibility Holtz embraces. Wilcox noted the possibility that Acts may be dependent for many of its scriptural citations upon "composite testimonia" circulating in the church at the time, but did not press the issue.\(^\text{22}\) Holtz, however, unequivocally states this possibility as his conclusion.\(^\text{23}\) In many ways Holtz’s work is a methodological gem. He employs the book-by-book approach to the study of OT citations recently exemplified by Dietrich-Alex Koch in his monograph on Paul.\(^\text{24}\) Furthermore, he recognizes the influence of sources on the Gospel material (adhering as he does to the two-source hypothesis), and the need for comparative study to understand Luke’s method of quotation.\(^\text{25}\) (Both of these methodological considerations, I might add, will be followed in the present study.)

He sets as his main purpose to determine from where the Lukan citations arise and what form of the text is used:

\[
\text{Es soll danach gefragt werden, woher die einzelnen Zitate stammen, ob und in welchem Umfang ihr Text direkt einer der Formen des Alten Testaments entnommen ist oder ob er dem behandelten Schriftsteller durch}
\]

\(^\text{22}\) Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 23.

\(^\text{23}\) Holtz, 172-173.


\(^\text{25}\) Holtz, 1.
Holtz considers that some citations reflect, in his words, "selbständigen Textbehandlung," that is, they appear to be citations taken by Luke directly from the text of the OT. He states as a presupposition that if Luke demonstrates a similar manner in handling different citations from the same OT books, and they appear to be "selbständigen," then it can be concluded that Luke knew and used these books of the OT. On the other hand, if for a given OT book the cited texts strongly depart from their LXX form (i.e., from the only form of the OT which Luke certainly knew), and if there is evidence that the citation and thus its textual form are traditional ("aus der Tradition"), we can conclude that Luke was not so familiar with this book: "daß Lukas den Texte dieses Buches nicht selbständig zitiert, jedenfalls ihn nicht bei seiner schriftstellerischen Arbeit benutzt." Hence, for Holtz, a departure from the LXX form in a citation would signal the possible use of another source:

Schließlich werden einige Zitate unterschiedlicher Herkunft behandelt werden, die größtenteils zwar aus alttestamentlichen Büchern stammen, die Lukas vermutlich kennt, deren besondere Form aber darauf schließen läßt, daß er sie nicht aus seiner LXX direkt, sondern aus einer anderen Überlieferungsquelle geschöpft hat.
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27Ibid, 1.
28Ibid, 3.
29Ibid, 4.
These preliminary remarks by Holtz are important to note since they determine the boundaries of Holtz’s whole endeavour. Notice that he is not interested in demonstrating that Luke only knew the LXX or that he used sources, Semitic or otherwise. Rather, Holtz is more interested in demonstrating the extent of Luke’s OT knowledge and the possibility that the Lukan citations give evidence of Luke’s knowledge of certain OT books and his ignorance of others.

Holtz divides the Lukan citations into "selbstständigen Zitate" and those which are not "selbständigen" based on the criteria given above. Under "selbständigen Zitate" he places the major citations from the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms. He then deals with the Pentateuch citations, including the material in Peter’s speech in Acts 3 and the Stephen speech in Acts 7. Then, under the title of "Zitate unterschiedlicher Herkunft" (citations from diverse sources) he notes the citations in Paul’s speech in Acts 13, the Psalms citations in Peter’s speech in Acts 2 and several citations, which he describes as of uncertain origin, from the Psalms and Isaiah.

Possibly Holtz’s most startling conclusion regards the Pentateuch citations.30 Here Holtz notes that we do not have the same kind of citations as the "selbständigen" citations mentioned above. While the latter were clearly marked and more or less verbally in agreement with a passage in the LXX, these citations are shorter, depart regularly from the LXX, and often, as in Acts 7, are worked into a narrative framework without warning.31 In the Gospel, Luke shows that he does not independently know the

30See Bovon, 100.
31Holtz, 60.
text of the Pentateuch, but rather depends on his source (Mark) for its citation.\textsuperscript{32} Furthermore, in Luke 20:28, Luke demonstrates his ignorance of the context of the passage he is citing; Holtz thinks it likely that this indicates his ignorance of the entire book (in this case Deuteronomy).\textsuperscript{33} In the speeches in Acts Luke shows evidence of having an "impression" of the contents of the Pentateuch but not the text in front of him. While he has reproduced the form of the scripture in question, he has not reproduced the exact sense of the scripture directly, nor shown awareness of its context.\textsuperscript{34} Holtz also finds evidence of citations having their origin in the catechetical traditions of either the Jews or earliest Christians.\textsuperscript{35} Similarly, the citations in Stephen's speech generally have their origin in the Jewish tradition, and the details which depart from the LXX are not corrected toward the LXX by Luke because he was unable to do so, not having a copy of the LXX Pentateuch to which to refer.\textsuperscript{36} Thus Holtz is able to conclude that as far as the Pentateuch is concerned, Luke did not have immediate access to these Scriptures but found the citations he used in the traditions he recorded.

\textsuperscript{32}Ibid, 64, 68.

\textsuperscript{33}Ibid, 70.

\textsuperscript{34}Ibid, 80-81. Actually, ignoring the context is not all that unusual in ancient writings, whether the authors were "aware" of it or not. See, e.g., the various comments regarding many of the speeches in Chronicles by R. Mason (Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics After the Exile [Cambridge: University, 1990] e.g., 20-25, 32, 34, 66-68, etc.).

\textsuperscript{35}Holtz, 81-82.

\textsuperscript{36}Ibid, 100, 109.
While there was never any debate over Luke’s preference for the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms, Holtz concluded that Luke did not even directly know the LXX apart from these books. Rather, he suggests that Luke was only aware of the contents of the rest of the OT by way of Jewish or Christian tradition, likely in the form of small collections of testimonia circulating in the early Church. While the question of testimonia is not particularly original, the conclusion concerning the extent of Luke’s knowledge certainly is, and constitutes Holtz’s most important contribution to the debate. The LXX was translated somewhat piecemeal at different times and by different translators; moreover, the different OT books were circulated separately. Hence it is possible that Luke may have possessed only three scrolls of the LXX at the time of his writing. This fact alone makes Holtz’s hypothesis quite tenable, a surprise to the more traditional scholars who hold that Luke was steeped in knowledge of the LXX.

Although he has apparently not engendered such a storm of criticism as Max Wilcox, Holtz is not without his detractors. The reason that there has not been such a deluge of literature directed against his theory probably arises from the fact that his careful, systematic methodology, and the clear parameters of his conclusions have given scholars pause in order to rethink cautiously the whole area of Luke’s relationship to the

---

37See Bovon, 100.
38Holtz, 169-170.
LXX. There have been some scholarly criticisms, however, and it is to examples of these that we now turn. Martin Rese's attack is for the most part single pronged. He states that Holtz does not take enough account of Luke as the author of Luke-Acts and so does not credit him enough with the final shaping of the citations, especially from theological motives. Similarly, in a footnote at the end of his critique of Wilcox, Richard notes that the divergences from the LXX noted by Holtz could also be explained by redactional and textual considerations, rather than assuming sources. Darrell Bock points out a methodological limitation, in that Holtz confines himself to citations and assumes that the texts specifically cited reflect all of what Luke knew, which is certainly questionable. François Bovon lists all of these points; he notes as well that it is important to understand that the citations from the Pentateuch, being generally shorter than those from Luke's favoured books, leave more room for redaction and loose citation. Moreover, he suggests that Holtz's theory does not take heed of what he terms the principle, verified on the quotations of Clement of Alexandria, according to which the verbatim citations often come from books which
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42Rese, 216.


44Bock, 15. Bock's criticism here is well-founded; see above, p. 8, n. 31.

45Bovon, 100.
the author knew less, and to which he must refer to the text in order to verify it, in a quite unselbständig manner.\textsuperscript{46}

Finally, Bovon appeals to Luke's theological and literary (redactional) activity as areas to which Holtz needed to apply himself more.\textsuperscript{47}

All of these criticisms have merit and need to be considered in evaluating Luke's knowledge of the LXX. Especially noteworthy are the suggestions of giving more attention to redactional considerations (theological and otherwise) and issues pertaining to the LXX textual tradition, which will be incorporated into the methodology of this study. Expanding beyond the citations would be a worthy aim for a study as well, but space and time only permit me to take brief account of other factors (e.g., Luke's Greek, etc.) while examining in detail only the citations themselves. This is unfortunate methodologically as it seriously limits the scope of the proposed conclusions, much as Holtz's conclusions were limited by the same restrictions. As a basis for further research, however, the present study is valuable since we can only be reasonably certain of the OT passages underlying direct citations; the freer the reference to the OT, the more difficult it is to determine not only the text of the OT passage used, but even at times to which OT passage the author is referring.\textsuperscript{48} Hence this study will confine itself, as much as is possible, to those OT references about which there is some certainty.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{46}Ibid, 101.
\item \textsuperscript{47}Ibid.
\item \textsuperscript{48}See e.g., the comments by Koch (17-18) and Holtz (1-3); note also the comments by Emerton (284) on the difficulty of determining the textual form of an allusion, as opposed to a citation. More on this issue below.
\end{itemize}
regarding their referent. In short, for a number of reasons, Holtz's conclusions need to be re-evaluated.

The question of divergent LXX texts, which Luke may have used, is a very complicated issue. Clearly as John Wevers asserts, the LXX is "a composite book, the work of various translators of varied ability who worked at different times." Therefore, it is not difficult to imagine different translators, or groups of translators, who may have translated the same book, and thus different versions may have existed side by side. Indeed, there is ancient testimony about Greek versions of the OT attributed to Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, dating from as early as the second century CE, and about recensions or revisions of the LXX attributed to Origen, Hesychius and Lucian in the third and fourth centuries CE. Though these putative versions and recensions are too late to have influenced Luke, they illustrate the possibility of earlier Greek versions of the OT, which depart from the LXX as we know it, and which may have influenced Luke-Acts.

Recent advances in LXX textual criticism have disclosed something of the very complicated textual history of the LXX. Indeed, there has been some question whether we are even right to speak of the textual history of the LXX. While most LXX scholars have followed Paul de Lagarde, who concluded that all mss of the LXX derived
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50 See e.g., Wevers, "Septuagint," 275-276; Tov, Textual Criticism, 144-148.

51 On the motivating factors for the creation of these revisions of the LXX, see Tov (Textual Criticism, 143).

52 See Tov, Textual Criticism, 136, 183.
ultimately from one archetype (later called the "Urtext theory"), some scholars have disagreed, the most prominent being Paul E. Kahle. Kahle took the evidence suggesting different Greek versions at an early period to the logical extreme and advanced the theory that prior to the Christian era there was no standard LXX text. It was only the Christian Church which felt the need for an authoritative text of the whole OT:

This text was preceded by divergent forms of text which had been used by Jews and early Christians. The Church took over one form of the earliest texts which had been used before. This text was revised and adapted for the use of Christian readers. By copying this text again and again the Church came into possession of a standard text.

Among the evidence cited by Kahle are the quotations from the OT in the NT which do not conform to the LXX text as we know it. Thus Kahle not only advocates the existence at an early period of Greek texts differing from the LXX as we know it, but also comes out in favour of the idea that NT citations which do not conform to the LXX stem from independent Greek renderings of the OT existing at the time of the NT.

Recent research into the history of the LXX, however, owes much of its impetus to Dominique Barthélemy, whose monograph Les devanciers d'Aquila, published in
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1963,\textsuperscript{57} changed the course of LXX studies. Basing his work on earlier studies by Thackeray\textsuperscript{58} and his own examination of a Greek Minor Prophets scroll discovered in 1952,\textsuperscript{59} Barthélemy postulated the existence of a Hebraicising recension of at least extensive portions of the LXX, which has been termed the "kaige recension."\textsuperscript{60} This early revision is evidenced not only in certain sections of Kingdoms thought by Thackeray to have been translated late, but also Lamentations, the Song of Songs, Ruth, certain mss of Judges, the Theodotionic recension of Daniel, the Theodotionic additions to Job, the anonymous additions to Jeremiah, the Theodotion column of the Hexapla, the Quinta column of the Hexapla for the Psalms, and the newly discovered scroll of the Minor Prophets.\textsuperscript{61} The most important of Barthélemy's conclusions would have to be that the *kaige* version appears not to be a fresh translation of the Hebrew, but a Hebraicising recension of the LXX, part of a process which culminated in the extremely literalistic version of Aquila.\textsuperscript{62}

\textsuperscript{57}D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila: Premiere publication intégrale du texte des fragments du dodécapropheton* (VTSup, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

\textsuperscript{58}E.g., H. St. J. Thackeray, "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings," *JTS* NS 8 (1907) 276-277.

\textsuperscript{59}The contents of this scroll have recently been published in Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8Hev XIIg): (The Seiyil Collection I)* (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

\textsuperscript{60}Tov (Textual Criticism, 145) attributes this name to Barthélemy. This supposed revision is now commonly named "kaige-Theodotion."

\textsuperscript{61}Barthélemy, 47; the proposed dimensions of this recension have been expanded to include Theodotion for Exodus (K. G. O'Connell, "Greek Versions [minor]." *IDBS* [1976] 379-380; see also O'Connell, *The Theodotionic Revision of the Book of Exodus* [HSM 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1972]).

\textsuperscript{62}Barthélemy, 80, 81, 88, 91.
Clearly, as Barthélemy himself declared, these findings do not support the thesis of Paul Kahle. Rather than a number of disparate Greek texts which were harmonized into a standard LXX text, we have a recensional movement beginning relatively early in the history of the LXX, which attempted to correct deficiencies in the original LXX by moving closer to the Hebrew. Generally, response to Barthélemy's book has been positive, with perhaps some urging toward further research based on more complete critical editions of the LXX than Barthélemy had at his disposal. There has been a great deal of work done both expanding the parameters of the so-called *kaige* recension and adding to the knowledge of its characteristics. All of this has acted to change the face of LXX textual criticism and clear the way for a more thorough understanding of its textual history. More important for our study, however, is the suggestion that such Hebraicising texts were in existence early enough to influence the citations found in the NT, and could be considered a possible explanation for the divergences from the LXX found therein. Dietrich-Alex Koch has applied this theory to the works of Paul with some success, and it is possible that such evidence may contribute much to the analysis of Lukan citations as well.
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The above studies indicate that the problem of the Lukan citations is not a simple one. While it is agreed generally that Luke used the LXX for many of his references to the OT, there is still no clear consensus concerning the origin of citations which do not match the LXX as we know it. Among all the voices raised with solutions to this problem the clearest is that of Holtz, the only one who gives a clear reason for the septuagintal nature of many of Luke’s citations and the non-septuagintal nature of many others. Holtz states that Luke preferred the LXX and that he only departed from the LXX when he had to, because his knowledge of the LXX was incomplete. When his source contained quotations from books of which he was unaware of the LXX version, he of necessity used the quotations as they were found in that source. This conclusion is neat and uncomplicated. Maybe too neat. Maybe too uncomplicated. It is this solution which I will investigate in this study.

A quite different approach to the Lukan citations may be noted briefly here. Holtz (81-82) briefly suggested the possibility that some Lukan citations owe their existence to a liturgical tradition of some sort. That possibility has received more detailed analysis by other scholars. For M. D. Goulder, the dominating factor in Luke’s use of the OT is liturgical (The Evangelist’s Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture [London: S.P.C.K., 1978] 17-18). Goulder wishes to assert that the whole Gospel of Luke, including the citations, was a liturgical Gospel written to be read in church worship (15), and that the citations in Luke’s Gospel reflect the Jewish lectionary cycles of Torah and prophetic readings (50, 106-111; by way of comparison, note should be taken of Mason’s comments [Preaching the Tradition, 258-260] on the supposed influence of the preaching of the second temple on Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Haggai, Zechariah and Malachi; cf. also Mason, "Some Echoes of the Preaching of the Second Temple? Traditional Elements in Zechariah 1-8," ZAW 96 [1984] 221-225). Goulder has recently applied his theories to the Gospel of Luke in a rather detailed manner (Luke: A New Paradigm [JSNTS 20; 2 vols.; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989]). C. Perrot seems to concur in this regard and affirms that Jesus’ reading of Isa. 61 in Luke 4 was included by Luke in order to legitimise the practice of liturgical reading in the Christian Church (“Luc 4,16-30 et la lecture biblique de l’ancienne synagogue,” RevSR 56 [1982] 337). K. J. Thomas further states that the citations ascribed to Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels were liturgical citations, and that the Gospel writers preserved these citations in a septuagintal form (“Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics,” NTS 22 [1975-1976] 213-214). The whole theory, however, is called into question by L. Crockett who asserts that it does not come to grips with the basic problems of the text and fails to take into account other factors which would explain the problems at least as well (“Luke iv.16-30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle: A Word of Caution,” JJS 17 [1966] 44-45). It certainly appears that the theory has little relevance for determining Luke’s knowledge and use of the LXX, especially in regard to the Lukan citations.
B. "Rhetorical Imitation"

The term "Rhetorical Imitation" was apparently coined by Thomas Brodie to indicate the imitation of existing literature by a specified writer, in this case the author Luke imitating the literature of the LXX. This imitation encompassed not only style, but content as well, as existing narratives were utilized, by adaptation, expansion, or internalization ("a shifting of focus from external attributes and actions to various qualities and developments that were more internal"), in the formation of new narratives. What resulted was a narrative in which the writer sought to emulate the writing on which he based his imitations. Brodie has shown that this form of imitation did occur in literature in the NT period, and since Luke appears to have been a literary Hellenistic writer, Brodie suggests that he may have used this method as well.

Brodie was not, however, the first to express this idea. David Strauss, in what Leonhard Goppelt calls a "monstrous exaggeration," considered that large portions of
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the Gospel narratives were fabrications by the Church based on the OT. Later, however, less "exaggerated" studies were conducted which lead to a similar result. In 1955 C. F. Evans published an article in which he argued that the non-Markan material in Luke 9:51-18:14 follows the Greek version of Deuteronomy in the "form of a journey to the borders of the promised land." Craig A. Evans has continued this line of reasoning by noting that the biblical idiom \( \text{oiv\delta} \tau\omicron \ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\omicron\varphi\omicron\nu \ \varepsilon\omicron\tau\omicron\rho\omicron\iota\omicron\omicron \tau\omicron \ \pi\omicron\rho\omicron\varepsilon\omicron\nu\sigma\theta\omicron\alpha \ \epsilon\omicron\varsigma \ \iota\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\omicron\sigma\alpha\lambda\eta\mu \), which begins this section in Luke, is based on LXX language. In a similar fashion, David Moessner has argued that the central section of Luke's Gospel contains a "Moses-Deut typology." He argues that the central Lukan section corresponds to the calling of Moses in Deuteronomy, and is introduced by 9:51 as a lens through which

the reader is able to focus the lights and shadows of the winding contour ahead as that of the journey of the Prophet Jesus whose calling and fate both recapitulate and consummate the career of Moses in Deuteronomy.
Moessner connects this type of rhetorically imitative narrative to "Luke’s penchant for the dynamic fulfillment of OT history which moves on into the mission of the church."\(^{80}\)

Reactions to the suggestion of C. F. Evans have not been entirely favourable, however. Richard Longenecker, for example, considers the evidence for the patterning of Luke 9:51-18:14 after Deut. 1-26 to be "highly inferential."\(^{81}\) C. H. Cave has further indicated that one of the key parables in the section, that of Lazarus and the rich man, has nothing whatsoever to do with Deuteronomy,\(^{82}\) and this may raise doubt as to the conclusion regarding rhetorical imitation here.

Other instances of rhetorical imitation have been found. Building on the "proof from prophecy" argument articulated by Paul Schubert,\(^{83}\) Nils Dahl has noted that throughout Luke-Acts "the story of Abraham is used as a vehicle for interpreting the gospel message and its significance,"\(^{84}\) and that Luke appears as an imitator of OT history in his narrative even to the point of imitating the language of the LXX.\(^{85}\) In this way he underscores his theme that the OT is being fulfilled in Jesus and the Church.
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\(^{85}\)Ibid, 142-143, 152-153; see also Moessner, *Lord of the Banquet*, 81-222.
Further evidence of rhetorical imitation has been found in the presence of "commissioning stories" in the Lukan writings. Benjamin J. Hubbard has concluded that the OT contains a "typical form or style of narrating commissioning accounts," and that Luke, "under the influence of the LXX," uses this form often in his narrative as a vehicle for his theology. A similar note has been struck by William S. Kurz regarding farewell speeches, who avers that Luke 22:14-38, among other passages, is formed according to the ancient pattern of literary farewell speeches, but that, rather than drawing his pattern from Greco-Roman farewell speeches, Luke "gave Luke 22 a 'biblical flavor' by alluding especially to Greek OT farewell speeches." He concludes that both I Kings (III Kgdms.) 2:1-10 and I Macc. 2:49-70 have had a special influence on the motifs, the structure and vocabulary of Luke 22.

There is yet more. Further rhetorical imitation may be found in the speeches in Luke-Acts, especially the Magnificat, Peter’s Pentecost sermon and Paul’s *Areopagus* speech. The nativity stories in Luke have also come under scrutiny as instances of
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88 Kurz, 268.

89 On the Magnificat, see e.g., the seminal study by A. von Harnack "Das Magnificat der Elisabeth (Luk 1.46-55) nebst einigen Bemerkungen zu Luk 1 und 2," *Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* (27; Berlin: 1900) 538-566; and the analysis of the question (with a somewhat negative conclusion) by S. Farris, *The Hymns of Luke’s Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance* (*JSNTS* (continued...))
rhetorical imitation. C. T. Ruddick, Jr., for example, has concluded that the framework and details of Luke’s nativity stories have been largely determined by the sequence of events in Gen. 27-43. We have already mentioned the work of M. D. Goulder who described Luke’s dominant motivation as liturgical and attributed the basis of certain details in the events portrayed by Luke to the OT. This may be another form of rhetorical imitation.

Probably the most thorough-going proponent of rhetorical imitation, however, is Thomas Brodie. Brodie is convinced that there is considerable evidence that "Luke generally imitated the LXX," not only in form and style, but in content as well. For example, while he agrees that Luke used sources in the composition of the account of Stephen’s martyrdom in Acts 6-7, he asserts that one of these sources is the OT episode of the accusing and stoning of Naboth (I Kings 21 [III Kgdms. 20]:8-13), which
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Luke has "deliberately adapted or distilled" for his purpose. Similarly, he finds that the stories of Simon and the Ethiopian (Acts 8:9-40) are modelled "largely, but not exclusively," on the story of Naaman and Gehazi (II Kings [IV Kgdms.] 5), that Luke 1-2 and 3-4:22 are complementary and involve a "rewriting" of II Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, in which Jesus takes the place of the temple and his gospel the place of the Law, that Luke 7:1-8:3 is especially indebted to the accounts of Elijah and Elisha, and, most recently, that the story of the saving of the centurion's servant in Luke 7:1-10 is based on the story of Elijah's saving of the widow and her child in I Kgs. 17:1-16.

There appears at first glance to be a great deal of evidence in favour of the theory of rhetorical imitation in Luke-Acts. The implications of this theory for Luke's knowledge of the LXX are great, in that he needed to know the LXX to have imitated it. The charge against the theory of being highly inferential, however, is not without foundation, and the whole theory needs to be evaluated. This theory involves the larger question of typology, and although some have denied to Luke a typological
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orientation, Goppelt has found evidence of typology in the Lukan writings. While the issue of typology itself goes beyond the scope of this study, it must be noted that if Luke was indeed aware of the typological method of interpretation of the OT, then it is reasonable that he would have used this method to some extent in interpreting the events of Jesus' life. In this way, it is not unlikely that Luke may have constructed his narrative with OT types in mind, and thus, consciously or unconsciously, used the LXX as a model for his story. This patterning clearly took place at the redactional level and would represent the orientation of Luke (using the name for the major redactor of Luke-Acts) rather than that of any sources.

For our purposes, the greatest problem with the whole idea of rhetorical imitation is the difficulty of establishing that the patterning of the stories reflects LXX influence and not simply an undefined remembrance of OT stories. Such proof must rest in part on linguistic evidence. But, as we shall soon see, the linguistic evidence is a problematic area for scholars. If, however, the passages which are considered to exhibit rhetorical imitation can be linked with reasonably clear OT allusions, especially linguistic allusions or implicit citations, then the case for rhetorical imitation would be strengthened. Interestingly enough W. K. L. Clarke suggested already in 1922 the influence of the

99e.g., Hanson, 87.

100Goppelt, Typos, 75-120; see also Moessner (Lord of the Banquet), who discusses typology extensively.

101Actually, the evaluation of the theory of rhetorical imitation also goes beyond the scope of this study. It does seem rather over-imaginative in many cases. I will, however, take note of any contribution this theory may make to the study of particular Lukan citations.
LXX on the narrative of Acts and determined that the parallels were by no means close. Clearly this whole area needs to be reevaluated.


Finally, there is the question of Luke's Greek. While it seems fairly clear that the LXX influenced the language of the NT, the Greek of Luke-Acts is particularly interesting because of its abrupt stylistic changes. Joseph A. Fitzmyer has noted that while the literary Greek of Luke's prologue shows that the author could have written his history in good literary Greek style, he did not do so, but rather adopted a much more Semitic style, especially in the infancy narratives, but also throughout his work. As to why Luke did this there are three different positions in the literature. The first
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102 Clarke, 103.

103 See e.g., M. Silva, Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics (Grand Rapids: Academie/Zondervan, 1983) 56-68. Silva surveys the early work done on LXX influence on the NT and concludes (68): "It appears then that, in spite of all our reservations, research into the LXX vocabulary is of fundamental importance for New Testament lexicology, not only with regard to theological terms (though foremost here), but also in connection with more general usages that may have affected certain stylistic decisions." See also C. Mohrmann, "Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church," VC 11 (1957) 25.

position may be described as the "Septuagintalism Theory," which basically asserts that Luke's Greek was influenced by the LXX, to the point that his Greek may be said to have been deliberately septuagintalized. The second position found in the literature is that Luke's Semitic Greek derives from his use of Semitic sources, whether Hebrew or Aramaic. The third position is that Luke owes his Semitic style to the "Jewish Greek" dialect commonly spoken, a dialect which he shared with the LXX. Let us look at these three theories a little more closely.

1. The Septuagintal Theory

For the septuagintal theory we begin again with W. K. L. Clarke. Clarke concluded that Luke-Acts exhibits a vocabulary more closely resembling that of the LXX for characteristic words and phrases than do other NT books. He studied the apocryphal books of the LXX especially, finding them a significant influence for Luke's Greek. The septuagintal theory really begins for modern scholars, however, with the work of H. F. D. Sparks. In 1943 Sparks published an article entitled "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel" in which he sought to answer the question: Why, if, as his prologue shows, Luke could write good Greek, did he nevertheless write the body of his work in a "curiously semitizing style"? He suggests three possible solutions to the problem: either (1) the Gospel, apart from the prologue, is a translation of a
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105Clarke, 69-73.
106Ibid, 73-80.
Semitic original, or (2) Luke used Semitic sources which either he or someone else translated, or (3) "he himself was consciously Semitizing." He concludes that the first solution must be incorrect as the two sources which we know Luke used for his Gospel are Mark and "Q", both of which were Greek. The latter two solutions, however, may both be correct to a certain degree. But if some of the Semitisms are attributable to sources, there are clearly a substantial number which can only be attributed to Luke himself.109

To account for Luke's Semitizing, therefore, one could suggest that his style derived from the Aramaic influence on the Greek spoken by the earliest Christians. But Sparks claims that there is little evidence of Aramaic influence on Luke's Greek; rather the influence appears to come from Biblical Hebrew, as it would if Luke were following a translation of Biblical Hebrew such as the LXX.110 Sparks lists five reasons for concluding that Luke's Greek is influenced by the LXX: (1) Luke normally quotes from the LXX, (2) the form of OT proper names in Luke are almost always identical to LXX forms, (3) Luke's characteristic vocabulary is largely explained as coming from the LXX, (4) a large number of Luke's most striking phrases have exact or very close parallels in the LXX, and (5) in a number of cases Luke has rephrased Mark to accord
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108Ibid. Sparks does not consider the possibility that Luke did not write either the prologue or the infancy narratives.


110Ibid, 132.
with LXX usage or in characteristically LXX language.\textsuperscript{111} He concludes in unequivocal terms:

This evidence is, I submit, conclusive. Granted that St. Luke was dependent upon Semitizing sources; granted also that he may have been influenced to a slight degree by the Semitic-Greek \textit{patois} of his Aramaic-speaking friends; the bulk of his Semitisms are to be ascribed to his reverence for, and imitation of, the LXX. They are, in fact, not 'Semitisms' at all, but 'Septuagintalisms'; and St. Luke himself was not a 'Semitizer,' but an habitual, conscious, and deliberate 'Septuagintalizer.'\textsuperscript{112}

In 1950 Sparks turned his attention to the Acts. He concluded that Luke-Acts is a unity and that the Semitisms occurring throughout the two books can be explained in the same way for Acts as for the Gospel.\textsuperscript{113} For the latter portion of Acts, the possibility of Aramaic influence is so small that the Semitisms found therein must be considered Septuagintalisms. And while some influence from Aramaic, and Aramaic-influenced Greek, may be found in the earlier portions of Acts, most Semitisms here are Septuagintalisms as well.\textsuperscript{114} Sparks further concludes that Luke chose to septuagintalize (more in one section of his work, less in another) for literary and theological reasons: "What more appropriate language therefore than the language of the Bible could anyone possibly choose as the main medium through which to present the manifestation of the Mystery?"

\textsuperscript{111}Ibid, 133-134.
\textsuperscript{112}Ibid, 134.
\textsuperscript{113}Sparks, "The Semitisms of the Acts," \textit{JTS} NS 1 (1950) 22.
\textsuperscript{114}Ibid, 22-26.
\textsuperscript{115}Ibid, 27.
Reaction to Sparks has been mixed. Generally approving statements are to be found in many critical works on Luke-Acts.\(^{116}\) Joseph Fitzmyer has largely followed Sparks's conclusions in his well-known commentary, concluding that LXX influence is usually the best explanation for most so-called Semitisms in Luke.\(^{117}\) Those, of course, espousing other theories tend to regard Sparks with a certain disfavour.\(^{118}\) However, William G. Most has more specifically called into question Sparks's assertion that Luke consciously imitated the LXX. He notes that Luke uses the apodictic καὶ and καὶ ἐγένετο too infrequently to be imitating the LXX (which uses these constructions very frequently indeed).\(^{119}\)

In 1940, and apparently independently from Sparks, Albert Wifstrand published an article which supports unequivocally the influence of the LXX on Luke-Acts.\(^{120}\) Wifstrand points out that Luke is uninterested in preserving or creating Semitisms as such, since in places he removes these from the Markan material which he uses. Rather, Wifstrand argues that the Semitisms which occur are the result of deliberate borrowing

---


\(^{118}\)E.g., Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 16-19.


\(^{120}\)Wifstrand, "Lukas och Septuaginta," *STK* 16 (1940) 243-262; I would here like to thank my thesis supervisor Dr. Stephen Westerholm for directing me to this article and summarizing it for me. Without his help I would not have been able to understand Wifstrand at all, since Swedish is worse than "all Greek to me."
from the LXX. He goes on to point out many instances where the language of Luke can only be septuagintal, as words and phrases are used in ways not otherwise attested in earlier Greek literature. He concludes, like Sparks, that Luke was attempting to give his work an elevated, uplifting style, by imitating the language of the holy history of the Greek OT, and thus causing his work to partake of that same "radiance." This article appears to have been largely ignored by scholars (perhaps the language it is written in has something to do with this), but its points need to be considered in assessing Luke’s knowledge of the LXX.

Many characteristics of Luke’s Greek, then, can be understood as "imitation Greek," at least in the opinions of Sparks and Wifstrand. Other scholars, however, do not consider the theory of "imitation Greek" to be sufficient to account for the Semitisms in Luke and Acts. Therefore, let us note what other theories have been advanced to account for Luke’s Greek.

2. Semitic Sources

C. C. Torrey, while certainly not the first to suggest a Semitic basis for Luke’s Greek, provides a convenient starting place in examining theories of Semitic sources for Luke-Acts. Torrey noted that the Greek of the first half of Acts (1-15) is completely different from that of the second half. Whereas the first half is full of Semitisms, the
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second half is relatively free of them. To account for this difference between the two halves of Acts Torrey suggested what he termed the "one obvious and satisfactory way of accounting for this fact, namely the hypothesis of translation in the first half." He goes on to show evidence of translation in the early chapters of Acts by noting what he considers to be mistranslations of original Aramaic expressions and other Semitic-sounding words and phrases. He concludes that the first half of Acts was originally an Aramaic document which Luke found and translated, and then completed by his own composing of the second half of Acts. Luke did not, however, alter the original document in any way, even where he felt it to be mistaken (cf. e.g., Acts 1:3 and Luke 24; Acts 1:4 and Luke 3:16). Thus, for the first part of Acts, it would be wrong to speak of Luke as an author.

While it has been recently stated that the argument of Torrey is still "holding up well" in the scholarly community, Torrey has drawn a good deal of criticism. F. C. Burkitt replied quickly to Torrey by asserting that the cases which he lists as mistranslations are not necessarily so and may be explained from the Greek as easily as from an Aramaic source. As well, he notes that Luke tends to use the LXX in the early chapters of Acts (especially noting James’s speech in Acts 15), and that the title παλαιός

---


125Ibid, 10-12.


127Ibid, 40.

θεοῦ, so predominant in the early chapters of Acts, is only possible with its full theological value in Greek, and would have been inadequate in Aramaic. Similarly, E. J. Goodspeed has failed to find the sharp transition at Acts 15:36 which is implied in Torrey's theory, and has noted that the "supposedly untranslatable passages," which Torrey points to as indicative of mistranslations, are not at all confined to the first part of Acts. Finally he notes that there are no existing Aramaic or Hebrew documents similar to Acts from the first century to which we may refer in comparison. H. J. Cadbury has noted a number of stylistic arguments which explain the stylistic shifts in Acts equally as well as Torrey's theory. Sparks has objected, in addition, that not only are LXX citations found in the early part of Acts but also the LXX background and influence is seen throughout; and the Semitisms in the latter portion of Acts, as well as the unity of themes, presuppose an original unity to the whole book.

In spite of these criticisms the theory has not died. Torrey himself attempted to answer his critics, with reasonable success, and a number of scholars have used the theory as a basis for their own investigations into Aramaic sources. Into this stream of turbulent scholarship in 1946 broke Matthew Black's famous monograph, An Aramaic
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131 Cadbury, "Luke—Translator or Author?" AIT 24 (1920) 436-455.


Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Although stressing similar conclusions, Black is conservative when compared with Torrey. While he notes Aramaic influence on all the Gospels and Acts he only suggests Aramaic sources for small portions. For the Lukan writings he suggests that the only likely places for Aramaic sources are the words of Jesus, the first two chapters of the Gospel and the speeches of Peter and Stephen in the Acts. The book was later republished in its third edition and has had some more recent criticism levelled at it, but on the whole remains very influential. That the words of Jesus were originally Aramaic has been largely accepted in the scholarly community, although the possibility that Jesus may have spoken a form of Hebrew similar to that of the Mishnah is not ruled out. The infancy narratives are fruitful ground for speculation about sources. Paul Winter has written prolifically on the infancy narratives in Luke and has come to the conclusion that they could not have been written by a Gentile such as Luke without access to Jewish literary sources, and considers the


138 See, e.g., Black (1967), 47-50. On the whole question see J. Barr, "Which Language Did Jesus Speak?--Some Remarks of a Semitist," *BJRL* 53 (1970-1971) 9-29. Barr concludes (29) that while the possibility of Jesus having spoken a form of Hebrew is not out of the question, "it seems likely that his language was Aramaic, or that he spoke more Aramaic than he spoke Hebrew." See also Jeremias, "Die aramäische Vorgeschichte unserer Evangelien," *TLZ* 74 (1949):527-531. For an example of a thoroughgoing approach to the teaching of Jesus on the basis of Aramaic as the original language, see Jeremias (New Testament Theology [London: S.C.M., 1971]).
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underlying document or documents to have been Hebrew. This conclusion is widely accepted. Similarly, Acts 3 and 7 have often been regarded as drawing upon early sources.

While Black was relatively conservative in his conclusions, his student Max Wilcox was less so. Where Black found only a few instances of Aramaic sources, Wilcox, dealing only with Acts, found many more. Although rejecting Torrey’s view that Luke translated a great deal of Aramaic or Hebrew material, and acknowledging the presence of septuagintalisms in the text, he notes a great number of Semitisms which are not to be explained as septuagintalisms, and which point to traditional material from the


early days of the Church which Luke used. Much of this material may have come from oral tradition; however, he suggests that parts of the speeches of Paul at Pisidian Antioch, Stephen and others likely came from written sources. He states that these sources, while originally Aramaic, may have attained a fixed form in Greek by the time Luke used them.\textsuperscript{142} As we have noted, Wilcox’s theory has received a good deal of criticism,\textsuperscript{143} but in spite of that his conclusions are still respected among many scholars.\textsuperscript{144}

But even Wilcox appears conservative beside some of the more thoroughgoing attempts at demonstrating the use of Aramaic or Hebrew sources by Luke and the other evangelists. Recently Frank Zimmerman, building on the work of Torrey, Black, Wilcox and others, has concluded that the four Gospels (and the first portion of the Acts) represent the translation of underlying Aramaic documents.\textsuperscript{145} He uses methods common to the earlier researchers to discern that a "proto-Syriac" dialect, as he terms it, was the original language of the Gospels which were later translated into Greek.\textsuperscript{146} Zimmerman’s analysis appears somewhat strained. He has, to be sure, found evidence of Aramaisms in the Gospel accounts, but whether the evidence justifies such a wholesale

\textsuperscript{142}Wilcox, Semitisms, 184.

\textsuperscript{143}E.g., Emerton, 296-297; see also Kilpatrick, "Language and Text," 161-171.


\textsuperscript{145}Zimmerman, 22.

\textsuperscript{146}Ibid, 20-23.
commitment to Aramaic original documents is certainly questionable. His conclusion is without doubt a creative one, and in case one is tempted to regard all the above research as mere scholarly pedantry, I would point out that the question of an Aramaic document underlying the NT Gospels was brought to popular attention through Irving Wallace’s novel *The Word*, which is based on the fictional discovery of just such a document. Alas, such a document has never been discovered outside of fiction (even in the novel the document turned out to be a forgery), and the existence of an Aramaic original for the Gospels and Acts remains in the realm of speculation.

Advocates of Semitic sources have, as we have seen, been insistent that their evidence demonstrates the existence of such sources underlying Luke-Acts. The demonstration of the existence of hypothetical sources, however, has always been fraught with pitfalls, as the history of the Synoptic Problem amply demonstrates. It is so difficult to demonstrate a hypothetical source that it is usual among scholars (perhaps with the exception of the two-source hypothesis for the Synoptic Problem) to try to find a simpler adequate explanation of the data. When all is said and done the only certain result issuing from the research into Semitic sources behind Luke-Acts is that there is certainly some form of Semitic influence on these writings. And there is yet one more theory to consider.

---

147. Wallace, *The Word* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1971); I recommend this book for Biblical scholars who have lost touch with the excitement and challenge inherent in their field of study.
3. Jewish Greek

While suggested earlier by a number of other scholars, Nigel Turner has been perhaps the most vigorous proponent of the theory that Luke "owes little of his Semitic style to his sources, and more to the peculiar language of Biblical or Jewish Greek which he shared with the LXX."148 In an essay entitled "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts," Turner concludes:

We do not think it needed much conscious effort for St. Luke to write in what merely looks like a LXX style, because it was Jewish Greek; this was his natural speech, and he was expert enough to make it sound quite classical at times.149

Clearly, then, for Turner, Luke freely composed the narrative of Luke-Acts in his own accustomed style. Turner thinks that Luke may have become acquainted with this Semitic style of spoken Greek through his association with Paul,150 and that its Semitic qualities formed part of a distinctive primitive Christian language spoken by Luke's colleagues.151 Turner has even applied his theory to the infancy narratives,152 for which he is taken to task by Paul Winter.153


149Ibid, 400.


151Turner, Style, 62.


What can be said about such a theory? The reaction of the scholarly community to Turner's thesis has been guardedly critical. While some\textsuperscript{154} express approval of Turner's work, most are less than happy with it. Lorenz Nieting, for example, notes that while Turner's thesis regarding Aramaic influence on the language of the NT is "safe enough," his overall approach to language is out of date.\textsuperscript{155} Edgar McKnight considers the whole concept of Jewish Greek "a questionable presupposition."\textsuperscript{156} Perhaps "a questionable presupposition" is the best one can say of this theory. A hypothetical language seems to be at least as elusive as a hypothetical source, perhaps more so. It appears to be a position which is incapable of proof or disproof, as no evidence really exists for this Jewish-Greek language outside of the NT and the LXX. And to use the data to be explained as evidence for the hypothesis presented to explain them seems circular reasoning at best. Turner's suggestion, however, that Luke's Septuagintalisms may not have been such conscious or deliberate imitations, as asserted by Sparks, is one that merits further scrutiny, although, again, beyond the scope of this study.

In looking over the results of scholarship regarding the character of Luke's Greek we find ourselves in a Sargasso Sea of conflicting evidence and scholarly opinion. To attempt to sort through the mass of data and come up with a solution seems a monstrous task and, thankfully, is not the purpose of the present study. What is clear, however,

\textsuperscript{154}E.g., Burchard, 295, n. 55.


is that the situation regarding the composition of Luke-Acts is extremely complex, and it is more likely that Sparks was right in ascribing Lukan style to a variety of factors (Sparks specifically mentions the above three theories)\textsuperscript{157} than to one theory exclusively.

One clear advance comes from Wifstrand. In finding words and phrases in Luke-Acts undoubtedly drawn from the LXX, he makes a clear case for Luke’s dependence on the LXX. Such a conclusion is valuable for our study. Wifstrand’s evidence suggests that we may not be speaking merely of Semitic phrases here, but of allusions to Biblical material, and specifically LXX material. This appears to provide evidence for Luke’s intimate knowledge of the LXX, and is clearly an approach worthy of further examination.

D. **The Methodology of the Present Study**

We have now come to the end of our brief survey. Clearly we have not dealt with the entire volume of scholarship presented on these subjects over the years, but we trust that our survey has been largely representative. If anything is clear at the end of this survey it is that nothing is clear. The picture is complex and it is probably best to regard it as complex, rather than oversimplifying the evidence. One voice in the above babel has made a clear conclusive statement, at least regarding the LXX. And that is Traugott Holtz. Holtz’s position that Luke used the LXX when he knew it, and that when he did not know it he used other sources, would seem to answer at least the

\begin{footnote}{Sparks, "St. Luke’s Gospel," 134.}
\end{footnote}
question why Luke’s citations at times appear septuagintal and at times do not. Holtz’s answer to this question, that Luke was familiar with only very little of the LXX, however, needs to be evaluated.

It would be ideal of course to expand and augment Holtz’s study by taking account not merely of the Lukan citations, but also of possible biblical allusions, and to evaluate the whole area of rhetorical imitation, and the nature of Luke’s Greek. Such an enterprise, however, would take a great deal of time and space, and is not practical in this particular study. On the other hand, a reexamination of the Lukan citations places us on very firm ground for evaluating Luke’s knowledge of the LXX. The citations clearly reflect OT material. What needs to be ascertained, however, is whether they reflect LXX material, and if so, whether a case can be made that it is Luke himself who is using the LXX citations.

One problem, however, which does impinge on this study is that of differentiating between an allusion and a citation. Krister Stendahl, in his study of the OT citations in Matthew has defined "strict quotations" as:

those passages introduced by a formula, and . . . those which, although lacking such formula, are nevertheless conscious quotations, judging from the context, or which agree verbatim with some passage in the O.T. in its Greek or Hebrew form.

Dietrich-Alex Koch has further elaborated on the methodology of discerning citations and allusions. He lists six further principles in determining that a reference to the OT is a

---


citation rather than an allusion: one can assume that the OT reference is a citation when (1) the same OT passage is quoted verbatim in close proximity to the passage under scrutiny (e.g. Rom. 4:3 and 22); (2) the author adds a clearly indicated interpretation to the OT reference; (3) the wording of the OT passage is not integrated syntactically into the NT context; (4) the wording of the OT passage can be distinguished stylistically from the present context; (5) the author marks the passage by a linguistic emphasis (e.g., υποσκόπη [Rom. 10:18], γε [Gal. 3:11], ἀλλὰ [Rom. 9:7], or an inserted γάρ [Rom. 10:13] or δὲ [II Cor. 10:17]); (6) it is a question of a sentence or saying which belongs to the culture or tradition of the author and reader.\footnote{Koch, 13-15.} Stringently applied, the above principles would likely cause many of the citations dealt with by Holtz and others to be characterized rather as allusions. Koch's point (6), on the other hand, taken by itself, would characterize many generally recognized allusions as citations. Certainly Koch's criteria allow for more direct citations of the OT in the NT than do Stendahl's. We are left then with a problem. Emerton has argued that "it is very questionable how far it is legitimate to use allusions to, or echoes of, the Old Testament, as distinct from direct quotations," in determining which text of the OT Luke used.\footnote{Emerton, 284.} If Emerton is correct, then it is important which criteria we use in examining Luke's citations. Furthermore, as Luke appears to be an active editor, do we classify all OT references in which Luke has made alterations as allusions? We would then be left with very little to work with.
Clearly Luke does alter the wording of many OT passages generally accepted as citations (as a reading of Clarke and Holtz demonstrates). Contrary to Emerton, however, this does not necessarily mean that the passage is of little value as evidence for which text Luke used. Rather, each passage must be examined to determine if the underlying text can be adduced. If there is enough data in the passage under discussion to determine its origin, then it is of value as evidence, whether it is an allusion or a direct quotation.

I have taken as my basic indicator of generally accepted OT citations those listed in the *UBSGNT3* Index of Quotations, and this seems to accord well with the work of Holtz, Swete, Clarke and others who will be mentioned in the course of the study. I am, however, aware that a number of these could be construed as major or extended allusions. My criteria for classifying a passage as an allusion or a citation within this group generally coincide with those of Stendahl, with one important modification. I look for *enough* verbatim agreement to indicate a high probability that Luke was citing the OT passage directly. Admittedly this involves a matter of judgement on my part rather than the application of a few rules. It does, however, allow for more recognition of Luke’s creativity in handling OT material, and moreover allows one to ask the further question: Is there *enough* data to determine with any probability which text of the OT Luke was using? The latter question is the important one for this study.
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As Holtz has already dealt with the citations in some detail, I will of necessity depend a great deal on his work, although I will not simply duplicate it, but will attempt to reevaluate it on the basis of current knowledge of the LXX text and my own research, taking into account how, in certain instances, the theories of rhetorical imitation and the nature of Luke's Greek impinge on the study of particular citations. Clearly, as I have noted, Holtz's methodology is sound in its general approach of examining the citations according to their OT source. Thus he first examines the citations from the Minor Prophets, then those from Isaiah, then from the Psalms, and then from the Pentateuch. Since the textual tradition of the LXX differs from book to book, this method allows one to ascertain which textual tradition of the particular section of the OT Luke is following. Furthermore, it allows one to speculate upon which books Luke knew and which he did not. This method will be followed in this study, with one major difference. Holtz, as I noted above, divides the Lukan citations into those which are "selbständig" and those which are not. He thus appears to have determined the issue before starting his investigation. I prefer to proceed more inductively, and leave the determination of which citations are independent quotations, and which are not, till I have examined the evidence. This is not to say that Holtz did not proceed with his research inductively, but merely to comment on writing procedure.

The fact that the Gospel of Luke is one of the Synoptic Gospels, and partakes of the Synoptic inter-relatedness, adds further problems of methodology. In the major hypotheses proposed for the resolution of the Synoptic Problem, it is recognized that Luke used at least one of the other Gospels as a source: for the two source hypothesis,
Mark and "Q"; for the Augustinian position, Mark and Matthew; and for the Griesbach hypothesis, simply Matthew. Thus the Lukan citations can be divided into two further groups: those citations which Luke shares with Mark, Matthew or "Q", and those which appear in his own distinctive material (which I will refer to as "L" with Streeter).

Although all the citations will be examined, the main emphasis will be placed on Lukan citations which are not shared with other Gospels, since these are more likely to reflect Luke's own use of Scripture than those in which it is recognized that he may be using a source. Also, the citations from the Pentateuch will be the focus of more thorough investigation than the others, because it is the Lukan derivation of these citations from the LXX which is questioned by Holtz. But all the Lukan citations need to be examined, not just those deriving from the Pentateuch. The reason for this is twofold. First of all, we need to see the way material from books which it is acknowledged that Luke knew and used is cited by Luke in order to compare his methodological pattern regarding that material with his pattern of citation of the Pentateuchal material. Secondly, we need to consider the instances in which does not cite the LXX of these books, in order to discern why he did not use the LXX when it is certain that he knew it.

While earlier research has for the most part determined which citations are virtually septuagintal and which citations deviate from the LXX text as we know it, the above-mentioned advances in the knowledge of LXX textual history have opened the door to further work in this area and some refinements of the earlier work may need to be made. The researches of Dominique Barthélemy and others have suggested the
possibility that Luke may have been using a proto-Aquila Greek text, based on the LXX but characterized by a Hebraicizing tendency.\textsuperscript{163} Such a text may include significant variations from the LXX. Hence, one of the purposes of this study is to determine what evidence there is for Luke's use of Greek texts with such a Hebraicizing tendency.

A further question that needs to be answered has to do with the nature of the traditional material that Luke uses. By "traditional" material I am referring to OT material which Luke, however, did not derive from the OT directly, but from another source, whether the latter source was citing the LXX or not. The question which needs to be asked is: What sort of traditional material is Luke using and how does he approach it? Since we know that Luke is using sources (such as Mark and "Q") for his composition of the Gospel, we can be certain that he uses traditional material there. Hence, the Gospel material is useful for understanding Luke's method and purpose in citing traditional material.

Thus, we will proceed in this fashion: as far as the Mark and "Q" material is concerned, we shall compare the parallel citations in Matthew and Mark to determine if Luke is more or less septuagintal than his sources, and will attempt an explanation for cases in which he appears to be less septuagintal. In cases where he is more septuagintal, it is likely that he is bringing his sources into closer approximation to the

\textsuperscript{163}This latter possibility has been suggested for a verse not generally considered a citation. R. E. Brown ("The Meaning of the Manger: The Significance of the Shepherds," Wor 50 [1976]:533-534) has suggested that the census of Luke 2:1 is a reference to Ps. 87:6 as it appears in Origen's Quinta: "In the census of the peoples, this one will be born there." He further suggests that Luke is referring to an early recension of the Greek, "parallel to the kaige revision of the LXX." While we may not wish to be too quick to accept Brown's conclusion here, the door is definitely opened for Luke's possible use of such a recension.
LXX translation. If a pattern of "septuagintalizing" can be established, it will add to the evidence of the influence of that version on Luke. It is interesting to note in this regard the conclusion of A. W. Argyle that it is a feature of OT quotes in "Q" that they are not cited according to the LXX. Therefore, if Luke's version of a "Q" citation is more septuagintal than Matthew's, it may show Luke's septuagintalizing of his source (although, since we do not have "Q" before us, we do not know whether Matthew has altered his version of the "Q" citation). In this regard, while we will accept as a working premise the two source hypothesis of Synoptic origins, we will make mention of how adherence to one of the other theories would affect our conclusions.

Finally, since it appears that Luke, like other NT writers, tends to adapt the OT to particular needs and contexts, it is a reasonable assumption that Luke may have altered the text for his own reasons. Thus, not only will theological and redactional considerations be employed in attempting to understand the reasons for any of Luke's deviations from the LXX in his citations, but we will be interested to know just how much editorial activity Luke engages in in his citation of the OT.

In summary, then, the aims of this study are fourfold: to ascertain, if possible, the extent of Luke's knowledge of the LXX, to determine what sorts of traditional material Luke uses, and how he uses it, to ascertain the extent of possible influence by

---


a Hebraicizing tendency in the LXX mss on Luke's citations, and to understand to what extent Luke's redactional activity is responsible for the final form of the Lukan citations.

Without further ado, then, let us look at Luke's citations.
CHAPTER TWO

THE CITATIONS FROM THE MINOR PROPHETS

Luke quotes from the Minor Prophets in six instances throughout Luke-Acts, once in what appears to be "Q" material, once in "L" material and four times in Acts. He quotes twice from Amos, and once each from Hosea, Joel, Habakkuk, and Malachi.¹

A. "Q" Citation: Luke 7:27 = Mal. 3:1 (+ Ex. 23:20)

In this passage we have a classic example of a fused citation. It is found in all three synoptic Gospels (parallel in Mark 1:2; Matt. 11:10). At first glance (according to the two source hypothesis) one would be tempted to ascribe the quotation to Mark. But a closer look shows that Luke received this citation from the "Q" tradition (or from Matthew, if one does not follow the two source hypothesis). In Mark the citation occurs in his introduction to John the Baptist's ministry, while in Matthew and Luke it appears in the speech of Jesus after the visit by messengers from John, asking if Jesus was the one expected. Also the wording of the citation in Luke and Matthew is identical (except for the omission of ἐγὼ by Luke), while Mark omits the final ἔμπροσθεν σου recorded by the other two accounts. Thus, it is likely that Luke has taken this citation largely from the "Q" tradition.² It may be that he had both traditions before him and omitted the ἐγὼ to bring the citation more into conformity with that found in Mark. One who

¹All translations of extensive excerpts of biblical material in this study, unless otherwise indicated, are from the RSV. All translations of individual words and short phrases, unless otherwise indicated, are my own.

²This conclusion is supported by the manner in which Kurt Aland presents the passages in SFG, 98.
argues that Luke used only Matthew and not Mark (the Griesbach hypothesis) would have to assume that Luke removed the ἐγώ for his own reasons, perhaps to shift the emphasis from the speaker to the one of whom he is speaking.  

That the citation is fused is clearly seen from the substitution of ἀποστέλλω from Ex. 23:20 for ἐπανομήστελλω as found in Malachi, and the changing of the pronoun μον to σου.  

Stendahl and Holtz both tentatively conclude that the fusion of the two texts can be best explained by assuming that testimonia were used by the authors of Mark and "Q".  

Clearly Luke found this citation as it is in his source and did not alter it (except perhaps for the omission of ἐγώ).

Regarding the citation's relationship to the LXX, Swete concluded that it was septuagintal.  

It appears, then, that the LXX has read the Hebrew word as qal of "put out of the way" or "make clear"; however, the root ἓς ἔσται in the qal means to "turn" or to "turn and look." It appears, then, that the LXX has read the Hebrew word as qal

---

3But see also J. Marcus (The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark [Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1992] 15-17) who argues that the form of the citation in Mark is a result of Mark's redactional activity on the "Q" tradition. Thus, in his view, Matthew and Luke are independently citing the "Q" tradition, without reference to Mark, while Mark cites the "Q" tradition as well, making alterations to it. This analysis seems to be a departure from all three mainstream positions on source criticism of the Synoptics.

4See Stendahl, 49-50.

5Ibid, 51-53; Holtz, 27; see also Marcus, 15-17.

6Swete, 387.

7BDB, 815.
while the Synoptic citation, like the MT, has read it as piel. It is the sort of confusion that could easily have come about through the translation of an unpointed Hebrew text. Interestingly enough, Aquila employs the term ἀποσκευάσεις, a term etymologically closer to the NT citation than to the LXX. NT κατασκευάσεις may thus be evidence for the use of a LXX text that has undergone some Hebraicizing, although there is no evidence at this point for such a tendency elsewhere in the LXX tradition.9 Also, ἐμπροσθῆν (with the first person singular μου changed to second person singular σου for contextual reasons, as well as influence from Ex. 23:20)10 is as good a translation of the Hebrew וַעֲדַיָּן as the rather literalistic LXX πρὸς προσώπον μου.11 One would expect, however, if the Gospel citation is derived from a LXX text of Malachi with a Hebraicizing tendency, that the more literalistic LXX formula would have been maintained. Hence the evidence for a LXX ms that has been Hebraicized is rather equivocal.12

It is perhaps better to conclude that the citation is not septuagintal at all, unless we accept a septuagintal base that has been modified by conflation with Exodus, contextual adaptation, and Hebraicizing elements. In any case, if Luke knew the LXX of the Minor Prophets (and even Holtz agrees that he did), we must explain why he has

---

9GottLXX13, Mal. 3:1.

9See ibid.

10Context also probably accounts for the insertion of the extra σου after ἄδοντος.

11See BAG, 256.

12Note that Barthélemy (84, n. 1) has characterized the kaige equivalent of וַעֲדַיָּן as ἐνώτιον, not ἐμπροσθῆν or the more literal πρὸς προσώπον μου.
not corrected the citation which he found in his sources toward the LXX. It is of course possible that his ms of the LXX read κατασκευάσει (and perhaps εὑροσθέν), although there is no firm textual basis for this supposition. If not, and the "Q" citation which Luke had before him indeed disagreed with his LXX text, can we suggest reasons why he did not alter it?

Two suggestions can be made. First of all, the LXX version of this text is less amenable for use in the context than is the "Q" citation. Even if Luke revered the LXX, he would not likely exchange a clearly applicable word (κατασκευάσει) for one that, in the context, was less useful (ἐπιβλεψεται). Secondly, and more importantly, this citation, at least in the "Q" material, is part of the words of Jesus. It is to be noted that the narrative portions of the Synoptic Gospels tend to vary more than the logia portions, and this is true also of Luke. Hence it is likely that the words of Jesus were particularly important for the writers of the Synoptic Gospels. Thus passing on the tradition of what Jesus said would have been more important for Luke at this point than simply citing the LXX.

In summary, then, the citation of Luke 7:27 is a traditional citation which Luke has picked up from his source ("Q" or Matthew) without any significant redaction on his part. It does not appear to be from the LXX. Whether it represents an Hebraicizing

---

13 See Lategan, 95-103.

Greek recension is impossible to say because of the scarcity and equivocal nature of the evidence.

B. "L" Citation: Luke 23:30 = Hos. 10:8

This citation occurs in Luke's special material, and although Hanson suggests that it corresponds to Matt. 27:25, the only verbal correspondence appears to be ἔφ' ἡμᾶς which seems too little evidence on which to build any relationship. The citation is basically septuagintal except that the words καλύψατε and πέσετε are transposed and the LXX has πέσετε instead of πέσετε. The latter variant is of no consequence. The former, however, may be significant. Some mss of the LXX (including A) have the words in the same order as in Luke, although the general consensus is that these mss have been influenced by the NT at this point. Helmer Ringgren likely represents the majority view when he concludes that Luke is probably quoting from memory and notes the same phenomenon of transposition elsewhere (Isa. 2:4 and Mic. 4:3). Holtz, however, has a different suggestion to make. He notes the similar citation in Rev. 6:16, in which the word order is the same as in our citation, and concludes that in the first century there must have existed a form of the LXX in which this word order was found.

---

15Hanson, 88.
16It is to be noted, however, that codex Alexandrinus and a great number of LXX mss read πέσετε with Luke 23:30; see GottLXX13 and RahlfsLXX, Hos. 10:8.
17See GottLXX13, Hos. 10:8. "Influence from the NT" indicates that LXX scribes have consciously or unconsciously corrected the LXX ms before them according to its form in a NT citation.
This variant text, according to Holtz, was found in Luke’s LXX.\textsuperscript{19} We must note, however, that if Luke used such a ms, it could not have been a Hebraicizing ms as the word order of the MT agrees with the LXX against both Luke and Revelation,\textsuperscript{20} although Rev. 6:16, hardly more than an allusion to Hosea, has κρύψατε instead of καλύψατε.

We are left, then, with this conclusion: Luke used the LXX for this passage and the deviation can be ascribed either to loose citation or to a variant text of the LXX, albeit not a Hebraicizing text. The evidence for a textual variant is not entirely convincing, but the possibility remains. Similarly, the changing of πέσατε to πέσετε may indicate loose citation, but there is textual evidence for the latter reading in the LXX tradition (see n. 16). Clearly, however, Luke used the LXX, citing either a variant form, or the LXX loosely.

\textsuperscript{19}Holtz, 28.

\textsuperscript{20}Compare BHS with GottLXX13, Hos. 10:8.
C. Acts Citations


This citation is listed by Clarke as a "free version of the LXX,"21 and appears to be regarded generally as having been made from memory.22/ Divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts has ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέρας instead of μετὰ ταῦτα; (2) Acts adds λέγει ὁ θεός; (3) the phrases καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι ὑμῶν ἐνύπνια (Acts reads ἐνυπνίοις) ἐνυπνιασθήσονται and καὶ οἱ νεανίσκοι ὑμῶν ὀράσεις δύονται are transposed in Acts; (4) Acts reads καὶ γε instead of a simple καὶ before ἐπὶ τούς δούλους; (5) Acts adds the pronoun μον after δούλους and δούλας; (6) Acts adds the phrase καὶ προφητεύσουσιν after ἐκχεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου; and (7) Acts adds ἐνω after τῷ ὀφρανῷ and σημεῖα before and κάτω after ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς. I shall examine these one by one.

Regarding point (1), it is to be noted that certain mss of Acts, B and 076 being the main ones, read μετὰ ταῦτα with the LXX here.23 This is generally thought to have been the result of an Alexandrian corrector who attempted to bring the citation into conformity with the LXX.24 The prevailing view, however, has been challenged by G. D. Kilpatrick, who considers the LXX reading to be more difficult here, since "in the last days" fits better in the narrative, and thus would less likely have been altered by a

---

21Clarke, 88-89.
22See Bruce, Acts (1951), 89; Ringgren, 233.
copyist than the more vague "after these things." Ernst Haenchen has also argued that
the phrase "in the last days" is inconsistent with Lukan eschatology and is thus probably
secondary. Holtz follows these two scholars, and is in turn followed by Rese, concluding that the phrase "in the last days" is a formula of the sub-apostolic church, and
its reading here dates from that time.

The external evidence, however, is strongly weighted toward ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, and it is difficult to understand why, if μετὰ τῶν ἡμῶν were the original reading, there is not more evidence for it in the textual tradition. Furthermore, Franz Mussner has challenged Haenchen, and by inference Holtz, on this issue, concluding that Lukan eschatology is not compromised by the phrase "in the last days"; rather the phrase fits well the eschatology evident in the immediate context of the speech in Acts 2.

While he seems to agree with Mussner on the question of eschatology, Holtz still argues that the phrase is an insertion from the later church.

---


27 Rese, 51-52.

28 Holtz, 7-8.

29 See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 295.

30 See Bock, 161.

31 F. Mussner, "'In den letzten Tagen' (Apg 2,17a)," BZ (1961) 264; note that this is the same argument used by Kilpatrick to argue that "in the last days" is secondary (see "Some Quotations," 82).

32 Holtz, 7.
In any case, the assumption must be that the origin of this portion of the citation is the LXX. The change from μετὰ ταῦτα to ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις, if not a later scribal alteration, must then have come from Luke himself. If it is not simply a case of quoting loosely from memory, but involves deliberate alteration, there are two possible reasons for it. Longenecker suggests that Luke (or Peter) alters the quotation to heighten the aspect of fulfilment, an emphasis for which Luke is noted. Goppelt, on the other hand, sees in this quotation a mixed citation in which the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις is interpolated from Isa. 2:2. Either of these solutions is possible and does not challenge the fact that Luke is using the LXX.

The addition of λέγει ὁ θεός (2) is probably not an alteration in the citation at all, but rather reflects Luke’s (or Peter’s) introduction to the citation. Thus, in v. 16 he states that the citation is from the prophet Joel, and in v. 17 asserts its divine origin. It can be classified, then, as a theologically motivated addition, necessitated by the new context.

Point (3) above, the transposition of the two clauses, can be seen either as evidence of quoting from memory, or as a stylistic alteration to improve the flow of

---

33Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 100.
35Goppelt, Typos, 118 n. 66.
36Holz, 5-6; see Bock, 161, 244 n. 25.
37As e.g., Ringgren, 233.
the sequence. Either of the above suggestions would serve until a better one is found, but the stylistic change is quite in keeping with Luke’s handling of his sources.

The substitution of the dative ἐνυπνίος for accusative ἐνυπνία is another matter. Here the weight of the external evidence of the LXX textual tradition would seem to favour the dative in the Joel text, which includes most of the Alexandrian tradition. Both Ziegler and Rahlfs, however, consider this reading to have been influenced by the Acts passage. In favour of the dative reading as original in Joel we may note, in addition to the weight of textual evidence, the fact that this is the more difficult reading (the verb ἐνυπνίαξω normally takes the accusative and the LXX commonly renders this verb with the accusative). Hence, it is not unlikely that Luke may have had the dative in his ms of the LXX. If, on the other hand, he had the accusative in his ms, what reason could there be for Luke to change cases here? Holtz rightly argues that it is highly unlikely that Luke did not know the correct usage of this word. Bock rather feebly suggests a stylistic alteration, but for what reason can hardly even be guessed. Nigel Turner, on the other hand, has suggested that the dative here shows evidence of the influence of the Hebrew infinitive absolute, producing, in Greek, the cognate dative

---

38 As e.g., Bock, 162.
39 See GottLXX13, Joel 2:28.
41 See Holtz, 9.
42 Ibid, 9-10.
43 Bock, 162.
of verbal nouns, or the so-called "dative of manner," which reinforces a verbal notion. But there is no infinitive absolute at this point in the Hebrew underlying this passage in Joel. Hence we cannot attribute the dative in Acts to direct influence from the Hebrew. Rather, since the LXX often uses this so-called cognate dative, Turner appears to argue that the Hebrew construction has here indirectly influenced the language of Luke. While I would not dispute that the language of the LXX has influenced the language of Acts, at this point it seems more likely that the dative appeared in Luke's ms of the LXX.

Therefore, Holtz's conclusion has much to recommend it. He concludes that Luke would only have used the dative here if he had found it in his copy of the LXX. One could then conclude that the LXX originally read the dative and was corrected to the accusative by a later hand in accordance with the usual construction. This seems to be the only theory which at present sufficiently accounts for the facts.

The use of καὶ ἐγειρεμένος instead of a simple καὶ before ἐπὶ τῶν διώκοντων, point (4), is suggestive of the so-called kaige recension described by Barthélemy and others. The construction καὶ ἐγειρεμένος is used very seldom in the NT, being found elsewhere only in Acts

---


46Turner, Syntax, 241.

47This does not necessarily challenge the findings of Ziegler and Rahlfs regarding the LXX ms containing the Acts reading, since the ms investigated by these two eminent scholars may indeed have been influenced by Acts. My conclusion (and that of Holtz [10]) does, however, open the door for the reconsideration of the textual merit of these ms.

48Holtz, 10.
17:27 and in a number of mss for Luke 19:42. While Luke is the only NT author to use the phrase, Holtz correctly doubts that he was so accustomed to using it that he would have independently substituted it for κοινονία in a citation such as this. He may have put it in to emphasize that "even" for the δοῦλοι, which for Luke may have connoted Christians, is the Spirit poured out; however, as Holtz points out, this would work equally well in the LXX of Joel to indicate the inclusion of the slaves in the promise. We must note that the Hebrew here reads דְּבַר, typically rendered κοινονία in the recensional texts which Barthélemy has identified; thus the relative paucity of the phrase in the NT, and its presence here in an OT citation, suggest the possibility that a LXX text which has undergone some Hebraicizing has influenced Acts at this point. We should note that κοινονία is well attested in the LXX textual tradition here as well, again ascribed by Ziegler to influence from Acts; but it is also possible that the evidence for κοινονία in the LXX tradition reflects a pre-Lukan adaptation of the LXX

---

49See BAG, 152.
50Holtz, 10.
51See Ibid.
52See BDF, 226.
53Holtz, 10.
54Note, however, the cautionary words of Wevers ("Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies," 33-34) to the effect that many Greek texts, both recensional and otherwise, use κοινονία to render דְּבַר.
55GottLXX13, Joel 2:28.
toward the Hebrew. Such evidence tends to support Holtz’s conclusion that Luke found καὶ γε in his ms of the LXX.56

The addition of the pronoun μου after δοῦλους and δοῦλος (5) is similar to the use of καὶ γε in that there is large textual support for its inclusion in the LXX. But, again, this textual evidence is largely ascribed to influence from Acts,57 in this case probably correctly. While Luke could possibly have found these pronouns in his LXX, they have no claim to originality, as Holtz puts it,58 and were doubtless added later, with the most likely reason being their presence in the Acts citation. They make "servant" here a spiritual concept instead of a social designation59 and thus would pave the way for interpreting the δοῦλος as Christians. For this addition, then, there is a theological reason.

The phrase καὶ προφητεύουσιν (6) appears to be an interpolation into the citation. Longenecker states that here Peter is "breaking into the quotation to emphasize the fact of the restoration of prophecy."60 But Holtz takes a different view, noting that prophecy is not an emphasis in Acts 2, which rather concentrates on tongues.61 He thus considers the occurrence of καὶ προφητεύουσιν in v. 18 to be mere repetition of the

---

56Holtz, 10.
57GottLXX13, Joel 2:29.
58Holtz, 11.
59Ringgren, 233.
60Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 100.
61Holtz, 11.
same words following the outpouring of the Spirit in v. 17, a textual error which appeared in Luke's ms of the LXX. As there is some textual evidence for this in the LXX tradition, Holtz's conclusion is not impossible. On the other hand, it may be that Holtz is pressing too firmly a Pauline distinction between tongues and prophecy. It seems beyond question that tongues and prophecy are intimately related in Acts in a way that is not so in Paul (see especially Acts 19:6). With this in mind, it does not seem impossible that Luke would have inserted the phrase καὶ προφητεύουσαν here. Thus, while a textual error is not unlikely, a theological interpolation is equally possible.

The addition of σημεῖα, ἀνω and κάτω (7) are hailed by Clarke as evidence of free citation. While σημεῖα possibly may have been found in Luke's copy of the LXX, it is more likely attributable to Luke. The terms "signs and wonders" appear together throughout the early part of Acts, and we may sense a Lukian (or that of an earlier editor) predilection for having the two terms together. 'Rese suggests that the insertion of σημεῖα helps to connect the prophecy of Joel with the words concerning

---

62Ibid, 12.
63See GottLXX13, Joel 2:29.
65Clarke, 93; Ringgren, 223.
66See Holtz, 13.
Jesus in v. 22. While there are problems with this suggestion (e.g., why did Luke not also add δυνάμεις and thus connect the two verses completely), when we take the connection with v. 22 and Luke’s predilection for "signs and wonders" together, we have the most reasonable explanation for this addition. With regard to ἄνω and κάτω, Rese disagrees with Clarke’s assessment and suggests a theological reason for the addition of these two small words. He sees them as emphasizing the earth as the scene of eschatological acts, connecting the eschatological signs in heaven with the sign on the earth, that is the crucifixion of Jesus. This seems, however, to be more weight than these two little words will bear. Ernst Haenchen suggests that the additions are stylistic and give the verse a tripartite structure, but Bock rightly points out that it is difficult to see the stylistic improvement in that. Holtz argues that they were part of the text cited by Luke, a text which attempted to come closer to the Hebrew; but there is no equivalent in the Hebrew for these two words. Hence, however much we may dislike it, we are left with "free citation" as an explanation.

---

68Rese, 52-53.
69See Bock, 162-163.
70Rese, p. 54; this explanation seems more consistent with Mark’s use of imagery than with Luke’s (see Tyson, New Testament, 178).
72Bock, 163.
73Holtz, 13.
74See BHS, Joel 3:3.
To summarize, then, the evidence indicates that we have a LXX passage here which has undergone some revision either in textual transmission or in being cited. The introductory formula indicates that this passage is to be regarded as a citation, and even with the extensive alterations, its OT origin is clearly recognizable. Bock suggests that there is enough divergence from the LXX here to conclude that Luke is not responsible for the quotation as a whole unit, but received the citation as is from early Church tradition. He bases his argument on the observation that "nowhere else does Luke present a quotation from the OT with so many changes from the LXX." Bock, however, appears to be mistaken here as the citation of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-17 seems to contain more alterations of the LXX text than that in Acts 2. I have already noted that Holtz accounts for many of the deviations by supposing that Luke had an alternate text of the LXX. The only evidence, however, which clearly points in this direction is the alteration of the accusative ἐνυπνα to dative ἐνυπνιοῦς, and the change of καὶ to καὶ γε. On the other hand, the other deviations from the LXX can be more adequately explained as Lukan alterations. Therefore, while the possibility exists that Luke may have been using a slightly Hebraicized ms of the LXX, the evidence is not conclusive. In any event, there is no need to appeal to a traditional source for this citation. That the text is basically septuagintal is proven by the phrase ἡμέραν κυρίου τῆν

75Bock, 163.
76Ibid.
μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανή, which preserves the error of the LXX in reading ἡ ἄρα ἔτη for ἡ ἄρα ἔτη. 77


The next citation from the Minor Prophets occurs in Stephen's speech in Acts 7. A great deal has been written about sources in this speech so it is not surprising that some have ascribed this citation to a traditional source. 78 Charles Scobie has asserted that in Acts 7 we have a Christianized version of an original Samaritan tract to which certain additions were made, among them the citation from Amos. 79 Longenecker has noted here affinities with Dead Sea Scrolls texts, 80 but the significance of this is not clear. On the other hand, Clarke lists this as a free citation of the LXX. 81

The citation differs from the LXX on the following points: (1) the words τεσσαράκοντα ἐτη (Acts has τεσσεράκοντα) are inverted in Acts; (2) Acts adds the words ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ; (3) some texts of Acts omit ὑμῶν after τοῦ θεοῦ; (4) Acts omits αὐτῶν after τοὺς τύπους; (5) Acts changes ἐαυτοῖς to προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς; (6) Acts has Βαβυλώνως for LXX Δαμασκοῦ.

77 Ringgren, 233.
78 E.g., Hanson, 85.
79 Scobie, "Use of Source Material," 412.
81 Clarke, 91. Dupont (Salvation, p. 139) has noted that the quotation is "considerably altered."
The inversion of τεσσαράκοντα ἐτη (1) is probably owing to the Lukan predilection for placing the year before the number (always in Acts and nine of eleven times in Luke, even to the extent of modifying Mark [Luke 8:43 = Mark 5:25]). Earl Richard, however, thinks there may be textual evidence which can explain this inversion. Although there are no variant readings for this inversion for the LXX of Amos here, Richard appeals to the evidence for such readings in Genesis and Deuteronomy as evidence that there could have been a textual tradition which read the inverted words in Amos 5 as well. Holtz also agrees with this conclusion. But since the textual tradition is so different for various sections of the LXX, this seems a very tenuous argument, and it is probably better to consider the inversion as a result of Lukan proclivities. The variant τεσσαράκοντα is simply the Ionic-Hellenistic form of τεσσαράκοντα, and can probably be ascribed to a stylistic alteration (or a simple spelling mistake), whether by Luke or the later scribal tradition.

The addition of ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ (2) has surprisingly strong textual support in the LXX, again attributed by Ziegler to the influence of the Acts citation on the tradition. The textual history is extremely complex at this point and it must be noted that the MT
contains the equivalent phrase here (נַעְרָה). To be noted as well, Theodotion has the words in his version. Holtz suggests that Luke read this probable gloss in his text, which belonged to the textual tradition evidenced in Egypt in the third century by the text family of W.\(^8\) Given that this phrase brings the LXX closer to the Hebrew, and that the words are found in Theodotion,\(^9\) one is tempted to suggest that Luke is following a text which has been assimilated to the Hebrew at this point. This, however, leaves inexplicable why such a Hebraicizing ms would have left the fallacious 'Ραουφων in its text for the Hebrew נַעְרָה, an indication that this citation was taken from the LXX pretty much as we have it.\(^{90}\) If Luke's ms was a Hebraicizing ms, it must have been only slightly so. Unless we can assume that Luke added the term for clarification purposes,\(^1\) however, we are left with reasonably good evidence that Luke found this phrase in his text.

The omission of ὑμῶν after τοῦ θεοῦ in some mss of Acts (3)\(^{92}\) is probably to be dismissed as a later scribal alteration, to avoid the possible interpretation that Raiphan was the God of Israel.\(^{93}\) In any case the omission need not concern us further.

\(^{8}\)Holtz, 16.

\(^{9}\)For the relationship of Theodotion to Hebraicizing recensions, see Barthélemy 153-160.

\(^{90}\)See Ringgren, 234; he also considers the rendering Μολοχ for the Hebrew נַעְרָה to be fallacious; it is, however, possible that with an unpointed text in front of him the LXX translator could have considered the two terms equivalent.

\(^{91}\)See M. Carrez ("Présence et fonctionnement de l'Ancien Testament dans l'annonce de l'évangile," RSR 63 [1975] 334) for a theological explanation of the function of this phrase here.

\(^{92}\)See Nestle-Aland26 and UBSGNT3, Acts 7:43.

\(^{93}\)See Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 161; Holtz, 14.
On the other hand, the omission of the other pronoun, αὐτῶν, after τῶν τύπων (4), probably reflects a textual variant in the LXX tradition. The witnesses to the omission in the LXX, according to Ziegler, include: A-Qσ, L τ-36, C-68, plus the Bohairic and a citation of Justin. The Justin citation likely reflects the influence of Acts, but the others may represent an earlier tradition. It does not bring the citation any closer to the Hebrew, however (וֹדֵֹבּ). Rather, the MT, LXX and Acts all preserve different readings: the MT "your images," the LXX "their images" and Acts "the images." The MT reading has the effect of strengthening the accusation against the people of Israel: "they were your images." The LXX has softened this polemic, by using the more ambiguous "their." The reading in Acts and the LXX mss noted above softens the accusation somewhat further, and since this sort of softening is unlikely in the polemical speech of Acts 7, we should probably conclude that the LXX ms used by the author of Acts 7 did not include αὐτῶν.

The change of ἐαυτοῖς to προσκυνεῖν αὐτοῖς (5) was explained by Clarke as a Lukan explanatory gloss. The phrase seems non-septuagintal as no ms of the LXX

---

94Holtz, 17.

95See GottLXX13, Amos 2:26.

96See Holtz, 17 n. 1.


98While "their" could mean that the images belonged to the children of Israel, as does "your", the more immediate connotation is that these images belong to the gods mentioned. Although the alteration may have been deliberate on the part of the LXX translator, it could have come about through a misreading of ἐπὶ τῶν θεῶν as ἐπὶ τῶν ἱερῶν.

99Clarke, 94.
has it. Certainly Clarke's suggestion is the simplest explanation, and he is, in fact, followed by Holtz\textsuperscript{100} and Richard\textsuperscript{101} at this point. It is to be noted that the two words \textit{προσκυνέω} and \textit{λατρεύω} are found together throughout the LXX to indicate cultic worship, whether of the true God or of false gods. Furthermore, Holtz points out that the citation is influenced by Ex. 32:8 (\textit{ἔπαινοσαν ἑαυτοῖς} μόσχων καὶ προσκυνήκασθαι αὐτῷ), which is alluded to in Acts 7:41.\textsuperscript{102} Richard has suggested that it is Deut. 4:19 which has led Luke to use the Amos passage here,\textsuperscript{103} although the evidence for this seems tenuous at best.\textsuperscript{104} In any case, the conclusion that this is a Lukan addition which serves to strengthen the guilt of Israel is the most reasonable.

The final alteration in the citation, the changing of Δαμασκὸν to Βαβύλωνος (6), is by far the most important. Again, however, it cannot have been found in Luke's LXX since only Q\textsuperscript{521}, 26 and Cyril of Jerusalem attest the reading.\textsuperscript{105} Therefore, it must be considered an editorial alteration. Johannes Munck suggests that it is only a "partial correction" as what is meant by the author of Acts 7 is "to Babylon," which is

\textsuperscript{100}Holtz, 17-18.

\textsuperscript{101}Richard, "Creative Use," 40-41.

\textsuperscript{102}Holtz, 91; see also A. Pelletier, "Une création de l'apologétique chrétienne: \textit{μοσχοποιεῖν}," \textit{RSe} 54 (1966) 411-413; "Valeur évicatrice d'un démarquage chrétien de la Septant," \textit{Bib} 48 (1967) 388.

\textsuperscript{103}Richard, "Creative Use," 40; he also states that Luke cites Ex. 20:4-5 and Deut. 5:8-9 in Acts 7:41-42, but this conclusion appears unwarranted.

\textsuperscript{104}His argument is: "the author of Acts employs Dt 17:3 . . . to formulate his accusation against the Hebrews [in 7:42]. . . [and] under the influence of a very similar passage from Dt 4:19 . . . he is led to the one text in the OT where a false god and a star are associated--Am 5:26" (Richard, \textit{Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition} [ed. H. C. Kee and D. A. Knight; SBLDS 41; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1978] 123). This argument has been followed in some detail recently by H. van de Sandt ("Why is Amos 5,25-27 Quoted in Acts 7,42f.?" \textit{ZNW} 82 [1991] 67-87; "An Explanation of Acts 15.6-21 in the Light of Deuteronomy 4.29-35 [LXX]," \textit{JSNT} 46 [1992] 73-97).

\textsuperscript{105}See Gott\textit{LXX}13, Amos 5:27; Cyril of Jerusalem states that Βαβύλωνος comes from the "Εβραῖοι".
substantially true to the original idea contained in "beyond Damascus." Holtz attributes this alteration to Luke who understood this citation as referring to the Babylonian exile, and as such amended the text to bring it into conformity with his knowledge of the history of Israel. A more theological motive is suggested by Richard, who suggests that as the history of Israel recounted by Stephen begins with Abraham in his homeland, this citation brings the history of Israel full circle and leaves them back where they started. William Neil suggests, more prosaically, that the Babylonian captivity was more important to Jerusalem Jews and that is why it was mentioned here. The suggestion of F. F. Bruce, however, is more interesting. He suggests that the alteration goes back to Stephen himself and represents an "example of quoting from memory in an impassioned speech." Thus Stephen had the Babylonian captivity in mind and unconsciously made the alteration. If this is the case, then the citation would have to be considered as coming from early Church tradition and the Lukan changes which we have noted would have to be ascribed to Stephen, or earlier editors. Holtz, however, while he explains other citations in Acts 7 as traditional, here

---

106See Munck, 64; but cf. Mays (113), who suggests that the original meaning of the phrase may have pointed to Assyria.

107Holtz, 18.

108Richard, "Creative Use," 42.


110Bruce, Acts (1951), 174.
ascribes the citation to Luke. I will be in a better position to comment on this issue after I have examined the other citations in Acts 7 (see below, pp. 128-131; 282-376).

In summary, the citation is septuagintal with significant alterations, most likely attributable to Luke. It is too divergent from the MT to consider the latter as the immediate source, and while there is some evidence to indicate that Luke’s LXX at this point may have been Hebraicized, it could not have been extensively as his citation repeats the mistakes made by the LXX, and, in fact, it is these mistakes which enable "the author of Stephen’s speech to associate idolatrous worship with the worship in the tabernacle." Thus, whether Lukan or traditional, the citation is based on the LXX.

3. Acts 13:41 = Hab. 1.5

This citation occurs in Paul’s speech in Pisidian Antioch. Clarke describes this as a "shortened and modified" form of the LXX of Hab. 1:5. The divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) ἐπιβλέψατε καὶ θαυμάσατε θαυμάσια καὶ ἀφανίσθητε has been shortened to θαυμάσατε καὶ ἀφανίσθητε; (2) διότι has been changed to ὅτι; (3) ἐγὼ ἔργαζομαι has been inverted; (4) ἔργον has been added before δ ὦ μὴ πιστεύσητε; (5) ὑμῖν has been added after ἐκδιηγήσατε.

111Holz, 17.
112See Bruce, Acts (1951), 173.
113Hanson, 85.
114Clarke, 94.
The first variation (1) can only be explained (at present)\textsuperscript{115} as a stylistic alteration for the sake of shortening the material.\textsuperscript{116} Holtz notes that this cannot come from any knowledge of the Hebrew since \textit{επιβλέψατε} is a suitable translation of the Hebrew \textit{יִתֵּן}, whereas \textit{ἀφανίσθητε} is not a suitable translation of \textit{יִתֵּן}, yet Luke retains the latter while rejecting the former.\textsuperscript{117} Ringgren suggests that Luke may have found \textit{επιβλέψατε} superfluous after \textit{Ἰδε}.\textsuperscript{118} Similarly, the removal of \textit{θαυμάσατε} may be seen as a stylistic improvement,\textsuperscript{119} and may, in fact, be an instance of Luke removing a Semitism from his LXX text.

The change of \textit{διότι} to \textit{ὅτι} (2) is only a minor variation, and Holtz notes that the \textit{διότι} of Hab. 2:3 appears as \textit{ὅτι} in Codex Alexandrinus, thus concluding that Luke's LXX very likely contained it also at 1:5.\textsuperscript{120} It is to be noted that 8HevXIIgr reads \textit{ὅτι} for \textit{διότι} in Hab. 1:5;\textsuperscript{121} indeed that ms alters the LXX so that Hebrew \textit{יַג} is

\textsuperscript{115}\textit{It is to be noted that a similar shortening appears to have occurred in 8HevXIIgr, which reads simply \textit{θαυμάσατε} (Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 50-51). The text at this point is very fragmentary, however, and it is impossible to ascertain whether or not this shortening represents a scribal alteration, or simply (and more likely in this case) a result of the loss of most of the verse to the ravages of time. Hence, while a relationship may exist between 8HevXIIgr and Acts 13:41, it cannot be seriously considered on the basis of the existing evidence.}

\textsuperscript{116}Holtz, 20.

\textsuperscript{117}Ibid, 19; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 272.

\textsuperscript{118}Ringgren, 234.

\textsuperscript{119}\textit{BDF}, 85.

\textsuperscript{120}Holtz, 20.

\textsuperscript{121}Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 50-51.
consistently rendered by ὅτι. Hence, it is likely that Luke found ὅτι in his ms of the LXX.

The inversion of ἐγὼ ἐργάζομαι (3) may be a stylistic alteration, in the interest of better Greek, as suggested by Holtz, who also notes that the presence of ἐγὼ points fairly conclusively to the LXX as the source for this citation since the Hebrew has no personal pronoun. As there is no textual evidence for this inversion among LXX mss, stylistic alteration is the best explanation.

The addition of ἐργάσει (4) again represents a stylistic alteration. Holtz notes that the addition strengthens the impact of the passage (it gives it "Schwung") and Ringgren agrees that it must have been added for clarity.

The addition of the final ὅπως (5) has considerable support in the LXX mss, especially in the Alexandrian group. While this may be attributed to the influence of Acts on the LXX tradition, Holtz considers it unlikely since the other variations in the text of the Acts citation are not evident in the LXX tradition, and one would have

122Cf. Ibid., 131, 140.
123Holtz, 20.
124Ibid., 20 n. 5.
125See Gottling, Hab. 1:5.
126Holtz, 20; Ringgren, 234. O. Glombitza ("Akta XIII. 15-41. Analyse einer Lukanisehen Predigt vor Juden: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Reden in Akta," NTS 5 [1958-1959] 315-316) takes this even farther when he asserts the importance of the repetition of ἐργάσει to show that it is God who has performed this eschatological work in Jesus Christ and his Church.
127See Gottling, XX, Hab. 1:5.
expected them. Rather, Holtz suggests that here Luke was using a text which was close to the Alexandrian textual tradition, and which contained the ὕπατος. While this is possible, it is equally easy to see how this word could have been inserted in this speech to bring the point home to those whom Paul is addressing in the Acts context. Thus a stylistic alteration is not out of the question here.

To summarize, then, we have here a LXX quotation which has been altered for stylistic reasons. The passage is clearly from the LXX. While in the Hebrew text the passage directs attention to the "pagan nations," in the LXX this is not the case, thus allowing Paul (and Luke) to apply these words to the Jews. Holtz has found evidence for Luke's using a particular kind of LXX ms. A. Sperber, as well, has suggested that the Greek text used by the NT writers was similar to that in the fifth column of Origen's Hexapla, and Wilcox lists this citation as one with parallels in Origen's fifth column. While none of the parallels they cite are completely convincing, the presence of ἀρχαὶ in this citation and in Hab. 1:5 in 8HevXIIgr suggests that Luke's ms for Habakkuk may have been slightly Hebraicized.

128Holtz, 20.
129Ibid, 21.
130Dupont, Salvation, 39.
132Wilcox, Semitisms, 39.

This citation, which occurs in the speech of James at the Jerusalem Council, is perhaps the most discussed Minor Prophets citation in Luke-Acts. Haenchen asserts that "the text here agrees entirely in meaning, and for the most part in wording, with the LXX";133 however, Clarke lists it as a "free version,"134 and Hanson notes that "the Greek of the Amos Citation differs markedly from the LXX, which in its turn differs from the MT."135 Obviously agreement over this text is rare. We will approach it in the same way as we have the previous citations.

The divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts changes ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἑκείνη to μετὰ ταύτα ἀναστρέψω; (2) καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω is removed after πεπτωκύιαν and placed before τὴν σκηνὴν Δαβίδ, replacing the word ἀναστήσω; (3) τὰ πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς is omitted in Acts; (4) ἀναστήσω καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω is inverted and ἀναστήσω is replaced by ἀνορθώσω; (5) καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος is omitted; (6) Acts adds ἀν after δπως; (7) τὸν κύριον is added after τῶν ἀνθρώπων; (8) the ὁ is omitted before ποιῶν; (9) Acts adds γνωστὰ ἂν τ’ αἰῶνος at the end.

Point (1) is a major alteration, and it is therefore amazing that Holtz does not treat it in more detail, preferring rather to concentrate on the

134Clarke, 92.
135Hanson, 85.
κατεστραμμένα/κατεσκαμμένα variant in the text of Acts. It may be that point (1) is not a part of the Amos quotation at all. It has been suggested that we have a conflated citation with the first three words deriving from Jer. 12:15. While the sense is the same as that conveyed by the Jeremiah passage, however, the word ἀναστρέψω is not found there. Rather, Jeremiah has ἐπιστρέψω. In fact, the phrase as we have it in Acts 15:16 does not seem to appear anywhere else in scripture, and ἀναστρέψω is not used by the LXX to indicate God favouring ("turning to") Israel with an act of mercy. Holtz suggests a relationship of sorts with Zech. 1:16, but the same comments apply there as to the Jeremiah passage. Richard suggests that the two words ἐπιστρέψω/ἀναστρέψω were bound together in Luke's thinking, but this seems highly speculative. He also suggests that μετὰ ταῦτα and ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνη were expressions which were interchanged according to Luke's needs, but, again there seems to be no good reason to assume this. Jan de Waard has concluded that the two

136Holtz, 21-22. The LXX mss also have this variant in their tradition (A', Q') (see Grotf. LXX 13, Amos 9:11), and so the problem is a complicated one. However, κατεσκαμμένα appears to be the more difficult reading, and both UBSGNT3 and NestleAland26 have adopted this reading for Acts 15:16 (see also Metzger, Textual Commentary, 429).


139Hanson, 85-86.

140Holtz, 24.


temporal phrases are merely translational variants of ⇝ obesity,\textsuperscript{143} but this seems rather a tenuous conclusion.\textsuperscript{144}

We are therefore left with the probability that these words are not septuagintal, and that the citation does not depend on the LXX at this point. It may yet be a loose citation of the passage, or of Jer. 12:15 or Zech. 1:16, but the difference is significant enough to give us pause. The conclusion that it is not a part of the citation at all, but is an interpretive introduction to the citation,\textsuperscript{145} is attractive, but unproven.

The replacement of ἀναστήσω by καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω (2) could be described as a simple replacement of the verb with another together with a καὶ to connect ἀνοικοδομήσω to ἀναστρέψω. Ringgren has suggested that the verb was changed for stylistic reasons,\textsuperscript{146} although what those reasons were is unclear. Richard suggests a theological motivation for the change, in that for Luke ἀναστήσω was a theological term restricted to the raising of Jesus (and in three cases related to Deut. 18:15—the raising up of a prophet like Moses), and thus Luke substituted a more appropriate word to his way of thinking.\textsuperscript{147} The appropriateness of ἀνοικοδομήσω has not gone unnoticed. Chaim Rabin has suggested that this word is a better translation of ὁ ὄρος than the LXX


\textsuperscript{144}See Braun, 115.

\textsuperscript{145}Ibid, 116.

\textsuperscript{146}Ringgren, 235.

\textsuperscript{147}Richard, "Creative Use," 47.
translation, and has concluded that there seems to have been some sort of relationship between the Acts citation and the MT.\textsuperscript{148} Rabin has been followed by de Waard and Michael Braun.\textsuperscript{149} Holtz, however, has come to the opposite conclusion that the LXX is nearer the Hebrew than the Acts citation.\textsuperscript{150} Neither of these opposing viewpoints is manifestly better than the other.

The existence of καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω in the LXX of Amos 9:11 following πετωκοίαν, but missing from that place in the Acts citation, however, suggests that Luke has not simply replaced ἀναστήσω with another word, but that he has replaced it specifically with a word found later in the passage. In other words, the text has been rearranged.

The evident rearrangement of the text suggests that this variant must be understood in conjunction with point (3), the omission of τὰ πετωκότα αἰνής. This omission (together with the above-mentioned rearrangement) is likely an abbreviation of the passage for the sake of clarity.\textsuperscript{151} It is to be noted that the LXX at this point is very repetitive (twice a verb of "restoring," one use of "tent" together with a pronoun referring back to "tent," and two uses of the perfect participle of πίπτω). Hence Luke may have considered the wordiness of the LXX superfluous, and thus abbreviated the passage.


\textsuperscript{149}de Waard, \textit{Comparative Study}, 25; Braun, 116.

\textsuperscript{150}Holtz, 25.

\textsuperscript{151}Holtz (24) finds this conclusion questionable, but does not indicate his reasons.
Point (4) is similar in that some words have been inverted and one replaced. This inversion has gone largely without comment\textsuperscript{152} (Ringgren mentions it as a possible stylistic change or "slip of memory")\textsuperscript{153} with scholars concentrating on the change of \(\dot{\alpha}ν\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}σ\omega\) to \(\dot{\alpha}ν\rho\sigma\\theta\acute{\omega}\sigma\omega\) (e.g., Holtz), or to \(\dot{\alpha}νοικόδομήσ\omega\) (e.g., Richard). Richard applies the same argument which I noted above to this substitution,\textsuperscript{154} while Holtz suggests that Luke's text of Amos 9:11 is not that of the LXX.\textsuperscript{155}

Again, however, I would suggest that point (4) needs to be taken together with point (5), the omission of \(\kappaα\theta\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\iota \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\varepsilon\eta\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\vartheta\nu\varsigma\). Holtz asserts that this omission makes questionable whether Luke is citing the LXX here at all.\textsuperscript{156} This omission, as well as the rearrangement noted above, however, probably again indicates abbreviation on Luke's part. But it is also possible that the omission of \(\kappaα\theta\omega\varsigma\ \alpha\iota \eta\mu\epsilon\rho\varepsilon\eta\iota \tau\omicron\upsilon \alpha\vartheta\nu\varsigma\) has a theological purpose. "As the days of old" suggests that the kingdom of David would be restored to its original position (i.e., a political dynasty which would restore the security and affluence of David's time).\textsuperscript{157} The OT passage had a "distinctly nationalistic element as its referent,"\textsuperscript{158} and the LXX has reproduced this effect. But

\textsuperscript{152}As has the rearrangement of the text in point (2) above.

\textsuperscript{153}Ringgren, 235.


\textsuperscript{155}See Holtz, 24-26.

\textsuperscript{156}Ibid, 24.

\textsuperscript{157}See e.g., Mays, 164.

\textsuperscript{158}W. C. Kaiser, Jr., "Davidic Promise," 101.
Luke (or James) does not have this referent in mind and so removes the words which point to a literal nationalistic interpretation of the oracle. As well, the passage is improved stylistically: ἀνοικοδομήσω is placed with κατεσκαμμένα, thus maintaining the figurative speech of the original by creating a parallelism between the "ruins" and the "booth of David," since both have ἀνοικοδομήσω as their verb. Thus stylistic, and perhaps theological and political, concerns likely account for these alterations.

The addition of ἄν after ὁ (6) and of τῶν κυρίων after τῶν ἀνθρώπων (7), may be, as Richard asserts, redactional.159 Holtz, however, notes the large textual support in the LXX for both of them in the Alexandrian tradition and concludes that Luke had these changes in the text from which he was citing.160 On the other hand, Ziegler attributes the presence of these words in the LXX mss tradition to the influence of Acts,161 which in this case is likely.162 Richard suggests that ὁ is an imitation by Luke of the construction as found in earlier books of the LXX and that Luke added τῶν κυρίων to the "unwieldy LXX text," to give the sentence an object. He points out that some scribes apparently felt this need as well and added με to several of the LXX mss.163 This makes it more likely that point (7) is redactional, while point (6) could as easily as not have been in Luke's LXX.

---

159Richard, "Creative Use," 45.
160Holtz, 23.
161See GottLXX13, Amos 9:12.
162See Richard, "Creative Use," 46 n. 19.
163Ibid, 46; see also GottLXX13, Amos 9:12.
The omission of ḍ before ποιῶν (8) is not found in any ms of the LXX. But the omission brings the citation closer to the Hebrew (יִהְיָהוּ יִהְיָהוּ יִמְעַל וַאֲמַל), and this could suggest that the text Luke is using is closer to the Hebrew at this point than the LXX. Holtz rejects this idea, however, noting that the ḍ appears in a number of mss of Acts, and suggests that the omission is a textual error in the mss tradition of Acts which coincidentally mirrors the MT.\footnote{Holtz, 23.} This conclusion becomes even more likely when we consider the errors in the rest of the citation when compared to the Hebrew: the misreading of ἐκείνης as ἔκτη σήμων and ὅλας as τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Finally, the addition of γνώστα ἀπ' αἰῶνος at the end of the citation (9) may be an addition to the text reflecting Isa. 45:21: ἵνα γνῶσιν ἄμα τίς ἀκούστα ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἀπ' ἀρχῆς.\footnote{See Goppelt, Typos, 118; Bruce, Acts (1951), 298; Dupont, Salvation, 145; see also Neil, 173; Hanson, 87.} Swete lists this phrase as a LXX citation from the Isaiah passage;\footnote{Swete, 388.} however, it is not at all close in wording to LXX Isaiah, and could only be a vague allusion at best. The suggestion that Isaiah is reflected here has given rise to the idea that the whole citation is a testimonium which conflated passages from Amos and Isaiah.\footnote{E.g., Rendell Harris, 2. 78-79.} Holtz, however, rejects this idea, as the Isaiah quote is evidently not septuagintal while the latter part of the Amos citation evidently is, and thus such a testimonium would have combined a LXX quote and a non-LXX quote, a situation he
finds unlikely. Rather, he thinks it is a conclusion to the citation which Luke has placed in James' mouth regarding "des ewigen Heilsrates Gottes." This seems very likely, making the citation fit in with Luke's eschatological perspective that the Church is the final act in God's plan for the ages.

We now come to the most difficult problem associated with this passage: the determination of its origin. I have noted the general assumption that the passage is septuagintal, and that appears to be confirmed by the fact that the citation retains the LXX mistranslations noted above, and, in fact, James' whole argument turns on these mistranslations. It has been suggested, however, that this citation does not come from the LXX at all. Rather, some have stressed its affinities with the text of Amos as found in CD. Rabin has noted that CD 7:16 reads لًلدأ for MT لًلأ in Amos 9:11. He argues that the CD reading implies the idea of "re-erect" which would correspond well to Acts ανακοδομήσω rather than the LXX αναστήσω. Similarly, de Waard claims that there are clear similarities between Acts 15:16 and 4Q174 (Florilegium) 1:12. He notes that both end the first clause with "which is fallen,"

---

168 Holz, 22-23 n. 6.

169 Ibid, 22.


171 Hanson, 86; Bruce, Acts (1951), 298; Dupont, Salvation, 139; see also King, 8-13.

172 Rabin, 29 n. 2.

173 de Waard, Comparative Study, 25.
omitting the further reference to πεπτωκότα. He further asserts that the copulative καὶ of Acts 15:16 (καὶ ἀνουκοδομήσω) is a faithful rendering of ἡ ἀναταξάσσεσθαι, a converted perfect form in the Qumran text as opposed to the imperfect ἢ ἀναταξάσθη of the MT. Finally, he notes that the introductory formula in Acts 15:15, καθὼς γέγραπται, corresponds to the introductory formula of 4Q174 1:12: יִגְרַּ֖א עַמְּיוֹנָ֥ה. 174

A possible conclusion which could be drawn from this is that the Acts citation is taken, not from the LXX, but from a Hebrew text such as that preserved in 4Q174. 175 On the other hand, the resemblance of Acts 15:16 to this Qumran text does not account for the apparently septuagintal reading of Acts 15:17. This has also been challenged, however. First of all, Bruce has suggested that the LXX mistranslations of Amos 9:12 are not mistranslations, but rather show the dependence of the LXX on a Hebrew text departing from the MT which contained the readings underlying the LXX version. 176 Michael Braun notes that there are only three minor changes needed to conform the MT to the text of the Acts citation. To change "they shall possess" to "they shall seek" all that is needed is the change of יִנְפֹּ֣רָי to יִנְפֹּרָי, and Braun asserts that there was a time in the history of the transmission of the OT text when י and י were "virtually

---


175See de Waard, Comparative Study, 26 n. 2.

176Bruce, Themes, 79 n. 3.
indistinguishable." Building on the work of Mitchell Dahood,\textsuperscript{177} he suggests that the Massoretes may have mistaken the ancient title for God \(\text{יְהֹウェָא} \) for the direct object marker \(\text{יְהֹウェָא} \), and finally, he notes that \(\text{יְהֹウェָא} \) and \(\text{יְהֹウェָא} \) could be easily confused in unpointed texts.\textsuperscript{178} We might further comment that the omission of \(\delta \) before \(\pi\nu\omega\nu \), discussed above, would tend to support a closer relationship to a Hebrew original.

Involved in Braun’s study is the attempt to ascribe the speech of Acts 15 to James, which is considered by many to be impossible since the LXX is used here.\textsuperscript{179} Braun assumes that James would not have used the LXX. But both Bruce and Neil, for


\textsuperscript{178}Braun, 116-117. Braun also argues that Judaism tended to react to Christian use of the OT by excluding OT references to Gentiles having a hope of salvation. He concludes that James may have been using a Hebrew text antedating these Jewish alterations which affected the MT, and thus superior to it. He bases his argument on the evidence that while early Jewish apocalyptic held out some hope to the Gentiles (e.g., I Enoch 90:30; Baruch 13:48), as R. H. Charles points out, "later Judaism almost universally denied this hope to the Gentiles" (\textit{APOT}, 1. 255), and on the interpretive elements of the Targums which were, in the words of J. W. Bowker, "often deliberately designed to exclude the Christian argument" (\textit{The Targums and Rabbinic Literature} [London: Cambridge University, 1969] xi). He also points to the reading of Targum Jonathan which adds "even the house of Israel" to Amos 9:11-12. The latter phrase was "certainly added," Braun argues, to exclude the Gentiles "from any hope of salvation" (116). He then cites H. Alford to the effect that James "would not himself (nor would the Pharisees present have allowed it) have quoted any rendering, especially where the stress of his argument lay in it, at variance with the original Hebrew" (H. Alford, \textit{The Greek Testament} [2 vols.; Chicago: Moody, 1968] 2. 166-167). Hence James' quotation must have been in agreement with the authoritative Hebrew text at the time. This argument is exceedingly speculative. Besides speculating on what James must or must not have thought or done, and assuming that the citation as we have it is as quoted by James himself, the only evidence for Jewish altering of the OT text for anti-Christian polemical reasons (outside of the Targums, which were never regarded as fully authoritative—see B. K. Waltke, "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament," \textit{The Expositor's Bible Commentary} [12 vols.; ed. F. E. Gaebelein and J. D. Douglas; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979] 1. 223) concerns the LXX, which came into Jewish disfavour through its use by Christians (Jellicoe, \textit{The Septuagint in Modern Study}, 74). The resulting revisions, such as Aquila (see Jellicoe, \textit{The Septuagint in Modern Study}, 76) and possibly \(\text{HevXIIgr} \) (see Waltke, 216), however, can only be characterized as more literal translations of the Hebrew (see e.g. Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 146 [on Aquila]). They do not appear to represent a polemical anti-Christian tendency, but rather the desire of the Rabbis for an accurate Greek text (see Waltke, 216). There is no evidence for a polemical altering of the MT by Jewish hands and in view of their overall conservativism in transmitting it (see Waltke, 216-218), such speculation seems very far-fetched.

\textsuperscript{179}See e.g., Haenchen, "Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act 15," \textit{Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias} (ed. W. Eltester; BZNW 26; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960) 157; \textit{Acts}, 448; see also Munck, 140.
example, see the use of the LXX as not inconsistent with James being the author of this speech. Obviously the historical question does not hang on this citation, and so I will not attempt to deal with it here.

Braun attributes the misreadings of the original Hebrew reflected in Acts and in the LXX to copyists whose errors found their way into MT Amos 9:12. But the argument can be reversed: it was the LXX translator who misread his Hebrew text and mistranslated these terms. In fact, the agreement of the LXX and Acts here is too much of a coincidence to assume that we have an independent translation of a Hebrew Vorlage for this citation. That the LXX text may have followed an alternate Hebrew original at this point is an intriguing idea; however, there is virtually no way of proving it. In any case, it appears likely that Luke (or James) is using the LXX to make his point, whether the latter mistranslated from the Hebrew, or correctly represented an alternate Hebrew reading.

The citation of Amos 9:11, however, is more difficult. Wilcox has suggested the possibility that a text related to 4Q174 1:12 has been adapted to the context of Amos 9:12 LXX and combined with it here, although he admits that the case is not particularly strong. De Waard also only admits the relationship of 4Q174 1:12 with

---

100 Bruce, Acts (1951), 298; Neil, 173.
101 His words are "an originally circulating element," an enigmatic description, to say the least.
102 Wilcox refers to this text as 1QFlorilegium 1:30.
103 Wilcox, Semitisms, p. 49.
the first part of the Acts citation. Similarly, Holtz argues for a "grundsätzlicher Unterschied" between the two halves of the Acts citation. He concludes that the second half comes from Luke. The first half was present in the tradition of the Jewish-Christian Church, perhaps brought over from Judaism, and represented the hope of the restoration of Israel through the Davidic line (which, interestingly enough, agrees with the argument in the 4Q174 fragment). The second part of the quotation was added by Luke from the LXX as legitimation for the Gentile mission.

The citation in Acts 15:16 (=Amos 9:11) does not, however, correspond exactly to 4Q174. First of all, 4Q174, according to the text as published by J. M. Allegro, has מֵתMatt (as does CD 7:16), which, while explaining the τιτις, does not correspond as neatly to ἀνοικοδομήσαω as Rabin would like. BDB lists several places where the Hiphil form of מֵת may mean "build," but while in some cases the context could suggest the translation of "build" (e.g., heaps of stones, Josh. 7:26; altars, II Sam. 24:18; siegeworks, Isa. 29:3), generally, even for those examples just listed, the sense of "raise up" or "erect" (cause to stand up) would serve as well. In most cases, however, "build" will not suffice: e.g., to raise up the prostrate (II Sam. 12:17; Deut.

---

184de Waard, Comparative Study, 79-80.


187Allegro, Qumrán Cave 4, 53; "Fragment," 353.

188Rabin, 29.

189BDB, 878.
22:4; etc.), to lift up a shield (Ez. 26:8), to bring judges, prophets, etc., onto the scene (Ju. 2:16, 18; Jer. 29:15; Deut. 11:15, 18; etc.), and so forth.\(^{190}\) In every case where the LXX translates the word, it does so with a form of ἑστήκαμεν, and we would tend to agree with Holtz that the LXX has got it right.\(^{191}\) Although a "booth", νῷν, such as we have in Acts 15 and the Qumran documents, could theoretically be "built," instances of the word suggest that the OT writers tend to avoid this connotation. For example, in Gen. 33:17 Jacob is presented as building houses (νῷν—the usual Hebrew word for "build")\(^{192}\) but he "makes" (נְעָמָה) booths. In fact, in all cases where the "setting up" of booths is recorded in the OT (Neh. 8:15, 16, 17; Jon. 4:5; see also II Sam. 22:12) the word for "build" is avoided. The LXX normally translates νῷν by a form of οἰκοδομέω, and again I must agree with Holtz that this is the proper translation.\(^{193}\) Thus ἀνοικοδομέω does not seem to be a good translation for any form of νῷν, and I must disagree with Rabin and de Waard that the reading of CD 7:16 and 4Q174 1:12 is a better basis for ἀνοικοδομήσω than the MT. Actually, the only real difference between the readings of CD and 4Q174 and the MT is one of tense, and Rabin's interpretation of the perfect as "re-erect" seems tenuous.\(^{194}\)

\(^{190}\)As well, the Hiphil form is used for the setting up of a tent. While one could theoretically "build" a tent, the translation "set up" or "raise up" would be more appropriate here (e.g., Ex. 26:30; Jer. 10:20; Ex. 40:2, 18, 33; etc.).

\(^{191}\)See Holtz, 25.

\(^{192}\)See BDB, 124-125.

\(^{193}\)See Holtz, 25.

\(^{194}\)See BDB (878-879) on the Hiphil perfect of νῷν.
Similarly, the use of the vav-consecutive form in 4Q174 can probably be understood in the context of the fragment itself. Unfortunately the fragment is missing the crucial piece at this point. Apparently the citation in this text concerns the "Shoot of David" who will arise and do something in Zion, or, more likely, in view of the preceding statements, who will have his throne established in Zion. In fact, the earlier portions of the fragment have several statements concerning God's actions toward David's kingdom in the last days. It is instructive at this point to see the whole context of the citation, as translated by Allegro:

['And] Yahweh tells you that he will build a house for you, and I shall set up your seed after you, and I shall establish his royal throne [for ever]. I shall be to him as a father, and he will be to me as a son.' He is 'the Shoot of David' who will arise with the Interpreter of the Law, who, [. . .] in Zion in the last days; as it is written, 'And I shall raise up the tabernacle of David that is fallen.'

This is obviously a series of things which God will do to David's successor in the last days and our citation is but part of that series. Thus the vav-consecutive fits perfectly in the context. But the context in Acts requires a copulative καὶ for a different reason. Here, Luke has added the word ἀναστρέψω, thus necessitating a following καὶ. Hence the reason for the vav-consecutive and the copulative καὶ are both to maintain continuity with what has gone before, but what has gone before in each case is entirely different.

Similarly, the μετὰ τοῦτο in Acts is not reflected in the Qumran document. Rather, there the words are יִנֶּה הַנְּרֹת, "in the last days," which is closer to MT.

---

195 Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4*, 54; see also "Fragment," 353.
and the LXX ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ, than to Acts. Again, while both 4Q174 and Acts have the equivalent of "as it is written," CD has rather ἔν τῷ ἔκκειτο, "as it is said." Thus, there is no parallel in the latter document. While καθὼς γέγραπται is only found here in Acts, it is found once in Luke (2:23), and throughout the NT, and appears to be a rather common method of introducing Scripture citations. Hence, since "as it is written" is a standard formula in pesher texts, to find the words echoed in a Qumran document is probably not too significant. Finally, it is not quite correct to say that both Acts and 4Q174 end with "which is fallen." While the citation in the Qumran document appears to end here (although the fragment continues), the Acts citation continues after omitting several words. Obviously both citations have been shortened, likely with the same motive, that of accommodating the OT text to a new context. However, as Fitzmyer points out, the CD passage, the 4Q174 passage and the Acts passage show no real similarity in the use of the text. In CD the "fallen hut of David" is somehow obscurely related to the "hut of the king," while in 4Q174 the emphasis is on the scion of David, who will bring salvation to Israel. But in Acts, there

---

196 Rabin, 26.
197 See M&G, 176-179.
198 See e.g., Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 98-100; Stendahl, 183-202.
is no mention of the scion of David. Rather, the whole emphasis is shifted to the salvation of the Gentiles.²⁰⁰

This latter point may spell doom for Holtz's theory that the two halves of the citation come from different traditions. Hanson has noted that it is difficult to imagine the appeal for early Christians of the first half of the quotation, without the second.²⁰¹ Certainly in the context it would appear fruitless for James to quote v. 11 without v. 12, as his whole point depends on v. 12. Furthermore, there is no evidence in the NT of v. 11 being applied messianically apart from v. 12 (in fact this is the only reference to these verses in the NT), and one might have expected this if it circulated separately, and especially if it had some relationship to the Qumran material. Finally, Jacques Dupont has suggested that the language of Acts 15:14 has been influenced by the citation in vv. 16-17.²⁰² This would not be unlikely in a speech of this kind if the whole quotation were part and parcel of the speech itself. If not, it would be more difficult to account for this similarity of language.

Therefore, it seems likely that the form of the citation of Amos in Acts 15 owes most to its LXX origin and to the redactional activity of the author, altering the form of the passage to fit his theological or literary needs. Whether this was Luke or James is

²⁰⁰Ibid, 329.

²⁰¹Hanson, 86.

virtually impossible to say. But the citation is septuagintal, and that is the point I wish to make.

In summary, then, I have spent a good deal of time on this citation, but it appears to be an important one. It demonstrates that a citation may be septuagintal in spite of numerous deviations from the text of the LXX as we have it. In fact, redactional considerations are often paramount in determining the origin of a given passage, and in this passage again Lukan redaction appears to be considerable. In this case, the LXX supplied the motivation for citing the passage in the context of the James speech, through its rendering of ὡς ἔκθεσον οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων, but the LXX was altered to make the point more clear.


The Lukan citations of the Minor Prophets show certain unmistakable characteristics. In all but one, the citations are from the LXX. The one citation not from the LXX derives from "Q" (or Matthew) and is not septuagintal. Nor does it appear to have been altered in any way. Here we probably see Luke’s reverence for his source’s transmission of the words of Jesus. In all other citations the LXX has been used and altered in some way. In the citation from his special material in the Gospel Luke does not appear to have altered his text to any great extent, and has probably only quoted

---

203 The passage also exhibits the problems involved in categorizing a reference to the OT as either a citation or an allusion. Here the passage appears to be a citation, from the introductory formula "as it is written," but the many alterations in the text suggest that Luke is not citing his text at all closely, and may simply be alluding to the OT passage. There is, however, sufficient verbatim agreement with the OT passage to recognize the text from which it is cited. Hence the passage is a citation.
the citation loosely. The Acts quotations, however, are all significantly altered. The overall principle governing Luke's use of OT scripture, at least in the sample thus far studied, is that of applicability to the context in which they are placed in his narrative. Luke is not doing exegesis of the OT material so much as he is using it to illustrate the "things which have been accomplished among us" (Luke 1:1). Hence his primary focus is not on the OT text itself, but on the events which the text illustrates. His alterations of the OT text, then, constitute his interpretation of the text on the basis of the events he is describing. 204

The fact that all the Acts citations are in speeches brings up the possibility that Luke is drawing on some traditional material. 205 However, there is nothing in the handling of the citations themselves which points unequivocally to this conclusion. In most cases the LXX is quoted to a particular purpose, a purpose which is served best by the LXX version. Again, though, there is no evidence that Luke, in Hanson's words, has compiled his citations "from whatever version of the text suited best the sense he wanted," 206 since the sense he wanted comes uniformly from the LXX, which he altered to fit his needs.

There is some evidence that Luke's LXX text had undergone Hebraicizing alterations. Although the corrections to the Hebrew are not extensive, three out of the


205 It is possible that Luke restricted OT citations to the speeches in Acts deliberately, to indicate that the main figures in his drama are in a direct line of succession to the OT prophets (see Ellis, 27-41).

206 Hanson, 87.
six passages which Luke cites from the Minor Prophets (or 50%) show some evidence of a Hebraicizing tendency. This is a significant percentage and may indicate that Luke’s ms of the Minor Prophets was a Hebraicizing one, although only slightly so, since most of the data point to a ms not far from the LXX as we have it.

Thus, in terms of the overall aims of this study, the citations from the Minor Prophets demonstrate that Luke knew and used the LXX, although sometimes he cites the passage rather loosely, possibly from memory. We also note that he does use traditional material at times, although only one clear instance in this case, and seems to have a particular historical/theological reason for choosing to use traditional material, in this case reverence for the words of Jesus. While there is some evidence for the influence of a Hebraicizing tendency on Luke’s citations here, there is a great deal of evidence that Luke readily redacted his OT citations for stylistic, contextual and theological reasons.
CHAPTER THREE

THE CITATIONS FROM ISAIAH

Luke quotes eight times from Isaiah: once in Markan material, once in "Q" (Matthean) material, twice from his special material in the Gospel, and four times in Acts (discounting the possible reference to Isa. 45:21 in Acts 15:18, discussed in chapter two).

A. Markan Citation: Luke 3:4-6 = Isa. 40:3-5

Here we have a citation which in varying extents is found in all three of the Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:2-3). Of the three, Matthew's version is considerably abbreviated, while Mark adds Mal. 3:1 but does not cite Isa. 40:4-5. Luke

---

1While UBSGNT3 (899) lists Luke 8:10 as a citation of Isa. 6:9, this passage is an allusion rather than a citation. There is no introductory formula, and while the OT text can be recognized, there is little verbatim agreement between the two. Luke shares this allusion with both Matthew (13:13) and Mark (4:12); however it is very different in the three accounts. Mark has the longest version but it does not appear to be a citation either (although Marcus [1] argues that Jesus is "using" Isaiah); Matthew's is shorter at this point, although he adds an explicit LXX quotation afterward, with the introductory words: "With them indeed is fulfilled the prophecy of Isaiah which says." Matthew here appears to regard the explicit LXX quote as the explanation of Jesus' words. Matthew's addition of the explicit LXX citation indicates that he did not regard the words reproduced in Luke as an OT citation. Rather, he felt that he needed to explain precisely to which scripture Jesus was referring. Its character as an allusion is further shown in that all three Gospels differ from the LXX in the order of the clauses (LXX "hear/see"; NT "see/hear"). Ringgren (228) attributes this to oral transmission or quoting from memory. But the LXX order is kept in the quotation which follows in Matthew. Given, then, that Matthew knew the LXX version here, we may conclude that he did not regard these words of Jesus as a quotation from Isa 6:9 at all and thus did not alter them according to the LXX. Luke as well seems not to have referred to the LXX here but has taken Mark (or perhaps Matthew, without regard to his subsequent citation of the LXX) as his starting point (Fitzmyer, Luke [I-IX], 709). He improves the Greek by reducing the Hebraistic δειοντες δειονται and ἀκοινοντες ἀκοινωνον to circumstantial participles (Fitzmyer, Luke [I-IX], 709), and suppresses the "lest they should turn again and be forgiven" of Mark 4:12, perhaps to avoid the impression that Jesus wished to hinder conversion (see Dupont, "La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc," Apophorsa: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10. December 1964 [ed. W. Eltester; BZNW 30; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964] 102—those who do not follow the two-source hypothesis would say that he is merely following Matthew more or less closely, a reasonable conclusion in this instance). Therefore, it is most likely that Luke is not consciously quoting the OT here, but rather is abbreviating a word of Jesus which he found in his source. That this word of Jesus was widely circulated can perhaps be seen in the echo of it which is found in John 9:39.

101
is the only one who quotes all of Isa. 40:3-5. The citation of Isa. 40:3 in John 1:23 may indicate that this is a citation traditionally interpreted as applying to John the Baptist.

The question has been raised as to whether this is Markan material or "Q" material. This is one of those infamous occasions of minor agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark which have fostered much controversy over the Synoptic Problem. Both Matthew and Luke mention John in the desert before they begin the citation, whereas Mark notes this afterward, and neither Matthew nor Luke begin with the citation from Mal. 3:1. Those who argue that Luke used Matthew (Griesbach hypothesis) or Matthew and Mark (Augustinian hypothesis) would have to conclude that Luke is following Matthew here and adding some of his own material. Others, however, have argued that Luke and Matthew have both followed "Q" here,$^2$ or have fused the accounts of Mark and "Q".$^3$ On the other hand, Fitzmyer considers that both Matthew and Luke independently corrected Mark to remove the erroneous ascription of the Malachi passage to Isaiah.$^4$ It is probably best to regard the citation, therefore, as Markan material which has been corrected, whether independently or with reference to "Q" material, and to which Luke has added the rest of the citation of Isa. 40:3-5.

The citation is listed by Swete and others as septuagintal.$^5$ There are, however, divergences from the LXX text as we know it. These divergences are as follows: (1)

---

$^2$See e.g., T. Schramm, Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung (SNTSMS, 14; Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1971) 34-35.


$^4$Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 452; see also Rese, 168-169.

$^5$See e.g., Swete, 387; Stendahl, 48; Ringgren, 227.
Luke (with Mark and Matthew) changes LXX τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν to αὐτοῦ; (2) Luke omits πάντα before τὰ σκολιὰ; (3) Luke changes LXX singular ἡ τραχεία to plural αἱ τραχεῖαι; (4) Luke omits καὶ ὄφθησεν ἡ δόξα κυρίου.

Point (1) is the only change in the portion of the citation which comes from the Synoptic tradition, and this change is found in all three Gospels. Certain later mss of the LXX read the same as Luke at this point; however, it is highly likely that they have been influenced by the Synoptic tradition. Holtz concludes that Luke simply reproduced the Synoptic tradition of this verse, even though he knew the correct LXX reading. Krister Stendahl has noted that the αὐτοῦ is used so that the citation may be applied to Christ, instead of to Yahweh. De Waard, on the other hand, considers the αὐτοῦ to be a secondary simplification of the original τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν, which is preserved in the Syriac tradition. The textual evidence for the latter, however, is not convincing, and it is probably best to conclude that the αὐτοῦ is original in the Synoptic citation and was altered from LXX τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν to place the focus on Christ.

The rest of the alterations occur in the Lukan portion of this citation. The omission of πάντα (2) seems to bring the citation closer to the MT, which has no

6See GottLXX14, Isa. 40:3; see also Holtz, 37 n. 2.

7Holtz, 37.


9See de Waard, Comparative Study, 50; see also Nestle-Aland26, Luke 3:4. Snodgrass (34) relates the use of the pronoun here to 1QS 8:13 where the third person pronoun is used as a circumlocution for מִן in the MT; Marcus (38 n. 90), however, has correctly argued that this explanation of the pronoun does not work for the Synoptic citation of Isa. 40:3.
equivalent for the LXX πάντα καὶ βούνας.\textsuperscript{10} This point is similar to point (3) where the plural form in the citation is closer to the MT than the LXX singular form.\textsuperscript{11} There is evidence in the LXX textual tradition for both of these Lukan readings, and Holtz argues that this evidence is important. For point (2), he argues that the Lukan reading better represents the original LXX than does that adopted in our critical texts of LXX Isaiah. The addition of πάντα in the LXX tradition came about, he argues, to make the statement parallel to the πάντα before δοῦνα καὶ βούνας,\textsuperscript{12} not to mention the πάντα οὐκ ουκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐκ οὐν οὐν οὗτος,\textsuperscript{13} On the other hand, the LXX textual evidence seems clear that for point (3) the singular is original.\textsuperscript{13} Holtz suggests two possibilities for explaining the change from singular (LXX) to plural (Luke): either Luke is a mere witness to a variant reading which is also attested elsewhere in the LXX mss tradition, or he himself was responsible for the introduction of the plural form. Because of the breadth of representation of the plural form in the tradition (the A group, the C group and the mixed codices are all represented), he thinks the former is more likely. Thus Luke becomes merely the earliest witness for this variant. On the other hand, he considers it plausible that Luke may have smoothed out the reading by, consciously or unconsciously, correcting the singular to plural to accord with δοῦνας.\textsuperscript{14} Since none of the major early uncials in the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{10}See BHS, Isa. 40:4; Holtz, 38 n. 3.
\textsuperscript{11}See Bock, 94; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 40:4.
\textsuperscript{12}Holtz, 38.
\textsuperscript{13}See GottLXX14, Isa. 40:4.
\textsuperscript{14}Holtz, 39.
LXX textual tradition has the plural reading, it seems likely that the latter reading was influenced by the Lukan citation.

The closeness at this point to the MT has led Bock to conclude that the citation as a whole is traditional, not Lukan in origin, and has traces of a Semitic background, which has undergone some assimilation to the Alexandrian LXX text. But there are several points which point clearly to a LXX origin for this citation. First of all, in the LXX the phrase "in the desert" (€ν τῇ ἔφοβο) is syntactically connected with the crying voice and not with "prepare," as in the MT (although, to be sure, the Hebrew consonantal text is not unambiguous at this point). Similarly, the second referent to the wilderness in the MT (η ἠπατής 3) is dropped from the LXX and Luke. Bock argues against the view that the MT syntax is due to the Massoretic punctuation, not to the consonantal Hebrew text itself. Furthermore, he points out that the LXX rendering is reflected in the Vulgate, Peshitta and in some Rabbinic exposition. This latter point, he argues, points to the conclusion that competing renderings of the Hebrew text "existed and continued to be adhered to after the first century." While this may be so, Bock's arguments do not account for the dropping of η ἠπατής from the LXX

---

15Bock, 94.
16Stendahl, 48.
17See Str-B, 1. 96-97; 2. 154.
18Bock, 95.
19Note, however, the statement of Clause Westermann (Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969] 37), who argues that the parallelism and rhythm as well as the general train of thought of the Hebrew text demand the reading of the MT.
reading, followed by Luke. Another important LXX deviation from the MT, also followed by Luke, is the replacement of "all flesh shall see it together" (Isa. 40:5-6) with "all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (καὶ δύνηται πάσα σώφρον στό σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ). This appears to be the important part of the citation for Luke and likely the reason he cites the passage.²⁰ Leon Morris suggests that "salvation" may be an interpretation of וָדַע ("glory") which occurs earlier in the verse;²¹ however, the LXX does translate וָדַע with δόξα, and σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ is not a translation of וָדַע. Bock argues that the LXX here is interpreting the passage in the light of its context of the deliverance of God's people.²² Similarly, L. H. Brockington has suggested that the LXX translator may have been reluctant to speak of "all flesh" seeing the glory of the Lord, since that is "a revelation of the full majesty of God's glory (or person)." Hence, he argues, the translator may have felt that all flesh would be allowed to see "the effect of God's presence, the salvation of his people."²³

Approaching the problem from another angle, Joseph Ziegler has argued that the Hebrew Vorlage for this verse read מְלֹא יָדַע וָאָדָם, as in Isa. 52:10. He argues that this

²⁰See Snodgrass, 39; Morris, St. Luke, 95; Plummer, 88; Reze, 170.
²¹Morris, St. Luke, 95; see also Reze, 170-171.
²²Bock, 97.
variant may have occurred as a result of a scribe reading Ἰοφής as Ἰοφήται.24 While evaluating these suggestions for the solution of the LXX textual problem actually goes beyond the scope of this study, it is clear that the LXX is the Vorlage of Luke here. This is further confirmed by Luke’s agreement with the LXX against the MT in the use of the plural σκολιά for the singular ὡς ἔργῳ.

There is yet one more point of discrepancy between Luke and the LXX: the omission of καὶ ὁφθησε αὕτη δόξα κυρίου (4). Bock claims that this omission has no clear theological motive, and therefore points to Luke’s use of a traditional text source25 (as if a traditional text source could have no theological motivation). But I. Howard Marshall has suggested that Luke may not have seen the revelation of divine glory as fulfilled in Jesus’ early ministry, and thus felt the theological need to remove this phrase.26 Holtz suggests that Luke probably wanted to relate the citation to the words of Simeon in 2:30: "for mine eyes have seen thy salvation," and felt that the preceding line was superfluous.27 Given that this citation does not occur in a speech, but in a narrative section,28 and that, while v. 4 is taken from Mark, and thus is traditional, the remainder of the citation is only found in Luke, the section of the citation we are dealing

24. Ziegler, Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias (AltAb 12,3; Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934) 150.

25. Bock, 94.


27. Holtz, 38; see also Ringgren, 227.

with probably comes from Luke himself, who omitted καὶ ὄφθησεν ἡ δόξη κυρίων because he felt it was superfluous or, perhaps, for (not very clear) theological reasons.

In summary, then, the citation is septuagintal, with all but the first verse (which is traditional, Markan) probably coming from Luke himself. The LXX here admirably fits Luke’s theological framework, and thus Luke chose to cite the whole passage, with only a couple of small stylistic and/or theological alterations.

B. "Q" Citation: Luke 19:46 = Isa. 56:7

This citation appears in all three Gospels (Matt. 21:13; Mark 11:17) but I have tentatively assigned it to "Q" (or Matthew) for the following reasons. This is another of the "minor agreements" passages, and these agreements between Luke and Matthew against Mark are difficult to explain except by the Griesbach hypothesis that Luke followed Matthew, or (according to the two source hypothesis) that he chose the "Q" version over the Markan. The agreements are these: the introductory formula is almost identical in Matthew and Luke, but quite different in Mark, and both Matthew and Luke leave out the septuagintal phrase πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι which Mark has.

The latter point is important as this omission is not only a deviation from Mark, but also from the LXX. If Luke was using Mark here, we might have expected him to have included this universalizing phrase. The same thing can be said if one argues that Luke was using the LXX directly. Reasons can be given, however, why Matthew

---

29Plummer, 454.
and Luke would have left this phrase out of the saying. J. M. Creed and Fitzmyer concur that, since both Matthew and Luke wrote after the destruction of the temple, they would not have considered the temple as ever becoming a "house of prayer for all nations," especially as the church would have been considered by them to have replaced the temple in God's plan.\(^{30}\) These arguments work equally well if one is arguing either that Luke and Matthew altered the text independently, or that both chose the "Q" reading over the Markan (or Luke chose Matthew over Mark). But the introductory formulae seem to point to "Q" (or Matthew) as the source for this citation.

This brief citation at first glance appears septuagintal, with an allusion to Jer. 7:11 following.\(^{31}\) The allusion to Jeremiah (σπήλαμον λήστῶν) appears to be connected to Isa. 56:7 by the use of the words ἀκός μου in both passages. This connection, however, only applies to the LXX of these two passages, as the MT has Ψηφιά in Isa. 56:7 and Ἰς in Jer. 7:11.\(^{32}\) But there is one significant difference between the LXX rendering of Isa. 56:7 and Luke's citation: Luke has καὶ ἐσταυ for LXX γὰρ . . . κληρήσεταυ. A number of mss of Luke do have the LXX reading here;\(^{33}\) however, it is likely that these mss are harmonizing with Matthew and Mark or, possibly but less


\(^{31}\)See e.g., Stendahl, 66; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1268; Plummer, 454; Ringgren, 228.

\(^{32}\)Stendahl, 66.

likely, the LXX itself. Clearly καὶ ἐστῶν is original in Luke, and that poses a problem, since not only is this phrase non-septuagintal, but it is also a Semitism. It does not, however, bring the citation any closer to the MT. Furthermore, it is this phrase which differs from Mark and Matthew, where the citation appears in its LXX form, minus the γάρ.

Holtz suggests that there were, in fact, at least three versions of the story of Jesus' cleansing of the temple. Martin Dibelius has noted that the variant story in John 2:14-17 is likely a different "Paradigm" of the same story recorded in Mark. Rudolf Bultmann has concluded that Mark has replaced an older pronouncement of Jesus, still preserved in John 2:16, with the citation of Isa. 56:7 and the allusion to Jer. 7:11. Holtz suggests that Luke followed yet another version of this story, which may have originally been a Jewish saying, close to the LXX of Isa. 56:7, which served as a justification for the institution of the synagogue. Thus, contrary to the general opinion

---

34See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1267-1268.
35Holtz, 164.
36Holtz, 164-165.
37Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, 45; see also I. Buse, "The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John," ExpTim 70 (1958-1959) 22.
39Holtz, 164-165; see also O. Michel, "ὁικείον," TDNT 5 (1967) 121.
that Luke's version here is a redaction of Mark,”40 or that Luke is dependent on a similar tradition to Matthew,”41 Holtz suggests special Lukan material here.

While Holtz's theory explains the presence of καὶ ἐσταὶ, it does not explain the evident similarities with Matthew's version. Rather, perhaps, we should note the fundamental difference in the force of this text which the alteration makes. This difference, granted, is not one of meaning, since both "it will be" and "it will be called" probably refer to the actual purpose of the temple as a house of prayer. The former, however, is definitely stronger, as the verb "to be" tends to imply actuality more forcefully than the passive "be called". As well, the future indicative of εἰμί, used to render "categorical injunctions and prohibitions . . . in the legal language of the OT,"42 appears in the first commandment in the LXX: ὄν κ ἐσονται σοι θεοί ἐτερον πλην ἔμοι (Ex. 20:3). Therefore, the use of καὶ ἐσταὶ instead of γὰρ . . . κληθῆσεται would tend to make the temple a house of prayer, not merely in an expression of the purpose of God, but by a direct command of God. While this point does not really remove the possibility of a special source for Luke here (as obviously this change could have occurred in the source), it does open up the possibility that Luke could have made the change himself for theological reasons.

40See e.g., Schramm, 149; Conzelman, Theology, 76.

41See e.g., Buse, 23.

42BDF, 183.
Therefore, in summary, it is probably best to regard this citation as basically septuagintal, and taken over from "Q" (or Matthew). It has been altered, very likely, but not certainly, by Luke, to give the statement more force.

C. "L" Citations


This citation occurs only in Luke as Jesus reads in the synagogue of Nazareth. Matthew and Mark record Jesus' visit to "his own country" and teaching in the synagogue, but only Luke records his reading from the book of Isaiah. Thus this citation is clearly Luke's special material.

The divergences (apart from orthographical) from the LXX are as follows: (1) Luke omits the clause ιάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ; (2) Luke inserts a clause from Isa. 58:6: ἀποστέιλει [LXX has ἀπόστειλε] τεθραυσθέντος ἐν ἀφέσει; (3) Luke replaces LXX καλέσαν with κηρύξας; (4) Luke leaves off at the end of the citation the LXX words καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως.

Points (1) and (2) should probably be taken together. I will look at point (2) first, as this alteration seems to provide the key for understanding point (1). The first thing we can say about this insertion from Isa. 58:6 is that it makes it quite unlikely that this was an actual synagogue reading. Charles Perrot makes the point in this way:

Jamais un lecteur de synagogue, en Palestine et ailleurs, ne se serait permis de modifier à ce point le texte biblique! Ces versets présentent
Although some have argued that this passage may have been altered by Jesus himself at the time of his reading of the Isaiah scroll, this seems unlikely. The citation's obviously composite character has suggested the possibility of a traditional *testimonium* text. This combination could conceivably have come about in the *haphtara* prophetic reading of the ancient synagogue, though the insertion of Isa. 58:6 requires going backward on a scroll, a practice contrary to rabbinic tradition (*b.Meg.* 24a [*gemara*]).

Perrot considers the citation to be a piece of Christian homily, based on the practice of the synagogue, to legitimize the Christian use of the OT. Bock carries it further and proposes a traditional text source in which the Hebrew root נליא found in Isa 61:1 and 58:6 provided the midrashic link between the two passages, along with נליא in 61:2 and 58:5. He also notes that our point (4), the change of καλέσαν to κηρούξα, brings the passage closer to the Hebrew, by giving the same rendering for both uses of נליא.

This also, he argues, is evidence of a traditional source with links to a Semitic

---

43Perrot, 327; see also Bock, 107.


45See Perrot, 328-333.

46Stendahl, 96.

47Perrot, 337.
context. Bruce Chilton has argued that the citation is traditional and goes back to Jesus himself, since the relating of Isa. 61:1 to 58:6 must have Jesus’ authority behind it. Holtz suggests the possibility of a testimonium here, but finds the proposal unsatisfactory.

As far as the insertion goes, although conceivably, as Bock suggests, the connection could have been made in Hebrew, it is more likely to have occurred in Greek. The connection in the LXX would be between the use in the two passages of the same word ἀφθονι (ἀφέσει in 58:6), which translate very different words in Hebrew (נַע in 61:1 and יִשְׁרֵי in 58:6). Thus a connection from the LXX is most natural. The Isa. 58:6 citation follows the LXX exactly, only changing the imperative ἀποστέλλει to the aorist infinitive ἀποστέλλω to conform to its new context. As far as the change of καλέσαι to κηρύξας (our point [3]) goes, it can be easily explained, as does Holtz, as a simple error, reduplicating the κηρύξας from the previous verse. It is also to be

---

48Bock, 106-107, 316-317 n. 55.


50Holtz, 41.


52Holtz, 40.

53Ibid.
noted that none of the evangelists uses *καλέσω* in the sense we find it in LXX Isa. 61:2, and Luke does show some preference for *κηρύξω* in regard to preaching. Hence it seems reasonable to conclude that the LXX is the basis for this citation.

Furthermore, there are other indications that the citation as a whole is septuagintal. For example, Luke follows the LXX in omitting twice the rendering for *ἵππος* and in rendering the Hebrew *יִשְׂרָאֵל* with *τυφλοῖς ἄναβληψιν*. Thus it seems certain that Luke is following the LXX here.

Turning to point (1), the omission of *ιάσασθαι τοὺς συντετριμμένους τῇ καρδίᾳ*, it is to be noted that some NT mss contain this clause (A, Θ, Ψ, 0102, f, the majority text, and some versions), although the textual evidence seems more weighted in favour of the omission. Bo Reicke has argued that the inclusion of the clause is probably original on the basis of the context (vv. 23, 27) and because it provides better poetic symmetry. It is, however, difficult to explain why a later copyist would delete the line. On the other hand, given the references to healing in vv. 23 and 27, it is also difficult to explain why Luke himself would omit it. Holtz suggests that in Luke’s ms

---


55Rese, 145; Ringgren (228-229) suggests that the use of *κηρύξω* improves the Greek.

56See Bock, 106; Stendahl, 96; Dupont, “L’ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Matthieu 11,2-6; Luc 7,18-23),” *NRT* 83 (1961) 949 n. 87.


58Reicke, “Jesus in Nazareth,” 49.

59Bock, 317 n. 57.
of the LXX this clause was misplaced.\textsuperscript{60} Thus Luke is reproducing the LXX as he had it. But, again, there is no textual evidence whatsoever for this, and Holtz's suggestion must be regarded as speculative.

We are left then with the suggestion that Luke omitted this phrase himself, but the question remains as to why. Rese has suggested a theological reason for the omission. He builds on Eduard Schweizer's note that never in Luke are miracles or healings ascribed to the Spirit,\textsuperscript{61} and concludes that Luke removed the line to make clear that the Spirit of God is not a wonder-working spirit, but a prophetic spirit.\textsuperscript{62} Another theological reason has been suggested by U. Busse, who considers it likely that Luke wished to remove the idea of "comfort" from Jesus' mission.\textsuperscript{63} The latter suggestion appears somewhat tenuous, but Rese's suggestion may have some merit, although it is difficult to evaluate properly, and creates a problem owing to the "healing" context of Luke 4:23,27. It appears from the latter two verses that Luke 4 does present the Spirit as a wonder-working spirit in some sense, or at least a "healing spirit."

It seems that there is really no good theological reason for Luke to omit the clause. What other reason, then, could there be? Walter Grundmann suggests that the omission was an oversight, given the context, and not a purposive omission.\textsuperscript{64} This is

\begin{footnotes}
\textsuperscript{60}Holtz, 40.


\textsuperscript{62}Rese, 145.

\textsuperscript{63}Busse, 34-35, 77-78.

\textsuperscript{64}W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (THKNT 3; 2d ed.; East Berlin: Evangelische, 1961) 120.
\end{footnotes}
certainly not impossible, and becomes even more likely if Luke were quoting from
memory, as Ringgren suggests, especially if he inadvertently replaced the clause
(albeit not in the exact same place) with the clause from Isa 58:6 (point [2]). Here the
\( \alpha \phi \varepsilon \alpha \nu / \alpha \phi \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \) mnemonic cues would provide a concatenation of catchwords which
would tend to connect the two passages in his mind. If Luke was quoting from memory,
this would also explain his use of \( \kappa \eta \rho \Sigma \xi \alpha \iota \) instead of \( \kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \sigma \alpha \iota \) (point [3]). Hence, while
it is not the most profound solution to the problem, the simplest adequate explanation of
points (1) and (2) is that Luke was quoting from memory.

Point (4), however, the omission of \( \kappa \alpha \iota \, \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \alpha \nu \, \alpha \nu \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \theta \sigma \sigma \varepsilon \omega \varsigma \) from the end of
the citation, is probably deliberate on the part of Luke. It has often been mentioned that
the Lukan Jesus ends the citation where he does in order to demonstrate that he comes
as Saviour and not as Judge. It has further been asserted that this citation is
programmatic for Luke, defining the person and mission of Jesus as Luke wishes to
present them. Thus, it is not hard to understand that Luke would leave out this final
statement. James Sanders has further commented that Luke has Jesus end the citation
on the word \( \delta \varepsilon \kappa \tau \omicron \nu \) to provide a prophetic challenge, noting that the day of salvation was

---

65Ringgren, 229.

to the Romans [BNTC; London: Black, 1957] 69) for a NT example of a catena quotation (Romans 3:11-18).

67See e.g., Grundmann, Lukas, 121; George, 27; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 533; E. Samain, "Le discours-programme
de Nazareth. Lc 4,16-21," AsSeign 20 (1973) 17-27; see also W. J. Harrelson, "Vengeance," IDB 4 (1962) 748;
Monshouwer, 90-99.

68See e.g., Seccombe, 253; Plummer, 122.

69See Perrot, 327.
acceptable to God, though not acceptable (v. 24 δὲκτὰς) to those to whom it came.\textsuperscript{70} Whatever one makes of the theological argumentation here, it seems that the omission of point (4) was deliberate,\textsuperscript{71} and comes from Luke.

There is other evidence as well that the citation comes from Luke. Rainer Albertz has pointed out that the concept of the "poor" in Isa. 58 comes close to Luke's conception of the "poor" (see Luke 7:22; 6:20-26; 1:53) and probably indicates Luke's desire in this passage to identify Jesus as the one sent to the "poor."\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{72}} E. Samain also notes that the declaration of the oracle as "fulfilled" "today" is characteristic of Lukan soteriology (Luke 2:11; 5:26; 13:32-33; 19:5,9; 23:43).\textsuperscript{73} All this makes it very likely that the citation in its present form is Lukan.\textsuperscript{74}

In summary, then, we conclude that this mixed citation is essentially Lukan, and follows the LXX, with some differences owing largely to its being quoted from memory, and some deliberate alterations by the hand of Luke.


\textsuperscript{71}See Ringgren, 229.


\textsuperscript{73}Samain, 17-27.

\textsuperscript{74}See Stendahl, 96; Holtz, 41; but cf. Baarlink, 209.
2. **Luke 22:37 = Isa. 53:12**

Here we have a very brief quotation attributed to Jesus in Luke's special material (the addition of Mark 15:28 can certainly be traced to harmonization with Luke). The citation reads καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἔλογίσθη, while the LXX reads καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἔλογίσθη. Here there is complete agreement of only two words with the LXX, καὶ and ἔλογίσθη, while the preposition μετὰ instead of ἐν changes the case of the following noun from dative to genitive. The citation appears closer to the MT (which reads πλημμύρησεν) than the LXX here. The preposition μετὰ is perhaps a better translation of -πλημμύρησεν than ἐν, and the omission of the definite article also seems to bring the citation closer to the Hebrew.

There are three possible ways to account for this change from the LXX: (1) Luke used a LXX text which had been assimilated to the Hebrew at this point; (2) Luke altered the text himself; or (3) the citation is a traditional Semitic citation from the early church. I will look at each of these in turn.

Hanson argues that Luke may have had a Greek text deviating from the LXX here. There is no ms of the LXX which agrees with Luke at this point, however, although Symmachus reads μετὰ, but with τῶν ἀσεβῶν instead of ἀνόμων and ἀριθμηθηθή

---


76The introductory words: "For I tell you that this scripture must be fulfilled in me," indicate expressly that this passage is meant to be a citation rather than an allusion.


78Hanson, pp. 79-80.
instead of ἐλογίσθη. H. W. Heidland has suggested that Luke is using a text which may relate to Justin Apol. I,50,2, which also reads μετὰ ἀνώμων. But Holtz rightly points out that Justin's citations of this passage are exactly septuagintal elsewhere (Apol. I,51,2; Dial. 13,7; 89,3), and so it is more likely that Justin is paraphrasing in I,50,2. Even without support from Justin, however, the possibility of an Hebraicized ms here remains a viable alternative.

The suggestion that Luke altered the LXX text himself deliberately was forcefully argued by H.-W. Bartsch. Bartsch argues that the citation is introduced and concluded in characteristic Lukan style and betrays the fact that this is clear Lukan material. He also argues that Luke altered the ἐν to μετὰ in order to guard against the assumption that Jesus was crucified as a revolutionary (taking ἄνωμος as a cryptic reference to Jewish revolutionaries). Thus he was reckoned "with" the lawless (revolutionaries) and not "among" them, as the ἐν could be taken. But, even if ἄνωμος here does mean revolutionary (a conclusion which is by no means sure), Luke, contrary to the other synoptics, apparently does have Jesus convicted on the charge of being "a Zealot king,

---

79See GottLXX14, Isa. 53:12.
81Holtz, 43 n. 1.
83Ibid, 195-196.
84Cf. BAG 71.
inciting the people" (Luke 23:2-5). Thus, it does not appear that Luke was attempting to guard against the assumption that Jesus was charged with being a revolutionary, and Bartsch's argument is not supported.

Holtz, similarly to Bartsch, argues that the alterations are Lukan. He notes that the citation of Isa. 53:7-8 in Acts 8:32-33 demonstrates that Luke knew this portion of Scripture in its LXX form. He concludes that Luke has, perhaps unconsciously, made a small stylistic improvement here, and, like Eusebius, has paraphrased the citation, making it clearer, but preserving the sense of the original. We could thus classify this as a loose citation. The likelihood that Eusebius was influenced by Luke, however, is not small, and Eusebius' paraphrase may be equally a reference to the words of the Lukan Jesus as to the LXX. If so, one would question whether Luke's replacement of μετὰ for ἐν in this context was a natural paraphrase, and even whether there really is any stylistic improvement here. Furthermore, a loose citation would not explain the closeness of the reworked citation to the MT.

This closeness has given rise to the theory that Luke may have been using a traditional source. Krister Stendahl has suggested: "We find here signs which indicate that Is. 53 had been the subject of early Christian translation and interpretation in

---


86 Eusebius (Prep. Ev. III.2) cites the LXX verbatim in vv. 68-69 (καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνήμοις ἐλογίαθη), but in v. 70 paraphrases (καὶ μετὰ ἀνήμοιν λογισθήνεται).

87 Holtz, 42-43.
connection with its significance for Christology," and notes that it occurs in the passion narrative in which there are other traces of "retained Semitic wording." Joachim Jeremias thinks that the citation is firmly anchored in the context, and that context (the sayings about the swords in vv. 36 and 38) is "obviously ancient." Vincent Taylor, among others, has argued for the authenticity of these verses as coming from Jesus himself. Marion Soards and Bock have followed these suggestions and concluded that the citation is traditional and old.

There are points which tend to count against this explanation, however. First of all, Holtz has argued that Luke must have used the LXX here, because they both render the niphal form of Ἰλ Ἰούτην by λογίζεσθαι, while it is more commonly rendered by ἀριθμεῖσθαι. In fact, it is the only use of a form of λογίζομαι for Ἰλ Ἰούτην in the LXX. Therefore, the replication of λογίζεσθαι in this citation would seem to point to LXX influence at least. Secondly, although Taylor has concluded that there is a

---

88Stendahl, 94-95.
89Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ," 716.
92Holtz, 42. Although Bock says that Holtz is mistaken (137), the references which he lists as refuting Holtz, tend rather to support him (337 n. 194).
93Of the 18 instances of Ἰλ Ἰούτην in qal or hiphil, only two are not rendered with a form of ἀριθμεῖσθαι (III Kgdm 21:25 [ἀλλάκσασθαι] and Isa. 53:12).
"notable absence" of characteristic Lukan words and phrases in this episode,\textsuperscript{94} evidence of Lukan redaction has been found by Bartsch, as I have already noted, and others.\textsuperscript{95} Furthermore, the citation is clearly related to Jesus' crucifixion (23:39-43),\textsuperscript{96} and functions, as Fitzmyer puts it, "in typically Lucan fashion, as a prediction that is to find realization in the passion and death of Jesus."\textsuperscript{97} Finally, theologically, this citation fits into Luke's overall picture of Jesus as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah.\textsuperscript{98}

There seems, therefore, to be evidence both for a traditional citation and for Luke's use of the LXX in this citation. Such influence from both a traditional source and the LXX is possible. It seems likely that this whole episode was formed out of pieces of Luke's special material (L), but that Luke himself put the pieces together in their present form.\textsuperscript{99} If so, and if his source material did contain this citation as a word of Jesus, Luke may not have wished to alter it, as I noted in regard to the citation from Mal. 3:1 in Luke 7:27. On the other hand, the presence of \( \dot{e} \lambda \omega \gamma \iota \sigma \theta \eta \) seems to indicate LXX influence at least. Either (1) Luke found a traditional citation in his special material which was influenced by the LXX at this point, or (2) he corrected the citation


\textsuperscript{95}See Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke (X-XXIV)}, 1429.

\textsuperscript{96}See Bartsch, 196; Rese, 156; Goppelt, \textit{Typos}, 123.


\textsuperscript{98}See D. J. Moo, \textit{The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives} (Sheffield: Almond, 1983), 160-161; Larkin, 333-334.

to the LXX to read ἔλογισθη, but did not alter the rest of the citation, or (3) he used a Hebraicizing LXX ms. Although each of these conclusions is possible, the presence of ἔλογισθη, indicating LXX influence, and the use of μετὰ with the genitive and the omission of the definite article, indicating influence from the Hebrew, imply a Hebraicizing LXX ms. Although the evidence is not conclusive, the suggestion that Luke was using a Hebraicizing LXX ms provides the simplest adequate explanation of all the phenomena in this citation.

To summarize, then, this citation is probably Lukan and septuagintal, having been drawn from a Hebraicizing ms. While this explanation is most likely, it is also possible that Luke is citing from a traditional source. If the latter, then either the source was influenced by the LXX, or Luke corrected the citation to the LXX, but only slightly and without appreciable reason. A Hebraicizing LXX ms, however, has the advantage of explaining the relation of the citation to the LXX and the closeness of some elements in the citation to the MT, while avoiding the problems encountered in other explanations.

D. Acts Citations


This citation occurs in Stephen's speech which I have already noted has become fertile ground for the practice of source criticism. Thus the possibility of a non-Lukan origin for citations in this chapter must be kept in mind. The citation from Isa. 66:1-2 differs from the LXX in the following particulars: (1) Acts leaves out the introductory οὗτως λέγει κύριος; (2) Acts adds λέγει κύριος after οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι; (3) Acts replaces
ποίος with τίς before τόπος; (4) Acts changes the word order of πάντα . . . ταύτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χείρ μου; (5) Acts omits γάρ and seemingly puts in its place οὐχὶ.

This text, like the Amos citations in Acts 15 and earlier in chapter 7, shows evidence of rearrangement. Thus it seems likely that points (1) and (2) should be taken together. Ringgren asserts, as does Clarke, that this alteration as well as the others in the passage must be the result of free citation.\(^{100}\) Holtz, however, suggests a very plausible reason for the alteration. He asserts that Luke wished to separate the λέγει of the quotation from the λέγει in his introductory statement (v.48), thus improving the style of the speech.\(^{101}\) This seems very likely. The original of Sinaiticus for the LXX here omits οὗτος λέγει κύριος, and Luke’s ms may have likewise omitted the phrase, but the presence of λέγει κύριος later in the citation makes it more likely that Luke rearranged the material. The group of LXX mss which add the later λέγει κύριος probably reflect influence from Acts.\(^{102}\)

The replacement of ποίος with τίς (point [3]) presents another problem. The use of τίς accrds with the form of the citation found in Barn. 16:2, and so it has been suggested that Luke and the writer of Barnabas may have used the same testimonium.\(^{103}\) Holtz suggests that both Luke and the writer of Barnabas were using a variant LXX ms

---

\(^{100}\) Ringgren, 234; Clarke, 91-92.

\(^{101}\) Holtz, 29.

\(^{102}\) See ibid; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 66:1.

\(^{103}\) Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 159-160; Bruce, Acts (1951), 176.
with this reading, and further notes that, since Barnabas has λέγει κύριος in the same place as the LXX and not where Luke has it, it is unlikely that a testimonium was involved. I might go on to say that this latter point seems also to rule out the influence of Acts on Barnabas for this citation. Holtz’s conclusion seems well founded, and I am inclined to accept it here.

Points (4) and (5) should also be taken together, and probably display more Lukan rearrangement of the text. The affect of this rearrangement, as Holtz points out, turns the LXX statement into a rhetorical question, aimed at the hearers—a common practice in preaching, which tends to make the point of the text in a more powerful way. This seems highly likely in the context, but brings up the question to whom this citation belongs. The speech of Stephen is basically a polemical homily and does not completely work as a defence against the accusations levelled at him. Thus the speech has been considered as extraneous material inserted into the framework of the martyrdom of Stephen story. This has led to the suggestion that perhaps the Stephen speech is a Christian tract which has been inserted here, and in which this citation was originally

104He argues that LXX mss 26-86, which read τις, are from the Alexandrian tradition, which shows little Hexaplaric influence, and thus may indicate an early reading.

105Holtz, 30; cf. GottLXX14, Isa. 66:1.

106Cf. GottLXX14, Isa. 66:1; Bruce, Acts (1951), 176.

107Holtz, 30-31.


found. But signs of Luke’s interaction with the material have also been found, and some scholars have gone so far as to attribute the whole composition to Luke. While it is beyond the scope of this study to settle the source question here, it must be noted that, while the homiletical and polemical nature of the speech points perhaps to early source material, the rearrangement of this citation could easily have been Lukan. The use of the LXX and similar rearrangements elsewhere point to this latter conclusion.

In summary, then, the citation appears to be from the LXX (perhaps a variant, though not Hebraicizing, ms), although freely rearranged for literary or homiletic purposes. The citation is probably Lukan, although a source may figure into the citation, but only if that source quoted from the LXX.

---


113But cf. Tyson, Images of Judaism, 115.

2. *Acts 8:32-33 = Isa. 53:7-8*

This citation is one of the few in Acts which do not occur in a speech, but rather is part of the narrative framework. The context presents this citation as an extract from the book of Isaiah which is being read by an Ethiopian official, and which is interpreted to him by Philip, one of the seven "deacons". Ringgren states that this is a verbal quotation from the LXX, while Clarke lists it as having "substantial agreement" with the LXX. Since the narrative portrays this scripture being read by a Gentile from North Africa, the LXX translation is a logical choice for this citation, as that version is probably the only one with which such a person would be familiar, or perhaps even be able to read. Hence, the use of the LXX here presents no problem for those who wish to see here the recounting of an actual event. But it is much more likely (given that it occurs as a part of Luke's narrative and not in a speech) that Luke has inserted the citation here in accord with his custom. The theology behind the citation and its interpretation by Philip certainly appear to be Lukan.
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115 Ringgren, 234.

116 Clarke, 87-88.


119 See Hanson, 80.

The citation does not accord completely with the LXX, however, although the discrepancies are minor. The divergences are as follows: (1) the present participle \textit{keiροντος} is changed to aorist participle \textit{κειραντος} in Acts; (2) some mss of Acts include \textit{αὐτοῦ} after \textit{ταξεινώσει}.

The change from present to aorist (point [1]) is reflected in the LXX tradition of a number of mss, particularly of the Alexandrian group.\textsuperscript{121} Similarly, a number of NT mss contain the present participle (Vaticanus and the majority text).\textsuperscript{122} While the NT ms evidence probably points to a harmonizing with the LXX text, Holtz argues that the aorist is probably the original reading in the LXX, and points to the citation of the passage in Barn. 5:2 and 1 Clem. 16:7 (which both contain the aorist) as evidence that an alternate LXX text containing the aorist participle was in use at the time of Luke.\textsuperscript{123} While one could propose a \textit{testimonium} here, used by all three writers, Holtz argues that the differences between the citations in the three documents preclude the use here of a common \textit{testimonium}, as well as the fact that the citation is firmly anchored in Luke’s theological development of the passage.\textsuperscript{124} This latter point, however, may indicate an alteration of tense on the part of Luke himself. Bock points out that the change to aorist may be a stylistic (or theological) change, giving a nuance of completion to the simile,

\textsuperscript{121}See GottLXX14, Isa. 53:7.

\textsuperscript{122}See NestleAland26, Acts 8:32.

\textsuperscript{123}Holtz, 31-32.

allowing reference to the completed act of Jesus. In view of Luke’s perceived method of handling scripture observed thus far, this is not unlikely. Assuming that the aorist participle represents a Lukan alteration of the LXX text, the citations of 1 Clement and Barnabas, and the LXX tradition may all have been influenced by Acts. On the other hand, it remains possible that Luke simply followed an aorist tense in his Vorlage. In either case the LXX is the origin of this citation.

The addition of αὐτοῦ in some mss of Acts (point [2]) is similarly complicated textually. Metzger notes that the good external testimony for the reading which lacks αὐτοῦ (p74, 8, A, B, 103, 629, 1642*, 1739c, vg al) "generally carries conviction of originality," but the possibility that αὐτοῦ was deleted from the text of Acts to conform to the LXX is also good. As far as the LXX itself is concerned, the longer reading (with αὐτοῦ) is witnessed by a large number of Lucianic witnesses, the Alexandrian text 106, and several mixed mss. Holtz concludes that the αὐτοῦ in Acts 8:33 is a gloss inserted to point the reader to the story of Jesus. But is this a later gloss, or a Lukan gloss? In the context of Philip’s interpretation of the passage the likelihood of a Lukan gloss here is strengthened.

---

125 Bock, 228; see also Rese, 99.
126 See GottLXX14, Isa 53:7.
127 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 359.
128 See GottLXX14, Isa. 53:8.
129 Holtz, 31.
The LXX, when compared with the MT, reflects two divergencies: for MT ἔν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ηρθη, "with restraining and judgement he was taken," LXX has ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἡ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἐρημωθη, "in humiliation his judgement is lifted up," and for MT ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῆς ἁπάντησεως ἡ ζωή αὐτοῦ ἐφαρμόσθη, "because he was cut off from the land of the living," LXX has ὅτι αἱρεται ἀπὸ τῆς ζωῆς ἡ ζωή αὐτοῦ, "because his life is taken up from the earth." The Hebrew is somewhat unclear at this point, and Bock is probably correct in asserting that the LXX has opted for a stylistically simpler and more explanatory rendering. Generally speaking, the LXX is more amenable to christological interpretation than the MT, although Bock argues that the christological interpretations can be understood from the Hebrew. In any case, these LXX renderings in the Acts citation point conclusively to the LXX as the source.

To summarize, this is a LXX citation. While it is not impossible that Luke was using a variant textform, it is better to view the divergences from the LXX in this citation as Lukan redactional alterations.

---

130See D. J. A. Clines, I, We, & They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53 (JSOT Sup. 1; Sheffield: JSOT, 1976) 17; Westermann, Isaiah 40-66, 264-265.


132Rese, 98; see also Haenchen, Acts, 312; Conzelman, Acts, 63.

133Bock, 229; see also Payne, "The Servant of the Lord," 138.

Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13 is a complicated speech resembling in many ways the speech of Stephen in Acts 7.\textsuperscript{134} There are a number of citations in this speech as well as a sketch of the history of Israel. In v. 22 Paul apparently cites Isa 44:28 as the finale of a combined citation including Ps. 89:20 (LXX 88:21) and I Kgdms. 13:14. In v. 34 Isa. 55:3 is cited in close proximity with Ps. 2:7 (v. 33) and Ps. 16:10 (LXX 15:10) (v. 35). The citation of Isa. 49:6 in v. 47 seems to stand on its own.


The brief citation (ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου),\textsuperscript{135} which Swete characterizes as septuagintal,\textsuperscript{136} appears to be a rearrangement of LXX πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου ποιήσει. In the Isaianic context the verse is applied to Cyrus, whereas in Paul's speech the words are applied to David. The connection of these words to David may not, however, be evidence of ignorance of their OT context. Isa. 45:1 has the Lord speaking to τῷ χριστῷ μου κύριῷ, and it is not hard to see how a christological connection could be seen here. Furthermore, some Patristic witnesses to the LXX replace κύριῳ with κυρίῳ, which, if the latter reflects a LXX tradition, would make the connection all the

\textsuperscript{134}See Munck, 124; Blaiklock, 105.

\textsuperscript{135}The introductory formula: "of whom he testified and said" (Acts 13:22) makes it likely that a citation is meant here.

\textsuperscript{136}Swete, 398-399.
more clear. Longenecker sees in this joining of passages the midrashic technique of *gezerah shawah* (analogy);\(^{138}\) such a technique would be typical of traditional Jewish or Jewish-Christian treatments.

This brings up the problem whether we have here a Lukan citation or a traditional one. Otto Glombitza and J. W. Bowker conclude that the whole passage from vv. 17-25 is a traditional text taken from the preaching of the synagogue,\(^ {139}\) and Wilcox has found affinities in the Isaiah quote with the Targum of I Sam. 13:14, affinities which lead him to speculate that the Targum was the origin of this latter phrase, not the LXX.\(^ {140}\) The evidence from *1 Clem.* 18:1, in which the Psalms and I Kingdoms citations are joined in the same way as here in Acts, but which leaves out the Isaiah citation, can be interpreted as evidence of a *testimonium* being used both in Acts and in *1 Clement*, where the Isaiah citation was either not present or not recognized as a quotation.\(^ {141}\)

Wilcox encounters difficulties, however, and is forced to conclude that ἀνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου and τοῦσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου are different renderings of the same Hebrew phrase from I Sam. 13:14, the former septuagintal, and the latter

\(^{137}\)See Holtz, 134 n. 5; see also Gott, *LXX* 14, Isa. 45:1, and 100; Dupont, *Salvation*, 144.


\(^{140}\)Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 21-23.

\(^{141}\)Ibid, 22-23; Holtz, 134-136; Neil, 158.
targumic. 142 How a targumic and a septuagintal version of the same words found their way into the passage in Acts is, as both Emerton and Richard affirm, difficult to understand. 143 Wilcox runs into more problems with the presence of πάντα in the latter phrase, since it is not evident in the Targum. He ends up by concluding that its presence "may be due to the editor, or perhaps to assimilation of the words to the form of the passage from Isaiah." 144 Wilcox's hypothesis seems fraught with difficulties, and it is much simpler to attribute this phrase to the LXX of Isaiah, as does Swete.

The question remains whether the citation is Lukan or traditional. Since it appears in a midrashically combined citation one might suggest a traditional source, as it could be argued that such a midrash is typical of Jewish exegesis (see above). 145 It is to be noted that the manner of citation (i.e., a catena quotation) here is one which Paul at times uses (e.g., Rom. 3:10-18), and this may argue in favour of a Pauline origin for this speech. It does appear, however, that Luke was familiar with some tradition of learned exegesis (note, e.g., the question asked by the Ethiopian official in Acts 8:34), 146 and he certainly could have combined these citations himself. The parallel citation in 1 Clement, though somewhat different, may be evidence of testimonia here, but only for the citation from the Psalms and I Kingdoms. The Isaianic passage is not

142Wilcox, Semitisms, 22.

143Emerton, 287; Richard, "Old Testament," 331.

144Wilcox, Semitisms, 22.

145See also Glombitza, 310; Bowker, "Speeches in Acts," 101-105.

146See Hanson, 80; Richard, "Old Testament," 331.
present. The absence of this latter passage can only be ascribed to absence from the *testimonium*, since its very appearance in a document of this sort would give it authority as a messianic citation, and it is difficult to see why it would be left out by Clement. If so, then we must at least conclude that Luke added the citation from Isaiah to the original *testimonia* with which he was working. On the other hand, even if one grants that Clement left it out of his *testimonium* source, its omission can be just as easily explained if 1 Clement is dependent on Acts here. All in all, the origin of this citation could as readily be Lukan as traditional, and in view of his knowledge of LXX Isaiah, which we have seen thus far, it is probably Lukan; still a Christian homily, whether Pauline or otherwise, is not inconceivable as a source here.

b. *Acts 13:34 = Isa. 55:3*

Although not a combined citation in the strict sense of the word, this citation is found in close midrashic relation with Ps. 2:7 and 16:10 (LXX 15:10). The divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts replaces διαθήκομαι with δώσω; (2) Acts omits the phrase διαθήκην αἰώνων.

---

147See Bruce, *Acts*, 265; the relative dating of Acts and 1 Clement, however, complicates the matter somewhat (see Kümmel, 185-186), but if an early date is assigned to Acts, such as in the early 60s (e.g., J. A. T. Robinson, *Redating the New Testament* [Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976] 116; a similar conclusion has been reached recently by J. Wenham in his monograph *Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem* [London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991]), then the complications are avoided.

148Wilcox suggests that vv. 17-22 may belong to the Stephen material (*Semitisms*, 164).

Holtz is correct in asserting that the two points belong together, since both relate to the covenant idea, and both are probably removed for that reason. Bruce, however, considers that δῶσω may be used because of influence from δῶσεις in the following citation from Ps. 16:10 (LXX 15:10). In any event, the covenant idea is removed here, possibly, as we shall see, to remove any suggestion that Israel enjoys exclusivity in its relationship with God.

The connection of Ps. 16:10 (15:10 LXX) to Isa. 55:3 appears to come from the use of the term δοσος in each. Now, the occurrence of δοσος in the Isa. 55:3 is somewhat surprising, since the common rendering of γίνεται is ἔλεος and we would have expected the Hebrew יִנְקַד יִנְקַד to be rendered τὰ ἔλεη Δαυίδ as in II Chr. 6:42. Dupont has noted that the LXX has confused γίνεται (“grace”, “mercy”, “favour”) with the adjective τὸν (“pious”), thus reading γίνεται ἄλλον. Thus it has been concluded that the word-play is possible only in Greek, and the citation, therefore, must be

---

150Holtz, 137-138.

151L.&S. 196.

152Bruce, Acts (1951), 270.

153Similar, although not identical, views to mine are expressed by Rese (87), Bock (251), and Holtz (138); see also Lövestam, Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13:32-37, With an Appendix: ‘Son of God’ in the Synoptic Gospels (ConNeot 18; Copenhagen: Gicrup, 1961) 76-79.

154Only a very few of the over a hundred occurrences of γίνεται are not translated by ἔλεος; the overwhelming preponderance of ἔλεος for γίνεται can be seen in even a cursory comparison of the data in G. Lisowsky, Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament (2d ed.; Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958) 512-514, and E. Hatch and H. A. Redpath, eds., A Concordance to the Septuagint (3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1897) 1. 451-452.

155Dupont, “ΤΑ ὉΣΙΑ ΔΑΥΙΔ ΤΑ ΠΙΣΤΑ (Ac XII 34 = Is LV 3),” RB 68 (1961) 97; see also Bruce, Themes, 69; Acts (1951), 270.
septuagintal.\textsuperscript{156} Jan Willem Doeve, however, followed by Bock, has argued that the connection is possible as well in the Hebrew through the root \( \text{יְנָה} \) and its derivative \( \text{יָנָה} \).\textsuperscript{157} Similarly, Longenecker has concluded that this "promise [of Isa. 55:3] was certainly involved in traditional Jewish messianology,"\textsuperscript{158} and Glombitza asserts that the speech of Acts 13:33-37 reflects "das große Gebiet einer vorchristlichen messianischen Ämterlehre."\textsuperscript{159} While Holtz concurs here that the midrashic joining of the two citations suggests Jewish tradition, he argues that the citations themselves were taken from the LXX.\textsuperscript{160}

Although, as Doeve and Bock aver, the connection between the verses could, at least theoretically, be made from the Hebrew, it is much more likely from the Greek. Similarly, we should note that the rendering of \( \text{διαος} \) for \( \text{יָנָה} \) would not likely occur to a translator, unless he made the same mistake as that made by the LXX. The evidence of Symmachus and Theodotion, who both translate the word with \( \text{ἐλέη} \), show that the latter is the preferred rendering.\textsuperscript{161} Thus, while the connection could possibly have been made at the Hebrew level, in Acts 13 the connection appears more likely septuagintal in origin.

\textsuperscript{156}Dupont, "TA 'OΣΙΑ," 96; Ringgren, 234.

\textsuperscript{157}Doeve, 174; Bock, 251; see also F. Hauck, "\( \text{διαος}, \text{διαός} \)," in \textit{TDNT} 5 (1967) 491; Dupont, "TA 'OΣΙΑ," 98.

\textsuperscript{158}Longenecker, \textit{Biblical Exegesis}, 103.

\textsuperscript{159}Glombitza, 315.

\textsuperscript{160}Holtz, 137-141.

\textsuperscript{161}See Ibid, 137; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 55:3.
But the question whether the citation is Lukian or traditional is more difficult. Holtz argues that the words concerning the covenant would not have been removed by Luke. He argues that for Luke, as well as the early church, the idea of covenant, especially the new covenant, as expressed in the very early tradition stemming from Jesus at the Last Supper (e.g., Luke 22:20; I Cor. 11:25),162 was a well known and very important theological tradition. Hence Luke and Christian tradition would have little reason to omit the reference to the covenant.163 Holtz concludes that the citation comes rather from a Jewish *testimonium* legitimizing the office of the Davidic messiah.164 He sees this as embedded in the history of Israel presented in Acts 13, portraying the history of Israel as culminating in David.165 Thus Holtz finds himself in agreement with Glombitza regarding this whole speech.

Holtz and Glombitza, however, do not answer the question why the references to the covenant are removed. The covenant was manifestly as important to the Jews as it was for the early Church, and the Davidic covenant in particular.166 That the reference to the Davidic covenant would be excised in a Jewish *testimonium* remains inexplicable in Holtz's theory. On the other hand, that Luke, or Christian tradition, had no reason to omit this reference is probably a mistaken assumption. What Holtz fails to realize,

---

162See e.g., Gerhardsson, 36; J. Behm, "The NT Term διαθήκη," *TDNT* 2 (1964) 133-134.

163Holtz, 139.

164Ibid, 141.

165Ibid, 140.

and what Rese points out, is that it is a specific reference to the Davidic covenant that is removed. Why is that? I would suggest that the answer lies in the specific relationship within Judaism of the Davidic covenant and the desire for national restoration. Specifically, the Davidic covenant became linked in Judaism to the restoration of Jerusalem and the renewal of the Davidic kingdom. This nationalist hope was not on the agenda of either Paul or Luke, especially the latter, who saw the church as the eschatological continuation of Israel in the plan of God. Thus the removal of the reference to the Davidic covenant is more consistent with Christian tradition, especially Luke, than with Jewish tradition.

A Christian testimonium is not ruled out, however, by the arguments just cited. But there are certain other factors which may indicate that a testimonium of this sort was not used. First of all, Dupont argues that the citation itself adds nothing to the argument unless the Isaianic context is kept in mind. Hence, it would appear that the author of the speech was aware of the context of the citation, and did not simply cite an isolated text from a testimonium. Another point against the use of a Christian testimonium is that the speech as a whole appears to be a unity, and seems to be an integral part of the narrative of Acts (it cannot with certainty be isolated as a fragment inserted in the

---

167 Rese, 87.

168 Weinfeld, 192.

169 Dupont, Salvation, 145-146; Immediately following in Isa. 55:4 (LXX) appear the words "behold, I have given him as a witness to the gentiles." Dupont notes that the significance of this universalistic statement would have been readily grasped by Christians reading it.
narrative).\textsuperscript{170} Dupont has noted that the finale of the speech has a distinctly Pauline tone,\textsuperscript{171} and I would have to agree that the citation, related as it is to the Psalm citations both preceding and following, is similar to Paul's method of citation (e.g., Rom. 10:5-21). Thus, one could argue that here we have a Pauline speech, which Luke has inserted into his narrative. This "Paulinism," however, may be more apparent than actual. Philipp Vielhauer has noted that the structure and contents of Acts 13 are closely akin to that of the Petrine speeches in the first part of Acts, and the theology is common to Acts but not distinctively Pauline.\textsuperscript{172} This is especially true of the doctrine of justification in vv. 38-39, which shows a more Lukan perspective.\textsuperscript{173} Eduard Schweizer has also noted that Paul here sounds basically like Peter, and that all of the speeches in Acts follow the same general scheme throughout, indicating that "one and the same author is decisively involved in the composition of all the speeches."\textsuperscript{174} Munck further notes that in vv. 30-31 the Lukan Paul makes reference to the resurrection without mentioning his own revelation of Christ, a distinctly un pauline thing to do.\textsuperscript{175} Specifically Lukan marks have been found in, for example, vv. 24-25, 31,\textsuperscript{176}

\textsuperscript{170}Dupont, "TA 'ΟΣΙΑ," 113-114.

\textsuperscript{171}Ibid.


\textsuperscript{174}Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212, emphasis Schweizer's.

\textsuperscript{175}Munck, 123.

\textsuperscript{176}Dupont, "TA 'ΟΣΙΑ," 114 n. 81.
and taken with the Lukan theology and the evident unity of the speech, we must conclude that Luke himself was the composer.

This makes it likely that the citation of Isa 55:3 is also Lukan. While it may be that Luke has used earlier sources, or earlier Christian homilies, they have been thoroughly reworked by Luke, so that the final form is his, and his alone. Hence the citation is septuagintal, and owes its present form and place to Luke.


This brief citation stands on its own in the narrative of Acts 13 as part of a speech by Paul and Barnabas on the sabbath after the occasion of the major speech in the chapter (v. 46). That Luke ascribes this speech to both Paul and Barnabas (Is he unaware of who exactly did the speaking? Did they speak in unison?) would seem to indicate that Luke has composed this speech as a typical speech for the occasion.

Clarke considered this a free citation of the LXX, whereas Wilcox and Haenchen find the discrepancies too great to allow for this explanation. Wilcox and Haenchen appear to have been dealing with a text similar to that found in Rahlfs’s edition of the LXX, containing the words εἰς διαθήκην γένους between τέθεικα σε and εἰς φῶς, which are omitted in the text of Acts. Ringgren advanced the very plausible

---

177See e.g., Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, 15-18; Dupont (“ΤΑ ὈΣΙΑ,” 114 n. 81) specifically delineates the argument which demands that the use of Isa. 55:3 be ascribed to Luke’s source; see also Wilcox, Semitisms, 51.

178Clarke, 92.

179Wilcox, Semitisms, 51; Haenchen “Schriftzitate,” 160.

theory that Luke omitted the words regarding a "racial (or national) covenant" because Paul is here speaking to Gentiles.\textsuperscript{181} This is reasonable, as such a statement is antithetical to Luke's concern with the Gentile mission, and his proposition that the church is the fulfilment of Israel.

These speculations are brought to naught, however, by advances in LXX textual criticism. The omitted words are found in a great number of mss of the LXX, but the Alexandrian group, especially the primary witnesses (A, Q, 26, 86, 106, 710), omit the phrase, and on the basis of this very strong textual evidence Ziegler has adopted the reading without these words, ascribing their insertion to influence from Isa. 42:6, which contains these words after εδωκα σε.\textsuperscript{182} As the MT has no equivalent of the phrase, one could conjecture that the Alexandrian reading has been conformed to the MT; however, it is more probable that the words are a later addition under the influence of 42:6 and the Alexandrian reading is original.

Thus the Acts citation is word for word septuagintal except for one minor alteration, and that is the omission of ιδού at the beginning. A number of the Fathers, including Barnabas and Justin, omit the word, and while this is likely due to the influence of Acts,\textsuperscript{183} Holtz argues that Luke did not have the word in his text.\textsuperscript{184} While the

\textsuperscript{181} Ringgren, 235.

\textsuperscript{182} Ziegler, Untersuchungen, 76; GottLXX14, Isa. 49:6; see also Holtz, 33.

\textsuperscript{183} See GottLXX14, Isa. 49:6.

\textsuperscript{184} Holtz, 33.
evidence seems hardly conclusive, it is not too difficult to see Luke removing the ἰδοὺ as an unnecessary Semitism, interrupting the train of thought in Paul's speech.


But there are two considerations which make this suggestion unlikely. First of all, there is no textual evidence for such a change in the MT or LXX traditions. Secondly, the alteration in D makes little or no change in the meaning of the text, but does make a substantial stylistic improvement. Since the D text type is known for its stylistic improvements, it is more reasonable to accept this alteration as such a stylistic improvement.

---

185Wilcox, Semitisms, 51.
186Wilcox, Semitisms, 50.
188Emerton, 290.
d. Summary: Isaiah Citations in Acts 13

In summary, then, the citations of Isaiah in Acts 13 are all septuagintal in origin, although they may not all be Lukan. The third citation definitely belongs to Luke, but the first two may have had their origin in early Christian homilies, although it is just as likely that Luke used these citations on his own, or at least reworked them to fit his purpose.


This citation occurs at the very conclusion of Acts and forms what Dupont has called "the true conclusion of the entire book of Acts." The citation is applied to the Jews as the Lukan Paul's final word to them, as indicative that the rejection of Christianity by the Jews was in fulfilment of prophecy. The same citation is used by the Paul of the epistles in a similar connection (Rom. 11:8). Clarke has listed this citation as having substantial agreement with the LXX. The agreement is not absolute, however. The (non-orthographical) divergences from the LXX are as follows:

(1) Acts has πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τούτον καὶ εἰπόν for LXX πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπον τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ; (2) Acts omits αὐτῶν after ωάιν.

---

190 Dupont, Salvation, 141.
192 See Bruce, Acts (1951), 479.
193 Clarke, 88; see also Ringgren, 205.
In point (1) the καὶ ἐπον has been moved from close connection with παρεύθην and the preposition πρὸς has been added, changing the case of the object from dative to accusative. Some mss of the LXX and Athenasius share πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον with Acts (retaining, however the object for ἐπον), possibly owing to influence from Acts. The change does not bring the LXX closer to the Hebrew, as the MT and even the Targum correspond exactly with the LXX here. The stylistic advantages of such a change are not readily apparent. There seems to be basically no change in the content of the sentence, and hence no good reason for Luke to alter it here. We are thus left, as is Holtz, with the dual possibility of it being a loose citation by Luke, or a variant form of the LXX which Luke had and which is evidenced in the few LXX witnesses which only partially agree with Acts (393, 534, Ath. II.1001). The small and late textual representation makes the latter option unlikely. The relative infrequency of the locative dative in the Greek of Luke’s time, on the other hand, makes it likely that if Luke were citing loosely or from memory, he would tend to substitute a prepositional phrase for the less familiar construction. Hence, loose citation appears to be what we are left with.

---

194 GottLXX14, Isa. 6:9.
195 See Holtz, 36 n. 3.
197 Holtz, 36.
198 GottLXX14, Isa. 6:9.
199 See BDF, 107.
The omission of \( \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \) (point [2]) raises a further problem. Not only does the omission go against the LXX and the MT, but Matthew's citation also omits it (13:15). This has given rise to the suggestion that there may be a Christian testimonium behind the citations.\(^{200}\) It has further been noted that the Acts citation has the same thrust as the citation in John 12:40,\(^{201}\) and the fact that Paul uses the same words to make a similar point in a catena of quotations (Rom. 11:8) gives further evidence of a testimonia source.\(^{202}\) On the other hand, it must be noted that the John citation is very different from the Acts and Matthew citations, deviating much more greatly from the LXX than does Acts.\(^{203}\) As far as the Romans citation goes, any reference which Paul may be making to Isa. 6:9-10 can only be in the form of an allusion, as the actual citation appears to be a combination of Deut. 29:4 and Isa. 29:10.\(^{204}\) For Matthew, the citation relates to the "mysterious presence of the kingdom of God,"\(^{205}\) whereas in Acts the context of Isaiah is taken more into account, and describes a working-out of the hardening process described in Isa. 6.\(^{206}\) Holtz rightly concludes that this could only

\(\text{---}\)

\(^{200}\)See R. Harris, 2, 65, 74, 137; Neil, 258; see also Holtz, 34-36.

\(^{201}\)Dupont, Salvation, 141.

\(^{202}\)See Bruce, Acts (1951), 479.

\(^{203}\)See Holtz, 35 n. 3 & 4.

\(^{204}\)See UBSGNT3, Rom. 11:8.


\(^{206}\)See O. Kaiser, 82-83.
have come about if Luke knew the context of Isaiah, and did not simply refer to an isolated *testimonium*.\(^{207}\)

This leaves us with the possibility that Luke and Matthew used the same text of the LXX. In the LXX tradition the *αὐτῷ* is left out in the original reading of Sinaiticus, as well as one later ms (538) and several commentaries by the Fathers. Similarly, Symmachus's highly paraphrased version leaves out the *αὐτῷ*.\(^{208}\) Holtz concludes that while the later ms and the Fathers likely were influenced by Matthew and Acts, the readings of Sinaiticus and Symmachus may indicate an early tradition in which the *αὐτῷ* was missing.\(^{209}\) While the witness of Sinaiticus need not attest a particularly early reading, and the Symmachus reading is quite different at this point, and therefore not the best evidence, the possibility of an early reading without *αὐτῷ* still exists. Furthermore, Matthew and Acts both agree at this point against the rest of the LXX tradition and the MT, an agreement which certainly could indicate an early reading. Hence, the evidence suggests that Holtz's hypothesis is correct.

To summarize, then, Luke appears to have somewhat loosely cited this passage from a ms of the LXX which (like Sinaiticus) lacked *αὐτῷ*.

\(^{207}\)Holtz, 35.

\(^{208}\)GottLXX14, Isa. 6:10.

\(^{209}\)Holtz, 34-35.

The citations of Isaiah in Luke-Acts display similar features to what we noted regarding the Minor Prophets citation. Except in a couple of cases, in which Luke is clearly dependent on Mark or "Q", the citations are septuagintal. Even in the citation of Isa. 53:12 in Luke 22:37, which, at first glance, appears to have a traditional base, it is most likely that Luke is using a mss of the LXX preserving a divergent reading. The citations in Acts are similarly from the LXX, although in some cases heavily redacted to fit Luke's purpose in writing. While there is some evidence of traditional material (material from Jewish or Christian tradition containing the citation, whether from the LXX or not) in the Acts accounts, if Luke indeed used traditional material, it seems clear that he compared it with his text of the LXX for Isaiah and made certain corrections based upon that text.

The citations from Isaiah, then, confirm Luke's knowledge of the LXX, at least for that book, but also indicate that he used traditional material at times, certainly in the cases of material from his Markan source and "Q", but also possibly in the homily of Acts 13. It appears that, even though he knew the LXX of Isaiah, he would sometimes use the citation as presented in what he considered to be a reliable source (sometimes, however, correcting it by means of his LXX text). There is some slight evidence of a Hebraicizing tendency in the text of Luke's LXX, but a great deal of evidence of Lukan redaction. Luke seems to have felt free to alter the text of the OT often for both stylistic

---

210 Although the evidence by no means compels the conclusion that Luke was not drawing on the LXX.
and theological reasons. Interestingly, when compared to the Minor Prophets citations, one notes that there appears to be somewhat more theologically-motivated redaction in the citations from Isaiah. The latter evidence probably reflects the consideration that the nature of the Isaianic material made it particularly amenable to christocentric eschatological interpretation.\textsuperscript{211}

\textsuperscript{211}See Longenecker, \textit{Biblical Exegesis}, 98-99.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE CITATIONS FROM THE PSALMS

Luke refers to the Psalms, sometimes in extended citations, but often in very short excerpts. While a number of the latter are regarded by some scholars as citations from the OT, many are in fact little more than allusions, and will be noted as such in this study. In some cases the allusions are so vague as to be of little help in determining the text Luke was using. In other cases, however, conclusions can be reached concerning Luke’s use of the LXX and his method of handling scripture. Four of these references to the Psalms occur in Markan material, two in "Q" material and one in "L" material, while no less than ten occur in Acts.

A. Markan Citations


This citation is found in all four Gospels (Matt. 21:9; Mark 11:9; John 12:13). Some have discerned a special source for Luke here, as Luke inserts into the citation the words ὁ βασιλεὺς, and replaces Mark’s "Hosanna in the highest" with "Peace in heaven and glory in the highest." This source is often linked to John, since John exhibits many similarities to Luke’s account, including the words after the citation: καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ

1Although there is no introductory formula evident in this passage, the text shows enough verbatim agreement with the LXX to indicate that it is a citation rather than an allusion.


150
'Ἰεροῦ, which may be linked to Luke’s use of ὅ βασιλεύς. The differences between the two accounts, however, are even more striking, and thus Fitzmyer, for example, concludes that Luke has derived the story, including this citation, from Mark, having redacted it somewhat. Raymond Brown notes that the only point at which John is close to the Synoptics is in the citation, which derives, he notes, from the LXX. The change from "Hosanna in the highest" (Mark) to "Peace in heaven and glory in the highest" (Luke) appears to be an interpretation of "hosanna" in a form more readily recognizable by Gentile readers. Therefore, I regard this citation as basically markan material.

That the citation itself is traditional, then, seems to be without question, as it is extremely similar in all the Gospels. The presence of this citation is likely related to the singing of Hallel psalms at the passover meal and the use of Ps. 118:26 to greet pilgrims at the feast of Tabernacles, and the events of "Palm Sunday" would likely have called this to mind for early believers. Thus Holtz’s conclusion that it has a firm place in the Jesus tradition seems well founded.

---


5Brown, John (i-xii), 460.

6Plummer, 448; Stendahl, 65; but cf. Ringgren [228], who sees this as an allusion to 2:14.

7Those who regard Mark as the latest Gospel and consider that Luke used only Matthew and his special material (the Griesbach hypothesis) are forced to regard this citation as Matthean material.


9Holtz, 160.
But if it is traditional, it is also septuagintal. The Lukan text reads word for word from the LXX except in one instance which also departs from Mark: the insertion of ὁ βασιλεύς. Luke also omits the words in Mark (not a part of the Psalm quote): "Blessed is the kingdom of our father David that is coming." This can easily be understood in the light of our earlier research where we noted a distinct Lukan aversion to any intimation of the renewal of the political Davidic dynasty. But then why does Luke insert ὁ βασιλεύς? This may be a reminiscence of Mark 11:10, as Lohse suggests, but then why does Luke include this reminiscence, having omitted the whole verse? Likely Luke felt that ἐρχόμενος by itself needed further definition; but why ὁ βασιλεύς, in particular? Conzelman has argued that Luke is here making a political statement concerning Jesus' kingship, and this is quite likely in view of the foreshadowings found in the Gospel (e.g., 1:32) and the political charge of which Jesus is convicted in Luke 23:2. In fact, the whole scene is regal, and Luke may have simply inserted the words "the king" here to make the regal imagery more explicit. While the intention of this citation at this point is clearly messianic, in view of Luke's desire to avoid reference to the restoration of the Davidic kingdom literal political kingship is probably not in view for Luke. Rather, the interpretation of Jesus' entry into Jerusalem by the

11Conzelman, Theology, 198-199.
12See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1251; Rese, 199; Bock, 124.
14See e.g., Bock, 123; Rese, 199.
Sanhedrin and Pilate in 23:2-3, making Jesus a political pretender to the literal throne of David, is mistaken, according to Luke.\(^{15}\)

In summary, then, the citation is both traditional and septuagintal, with evidence of Lukan redaction.


This citation occurs verbatim in all three synoptic Gospels (Matt. 21:42; Mark 12:10), although both Mark and Matthew include v. 23 of the psalm as well. Similarly, the longer text of Matthew (v. 44) agrees with Luke in adding the substance of Luke 20:18. While this latter consideration provides no problem for those who argue that Luke used Matthew as a source for his Gospel, followers of the two source hypothesis are tempted to see "Q" material here.\(^{16}\) But textual critics are uncertain whether or not to regard the reading of Matt. 21:44 as original (it is omitted by D, 33, it, sy\( ^{4} \), and Eusebius).\(^{17}\) Metzger is inclined to accept it as original, on the basis of differences between the Matthean and Lukan forms of the verse and the possibility of explaining its omission in some mss by haplography (cf. \( \alpha \nu \tau \eta \varsigma \) [v. 43] and \( \alpha \nu \tau \omicron \omicron \) [v. 44]), but admits


\(^{16}\)See e.g., A. T. Cadoux, *The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use* (London: Clark, 1931) 40; but if Luke used Matthew, why did he not reproduce Matt. 21:43 (see Plummer, 462)?

\(^{17}\)See Nestle\-Aland\( ^{26} \), Matt. 21:44.
that (at least in the eyes of the committee of UBSGNT3) the verse may equally be an accretion to the text.\(^{18}\)

While certainty on the textual issue appears impossible at this time, there is a further complication here. This Lukan addition is often considered an allusion to Isa. 8:14,\(^{19}\) and some scholars also see a reminiscence of Dan. 2:34,35,44 here.\(^{20}\) Ps. 118:22 and Isa. 8:14 are cited together in I Peter 2:7-8, without Ps. 118:23. Similarly Acts 4:11, Rom. 9:33 and Barn, 6:4 cite Ps. 118:22 without v. 23. Thus the suggestion of a testimonium used by Paul, the author of I Peter, Luke, the author of Barnabas, and perhaps Matthew, comes to the fore.\(^{21}\) The connection here with Isa 8, however, is not without problems. The citation of Isa. 8:14 in I Peter is very close to the OT, but Luke’s allusion must be seen as free in the extreme,\(^{22}\) so free that Jeremias has questioned any such allusion, and Holtz and Bock have categorically denied it.\(^{23}\) In view of the major discrepancies between Luke 20:18 and Isa. 8:14, the most reasonable alternative appears to be that there is no allusion to the Isaiah passage in Luke 20:18.

An allusion to the Daniel passage, however, is not out of the question;\(^{24}\) but, as Günther

\(^{18}\)Metzger, Textual Commentary, 58.

\(^{19}\)See e.g., Stendahl, 68; Ringgren, 228; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1286.


\(^{21}\)See e.g., R. Harris, 1. 26-32; 2. 66; Stendahl, 68; see also Holtz, 161; Dodd, The Parables of the Kingdom (New York: Scribner's, 1961) 128 n. 1.

\(^{22}\)Rese, 173.

\(^{23}\)Jeremias, "λιθος," 276; Bock, 127; Holtz, 161; see also Bornkamm, "λωκέω," 281.

\(^{24}\)See Jeremias, "λιθος," 276; Holtz, 161-162 n. 7.
Bornkamm warns, "one can hardly say that the whole of v. 18 is a deliberate combination of prophetic sayings." In any case, Daniel is not reflected in I Peter, and in Barnabas the citation of Ps. 118:22 is followed by a reference to Isa. 28:16, not Isa. 8:14. Therefore, a testimonium of combined or related prophecies is unlikely here.

Holtz argues that v. 18 is an interpretation of the Psalms passage which Luke found in the tradition. This conclusion is supported by those scholars who wish to see an authentic word of Jesus at the nucleus of this passage. If this passage contains an authentic word of Jesus, it would explain why Ps. 118:22 was such a favourite passage for the early church. The same cannot be said for Ps. 118:23, which is nowhere else quoted in the NT, except in the Matthew and Mark parallels to Luke 20:17. A good case can be made for Lukán redaction in removing the verse from the citation in Luke 20, in that Luke wishes to connect more clearly the "stone" of the citation with the "stone" in v. 18. Fitzmyer argues that there is sufficient evidence of Luke’s hand in this passage to consider the possibility of a Lukan redaction of Mark, with the additional material coming from Luke himself. Thus, perhaps, v. 18 is a Lukan composition,
rather than a traditional formulation. This conclusion is further supported in that, with
the exception of the possible accretion in the Matthean parallel, v. 18 is reproduced
nowhere else in the NT.

In any event, in summary, the citation of Ps. 118:22 is traditional, coming from
Mark, and also septuagintal.


This citation is found in all three Synoptics (Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36), and is
clearly Markan in origin. That it has been redacted by Luke in conformity with the
LXX is also clear, in that Luke replaces Mark's ἐπικάτω with septuagintal ἐπισοῦδιον.
The one divergence from the LXX in all three is omission of ὁ before κύριος, although
the textual evidence is ambiguous at this point. On the other hand, one ms of the
LXX (R) from the sixth century omits the article. This ms could possibly also have
been influenced by the NT, although it may reflect an early reading. In any case, the

34 See SFG, 250; see also Stendahl, 78; Marcus (39) assumes the presence of ὁ in his interpretation of Mark 12:46
35 See GottXX10, Ps. 109:1.
36 See Holtz, 52-53.
use of the article appears to be arbitrary, and may have been omitted simply for reasons of style.\textsuperscript{37}

It has been suggested that because of the double use of κύριος in the LXX, not differentiating between ιην and ςις, the identification of Christ with Yahweh becomes possible.\textsuperscript{38} This latter point has raised the contention that the use of this passage in reference to Christ originated in the Hellenistic church.\textsuperscript{39} R. H. Fuller even argues that this identification was impossible in Hebrew or Aramaic.\textsuperscript{40} Fitzmyer and Bock, however, both contend, on the basis of Qumran material, that the identification of the two "Lords" in the passage is possible in Aramaic as well.\textsuperscript{41} Bock contends that either the Hebrew text or an Aramaic text (such as a Targum) would produce in translation a text similar to the LXX, and that, therefore, the LXX is not necessary here.\textsuperscript{42} This may account for the reading of the citation in Matthew and Mark (including perhaps the omission of the article), but it is clear that Luke has attempted to correct the citation on the basis of the LXX, possibly noting that the significance comes through more clearly in that version.


\textsuperscript{39}Bultmann, \textit{History}, 136-137; Fuller, 185.

\textsuperscript{40}Fuller, 185.

\textsuperscript{41}Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke (X-XXIV)}, 1312; Bock, 130.

\textsuperscript{42}Bock, 130.
In summary, then, here we have a traditional citation which Luke has redacted, conforming it to the LXX.


Although sometimes listed as a citation,\(^3\) this passage is clearly an allusion to the OT text.\(^4\) As such it has limited value in determining possible LXX origin. It does evince signs of Luke's redactional activity on traditional material, however. Hence, it is in order to examine it briefly. It is found in all three Synoptic Gospels (Matt. 26:64; Mark 14:62), but the question of sources here, and throughout the trial narrative, is a complicated one. Some scholars are convinced that a source other than Mark is being used for Luke's version of the trial of Jesus,\(^5\) while others are just as confident that the dependence on Mark is "unmistakable."\(^6\) Luke almost certainly used Mark at times since the verbal similarity in places is word-for-word (e.g., Luke 23:3 and Mark 15:2).\(^7\) As far as vocabulary is concerned, in Luke 22:67-71, 27 of Luke's 74 words (36%) are common with Mark (if the unparalleled material in vv. 67d-68b is excluded, the data are 27 of Luke's 62 words [44%]), although, as Taylor has concluded, "they are not significant and are such as would be naturally used in references to the question of

---

\(^3\) E.g., *UBSgnt3*, 901.

\(^4\) Not only is there no introductory formula, but its links to the OT text are more conceptual than verbal.


\(^6\) Creed, 276; see also Conzelman, *Theology*, 84 n. 3.

\(^7\) Tyson, "The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus," *NovT* 3 (1959) 251.
Messiahship. There appear to be few of Luke's characteristic words in this section, which may point to a source which Luke used without much embellishment. In the final analysis, however, the appeal to vocabulary is inconclusive.

It is the divergence in detail which has, in fact, become the cornerstone of the argument for a special Lukan source. This evidence, however, is also inconclusive since, at least in some cases, Luke's passion narrative can be explained as the result of Luke's redactional activity. In an attempt to do justice to all the evidence, it has been suggested by some that Luke used a special source for the trial of Jesus but that he has fused this with material from his Markan source (cf. Luke 23:3 and Mark 15:2).

While none of these arguments is totally convincing, we can come to some conclusions regarding Luke's possible use of sources. First of all, it seems likely, on the basis of the evidence, that if Luke used a special source for his trial narrative, he also used Mark. Secondly, whether or not he used a special source, he has edited Mark and whatever other sources he may have used, whether conflating them, or deliberately altering their content. Thus, whether he used a special source or not, it is reasonable to

---

48Taylor, Passion Narrative, 81. The data are from Soards (Passion, 88). Taylor's data (Passion Narrative, 81) are: 33 out of 94 words in Luke 22:66-71, common to Mark and Luke (35.1%).

49Taylor, Passion Narrative, 84; but cf. Soards, Passion, 89-96.


51E.g., Taylor, Passion Narrative, 81; Perry, 44; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1466; D. R. Catchpole, The Trial of Jesus (Leiden: Brill, 1971) 192.


suppose that Luke’s editorial activity played a significant role in the formation of his trial narrative.

For the specific passage in which our allusion occurs, the picture is much the same. Paul Winter has concluded that Luke 22:67-71 is a later editorial addition inserted in order to harmonize the Lukan account with those of Mark and Matthew. Most scholars, however, are not in agreement. David Catchpole, for example, has noted signs of Lukan redaction in v. 69, and Conzelman has concluded that this passage is typically Lukan. Thus it is very possible that the passage as it stands comes from Luke. In any case, if the purpose of this later addition was to harmonize with Matthew and Mark, one would think that it would have come closer to them in its content. As it stands it appears as a very poor harmonization indeed.

More likely Luke either followed a non-Markan source for this scene, or else he used Mark and deliberately chose to change certain Markan details. A third alternative would see a certain amount of dependence on both Mark and another

---


55Catchpole, Trial, 193.

56Conzelman, Theology, 85.

57Catchpole, Trial, 200.

58See Soards, Passion, 123; Creed, 278; see also Streeter, 222; Taylor, Passion Narrative, 83-84.
source. After examining the evidence, Fitzmyer has finally declared that it is quite impossible to know which of these possibilities is the right one.

The allusion itself is likely taken over from Mark, in spite of the possibilities of other sources. If it did originally come from another source, it must have been assimilated to Mark, probably by Luke. It seems more logical to regard it as Markan. The Psalms allusion is thus traditional and appears fused with one to Dan. 7:13. In the Matthean and Markan parallels the words τὸν νῦν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου and ἔρχομενον μετὰ (Matthew has ἐπὶ) τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ correspond to Daniel (LXX and "Theodotion") which reads ἐπὶ ("Theodotion" has μετὰ) τῶν νεφελῶν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὡς νῦς ἄνθρωπον ἡρχετο ("Theodotion" has ἔρχομενος), while καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν (Luke; Matthew has καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν; Mark has ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον) correspond to κάθων ἐκ δεξιῶν μου in Ps. 110 (109):1. Luke, however, retains only the words νῦς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου from Daniel.

Why Luke omits the Daniel reference to the coming of the son of man on the clouds of heaven is rightly connected by Bock to the question of Jesus’ conviction on the

---


60Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1459.

61See Grundmann, Lukas, 418-419.

62See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1458; Catchpole, Trial, 193; Soards, Passion, 123-124.

63See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1467.
charge of blasphemy (in Mark and Matthew),\textsuperscript{64} but he seems to miss the logical reason for this change.\textsuperscript{65} The charge of blasphemy as found in Mark 14:64 and Matt. 26:65 is not found in Luke’s account of the trial. It is to be noted that in Mark and Matthew the charge of blasphemy and the subsequent tearing of the high priest’s robes come directly after this statement by Jesus. This leads one to conclude that the charge of blasphemy is to be connected in some way with a claim to divinity apparently implicit in the use of the biblical allusion.\textsuperscript{66} It is to be noted that in the Talmud (\textit{b.Sanh.} 38b) Rabbi Akiba connects Dan. 7:9 with David’s session at the right hand of God, to which Rabbi Jose responds that thus Akiba has profaned the name of God (cf. \textit{m.Sanh.} 4:6).\textsuperscript{67} The importance here is clearly that the session is in heaven, and only God is considered to sit down in heaven.\textsuperscript{68} Jesus’ application of Ps. 110:1 to himself would give him a claim to kingship under God’s rule, as had David, but the fusing of this citation with Dan. 7:13 (cf. v. 9) unequivocally locates the session in heaven, and thus hints at divinity.\textsuperscript{69} Thus Luke, in removing this reference to Daniel, removes the cause of

\textsuperscript{64}Bock, 139.

\textsuperscript{65}See Ibid, 142; Bock contends that the charge of blasphemy still stands.


\textsuperscript{67}See Bock, 140; Catchpole, "You Have Heard His Blasphemy," \textit{TB} 16 (1965) 18.

\textsuperscript{68}See F. Neugebauer, "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii.35-7 Parr.) und der Menschensohn," \textit{NTS} 21 (1974-1975) 107.

blasphemy, and thus makes his record of the trial of Jesus, which contains no conviction for blasphemy, consistent.

This passage, then, is a redacted form of the Markan passage, and thus traditional. But what is its relation to the LXX? I have already noted that it only has a few words in common with Ps. 110 (109):1, and these are adapted to the NT context, with no attempt to follow the psalm’s syntactical structure. With reference made to only a few words, and no particularly striking LXX expressions being used, it is impossible to determine with certainty whether this allusion is septuagintal or not.

In summary, then, this allusion is traditional, and very freely adapted to the context in its traditional form. It also shows signs of Lukan redaction, removing the reference to Dan. 7:13. Here, interestingly, Luke has altered a word of Jesus which he received from Mark in order to fit better into the historical context of his narrative. Thus, while Mark records Jesus as claiming divinity, in some sense at least, and thus incurring the charge of blasphemy, Luke, who depicts Jesus as condemned for a political charge, removes the overtones of blasphemy from the allusion to the OT. Thus in this passage Luke’s concern with a consistently politically-oriented trial narrative has overcome whatever reluctance he may have felt toward altering a word of Jesus, as well as any theological concerns having to do with Jesus’ divinity.

---

69(...continued)

70See also Bock, 139.
This passage illustrates a further problem which we will encounter more and more in our examination of the Lukan citations from the Psalms and the Pentateuch in the next chapter, and that is the difficulty of determining when departures from the LXX text indicate a mere allusion to the LXX, and when they point to a source other than the LXX. Since an allusion by its very nature does not replicate the text in question, its value as a witness for or against theories of sources other than the LXX in the Lukan citations is greatly reduced. On the other hand, the chance replication of a particularly striking word or phrase in an allusion may point to a particular text as a source for the allusion. In this case, however, there are none.

B. "Q" Citations


The temptation scene, in which this citation occurs, is paralleled only in Matthew (the citation is found in Matt. 4:6) and is clearly "Q" material. Luke has changed the order of the temptation, probably for literary-theological reasons. Similarly, other modifications in the story reflect Lukan redaction. There can be no doubt but that the

---

71See e.g., Emerton, 282-283.


citation is septuagintal, but it is also traditional as it reads almost verbatim with the Matthean parallel, including the introductory formula. It differs from Matthew only in that the latter does not contain the words τοῦ διαφυλάξας σε and the second ὑπό. The second ὑπό is probably an addition to the text by Luke, as it is not in the LXX. Likely for Luke it functions as a recitative ὑπό and was added after the καὶ to clarify the connection with the first part of the citation in which ὑπό also occurs. Holtz argues that Matthew has removed the τοῦ διαφυλάξας σε from "Q" while Luke has retained it. This suffices for the two source hypothesis, but if one argues that Luke used Matthew, then one is forced to conclude that Luke added the words. This leads to further difficulty, because one then has to explain why Luke did not add the rest of the verse found in the LXX: ἐν πάσας ταῖς ὑποῖς σου. Certainly the omission of this latter phrase makes the citation applicable more specifically to the present instance; but this is equally true for "Q" as for Luke. It is then likely that Luke, using "Q", did not find these words, but did find τοῦ διαφυλάξας σε.

The addition of καὶ ὑπό to the text of the LXX serves to separate the citation into two equal points, each having their purpose in Satan's temptation. The addition of καὶ

---

75Swete, 387; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 517.
76Holtz, 57; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 517.
77Holtz, 57.
78See Plummer, 113.
is traditional (from "Q"; cf. Matt. 4:6), while the addition of ὁρη is the only sign of Lukan redaction in this citation.79

In summary, then, the citation is both traditional and septuagintal, with very little evidence of Lukan redaction.


This citation80 occurs as well in Luke 19:38, which I have noted as Markan material. Here, however, it occurs in "Q" material (paralleled in Matt. 23:39).81 The order of events is different in Matthew and Luke, with some other minor variations, and it is usually considered that Matthew has preserved the original order, and that Luke has improved the passage somewhat stylistically.82 The citation, however, is verbatim in both Luke and Matthew, and in the LXX. While obviously, as Holtz avers, this citation is traditional, having its origin in the Jesus tradition already in "Q,"83 it is still interesting to find a septuagintal quotation both in "Q" and in Markan material, especially if Bultmann is right and this prophecy by Jesus was originally a Jewish prophecy placed on Jesus’ lips.84 The LXX here, however, is an accurate translation of the Hebrew,85

79See Holtz, 57.
80Although this passage occurs as a word of Jesus with no introductory formula indicating a citation, there is certainly enough verbatim agreement with the OT text to consider this a citation.
81See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1034.
82E.g. Bultmann, History, 114-115; Rese, 191; see Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1034; see also S. Schulz, Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten (Zürich: Theologischer, 1972) 347 n. 187.
83Holtz, 160.
84Bultmann, History, 114-115.
and as Argyle notes, it may be that "the Hebrew could hardly be rendered into Greek in any other way."\textsuperscript{86} Therefore, it perhaps need not be a septuagintal citation after all.

In summary, then, the citation is traditional, coming from "Q," and could possibly be non-septuagintal, although, in view of its word-for-word accord with the LXX, it seems most reasonable to accept the citation as septuagintal.

C. "L," Citation: Luke 23:46 = Ps. 31:5 (30:6 LXX; 31:6 MT)

The final word of Jesus from the cross in Luke is not found in the other Synoptics; both Matthew and Mark have Jesus uttering a "loud cry" (Mark 15:37; Matt. 27:50 has Jesus speaking "with a loud voice"), but do not preserve that cry. Some commentators are convinced that Luke is preserving a special source here,\textsuperscript{87} which is taken by some to indicate an authentic word of Jesus.\textsuperscript{88} There are, however, signs of Lukan redaction throughout this passage,\textsuperscript{89} and thus some have concluded that Luke has expanded upon his Markan source here.\textsuperscript{90}

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{85}(...continued)

\textsuperscript{86}Argyle, "The Accounts of the Temptation," 382.

\textsuperscript{87}See e.g., Taylor, \textit{Passion Narrative}, 96; Rese, 200; Bock, 147-148.

\textsuperscript{88}Rese, 201; Bock, 147; Moo, 281; Taylor, \textit{Jesus and His Sacrifice}, 200; see Plummer, 538; see also Marshall, Luke: Historian and Theologian (Exeter: Paternoster, 1970) 873-874.

\textsuperscript{89}See Taylor, \textit{Passion Narrative}, 95-96; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1513.

The citation, however, is clearly not Markan. Bultmann has concluded that Luke has replaced the Markan "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Mark 15:34; Matt. 27:46) with this citation, as Luke was offended by the former cry.91 A number of scholars have followed Bultmann in ascribing the substitution to Luke;92 however a number of others have suggested that Luke may have used an earlier tradition. For example, it has been suggested that Luke may have used Jewish tradition here, as Ps. 31 may have attained the status of a common evening prayer.93 But Fitzmyer points out that there is no evidence that Ps. 31:6 was in liturgical use in pre-Lukan times, whether Christian or Jewish.94 The similarity between this citation and the cry of τετέλεσται in John 19:30 (followed as it is by the words "and he bowed his head and gave up his spirit"), as compared with the other Synoptics,95 may suggest that the traditions are related, but there is really no evidence for this either.

Although Rese contends that the citation is possible from an Aramaic Vorlage,96 the evidence definitely favours the LXX as the source here. It diverges from the LXX on only two points: (1) the addition of the vocative πάτερ, and (2) the change from the

---

91Bultmann, History, 274.
92See e.g., Holtz, 58; Dibelius, From Tradition to Gospel, 203 n. 4.
93See e.g., Grundmann, Lukas, 435; E. Stauffer, Jesus and His Story (New York: Knopf, 1960) 142; see also Moo, 281; Rese, 201.
94Fitzmyer, Luke(X-XXIV), 1519; see also Bock, 147.
96Rese, 201.
future tense παραθησομαι to present tense παρατηθημαι. The use of the vocative "Father" in reference to God (point [1]) is confined to the words of Jesus in the NT, and favours authenticity, in the eyes of Taylor and Douglas Moo.97 On the other hand, the vocative form πάτερ does not occur in Mark, occurs three times in Matthew, five times in John and five times in Luke. Luke, then, shows a definite preference for the vocative πάτερ when compared to Mark, somewhat of a preference when compared to Matthew, but no preference when compared to John (perhaps indicative of contact between Lukan and Johannine tradition).98 In Matthew, furthermore, the πάτερ never stands alone but is always modified (πάτερ ἡμῶν, 6:9; πάτερ κύριε τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τῆς γῆς, 11:25; πάτερ μου, 26:39 according to the best reading).99 In Luke, as in John, the simple vocative πάτερ always stands alone, except in 10:21, which is parallel to Matt. 11:25. Similarly, in the Lukan version of the Lord’s prayer the simple vocative stands in place of Matthew’s longer, more elaborate address. If Matthew and Luke both used "Q," then Luke would probably have preserved the more original reading, preferring the simple vocative to any addition which might be made.100 Hence the simple vocative would seem to be a Lukan particularity which he shares with John. While the predominance of the simple vocative in both traditions could conceivably indicate its authenticity on the

97Taylor, Jesus and His Sacrifice, 200; Moo, 281.
98See Brown, John (i-xii), XLVI-XLVII.
100See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 897. Those who argue that Luke used Matthew (Griesbach and Augustinian hypotheses) are forced to conclude that he chose to simplify the address, thus showing definite preference for the simple vocative.
lips of Jesus, its prevalence in Luke, as opposed to Mark and Matthew, would seem to indicate a redactional preference by Luke. Therefore, we can say that, while the παραδήμων may reflect the actual manner of speaking of Jesus, its presence in this citation is due to Lukan redaction.

The change in tense (point [2]) is not impossible from the Hebrew imperfect נִנְעָתָה, as this tense could be rendered by either a Greek present or future. However, it is equally likely, or even more likely, that the present tense is evidence of redaction to the present situation. The occurrence of the present tense in LXX mss L<sup>235</sup> probably came about through assimilation to Luke, and the occurrence of the future tense in the majority text (with L, 0117, 0135, f<sup>13</sup>) of Luke, through assimilation to the LXX.

That the LXX is the source here is clear from two points. First of all, as Moo points out, the use of παραθέμισθε ἡμῖν is very rare for נִנְעָתָה, occurring only twice in the LXX. Secondly, as Bock points out, the plural εἰς χειράς σου for MT singular בְּשָׁמְךָ is found in the LXX of Ps. 30:6 and replicated here.

The replacement of Ps. 22:2 with this citation is consistent with Lukan theology. Rather than conclude with a possible note of anguish Luke chose to conclude with a word

---

101See GKC, 313; Moo, 280.
102Holtz, 58; Bock, 147.
104Moo, 280.
105Bock, 147.

Thus, in summary, while we should not rule out the possibility that Luke found this word of Jesus in the tradition, its use at this point seems to come from Lukan redaction. The text is septuagintal, and this also points to Lukan redaction.

D. Acts Citations

There are ten clear references to the Psalms in the book of Acts. Many of these are not extensive, however, and a number are more properly allusions, rather than citations. As well, a number of citations are closely associated in the same Acts passage. I will examine these in groups, according to their contexts in Acts.


Two Psalms citations occur in the speech of Peter regarding Judas' betrayal and replacement in Acts 1:20. These citations are closely related, being separated only by a καί. The use of these citations here in relation to Judas has been termed a pesher exegesis by Longenecker, employing Hillel's first exegetical rule, in that "that which is said about the unrighteous in general applies to the betrayer of the Messiah specifically."107 In view of this, Wilcox ascribes a good deal of the narrative in Acts


107Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 100; see also Goppelt, Types, 100; Dupont, "La destinée de Judas prophétisée par David (Actes 1,16-20)," CBO 23 (1961) 51; Salvation, 120-123; F. Manns, "Un midrash chrétien: Le récit de la mort de Judas," RevSR 54 (1980) 197-203.
1:15-26 to pre-Lukan Palestinian Aramaic tradition, with, however, redactional work by Luke, and Hanson ascribes these citations to Luke's special tradition. I will examine each citation separately, and then attempt to understand how they came together.

a. Ps. 69:25 (68:26 LXX; 69:26 MT)

Clarke lists this citation as a free version of the LXX. The divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts has αὐτοῦ for LXX αὐτῶν; (2) Acts has ἔρημος for LXX ἠρημωμένη; (3) Acts omits ἐν τοῖς σκηνώμασιν αὐτῶν; (4) Acts adds ἐν αὐτῇ at the end.

Although point (1) has been taken as indicative of an underlying non-septuagintal source, it is easily explicable from Hillel's rule as a movement from the general to the specific, and thus an adaptation to the Judas context. Similarly, point (4) should probably be seen as a replacement for the omission of point (3), with the same end of moving from general to specific and adaptation to the Judas context. Point (2) is more difficult. The LXX ἠρημωμένη translates adequately the MT nihal participle נִכְפִּי. Interestingly enough a few mss of the Massoretic tradition have נִכְפִי for נִכְפִי, which would adequately be translated ἔρημος (or ἔρημος) in Greek. It is tempting to posit

---


109Hanson, 84.

110Clarke, 88.

111E.g., Manns, 201-202.

112See Holtz, 47.

113See BHS, Ps. 69:26; BDB, 1081.
a variant LXX text here, but there appears to be no textual evidence for such a version of this passage. Although Hanson notes that the LXX frequently uses 
\( \varepsilon\rho\eta\mu\omega\) in situations such as this, it is never used for this niphal verb. However, 
\( \varepsilon\rho\eta\mu\omega\) is a very rare word in the NT, occurring only three times in Revelation (17:16; 
18:16,19), and once each in Matthew (12:25) and Luke (11:17). Thus it could be argued 
that Luke substituted the more familiar \( \varepsilon\rho\eta\mu\omega\) for the less familiar word. Again, one 
might perhaps suggest that Luke is making reference to the "Q" material found in Luke 
13:35 and Matt. 23:38, in Jesus' lament over Jerusalem, which reads (in Matthew and 
Lukan mss D, N, Δ, Θ, Ψ, \( f^3 \), 28, 33, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, etc.):\(^{117}\) \( \alpha\phi\iota\sigma\omega\upsilon\nu \) 
\( \delta\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma\upsilon\mu\omicron\acute{\nu}\varepsilon\rho\mu\omicron\varsigma\). On the other hand, the textual evidence favours the omission of 
\( \varepsilon\rho\mu\omicron\varsigma\) in Luke 13:35. We are left then with the two possibilities that either this citation 
is related to a minor variant in the Massoretic tradition, or that it is freely cited. The 
Targum is no help here as it is closer to the LXX and the MT than is this citation.\(^{118}\) 
Given the freedom employed in moving from the general terms of the OT passage to the 
specific terms of the NT situation, a freedom of citation for point (2) is not impossible.

\(^{114}\)See Hanson, 83.  
\(^{115}\)See GottLXX10, Ps. 68:26.  
\(^{116}\)Hanson, 82-83.  
\(^{118}\)Manns, 200.
But is this citation Lukan or traditional? Holtz argues that, since this citation was widely accepted in early Christianity as a passion psalm,\textsuperscript{119} and appears here in connection with the traditional story of Judas' death in "Blood Acre," properly part of the passion narrative, then Ps. 69:25 was likely traditionally connected with Jesus' betrayal and death, and came to Luke out of the tradition.\textsuperscript{120} But the citation may actually have little to do with the tradition of Judas' death. There are two NT traditions about the end of Judas, this one in Acts, which is probably "a local explanation of an odd place name," and that found in Matt. 27:3-8, which likely comes from Zech. 11:12-13, but also explains the name.\textsuperscript{121} In Matthew, there is no connection to Ps. 69:25. Furthermore, here in Acts, the story of Judas' death appears clearly as a parenthesis, an insertion into the speech of Peter which completely interrupts the flow.\textsuperscript{122} Holtz draws a line of demarcation between vv. 16-20a, which deal with the death of Judas, and vv. 20b-26, which deal with Judas' replacement.\textsuperscript{123} But Holtz's line of demarcation may be questionable, especially since Judas' death is again mentioned in v. 25.\textsuperscript{124} Rather, it seems more reasonable to conclude that vv. 18-19 form the parenthesis, which is inserted into Peter's speech.

\textsuperscript{119}See e.g., Dibelius, \textit{From Tradition to Gospel}, 184; Dupont, "La destinée de Judas," 51; \textit{Salvation}, 121; Dodd, \textit{According to the Scriptures}, 57-59.

\textsuperscript{120}Holtz, 44-45.

\textsuperscript{121}See Neil, 69; Stendahl, 197.

\textsuperscript{122}E.g., Bruce, \textit{Acts} (1951), 76; see also Wilcox, "Judas-Tradition," 442.

\textsuperscript{123}Holtz, 44.

\textsuperscript{124}Holtz (44 n. 5) ascribes this verse to Luke's connecting the two stories together.
While this parenthesis has been credited to Luke by some scholars, Wilcox has determined that vv. 18-19 contain "ready-made' traditional material," and given the nature of the parenthetical material, he is probably correct. This means, however, that the citation in v. 20 is to be connected with vv. 16-17, not vv. 18-19. There are many signs of Lukan redaction throughout Peter's speech, compared with vv. 18-19 which, in Wilcox's view, are strikingly non-Lukan. Now, the citation of Ps. 69:26 does refer logically to the insertion of 18-19, and it may even have provided the cue for the midrashic story found in the insertion; it does not, however, seem to be a part of that insertion, but fundamentally a part of the speech of Peter.

Without the parenthesis, however, the significance of the Psalm citation is obscure, and the insertion appears to have been made in order to clarify matters. If Luke found this citation in a source, without the story of vv. 18-19, it is easy to explain why the insertion was made. On the other hand, it is hard to explain this awkward insertion if Luke created this speech himself. Therefore, while Luke probably composed the speech, he likely made use of traditional materials, and Holtz may be correct in ascribing the citation of Ps. 69:26 to a traditional source, although if so, then it appears to be a traditional LXX citation.

---

127See Ibid, 441-442.
128See Manns, 200.
b. *Ps. 109:8 (108:8 LXX)*

Holtz notes that the second citation in v. 20 is clearly septuagintal and thus concludes that it is part of Luke’s redaction of the story (the Lukan material, according to Holtz, includes the bulk of the account of the replacement of Judas by Matthias [20b-26]). Clarke notes that this citation has substantial agreement with the LXX. The one divergence is the change of the optative λάβω to imperative λάβετω. During the NT period Blass notes that there was a strong tendency to prefer the imperative to the optative, and Holtz is probably correct in attributing this change to that tendency. The similar change in LXX ms R is probably due to the influence of Acts.

This citation is thus septuagintal, but is it Lukan? Holtz would say yes, seemingly on the basis of its LXX origin. But, if Acts 1:20 is fundamentally part of the speech of Peter, as I have noted above, and, as we have seen in the Gospel, so-called traditional citations may also be septuagintal, then it is possible that this citation is also traditional. Although this Psalms passage is not traditionally a Passion text, it could conceivably have been applied to Jesus as an innocent righteous sufferer in early

---

129 Holtz, 47-48; cf. p. 44.

130 Clarke, 87.

131 BDF, 194.

132 Holtz, 47; see also Haenchen, “Schriftzitate,” 163.

133 See GottLXX10, Ps. 108:8.

134 See Holtz, 47-48.
Christian tradition. On the other hand, as I noted in connection with Luke 23:46, Jesus the righteous sufferer is an important Lukan theme. The context of the present citation does not bring this point out, however, and the issue remains open.

c. Summary: Acts 1:20

In summary, then, we are at a virtual standstill with regard to these two citations. Holtz’s conclusion, that Ps. 69:25 is traditional while Ps. 109:8 is Lukan, has a certain amount of merit, but there is, it seems, equal evidence supporting a traditional origin for both, or even, perhaps, a Lukan origin for both. The evidence is certainly ambiguous. Clearly the second citation is from the LXX, but this is not so clear in the case of the first. The likelihood, however, is that it is a freely cited LXX citation.


This major citation occurs in Peter’s Pentecost sermon. Its length and importance are such that I will examine it separately from the other more minor references to the Psalms in the sermon. Clarke affirms that this citation is in exact agreement with the LXX. Nevertheless there are some (non-orthographic) points of difference:

1. some mss of Acts have μου after τὸν κύριον; (2) some mss of Acts have μου ἡ καρδία

---

135 Dupont, Salvation, 121-122.
136 Clarke, 85.
137 The divergence of Acts προσωπόμην from LXX προσωπόμην is merely orthographic; see Thackeray, A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint (Hildesheim: Olms, 1987), 89; Holtz, 49.
instead of ή καρδία μου; (3) Acts omits the last clause of the psalm: τερπνότητες εν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος.

The μου after τῶν κύριων (point [1]) occurs only in mss κ, D, 614, a few others, and the *Peshitta* for this passage in Acts. It is likely a scribal addition, perhaps attempting to identify τῶν κύριων here with that in Ps. 110:1. Similarly, μου ή καρδία (point [2]) occurs only in κυρίων, B, and Clement of Alexandria for this passage in Acts. Although the order ή καρδία μου (p74, κυρίων, A, C, D, E, Ψ, 0123, and the majority text) could be an accommodation to the LXX (especially κυρίων), the suggestion that the inverted order is a stylistic change to produce more elegance, or to create a chiasm with ή γλωσσά μου, is not unlikely.

The final omission (point [3]) of τερπνότητες εν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος ("pleasures at your right hand forever") is not a textual problem as there is no LXX textual tradition which omits the phrase. There seems as well to be no clear theological motive in its omission. Likely Luke left it out simply because the final phrase said nothing that Luke needed here.

The text of this citation is certainly from the LXX, but is it traditional or

---


139See Bock, 348 n. 58.


141See Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 154; Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 299; Holtz, 48-49; see also Bock, 348 n. 58.

142That the citation is from the LXX is clear from several points. The citation follows the LXX rendering of τῷ ἐπὶ in Ps. 16:8 with προορώμην (προορώμην), a translation which is never found otherwise for this Hebrew word (A. Schmitt, "Ps 16, 8-11 als Zeugnis der Auferstehung in der Apg.," *BZ* 17 [1973] 233). While Bock (172) considers (continued...)
Lukan? Hanson has concluded that the citation "must come from a very early source, since the Messiah himself is represented as speaking in the psalm and expressing a confident hope that God would raise him from the dead." Similarly, Barnabas Lindars argues that the citation is "the survival of a very primitive argument for the messiahship of Jesus from the fact of the Resurrection." John A. T. Robinson has

---

143(continued)

this a mere stylistic strengthening of the idea in the MT, maintaining the same conceptual point, A. Schmitt (233-234, 245) maintains that the LXX has here replaced a rather bland expression with a theologically meaningful expression, hinting at the "Gottesuchau" or "vision of God," and giving the citation an eschatological connotation, bringing in the idea of prophetic foreknowledge. The citation follows the LXX rendering of יָדְךָ with הַגָּדֶשֶׁךָ־ם in 16:9. Perhaps the LXX found difficulty with the idea of "glory" rejoicing, or, as some would have it (emending to יָדְךָ), one's "liver" rejoicing (Schmitt, 235; see also, e.g., D. Kidner, Psalms 1-72: An Introduction and Commentary on Books I and II of the Psalms [TOTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1973] 129 n. 1; C. A. Briggs and E. G. Briggs, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms [ICC; New York: Scribner's, 1914] 1. 126. It is to be noted, however, that the LXX translator would not likely have found difficulty with the reading "liver." Hence it is not likely that he found that reading in his Hebrew Vorlage. The citation follows the LXX in translating מַשֶּה, "in security," in v. 9 by דְּשֵׁדְפוּר, which, as Schmitt (237) suggests, opens the door for the concept of resurrection. Bock (175) and Rees (56-57) affirm that in the context of resurrection, the Hebrew would also make sense, as security can be considered a result of resurrection. But it is not clear that the idea of resurrection is present in the context of the Psalm (see e.g., P. C. Craigie, Psalms 1-50 [WBC 19; Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983] 153-159; W. Eichrodt, Theology of the Old Testament [2 vols.; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961] 2. 525); rather, it is the Greek expression which suggests a resurrection context, which would not be apparent without it. Furthermore, while one could conceivably construe the idea of resurrection from the Hebrew text, it suggests itself so much more clearly from the LXX that its use in this citation becomes obvious. Again, the citation follows the LXX in translating מַשֶּה, "pit," in v. 10 by דְּשֵׁדְפוּר, "corruption." Parallel to יָדְךָ, מַשֶּה becomes equivalent to the "pit of sheol" (see RDB, 1001; the parallelism here forms a "breakup pattern" in which "two words that are ordinarily a bound collocation, or more specifically a hendiadys . . . are broken up and made into parallel terms in the two versets of a line of poetry"; R. Alter, The Art of Biblical Poetry [New York: Basic, 1985] 72), and the sentence thus means that God will not allow his servant to come to (literally "to see") the pit of death. It has been argued, however, that in the context of sheol, מַשֶּה would mean the "grave," or the "decay of the grave" (see Job 17:14, where it is parallel to "the worm"); R. L. Harris, "shahat," TWOT 2 [1980] 911). Similarly, it has been suggested that in texts from Qumran and the Targums מַשֶּה comes to mean physical corruption in association with Gehenna, or the grave (see R. E. Murphy, "Sahat in the Qumran Literature," Bib 39 (1958) 61-66; Rees, 57; Bock, 175). But it seems clear that, even if the Hebrew word acquired this meaning, the LXX has made the point more concretely, and more clearly accessible to a resurrection interpretation (see Schmitt, 242). It has also been suggested that the LXX translation of מַשֶּה for יָדְךָ in v. 10 makes possible the reference to Christ (Bock, 175-176). The MT kethib is plural while the gere is singular, and it has been asserted that the gere would make the Hebrew equivalent to the LXX singular (Ringgren, 253; W. Kaiser, "The Promise to David in Psalm 16 and Its Application in Acts 2:25-33 and 13:32-37," JETS 23 [1980] 226). The plural is surely the more difficult reading here, but the singular better fits the pattern of the Psalm itself (see Cohen, 39; see also W. Kaiser, "The Promise to David," 226). In any event the LXX reading is certainly singular and thus the identification with Christ is facilitated.

argued persuasively that this form of christology is very primitive, and Rese has argued that the possibility of a christological interpretation from the Hebrew shows that the christological interpretation of the psalm did not begin in the Hellenistic church, but rather in the primitive Aramaic-speaking community. But the LXX is definitely in use here, whether, theoretically, the Hebrew could have provided the christological connection or not. Furthermore, Donald Juel has shown that the type of scriptural interpretation used in this passage is hardly primitive, but depends upon a long tradition of interpretation. Thus, although it may preserve primitive christology, the application of Ps. 16 from the LXX at this point need not be early. Two other points argue in favour of a Lukan origin for this citation. First of all, no one in the NT uses Ps. 16 except Luke. Therefore, if this had been a traditional piece of exegesis, it must have been a very limited and localized tradition. An authoritative tradition that is virtually unknown outside of one author is highly unlikely, and it is more reasonable to assume that its origin is with that author. Secondly, the citation appears to fit neatly into the Lukan pattern of speech composition, here as elsewhere. Hence, while the

---

145See Robinson, "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" JTS NS 7 (1956) 180.
146Rese, 57; but cf. B. M. F. van Iersel, "Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworten: Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung (NovT sup. 3; Leiden: Brill, 1961) 45-46.
148See NestleAland26, 753; Hanson, 84.
149See e.g., A. Weiser, "Die Pfingstpredigt des Lukas," BibLeb 15 (1973) 1-12; Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212.
christology may or may not be primitive, the use of Ps. 16 in Acts 2 is probably Lukan.

In summary, then, the citation is from the LXX and likely Lukan, although he may be drawing on earlier tradition in his interpretation of it.

3. Acts 2:30,31,33 = Ps. 132:11 (131:11 LXX); 16:10 (15:10 LXX); 118:16 (117:16 LXX + 68:19 (67:19 LXX)

The next three references to the Psalms in Peter's pentecost sermon are probably more correctly allusions than citations. As such they offer little evidence for Luke's knowledge of the LXX. Since, however, they are considered by some to be citations from a source other than the LXX, I will discuss them very briefly.

a. Acts 2:30 = Ps. 132:11 (131:11 LXX)

This passage in Acts appears to be a summary of an OT story rather than a citation. It is very different from the LXX. Clarke attributes the form of the quote to free quotation from memory, but it is probably not even a quotation in the strict sense of the word. Rather, the speech appears to allude to the OT passage only in the

---


151 Only v. 31 has what could loosely be termed an introductory formula (καὶ λόγῳ τῆς ἀναστάσεως τοῦ Χριστοῦ); and even this appears more as an interpretive summary statement than an introductory formula. Each of the references to the Psalms in Acts 2:30,31,33 is thoroughly redacted into the speech, as noted below.

152 Clarke, 97.
course of summarizing the event recounted.\textsuperscript{153} There may possibly be an allusion here to II Chr. 6:9-10 as well.\textsuperscript{154} Attempts to discern an Aramaic Vorlage here\textsuperscript{155} have found little evidence in their favour. Holtz's suggestion that Luke has taken over a traditional testimonium from the early church of an authoritative traditional saying\textsuperscript{156} founders on the fact that this OT reference is not found elsewhere in the NT.\textsuperscript{157} Hence it cannot have been a very widespread authoritative tradition, as Holtz himself admits.\textsuperscript{158} It seems more reasonable to conclude that here we have a summary of an OT story containing an allusion to Ps. 132:11, possibly, but not necessarily from the LXX. As it is perfectly integrated into the surrounding speech, it would follow that the author of the speech is likely the originator of this OT allusion.\textsuperscript{159}

\textsuperscript{153}All reference to Ps. 131:11 LXX has been edited to fit the context of the Acts speech. The oath formula of the LXX: ζυγοσε ὡς τον Δαυδ ἐλθείν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀδετήσει αὐτήν, has been shortened to ἔρκῳ ζυγοσε αὐτῷ ὁ θεός. The fact of the oath is thus preserved, but in a more manageable form. David's name is replaced with the pronoun, since the context of the speech makes it clear to whom it refers. "God" replaces "the Lord" to avoid misconstruing the word as a reference to Christ. Ὀσφύος replaces κοδλας since the latter usually means "womb" and is strange as used in Ps. 131:11 to refer to David. Finally, the passage is placed in indirect speech (see Holtz, 143 n. 3, 147; BDF, 106-107; Rees, 108; Bock, 351 n. 79).

\textsuperscript{154}See Rees, 109; but cf. Bock, 351 n. 79; Haenchen ("Schriftzitate," 165) suggests II Kgdms. 7:13-13, but the verbal agreement is not very strong (see Holtz, 146 n. 7).

\textsuperscript{155}E.g., Wilcox, Semitisms, 56; see also Torrey, Documents of the Primitive Church (New York: Scribner's, 1941) 145 n. 1; Rees, 108-109; Clarke, 97.

\textsuperscript{156}Holtz, 148-149.

\textsuperscript{157}See NestleAland26, 756.

\textsuperscript{158}Holtz, 148.

b. Acts 2:31 = Ps. 16:10 (15:10 LXX)

We are faced here with another allusion. Here Peter, in his speech of Acts 2, again refers to Ps. 16:10, but in a different form from that in which he previously cited it. Because of the differences from the LXX and the previous citation Holtz ascribes this verse to a traditional source: "nämlich aus einer Testimonienzusammenstellung 'de Christo.'" But this conclusion is wholly unnecessary. Rather, the passage seems to be an allusion, resembling the interpretation given after the reading of Scripture in a sermon. Often preachers will repeat the key text of the Scripture reading in a sermon and connect it with other relevant Scriptures. This would explain both the links to other OT references found in this speech as well as the complete assimilation of the text of Ps. 16:10 into the text of the speech.

Holtz also appeals to the textual data of Acts 2:31 to support his contention that Luke used a traditional source here. Several mss of Acts 2:31 (A, Cvid, D, E, Ψ, and the majority text) read ζῆδον for ζῆδην. Certain mss of the LXX also read ζῆδον

---

160 Holtz, 50, see also 143-144.

161 The change of oive to οὐτε and οἶδε to οὐτε are stylistic improvements creating the better Greek οὐτε . . . οὐτε ("neither . . . nor") configuration (see BAG, 600). The second person future ἔγκατελέσθησεν becomes third person aorist passive ἐγκάτελεθήθη and infinitive ἔδειν becomes aorist active ἓδειν to emphasize that Christ, who has already been raised, is the subject of this prophecy (see Rese, 109). Since the subject of the sentence is Christ, the second person verb δοθήτην is omitted as unnecessary, and as inconsistent with the passive sense of the sentence. The change of τοῦ δοθῆν του to ἡ δόθη αὐτοῦ acts as an "explanatory parallelism," in Bock's words (178), to vv. 9a and 10 of the psalm, guaranteeing that what is being spoken of is bodily resurrection. The omission of τὴν ψυχὴν μου in the best attested reading of Acts 2:31 (mss C, E, Ψ, and the majority text read ἡ ψυχή αὐτοῦ, probably due to assimilation to the LXX and the preceding citation of Ps. 16:10 [see NestleAland26, Acts 2:31; Rese, 110; Holtz, 144 n. 1]) may have been made to avoid any hint of the dualistic connotation which ψυχή had acquired, which would have been inconsistent with Luke's insistence on the corporeality of the resurrection (see A. Dihle, "ψυχή in the Greek World," TDNT 9 (1974) 614-617; Schweizer, "ψυχή: D. The New Testament," TDNT 9 (1974) 647; Rese, 110).

162 In this passage it is not possible to determine with absolute certainty the reading in C (see NestleAland26, 65)

(several mss of the Lucianic tradition, Z, some mss of Theodoret, A, 1219). Holtz suggests that the tradition which Luke followed in v. 31 is different from that which he followed in v. 27. In v. 27 he followed his text of the LXX which read \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) with mss B, R, several different mss of the Lucianic tradition, and some other mss of Theodoret. But in v. 31 he followed a tradition which reflected the variant reading noted above. Thus, Holtz considers \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) as likely the original reading of v. 31, with \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) being an assimilation to the LXX. The issue, however, is not so clear cut. The change from \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) to \( \xi\delta\eta\zeta \) is definitely a stylistic change, as the latter is usual in classical Greek, while \( \xi\delta\eta\zeta \) is the usual LXX designation. Hence, while the presence of \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) in this reference to Ps. 16:10 could be an assimilation to the LXX, the reading \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) could equally be a scribal, or perhaps Lukan, stylistic improvement. If Luke had wanted to improve the diction of the citation, he would more likely have done it in his interpretive application of the citation, than in the citation itself, and while v. 27 is clearly a citation, v. 31 contains interpretive elements. Thus he may have used \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) in his explanatory allusion in v. 31. On the other hand, the textual evidence is usually taken as favouring \( \xi\delta\eta\nu \) here, in any case.

164 See GottLXX10, Ps. 15:10.
165 See Ibid.
166 Holtz, 50.
167 See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 300.
168 See Jeremias, "\( \xi\delta\eta\zeta \)" TDNT 1 (1964) 146.
169 See e.g., NestleAland26, Acts 2:31; UBSGNT3, Acts 2:31; Metzger, Textual Commentary, 300.
All in all the simplest adequate explanation of the data in Acts 2:31 is that it is an allusion to Ps. 15:10 LXX, interpreting homiletically the citation in Acts 2:27.

c. Acts 2:33 = Ps. 118:16 (117:16 LXX) + 68:19 (67:19 LXX)

While this reference is probably no more than an allusion, Rese argues that we have here a combined partial citation which is related to the Psalms references preceding and following through key words.\(^{170}\) The reference to Ps. 68:19 is surely no more than an allusion, appearing in v. 33 only in the word \(\lambda\alpha\beta\omega\nu\), with perhaps a hint in the word \(\dot{\alpha}v\dot{e}b\eta\) in v. 34.\(^{171}\) The reference, here, however, is very tenuous, and I question whether Rese has not stretched the evidence too far in considering this an actual reference to the Psalm. The reference to Ps. 118:16, on the other hand, is clearer. The words (117:16 LXX) \(\delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\nu\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\upsilon\nu\iota\psi\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu\mu\epsilon\) seem to be reflected in the words in Acts 2:31: \(\tau\eta\ \delta\epsilon\zeta\iota\nu\chi\omicron\upsilon\nu\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\ \iota\psi\omega\beta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\), with perhaps a reference to v. 17 of the Psalm ("I shall not die, but live") in the mention of Jesus' resurrection in v. 32.\(^{172}\) In any case it is clearly not a citation but an allusion, and should be recognized as such.\(^{173}\)

---

\(^{170}\)See Rese, 110.

\(^{171}\)Ibid; see Lindars, 44.

\(^{172}\)Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 99.

\(^{173}\)The reference to Ps. 117:16 LXX has been fitted into the context of the speech, with the active becoming passive (Jesus has been exalted by God, v. 32) and \(\kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\upsilon\) being changed to \(\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\) as in v. 30. The locative dative is used as a stylistic improvement (see Rese, 110; BDF, 107).
**d. Summary: Acts 2:30-33**

As I noted, the references to the Psalms in Acts 2:30-33 are not citations but allusions. As allusions, technically they can give us little information as to the specific OT text underlying them. On the other hand, all of the data in these references can be explained with reference to the LXX, and there is no need to posit traditional sources. Embedded as they are in the context of the speech, there is no reason to suppose that the author of the speech was not the originator of these allusions, and if that author be Luke, as is likely, then Luke is the originator of these allusions. The linking of OT passages by key words, or the mixing of citations, need not point to a source other than Luke for the passage in question, as such linking of OT texts appears to have been a favourite NT practice, especially for Paul, and there is no reason to suppose that Luke could not have used this method in composing the speeches in Acts.


We have already dealt with the use of Ps. 110:1 in connection with Luke 20:42-43 and 22:69, where Luke presumably was following Mark, and thus the citations were termed traditional. That this was an important Scripture for the early church can be seen both from its early attestation and from the plethora of references to it found throughout

---

174See Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212.

175See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 100.

the NT.\textsuperscript{177} In Luke 20, however, the citation was corrected, presumably by Luke, in accordance with the LXX, and here in Acts 2 the citation is identical with the LXX. This latter feature is in striking contrast to the rest of the NT, with the exception of Heb. 1:13, which tends simply to allude to the passage, or, in the case of the Gospels, cite it in a form differing from the LXX. The presence of this text throughout the NT, with the exception of the Johannine tradition, argues for its early provenance as a christological proof-text, but only Luke and the author of Hebrews are concerned to cite it precisely in its septuagintal form. Therefore, the text itself is traditional, but Luke preferred its septuagintal form to any other that may or may not have been circulating.

The one textual problem is the omission of the article before κύριος in some mss of Acts (A*, B*, D),\textsuperscript{178} but as I have dealt with this question in connection with Luke 20:42-43, there is no need to comment here.

In summary, then, the citation of Ps. 110:1 becomes the climax of the sermon in Acts 2. We should probably consider the citation of Ps. 16:8-11 as the Scripture reading, the key text of which is v. 10. Ps. 16:8-11 is connected to Ps. 110:1 by the mention of the "right hand of the Lord" in both passages.\textsuperscript{179} The latter Scripture provides the climax of the sermon, with the intervening allusions serving as interpretive links in midrashic fashion between the two Scriptures. These allusions and citations

\textsuperscript{177}See R. B. Hays, \textit{Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul} (New Haven: Yale, 1989) 84; see also Nestle\textit{Aland} 26, 756.

\textsuperscript{178}See Nestle\textit{Aland} 26, Acts 2:34.

\textsuperscript{179}Longenecker, \textit{Biblical Exegesis}, 97.
present a coherent argument, which seeks to demonstrate on the basis of prophecy that Jesus is the Christ, as evidenced by his resurrection. Thus, like Ps. 16, the climactic citation from 110:1 is quoted verbatim from the LXX. The intervening allusions are redacted into the argument of the sermon to provide interpretive "stepping stones" from the Scripture reading to the climax. Thus, given the essential coherence of the speech at this point, and the necessity of the allusions for the coherence of the argument, I must regard the whole interpretation of the Ps. 16 citation, that is Acts 2:29-36, as a unit. If a traditional source was in use here, I must conclude that it contained the whole of the unit as found in Acts. The lack of evidence for the relationship of Ps. 16 to 110:1 anywhere else in the NT challenges any theory of an authoritative traditional testimonia. The closest we come is Acts 13 and Heb. 1, but in the latter case Ps. 110:1 is related to different Scriptures, and, while Ps. 16 is present in Acts 13, there is no play on the word δεξιός, but rather on δοῦς, and the citation is related to Isa. 55:33. Hence, either the complete passage as it stands goes back to an early source, which is unknown elsewhere, or else, and more likely, the passage is Lukan. All the citations and allusions in the passage are understandable from the LXX, and in some cases the LXX origin is necessary for the argument to proceed.

---

\(^{180}\) See Ibid, 97, 103.

Luke refers to this Psalm a second time here, the first being in Luke 20:17, in which he redacted his Markan source. Here, however, there is no immediate source to compare. The reference occurs in Peter's defence before the Sanhedrin regarding the healing of the lame man (3:6). There is considerable divergence from the LXX here, as only three words are reproduced: εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας. Such great variation from the LXX in such a small citation makes it difficult to see the LXX as the source here. But many of these divergences can be explained on the basis of the context of the passage in Acts,181 and thus it is likely that we have an allusion here, rather than a citation.

It is the choice of the verb ἐξουθενθείς instead of ἀκεφαλίμασαν, however, that has given rise to theories of a source other than the LXX for this passage. The theory of an independent translation from the Hebrew was suggested by Clarke and followed by both Holtz and Bock.182 Clarke argued that the variance from the LXX in this citation was too great to be accounted for by a "lapse of memory," and thus posited an independent translation.183 But he also noted that the citation varies drastically from

---

181The change of οἱ οἰκοδομῶντες to ὁ ζυμὸν τῶν οἰκοδόμων can probably be explained as a paraphrase for the purpose of declaring that the Messiah has been rejected, as Neil says (89-90), "by the official builders of Israel, which regarded itself as the 'house of God' (cf. Heb. 3:2)." Clearly the directness of the statement, with the ζυμὸν, is an accusation against the leaders of the Jews (but cf. Holtz, 162). The actual structure of the introductory formula (οὗτος ἐστιν ὁ λάθος ὁ + participle) is one which Luke uses often in reference to Christ (Acts 9:20,22; 10:36,42; 17:3), as well as to Moses in Acts 7:37. Both Rese (114) and Marshall (The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary [TNCT 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980] 100) note its regal overtones. It is not, however, the form of introductory formula which one expects in the introduction of a citation from scripture (i.e. there is nothing close here to "it is written"). The use of the participle ὁ γεννηθεὶς instead of οὗτος ἐγεννηθή can thus be seen as a parallel to the phrase ἐξουθενθείς in the first part of the verse, thus establishing the identity of the rejected stone and the cornerstone.

182Clarke, 97; Holtz, 162; Bock, 200.

183Clarke, 97; see also Wilcox, Semitisms, 56 n. 1.
the MT as well. That the citation is not a result of a "lapse of memory" is probably correct; however, "lapse of memory" as a "catch-all" explanation for divergences from the LXX simply does not work in most cases, at least in Luke. The only other theory offered for this passage is that of an independent translation from the Hebrew, but the differences between Acts 4:11 and the MT of Ps. 118:22 indicate that such a translation can not have rendered the Hebrew exactly. Rather, even if an independent translation was used, the text has been altered, and redactional considerations likely played a major role in the final form of the verse. Holtz argues that the Semitism κεφαλὴν γωνίας need not have come from the LXX, but since this particular phrase only appears in the LXX and derived literature, this favours the LXX as the source

---

184Clarke, 97.

185Similarly, explanations such as "free" or "loose" citation are to be accepted only after all other possibilities have been rejected (as is the method in this study). A "loose" citation may actually be closer to an allusion than a direct citation.

186Compare the following (words which Acts 4:11 shares with MT in bold-faced type, words shared with LXX underlined):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>Acts 4:11</th>
<th>LXX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[the] rock the builders rejected became</td>
<td>this is the rock which was despised by you the builders, who became* [the] head of [the] corner</td>
<td>a rock, which the builders rejected, this one became [the] head of [the] corner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the Greek participle is not reflected in the Hebrew.

187Holtz, 162 n. 3.

188Jeremias, "κεφαλὴ γωνίας," TDNT 1 (1964) 792.
While an independent translation would explain the use of an alternate verb here, the question of why a translator would choose ἐξονθενέω over ἀποδοκιμάζω remains a mystery unless some form of redactional considerations be accepted.

Another possible explanation for the choice of the verb here is that the word reflects a different LXX text of the passage. According to Rahlfs, however, there are no variations corresponding to this alteration in the extant textual history of the LXX at this point. On the other hand, the LXX does translate ὙΝΩ with either ἐξονθενέω or ἀποδοκιμάζω (among other verbs), and a substitution in the LXX tradition is not impossible. But there seems to be no supporting evidence.

A related explanation was suggested by L. Cerfaux, who posited that the reference in Acts 4:11 has been influenced by Ps. 89:39 (88:39 LXX). This latter community lament psalm, speaking the language of experience, relates the disasters which have fallen on Israel to God’s "despising" the Davidic covenant. Bock, however, is probably right in rejecting this conclusion, since the connotation of Ps. 89:39

---

189 It is to be noted that ἩΝΩ is a hapax legomenon in the Hebrew Bible (Lisowsky, 1174). Symmachus translates it by ἀκρογωνίας (see GottLXX, Ps. 117:22), possibly because the location of the stone is problematic (see BAG, 33). While the NT interprets this passage christologically and messianically (see Kidner, Psalms 73-150: A Commentary on Books III-V of the Psalms [TOTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1975] 415), it was not interpreted messianically in Judaism until much later (Jeremias, "N8ο,$," 273 n. 45).

190 See GottLXX, Ps. 117:22.

191 See Clarke, 97.


is antithetical to the point of Acts, which is that while people have rejected Christ, God has exalted him. Another suggestion has been made by Dodd, Dupont and Lindars. They suggest that the citation has been influenced by Isa. 53:3, as found in a hypothetical early reading reflected in the version of Symmachus: εξουθένωμενος καὶ ἐλάχιστος ἄνδρων. In Symmachus the word εξουθένωμενος translates the Hebrew יְהוָה. The LXX appears widely variant from the MT here, and Symmacus is certainly closer to the MT at this point. If, then, a semantic borrowing from Isa. 53:3 occurred here in Acts 4:11, it must have come from a mss related somehow to Symmachus, or from the Hebrew. The latter is likely only if one supposes that the Hebrew text was available to the author of the speech. Furthermore, the redaction of the citation of Ps. 118:22 + Isa. 53:3 into the context of the speech, would then have had to be made from the Hebrew text. If the speech as it stands goes back to early Christian tradition, this is possible. On the other hand, even E. M. Blaiklock, who wishes to see an authentic speech of Peter here, is forced to admit that Luke has redacted the speech. Schweizer shows clearly that this Petrine speech follows the Lukan pattern

---

194 See Bock, 199; see also E. Kränkl, Jesus der Knecht Gottes: Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesus in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte (BU 8; Regensburg: Pustet, 1972) 158.

195 Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 92 n. 2; Dupont, Salvation, 122-123; Lindars, 81.

196 See GottLXX14, Isa. 53:3.

197 Blaiklock (65) notes that Ps. 118:22 is cited in I Peter 2:7. While this may indicate a commonality of tradition between the speech of Peter in Acts 4 and I Peter (cf. Marshall, Acts, 100), Ps. 118:22 seems to have been a "favourite proof-text in the early Church" (Neil, 90), with a fairly wide provenance among NT writers (see NestleAland26, 756; Kidner, Psalms 73-150, 415), and so the significance of its citation in I Peter 2:7 must not be overstated.

198 Blaiklock, 65.
evidenced throughout the speeches in Acts, and this would tend to point to Luke as the source of the speech.\textsuperscript{199} If so, the citation is probably Lukan and its redaction into the speech is Lukan, and thus a Hebrew Vorlage is unlikely. That the reference to Ps. 118:22 has been influenced by Isa. 53:3 in a ms whose reading has influenced the version of Symmachus, is not impossible, as that version is Hebraicizing at this point. It may be that Luke's ms of Isa 53:3 was a ms of this type.

The use of \( \varepsilon \xi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\beta\epsilon\varsigma\omega \) in Symmachus of Isa. 53:3 in connection with the "Suffering Servant" is suggestive that there may have been a theological reason for the use of that term in Acts 4:11. This is especially plausible as Acts 4:11 only presents us with an allusion to Ps. 118:22 (117:22 LXX), and not a direct citation. H. J. Cadbury's suggestion that \( \varepsilon \xi\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\beta\epsilon\varsigma\omega \) represents a paraphrase of the LXX is quite likely in that the whole of the passage appears paraphrased in Acts 4:11.\textsuperscript{200} Bock rejects this hypothesis because Luke has maintained the verbal similarity to the LXX in other uses of this OT reference.\textsuperscript{201} But Bock's point is misleading in that in the other use by Luke of Ps. 118:22 (Luke 20:17), he is dependent on Mark. This is his only independent presentation of this OT passage, and here it is only an allusion. Hence Luke is probably paraphrasing. If he was familiar with Isa. 53:3 in a ms containing a reading like that of Symmachus, the parallel between the rejection of the "Suffering Servant" and Jesus

\textsuperscript{199} Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 209, 212.


\textsuperscript{201} Bock, 199.
would likely not have escaped him and he would likely have used the same word found there for the Jews' rejection of Jesus. As well, it is to be noted that \( \varepsilon \xi \omicron \upsilon \theta e\nu \varepsilon \omega \) has more of the connotation of "despising" than does \( \alpha \tau \rho \sigma \delta \omicron \kappa \mu \alpha \zeta \omega \), and is thus a stronger verb that would more readily be used in a polemical speech to Jesus' accusers.\(^{202}\) Bruce further points out that the LXX uses \( \varepsilon \xi \omicron \upsilon \theta e\nu \varepsilon \omega \) in I Kgdms. 8:7 and 10:19 in the context of rejecting God, a similar context to Acts 4:11. He also notes that \( \varepsilon \xi \omicron \upsilon \theta e\nu \eta \theta \eta \) is used of Jesus in Mark 9:12, and this passage may have had some influence on Acts 4:11.\(^{203}\) In any event, the conclusion that Acts 4:11 is a paraphrase of Ps. 117:22 LXX, rather than a citation from some other source, seems to make the best sense of all the data of the passage.

In summary, then, Acts 4:11 appears to be an allusion to Ps. 117:22 LXX, paraphrasing the material found therein. There may be some influence from Isa. 53:3 in a ms containing the reading found in Symmachus (or from Mark 9:12), or perhaps Luke's LXX contained the reading with \( \varepsilon \xi \omicron \upsilon \theta e\nu \eta \theta e\iota \), although there is no evidence of such a ms. In any case, owing to the allusive and paraphrastic nature of Acts 4:11, it seems wholly unnecessary to posit a source other than the LXX for this reference to Ps. 118:22 (117:22 LXX).

\(^{202}\)See Grundmann, "\( \delta \omicron \kappa \mu \alpha \varsigma \)," TDNT 2 (1964) 256; BAG, 277.

\(^{203}\)Bruce, Acts (1951), 121; see also Reic, 114.

This citation occurs in the prayer of Peter in Acts 4 and is identical with the LXX, except for Ἰνατέ instead of Ἰνα τί, as it appears in modern editions of the LXX. The latter is merely a transcriptional variant, as the division of words was not evident in the LXX mss. Only two real problems surround this citation: the nature of the introductory formula, and the possibility of a traditional citation here.

The state of the introductory formula is, as Bock says, "frankly a mess." It reads: ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν διὰ πνεύματος ἁγίου στόματος Δαυίδ παιδός σου εἰπών. The definite article is placed a great distance from εἰπών, to which it presumably refers. The words τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν have no clear grammatical referent, and στόματος is awkwardly placed. Translations (e.g., NASB, RSV, NIV, etc.) tend to make sense of the words by rearranging them, and by adding a preposition ("by" or "through," etc.). The textual tradition is full of emendations as well, and Metzger finds the solution proposed by NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 (taking the reading of p74, 8, A, B, E, 33, 88, etc.) ultimately unsatisfactory, but the best which is available. The only thing which concerns us at this point is the possibility, suggested by Torrey, that we may have a translation here from Aramaic. He suggests that the chaos resulted from the accidental lengthening in Aramaic of the َ of نَئل to ََ, producing نَئلَ which was

---

204Bock, 202.
205Metzger, Textual Commentary, 322.
then necessarily rendered ὅ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν. It is, however, unlikely that Luke (or another translator) would have produced this jumble of words in translation, without making sense of them. The most likely solution is that the jumble has come about through faulty textual transmission.

It has been argued that the interpretation of the citation as given in Acts 4:27-28 is possible only on the basis of the LXX text of Ps. 2:1-2. Dupont, for example, asserts that the LXX facilitates the identification of the ἐθνη of the citation with the ἐθνεσίων of v. 27, and the λαοῖ of the citation with the λαοῖς Ἰσραήλ of v. 27. While in the LXX λαοί is usually preferred when referring to Israel, and ἐθνος is used most often in connection with foreign peoples, the Hebrew נ� is sometimes used of either. In fact, in the MT of Ps. 2:1, נ� appears in inverted parallelism with נ, and thus probably refers to foreign peoples. Dupont argues that the LXX translation of Ps. 2:1 facilitates the distinction made in Acts 4 between the Gentiles and Israel.

---

206 Torrey, Composition, 17-18.
207 See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 322; Bock, 203.
209 Dupont, Salvation, 118.
211 See BDB, 522.
212 Dupont, Salvation, 118; see also Briggs and Briggs, 1. 12; but cf. Kidner, Psalms 1-72, 50.
213 Dupont, Salvation, 118.
Bock, however, argues that, since ΜΧ is ambiguous, and thus in Ps. 2:1 could refer to Israel, the interpretation of the term in Acts 4 does not necessarily come from the LXX version, but from the christological context in which the citation is used. Hence, the interpretation of Acts 4:27-28 could, in fact, be based on the Hebrew rather than the LXX. But it is manifestly the LXX which is in use here, and the play on the terms λαος and ἄνδρα shows the author's evident familiarity with the general LXX distinction between them. Hence the identification of λαοι and Israel in Acts 4 is more readily conceivable in relation to its LXX context.

The above tends to support a septuagintal and a Lukan origin for this citation.

I. Howard Marshall, on the other hand, argues that the whole prayer is traditional. He lists three reasons: (1) the prayer is only loosely connected to the situation, as the references in the prayer relate not to the experiences of the Apostles' persecution, but only to Jesus; (2) the wording of v. 25 is so jumbled it is unlikely that Luke would have composed it himself; and (3) the portrait of Pilate is inconsistent with the general tendency of Luke-Acts not to place the blame on Rome for Jesus' crucifixion or the persecution of the church. These points can be answered, however. That the prayer only refers to Jesus and not to the Apostles' experience (1) may be indicative of a general prayer being inserted here, but need not indicate any such thing. It may be that Luke


215 Marshall, Acts, 100-104.
is only identifying the trials of the apostolic community with those of Christ, in keeping with his tendency to draw parallels between Christ and the apostles throughout Luke-Acts. As to the jumble in v. 25 (2), as I have noted, the textual state is too uncertain to determine the origin of the passage. In any event, it is almost equally unlikely that Luke would have left the jumble as he found it in his source, as it is that he composed it himself. The portrait of Pilate (3) is more problematic, and may reflect a traditional source; however, if anyone would have given the Romans equal share with the Jews in the crucifixion of Jesus, it would likely have been Luke. In Luke, in contrast to the other Gospels, Jesus is brought before Pilate and eventually convicted on

216 Bock, 206.


a political charge, not on a religious charge of blasphemy. Pilate took part in his conviction (Luke 23:24), under protest, to be sure (Luke 23:14-22), but the effect of the political charge in Luke is to give Rome an important place in Jesus' sentencing. Therefore, the portrayal of Pilate in Acts 4:27 is not totally out of place in Luke's work.

If we add to this the fact that the prayer specifically mentions Herod's part in Jesus' passion, an event which is only recorded by Luke (Luke 23:6-12), we can understand the prayer of Acts 4 as a direct reference to the events of Luke 23, including the mention of all the important participants in the trial, as recorded by Luke and no other. Thus the portrait presented in the prayer appears very Lukan indeed.

Other arguments for Lukan composition have been advanced. M. Dömer has noted that the detailed exegesis of Ps. 2 within the community prayer is artificial, the contextual link between the prayer and the events makes the prayer likely a component of the Lukan setting, while the loose contextual link of the psalm to the setting is unlikely in traditional material. Further, he notes that the prayer fits the pattern of OT prayers, such as Isa. 37:16-20 and II Kings 19:15-19, and that the elements of the text not reflecting OT language are expressed in distinctively Lukan language. Bock challenges all these points and concludes that they only prove that Luke has remodelled

---

219See Walaskay, "And So We Came To Rome," 40; "The Trial and Death of Jesus," 84; Kennard, 48-49.

220See the comments by Walaskay ("And So We Came to Rome," 40-42).

221See Holtz, 55-56.

222Dömer, 63-66.
the traditional material in his own words. But while Bock is doubtless right in asserting that Luke could have used traditional material, the evidence, both from Domer, and that which I have outlined above, indicates that the composition of this prayer, including the citation, belongs primarily to Luke.

In summary, then, the evidence supports Holtz's contention that the citation is from the LXX and primarily Lukan.


These three short Psalms excerpts occur in relation to each other and other OT citations in Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch. I will examine each in turn.


Rather than a citation, this is more properly an allusion fused with other OT passages (I Sam. 13:14 and Isa. 44:28), and as such requires little comment. It encompasses only two words: Ἐφορὸς Δαβὶδ, to which Acts adds τὸν τοῦ Ἰσαὰκ. Haenchen and Holtz suggest that here we have influence from Isa. 11:1,10; II Kgdms. 23:1 or Ps. 71:20 LXX. The reference to Isaiah here would have a messianic appeal

---

223Bock, 204-205.
224Holtz, 55.
225Interestingly, there is an introductory formula here. The formula, however, probably refers to the Isaiah citation (see above, pp. 132-135).
and fit well into this passage in Acts. Whether this allusion is from the LXX or not is impossible to say, as $\text{ὢ φανωκρινής}$ (89:21 MT) is most naturally translated by εὐρούς.

b. Acts 13:33 = Ps. 2:7

This citation occurs in close association with Isa. 55:3 and Ps. 16:10. Holtz argues that as such it forms part of the testimonia tradition which underlies the composition of this speech. But my comments regarding the citation of Isa. 55:3 (see above, pp. 139-144) also hold good for this citation, and the possibility of a testimonium here is not as strong as Holtz would like to claim. The citation is identical with the LXX, which is also extremely close to the MT. Holtz notes that the introductory formula ("as is also written in the second psalm") indicates Luke's knowledge of this citation from his own text of the LXX. He points to the citation of Ps. 2:7 in Heb. 1:5 as evidence that a testimonium containing this psalm existed in the early church, which Luke has revised according to his knowledge of the LXX. In Hebrews the connection is made to II Sam. 7:14 in a midrashic manner, and it has been suggested that the two passages were associated messianically in pre-Christian times. In support of this it has been noted that 4Q174 relates II Sam. 7:14 to Ps. 2. It is, however, not Ps. 2:7 in 4Q174, but Ps. 2:1, and it is not directly connected to II Sam.

---

227Holtz, 56.

228See Lövestam, Son and Saviour, 17; see also Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 98; Doeve, 172.
Furthermore, in Heb. 5:5, Ps. 2:7 is again cited, but this time in connection with Ps. 110:4. In Acts 13 the citation seems clearly connected to the resurrection of Jesus (in the rest of Acts 13:33 and in v. 34), but in Hebrews it is not. Similarly, while the 4Q174 citation is messianic, it contains no resurrection reference. Hence, while the Hebrews citation, at least that of 1:5, may be related to a testimonium like 4Q174, the Acts citation is used in a far different manner from either of them. In light of this it is difficult to conceive of a common testimonium underlying Acts and Hebrews. What was said earlier concerning the unity of the speech of Acts 13 holds here as well, and thus we probably have a Lukan LXX citation here.

c. Acts 13:35 = Ps. 16:10 (15:10 LXX)

This citation is identical with the LXX and its earlier occurrence in Acts 2:27, except for the change of ὅδε to ὅ. The latter is merely a stylistic change as the text no longer appears with its parallel in Ps. 16:10a. Holtz considers this a part of a testimonium which Luke has corrected to the LXX. His argument hinges on the ascription of the citation of this passage in Acts 2:31 to a testimonium which Luke has not revised. I, however, have found that this explanation is wholly unnecessary in

---

230 See Allegro, Qumran Cave 4, 53-55; "Fragment," 351-354; "Further," 176-177; Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 98 n. 57.

231 See e.g., Lövestam, Son and Saviour, 37-48; Fuller, 187; but cf. Rese, 83-85; Bock, 246-249.

232 See Bock, 246.

233 Ibid, 255.

234 See Holtz, 144.
view of the redactional considerations which bear on Acts 2:31. There is nothing in Acts 13 to suggest the use of a testimonium, except for the connection of this citation and the other scriptures used in the speech. Again, as previously noted, there seems to be a tendency among some scholars to consider Luke unable to combine scriptures himself. The discussion above on Acts 13:22, 34, 47 = Isa. 44:28; 55:3; 49:6 (pp. 135-147) shows that this assumption is largely unnecessary.

d. Summary: Psalms citations in Acts 13

In summary, then, the Psalms references in Acts 13 are likely all from the LXX, although in the case of the allusion in v. 22, it is impossible to say with certainty. The citations are probably Lukan, although there is still a possibility, as I remarked concerning the Isaiah citations in this chapter, that Luke is drawing on some traditional material.


In our examination of the Psalms citations in Luke-Acts we have found a good deal of evidence for traditional material, especially in the Gospel, but also possibly in Acts. Often Luke does not alter the traditional material which he received from Mark or "Q," although in one clear instance he has corrected the citation toward the LXX. Usually, however, the alterations are redactional in nature, according to contextual or theological needs. Evidence of traditional origin for the Acts citations is often somewhat questionable; however, it cannot be completely discounted. Even if the citations are taken as traditional, Lukan redaction is almost always evidenced and the origin of the
citations is normally from the LXX, although one instance of a "Q" citation does not appear to be so. Thus we have much evidence of citations which are both traditional and septuagintal, especially in the Gospel, and if traditionality is accepted for a number of the Acts citations, for them as well. In many cases the citations in Acts are really only allusions, fitted snugly into the argument of the speeches. The latter is a very important observation as we move into the Pentateuch citations.

In terms of the overall aims of this study, then, we note that Luke's Psalms citations are more likely to be traditionally derived than those from the Minor Prophets and Isaiah, especially in the Markan and "Q" material found in the Gospel. He does, however, clearly know and use the LXX, even correcting a traditional citation in one instance toward the LXX. He possibly uses traditional sources in his own material as well, although this is not demonstrated conclusively. Luke appears to balance fidelity to his source (especially Mark and "Q") with redactional considerations, and often freely edits the citations (especially those from the LXX) to fit the context of his narrative. In fact, with the Psalms material, sometimes Luke appears more concerned with literary fidelity to the direction of his narrative, than with fidelity to his source. For example, Luke appears to have removed the reference to Daniel from Jesus' words before the Sanhedrin (Luke 22:69), which he found in his Markan source (Mark 14:62), in order to make Jesus' speech consistent with the charge for which Luke has him condemned. This may imply criticism on Luke's part as to the accuracy of his sources, as has been
noted, for example, in Luke's prologue (Luke 1:1-4). Hence Luke alters the material to fit his presentation of the events. Finally, there is no evidence of a Hebraicizing tendency in Luke's LXX ms.

---

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CITATIONS FROM THE PENTATEUCH

All references to the Pentateuch in Luke-Acts are brief, many being no more than allusions. In Luke’s Gospel, they all occur in speeches, although some of the speeches are very short, and form parts of conversations between Jesus and others. In Acts, the majority of the pentateuchal references are found in the lengthy speeches of Acts 3 and 7, with only one pentateuchal reference outside of these two speeches (23:5), and this is part of a conversation during Paul’s trial narrative. In all there are some thirty-five major pentateuchal references in Luke-Acts (not counting the possible reference to Ex. 23:20 in Luke 7:27, already dealt with):¹ four in Markan material, one each in "Q" and "L" material, and the rest in Acts.

A. Markan Citations


The origin of this citation is extremely uncertain, and has given rise to a number of explanations, none of which is completely satisfactory. I am tentatively ascribing this citation to Markan material, although there are different viewpoints on the matter. For example, because of a number of minor agreements between Luke 10:25-28 and Matt.

¹If all the allusions to the Pentateuch are counted, there are, of course, many more than thirty-five (see Nestle-Aland26, 739-747). I am, however, confining my study to the passages listed as citations by UBSGNT3 (897-898, 901), with the qualification that a number of the latter are allusions as well.
22:34-40 some have ascribed the episode to "Q." 2 Others perceive the differences as so great between the three Gospels that they assign the material to "L, n 3 although some allow for Markan influence. 4 Others consider it completely Markan. 5 Some have suggested that two separate incidents are recorded by Matthew/Mark and Luke. 6 It is possible, however, that most of the differences can be explained by reference to Lukan redaction of Markan material. Fitzmyer has suggested that the removal of the shema proper (Deut. 6:4) from the Markan citation (12:29-30), and the use of "lawyer" instead of "one of the scribes" can be explained by Luke's concern for the Gentile audience to whom he is writing. 7 Beyond that, I would suggest that the removal of the references to the commandments as "first" and "second" has the effect of producing a single two-pronged command, which encompasses all that the Law states (v. 26), and thus not merely the two most important commandments in a list of others. The placing of the citation on the lips of the lawyer in Luke as opposed to Jesus in Matthew and Mark, and Jesus' agreement with the Law as summarized by the lawyer (v. 28), perhaps serve to underline the continuity between the true faith of Israel and Christianity, a common

---


4See e.g., Schramm, 49.

5E.g., E. Klostermann, Das Lukasevangelium (HNT 5; Tübingen: Mohr, 1975) 118. For followers of the Griesbach hypothesis, the choice is between Matthew and Luke's own material, while for those who argue for the Augustinian hypothesis, the choice is between Matthew and Mark.


Lukan emphasis. Furthermore, Kenneth J. Thomas has noted that, as it stands in Luke, the passage provides an excellent introduction to the parable of the good Samaritan, which emphasizes the love of neighbour as does the Leviticus passage.⁸

The feature, however, which seems to point fairly conclusively to Mark as the source of the citations is the reference to "all your strength" in both Mark and Luke (Mark: εὐ δόλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου; Luke: ἐν δόλη τῆς ἰσχύς σου), but not in Matthew or the LXX of Deut. 6:5.⁹ While a hypothetical common tradition for Mark and Luke is still possible, the simplest explanation is that Luke used Mark.

There are, however, problems with this analysis which need to be considered, both in regard to the relation of the Lukan citation to the LXX, and to its form in Mark. As far as Lev. 19:18 is concerned the text is septuagintal, and is cited verbatim from the LXX in both parallels to the Lukan citation (Matt. 22:39; Mark 12:31) as well as James 2:8; Rom. 13:9; Gal. 4:14; while Matthew again cites part of the text in 5:43. Luke has, as noted, replaced ἀγαπὴςεἰς with a simple καὶ in order to make the double citation into a single two-pronged command.

The Deut. 6:5 citation is more problematic. The LXX reads, according to the Götttingen edition, verbatim with the Lukan citation until we come to the various parameters of the love for God. Then the LXX reads: εὐ δόλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐὐ δόλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ εὐ δόλης τῆς δυνάμεως σου, while Luke has, like Mark, four parameters, although in a different order: LXX διανοίας becomes καρδίας (with Mark

---

⁸Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 211; see also Manson, 259.

⁹Stendahl (75) argues that Matthew has also used Mark, but dropped the reference to ἰσχύς.
and Matthew), while Luke adds καὶ ἐν δὸλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου at the end (with Matthew; Mark places it before the final parameter), and δυνάμεως becomes ἵσχὺ (with Mark, but Mark places it last). Another change is the replacement of ἐξ plus the genitive (so LXX, Mark) with ἐν plus the dative in the last three parameters (Matthew has ἐν plus dative throughout). The MT, like the LXX, has only three parameters, but in some ways the Lukán citation is closer to it than is the LXX at this point. Καρδία is a more literal translation of בַּל than is διάνοια (in fact, this is the only place where LXX Deuteronomy translates the characteristic Deuteronomic phrase יִשְׁמַעְתָּ הָאֱלֹהִים with διάνοια for בַּל instead of καρδία),¹⁰ and the use of ἐν better accords with Hebrew בַּל than does ἐξ. Furthermore, ἵσχὺς is just as possible a translation of בַּל as is δυνάμεως.¹¹

Besides the foregoing problems there is also a mass of confusion in the textual tradition of both the LXX and the NT. Without going into detail here, let me simply state that the textual traditions record a great number of what appear to be corrections, in the case of the LXX, under the influence of the Hebrew text and the varying NT citations, and in the case of Luke, under influence from Matthew and Mark.¹² It appears that the various scribes were as baffled by the situation as we are.

¹⁰T. K. Wittstruck, "The Greek Translators of Deuteronomy" (PhD. Dissertation: Yale University, 1972) 382. Διάνοια is used to translate בַּל in the same phrase once in Josh. 22:5, but Deut. 6:5 is its only occurrence for this phrase in Deuteronomy (see Hatch and Redpath, 1. 306-307; Lisowsky, 709).

¹¹See BDB, 547.

¹²See GottLXX2.2, Deut. 6:5; NestleAland26, Luke 10:27; see also Wittstruck, 382.
Kenneth J. Thomas traces the divergences from the LXX in our citation through various layers of traditional liturgical reformulations, but considers the LXX as their primary source. He takes the basic LXX text to be the one represented by Alexandrinus (A) and Ambrosianus (F), as opposed to Vaticanus (B), etc.; the former followed by RahlfsLXX, the latter by GottLXX3.2. The former contains καρδία instead of διάνοια. As διάνοια is a common LXX equivalent of בְּלָוי, and represents a more Hellenistic rendering of the term, one could either see καρδία as an assimilation to the Hebrew, or διάνοια as a Hellenizing of the original LXX. Thomas suggests that ἰσχύος (Mark 12:30, ἰσχύει in Luke) is also based on a variant Greek tradition, although the textual evidence is not very supportive of this suggestion. He suggests that the change of εξ to εν reflects an attempt to approximate the Hebrew ב in the liturgical tradition, and that the reference to διάνοια in the Gospels resulted from the fact that both readings (καρδία and διάνοια) were highly regarded, and a marginal reading originally preserving a variant thus crept into the text of a LXX ms, where it served as a source for the Gospel tradition.

---

15 See Stendahl, 74-75.
16 Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 209.
17 See GottLXX3.2, Deut. 6:5.
18 See also Goulder, Luke, 486.
Thomas's suggestions are ingenious, and do, in fact, explain some of the variants, especially the double translation of דָּבָר, in a way which appears at first glance impossible by any other suggestion. There is another possibility, however, which needs to be noted. Based upon the fact that the words καρδία and ἰσχύς, as well as the ἐν plus dative construction, occur in IV Kgdms. 23:25, influence from the latter passage on the citation of Deut. 6:5 found in the Gospel tradition has been suggested. Although Stendahl, reacting to the suggestion as first made by A. H. McNiele in 1915, thinks that such influence on the Jewish central Scripture from a passage in IV Kingdoms is unlikely, I would point out that what may be unlikely in a Jewish context, may not be in a Christian context. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that any particular form of the shema was authoritative at this time, and so influence from IV Kingdoms on the Christian liturgical form of Deut. 6:5 is not out of the question.

---

20The suggestion, for example, of Goulder (Luke, 485) that we have "a clear instance of a mixed citation from memory" does not adequately account for all the complications involved (cf. also Sperber, 223; see Holtz, 65).

21Stendahl, 75 n. 2.

22See Stendahl, 76; Holtz, 66-67; see also de Waard, Comparative Study, 64.

23A possible, though complicated, solution to the problems is that Luke may have reworked the traditional citation which he received from Mark according to the LXX of Deuteronomy and IV Kingdoms. We can thus see where the various elements of the latter part of the verse originated:

```plaintext
έξ διλης τῆς καρδίας σου
καὶ ἐν διλή τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐν διλή τῆς ἰσχύς σου
καὶ ἐν διλή τῆς διανοίας σου
```

- from Mark

- from IV Kingdoms, with αὐτοῦ changed to σοῦ for contextual reasons, and rearranged in accord with Deut. 6:5

- from Deut. 6:5, brought into harmony with the grammatical form of the foregoing citation from IV Kingdoms, and placed last for emphasis (see below)

(continued...)
While the above analysis explains how divergent forms of Deut. 6:5 may have evolved, the simplest explanation for the Lukan form is dependence on Mark. But if Luke used Mark, how do we account for the two major divergences from Mark: the change from ἐξ plus the genitive to ἐν plus the dative in the last three parameters, and the removal of καὶ ἐν δεκτὴ δηναις σου to the end? As the problem is a difficult one, and no-one appears to have dealt with it in any satisfactory manner, I can only suggest a tentative solution. Thomas states that "the appearance of both ἐκ and ἐν with the corresponding genitive and dative cases is a sign of the conflation of more than one text tradition." But rather than looking for this conflation in a hypothetical special tradition available to Luke, I would suggest that Luke may have conflated the two traditions which we know he used: Mark and "Q." Thus Mark and "Q" represent two varying liturgical forms of Deut. 6:5. Matthew has reproduced "Q" and Luke has conflated Mark and "Q." There is one problem with this analysis, however. If Luke conflated Mark and "Q" for this citation, we would have expected ἐξ with the genitive to be with ἰσχύος rather than with καρδία, since the reference to ἰσχύος is the element in the Lukan citation that is clearly Markan. This is a difficult problem and the only

23(...) continued
In this way, Luke has presented a complete form of the shema, containing elements from both the Deuteronomy tradition and that of IV Kingdoms. If this analysis is indeed correct, Holtz's conclusion (68) that Luke had no independent knowledge of the LXX of this passage is in error. Given the numerous uncertainties in the passage, however, and the complicated nature of the analysis itself, the above analysis can only be offered as a tentative suggestion.


25Beare's suggestion (159) that Luke is citing "Q" while Matthew has conflated Mark and "Q" does not appear to provide a solution to the problems. Neither does it seem to agree with the evidence in the passages.
explanation I can offer is that, rather than simply conflating Mark and "Q," Luke wished to reproduce the longer Markan version of the citation in the style of the "Q" version, but got careless and left the first parameter in the style of Mark. A mistake such as this is evidence that, while Luke may have been influenced by the style of the "Q" passage, his source for the content of the passage was Mark.  

Turning to the removal of καὶ ἐν δύν ῥῇ διανοίᾳ σου to the end of the passage, again the problem is difficult. One could argue that Luke has placed the reference to διανοιᾳ last for emphasis. Διανοιᾳ, however, is not an important word for Luke. Hence the reason for emphasizing it is obscure. He uses it only on one other occasion (Luke 1:51), but its use there is instructive. Luke 1:51 reads διανοίᾳ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν (cf. Heb. 4:12). The genitival construction here indicates the close relation between διανοιᾳ and καρδίᾳ in the mind of the writer. Both words refer to the person's inward thoughts and motivations. In Luke 10:27 the four parameters can be understood to form a chiasm with the two references to the inner motivations of the person enclosing the references to the person's life and actions:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \quad \text{καρδίᾳ} \\
\text{b} & \quad ψυχῇ \\
\text{b'} & \quad ἵππῳ \\
\text{a'} & \quad διανοιᾳ
\end{align*}
\]

---

26It is interesting to note that this passage may be one in which the Augustinian position (that Luke used Matthew and Mark) may work better than the two source hypothesis, since with the Augustinian position we do not have to assume that Matthew has reproduced "Q."

27See Brown, Birth, 337; Farris, 121; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 368.

Thus Luke may have moved the reference to διάνοια to the end to create this structure. It was, however, not likely original with him as the "Q" version (Matt. 22:37) is also chiastic:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a} & \text{ καρδία} \\
\text{b} & \text{ ψυχή} \\
\text{a'} & \text{ διάνοια}
\end{align*}
\]

Hence Luke, in reproducing the Markan material in the style of "Q," has also reproduced the chiastic structure by moving the reference to διάνοια to the end.

The citation is therefore traditional as comes from Mark (with influence from "Q"), yet how traditional it is remains unclear. That we have here a citation of the shema, the foremost text in Judaism, argues for Jewish tradition. As the shema was sometimes recited in Greek, and appears to have existed in Greek in various forms, with none particularly authoritative, such variety of form could account for the variations found between the Gospel citations, the LXX and the MT.\(^{29}\) The combination, however, of the shema with Lev. 19:18 is not so clearly Jewish. The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs contain references which appear to show this combination. T. Issa. 5:2 states "love the Lord and your neighbour"\(^{30}\) while 7:6 states "I loved the Lord; / Likewise also every man with all my heart." Similarly, T. Dan. 5:3 states "Love the Lord through all your life, / And one another with a true heart." R. H. Charles has argued that the NT combination of these verses is dependent on these references in the

\(^{29}\)See Stendahl, 76; Holtz, 66-67; see also de Waard, Comparative Study, 64.

\(^{30}\)All translations of the OT Pseudepigrapha are from APOT 2.
Testaments. On the other hand, others suspect that the references in the Testaments themselves are Christian interpolations. Philo of Alexandria may have based some of his ethical precepts on this combination of Scriptures (e.g., De spec. leg. 2.15§63); however, Fitzmyer is hesitant about this. On the other hand, later Christian tradition shows clear and unmistakable evidence of this combination (e.g., Did. 1:2; Barn. 19:2,5; Mart. Pol. 3:3; Justin, Dial. 93:2-3) and Fitzmyer concludes that "Jesus himself was the catalyst for the development of the double command in the Christian tradition." Hence, while the combination of the two Scriptures is certainly traditional, it may not be traditionally Jewish, but Christian.

In summary, then, this citation is a combined traditional liturgical citation which may have had its origin in the LXX of Deut. 6:5 (+ perhaps IV Kgdms. 23:25) + Lev.

---


32 See e.g., Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 879.

33 Ibid. There is no clear referent in Philo to these two scriptures, rather only a general reference to two preeminent topics for discussion in Sabbath schools: duty toward God and duty toward human beings.


35 Luke's placing the command on the lips of the lawyer rather than Jesus may indicate that from his standpoint, the combination was a commonplace in Jewish thought, not original to Jesus, and could reasonably be ascribed to a Jewish lawyer as a summary of the Law (see Stendahl, 77). On the other hand, Luke probably had other reasons, as I have noted, for placing the words on the lips of the lawyer. As well, the centrality of Deut. 6:5 in the OT covenantal context as compared with the seemingly peripheral status of Lev. 19:18 might be thought to make the linking of them unlikely from a Jewish perspective (see W. J. McKay, "Man's Love for God in Deuteronomy," VT 22 [1972] 426-435; Craigie, The Book of Deuteronomy [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976] 169-170; M. Noth, Leviticus: A Commentary [OTL; London: SCM, 1965] 142; but cf. G. J. Wenham, The Book of Leviticus [NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979] 269; Eichrodt, 1. 93-94).
19:18. Luke, however, has used the citation as found in Mark and has edited it according to the style of the citation in "Q."

2. **Luke 18:20 = Ex. 20:12-16 (Deut. 5:16-20)**

This OT reference is much more clearly Markan (parallel Matt. 19:18-19; Mark 10:19), although followers of Griesbach and Augustine would likely see Matthean material here, in light of the omission of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς by both Matthew and Luke. The differences, however, between Luke and Matthew make dependence on "Q" or Matthew highly unlikely. On the other hand, Luke's similarity to Mark makes a Markan origin more likely.\(^{36}\) The citation is not complete, and might be considered an allusion, as it only preserves a summary of certain commandments of the decalogue, either from Ex. 20 or Deut. 5.\(^{37}\)

Luke follows Mark throughout, except for the above-mentioned omission of μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς and the reversal in order of μὴ φονεύσῃς and μὴ μοιχεύσῃς. These alterations may be viewed as corrections of the Markan material. As the decalogue took varying catechetical forms at the time the Gospels were written,\(^{38}\) it is likely that Mark derived the words μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς from Jewish catechetical tradition. He probably

---

\(^{36}\)See Schramm, 142; Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1196. Those who argue that Mark was the last Gospel written (Griesbach hypothesis) would have to consider this passage Luke's special material which Mark has followed.

\(^{37}\)The introductory words "you know the commandments" may indicate a summary as naturally as a citation.

found the fourth commandment placed after the eighth in the same tradition, and perhaps the use of μη with the subjunctive, as opposed to LXX οὐκ with indicative.39

As far as the omission of μη ἀποτερήσας is concerned, it appears that both Matthew and Luke corrected the Markan text according to the OT, in which the words do not appear as part of the decalogue.40 The version of the OT used appears in Matthew to be the LXX (since he corrects μη + subjunctive to οὐκ + indicative), although the omission of course brings the text closer to the MT as well.41 For Luke, the LXX is also likely as the form to which he corrected the citation, but not likely the same text as used by Matthew. The change in order in Luke, not paralleled in Matthew, resembles the B text of the LXX (Vaticanus) for Deut. 5:16-20, while Matthew is closer to the A text (Alexandrinus) of both Exodus and Deuteronomy.42 That the reading of Vaticanus was likely fairly widespread at Luke’s time is shown by its agreement with Philo (De decal. 12§51), Rom. 13:9 and James 2:11. The reflection of the same order in the Nash papyrus also argues for the early provenance of this reading.43 We have,

39 See Stendahl, 62; see also Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 207.
41 See Stendahl, 62; Ringgren, 228; Ringgren’s analysis seems confused at this point.
42 See Stendahl, 62-63; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1199; Thomas "Liturgical Citations," 207; note also that the order of LXX Deuteronomy is followed by the "C n x text" of Ex. 20 (Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus [SBLSCS 30; Atlanta: Scholars, 1990] 314).
therefore, reasonable evidence here that Luke corrected Mark in accordance with a ms of the LXX related to B, while Matthew corrected Mark according to a ms akin to A.\textsuperscript{44}

All of this would tend to indicate that Luke compared the Markan material with his copy of the LXX of Deut. 5:16-20, and corrected it thereby. That he did not correct the use of \( \mu\acute{\eta} \) with the subjunctive, as Matthew did, may be explained by the fact that \( \mu\acute{\eta} \) with subjunctive is stylistically better.\textsuperscript{45}

In summary, this citation is not so widely at variance with the LXX as Holtz would suggest.\textsuperscript{46} Rather, although the Markan form is likely non-septuagintal, Luke’s version shows signs of having been corrected to a LXX text akin to that found in B.


These two brief citations occur in the dialogue between Jesus and the Sadducees concerning the resurrection as scriptural components of the opposing arguments. The material of vv. 27-40 is clearly Markan (Mark 12:18-27, parallel Matt. 22:23-33), but has been redacted by Luke throughout, improving the Greek, adding his own conclusion in 38b-39 instead of Mark 12:27b, and moving the gist of Mark 12:34 to the conclusion of the story (Luke 20:40) as he omits the next Markan episode.\textsuperscript{47} T. Schramm has

\textsuperscript{44}See Thomas "Liturgical Citations," 207; Stendahl, 62.

\textsuperscript{45}See BDF, 183-184.

\textsuperscript{46}Holtz, 168.

\textsuperscript{47}Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke (X-XXIV)}, 1299; see also Holtz, 69.
argued that vv. 34b-36 betray signs of another source, but it is equally likely that Luke has redacted these verses, removing the accusation of the Sadducees and alluding to IV Macc. 7:19. In any event, both citations are clearly Markan. I will examine each in turn.


Mark 12:19 must be considered an allusion or a summary of Deut. 25:5, with some additional words from Gen. 38:8 (καὶ ἀνάστησιν [Mark and Luke have ἐξανάστησιν] σπέρμα τῶ ἀδελφῶ σου [Mark and Luke have αὐτοῦ]). Luke has taken this allusion over from Mark with certain stylistic changes, in no way bringing the text closer to the LXX. Deut. 25:5 and Gen. 38:8 have been summarized by Mark into a conversational pattern and used as a piece of conversation in the present context. Luke has further refined the passage stylistically. Hence this allusion is traditional for Luke, coming from Mark, redacted stylistically, but not according to the LXX. Fitzmyer is reasonably confident that Mark's summary is basically from the LXX, but the

---

48Schramm, 170-171.


50See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1304. Although there is an introductory formula (Μωϋσῆς ἔγραψεν ἡμῖν), such a formula may introduce a paraphrase rather than a citation (see Koch, 15-16).

51See Holtz, 69.

52Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1304.
differences are so pronounced that it is difficult to say for certain. In any event, Luke is using Mark as his source, not the LXX.

Holtz regards this passage as demonstrating that Luke did not know the LXX of Deuteronomy or Genesis here. Certainly he has not used the LXX at this point to correct his text as he did earlier. It is likely, however, that Luke recognized this passage for what it was, a summary, and rather than overburdening his reader with a more accurate citation, which would have been far more verbose, and would have had to be adapted to the context in any case, he simply let the summary remain.


Similarly, Mark (12:26) is likely the source for this OT reference. There is no question whether Mark or Luke recognized this passage as an OT reference, as they demonstrate that they recognized it in the words: "have you not read in the book of Moses, in the passage about the bush" (Mark 12:26), "even Moses showed, in the passage about the bush" (Luke 20:37). It seems, however, that they have paraphrased the OT rather than citing it directly. Luke abbreviates Mark in the interests of style, and makes clear that Jesus is quoting Moses in opposition to the Sadducees' quotation of Moses. A problem might be seen in that Luke attributes the statement to Moses and

53See Holtz, 69-70.
54Ibid.
55See Koch, 15-16.
56See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1306.
not to Yahweh, the speaker in Exodus. One might conceivably ask whether, if he knew
Exodus, he could do this in the face of the obviousness of the text. But the point is
surely that for Luke, these words are Moses' words because they were written by Moses,
and since the Sadducees' quote the authority of Moses, Luke has Jesus quote him as well.\(^57\) The Markan citation is not verbatim from the LXX, omitting \(\varepsilon\iota\mu\iota \delta \ \theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma \ \tau\omicron\upsilon \ \pi\alpha\tau\rho\rho\varsigma \ \varsigma\omicron\upsilon\), and inserting the article before \(\theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma\), probably throughout.\(^58\) Stendahl suggests that the citation may have had an oral existence without reference to the
LXX;\(^59\) however, the divergences are not so great that this could not be considered a
loose citation of the LXX. Luke has reedited the Markan citation to fit his complex
sentence (nominative \(\theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) becomes accusative), and thus moved farther from the LXX,
yet the LXX is still possible as the origin. There is, however, by no means certainty
here, owing to the allusory quality of the OT reference.


In summary, these two references are no more than allusions; they are traditional
and show no certain links to the LXX. Both have been heavily redacted: in the former
case by Mark, and Luke has reproduced that redacted version; in the latter case, by Luke
himself, probably based on the loose reference in Mark. In neither case can definitive

---

\(^{57}\)See also W. D. Davies, "Law in First-Century Judaism," IDB 3 (1962) 91.

\(^{58}\)Mss D, W, and a few others omit the article before the first \(\theta\varepsilon\omicron\omicron\varsigma\) while mss B, D, and W omit it before the
second and third (see NestleAland\(^{26}\), Mark 12:26).

\(^{59}\)Stendahl, 71.
statements be made about Luke's knowledge or ignorance of the LXX of these OT passages.

B. "Q" Citations: Luke 4:4,8,12 = Deut 8:3; 6:13,16

These three citations occur in the temptation narrative on the lips of Jesus, as responses to the temptations of the devil. I have already discussed the dependence of this narrative on "Q" material. The only words spoken by the Lukan Jesus in this narrative are citations from scripture (contrast Matt. 4:10). Luke thus portrays Jesus as conquering the devil by recourse to scripture, and to scripture only.60 It is interesting to note that while the devil cites scripture, in the form of Ps. 91:11-12, Jesus cites only the Torah. Hence Jesus goes straight to the heart of Judaism for his strength against temptation,61 and, if anything, this dependence on the Torah is stronger in Luke than in Matthew. I will now examine each citation in turn.

1. Luke 4:4 = Deut. 8:3

The citation is from the LXX (which is very close to the MT) verbatim and agrees with Matthew verbatim, except for omitting ἀλλ' ἐπὶ παρθηματὶ ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ, "but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4).

---

61See W. D. Davies, 91; see also Craigie, Deuteronomy, 185 n. 3; S. Westerholm, "Whence 'The Torah' of Second Temple Judaism," Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period: The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity (ed. P. Richardson and S. Westerholm; SCJ 4; Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfrid Laurier University, 1991) 39-41.
This latter phrase is surely septuagintal\textsuperscript{62} as the MT reads: בִּכְרָשָׁה יִבְּרָא לֵכָּה, "but by everything coming out of the mouth of the Lord." The word ḥµαττ is thus an interpretive element in the LXX. Luke, however, omits this phrase, the longer readings in the Lukan textual tradition being clearly secondary assimilations to Matthew.\textsuperscript{63} There are two possible explanations for this omission. E. Lohmeyer has suggested that Luke has removed the words to make the citation correspond more closely to the situation of Jesus' physical hunger.\textsuperscript{64} Hence Luke would have redacted the citation, removing words which spiritualize the temptation, in order to make the temptation more practical. Holtz and Fitzmyer, on the other hand, argue that the words were not originally in "Q," but were added by Matthew in accord with his image of Jesus as a teacher of Wisdom.\textsuperscript{65} The latter view, then, portrays Matthew as redacting the passage according to his interests, while Luke leaves it as he found it. According to this view, Matthew must have supplemented the citation according to the LXX as the phrase is certainly from that version.\textsuperscript{66} Neither view appears demonstrable.

\textsuperscript{62}See \textit{GottLXX3.2}, Deut. 8:3.


\textsuperscript{64}E. Lohmeyer, "Die Versuchung Jesu," \textit{ZST} 14 (1937) 628 n. 1.

\textsuperscript{65}Holtz, 61; Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke (I-IX)}, 515.

\textsuperscript{66}See Stendahl, 88, see also p. 60.

This citation is taken verbatim from "Q." Luke's citation contains two divergences from the LXX (as does Matt. 4:10). These are the substitution of προσκυνήσεις for φοβηθήσομαι, and the insertion of μόνον after αὐτῷ. The LXX is closer to the MT than is the citation in both these cases. Both the substitution and the insertion are found in the A text of the LXX (+ 82 and some Fathers for the former; + a great many witnesses, including a corrector of F, V, papyrus 963, and the C group of mss, etc., for the latter). These have generally been considered assimilations to the NT.67 Holtz argues that the LXX text behind this "Q" citation probably contained the A reading;68 but it seems to me more likely that the change from a verb of "fearing" to one of "worship" took place in "Q." The latter verb is preferable as more concrete in any case; of even more importance is the occurrence of προσκυνήσεις in the words of temptation (Matt. 4:9; Luke 4:7). Thus, the use of προσκυνήσεις in the citation of Luke 4:8 (Matt. 4:10) makes Jesus' answer parallel to the devil's question. Presumably μόνον was added in "Q" to strengthen the statement.

In any case, Luke has used "Q" and not altered the citation in favour of the LXX. While this may indicate that Luke did not know this portion of Deuteronomy, it could also indicate that Luke found the altered form best suited in the context.

---

67See GottLXX3.2, Deut. 6:13; Lohmeyer, 641 n. 2; but cf. Stendahl, 89; Holtz, 62 n. 2; cf. also GottLXX3.2, Deut. 10:20.

68Holtz, 63.

Luke cites Deut. 6:16 in the same words as we find in Matthew (4:7) and the LXX. That the citation is ultimately derived from the LXX is relatively certain, as the MT has a plural verb, while Matthew and Luke reproduce the LXX singular.\textsuperscript{69}

4. Summary: "Q" Citations

In summary, then, I must agree with Holtz that these brief citations offer no certain proof of Luke's knowledge of the LXX of the Pentateuch.\textsuperscript{70} All we can firmly say is that Luke followed "Q" and that the citations here in "Q" are septuagintal, except perhaps for Luke 4:8. This latter conclusion does demolish Argyle's contention that "Q" citations are not septuagintal,\textsuperscript{71} but whether Luke knew the LXX for the Pentateuch will have to be decided on the basis of other citations.

C. "L" Citations

There are only two major Pentateuchal references in "L" material. They occur in the infancy narrative at the point of the presentation of Jesus at the temple.

\textsuperscript{69}See Holtz, 63-64; Stendahl, 89.

\textsuperscript{70}Holtz, 64.

\textsuperscript{71}Argyle, "Accounts," 382.
1. Luke 2:23 = Ex. 13:2,12,15

Luke 2:23 can only be considered a summary of the various elements of Ex. 13:2,12,15. Certain elements in the Lukan text, however, suggest that the reference is to the LXX. Most important of these is the phrase Πᾶν ἄρσεν διανοίγον μῆτραν. The translation of ἹΣΙΙ by διανοίγον appears to be a septuagintalism of the first order, here in Ex. 13. The word in connection with μῆτραν only occurs in the LXX, as far as is known, and while Bock suggests the possibility of a technical idiom with a wider provenance than the LXX, there is no evidence for it. Beyond this Ex. 13:2 makes reference to the firstborn child being holy to the Lord:

\[ \text{Αγίασθω μοι πᾶν πρωτότοκον πρωτογενὲς διανοίγον πᾶσαν μῆτραν, while v. 12 says: άφελείς πᾶν διανοίγον μῆτραν, τὰ ἀρσενικά, ἀγιάσεις τῷ κυρίῳ (similar in v. 15). One can easily see a paraphrasing combination of these verses in the summary statement given by Luke here.} \]

On the other hand, there are two points which tell against a LXX origin for this summary citation (or allusion). The first is the use of κληθήσεται, not found in the LXX at this point. But Rese points out that "shall be called" has the same sense as "will be," and is connected to the prophecies concerning Jesus and John the Baptist throughout the early part of Luke's infancy narrative (see 1:13,31,32,35,60,76; 2:21). Fitzmyer has connected the citation here closely with 1:35, διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἀγιόν κληθήσεται,

---

72The introductory formula (καθώς γέγραψαν εἰς τὸν κυρίῳ) certainly seems to indicate a citation here, but the inability to precisely determine its referent in Ex. 13 points to a summary.

73See Holtz, p. 83 n. 1.

74See Bock, 83, 307 n. 116.

75Rese, 140-141.
ūδός θεοῦ, and has asserted that in the citation of 2:23, "Luke plays on the title he gave to Jesus in the announcement to Mary." These observations seem reasonable. This citation, then, is not simply inserted in the narrative here, but is intimately connected to the infancy narrative as a whole. Thus, the insertion of κληθήσεται is redactional, rather than an indication of a text differing from the LXX.

The second point is brought up by Bock who notes the overwhelming number of times the term πρωτότοκος is used in Ex. 13. He considers that its absence in Luke at this point argues against dependence on the LXX, as its inclusion would have opened the door to a messianic interpretation. But πρωτότοκος does not appear to be an important term for Luke, who uses it only once (2:7), and it does not appear, for Luke, to have the messianic connotations evidenced in Hebrews (1:6), Colossians (1:15), and even, perhaps, Paul (Rom. 8:29). Even Bock admits that the only other Lukan use of the term (2:7) is non-messianic. Considering the relation of the citation to 1:35, it was certainly more important to present Jesus as "holy to the Lord," rather than as "first-born," which apparently had no messianic connotation for Luke.

Therefore, this summary citation appears to have had its origin in the LXX, and given the interconnectedness of the citation and the birth narratives as a whole, it is likely that the composer of the birth narratives knew the passage in its LXX form. Unfortunately, however, we find ourselves now entering the dense jungle of source

---

77 Bock, 307 n. 117.
78 Ibid, 307 n. 118.
criticism of the infancy narratives. The question of how much of the birth narrative is Lukan, and how much is from an early Jewish-Christian source, plagues everyone who deals with the infancy narratives. Paul Winter is likely correct in asserting that much of the detail in the Lukan narrative probably stems from authentic Palestinian information, and this may point to a traditional source. He concludes:

this astonishing familiarity with the country, its inhabitants, their social conventions and traditions, this competent and hardly erring description of minute details could not have been "imitated" by an outsider. Only a person who was at home in Jewish Southern Palestine, a person who lived there, to whom all these matters of liturgy, folklore, conventional fashions and social modes of life came naturally, could have been the ultimate source of information. 79

On the other hand, Paul Minear and Robert Tannehill have shown that there is a great deal of unity between motifs found in the birth narratives and the rest of the Gospel. 80 Hence, whatever the ultimate source of Luke 1-2, Luke appears to have so edited his Gospel as to produce a unity throughout, intimately connecting the birth narratives with

---

79Winter, "Cultural Background," 242. Winter lists seven passages (Luke 1:5,9,10,19,58; 2:8,37) in which the author must have, in his estimation, been thoroughly familiar with Jewish Palestine. Some of these cases may be explained as the result of detailed study. Some, however, certainly seem to point to an author immersed in Jewish Palestinian customs in the first century. Particularly telling, in my opinion, are the following: Luke 1:9-10, the accurate account of the burning of incense in the Temple (which could hardly have come from a Gentile author [Winter, "Cultural Background," 231-236]); Luke 1:58, the descriptions of the fête celebrated after the birth of John the Baptist, and the knowledge of Jewish custom and folklore revealed therein (cf. 4 Ezra 9:45--Winter, "Cultural Background," 237-238); and Luke 2:8, the topographical accuracy and knowledge of Jewish folklore and religion evident in the story of the shepherds (Winter, "Cultural Background," 238-241). Farris (97) also has concluded that the hymns in the Lukan infancy narratives were composed in the Palestinian Jewish Christian church.

the rest of his narrative. Therefore, while the citation of 2:23 could be from a traditional source, as held by Holtz, Rese and Bock, the connection of the citation to the infancy narrative as a whole, and the connection of the infancy narrative to the rest of the Gospel, as well as the redactional signs in the citation itself (the omission of \( \pi_\omega_\tau_\nu_\delta_\tau_\kappa_\omega_\zeta \) would seem to be a sign of Lukan redaction), tend to argue for a Lukan source for this citation.

Therefore, in summary, I suggest that the case for a LXX origin for Luke 2:23, and for Lukan material in this verse, is much stronger than is often surmised. If Luke indeed summarized Ex. 13 in this citation from the LXX, as seems likely, we then have evidence supporting Luke's knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch.


This citation is generally taken to be a citation of Lev. 12:8. Introduced by the words \( \kappa_\alpha_\tau_\delta \tau_\varepsilon_\iota_\rho_\eta_\mu_\epsilon_\varepsilon_\nu_\nu \varepsilon_\iota_\rho_\iota_\mu_\varphi_\kappa_\varphi_\iota_\iota_\nu_\zeta \), this citation is verbatim from the LXX except that \( \varepsilon_\iota_\nu_\gamma_\circ_\zeta \) replaces \( \delta_\nu_\circ \) before \( \tau_\rho_\nu_\gamma_\omega_\circ_\nu_\circ \) (LXX of Lev. 12:8 has \( \tau_\rho_\nu_\gamma_\omega_\circ_\nu_\circ \)).

There is no evidence for this reading in the textual tradition of LXX Lev. 12:8 other than here in Luke. There is nothing in the MT which would give rise to this word except

---

81 O'Fearghail also emphasizes this conclusion throughout his monograph (*The Introduction to Luke-Acts: A Study of the Role of Luke 1,1-4,44 in the Composition of Luke's Two-Volume Work* [AnBib 126; Rome: Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 1991]). One could argue from the evidence of unity between the birth narratives and the rest of Luke that the same author composed both. But the evidence of Winter and Farris indicates that the origin of the infancy narratives is likely more complex than this.

82 Holtz, 82-83; Rese, 141; Bock, 83.

83 See *GottLXX2.2*, Lev. 12:8.
as a free rendering. However, the phrase appears exactly as in Luke with reference to
a sin offering in Lev. 5:11. Holtz states that it must be that Luke, or his source, cites
Lev. 12:8 in the words of 5:11, which to him indicates a Greek translation of the MT
not related to the LXX. Of course Luke may be actually citing the latter passage, but
against this conclusion is the evidence of the introductory formula which seems to echo
Lev. 12:7: οὐτος ὁ νόμος τῆς τικτούσης ἀρσεν ἡ θηλυ. Bock succinctly outlines the
three possibilities for explaining the use of ξεύγος here: (1) a citation from memory; (2)
an independent rendering from the Hebrew; (3) "a direct reference to a sin-offering
sacrifice, pointing to Joseph's involvement in the purification process." It is the third
alternative which Bock argues for, and the possibility is intriguing, to say the least.

There are two points in favour of Bock's conclusion: the use of the plural αὐτῶν
with τοῦ καθαριμοῦ in Luke 2:22, suggesting that both Joseph and Mary were being
purified, whereas Lev. 12:8 concerns the purification of the mother only; and the
parallels in the passage to the birth and dedication of Samuel (I Sam. 1-2). Regarding
αὐτῶν, there are textual variants in Luke 2:22, reading αὐτοῦ (D, 2174*, the Sinaiitic
Syriac version, a ms of the Sahidic Coptic version, and the Paschal Chronicle) and αὐτῆς
(76; a number of mss of the Old Latin, and the Vulgate read the equivalent of either
αὐτοῦ or αὐτῆς). Aὐτῶν is by far the best attested reading, and it is also the most
difficult reading, as the Law prescribes no purification ritual for the father of a new-

---

84Holtz, 83.
85Bock, 83.
born. The correction to αὐτῇς is to be seen in the light of this fact, and that to αὐτῶν is likely a transcriptional error.\textsuperscript{87} The correction in D shows the problem which this passage presented to later scribes, and this leads us to the first proposed solution to the problem. Bultmann and Fitzmyer conclude that Luke is simply wrong in his understanding of the Law here.\textsuperscript{88} This is not an unlikely solution, since Luke was not a Palestinian Jew and may thus not have had first-hand information regarding the practices in Palestine. This also could support an argument for Luke's ignorance of the Pentateuch. Against this, however, is the evident knowledge which Luke displays of Palestinian customs and practices in the infancy narratives, whether because of sources or simply from inside information.\textsuperscript{89} Another proposed solution is that Luke is merely summarizing and is careless about exactly who was being purified.\textsuperscript{90} This has in its favour the observation that Luke has shown his tendency to summarize in 2:23. Thus Luke said both of them, but meant Mary. A third solution is to take the αὐτῶν as referring to Mary and Jesus,\textsuperscript{91} but this theory runs into trouble because the αὐτῶν clearly reflects the plural ἀνήγαγον: "they" brought Jesus to Jerusalem for "their" purification. Moreover, there is no requirement for a newborn child to be purified.\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{87}Metzger, Textual Commentary, 134; see also W. H. P. Hatch, "The Text of Luke II.22," \textit{HTR} 14 (1921) 377-381.


\textsuperscript{89}Winter ("Cultural Background," 242) admits there are some inaccuracies in the Lukan infancy narrative. This, then, may be one of them.

\textsuperscript{90}See Bock, 84, 308 n. 127.

\textsuperscript{91}E.g., Creed, 39; see also Hauck, "καθαρισμός," \textit{TDNT} 3 (1965) 429 n. 5.

\textsuperscript{92}See Plummer, 63; Fitzmyer, \textit{Luke (I-IX)}, 424.
A fourth solution considers the possibility that Joseph had to be purified, since he became ritually unclean through normal contact with his wife Mary, who was ritually unclean.\textsuperscript{93} A fifth proposed solution suggests that Joseph accompanied Mary to the Temple for her purification and as the legal head of the household was included by Luke in the ceremony.\textsuperscript{94} As the circumstances are not spelled out by Luke, we are left with the conclusion that the  \(\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu\) includes Joseph in the purification, whether because he had contracted some form of ceremonial defilement, or because Luke included him through carelessness (or ignorance) about who specifically was being purified.\textsuperscript{95} This inclusion of Joseph brings us to the relationship of the Lukan narrative to I Samuel.

\textsuperscript{93}Plummer, 63; Morris, St. Luke, 87. Morris argues: "if Mary was ceremonially unclean it was almost a certainty that Joseph would contract defilement and they would both need cleansing." It is, however, to be noted that there is no mention in Lev. 12:1-8 of others contracting defilement through normal contact with the woman unclean through giving birth. On the other hand the words "as at the time of her menstruation" (Lev. 15:29) may indicate that the law for uncleanness after giving birth was interpreted as essentially the same as that for menstruation, in which case another could contract ritual uncleanness (Lev. 15:29-31). Hence Joseph could have become unclean through normal contact with Mary (but cf. M.-J. Lagrange, Évangile selon saint Luc [Paris: Gabalda, 1948] 82: "absolument rien dans l'Ancien Testament ne suppose l'impureté du père, ni même qu'il ait été contaminé par le contact de son épouse").

\textsuperscript{94}R. Robert, "Comment comprendre 'leur purification' en Luc II, 2?!" RevThom 90 (1990) 454-455. An argument could be made that Luke portrays Joseph as not only the legal father of Jesus but as his actual physical father (see e.g., Fitzmyer, "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament," TS 34 [1973] 566-567) and so he is associated with Mary in the purification. But this argument is problematic for two reasons: first of all it is highly unlikely that Luke is presenting Joseph as Jesus' physical father. Even if one does not wish to accept that Luke portrays Jesus' birth as a virgin birth (for arguments against Fitzmyer and for a Lukan virgin birth, see Brown, "Luke's Description of the Virginal Conception," TS 35 [1974] 360-362; "The Problem of the Virginal Conception of Jesus," TS 33 [1972] 3-34; "Virgin Birth," IDBS [1976] 940-941) the evidence indicates that Luke is not presenting Joseph as the physical father of Jesus (J. Schaberg, The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives [San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987] 82-83, 91-92), but is very conscious that Jesus' birth was socially irregular, and occasioned the charge of illegitimacy (Schaberg, 138-139, 152-153; note also that Fitzmyer has modified his view [see Luke (I-X), 338]). Secondly, there is no legal reason why Joseph would have had to be purified as the physical father of Jesus (Lagrange, 82).

\textsuperscript{95}See J. G. Machen, The Virgin Birth of Christ (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965) 72-73. One other view, suggested first by Legrange (82), and dismissed, but taken up by Laurentin (The Truth of Christmas: Beyond the Myths: The Gospels of the Infancy of Christ [Petersham, Mass.: St. Bede’s, 1986] 75-76), argues that the  \(\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu\) refers to the Jewish people and the Temple who were purified by the coming of Christ. This theological view, however, is to be rejected on the basis of the evident grammatical necessity of the  \(\alpha\nu\tau\omega\nu\) referring to Joseph and Mary (Robert, 454).
That the Lukan narrative at this point is modeled on the childhood of Samuel has been urged by Raymond Brown. He finds strong similarities between Luke 2:39 and I Sam. (I Kgdms.) 2:20 and in the double growth motif of Luke 2:40,52 and I Sam. (I Kgdms.) 2:21,26. Although the verbal similarity with the LXX is not striking, the double growth motif is unique to Samuel and Luke in scripture, and suggests some form of dependence. Similarly, Brown finds parallels between Eli and Simeon in the blessing of the parents, between Anna’s presence and that of women ministering at the door of the temple in I Samuel (2:22), and perhaps between the names Anna and Hannah. Bock argues that some of these points are tenuous. He notes, for example, that the parallel between Anna and the women ministering at the sanctuary door is not exact since the former appears alone while the latter appear as a group; moreover, "the link is not at all clear or established" between Eli and Simeon, since Simeon was not a priest. Furthermore he argues that the blessing is a common motif in scripture (Bock notes Gen. 49 and I Kings 8:14 as examples) and thus need not be evidence of a parallel with I Sam. 2:20. The double growth motif is parallel and unique, however, and the specific blessing of the parents is unique and parallel as well. Whatever we make of some of Brown’s parallels and Bock’s criticisms, some relationship between Luke and I Samuel seems indicated.

---

97 See Bock, 84-85.
98 Brown, Birth, 448-451.
99 Bock, 84-85.
If Luke did have the Samuel story in mind, then what he is describing in 2:24, in addition to a purification ritual, is the consecration of a child to God. The latter is what takes place in I Samuel, where Elkanah carries out the paying of Hannah’s vow (cf. Num. 30:11). The motif of consecration to God is clearly present in Jesus’ presentation in the temple, as we have seen in our discussion of 2:23. The payment of the vow in I Samuel is connected with a burnt offering (I Sam. 1:25). This offering cannot, however, be linked to the sacrifice of purification, since the latter took place shortly after birth (cf. Lev. 12:1-4), while the sacrifice in I Sam. 1:25 took place after the weaning of Samuel, which may have been several years after his birth (see II Macc. 7:27). The sacrifice of consecration took place at Shiloh, which would be equivalent to the Temple in Jesus’ day; on the other hand, the ritual of purification, and even the redemption of the firstborn in Ex. 13, did not require the presentation of the child in the temple.

Luke’s account of Jesus’ presentation must be considered inaccurate if it is assumed that he is referring exclusively to Lev. 12:8. The use of αὐτῶν shows Joseph’s participation, and this is unnecessary for the purification ceremony, or even for the redemption of the first-born. But if Luke is referring to a general sin offering, in connection with a special dedication ceremony for Jesus, the use of αὐτῶν, and the

---


102 See Hertzberg, 28.

103 See Bultmann, History, 229; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 425.
presentation in the Temple make sense (although they are still not accurate as to customary practice). Although it cannot be stated with certainty that the sacrifice in I Sam. 1:25 was a sin offering, it is likely that the burning of the bull would have suggested to a reader the sacrifice of Lev. 1:5, and thus 1:14.

This analysis is interesting and certainly makes one thing clear, that Luke is not primarily interested in the ritual of purification found in Lev. 12:8. His primary emphasis is on the presentation of Jesus to God. This, however, does not really answer the question why he cites Lev. 5:11, which does not refer to a sin offering of a bull, and is thus not readily connected to I Samuel. On the other hand, it does show that the purification ritual for birth was not the only thing on Luke's mind in this passage, and increases the likelihood that Luke might have been referring to a scripture other than Lev. 12:8; and the wording of the citation indicates that if he was not referring to the latter passage he could only have been referring to Lev. 5:11.

That he did cite LXX Lev. 5:11 is likely from the following two points. First of all, ἡ τούτῳ in the LXX generally refers to a yoked pair of oxen (not the yoke itself, which is translated τὸν ὀμοστόντος), and it is not very often used even in that context (e.g., III Kgdoms 19:21; Job 1:3,14; 42:12; τὸν ὀμοστόντος is often used for the yoked oxen as well). Furthermore it is found only in Lev. 5:11 to translate ἡ τούτῳ. It would seem, then, that the translation is uncommon enough for us to question its being used in an independent translation of Lev. 12:8. Secondly, the citation agrees exactly with LXX Lev. 5:11, whereas the latter is not exact in its correspondence with the MT. Therefore, it is only
logical to assume that, rather than the MT of either 5:11 or 12:8 being the source of this citation, it is the LXX of 5:11.

Against the citation of 5:11 is the fact that the context in Luke is related to the purification rite after birth (Luke 2:22), which is not in view in Lev. 5; moreover, there is a possible reference in Luke’s introductory formula to Lev. 12:7, as mentioned above. Regarding the context, our evaluation of Brown’s and Bock’s arguments have demonstrated that Luke’s primary interest is not in the purification ceremony, but in Jesus’ presentation to the Lord (note παραστήσοντα τῷ κυρίῳ, 2:22). The introductory formula may refer to Lev. 12:7, but it is to be noted that the only word in common is νόμος (τῷ νόμῳ in Luke). Again, the word θυσία appears in Luke 2:24, introducing the situation and the citation, and is found as well in Lev. 1:13, just before a reference to turtledoves and pigeons. The introductory formula thus begins to look like a summary formula referring to the general laws of sacrifice contained in Leviticus. We have seen elsewhere that Luke often refers summarily to Moses and the Law. It is likely, then, that the introductory formula does not make exclusive reference to Lev. 12:7, but a general reference to the laws of sacrifice.

But why cite Lev. 5:11, particularly? Lev. 12:8 fits better the context of the birth purification, while Lev. 1:14 the context of I Samuel. Lev. 5:11 refers to the general law of purification from sin or uncleanness, and thus could be seen as having a more general referent than 12:8 or 1:14, but it is not clear how this would have been of any
value to Luke. There really seems to be no conceptual or contextual reason for the selection of 5:11 for the Lukan citation. It may simply come down to Luke's preference for a citation that read somewhat better, or that he was citing from memory and unconsciously modified the passage to read better. Certainly the use of ἀναγραφῶ here makes the passage read more smoothly than does the repetitious double δύο as found in Lev. 12:8 and 1:14. It is to be noted as well that in secular Greek ἀναγραφῶ often means "a pair," and the particular diction of Lev. 5:11 may have appealed to Luke.

In summary, then, I conclude that Luke is summarizing the laws of sacrifice for the poor in light of his purpose in making the sacrifice of purification into a consecration of Jesus to God, in parallel with I Sam. 1-2. Hence he is not making a specific reference to the law of purification after birth, but rather a general reference to the laws of sacrifice. In doing this he has either chosen to cite Lev. 5:11 as the OT version of this law which reads best, or he has cited the passage from memory, unconsciously altering it. The latter point makes it quite likely that the citation is Lukan and not traditional, as Luke tends to improve the readability of the Greek of his narrative. Similarly, as I noted for 2:23, this citation occurs in a passage whose themes, since they are found throughout Luke's work, do not indicate a source limited to the infancy narrative. His summarizing of the Law and his choosing of the OT passage on the law which read the best suggest that Luke was quite familiar with LXX Leviticus.

---

104 Unless one accepts that Joseph had become ceremonially unclean (Plummer, 63; Morris, St. Luke, 87).
105 BAG, 337.
D. Acts Citations

The major references to the Pentateuch in Acts all occur in the speeches of chapters three and seven, with the exception of the citation of Ex. 22:28 in Acts 23:5. As the material in chapters three and seven is generally considered special material in Acts, I will deal with the citations contained in each speech as a unit. I will begin, however, with the citation in Acts 23. Since the latter portion of Acts is generally considered Lukan material, and source-critical questions are few, it is probably best to deal with the relatively less complicated passage before taking on the problematic early speeches.


Strictly speaking this citation does not occur in a speech, but rather in a conversation in the trial of Paul before the Sanhedrin. Clarke considered this a free version of the LXX, working as he was from the version of the LXX found in Vaticanus, and ascribing the singular ἀρχόντα in Acts (in place of the plural ἀρχόντας in Vaticanus for the Exodus text) to an alteration to produce a more suitable reading.¹⁰⁶ Presumably the substitution of οὐκ ἐρείς κακῶς for οὐ κακῶς ἐρείς could also be a stylistic improvement. Ἀρχόντα in place of ἀρχόντας, however, is found in all LXX mss except B, 15˚-376, 30-85-343˚-730˚, x, and 527, while οὐκ ἐρείς κακῶς replaces οὐ κακῶς ἐρείς in all LXX mss except B, 58˚-82, and 527 (ms 127 reads κακῶς οὐκ

¹⁰⁶Clarke, 93-94.
The singular ἀρχοντα is closer to the MT, but ἐρεῖς κακῶς and κακῶς ἐρεῖς are equally divergent from the MT "curse." The Vaticanus reading is clearly a paraphrase of the MT, not a direct translation, and while assimilation to the MT could be argued for Alexandrinus, etc., when it comes to singular ἀρχοντα, there is no assimilation in the translation of "curse" in these mss. While the Alexandrinus mss tradition may have been influenced by the Acts citation, it is equally likely, as Holtz points out, that the Alexandrinus tradition is original and the singular ἀρχοντα became plural through assimilation to the plural θεοῦς in the first half of the sentence. He also attributes the Vaticanus reading of οὐ κακῶς ἐρεῖς to a smoothing out of the grammar, but this is debatable. It is clear, however, especially in view of the paraphrase of "curse," that the citation is from the LXX, whether from a ms akin to Alexandrinus, or one akin to Vaticanus, that was then altered for stylistic reasons.

Holtz does not debate the LXX origin of this citation. What he does debate, however, is that it is Lukan. He notes that Acts 23:1-5 is parallel to John 18:19-24, and argues for a relationship between the two accounts in which the Pauline trial account

---

107 GottLXX2.1. Ex. 22:28 [27]. Wevers (Notes on the Greek Text, 355) comments that the alteration of οὐ κακῶς ἐρεῖς to οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς occurs "for no apparent good reason."

108 See Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text, 355.

109 Holtz, 127 n. 2; see also Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text, 355.

110 See Turner, Syntax, 228-229; but cf. Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text, 355: "The majority of witnesses in the tradition transpose κακῶς ἐρεῖς for no apparent good reason."

111 See also Munck, LXXVII.
is secondary to that of Jesus. He goes on to argue that Luke would never have himself attributed to Paul an event from Jesus’ passion, and the fact that Luke’s version of the passion does not contain this event makes it likely that, in the tradition which Luke received, and which he used for his narrative here, the event was already linked to Paul. As the citation is an integral part of the narrative, he notes that it as well must have come from the tradition which Luke received.\(^{112}\)

Holtz’s argument hinges on three points: (1) the similarity between Jesus’ trial in John and Paul’s trial in Acts; (2) the unhistorical nature of the Acts account of Paul’s trial; and (3) the unlikelihood that Luke would have composed such a scene. Regarding point (1), it would be well to examine briefly the actual similarities involved. Linguistically there is slight similarity, beyond that of subject matter, although Bultmann finds a reminiscence of Ex. 22:28 (27) in Jesus’ words \(\epsilon \iota \kappa \alpha \kappa \omega \zeta \varepsilon \lambda \alpha \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \) in John 18:23.\(^ {113}\) This would fit the occasion, given the possible legal implications of the slap which Jesus receives. Hence Jesus’ answer would be a rebuke, based on the Law, pointing out that he has not said anything warranting such treatment.\(^ {114}\) Similarly, both Jesus and Paul are struck by one standing near (Jesus by \(\epsilon \iota \zeta \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \theta \kappa \zeta \zeta \tau \delta \omega \nu \) and \(\nu \nu \rho \epsilon \tau \varepsilon \nu \), and Paul by \(\pi \tau \zeta \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau \theta \omega \zeta \zeta \nu \alpha \nu \tau \delta \zeta \), but the description of the blow is different (John = \(\varepsilon \delta \omega \kappa \varepsilon \nu \rho \alpha \pi \iota \sigma \iota \sigma \alpha \); Acts = \(\tau \upsilon \pi \tau \varepsilon \nu \alpha \nu \tau \delta \zeta \sigma \tau \omicron \sigma \alpha \)). After the slap in both cases Jesus

---

\(^{112}\) Holtz, 128-129.

\(^{113}\) Bultmann, \textit{Das Evangelium des Johannes} (Göttingen: Vandenhoek & Ruprecht, 1959) 500 n. 10.

and Paul are rebuked for answering the High Priest in an unacceptable manner (John = οὗτος ἀποκρίνη τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ; Acts = τὸν ἀρχιέρεα τοῦ θεοῦ λοιδορεῖς;).

The order of events is somewhat different in each trial scene:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JOHN</th>
<th>ACTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. the question by the High Priest (v. 19)</td>
<td>(a.) missing (see 22:30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the answer of Jesus (vv. 20-21)</td>
<td>b. Paul’s statement (v. 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Jesus is struck (v. 22)</td>
<td>c. Paul is struck (v. 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the rebuke of Jesus for speaking in an unworthy manner to the High Priest (v. 22)</td>
<td>d. the rebuke of Paul for speaking in an unworthy manner to the High Priest (v. 4—occurs after point e.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Jesus’ protest of his innocence of an offence demanding such treatment (v. 23)</td>
<td>e. Paul’s rebuke of the High Priest for the illegal nature of the blow (v. 3—occurs before point d.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f.) missing</td>
<td>f. Paul’s excuse and admission of guilt (v. 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g.) missing</td>
<td>g. Paul’s appeal to the Pharisees and the subsequent dissension (vv. 6-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. the end of the trial (v. 24)</td>
<td>h. the end of the trial (v. 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences are readily apparent. In John the slap and rebuke given to Jesus are related to the answer Jesus gave to the High Priest’s question. Jesus’ answer, especially the words "Why do you ask me? Ask those who have heard me, what I said to them; they know what I said," is a demand for a trial with witnesses, alluding to the illegality of the whole proceeding, and its tone is one of cavalier defiance.\(^{115}\) Paul’s words are similarly cavalier, especially in not waiting to be questioned, but his defiance comes later, and much more strongly. While in John both the slap and the rebuke are administered in response to Jesus’ words, in Acts the slap is related to Paul’s opening statement, and the rebuke is related to Paul’s later rebuke of the High Priest. Jesus’

---

protest of his innocence with possible reference to Ex. 22:28 is replaced in Paul’s trial by a rebuke of the High Priest concerning the illegality of the blow, without reference to Ex. 22. Paul’s language is reminiscent of Matt. 23:27 (τάφοις κεκοιμημένους = Acts 23:3: τοίχε κεκοιμημένε), a piece of "Q" material, which Luke alters by removing exactly the word here paralleled in Acts. Jesus’ protest of his innocence is hardly similar to Paul’s rebuke. While Jesus’ protest of innocence may contain an allusion to Ex. 22:28 as demonstration that Jesus was not deserving of harsh treatment, the latter passage is cited clearly in Acts, but with a very different purpose; that is, to show Paul’s readiness to comply with the Law and to admit his guilt (even though he claims the guilt was accidental).

There are other details which are divergent as well. Jesus is struck spontaneously by one of the temple police, while the High Priest orders Paul struck. Hence Paul rebukes the High Priest for his illegal action, while Jesus merely defends himself in a legally acceptable manner. Finally, there is nothing in John to correspond to Paul’s excuse of not knowing the High Priest and his admission of guilt. Jesus never admits to having broken the Law in his actions toward the High Priest.

The above differences make one point immediately clear, and that is that, if both stories go back to a single tradition, they have been heavily redacted to fit the circumstances of the narrative in which they are placed. The redaction is clearest in Acts

116 See Munck (222), who also notes the similarity to Josephus, Ant. 20.9.1§199-203.
118 See Morris, John, 757.
where this scene serves as an introduction to the scene of the disturbance of the Sanhedrin by Paul's siding with the Pharisees. We cannot, therefore, speak simply of a piece of tradition which Luke has inserted into his narrative, without noting that it has been redacted heavily to fit into the narrative structure for Luke's own purpose.

That the account of Paul's trial is unhistorical (2) is argued from several particulars. For one thing, as Holtz points out, it is unlikely that Paul would have mistaken the identity of the High Priest, as he claims.119 Similarly, the composition of the Sanhedrin, and the effect of Paul's argumentation are equally unlikely historically.120 On the other hand, Paul's statement concerning the High Priest has been taken variously to reflect his poor eyesight, or the circumstance that the High Priest was simply sitting in the council (not presiding), or that Paul really was unacquainted with Ananias.121 These solutions, I suppose, are possible, but not very likely. William Neil argues that Paul's statement is ironic:

Surely the explanation is that Paul's words are spoken with biting irony: such a man as Ananias made a mockery of the office of High Priest. Paul, as a devout Pharisee, refuses to recognize this corrupt Sadducee as in any sense worthy of the respect which all loyal Jews would normally give to the holder of this distinguished position.122

This explanation has the advantage of agreeing with the Pharisee-Sadducee dichotomy observed throughout the passage, and, although it really does not add to the historical

119Holtz, 128.


121See Neil, 227-228; Bruce, Acts (1951), 410.

122Neil, 228.
plausibility of the scene, it does follow logically from the story as Luke has it. Similarly, the composition of the Sanhedrin, and the effect of Paul’s words on them are important for Luke’s scheme of salvation history, as we shall see shortly. We are thus left with the likely conclusion that the elements of the story that may not be historical owe their lack of historicity, not to an aberrant source, but to redactional considerations.

Whether Luke could have composed this narrative (3) is dependent on one’s view of Luke’s purpose in including it. If, as Holtz suggests, it merely serves to demonstrate Paul’s knowledge of the Law, then Lukan composition is unlikely. That is not, however, Luke’s purpose here. The central point of the trial revolves around two motifs: Paul’s conduct as a good Pharisee, and the doctrine of the resurrection. These two points are heavily intertwined. I have noted already Luke’s overarching desire to show continuity between Israel and the Church. Paul’s argument before the Sanhedrin is centred in the doctrine of the resurrection, perhaps the doctrine of utmost importance to Luke. At this point the Pharisees take Paul’s side in the matter. Luke here is apparently demonstrating the continuity of Christianity and Judaism by having the Pharisees, for Luke the best of the Jews, become, for this crucial doctrine, the allies

---

123Holtz, 128.


Similar to the trial narrative as a whole, including Paul's declaration of fidelity to his Pharisaic ancestry and his words to the Sadducean High Priest, falls in with Luke's overall purpose. The likelihood of Lukan redaction or composition here playing a major role is thus greatly enhanced.

Besides the similarity to John 18, is there any other evidence of a source being used in this passage? It is possible that this narrative is part of the "we sections" of Acts, although the "we" is not evident. Haenchen argues that the "we sections" depend upon a source of eyewitness reports which Luke has included in his narrative, while Kümmel argues for a travel narrative, which Luke has incorporated. Dupont, however, has argued rather strongly that Luke used "his own notes" while composing the Acts, not outside sources. The latter suggests Luke's own eyewitness reports of the events. Munck notes that if the "we sections" had been taken over from another source

---


129 See Bruce, Acts (1951), 24.


they would likely have been taken over without the use of "we."\textsuperscript{132} In any event, the "we sections" have been thoroughly integrated into the Acts narrative so that, apart from the use of "we", it is not possible to separate them stylistically.\textsuperscript{133} Hence, if a source was used it has been so heavily redacted that its outlines are virtually untraceable.

If, then, the trial of Paul is based upon a tradition related to John 18, Luke has redacted it so completely that only the slap remains as evidence of its origin. Its presence in a "we section," if indeed that is what we have here, would indicate that either the trial occurred as stated, or that it was portrayed as such by Luke in accordance with his theological and literary objectives. In view of its concurrence with Luke's overarching purposes, the latter is most likely. Bultmann's suggestion, noted above, that Jesus possibly refers to Ex. 22:28 in John 18, is not enough evidence that Luke took the citation from that source, as it is not cited in John, and is referred to in words of Jesus not reflected in Acts. In John, the words are used to indicate Jesus' innocence, while in Acts the citation is used to indicate Paul's willingness to adhere to the Law of his ancestors. As such it forms part of Luke's purpose in the whole narrative. Hence, its redactional origin is likely.\textsuperscript{134}

In summary, then, I would argue that the citation is not only septuagintal, but part of Luke's redaction of the story, and demonstrates his knowledge of LXX Exodus.

\textsuperscript{132}Munck, XLIII.

\textsuperscript{133}See Kümmel, 177, 185; Dupont, \textit{Sources}, 85; Blaiklock, 14; Du Plooy, 28-35.

\textsuperscript{134}A similar conclusion has been reached recently by E. Larsson ("Lukas och Pentateuken," \textit{TTKi} 60 (1989) 293-299.)
2. The Pentateuch Citations in Acts 3

The OT references in Acts 3 are relatively brief, many no more than allusions, and several appear in a combined form. They all appear in the speech of Peter.

a. Acts 3:13 = Ex. 3:6,15

This reference poses several problems, both textual and source-related. The textual problem refers to the inclusion of ḫθεός before Θισαλάκ and Θισαλώβ. The words are included in p74, 8, C (A and D omit the article), and a few others, while B, E, Ψ, and the majority text omit them.135 The addition of ḫθεός coincides with both the Hebrew and most mss of the LXX for Ex. 3:6 and 15. While it is possible that the inclusion of the words in certain mss of Acts here is due to assimilation to the LXX, it is equally possible that the shorter text may be a result of "later stylistic pruning."136 The twenty-sixth edition of the Nestle text leaves the question unresolved; however, the issue becomes a problem in determining the source of the OT reference.

There are several divergences from the LXX of Ex. 3:6: (1) Acts omits the introductory ἐγὼ εἰμι; (2) Acts moves ḫθεός τοῦ πατρός σου from the beginning of the passage to the end, and changes the singular τοῦ πατρός σου to plural τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν; (3) if we accept the shorter reading of Acts, then Acts omits ḫθεός before Θισαλάκ and Θισαλώβ; if we accept the longer reading, then Acts adds the article before each occurrence of ḫθεός (except for mss A and D).

136Metzger, Textual Commentary, 310.
The omission of $\dot{\varepsilon}\gamma\omega$ $\varepsilon\iota\mu$ (point [1]) is clearly owing to the context in Acts, where the description of God as the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob functions as the subject of the sentence, rather than the predicate as in Ex. 3:6. The phrase, however, functions as a subject in Ex. 3:15, without $\dot{\varepsilon}\gamma\omega$ $\varepsilon\iota\mu$, and it may be that Luke is citing the latter passage in Acts 3:13. In either case the form of the Acts citation is readily explicable.

The removal of the reference to "the God of your father(s)" to the end of the phrase (point [2a]) is less clear. Bock has suggested that "it may have been intended to throw forward the reference to Abraham." This suggestion is less than crystal clear, and has little to commend it, since the only reason imaginable for "throwing forward" the reference to Abraham would be for emphasis, and it is unclear from the context that Abraham is indeed being emphasized. The change to plural (point [2b]) may reflect the influence of Ex. 3:15, but there the pronoun is $\dot{\iota}\mu\omega\nu$, not $\dot{\iota}\mu\omega\nu$. Bock suggests that the change from second person plural to first person plural allows the speech to more directly "include those addressed." But what it actually does is to make the Jewish ancestry of both those addressed and the one addressing them inclusive. Bock is right, however, in ascribing this change to redactional considerations.

The plural "fathers" (point [2b]) is found in the SP and SPTar. of Ex. 3:6 and this has led Wilcox to conclude that we have in Acts 3:13 influence from Samaritan

---


138 Bock, 187.

139 BHS, Ex. 3:6; Wilcox, Semitisms, 29.
Wilcox’s conclusion fits in with the thesis of Scobie that a Christian tract, containing a reworked Samaritan source, was used for the composition of the speech of Acts 7, and that the same tract was used in the composition of Acts 3:12-26.\textsuperscript{141} The suggestion of Samaritan influence, however, has been called into question. Frank Moore Cross, for example, has noted that there were many texts in existence at the time which were similar to the Samaritan texts, and speaks of a broader-based Palestinian textual family.\textsuperscript{142} Patrick W. Skehan and Reinhard Pummer both conclude from this that the bases for positing Samaritan influence in Acts 7 (and by inference Acts 3) are not nearly so conclusive as has been suggested, but that texts resembling the broader Palestinian text-type may underlie the OT citations there.\textsuperscript{143} A similar, though more specific, suggestion is offered by Richard, who shows that the plural "fathers" and the singular "father" are variously interchanged in many passages in the MT, SP, and the LXX, and thus he argues that, rather than a Samaritan source, a solution within the textual tradition of the LXX is to be sought.\textsuperscript{144} He also points to the fact that the plural is found in the LXX minuscule mss k and m, the Bohairic, Ethiopic codex C, quotations

\textsuperscript{140} Wilcox, Semitisms, 29-30, 34.


\textsuperscript{142} E.g., Cross, \textit{The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies} (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961) 173.


of Eusebius in some codices, some quotations of Cyprian, and the citations of Justin Martyr.\textsuperscript{145} He ends up by concluding that the traditions of Acts and Justin Martyr "support an original LXX plural reading for Exod. 3:6--'the God of your fathers'."\textsuperscript{146} But this seems to be too much to conclude from the available textual evidence, and perhaps another solution would better fit the evidence here. I will come back to this shortly.

Wilcox's argument is also bound up with point (3), the possible omission of \(\theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\zeta\) before 'Ισαάκ and 'Ισαάκβ.\textsuperscript{147} As I have noted, however, the textual evidence is far from convincing for Acts 3:13 (Acts 7:32 is more certain, and I will return to this question when I examine that passage). Richard asserts that Wilcox has misconstrued the textual data for 3:13, and that the reading with \(\delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\zeta\) is to be accepted as original.\textsuperscript{148} On the basis of the confusion in the textual data for Acts 3:13,\textsuperscript{149} it is precarious to assume one reading over the other without hesitation. The possibility, however, of stylistic pruning in the scribal tradition of Acts is certainly not unlikely, and one could even suggest a stylistic pruning by Luke himself in citing Ex. 3.\textsuperscript{150} On the other hand, the attestation for the longer reading seems somewhat better than that for the

\textsuperscript{145}Ibid, 200; see also BrookeMacLean, Ex. 3:6; Kahle, 144.

\textsuperscript{146}Richard, "Acts 7," 201.

\textsuperscript{147}Wilcox, \textit{Semitisms}, 34.


\textsuperscript{149}See Metzger, \textit{Textual Commentary}, 348.

\textsuperscript{150}On the LXX evidence for the omission of the repetitive \(\theta\epsilon\omicron\omicron\zeta\), see Wevers (\textit{Notes on the Greek Text}, 28).
shorter reading. The addition of the article before θεός in each case would appear to be stylistic, as the LXX reflects the anarthrous Hebrew style of the MT at this point, while the article might have been considered more appropriate here from a Greek perspective. 151

Wilcox argues that the citations of Ex. 3:6 in Acts 3:13 and 7:32 represent a common non-septuagintal source in that they agree with each other against Luke 20:37 which is septuagintal. 152 But it is to be noted that they do not agree as clearly as Wilcox seems to suggest. Even if we accept the short form of Acts 3:13, there are still differences between it and Acts 7:32 (the occurrence in the latter of ἐγώ, and of ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων σου [not ἡμῶν as in 3:13] at the beginning, not the end of the citation), and these differences are significant enough to give us pause. Richard notes that while Acts 7:32 apparently cites Ex. 3:6, Acts 3:13 appears to cite a combination of phrases from Ex. 3:6, 15-16 and Isa. 52:13. 153 It is not unlikely that Luke was referring to the passages in Ex. 3 in Acts 3:13 without citing any of them exactly. 154 Furthermore, while, as Wilcox affirms, the context of Moses before the burning bush is clear for Acts 7:32, 155 this is not at all clear for 3:13. These considerations, then, do not support the argument that Acts 3:13 and 7:42 agree against Luke 20:37. Finally, as I have noted,

151 See Bock, 187; BDF, 145; Moule, Idiom Book, 115.

152 Wilcox, Semitisms, 31.

153 Richard, "Old Testament," 336; the reference to Isa. 52:13, however, is very vague, no more than a reminiscence at best (see Bock, 188; see also Rese, 112; Haenchen, Acts, 205 n. 4).

154 There is no introductory formula indicating a direct citation from the OT.

155 Wilcox, Semitisms, 29.
the citation in Luke 20:37, while probably septuagintal, differs from the LXX as well. Hence, I must conclude that Acts 3:13 and 7:32 do not agree against Luke 20:37 and the LXX. Rather, Luke refers to the words "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" three different times in three different ways.

Nevertheless, there may be some relationship between Acts 3:13 and 7:32. Holtz suggests that both come from the catechetical-liturgical tradition of the church, and have exercised mutual influence on each other. While Holtz may be right here, as far as mutual influence goes, Wilcox takes the proposition further, asserting that there must be a common source underlying both citations, as the speeches in which they are embedded come from two different orators, Peter and Stephen. But Wilcox's conclusion would only hold if we were to presuppose that the speeches came directly from the orators unaltered. If, on the other hand, Luke himself composed the speeches, as has been suggested, or if he has redacted the speeches at all, then another reason for their similarity suggests itself. Luke, composing or redacting, has made both citations and has retained echoes of one in the other.

Again, however, too much should not be made of the similarities and differences in the three uses of the formula "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Luke 20:37; Acts 3:13; 7:32). The formula was a rather standardized address for God in Jewish

---

156 Holtz, 122.
157 Wilcox, Semitisms, 34.
158 E.g., Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 208-216.
circles in the first century,\textsuperscript{160} and the evidence from the MT, LXX, SP, and Justin, as noted by Richard, indicates that the formula had more than one accepted form.\textsuperscript{161} Richard also notes that the plural "fathers", the main similarity linking Acts 3:13 and 7:32, is found frequently in Acts generally in a formulaic sense (e.g., 3:25; 7:45; 13:17,32; 26:6) while the specific "God of the fathers" is found four times in Acts (3:13; 5:30; 7:32; 22:14), perhaps indicating a preference by Luke for this form. He also notes that "the God of the fathers" occurs four times in Ex. 3-4.\textsuperscript{162} If Luke indeed redacted the speeches of Peter and Stephen, as seems likely, we could conclude that the formula with the plural "fathers" was a Lukan predilection and thus appears in the formula in Acts 3:13 and 7:32, while the formula in Luke 20:37 reflects the source from which it was taken ("Q").

It seems to me unnecessary to postulate some common source or tradition lying behind the citations of Acts 3:13 and 7:32. We are dealing with two citations in one document, occurring relatively close together and in similar (though not identical) contexts. That they come from two different speakers in the Acts narrative is not a cogent argument in favour of separate provenance for the citations. Unless one is to deny categorically any redactional activity to Luke for Acts 7 and 3 (and this is most unlikely if one examines the evidence of Schweizer),\textsuperscript{163} then one cannot ignore the


\textsuperscript{162}Ibid, 199-200.

\textsuperscript{163}Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212.
likelihood that similarities in citation in a single document are the result of predilections of the author or redactor of that document. This seems to me the simplest adequate explanation.

In summary, then, the significant points of departure from the LXX in Acts 3:13 are due to Lukan preference for a particular form of the formula contained therein. Since there is no evidence that Luke is citing any particular OT passage exactly (note that there is no introductory formula indicative of an exact quotation), the passage should be considered at best an OT allusion.


Acts 3:22-23 is generally accepted as a mixed citation of Deut. 18:15-16,19 and Lev. 23:29, and this seems to be the simplest adequate explanation of its form.

But the question remains: How did the two passages come to be connected? It has been

---

164 See e.g., UBSGNT13, Acts 3:22-23; NestleAland26, Acts 3:22-23; Conzelman, Acts, 29; Holtz, 74; Ringgren, 233; Rese, 66.

165 De Waard (Comparative Study, 21-24; "The Quotation from Deuteronomy," 537-540) has challenged this prevailing view on several points: he claims (1) that the words πᾶσα ψυχή in Acts 3:23 reflect an independent rendering of the Hebrew וַיְנַסִּי in Deut. 18:19; (2) that the term εξολοθρευθήσεται in Acts 3:23 reflects a misreading of וַיִּתֵּן as וַיִּתָּן in a text like 4Q175 (Testimonia) from Qumran (also in Tg. Ps.-J. on Deut. 18:19b and Codex Neofiti I); (3) that the phrase εκ τοῦ λαοῦ reflects another misreading of a text like 4Q175 in which יְנַסִּי has been read as יְנַסִּי; and (4) that the words τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου in Acts 3:23, not attested in LXX or MT of Deut. 18:19 or Lev. 23:29, reflect the word וַיַּהְנֵה in a text like 4Q175. De Waard's analysis is rather speculative, very complicated, and furthermore runs into trouble in the following ways: the LXX rendering of וַיַּהְנֵה by διεθροστός is much more natural than ψυχή while the latter is much more naturally derived from וַיָּהֵן as in LXX Lev. 23:29 (Bock, 192); the phrase יְנַסִּי הָאָדָם יָאָדָם יָאָדָם יָאָדָם יָαָדָם YN in 4Q175 is actually closer to the LXX phrase δοκει ἐν καλλίστῃ τοῦ προφήτης ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου (Deut. 18:19) than the phrase τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου in Acts 3:23 (see also Allegro, "Further Messianic References," 183, 186 n. 107). The misreadings of points (2) and (3) are within the realm of possibility (see e.g., J. Schneider, "ὁλεθρεῖω, ὁλεθρος, ὁλεθρεύτης, ἐξολοθρείω," TDNT 5 [1967] 170); they are, however, wholly unnecessary to explain the form of the citation in Acts 3 (see also Holtz, 73-74 n. 5; Bock, 192).
suggested that such a connection between the passages is more likely Jewish-Christian than Gentile-Christian, and this brings into question the Lukan composition of this text. It is widely assumed that Luke has here used a *testimonium*. The reasons for this are given variously as follows: (1) its composite character; (2) the apparent widespread early Christian use of Deut. 18:15ff as a proof-text; (3) the presence of this composite citation in the *Pseudo-Clementines*; (4) its lack of cohesion with the surrounding material; and (5) its Jewish-Christian colouring.

The composite character of the citation has been considered evidence of *testimonia* since some claim that Luke, on his own, does not conflate scripture. From our previous work on other passages (e.g., Luke 4:18-19; Acts 2:33; 13:22), however, we have seen that this is not the case. Luke does use mixed citations quite often, and it is only by postulating that he has used a source for these citations other than the OT itself that one can come to the conclusion that he does not mix citations. As I have noted, this reasoning appears circular, and is based on an extrapolation of the results of one’s study on Lukan citations elsewhere to the particular citation presently under study. It seems to me that each instance of a mixed citation needs to be studied on its own to determine the likelihood of a Lukan or *testimonium* origin for that particular citation. The question of the citation’s composite character is bound up with the other arguments listed above, and these I will deal with in a moment. But is there anything which may indicate that Luke had something to do with the formation of this mixed citation? Most are in
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166 See e.g., Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 55-57; Rese, 68; Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 113; Holtz, 74.

167 See e.g., Bock, 192; Holtz, 74.
agreement that the primary divergences from the LXX are redactionally motivated.\textsuperscript{168}

In fact, Richard argues that the change in word order of Deut. 18:15-16 in Acts 3:22 is due to influence from Deut. 18:18 LXX (προφήτην ἀναστήσω αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτῶν ὅσερ ὁ, καὶ δῶσω τὸ ῥῆμά μου ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαλήσει αὐτοῖς καθότι ἐν ἑντελῶμαι αὐτῷ), which presents a stylistic parallel with a similar phrase in Acts 3:21 (πάντων ὃν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπὸ αὐτοῦ προφητῶν [object, verb, subject + prepositional phrase]) and which in turn corresponds to the word order of the citation in Acts 3:22 (προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν [object, verb, subject + prepositional phrase]).\textsuperscript{169} This stylistic parallel between vv. 21 and 22 makes it seem as though the citation was reworked to fit the speech. If so, then the author (or redactor) of the speech has had a hand in the composition of the citation, and if Schweizer is correct in his conclusion that the early speeches of Acts bear the mark of one author,\textsuperscript{170} then perhaps Luke compiled this citation himself.

Turning to the second point, admittedly Deut. 18:15ff was a much used "proof-text" for early Christians.\textsuperscript{171} But in the NT the only other preservation of this text (outside of Acts 7:37, which will be dealt with later) is found in allusions in the

\textsuperscript{168}E.g., Rese, 67; Bock, 191-192; Richard, "Old Testament," 336.


\textsuperscript{170}Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212; cf. also Kistemaker, 31-44.

\textsuperscript{171}Bruce, Acts (1951), 113.
Gospels, with no reference at all to it in the epistles. Similarly, no later work conflates Deut. 18:15-16 and Lev. 23:29, except the Pseudo-Clementines, which I will deal with shortly. There is simply no evidence of an early testimonium which conflates the two passages outside of Acts 3:22-23.

The citation in the Pseudo-Clementines (Recognitions 1:36) is interesting in that the document seems essentially Jewish-Christian in its outlook, although some of this colouring may be due to later Ebionite interpolations. Thus, the testimonium which is claimed by some to underlie the Pseudo-Clementine citation may have had a Jewish-Christian provenance. The citation in Recognitions 1:36 is almost verbatim with that in Acts 3:22-23, and thus some have argued for a common testimonium tradition underlying the two citations. On the other hand, as Rese points out, the overall use of scripture in the Pseudo-Clementines as well as this particular citation suggest that the author is quoting Acts and not Deuteronomy. If Acts is the source of the Pseudo-Clementine citation, the latter cannot be used as evidence for a testimonium source for Acts 3:22-23.
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172 See Ibid; NestleAland 26, 746.

173 Deut. 18:18-19 also is found in 4Q175 lines 5-6, but Deut. 18:15-16 do not appear (Allegro, Qumran Cave 4, 57, 59; "Further Messianic References," 183).


175 E.g., Bruce, Acts (1951), 113.

Turning to the place of the citation in the passage, Holtz argues that Luke has inserted this *testimonium* in the speech after the speech was composed.\(^{177}\) His argument rests on both grammatical and contextual observations. First of all, he argues that vv. 21 and 24 fit better together as they both deal with the "prophets" and Moses is not a prophet for Luke.\(^{178}\) He notes that, for Luke, Moses and the prophets are always separated conceptually (Luke 16:29,31; 24:27,44; Acts 26:22).\(^{179}\) In fact, v. 24 speaks of "all the prophets who have spoken, from Samuel and those who came afterwards," which, if taken absolutely, excludes Moses from the ranks of the prophets. Similarly, Holtz argues that the content of the prophecy in v. 21 (\(\chiρό\omega\nu\ \acute{\alpha}ποκαταστάσεως\ \pi\acute{\alpha}ντων\)) and that in v. 24 (\(\tau\alpha\zeta\ \eta\mu\ε\rho\alpha\zeta\ \tau\alpha\υτ\alpha\zeta\)) both refer to the eschatological day of salvation, while vv. 22-23 refer to the historical Jesus, and are thus out of place here.\(^{180}\) Now, in order to argue that 22-23 were not originally part of the speech of Acts 3 Holtz has to account for the \(\mu\epsilon\nu\)-\(\delta\epsilon\) construction of vv. 22 and 24.\(^{181}\) The introductory words of v. 22 (\(\Μω\υ\θ\iota\zeta\ \mu\epsilon\nu\ e\i\setminus\pi\epsilon\nu\)) could be paraphrased "on the one hand Moses said" while those of v. 24 (\(\kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\acute{\alpha}ντ\epsilon\zeta\ \delta\epsilon\ \oi\ \pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\alpha\iota\)) "and on the other hand also all the prophets."\(^{182}\) Holtz argues that the joining of vv. 22-23 and v. 24 by

\(^{177}\)Holtz, 79-80.

\(^{178}\)Ibid, 78-79.

\(^{179}\)Ibid, 79 n. 1.

\(^{180}\)Ibid, 77-78; see also Haenchen, *Acts*, 209.

\(^{181}\)Rese, 68.

\(^{182}\)See BDF, 232.


\[\mu\nu\nu\] and \(\delta\) derives from Luke himself, who inserted the citation and attempted to make it fit the context.\(^{183}\) He further makes a hypothetic conjecture that originally v. 24 may have read \(\pi\nu\nu\tau\varepsilon\varsigma\ \gamma\omega\rho\).\(^{184}\)

Holtz's arguments are well formulated; however, on closer inspection several problems arise. First of all, it is not at all clear that Moses is not a prophet for Luke. The passages that Holtz lists as conceptually separating Moses from the prophets can be interpreted as actually conceptually linking them. Moses is separated from the prophets in that he was primarily the mediator of the Law and in the Hebrew Bible the Law was a separate category of scripture from the prophets. In fact, several Lukan passages refer specifically to this distinction, and have nothing to do with Moses' status as a prophetic figure (Luke 24:44; Acts 28:23).\(^{185}\) Luke 24:27, however, may refer to Moses as a prophet. The passage reads that Jesus explained the scriptures to the disciples, "beginning from Moses and from all the prophets" (καὶ ἀρξάμενος ἀπὸ Μωῖσεως καὶ ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν προφητῶν). This could be interpreted as meaning "from all the prophets beginning with Moses,"\(^{186}\) and this would be a clear identification of Moses as the first prophet. Unfortunately the passage is not that clear. Gerhard Friedrich notes that the expression is imprecise and likely means that Jesus began his explanation with

\(^{183}\) Holtz, 79.

\(^{184}\) Ibid, 79 n. 4.

\(^{185}\) See Reise, 69, 13.

\(^{186}\) See Friedrich, 831 n. 337.
Moses and continued to the prophets. He is probably correct. On the other hand, even so, Moses is here clearly linked with the prophets in predicting Christ. Similarly in Acts 26:22 Moses is linked with the prophets in the function of predicting both the sufferings and the resurrection of Christ. Thus, while Luke never explicitly calls Moses a prophet, he clearly notes that Moses functioned as a prophet. Moses' prophetic function is further seen in the passage under discussion. The words ως ἐμέ (Hebrew יְסָכֶנ) in Deut. 18:15 can only mean that Moses was regarded as a prophet, and in fact the original prophet whom all those to follow were "like." It is probable that the author of Acts picked up on this reference to Moses as a prophet in the OT and included it in his account of what the prophets spoke regarding "these days." The reference to Samuel in Acts 3:24, then, would serve to set the later prophets off from the "Ur-prophet" Moses, but at the same time would make it clear that these later prophets reflected Moses in his function of prophet. As well, Rese suggests that the specific reference to Samuel and those following him would make it clear that Moses is not being referred to as the mediator of the Law or the writer of Torah, but as the first prophet, since Samuel and the others are representatives of the prophetic line of which Moses is the prototype. If this analysis is correct, there is no problem with seeing Moses as
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187Ibid.
189See also Craigie, Deuteronomy, 262.
190Rese, 68-69.
a prophet here, either in the context of the Lukan writings as a whole, or in the immediate context.

Holtz is correct that both Acts 3:21 and 24 refer to the eschatological day of salvation. But this does not mean that they must refer to the coming *parousia* of Christ, since it also seems that τὰς ἡμέρας ταυτας refers to the time of the writer. The early chapters of Acts often equate the present time and the eschatological day of salvation (e.g., Acts 2:16-17). Also, as Bock points out, the burden of the speech is to expound the events of the present time, or "to expound 'these days' as a whole and not just any particular element in it." Thus the present is the arena of the enactment of the "time of the restoration of all things" (3:21) which begins with the coming of the one like Moses. Therefore, it seems unnecessary to distinguish conceptually between vv. 21,24 and 22-23.

Hence Holtz’s rereading, or emending, of the *μέν-δὲ* construction in vv. 22 and 24, although possible, is unnecessary. It seems more likely that vv. 22-23 form an integral part of the speech of Acts 3. But even if we were to accept Holtz’s analysis, there is nothing in it that indicates that Luke used a *testimonium*. In fact, Holtz has specifically noted that the insertion of the citation shows signs of Lukan redaction. If Luke fit this citation into an already existing speech, then he redacted it, and there is nothing to indicate that the citation itself could not owe its present form to similar
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redaction by Luke. On the other hand, there is no compelling reason that the citation could not have formed part of the original speech.

Finally, turning to the Jewish-Christian colouring of the citation, this colouring is seen in two characteristics: the relationship of Deut. 18 to Lev. 23 and the prominence of the figure of the eschatological prophet. Regarding Lev. 23:29, Bock asks the question: "would a Hellenistic Christian be more likely to find and use such a text or such OT language than a Palestinian Christian would?"\textsuperscript{194} He implies that it is more likely that the passage is from a Jewish-Christian source than from a Gentile Christian such as Luke. Holtz concludes that the connection with the Day of Atonement (the topic in Lev. 23:24) in this passage in Acts coincides with the Hellenistic-Jewish emphasis on atonement, and that we should probably look for the source of the citation somewhere close to this milieu.\textsuperscript{195}

While this suggestion is not unreasonable, I think that the whole question of Jewish or Gentile Christian ability to deal with certain concepts needs to be rethought, at least in cases such as this one. What we are dealing with here is not specifically Jewish thought forms but knowledge of the OT, and the extent of Luke's knowledge of the OT is, in fact, what we are trying to determine. That the concept of atonement, and the Day of Atonement, have OT origins goes without saying.\textsuperscript{196} Atonement is also a

\textsuperscript{194}Ibid, 193.

\textsuperscript{195}Holtz, 74 n. 1; see also F. Böchel, "Σάρωμα: C. Ideas of Expiation in Judaism," TDNT 3 (1965) 313; J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Atonement, Day of," IDR 1 (1962) 316.

\textsuperscript{196}See e.g., C. L. Mitton, "Atonement," IDR 1 (1962) 310; Rylaarsdam, 314.
concept which is not foreign to the NT. The Epistle to the Hebrews, for example, places a great deal of emphasis on atonement (as does Paul), and specifically the Day of Atonement. Hebrews is an interesting example in that it has been argued that only a Jewish Christian could have written such an OT-centred book, and it must have been written to Jewish Christians. But the prevailing view of Hebrews now seems to be that it was not only written to Gentile Christians, but by a Gentile Christian. Kümmel, for example, concludes that the author of Hebrews, like the author of Luke-Acts, "is influenced by the thought world of later Gentile Christianity." Joseph Tyson further elaborates on this point:

He is a Christian of the second generation. He is acquainted with the OT . . . He knows about Judaism from the OT, but not from firsthand experience. He is an intelligent and skilful Gentile-Christian writer, deeply influenced by the OT, Plato, and Philo.

Kümmel further notes that it is not so difficult to see this letter as a Gentile document written to Gentile Christians, yet filled with OT allusions and concepts, as the OT had become "the Bible of the new community everywhere, and accordingly it had for them unassailable authority and effectiveness as a source of proofs." What the book of
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200 Ibid. 403.


202 Kümmel, 400; see also Mohrmann, 25.
Hebrews shows is that reference to OT concepts such as atonement is not at all limited to Jewish Christians, but because of the dependence of Christianity on the OT, can reflect a Gentile Christian author. Thus, there is nothing in the citation from Lev. 23 which, in and of itself, suggests that Luke could not have used it himself.

Regarding the reference to the eschatological prophet, the Jewish-Christian provenance is more certain. In fact, this is one of the clearest pieces of evidence which can be adduced for a Jewish-Christian context for this citation. The coming eschatological prophet apparently was a reasonably common eschatological expectation in the late second temple period. It has been noted, however, that outside John and Acts 3 and 7 no NT writing specifically conceives of Jesus as the eschatological prophet, and while the motif is preserved in the Pseudo-Clementines, it was not determinative for later Christian theology. On the other hand, R. H. Fuller has pointed out that the eschatological prophet motif "has contributed materially to the interpretation of Jesus in the earliest church," and Oscar Cullmann has noted that "it is without doubt one of
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205Fuller, 47.
the oldest Christologies we possess.\textsuperscript{206} Holtz agrees that this motif is early Jewish-Christian.\textsuperscript{207} Surprisingly he does not stress this point, however; but Fuller draws a more definite conclusion by stating that "the author of Luke-Acts is clearly drawing upon a very primitive tradition in close touch with the historical Jesus."\textsuperscript{208}

But is there anything to indicate that Luke could have known and used this motif himself? I have already acknowledged that Deut. 18:15ff was a favourite "proof-text" in the early church, and likely Luke would have known of it. Furthermore, Fuller, along with John A. T. Robinson, has found a good deal of evidence to suggest that Jesus saw himself in some sense as an eschatological prophetic figure.\textsuperscript{209} Particularly relevant for our concerns are Luke 10:16; 11:47-51; 12:49, which not only show Jesus speaking in a prophetic manner, but also seem (especially 11:47-51) to show his ministry as the culmination of the prophetic succession.\textsuperscript{210} If so, then the traditions concerning Jesus' words and teachings would have likely communicated this to Luke, and it would not have been too difficult to connect Jesus' prophet-like demeanour with Deut. 18:15ff. In any event, the above-mentioned passages, among others, show that the depiction of Jesus as

\textsuperscript{206}Cullmann, 42, see also Goppelt, \textit{Theology}, 1. 166.

\textsuperscript{207}Holtz, 78 n. 1.

\textsuperscript{208}Fuller, 169.


a prophet is a Lukan characteristic. Furthermore, David Moessner has noted that the figure of the prophet like Moses plays a significant role in the parallels between Jesus, Stephen, Peter and Paul in Luke-Acts. In the light of the foregoing, one might see the eschatological prophet as having particular appeal for Luke.

A further point needs to be made in this discussion. If Luke wished to provide a direct prophecy of Moses to the coming of Christ (in accordance with his scheme of declaring that "Moses and the prophets" speak of him unanimously [e.g., Luke 24:17; Acts 26:22]), he had not a great number of passages from which to choose. In fact Deut. 18:15ff is virtually the only passage attributed directly to Moses used in the NT as messianic. Other passages from the Pentateuch surely could have been adduced but these are not from the lips of Moses himself (e.g., Gen. 49:10-12 [Jacob]; Num. 24:17 [Balaam]; Paul's discussion of Gen. 17:18 in Gal 3:16, as well as the reference to Gen.22:18/26:4 in Acts 3:25 concern Abraham). Hence, If Luke wished to cite
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215See E. Jenni, "Messiah, Jewish," IDB 3 (1962) 362. Strictly speaking, one could argue that Deut. 18:15ff is an oracle of the Lord to Moses, not specifically a declaration of Moses. It is, however, reported by Moses to the people. Similarly, the words attributed to prophets often take the form in the OT of oracles of God to the prophets, but are referred to in the NT as the words of that prophet (e.g., Isa. 6:9-10 = Matt. 13:14-15; Joel 2:28-32 = Acts 2:17-21).
a prophecy of Christ from the lips of Moses, it is likely that he would have used Deut. 18:15ff.

The latter is especially likely if Luke had been influenced in his composition by traditions of the earliest church of which he knew. Such influence is likely as Luke admits in his prologue (Luke 1:1-4) to consulting previously circulating traditions. It is unlikely, however, that he has simply copied out these traditions, but rather has creatively interacted with the material to present an "orderly account." This is particularly the case of the speeches in Acts. Hence, I would argue in this case that Luke probably was aware of the early (Jewish-Christian) Church's use of Deut. 18:15ff as a prophecy by Moses of Christ, and that it fit his purpose here. Yet this in and of itself does not indicate that Luke used a pre-formed testimonium.

The discussion to this point has uncovered no clear evidence that Luke must have used a testimonium here. Rather, there are certain points which make it likely that Luke himself compiled the citation and used it: (1) the high likelihood that Luke composed the speech; (2) the redactional links between the citation and the speech; (3) the references to Moses and prophets in general, in relation to Christ, in Luke's overall
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narrative in Luke-Acts;\(^{220}\) and (4) the septuagintal nature of the citation, to which we now turn.

Holtz agrees with most scholars that the citation has its origin in the LXX.\(^{221}\) As I have noted, de Waard, followed by Bock, argues for a Semitic source,\(^{222}\) while Wilcox argues for a Greek source differing from the LXX.\(^{223}\) As the text in Acts reads, the words \(\text{προφήτην \ υ manière \ ἀναστήσει \ κύριος \ θεός \ υ manière \ è \ \& \ \text{ἐμέ \ αὐτὸν \ ἀκούσετε \ κατὰ πάντα \ come from Deut. 18:15, \ σα \ ἀν \ λαλήσῃ \ πρὸς \ υ manière \ and probably τού \ προφήτου \ ἐκείνου}\(^{224}\) come from Deut. 18:19, and ἦσται \ δε \ πᾶσα \ ψυχή \ ἦτις \ ἕκα \ μὴ \ ἀκούσῃ \ and ἐξολεθρευθήσεται \ ἐκ τού \ λαοῦ \ come from Lev. 23:29.

The divergences from the LXX of these passages are as follows: (1) the word order is altered from object + prepositional phrase (\(\text{προφήτην \ ἐκ τῶν \ ἀδελφῶν \ σου \ ὡς \ ἐμέ}\), verb (\(\text{ἀναστήσει}\)), indirect object (\(\sigma\)), subject (\(\κύριος \ θεός \ σου\)), in Deut. 18:15 to object (\(\text{προφήτην}\)), indirect object (\(\υ manière\)), verb (\(\text{ἀναστήσει}\)), subject + prepositional phrase (\(\κύριος \ θεός \ υ manière \ ἐκ τῶν \ ἀδελφῶν \ υ manière \ ὡς \ ἐμέ\)) in Acts 3:22; (2) the second person singular in Deut. 18:15 is changed to second person plural in Acts 3:22; (3) the words \(\text{πρὸς \ υ manière}\) are added in Acts 3:22 to the words \(\sigma\ \ \& \ \text{λαλήσῃ}\) from Deut. 18:19; (4)

\(^{220}\)See Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer'," 255-256; Marhall, Origins, 54; de Jonge, 106; O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," 22-29; and my discussion above.

\(^{221}\)Holtz, 72; see also Ringgren, 233; Reze, 67; Lindars, 207.


\(^{223}\)Wilcox, Semitisms, 37.

\(^{224}\)See Holtz, 74; Reze, 66.
the direct object of Deut. 18:19, expressed as τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, δόα ἐν λαλήσῃ ὁ προφήτης [ἐκείνος] ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου, is shortened to τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου in Acts 3:23 (the latter phrase also replaces ἐν αὐτῷ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταυτῇ in Lev. 23:29); (5) the words ἔσται δὲ προεδρεύειν τὴν ἑαυτῆν (Lev. 23:29) in Acts 3:23; (6) the word ταπεινωθήσεται in Lev. 23:29 is changed to ἀκούσῃ in Acts 3:23; (7) the word αὐτῆς at the end of Lev. 23:29 is left out in Acts 3:23.

These divergences can be explained in three ways: from the joining of the several OT citations, from redactional considerations, and from textual considerations. Some of these points have already been discussed and so I will only mention them here. First of all, in point (4), the replacement of ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταυτῇ by τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου is probably a result of the joining (and mixing) of the citations, to bring Lev. 23:29 into line with Deut. 18:15,19. Similarly, the changing of ταπεινωθήσεται to ἀκούσῃ, point (6), harmonizes Lev. 23:29 with the ἀκούσῃ of Deut. 18:15, and may even reflect the ἀκούσῃ of Deut. 18:19, which is not represented in Acts 3:23. Point (7), the dropping of αὐτῆς, is probably an attempt to bring the citation of Lev. 3:29 into harmony with the second person pronouns of Deut. 18:15.

Turning to redactional considerations, I have already noted Richard’s conclusion that point (1), the change in word order, has come about through the influence of Deut. 18:18, and an attempt at linkage with Acts 3:21.225 The only detail that is left unaccounted for by Richard, is the throwing forward of the indirect object (σοι) from

---

after the verb to after the object προφήτης (the indirect object also becomes plural ὑμῶν).

This can be explained redactionally, however, in that the throwing forward of the indirect object places more emphasis on the listeners as the ones for whom the eschatological prophet had come, which is in keeping with the speech as a whole as well as with the emphasis on the second person pronoun throughout Deut. 18:15. Similarly, point (3), the addition of πρὸς ὑμᾶς, adapts the citation to the situation of the speech, and further emphasizes the listeners as recipients of the words of the eschatological prophet.

Point (4), the shortening of τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, δόσα δὲν λαλήσῃ ὁ προφήτης [ἐκείνος] ἐπὶ τῷ ὅνόματί μου τῷ προφήτου ἐκείνου, is likely a stylistic shortening aimed at emphasizing the prophet himself, as opposed to his specific words.

Textual considerations may apply to two points: the second person plural (Acts 3:22) for second person singular (Deut. 18:15), point (2); and the insertion of ἐστοι δὲ in Acts 3:23 before πᾶσα ψυχή from Lev. 23:29, point (5). While it has been suggested that the change from singular to plural is redactional, adapting the citation to the situation of the speech, perhaps under the influence of the plurals in Deut. 18:18, there is some evidence that Luke may have been using a LXX text which contained the plural throughout. Wevers, in GottLXX3.2, lists some evidence for a reading in the plural.

226Rese, 67; Bock, 192.
227See Holtz, 74.
228Rese, 67; Bock, 191.
230GottLXX3.2, Deut. 18:15.
Furthermore, Richard notes that Targum *Pseudo-Jonathan* has the plural throughout, and, with further evidence of a similar text type from Syriac, Arabic, and Armenian mss, suggests that we may have "a late textual tradition, perhaps even contemporary to Acts, which contained such readings." While it is tempting to see some form of commonality between Acts and *Pseudo-Jonathan* here, it is more likely that the use of the plural in Acts and *Pseudo-Jonathan* is coincidental. *Pseudo-Jonathan* likely represents the final form of an originally unfixed oral interpretation of Deut. 18:15, in which the second person singular of the MT is interpreted as plural both to bring it into line with the OT context of an address to the whole people of Israel (this may account for the presence of the plural in the LXX textual tradition as well), as well as to make it more amenable to a synagogue reading for a congregation. Acts also interprets the singular of the LXX in order to direct the citation to the audience of the speech in Acts 3. Hence I see no need here to propose an alternate textual tradition for the citation of Acts 3:22.

The insertion of ἐσταύ δὲ into Lev. 23:29, however, poses quite a different problem. The words do not occur in either the MT or LXX of that verse, or in any of the textual variants. Bruce has, however, suggested that ἐσταύ δὲ is a rendering of
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the MT \( \text{MT} \) in Deut. 18:19, which is not rendered by the LXX, bringing the citation closer to the MT than the LXX.\(^{234}\) But the citation seems to be clearly septuagintal, rather than an independent rendering of the MT, in that it corresponds to the LXX even when the latter departs from the MT.\(^{235}\) One example of this is the omission of MT \( \text{MT} \) \( \text{MT} \) ("from your midst") in Deut. 18:15, in agreement with the LXX.\(^{236}\) Holtz also points to the rendering of \( \text{MT} \) by \( \text{MT} \) and the taking together of \( \text{MT} \) \( \text{MT} \) contrary to the MT's separation of \( \text{MT} \) and \( \text{MT} \) in Deut. 18:15-16 as indicative of a LXX origin.\(^{237}\) Thus the rendering of the MT \( \text{MT} \) \( \text{MT} \) with \( \text{MT} \) would have had to be from a LXX ms, rather than from the MT. Unfortunately there is no evidence for such a LXX ms.\(^{238}\)

Rese has suggested a redactional reason for the presence of \( \text{MT} \) \( \text{MT} \), arguing that the words have been inserted as a parallel to Acts 2:21 (\( \text{MT} \) \( \text{MT} \)), which cites Joel 2:32 (3:5, LXX).\(^{239}\) The parallel is striking, both passages being prophetic injunctions which indicate the results of certain actions: the action = "whoever will call upon the name of the Lord" (2:21), "every soul who does not listen to that prophet" (3:23); the results = "will be saved" (2:21), "will be removed utterly from the people" (3:23). In

---

\(^{234}\)Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 113; it is to be noted that the equivalent of \( \text{MT} \) \( \text{MT} \) does not appear in 4Q175 (see Allegro, "Further Messianic References," 183).

\(^{235}\)In agreement with Holtz (73); see also Lindars, 207.

\(^{236}\)Holtz, 73 n. 2; see also Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 33.

\(^{237}\)Holtz, 73 n. 2.

\(^{238}\)See GottLXX3, Deut. 18:19.

\(^{239}\)Rese, 67.
view of the lack of textual evidence for Bruce's suggestion, the suggestion of Rese gains credibility. Both are possible, however. Luke may have had before him a hitherto unattested text containing ἐσταρα δέ in Deut. 18:19, a possibly Hebraicizing text, translating the Hebrew הָלָּל. But Luke may well have added ἐσταρα δέ for stylistic reasons.

In summary, therefore, I conclude that Acts 3:22-23 is a combined LXX citation. Although it has traditional overtones, there is nothing that indicates definitely that it is not Lukian, while there are points which suggest that Luke himself compiled the citation. Similarly, although the presence of ἐσταρα δέ could suggest a source closer to the MT, the definite septuagintal characteristics of the citation rule out more direct contact with the Hebrew than a slightly Hebraicized text of the LXX. The presence of these words may be coincidental, however, as Luke may simply have been drawing a parallel with Acts 2:21. In any event, the citation is clearly from the LXX and was likely compiled by Luke himself.


In Acts 3:25 Peter is portrayed as citing the promise given to Abraham that "in his seed" all the world would be blessed. One particular problem in this citation has to do with what OT scripture Peter is citing. As Hanson points out, it could be Gen. 12:3; 18:18; 22:18; or 26:4. But, as "seed" (σπέρμα) appears to be the focus of the

---

240 Hanson, 88.
passage (similar to Gal. 3), and since neither Gen. 12:3 or 18:18 refer to the "seed," it seems likely that the reference is to Gen. 22:18 or 26:4.\textsuperscript{241} As 22:18 and 26:4 are identical, the source of the citation cannot be further linguistically determined. One point in favour of 26:4 is that LXX Alexandrinus omits ῥῆγγς in 22:18.\textsuperscript{242} This, however, does not ultimately disqualify 22:18 as the source of the citation, but simply casts doubt upon Luke's use of a ms related to Alexandrinus here.

As far as conceptual matters are concerned, on the other hand, there is much to be said for 26:4. The only serious objection to 26:4 is that in its context it is a statement to Isaac, not Abraham (see 26:1-2). However, 26:4 is clearly a quote of God's promise to Abraham, and thus the connection is maintained. In fact, the quote is introduced with the words "I will fulfil the oath which I swore to Abraham your father" (26:3). While the introductions to 26:4 and Acts 3:25 are not exact, the concept is similar: "the covenant which God gave to your fathers, saying to Abraham" (Acts 3:25). As the covenant between God and the people is intimately connected to his taking of an inaugural oath,\textsuperscript{243} it is not too difficult to see the relationship between the oath of Gen. 26:3 and the covenant of Acts 3:25. Again, between the introduction to the passage ("'By Myself I have sworn,' declares the Lord" [Gen. 22:16]) and the cited portion of Gen. 22:18 there is considerably more material than between the introduction (26:3) and

\textsuperscript{241}See Bock, 195; Rese, 73; see also UBSGNT\textsuperscript{3}, Acts 3:25; a LXX minuscule adds καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου after ῥῆγγς in Gen. 12:3 (GottLXX\textsuperscript{1}, Gen. 12:3), but this seems to be a secondary addition.

\textsuperscript{242}See GottLXX\textsuperscript{1}, Gen. 22:18; Holtz, 74 n. 3.

\textsuperscript{243}Schneider, "δρακος," TDNT 5 (1967) 460.
the cited passage of 26:4. All in all it seems preferable to accept Gen. 26:4 as the source of the citation of Acts 3:25.

There are only three possible divergences from the LXX here. The first is that ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου is thrown forward between καὶ and ἐνευλογηθέσονται in Acts. Secondly, there is a possible divergence in that some texts of Acts read the simple εὐλογηθέσονται instead of ἐνευλογηθέσονται. Finally, and most importantly, Acts reads πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαι instead of πάντα τὰ ἐθνη.

The throwing forward of ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου appears to be redactional, intended to emphasize the "seed." It is to be noted that in Gen. 26:4 there are two references to the "seed" which precede the cited reference, and so the emphasis is there already. But when the passage is cited as in Acts, without these preceding references, the emphasis is lost, unless something is done to reestablish it. Thus the throwing forward of ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου accomplishes this without adding to the quotation.

The textual problem regarding ἐνευλογηθέσονται/εὐλογηθέσονται is more complicated. In Acts, the simple form is read by A*, B, Ψ, 323, 945, and a few others, while the compound form is read by p74, Ψ, Aε, D, E, 0165, and the majority text. Although this variant may not appear important, Ringgren concludes that it is the use of ἐνευλογηθέσονται which proves the citation’s septuagintal origin. While it is often

---

244 Bock, 195.
246 Ringgren, 233.
argued that the simple form is secondary.\textsuperscript{247} Holtz argues that the compound form of the word is secondary. He bases his argument on the observation that \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\sigma\gamma\eta\theta\acute{\varepsilon}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\omicron \) is always used in the context of the Abrahamic promise in the LXX and appears again in the same context in Gal. 3:8, showing that it was known in NT times in that context. Thus, he concludes, it would be more likely that a scribe would change the simple form to the compound form in recognition of its LXX usage.\textsuperscript{248} Rese tends to agree with Holtz’s textual arguments, and concludes that the simple form is original in Acts 3:25, and suggests that the author of the speech changed the compound verb of the LXX to bring it into accord with the use of \( \epsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\alpha\gamma\omega\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha \) in Acts 3:26.\textsuperscript{249} Thus, while Holtz argues for a non-LXX origin for the citation, Rese argues for a LXX origin using the same textual data.

The LXX textual data is somewhat complicated as well. For Gen. 26:4 Wevers notes the presence of \( \varepsilon\nu\varepsilon\upsilon\lambda\omicron\sigma\gamma\eta\theta\acute{\varepsilon}\sigma\omicron\upsilon\tau\alpha\omicron \) in papyrus 911, minuscules 246, 619, and Justin and Theodoret. The same form is also read in minuscules 426, 664\textsuperscript{*}, 619 and Chrysostom and Theodoret for Gen. 22:18. For 12:3, Wevers lists uncial A, minuscules 833, 72\textsuperscript{'}, 569, 343, 59, and I Clement, and for 18:18, 72\textsuperscript{'}-708, and 59.\textsuperscript{250} Although

\textsuperscript{247}E.g., Haenchen, “Schriftzitate,” 165.

\textsuperscript{248}Holtz, 71-72.

\textsuperscript{249}Rese 73.

\textsuperscript{250}GottLXXI. Gen. 26:4; 22:18; 12:3; 18:18, respectively.
the evidence is not conclusive, there seems to be a tendency, in the LXX textual tradition at this point, to simplify the original compound verb.\textsuperscript{251}

One could certainly argue that, as with the LXX textual tradition, the textual tradition of Acts (that represented by A\textsuperscript{*}, B, Ψ, etc.) has tended to simplify the verb as well, possibly through accommodation to the following \textit{εὐλογοῦντα}.\textsuperscript{252} But, even if one accepts the simple form of the verb as original in Acts 3:25, this does not rule out a septuagintal origin for the citation. Rese argues that the change from the compound form of the LXX is redactional in nature, conforming the less familiar verb to the form of the more familiar \textit{εὐλογοῦντα} which follows in v. 26.\textsuperscript{253} This argument seems to explain the data very well. Such a change would have made the meaning of the passage more accessible to Greek-speaking readers who may not have been familiar with the LXX use of the compound word (note that the compound form is only attested in the LXX and dependent literature;\textsuperscript{254} note also that the church fathers often altered the compound form of Gal. 3:8 to the simple form),\textsuperscript{255} and this would have provided sufficient reason for Luke to have changed the verb.\textsuperscript{256}

\textsuperscript{251} Accepting the textual conclusions of Wevers.

\textsuperscript{252} This seems to be the conclusion of the editors of Nestle\textendash Aland\textsuperscript{26} (Acts 3:25). It is to be noted as well that the reading of ms C, \textit{ἐκειλογηθοῦντα}, is best explained by postulating \textit{ἐκειλογηθοῦντα} as original (see Holtz, 71 n. 7).

\textsuperscript{253} Rese, 73.

\textsuperscript{254} See L&S, 564.

\textsuperscript{255} See Holtz, 71 n. 9.

\textsuperscript{256} See Kümmel, 150.
The use of πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαι (Acts 3:25) instead of πάντα τὰ ἐθνῆ (Gen. 26:4) is more difficult. Πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαι is not attested in the LXX mss of Gen. 26:4.257 It has been suggested that Gen 12:3 is in view here, albeit not according to the LXX, as πατριαι is not attested for LXX Gen. 12:3,258 and this has led Bock to the conclusion that we have in Acts 3:25 a non-LXX source. He bases this conclusion on the fact that πατριαι is a common rendering for ἱπποῖον (Gen. 12:3) and thus could have been easily used in an independent translation.259 There are other possibilities, however. For example, Holtz follows Gottlob Schrenk in attributing the use of πατριαι here to the liturgical influence of the psalter on the community's language of prayer, as the LXX often renders ἵπποιον by πατριαι in the Psalms.260 Holtz sees the direct influence of LXX Ps. 95:7, in which a similar construction is used (αἱ πατριαι τῶν ἐθνῶν), arguing that Luke's knowledge of the psalm is evidenced in Acts 17:31.261 Nevertheless, he concludes that it does not come to Luke directly from the LXX in its present form.262 Haenchen and Rese suggest LXX Ps. 21:28 (πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαι τῶν ἐθνῶν--MT 22:28)

257 See GottXX, Gen. 26:4.
259 Bock, 358-359 n. 129; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 114.
261 Holtz, 75. Αἱ πατριαι τῶν ἐθνῶν, is perhaps a better translation of ἵπποῖον than is πατριαι alone, since ἵπποῖον has a broader connotation than does πατριαι (see e.g., W. L. Holladay, A Concise Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament: Based Upon the Lexical Work of Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971] 221).
262 Holtz, 80.
as the possible basis for the use of πατριαί, but conclude that Luke made the change deliberately. 263

The appeal to ἀνθρώπως as a basis for πατριαί becomes impossible if Gen. 26:4 is the source of the citation, since the underlying Hebrew here is שְׁוֵי, a word never rendered by πατριαί. Of course it is impossible to categorically deny any influence from 12:3 on the passage, but there is no evidence for such influence either, outside the supposed dependence of πατριαί on ἀνθρώπως. It seems more likely that Luke altered ἐθνη to πατριαί himself, out of regard for the context of the speech. 264 In its context the speech is addressed to Jews, and Haenchen argues that ἐθνη would not have served Luke here because that word carries for Luke the inevitable connotation of "the Gentiles," and at this point in the narrative the Gentile mission had not yet begun. 265 Bock challenges this idea, however, by asking why Luke did not choose φύλαί, the word which the LXX actually uses in Gen. 12:3. 266

The point of the alteration, however, is not to exclude the Gentiles from the citation at all. This can be seen in that the Gentile mission is already foreshadowed in Luke 24:46-47 and Acts 2, 267 as well as in the statement of Acts 3:26: "God, having raised up his servant, sent him to you first, to bless you." The word "first" (πρῶτον)

263Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 165-166; Rese, p. 73; see also Haenchen, Acts, 209; Conzelman, Acts, 30.


266Bock, 196; see also Hanson, 88.

267Dupont, Salvation, 135; Rese, 73 n. 28.
clearly indicates the Jews, but only as part of what is meant by πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαι τῆς γῆς in v. 25. Hence, both Jews and Gentiles are included in the word πατριαῖ.268

Now Bock contends that φυλαί would have worked equally as well in this case as πατριαι, as it is equally ambiguous,269 but Bock appears to be mistaken at this point. Although the LXX, and later versions, do often use φυλή ambiguously, it seems to have, at least in the NT period, generally become "a fixed term for the tribal system of Israel."270 Luke uses φυλή only in this way (Luke 2:36; 22:30; Acts 13:21). This in itself would indicate that for Luke φυλαί was not a word which would readily suggest to him the inclusion of the Gentiles, even if he saw that connotation in Gen. 12:3. Furthermore, in Judaism of the second temple period it seems that there was an eschatological expectation of the regathering of the ten tribes of Israel, and this was carried over, to a lesser extent, in the NT.271 If Luke were aware of this connotation, the possibility of misunderstanding "all the tribes of the earth" as the greater diaspora may have presented itself to him. Hence, while ἐθνοί would have connoted the Gentiles for Luke, and φυλαί the tribes of the Jews, it is likely that Luke would have seen the need for a word at this point which definitely included both Jews and Gentiles, without misunderstanding. Now πατριαι tends to indicate, in secular Greek, a family

268Rese, 73; Dupont, Salvation, 135.
269Bock, 196.
271Ibid, 248-249.
relationship, and in the LXX does not have the same strong Jewish connotation as 
φυλή. Thus, πατριά, especially with πᾶσαι, would here serve the definite purpose 
of including Jews and Gentiles in the blessing of Abraham without differentiation.

The only other use of πατριά in the NT is found in Eph. 3:14-15. In that 
passage the author clearly intends a unity of Jew and Gentile, undifferentiated. This 
universalistic use of the term is also seen in passages of the LXX expressing 
eschatological hope such as the "missionary" saying of Ps. 21(22):28(27) and 
95(96):7. The Ephesians passage, while not likely related to Acts 3:25, does show 
the use of πατριά in a universal context as well. If we combine this with the possible 
influence of the Psalms on Luke, as suggested by Schrenk and Holtz, for example, 
we can see that the word may have been a particularly apt term for Luke to use in this 
context.

Therefore, in summary, the evidence that the passage is non-septuagintal and non-
Lukan is highly questionable. Most likely Luke cites Gen. 26:4 from the LXX and 
makes a number of alterations for both stylistic and contextual reasons.

---

272 See Ibid, 245-246; Schrenk, 1015-1016.
273 See Schrenk, 1018.
274 Ibid, 1016.
275 Ibid, 1016-1017; Holtz, 75.
d. Summary: The Pentateuch Citations in Acts 3

The citations in Acts 3 from the Pentateuch appear to have been redacted into their context in the speech. Some are no more than allusions. For the most part they appear to be septuagintal in origin and the alterations redactional in nature. While non-Lukan sources are a distinct possibility in a speech such as this, there is nothing which definitively points to them and nothing which certainly excludes the possibility of Luke himself having cited these scriptures from the LXX.

3. The Pentateuch Citations in Acts 7

There are a great number of references to the Pentateuch in Stephen’s speech of Acts 7. Some of these are mixed citations. All the Pentateuchal references occur in the summary of the history of Israel which forms the main body of the speech. As such they are illustrative quotes to this summary history. Primarily these citations are taken from Genesis and Exodus, following the narrative of these books as it is summarized in the speech. Since they occur generally as part of this history, without formal introduction as quotations, one would expect them to be adapted to the speech grammatically and stylistically. In fact, most are only allusions. Very few assume the characteristics of direct citations with christological or other theological import.

I have already noted in connection with other material from Acts 7 that this chapter has become a fertile ground for source criticism. Although a full accounting of the source related issues in this speech would go beyond the scope of this study, a brief look at the issues is in order. It has been argued that because the speech in Acts 7 is so
different from the other ones in Acts, it was likely not written by Luke himself. The suggestion that we have in this speech a verbatim account of Stephen's defence has been virtually laid to rest by scholars, with the recognition that the speech does not fit in its context as a defence against the charges levelled at Stephen (Acts 6:13-14).

Several suggestions have been made regarding sources for the speech, but of most importance for our purposes is the view that Acts 7 represents a Christian tract containing a reworked Samaritan source, which agrees with a number of the conclusions of Wilcox regarding the citations in Acts 7, and the view that Acts 7 incorporates a Hellenistic Jewish synagogue sermon, which is followed by Holtz.

---


277 See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 22; but cf. Bruce, The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles (London: Cambridge University, 1973) 132; Bock, 216. Klijn ("Stephen’s Speech," 31) sees a relation between the Hellenists and the Dead Sea Sect based on Acts 7. M. Simon ("Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," JEH 2 [1951] 140) sees Stephen as a representative of Judeo-Christianity, rather than the Hellenists. Klijn’s conclusion is based on the parallels between the motifs of Acts 7 and those found in the Dead Sea Scrolls (particularly 1QS). This correspondence of ideas, however, may only indicate that the ideas shared by Acts 7 and the Dead Sea community were more widespread in Palestine in the first century than is usually supposed. Simon’s conclusion is based mostly on the correspondence between the anti-temple polemic in Acts 7 and later documents such as the Pseudo-Clementines. It is questionable, however, whether such correspondence indicates that Acts 7 is a part of the same tradition as these later documents, or whether the later documents were influenced by Acts 7. Hence, Stephen’s speech may have influenced Ebionite doctrine without the author of Acts 7 being a representative of "proto-Ebionitism."

278 See Dibelius, Studies, 167-169; Haenchen, Acts, 286; Wilson, 132; Donaldson, 40; Holtz, 30 n. 4.


283 See Holtz, 100-109.
Holtz sees the speech as comprising two sections: vv. 2-50, an abridgement of the history of Israel up to the establishment of the temple under Solomon, which has been taken over almost verbatim by Luke from Jewish tradition, and vv. 51-53, an anti-Jewish diatribe, with some features of a traditional Jewish martyrology, which has been taken over by Luke and reworked to relate the speech to Stephen's context.\textsuperscript{284} The latter verses contain OT citations, and whatever allusions and concepts are found therein (v. 52) are not the result of Luke's direct use of scripture, but of his use of traditional martyrological material.\textsuperscript{285} Since the citations from the Pentateuch all occur in the first part of the speech, the part which comes from Jewish tradition, Holtz concludes that they can in no way be used to show that Luke knew the LXX Pentateuch, as "er hat sie im wesentlichen wörtlich übernommen."\textsuperscript{286} 

Signs of Lukan redaction have been found throughout the early portion of the speech as well, however. Besides the diatribe of 51-53, Dibelius finds Lukan material in the polemical material of 35-43 and 44-50.\textsuperscript{287} In a somewhat more detailed fashion Haenchen sees the additions by Luke as comprising vv. 35, 37, 39-43, and 49-53.\textsuperscript{288} Agreeing that the "literary seams are evident" at the places where transitions occur from biblical history to polemical matters, Conzelman accepts Haenchen's analysis and

\textsuperscript{284}Ibid, 85, 100-109, 110-113.  
\textsuperscript{285}Ibid, 110.  
\textsuperscript{286}Ibid, 113.  
\textsuperscript{287}Dibelius, Studies, 167-170.  
\textsuperscript{288}Haenchen, Acts, 288-289.
suggests the possibility of Lukan material at vv. 25 and 27 as well.\textsuperscript{289} Holtz finds Lukan material in the early part of the speech at essentially the same places as Haenchen with possible redactional activity also in vv. 6-7.\textsuperscript{290} Essentially, the sign of Lukan interpolation for these scholars appears to be the appearance of polemic in an otherwise neutral recitation of Jewish history.

But polemical material is not confined to the material outlined in the above paragraph. For example, T. L. Donaldson has found evidence of polemic throughout vv. 23-53,\textsuperscript{291} while Richard has found polemicism in the Joseph episode (Acts 7:9-11) in which Joseph is seen as the forerunner of Stephen and Joseph’s brothers are the ancestors of the hostile Jewish audience, who become Stephen’s murderers.\textsuperscript{292} Furthermore, both Jane Via and Richard have discerned a thematic throughout the speech of Acts 7. Via notes that two related and interwoven themes dominate the speech:

1. the theme that God makes promises through the fathers with foreknowledge of serious obstacles to their fulfillment, obstacles which God acts to overcome and which serve to structure God’s ongoing relationship with the people;

2. God is wont to choose a person who is rejected by his people (brothers, vv 2, 8c-9, 23, 25, 26) to be a vehicle of God’s salvation to those same people in spite of their rejection of this chosen savior.\textsuperscript{293}

\textsuperscript{289}Conzelman, Acts, 57.

\textsuperscript{290}Holtz, 94, 98-99.

\textsuperscript{291}Donaldson, 39-41, see also p. 44.


She finds the first theme primarily in the Abraham material (vv. 1-8) with the link to the second theme in v 8 (the birth of Isaac). Hence God foretells the blessings and the obstacles to them, and overcomes the first obstacle through the birth of Isaac. The Joseph (vv. 9-19) and Moses (vv. 20-44) stories carry on the themes of promise/fulfillment/obstacle-to-fulfillment/overcoming-of-obstacle which have been introduced in the Abraham account.  

Richard concentrates on elements of duality and repetitiveness found in the speech. He notes: "by means of cognate expressions the writer draws parallels, contrasts or a variety of relationships between persons, episodes, and themes." Richard notes a great many of these expressions and concludes that the function of these parallels is thematic in nature, "whether promise/fulfilment or positive/negative contrasts between Abraham and his descendents." The researches of Via and Richard point conclusively to a more unified composition than seems indicated by the above analysis.

Not only thematic unity has been discovered in Acts 7, but stylistic unity as well. Richard has noted that the author has used connecting links between the various parts of the speech, the stylistic features are consonant throughout, and the speech exhibits a

---


296 See his extensive lists (Ibid, 178-180, 205-206).

297 Ibid, 205.
distinct, internally cohesive architectonic structure. This stylistic unity points as well to a unified composition.

Finally, it has been noted that Acts 7 displays a thematic unity with the rest of Luke-Acts. Acts 7 is central to the parallels which Luke draws between Moses, Jesus, Stephen, Peter, and Paul, throughout his two volume work. Furthermore, Robert Tannehill has argued persuasively that the Moses-Jesus parallel in Acts 7 is connected to the same Moses-Jesus parallel in the speeches of Peter in Acts 2-3. Via has noted that the themes of promise/fulfillment/obstacle-to-fulfillment in Acts 7 are also echoed in Acts 2-3. She also finds a similar thematic parallel with Acts 13. Tannehill notes that the anti-temple polemic of Stephen's speech is closely connected with the references to the conquest of Jerusalem and the destruction of the temple in the Gospel of Luke (e.g., 13:32-35; 19:41-44; 21:5-6, 20-24; 23:27-31), and that the theme of rejection by the Jerusalem authorities parallels both Jesus (Luke 22-23; cf also Luke 12:11-12) and Paul (e.g., Acts 13:44-48; 18:5-6; 28:23-28). Via also notes that the

---

298 Ibid, 201-204, 264-266.
300 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2. 85-86; see also R. Zehnle, Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter’s Speeches in Acts 2 and 3 (SBLMS 15; Nashville: Abingdon, 1971) 76-78.
301 Via, 200.
302 Ibid, 196-199.
304 Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2. 96-100; see also Moessner, "The Christ Must Suffer," 255-256.
descriptions of Jesus in Luke 1-2 are parallel to the descriptions of Joseph and Moses in Acts 7 (cf. especially, Luke 2:40, 52),\textsuperscript{305} and the themes of promise/fulfillment-obstacle/overcoming-of-obstacle appear as well throughout the resurrection narrative of Luke 24.\textsuperscript{306} Acts 7 appears at a critical juncture in Luke’s narrative, representing the judgement on the Jews,\textsuperscript{307} and the introduction of the Gentile mission.\textsuperscript{308} Thus the speech of Acts 7 is a thematic turning point in the overall Lukan narrative, and in its themes and purpose is an integral part of the Lukan composition as a whole.

There are also linguistic and stylistic parallels between Acts 7 and the other speeches in Acts. It has been pointed out that the vocabulary of the speech is similar to that in the other speeches in the early part of Acts.\textsuperscript{309} In the same way similarities between the pattern of the speech and others in Luke-Acts have been noted,\textsuperscript{310} especially with regard to Acts 13.\textsuperscript{311} Hence the conclusion that the speech comes

\textsuperscript{305}Via, 202-205.


\textsuperscript{307}Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 266.

\textsuperscript{308}See Wilson, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission, 165; Scott, 140-141.


essentially from Luke, either as the author of the whole speech,312 or as the composer
of the speech with reference to earlier materials,313 is a viable alternative to a strictly
source-related origin for Acts 7.

Sources cannot be dispensed with so easily, however. Clearly Luke drew upon
early church traditions in authoring his two volume work (see Luke 1:2),314 and this
consideration cannot be ignored. For instance, the speech of Acts 7 is developed
according to the pattern of Israel’s early history,315 and there is a great similarity
between Stephen’s speech and the many surveys of Hebrew history found in the OT and
later Jewish works. Holtz has summarized these historical surveys in the following
manner:

- ancient covenant formulae:
  - Deut. 6:20-24; 26:5-9; Josh. 24:2-13

- short recapitulations of the important stages in
  salvation history:
  - Pss. 78; 105; 106; 135; 136

- historical synopses:
  - Neh. 9:6-13 (compare Ezek. 20:5-29)

- late Jewish historical summaries:
  - Jdt. 5:6-18; I Macc. 2:52-60; III Macc. 2:2-20;
  - Josephus, Ant. 3:86-87 (5.3); 4:43-45 (3.2); I W
  - 5:379-419 (9.4); Heb. 11316

---


313E.g., Hengel, Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 72-73; Marshall,
Acts, 132-134; cf. also Kistemaker, 31-41.

314See also J. Roloff, Die Apostelgeschichte (NTD 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981) 117-119;
Kistemaker, 31-41.


316Holtz, 100-101; he also notes 4 Ezra 3:4-36; 14:29-31; CD 2:14-6:11; 1QS 1:18ff; Townsend (155) also
notes Sir. 44-49; Conzelman (Acts, 57 n 60) notes Pseudo-Clementines, Recognitions, 1:22ff.
There clearly existed a long tradition of this form of retelling Hebrew history and it would not be surprising if Luke had been influenced by it, especially since many of these historical surveys are readily available in the LXX. On the other hand, it is quite unlikely that the author of Acts 7 has modelled his survey on any particular example of the known historical surveys, either structurally or thematically. It appears, rather, that the speech of Stephen is dependent only on the general form of the historical survey genre.

Since there may have existed a model, of which we are no longer aware, which the author of Acts 7 has used for his historical survey, the possibility that Luke has used an unknown source as pattern for this speech is still viable. If so, however, in view of the stylistic and thematic evidence already noted, this unknown survey has been severely redacted for Luke’s purposes.

The suggestion that a Samaritan source underlies Acts 7 has been argued from three considerations: (1) the connection of Stephen with Samaria, (2) the agreement between citations in Acts 7 and the SP, and (3) the evidence for a Samaritan view of history and theology within the historical survey. The most important point for the purposes of this study is the agreement with the SP; however, I will deal with this point

---

318 Townsend, 155.
320 See Simon, St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church (Haskell Lectures 1956; London: Longmans, Green, 1958) 41.
321 Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 143) does not appear to deal with this possibility.
in my examination of the specific citations. Regarding the connection of Stephen with Samaria, it is often concluded either that Stephen was a Samaritan himself,\textsuperscript{322} or that the speech is a sermon dating from an early Christian mission to Samaria.\textsuperscript{323} The Samaritan view of history and theology has been found by Scobie in Acts 7:2-41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 53.\textsuperscript{324} He notes that there is an emphasis on Shechem as the divinely authorized sanctuary in these verses, and on the prophet like Moses, both of which he argues are Samaritan emphases.\textsuperscript{325} He does, however, see three stages in the development of the Stephen speech: the Samaritan source, a non-Lukan Christian re-editing (a Christian tract), and finally Lukan redaction.\textsuperscript{326}

All of these conclusions have been heavily debated,\textsuperscript{327} and are certainly not unequivocally decided. It must be noted, however, that the identification of the OT citations with the SP is a pivotal argument in this whole issue.\textsuperscript{328} In fact, it might be

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{324}Scobie, "Use of Source Material," 410.
\item \textsuperscript{325}Ibid, 408-412.
\item \textsuperscript{326}Ibid, 412-417.
\item \textsuperscript{328}See e.g., Scobie, "Origins," 393-395.
\end{itemize}
said that one's conclusions regarding the SP and its influence on Acts 7 will be of primary importance in deciding one's attitude to the Samaritan hypothesis as a whole.

In examining the Pentateuch citations in Acts 7 I propose to examine each citation upon its own merits. In each case I will attempt to determine the probability of LXX or other origin for the citation, and the likelihood of a Lukan or non-Lukan (source) use of the citation. After all the citations have been examined, I will determine what implications my conclusions have for theories of Jewish or Samaritan sources for Stephen's speech.

a. Acts 7:3 = Gen. 12:1

This citation has been characterized by Clarke as a free use of the LXX. The divergences from the LXX are the following: (1) καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου is omitted after τῆς συγγενείας σου; (2) καὶ δεῖφρο is inserted before εἰς τὴν γῆν. There are, however, textual difficulties in Acts which may indicate further divergences:

---

329 Clarke, 88, 90; Holtz appears to have overlooked this citation.

330 According to the text of NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 (Acts 7:3).

331 The introductory words of Acts 7:3, καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν, may be a loose citation of the introductory words of Gen. 12:1, καὶ εἶπεν κύριος τῷ Ἀβράμ (see how the text is laid out in UBSGNT3 [Acts 7:3] compared with the text in NestleAland26 [Acts 7:3]), omitting κύριος because in the Acts passage, unlike Gen. 12, the speaker has already been identified in 7:2, and, similarly, changing τῷ Ἀβράμ to πρὸς αὐτόν because Abraham has already been identified in v. 2. On the other hand, it is more likely that καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτόν is not part of the citation, but rather is an introductory speech formula (Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 41, 203), a common feature in the NT as well as the Mishnah and Qumran literature (see e.g., Fitzmyer, "Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations," 297-333; "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls," Studies in Luke-Acts [ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980] 251-257; de Waard, Comparative Study, 78-84; Metzger, "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah," JBL 70 [1951] 297-307), and specifically in this case redacted according to Luke's structural methodology (Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 203 n. 51).
(3) ms D has ἀπὸ instead of ἔκ before τῇς γῆς σου;\(^{332}\) (4) mss B and D omit ἔκ before τῇς συγγενείας σου; (5) the majority text omits τὴν before γῆν.\(^{333}\)

The omission of καὶ ἔκ τοῦ οίκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου (point [1]) seems to be necessitated by the chronological data of Acts 7:4, which reads:

then [τότε] he departed from the land of the Chaldeans, and lived in Haran. And after his father died, God removed him from there into this land in which you are now living.

The problem is that Acts depicts the revelation of God to Abram as occurring before he went to Haran (Acts 7:2-3), contrary to Gen. 12:1, which clearly places the revelation after the migration to Haran. Furthermore, according to Gen. 11:31, his father Terah accompanied him to Haran.\(^{334}\) Hence the command for him to depart, if envisioned before his emigration to Haran, could not include an admonition to depart from his father's house. This placing of the revelation to Abram before the migration from Ur to Haran may depend on passages such as Gen. 15:7 and Neh. 9:7, which imply that God called Abram and brought him "from Ur of the Chaldeans" (Gen. 15:7).\(^{335}\) A

---

\(^{332}\)Noted by Wilcox (Semitisms, 26).

\(^{333}\)NestleAland26 (Acts 7:3).


similar tradition, which ignores Haran in its chronology, is seen in Philo, *De Abrahamo*, 62-63 and Josephus, *Ant.*, 1:154.336

Wilcox sees influence of the SP and the SPTar in this chronology. 337 The reason for this is that Acts states that Terah had died before Abram left Haran (Gen. 11:32 suggests this by its place in the sequence, although the numbers do not work out), 338 which does not follow the generally accepted Biblical chronology which dates Abram's departure before Terah's death. 339 This latter chronology stems from the following analysis: Terah is 70 years old at the birth of his sons (Gen. 11:26); Abram is 75 years old when he leaves Haran, therefore Terah would be 145 (Gen. 12:4); but Terah is 205 years old when he dies (Gen 11:32); therefore, at the time when Abram leaves Haran, Terah still has 60 years to live. 340 The SP and its Targum, however, give the total years of Terah's life in Gen. 11:32 as 145 years, 341 which would place his death just before Abram departed from Haran, 342 and would then provide the basis


337Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 28-29; see also Kahle, 143-145.

338The SP chronology appears to be an attempt to make the numbers correspond with the placing of Gen. 11:32 in the sequence (see Hughes, 16).


341BHS, on Gen. 11:32; Westermann, *Genesis*, p. 140.

342This appears to be consonant with the overall chronological scheme of the SP (see Hughes, 16, Rook, "Studies," 153).
for the statement in Acts 7:4. Wilcox concludes that the tradition behind Acts 7:4 displays affinities with the SP and SPTar. 343

Scobie is much more adamant regarding Samaritan influence than is Wilcox, stating firmly that Acts 7:4 presupposes the chronology of the SP. 344 Kahle, however, has pointed out that the tradition of Terah dying before Abram’s departure is known to Philo (MigAb., 177 [23:176]). 345 Since it is highly unlikely that Philo used the SP, 346 Wilcox admits that a Samaritan origin for the tradition is problematic, and proposes the possibility of an alternate Greek OT version in use by both Luke and Philo. 347 Richard seizes this conclusion and, drawing on evidence from Qumran and other sources, 348 posits a reading common to Philo and Luke similar to that preserved by the Samaritan tradition. 349 There seems, however, to be no textual evidence for a Greek tradition at Gen. 11:32 giving Terah’s lifespan a total of 145 years. 350 Hence one can accept such a tradition only as a possibility. 351

343 Wilcox, Semitisms, 29.
345 Kahle, 144.
347 Wilcox, Semitisms, 29 n. 2.
348 See e.g., Pummer, “Samaritan Pentateuch,” 443; Cross, Ancient Library, 144; Kahle, 143-149.
349 Richard, “Acts 7,” 197; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 169 n. 1.
350 See GottLXXI, Gen. 11:32.
351 This theory, despite the paucity of textual evidence, remains firmly in the realm of possibility, owing to the early and widespread influence of the SP chronology. Rook (“Studies,” 144, 156, 217 n. 37) has argued that the SP chronology antedates that of the MT, LXX and Jubilees, and was used by both the LXX translator and the
But is such a tradition even necessary to account for the data in Acts? Could not this data have come about through a simple reading of the OT as we have it without recourse to "aberrant" tradition? For example, there has been some attempt to harmonize Acts and the OT tradition. The theory, once accepted, but now largely rejected, that Gen. 11:26 indicates not the birth of Abram, but of Haran, and that Abram may have been born 60 years later, has more recently been taken up by W. Harold Mare.352 Although such a solution is not, strictly speaking, impossible, there is no evidence in Genesis to support this reconstruction, especially in view of the fact that the first of the three sons which are mentioned in Gen. 11:26-27 is Abram, not Haran, perhaps indicating that Abram was first-born.353 It certainly does not indicate that Haran was first-born. Hence the theory appears unlikely.

But even a harmonization of this kind is unnecessary. The fact that Gen. 11:32 precedes Gen. 12:4 is probably enough to account for the discrepancy. Thus Luke, in reading his OT, likely assumed the order of events was reflected in the order of the OT

---

351(...continued)

writer of Jubilees in a number of instances at least (see also Pummer, "Book of Jubilees," 163). Hughes (16), on the other hand, argues that at this point the SP chronology derives from an exegesis of the information contained in the MT. If Hughes is right, then the SP chronology regarding the death of Terah cannot antedate that of the SP (there is, however, more involved in the Samaritan scheme in this chronology than just an exegetical summary of the MT [see Hughes, 16, 237-238; Rook, "Studies," 153]). As well, we should not forget the conclusion of G. Larsson (407, 409) that the LXX chronology has come about through exegetical alterations of the MT chronology (in any case the chronological data in the LXX are very different from those of the SP for Terah's length of life and death [G. Larsson, 406; for a full discussion of the relationships between MT, SP, and LXX, see Rook, "Studies," 126-169]). Hence, while a Greek ms influenced by SP chronology is not out of the question (perhaps belonging to the Palestinian text-type suggested by Skehan [97-98] and Pummer ["New Evidence," 98-117; "Samaritan Pentateuch," 441-443]), there is no firm evidence for it.

352Mare, 19; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 162.

353Jub. 11:14-15 has a six year period between the marriage of Terah to Edna and the birth of Abram. This would allow time enough for Haran or Nahor to be born. The Jubilees passage, however, seems to imply that Abram was first born. There is certainly nothing other than the six year gap to indicate otherwise.
narrative.\textsuperscript{354} It is unlikely that he paused to work out all the mathematics involved in computing the age of Terah at Abram's departure.\textsuperscript{355} The same could hold true for Philo, who in \textit{De Migratione Abrahami} appears to be writing to those acquainted with scripture,\textsuperscript{356} and thus is not vigorously working out all the details. The SP (and by association, its Targum), on the other hand, appears to have a theological reason for having Terah die before Abram's departure to Canaan.\textsuperscript{357} Hence it is likely that Luke was simply following the narrated order of the OT.

Therefore, it is probable that the omission of $\kappaαιν\kappa\epsilon\tauου\ οἰκου\ τού\ πατρός\ σου$ does not come from any influence from Samaritan sources, but is either a simple abbreviation of a pleonastic text, or an intentional alteration reflecting the influences of OT passages such as Gen. 15:7 and Neh. 9:7, which caused Luke to place the revelation


\textsuperscript{355}Jubilees does work out the mathematics involved according to the particular scheme of the author, involving a series of weeks and years divisible by seven and a calendar of 364 days per year (Rook, "Studies," 167, 169).


\textsuperscript{357}S. J. de Vries ("Chronology of the OT," \textit{IDB} 1 [1962] 581) has noted that the SP does this to emphasize Abram's departure as "a new beginning in human history." The date of Terah's death is certainly influenced by the overall chronological scheme of the SP, whether in placing the deaths of important ancestors in the exact years of important happenings (e.g., the flood--Hughes, 12, 16), or in ordering history in relation to the founding of the Samaritan sanctuary on Mt. Gerizim (see Hughes, 237-238), or in arranging that the lifespans of the ancestors fit a particular, well-developed numerical scheme (see Rook, "Studies," 153).
to Abram before his departure to Haran. Although Richard relates this omission to the "aberrant" tradition which Luke may have possessed, according to which Terah's death occurred before Abram set out for Canaan, it likely has nothing to do with such a tradition. Rather, Luke probably got the idea of Terah's pre-departure death from the narrative order of the OT itself.

The insertion of $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ (point [2]) involves another problem entirely. Although the word $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ corresponds to nothing in the MT, Wilcox has noted that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan contains the word $\lambda \rho \iota \varepsilon \nu \alpha \tau \lambda \eta \nu$ $\kappa \rho \iota \mu \sigma$, which corresponds to $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ in Acts. Thus he argues for "another point of contact between a Targumic tradition and the text in Acts." Richard challenges Wilcox's conclusions on three counts. He notes that neither the MT nor the ancient versions show any evidence of a different textual tradition at this point and that Pseudo-Jonathan appears to be a "stylistic paraphrase of the Hebrew Vorlage." Thus he concludes that the addition of $\pi\gamma\omicron$ in Pseudo-Jonathan is likely due to "rhetorical considerations." He also notes that the author of Stephen's speech is given to parallelism, doublets and various kinds of contrasts, and that the use of $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ allows him to use a "contrast by means of parallelism." Finally, he notes that there is significant evidence for the presence of $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$

---


359 Imperative of $\gamma\eta$: "weggehen, fortsetzen" (G. H. Dalman, Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch [Hildesheim: Olms, 1967] 11); "gehen, fortgehen" (J. Levy, Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim [4 vols.; Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963] 1. 51, 528); translated by Maher (52) as "go"; see also Ginsburger, 33.

360 Wilcox, Semitisms, 27; see also Ginsburger, 20.
in the LXX textual tradition (M, 17'-82-135-426, C', b, d, 53-246, n, s, 46-370, y, z, 54, 59, 509, 730, BasSel 104, Chr passim, Cyr 1:165, Eus. 6:9, Tht 3:760, La, Aeth, Arab, Arm, Bo [also Hipp 3:121]),\textsuperscript{361} and concludes that "there is, therefore, a strong likelihood that the author of Acts had such a reading at his disposal and that he chose the form which best suited his purpose."\textsuperscript{362}

It seems to me, however, that Richard is trying to "have it both ways." I do not think that we can assume that Luke had a number of versions in front of him and chose the one which best suited his needs. Either Luke read δευρο in his Vorlage, or he inserted it himself. A combination of the two is extremely unlikely.

So which is it? The evidence for δευρο in LXX Gen. 12:1 discloses a wide range of witnesses, which would tend to support a relatively early Vorlage containing δευρο. The evidence from the ancient versions tends to support this conclusion, as do the readings in the Church Fathers, except for the possibility of influence from Acts. Richard, however, notes that only two of the citations of Chrysostom and that of Hippolytus, in which δευρο occurs, omit the phrase και ἐκ τοῦ ὀικου τοῦ πατρός σου, thus indicating a clear dependence on Acts. The rest of the textual evidence, he says, is "unassailable."\textsuperscript{363} "Unassailable" seems to me too strong a word for the evidence, however, as the texts may have been influenced by Acts without conforming the whole verse to the citation of Acts 7.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[361] GottLXXI, Gen. 12:1.
\item[362] Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42; see also Ginsburger, 20.
\item[363] Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42 n. 24; Richard is using BrookeMacLean (Gen. 12:1).
\end{footnotes}
There is some textual evidence, on the other hand, which seems to indicate that something more is going on in the LXX tradition than simple accommodation to Acts 7. Instead of καὶ δεῦρο, 72-376, 319 have καὶ πορεύου, Origen IV:346 has καὶ ἀπελθε, the margin of 55 has καὶ ἐπαγε, and the margin of 15 has καὶ ἔλθε. This evidence seems to indicate a wider concern with providing a verb here (it could also indicate dissatisfaction with δεῦρο as a verb). If we take the LXX textual evidence together with the evidence of Pseudo-Jonathan and Acts 7:3, we see a general desire to provide the sentence with a verb at this point, an alteration which makes the sentence read better. Acts 7:3, Pseudo-Jonathan and the LXX textual tradition are all likely witnesses to this general desire. Would δεῦρο, however, be a word which would have sprung to a scribe’s mind as functionally equivalent to a verb in this context? In the LXX it is often used more as a hortatory adverb, often translating the imperative of ᾪτοι as a hortatory or introductory word (e.g., Gen. 31:44; 37:13; III Kgdms. [I Kings] 1:13; IV Kgdms. [II Kings] 14:8); sometimes the imperative of ἔλθε in a similar hortatory fashion (e.g., II Kgdms. [II Sam.] 13:11); and sometimes the LXX adds it to the translation of the Hebrew imperative as a further hortatory expression (e.g., Gen. 24:31). Sometimes, however, it does appear to be used for the infinitive or imperative of ᾪτοι in a context which implies actual "going" or "coming" (e.g., Ju. 18:19 in Vaticanus; Num. 10:29; I Kgdms. [I Sam.] 17:44; IV Kgdms. [II Kings] 10:16). The combination of δεῦρο ἔλθε.
is also found, for example, in III Kgdms. 1:53.\textsuperscript{365} However, by far the most common septuagintal rendering in such a context would be εἰσέλθε ἐις or πορεύου ἐις.

The LXX evidence appears to be amenable to two conclusions. First of all, δεῦρο would have been a possible choice to supply the lack of a verb in Gen. 12:1 in the LXX. If a translator or scribe had wanted to make up this lack he could have chosen δεῦρο. Secondly, however, the word is not so common in this context,\textsuperscript{366} and a preference for πορεύου or ἔλθετε would be natural. Hence the presence of δεῦρο in such a wide range of LXX mss would seem to point to a very early tradition containing δεῦρο which was then replaced by a verb in a number of later witnesses.

Turning to Acts, we need to ask whether Luke could have introduced the word. Richard, as we have seen, thinks it quite possible that the author of the Stephen speech introduced δεῦρο to create a better parallelism.\textsuperscript{367} It is unquestionable that the insertion of δεῦρο creates a better parallelism; it is, however, very questionable indeed whether the author would choose δεῦρο to create this parallelism. Luke tends to use the imperative of πορεύομαι or ἐρχόμαι for the imperative "go" or "come."\textsuperscript{368} Although δεῦρο is found in the NT in the sense of the imperative of "go" or "come" (only certainly in John 11:43 [cf. Ignatius, Romans 7:12]; Rev. 17:1 and 21:9 may be hortatory

\textsuperscript{365}See BAG, 175; BDF, 183-184; BDB, 234.

\textsuperscript{366}Δεῦρο would not have been a natural choice to translate the Aramaic imperative verb £££££££££ to either.

\textsuperscript{367}Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42.

\textsuperscript{368}Compare e.g., M&G (383-384, 385-386, 840-841) with e.g., J. Strong (The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible [Nashville: Abingdon, 1890 (reprinted 1975)] 205, 397).
particles), Luke only uses it twice (not counting the passage under discussion). He uses the word once, in common with Matthew and Mark (Luke 18:22 = Matt. 19:21; Mark 10:21), in a passage which is likely Markan in origin. Again the word is found in Acts 7:34, in a citation of Ex. 3:10. The latter citation will be dealt with below; however for the purposes of this examination of Acts 7:3, I will just note that δἐυρό is well attested for the LXX of Ex. 3:10, and Luke employs it in his citation. Thus one can conclude that Luke does not use the word outside of material which he has taken almost verbatim from a source. Furthermore, in both Luke 18:22 and Acts 7:34 (and, incidentally, in Ex. 3:10 LXX) δἐυρό clearly functions as a hortatory or introductory word, not as a literal imperative for "come" or "go." Hence Luke only uses the word in an introductory, hortatory sense, never in the sense found in Acts 7:3. Therefore, we may conclude that it is quite unlikely that Luke would have used this word on his own (given the differences in the use of the word it is unlikely that 7:3 was made to parallel 7:34).

It is very likely, therefore, that Luke used δἐυρό in Acts 7:3 because he found it in his version of Gen. 12:1. Given the evidence of the LXX for an early tendency to add a verb to the text, and the apparent preference for δἐυρό in LXX texts of Gen. 12:1 as a functional equivalent to a verb, it appears that Luke found δἐυρό in his copy of the LXX.

---

369See BAG, 175.

370See Schramm, 142; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1196; and my discussion above.

371See GottLXX2, Ex. 3:10.
Turning now to the NT textual issues surrounding Acts 7:3, the first noteworthy point is, as Wilcox has pointed out, that Codex Bezae (D) substitutes ἄπο for ἐκ before τὴς γης σοῦ (point [3]). What makes this interesting is that Metzger has concluded that in most cases in Acts 7 Bezae is in the habit of conforming the citations to the LXX, and in this case Bezae deviates from the LXX. This leads Wilcox to suppose that Bezae may preserve a more primitive form of the citation at this point, while the readings with ἐκ could be due to assimilation to the LXX. It seems, however, very unlikely that only D would preserve the original reading for this passage. Such thoroughgoing assimilation is highly unlikely, especially in view of the fact that B, for example, which reads ἐκ here, is not noted for assimilation to the LXX in Acts 7. There seems little to commend ἄπο as original in 7:3. Wilcox's offhand suggestion of the possibility of carelessness in D is not without merit.

The omission of ἐκ before τὴς συγγενείας σου (point [4]) is reasonably well attested (ἐκ is omitted in both B and D). In fact the 25th edition of the Nestle text follows B and D here, while NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 follow the other witnesses. Richard, however, considers the ms evidence for the omission of ἐκ to

---

372Metzger, Textual Commentary, 342-343.
373Wilcox, Semitisms, 26.
374Ropes, 60-61.
375Wilcox, Semitisms, 26.
376NestleAland25, Acts 7:3.
be not particularly compelling. He notes that the Latin column of D supports the LXX reading, while the Coptic mss are divided (Sahidic supports the omission while Bohairic reads ἐκ). For Vaticanus (B), Richard notes that it departs from the LXX in twelve out of seventeen instances in Acts 7, and concludes that it is "especially tendentious in that regard." But one might ask what the basis is for this tendency. Why should B move away from the LXX? While assimilation to the LXX is common in the ms tradition, there seems no good reason, outside of stylistic or doctrinal considerations, why a ms would move away from the LXX form.

In fact, the omission of ἐκ at this point may be due to stylistic pruning, and not to any tendencies in particular texts. The removal of the second ἐκ in Acts 7:3, especially in concert with the removal of καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἶκου τοῦ πατρὸς σου would serve to create a more clear parallelism between the single ἐκ before τὴς γῆς σου and the single εἰς before τὴν γῆν ἣν ἵνα σε δείξω. Thus "out of your land" strikingly parallels "into the land which I will show you." This stylistic alteration could be scribal, but it is more likely Lukan, in view of the evident parallelism throughout the speech. Hence it seems likely that Luke removed the second ἐκ for stylistic reasons, and that many later copyists reinserted it to assimilate the citation to the LXX.

---


379Ibid, 152; he similarly characterizes D as tendentious in deviating from the LXX, contrary to the analysis of Metzger (Textual Commentary, 342-343).


381See Ibid (43), where Richard notes that "assimilation to the LXX Vorlage cannot be dismissed as a possible explanation."
The omission of τὴν before γῆν (point [5]) by the majority text (as opposed to p74, κ, A, B, C, D, E, ψ, 1175, etc.),\textsuperscript{382} seems at first glance to be a case of haplography based on the similar endings of τὴν and γῆν. The strong attestation for the presence of the article also makes it likely that the omission is secondary. What makes the omission interesting, however, is that it is also rather well attested in the LXX of Gen. 12:1.\textsuperscript{383} The absence of τὴν in later LXX mss suggests that perhaps the later mss of the NT assimilated the Acts citation to the LXX as witnessed in the later LXX mss at this point, or, perhaps, that the later LXX mss were assimilated to Acts (although the reason for such assimilation is unclear). It is perhaps better to assume that haplography has occurred in both the LXX and the NT mss traditions. In any case, the presence of the article appears to be original.

In summary, therefore, most of the divergences from the LXX appear to be explainable either from the LXX textual tradition or from redactional activity by the author of the Stephen speech. Dependence on the tradition behind the Targum of Pseudo-Jonathan is unlikely, although a similar, somewhat expansionist tendency has likely affected the ms of the LXX that Luke is using.

\textsuperscript{382}See Nestle\textit{Aland}26, Acts 7:3.

\textsuperscript{383}See Gott\textit{LXX}1, Gen. 12:1.

Acts 7:5 appears to be either a passage composed by the author with certain OT allusions embedded in it, or an extremely complicated combined quotation. UBSGNT lists the following OT passages as possible sources for Acts 7:5: Deut. 2:5; Gen. 12:7; 13:15; 15:2,18; 17:8; 24:7; 48:4. The first part of Acts 7:5 ("yet he gave him no inheritance in it, not even a foot's length") appears to have some relation to Deut. 2:5 ("for I will not give you any of their land, no, not so much as for the sole of the foot to tread on"), especially the phrase οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός, which appears verbatim from the Deuteronomy passage, and which is unique in the LXX to that passage. A number of commentators are reluctant to call this a citation, however, considering the phrase more of a biblical reminiscence. Richard, on the other hand, argues strenuously for "an actual citation," arguing that the structure of Acts 7:5a is that of Deut. 2:5. He argues that καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν οὐτῷ in Acts 7:5a reflects the phrase οὐ γὰρ μὴ δῶ ῥημᾶ in Deut. 2:5, with certain grammatical changes required by the context of the citation in the speech.

---

384Note that there is no introductory formula indicative of a direct citation, and the OT referent is very difficult to ascertain with any certainty (see the discussion below).

385UBSGNT3, Acts 7:5.


387See e.g., Cadbury and Lake, 71; Bruce, Acts (1951), 162; Conzelman, Acts, 52; Haenchen, Acts, 278; see also Mare, 9 n. 52.

Also taking Acts 7:5a as a citation of Deut. 2:5, Wilcox considers it to be non-septuagintal, based both on the grammatical alterations and on the presence of κληρονομίαν, a word not evidenced in the LXX of this verse or paralleled in the MT. 389 He notes, however, that the SP and SPTar. also insert a similar word (ΠΨΠΩΣ/ΠΨΠΩΣ), which may indicate some sort of dependence. 390 But Richard points out that both the Old Latin and the Ethiopic have equivalents for κληρονομίαν at this point in Deut. 2:5, making the sentence read "I will not give you any of their land for an inheritance." 391 Of most importance, he says, however, is the Syriac version, which also contains an equivalent word (γνωρίσθη). 392 He argues that the latter is significant because the Syriac of Acts 7:5 has little in common with the Syriac of Deut. 2:5, thus, as he says, "ruuling out mutual influence." 393 He argues that a Samaritan solution to the problem ignores the full weight of the textual attestation, which would rather support the suggestion that Luke had at his disposal a Greek ms which contained such a reading. 394

Certainly Richard has demonstrated the presence of a tendency, at least in the versions, to add the concept of "inheritance" to Deut. 2:5a, but there is no known LXX

---

389 According to Wilcox (Semitisms, 27); the MT does, however, have ΠΨΠΩΣ later in the verse.


391 Richard, "Acts 7," 198; see also GottLXX3.2 and BrookeMacLean, Deut. 2:5.

392 Richard, "Acts 7," 198; see also BHS, Deut. 2:5.


ms which supports such a reading. Hence we are left with a hypothetical LXX Vorlage which Luke used and which contained the word κληρονομίαν. Another possibility that has been suggested is influence from the word κληροφ in the latter part of Deut. 2:5.\textsuperscript{395} In favour of this view is the fact that the two words are practically synonyms in the LXX (although not absolutely equivalent).\textsuperscript{396} Certainly a copyist, or in the case of the versions, perhaps a translator, could have attempted to balance the two parts of the verse, making it read: "I will not give you any of their land as an inheritance . . . because I have given Mount Seir to Esau as an inheritance." This would explain the presence of "inheritance" in SP, SPTar., Old Latin, Ethiopic, and Syriac; however, in view of the lack of Greek evidence, such a solution must remain speculative for Luke's Vorlage.

On the other hand, Richard argues that it may equally well have been Luke himself who transferred the term from the latter part of Deut. 2:5 to the former part of the verse, changing the form of the word in accordance with his synonymous use of κληρος and κληρονομία.\textsuperscript{397} How likely is such a solution? Luke tends to use κληρος slightly more often than κληρονομία (the former six times; the latter three times, not including Acts 7:5), although the difference in frequency does not appear significant (especially as κληρος in Luke 23:34 and Acts 1:26 has an altogether different connotation). Similarly, the difference in meaning for Luke does not appear particularly significant for these two terms, beyond the connotation of "lot" occasionally for κληρος.

\textsuperscript{395}See Mare, 9 n. 32; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 47 n. 40; "Acts 7," 198 n. 33; Richard rejects this argument.

\textsuperscript{396}Foerster, "κληρος," TDNT 3 (1965) 759-760.

\textsuperscript{397}See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 47; Mare, 9 n. 32.
The latter usage of the word does not, however, appear to be a significant enough reason for its alteration to κληρονομία in the present context. In fact, if κληρονομία in Acts 7:5 indeed reflects the occurrence of κληρος in the latter part of Deut. 2:5 LXX, there is no logical reason why Luke would have changed κληρος to κληρονομία.

It is not entirely clear, however, that the reference to Deut. 2:5 in Acts 7:5 is a citation at all. Certainly the phrase οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδὸς points unequivocally to the LXX of Deut. 2:5, as the wording is unique to this septuagintal passage. But Albert Wifstrand has pointed out that Luke often uses phrases unique to the LXX in passages where he is not making a direct citation. Therefore, it is not enough in a Lukan context to point to the reproduction of a unique OT phrase in order to indicate a definite citation.

By far the most telling evidence against a direct citation at this point is the fact that Deut. 2:5 simply has nothing whatever to do with the context of Acts 7:5, or, for that matter, with the following citation from Genesis. The context of Acts and Genesis deals with the possession of Canaan by Abraham (Genesis) or his descendants (Acts), while Deut. 2:5 deals with a prohibition to the children of Israel, upon entering Canaan, from provoking the Edomites, as Mt. Seir was given to Esau, not to Israel. In fact,
there is no explicit reference in the OT to Abraham himself being refused a possession in the land of Canaan. It appears that the author has inferred that Abraham did not possess a portion of the land from the subsequent history of Abraham in the OT. A proof-text citation for this idea, however, is not to be found, and Deut. 2:5 certainly provides none. The fact that Deut. 2:5 is completely unconcerned with the promise of the land of Canaan or with the promise to Abraham makes the verse an unlikely candidate for a proof-text citation.

It seems more likely that the reference to Deut. 2:5 is a mere verbal allusion, rather than a citation. As he does often, Luke apparently has simply reproduced a Biblical expression in his work, which need not have any particular links to the point he is trying to make. Hence, I would argue that the presence of καὶ ὀνομία in Acts 7:5a is probably simply due to Luke's argument, rather than evidence of such a reading in the text of Deut. 2:5. Similarly καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ in Acts 7:5 need have no relation to οὐ γὰρ μὴ δῶ ὑμῖν in Deut. 2:5. On the other hand, although only an allusion, this passage does have value as evidence regarding the text Luke used, as

---

400 Note that there is no mention of Abraham or his "seed," which is the major idea of the early part of Acts 7.

401 While it is certainly not unheard of in the NT for a writer to use an OT citation out of context in making his point, one could argue that there are usually conceptual links between the argument and the citation (see e.g., discussion in Longenecker [Biblical Exegesis, 80-104]; see also Goppelt, Typos, 17-18; Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 18; Hanson, 78; Bovon, 92-94).

402 In agreement with, e.g., Cadbury and Lake (71), Bruce (Acts [1951], 278), Conzelman (Acts, 52), Haenchen (Acts, 278), and Emerton (284).


404 Against Emerton (284).
the singular phrase οἶδε βῆμα ποδός points clearly to a familiarity with the LXX of Deuteronomy.

Turning now to the rest of the verse, commentators are again divided as to whether or not this is indeed a citation. It is hardly a direct citation, as there is no introductory formula, and furthermore, it is difficult to determine exactly which OT passage is meant. While most commentators consider the reference to be to Gen. 17:8, it seems that Gen. 48:4 provides the most comprehensive account of the elements in Acts 7:5b, with less necessary omissions than 17:8. On the other hand, 48:4 is not a direct speech to Abraham, as the context in Acts 7 would imply, but is a statement by Jacob regarding God’s promise to him (cf. 48:3). Hence, I will use Gen. 17:8 as the starting point for this investigation.

There is a textual problem as well in Acts 7:5b. While mss B, C, D, 36, 104, 614, 1241, etc. read αὐτῷ εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτὴν, mss P74, Ρ, Α, Ε, Ψ, 33, 323, 945, 1175, 1739, 2495, etc. read αὐτὴν εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτῷ. There is little to choose between the ms evidence for these two readings; however the difference in word order produces a more difficult reading for the former than the latter. As the word order

---


406 E.g., Bruce, Acts (1951), 162; Conzelman, Acts, 52; Holtz, 114; Haenchen, Acts, 279; Clarke, 88.


408 The Syriac version has the equivalent here as well.

409 See Nestle-Aland26, Acts 7:5.
would more likely have been corrected to read more easily, it is the former reading that
I will adopt here. 410

If we accept Gen. 17:8 as the OT reference, the divergences from the LXX are
as follows: (1) επηγγείλατο is inserted after the initial καί; (2) δώσω σοι becomes
δούναι αὐτῷ; (3) εἰς κατάσχεσιν appears to have been moved from the end of the verse
and inserted after δούναι αὐτῷ; (4) the adjective αἰώνιον relating to κατάσχεσις is
omitted; (5) αὐτήν is inserted before καὶ τῷ σπέρματι; (6) the second person singular
possessive pronoun σου after σπέρματι is changed to third person singular αὐτόν; (7)
μετὰ σὲ becomes μετ’ αὐτόν; (8) the words τὴν γῆν, ἦν παρουσεῖς, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν
Χανάαν have been omitted; (9) the final words of Gen. 17:8, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς θεός,
have been omitted; (10) the words οἶκ δντος αὐτῷ τέκνων have been added to the end of
the passage.

Although these differences seem thoroughgoing enough to question the LXX
source for this passage, even Holtz has concluded that the citation is septuagintal, with
the alterations having been necessitated by its context in the Stephen speech. 411
Redactional considerations, in fact, seem to have played a major role in the formation
of Acts 7:5b. Ἐπηγγείλατο (point [1]) is inserted to introduce the OT reference. The
change from second person to third person (in points [2], [6], [7]), is consistent with the
reference to Abraham in the third person in Acts 7. The insertion of αὐτήν (point [5])
not only refers back to the τὴν γῆν ταύτην of v. 4, but also summarizes the omission of

40See also Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 48 n. 41; Cadbury and Lake, 71.
41Holtz, 114. He regards this as a direct citation.
The relocation of εἰς κατάσχεσιν from the end of the passage to after δοῦναι αὐτῷ (point [3]) is, as noted by Richard, likely owing to the author's use of parallelism in this speech. Thus the word order of 5b is related intimately to that of 5a: καὶ ὁ ἐδώκεν / αὐτῷ / κληρονομίαν / ἐν αὐτῇ = καὶ ἐπηγγείλατο δοῦναι / αὐτῷ / εἰς κατάσχεσιν / αὐτῇν + καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ’ αὐτῶν.⁴¹³

Αἰώνιον (point [4]) and καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶις θεός (point [9]) may have been omitted simply because the author of the speech considered them irrelevant to his purpose, or the omissions may reflect polemical considerations on the part of the author. Although it has often been argued that polemical considerations are not present in the speech until at least 7:35,⁴¹⁴ Richard argues that the whole of v. 5 ("God did not give . . .") is "a polemical statement in direct response to the ending of v. 4 (the land where the audience of the speech dwells)."⁴¹⁵ While Richard's analysis seems a bit tenuous, one could argue that in omitting the above-mentioned phrases from his citation the author is polemicising against Jewish nationalist sentiments regarding the land and exclusivity regarding the worship of God, as well as indicating that in subsequent history the Jews repudiated their relationship to God. This, however, seems too much to read into a couple of omissions.

⁴¹²See Ibid.


⁴¹⁴E.g., Dibelius, Studies, 167.

I am inclined, rather, to view the omissions as owing to their perceived irrelevance to the purpose of the speech.\footnote{One could, perhaps, argue that the omitted words, if included, would have had a detrimental effect on the progress of the argument of the speech. Thus the use of αἰώνας in Gen. 17:8 underlines the possession of the land as the goal of patriarchal history (see W. Brueggemann, The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith [OBT; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977] 22; Rendtorff, The Old Testament: An Introduction [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986] 137), while for the author of the speech, the goal of history is the coming of the “Righteous One” (v. 52), in accordance with the idea that God’s people should not be tied to any particular spot (see e.g., Bruce, Acts [1951], 161). Similarly, καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτῶς θεὸς could conceivably tie the worship of God to the possession of the land, which the author of the speech does not wish to do.}

The final phrase, οὐκ ἰδώνος αὐτῷ τέκνου (point [10]), has been inferred from the context in Genesis, and thus added here. Richard suggests that this phrase is a "free quotation" of Gen. 15:2, τί μοι δώσεις; ἐγὼ δὲ ἀπολύσωμαι ἀτεκνος.\footnote{Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 46, 48.} But this seems much too free to be a quotation, or even a verbal allusion for that matter. If Acts had used ἀτεκνος, we could, perhaps, consider it at least a verbal allusion, as ἀτεκνος is not found in the NT outside Luke (Luke 20:28-29), and in the LXX sporadically enough (only five times) to warrant the conclusion of a reference here to a particular OT passage.\footnote{See M&G, 119; Hatch and Redpath, 1. 175; BAG, 119.} But as it stands, I fail to see any conclusive evidence for dependency on Gen. 15:2.

Although Richard has strongly argued that Acts 7:5b is an explicit citation of Gen. 17:8 (with 48:4), this passage is better characterised as an allusion, or perhaps a paraphrase.\footnote{See Koch, 15-16.} Richard bases his argument on the observation that Acts 7:5b shares with Gen. 17:8 (and 48:4) five distinct elements, although not their order: δίδωμι, two
indirect objects (Abraham and his seed after him), the land as the direct object, and \( \epsilon\iota\varsigma \) \( \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\varepsilon\omicron\upsilon \).\(^{420}\) His argument is persuasive that Gen. 17:8 (or 48:4) is the OT passage in view, and that the reference to it in Acts 7:5 is more than a reminiscence, but that it is an explicit citation is contradicted by the placing of Acts 7:5b into indirect speech (e.g., \( \delta\omega\nu\nu\alpha\iota \), point [2]), thereby making v. 5 an integral part of the narrative of the speech. Furthermore, as noted, there is no introductory formula in this verse, and no implication of a direct citation of a particular OT passage.\(^{421}\) Rather, the verse appears as simply a part of the descriptive narrative. In fact, as the above discussion has shown, the citation has been so heavily redacted into the narrative that only the broad outlines (Richard’s five elements) of the OT passage have remained. Such a free use of an OT passage is certainly less than an explicit citation, I would argue, but more than a reminiscence. Rather, it is an extended allusion, or, more accurately, a paraphrase, in which the passage is verbally connected to its OT counterpart, but not explicitly cited.\(^{422}\) Thus, the elements from the OT passage are weaved with elements of its own narrative structure.

Before leaving Acts 7:5 there is one more point which needs to be considered. Holtz finds the use of the word \( \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\varepsilon\omicron\varsigma \) surprising here.\(^{423}\) The word is only found in the NT in Acts: certainly in Acts 7:5 and 45, and in the D text of 13:33 and 20:16.


\(^{421}\)Cf. Ibid, 202-203.

\(^{422}\)See Koch, 15.

\(^{423}\)Holtz, 114.
In our passage, as noted, the word indicates "possession," similarly in the D text of 13:33 (cf. also addition to the Harclean Syriac version) and in I Clement 36:4 the word means "possession." The latter texts are both dependent on Ps. 2:8 LXX: αἵτις σας παρ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δῷς σοι ἑθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσιν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς. Again, in the LXX generally the word means "possession".

Similarly in T. Benj. 10:4 the meaning is the same. The D text of Acts 20:16 (also equivalent in [gig] and the Vulgate), however, uses the word with an entirely different connotation: μὴ ποτε γενήθη αὐτῶ κατάσχεσις τις (replacing ὁπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῶ χρονοτριβήσαι), "in order that he might experience no delay." The latter meaning for the term ("holding back," "restraining") is to be found also in secular Greek. But what is really surprising is the use of κατάσχεσις in Acts 7:45. There the phrase ἐν τῇ κατασχέσει is normally translated "dispossessing" (NASB) or "when they dispossessed" (RSV), although other translations appear as well (e.g., "took" [NIV], "took over" [TEV], "conquered" [JB], etc.). The precise meaning as given by BAG is...

---

426See BAG, 420.
427See APOT, 2. 359.
429Translation from BAG, 420.
430See Ibid.
would suggest that it comes about through the influence of the OT itself, specifically the LXX.

In summary then, I find little support for the contention that Acts 7:5 represents a combined citation. Rather, it consists of a verbal allusion to Deut. 2:5 and a paraphrase of Gen. 17:8. I also find little support for a Jewish Greek tradition underlying Acts 7:5, other than LXX Genesis. Rather, the supposed traditional elements can be explained through reference to the LXX. Although the OT references are allusions and not citations, there is enough evidence to support a Septuagintal origin for the OT material (especially the use of αὐδὲ βῆμα ποδώς and κατάσχεσιν). As the OT material is heavily redacted into the narrative structure of the speech itself, I would conclude that the author of the speech is the one who made the above allusions to the OT and redacted them. Absence of traditional elements which are not accountable by reference to the LXX point to Luke as the author here.

c. Acts 7:6-7 = Gen. 15:13-14 + Ex. 3:12 (+ Ex. 2:22?)

A combination of two OT passages appears in Acts 7:6-7. The combination appears to work in the following manner: ἔσται τὸ σφέρμα αὐτοῦ... ἐξελεύσονται is from Gen. 15:13-14, while καὶ λατρεύσουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ comes from Ex.

---


436 Against Holtz (114-115).

437 The introductory words ἐλάλησεν δὲ ὁ θεὸς δὲ probably reflect an introductory speech formula used by the author of Acts 7 for his own redactional and structural reasons (Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 47, 202-203; Holtz, 116). There are, however, some features which may point to some relation to Gen. 15:13, the LXX of which reads καὶ (continued...)
Beginning with the first part of the passage, the deviations from the LXX are as follows: (1) second person σου becomes third person αὐτοῦ; (2) πάροικον is inserted before ἐν γῇ; (3) ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδιεῖ becomes ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίῳ; (4) αὐτοῦς after δοῦλοσουσιν becomes αὐτό; (5) αὐτοῦς after κακώσουσιν is omitted; (6) the following καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτοῦς is also omitted; (7) τετρακόσια ἔτη becomes ἔτη τετρακόσια; (8) τὸ δὲ ἐθνὸς becomes καὶ τὸ ἐθνὸς; (9) δοῦλοσουσιν becomes δοῦλοσουσιν; (10) ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν is inserted after κρινὼ ἐγὼ; (11) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα becomes καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα; (12) ὁδὲ μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς in Gen. 15:14 is replaced by καὶ λατρεύσουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ, presumably from Ex. 3:12. There are also divergences from the LXX of Ex. 3:12: (13) second person plural λατρεύσετε becomes third person plural λατρεύσουσιν; (14) τῷ θεῷ becomes μοι; (15) ὁ ἄρη becomes τόπῳ.

The changes are so numerous that Conzelman, for example, sees only "echoes" of Gen. 15:13-14, with an "expansion" from Ex. 3:12, along with a "touch" from Ex. 2:22 ("Ὅτι πάροικός εἰμι ἐν γῇ ἄλλοςτρις"). Other commentators, however, consider this passage a combined quotation. The numerous divergences from the LXX need to be considered in relation to the function of the OT references in the speech of Acts 7, however, before we can comment on whether this is a direct citation, or an allusion.

The use of the third person αὐτοῦ for second person σου (point [1]) seems to indicate that the OT material has been placed in indirect speech in Acts 7:6. What is interesting, however, is that in v. 7 the author apparently reverts to direct speech, with the help of the inserted expression ὁ θεὸς εἰπεν (point [10]). This is curious: not only is the reversion from indirect to direct speech a rarity among Greek writers, but this reversion occurs in the midst of the citation (if it is a citation) of Gen. 15:13-14, occurring at the break between vv. 13 and 14. Cadbury argues that the author has begun his citation in indirect speech and then reverts to direct speech by following his OT model too closely. Richard, however, argues for direct speech throughout the citation, stating that the change from σου to αὐτοῦ in v. 6 only indicates that Abraham

---

439 Conzelman, Acts, 52.

440 See e.g., Bruce, Acts (1951), 163; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 49-53; Holtz, 98; Clarke, 88; see also Cadbury and Lake, 71-72; Haenchen, Acts, 279-280.


442 Ibid, 415.

443 Ibid, 416 n. 12.
is being spoken about, rather than spoken to; a direct speech by God is still intended. What has changed from Genesis is that God’s speech is now addressed not to Abraham, but to the audience. The latter point he finds demonstrated in the change of second person plural λατρεύσετε to third person plural λατρεύσουναυ in v. 7 (point [13]), even though that verse is clearly in direct speech, as evidenced in the change of τῷ θεῷ to μοι (point [14]). Holtz also thinks it is going too far to designate v. 6 as indirect speech. Rather, he sees the change from σου to αὐτοῦ as consistent with the author’s constant use of third person pronouns throughout the early part of Acts 7, and, like Richard, he argues that the insertion of ὁ θεὸς εἰπεν as paralleling similar speech formulae throughout the speech.

Gen. 15:13-14, however, is in the second person in both LXX and MT. Hence the author of Acts 7 is clearly altering the OT language in incorporating this OT passage. What is not clear is why he alters it. To simply say, with Holtz, that it is in conformity to the use of the pronouns throughout Acts 7, fails to explain why there is this preference for the third person in the speech. The answer is that the speech is a narrative, a style in which usually the third person is used, and which often has instances of indirect speech. Such a narrative style for the speech as a whole actually argues for indirect speech in v. 6. In fact, as both Holtz and Richard apparently fail to realize, the one and

---


445 Holtz, 117 n. 2.

only other occasion in the speech of Acts 7 where the pronouns are changed from second to third person in reference to an OT passage is v. 5, which is in indirect speech. When the author uses direct speech, even if he has been speaking in the third person, he reverts to second person (cf. vv. 3, 27-28, 33-34, etc.). Thus the most natural interpretation of the third person pronouns in v. 6 would be as indicative of indirect speech.

Furthermore, while, as Richard suggests, 447 ὃ θεὸς εἶπεν (point [10]) may indeed parallel the use of λέγει κύριος in v. 48, it is, however, not an exact parallel. In the latter verse, λέγει κύριος is part of the OT passage which is cited (although rearranged), while in v. 7 ὃ θεὸς εἶπεν is inserted into the OT passage. While it may have been inserted as a parallel to 7:48, the parallel would have been clearer if the same phrase had been inserted in v. 7 as we find in v. 48.448 Since the author of Acts 7 did not choose to parallel v. 48 exactly, perhaps such a parallel was not his concern. In any case, there appears to be more to the insertion of ὃ θεὸς εἶπεν than simply a wish for a stylistic parallel. Again, although the phrase may have been simply inserted for emphasis,449 Cadbury’s conclusion that ὃ θεὸς εἶπεν is used to aid the transfer from indirect to direct speech and parallels the use of φησίν in Acts 25:4-5 is significant: "Festus replied that Paul was being kept . . . 'So,' said he [φησίν], 'let the men of


448In fact, such a parallel does exist in the LXX textual tradition. The 𝜋 family of texts adds λέγει κύριος after κερδώ ἐγώ (also  Quodv Prom 1:18 [see Gottl. LXX1, Gen. 2:14]). While the variant εἶπεν ὃ θεὸς as read by Chrysostom II:890 is likely due to influence from Acts, this is less likely for λέγει κύριος (against Holtz [116]).

449Dupont, "La structure," 164.
authority among you . . .'". Since the switch from indirect to direct speech is an
oddity of sorts in Greek literature, and since in 24:4-5 Luke signals this change by the
insertion of an expression indicative of "saying," it would seem that here in 7:6-7
we have another instance of a Lukan alteration from indirect to direct speech. But it is
probably wrong to attribute this change from indirect to direct speech to Lukan
carelessness in following his source too closely in v. 7. Rather, the insertion of ὅ
θεος εἶπεν, as well as the alteration of τῷ θεῷ to μοι (point [14]), emphasizing the direct
speech in v. 7, indicate that the change from indirect to direct speech is deliberate.

Therefore, we can conclude that the change from οὐ to αὐτοῦ (point [1]), the
insertion of ὅ θεος εἶπεν (point [10]), and the change of τῷ θεῷ to μοι (point [15]),
all follow from the placing of part of the OT material in indirect speech, part in direct
speech.

Points (2) and (3), the insertion of πάροικον ἐν γῇ, and the change of ἐν γῇ οὐκ
ἴδικε to ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίῳ, should be taken together, I think. Thus LXX ἐν γῇ οὐκ Ἰδίκε

---

450 Cadbury, "Lexical Notes," 416.


452 As does Cadbury (Ibid, 416 n. 2).

453 Cf. Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 52-53; although Ex. 3:12 is in direct speech, God refers to himself in the third
person. The reason for this use of the third person in the OT context appears to be related to the identification of
God and Yahweh ("I am" Ἰδίκε vv. 12, 14 in close proximity to "God" θεός explicitly in this OT passage (Ἰδίκε [Yahweh] is God's name—see e.g., R. A. Cole, Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary [TOTC 2;
20-21, 23; G. Quell, "κόσμος: C. The Old Testament Name for God," TDNT 3 [1965] 1071-1072; but cf. Noth,

454 As well as the omission of the introductory words Γενόσκων γνώσῃ (see above, n. 437).

455 As well as, perhaps, the elimination of πάροικον from the introductory words.
becomes πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἄλλοτρίῳ. The two meanings are almost the same: Gen. 15:13, "in a land not their own"; Acts 7:6, "a sojourner in a foreign land." While Holtz argues that the substitution is made on stylistic grounds alone, with perhaps a reminiscence of the language of Exodus (e.g., 2:22; 18:3), Richard argues that Ex. 2:22 is cited specifically by the author of Acts 7. In support of this we may note that outside Ex. 2:22 and 18:3, ἄλλοτριος is only found together with γῇ in Ps. 137:4 (136:4 LXX); Baruch 3:10; I Macc. 6:13; 15:33, and πάροικον, ἄλλοτριος and γῇ are only found together in Ex. 2:22 and 18:3. As well, the expression used in Acts 7:6 is almost identical with LXX Ex. 2:22: πάροικος εἰμι ἐν γῇ ἄλλοτρίῳ. Hence, clearly we have here a reference to the Exodus tradition.

But there are considerations which make a direct citation of Ex. 2:22 (or 18:3) unlikely. First of all, as I have previously noted, the findings of Wifstrand demonstrate that a replication of an odd septuagintal phrase does not prove that it is an explicit citation. Secondly, while there is a conceptual link between Gen. 15:13 and Ex. 2:22, in that the former passage, one of the "pivotal sayings" of the OT, predicts a time of sojourning for the descendants of Abraham and the latter does speak of much the

---

456 Holtz, 116-117.
458 See Holtz, 117 n. 1.
460 Kidner, Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary (TOTC 1; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1967) 125.
same thing in the folk-etymology of the name Gershom (from \( \Psi \gamma \nu \) \( \Lambda \)),\(^{461}\) in fact the link is tenuous, since the Gershom passage relates directly to Moses’ being a sojourner (\( \pi \rho \rho \iota \kappa \nu \)\( \nu \)) in the land of Midian.\(^{462}\) Moses’ sojourn is specifically referred to in Acts 7:29; and, as Richard indicates, the latter passage alludes to Ex. 2:22 in this description of Moses, rightly understanding \( \pi \rho \rho \iota \kappa \nu \) \( \nu \) of Moses’ stay in Midian, not of the Israelites’ stay in Egypt.\(^{463}\) Hence it is unlikely that Acts 7:6 directly cites the same verse incorrectly of Abraham’s descendants in general. It appears, rather, that the link between Acts 7:6 and Ex. 2:22 is merely linguistic, brought about by the use of \( \pi \rho \rho \iota \kappa \nu \) \( \nu \) in both Gen. 15:13 and Ex. 2:22. The occurrence of \( \pi \rho \rho \iota \kappa \nu \) \( \nu \) in Gen. 15:13 has apparently called to the mind of the author of Acts 7 the language of Ex. 2:22, whence he (perhaps unconsciously) adapted the phrase \( \pi \rho \rho \iota \kappa \nu \ \epsilon \nu \ \gamma \nu \ \alpha \lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \iota \rho \iota \). Therefore, I do not think that we have a citation of Ex. 2:22 in Acts 7:6, but rather a reference to Gen. 15:13 coloured by the language of Ex. 2:22 (in agreement with Holtz and Conzelman).\(^{464}\)

The rest of the divergences from the LXX in Acts 7:6-7 can be explained on textual, stylistic and thematic grounds. Turning first to textual issues, the change of \( \tau \nu \ \delta \varepsilon \ \varepsilon \theta \nu \iota \zeta \) to \( \kappa \alpha \iota \ \tau \nu \ \varepsilon \theta \nu \iota \zeta \) (point [8]) is reasonably well attested in the LXX textual

\(^{461}\)See Clements, 17; Cole, 61.

\(^{462}\)See Clements, 17.

\(^{463}\)See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 86.

\(^{464}\)See Holtz, 116-117; Conzelman, Acts, 52.
tradition for Gen. 15:14 (C·413, b, n), and Holtz argues that this LXX reading could easily have come about without influence from Acts. Given the strong LXX attestation, it is not too much to suggest that the reading with καί may have been found in the author’s LXX ms. The change of μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα to καί μετὰ ταῦτα (point [11]), however, is not so well attested in the LXX (only 54, La⁴, [sed hab La⁴]). The change from δὲ to καί is somewhat strange stylistically for Luke as he generally alters his sources from καί to δὲ. Richard, however, has noted that the author of Acts 7 prefers καί to δὲ throughout the speech and has concluded that the alterations of both τὸ δὲ ἐννοεῖ and μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα are stylistic alterations in accordance with the author’s tendencies. Although καί is more conspicuous than δὲ in the Stephen material, it is to be noted that this portion of Acts is filled with references to OT passages, and

465 GottLXX1, Gen. 15:14.

466 Holtz, 116; see also Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 52 n. 52.

467 GottLXX1, Gen. 15:14.

468 See Turner, Style, 57.

469 In fact, throughout all of the Stephen material.


471 Especially when compared with the surrounding material (see Turner, Style, 58).
may simply reflect the LXX use of καὶ. But it seems most likely that Luke found καὶ in both cases in his ms of the LXX.

Point (9), the alteration of δουλεύσωσιν to δουλεύσουσιν, can be explained on textual grounds as well as stylistic. The indicative δουλεύσουσιν in Acts 7:7 is supported by p74, A, C, D, and a few others, while the subjunctive is witnessed by pH, N, B, E, Ψ, and the majority text. Although both NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 accept the indicative as the original reading in Acts 7:7, both Richard and Holtz argue that the attestation is better for the subjunctive. The two critical editions of the NT appear to base their conclusion on the suggestion that codex D, which here is the primary witness to the indicative, tends to assimilate to the LXX. Hence, if D shows the indicative, contrary to the LXX, when according to its tendency it should show

472 Since Brodie has suggested that the content of the Stephen material is modelled on I Kings 21:8-13 ("The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth," 419-420), and since it appears that Luke imitated the language of the LXX on occasion (see e.g., Sparks, "St. Luke's Gospel," 134; "Acts," 22-26; Fitzmyer, Luke (LIX), 123-125; Wifstrand, "Lukas och Septuaginta," 243-262), one could argue that he has imitated the LXX predilection for καὶ here (it is to be noted that Most [34-38] considers the use of apodeictic καὶ as an indicator of possible LXX imitation—cf. Sparks ["Acts," 27] who argues that Luke had both literary and theological reasons for septuagintalizing more in one section of his work, less than another). On the other hand, it needs to be noted that use of an aT model does not necessitate the use of aT language. For example, while the story of Ananias and Saphira in Acts 5 is considered to be modeled on the Achan story of Joshua 7 (see L. T. Johnson, The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts [SBLDS 39; Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1977] 205-206; Haenchen, Acts, 239; Bruce, Acts [1965], 110; Conzelman, Acts, 37), there is no reflection of this in the use of καὶ and δὲ. Whether Luke has septuagintalized in the Stephen material or not, however, a textual solution is to be preferred for the occurrence of καὶ in Acts 7:6-7.

473 If he had been using a source other than the LXX here, we would have expected him to have changed the instances of καὶ noted here to δὲ in accordance with his general tendency (see Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 57).

474 NestleAland26, Acts 7:7; Further evidence from the versions indicates that while the Sahidic Coptic supports the indicative, the Vulgate, Bohairic, and the Latin column of codex D support the subjunctive (see Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 53 n. 56).


476 See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 342-343.
subjunctive, then the indicative is likely the best reading. Both Ropes and Richard, on the other hand, have concluded that the tendency of D to assimilate to the LXX is dubious at best.477

There are other indications that the indicative is secondary in Acts 7:7. First of all, $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ with the indicative never occurs elsewhere in the Stephen speech, and Luke only uses it elsewhere in Luke 19:40.478 Furthermore, there appears to be no certain use of the future indicative with $\epsilon\alpha\nu$ in the NT.479 Hence it is an odd reading, certainly not Lukan, nor characteristic of the Stephen speech, nor of NT Greek. Grammatically, the subjunctive is better in a conditional relative clause, although the future indicative is permissible,480 and, indeed, expresses "a future supposition with more probability."481 It is also to be noted that there is a general tendency in the Koine to replace the subjunctive with the indicative in future suppositional expressions,482 and Richard argues that this tendency has likely affected some mss of Acts 7, producing the reading


478See M&G (238) for the data. Even this reference, however, is doubtful as uncial mss $\Theta$, $\Psi$, 063, minuscule families $f^6$ and $f^5$, and the majority text read subjunctive (NestleAland26, Luke 19:40).

479BDF, 190.

480Ibid, 192.


Holtz also argues that the indicative reading is secondary, having come about in some Acts mss through assimilation to the moods of the surrounding verbs. Either of these solutions is possible. In any case, Holtz and Richard are likely correct in considering the original reading of Acts 7:7 to be δουλεύσωσιν, while δουλεύσουσιν appears to be a later scribal stylistic alteration.

Holtz has also suggested that the alteration of τετρακόσια ἐτη to ἔτη τετρακόσια (point [7]) is textual in origin. The evidence for the transposition in the LXX textual tradition is impressive (M, 426, 77-422-500-551’-646, b, d, f53, n, s, 318’-527, 54, 55, 59, 730, as well as evidence from Chrysostom, Cyril of Alexandria, Epiphanius, Origen, Theodoret, Jerome, the Old Latin, and the Vulgate), and on this basis Holtz argues that the version which lay before the author of Acts 7 read ἔτη τετρακόσια. While the latter is not unlikely, other considerations must be taken into account. Interestingly enough, the author of Acts 7 presents us with the same situation in v. 42 which cites Amos 5:25 and changes τεσσεράκοντα ἐτη to ἔτη τεσσεράκοντα with far less LXX evidence in favour of the alteration (see discussion above). Richard argues that the LXX tradition demonstrates a widespread tendency to favour the order year/cardinal over cardinal/year, and this supports the contention that the LXX text employed by the author

484Holtz, 115.
485GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.
486Holtz, 116; Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 49 n. 45) suggests a similar solution.
of the Stephen speech followed the year/cardinal pattern. But, with regard to Amos 5:25, at least, there is no evidence of such a tendency. On the other hand, the author of Acts 7 employs the year/cardinal pattern as well in vv. 30 and 36, possibly showing a predilection for this word order, a predilection which is also found throughout Luke-Acts. It may be, then, that the inversion is a stylistic alteration, according to the author's stylistic preference. This would better explain the inversion in v. 42, given the absence of LXX textual evidence, and would be consonant with the evidence of the speech (and Luke-Acts as well) as a whole. If so, then the alteration in the LXX tradition for Gen. 15:13 could be attributed to influence from Acts, or it may be coincidental. Therefore, while the solution may be textual, it seems to me more likely that the inversion is a stylistic alteration.

Another alteration which has been accorded a textual origin is point (6), the omission of καὶ ταπεινώσουν αὐτοὺς. Wevers lists only ms 55 and the correction by the first hand of 82 as evidence for this omission in the LXX tradition. Hence, the attestation is not overly compelling for the omission, and certainly not prohibitive of influence from Acts on the LXX tradition. It is interesting to note that the LXX here

487Richard, "Creative Use," 40 n. 5.
488See GottLXX13, Amos 5:25.
489See Richard, "Creative Use," 38 n. 5.
490See Holtz, 115.
491See Holtz, 117.
492See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13; cf, however, BrookeMacLean, Gen. 15:13; see also Holtz, 117.
renders two Hebrew expressions (יְהִי אָבִיִּי יִתְנַהֲלָה) by three Greek expressions (καὶ δουλῶσον αὐτοὺς καὶ κακῶσον αὐτούς καὶ ταπεινώσον αὐτοὺς). It seems safe to assume that the LXX translation of Gen. 15:13 is an expansion of the Hebrew as preserved in the MT.493 There are two possible ways of accounting for this expansion. First of all, one could argue that the LXX translators chose to render the two Hebrew expressions with three verbs to ensure that the meaning was captured in Greek.494 Secondly, one could argue that the expansion of one or the other Greek terms (the LXX textual tradition would point to καὶ ταπεινώσον αὐτούς as the added phrase,495 while the editors of BHK apparently considered καὶ κακῶσον αὐτούς to be the Septuagintal expansion)496 was added in the later LXX textual tradition. The textual evidence, however, is so sparse concerning the omission of καὶ ταπεινώσον αὐτούς (and nonexistent for the omission of καὶ κακῶσον αὐτούς)497 that it is much more likely that the expanded form is the original.

Based on the above analysis there are four possible ways of accounting for the omission of καὶ ταπεινώσον αὐτούς in Acts 7:6. Two of these, however, are very unlikely solutions. First of all, if one supposes, against the evidence, that the expanded

493 That the LXX is reflecting a Hebrew Vorlage different from the MT here is possible. There is, however, no evidence for this outside of the LXX itself.


495 See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.

496 See BHK, Gen. 15:13; BHS makes no mention of the LXX evidence.

497 See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.
form of the LXX reading is secondary, then one could argue that the original LXX lacked ταπεινώ (or, according to BHK, κακώ), and hence that the author of Acts 7 may have cited a ms closer to the original LXX than any which we have. But, as I have already noted, the textual evidence does not support this. Secondly, one could postulate direct dependence on the MT. Scholars generally, however, do not find any merit in this suggestion (even Wilcox ignores this passage, while Holtz lists it as one of the "wörtliche übernahmen aus der LXX").

Owing to the closeness of the LXX to the MT, apart from the double rendering of †ΩΨΠ, and given the difficulty, of determining which of the two Greek terms is a more logical translation of the Hebrew piel ΠΨΠ, there appears to be no way of determining possible MT influence here. It seems more likely that the author of the Stephen speech either cited a LXX text which omitted καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς or omitted it himself.

Both Holtz and Richard espouse the view that the omission of καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς in Acts 7:6 reflects a later Hebraicizing tendency in the ms tradition of Gen. 15:13 LXX, and that this Hebraicizing tendency was reflected in the ms used by the author of Acts 7. Clearly such a solution is possible; however, owing to the paucity of textual data it cannot be confirmed.

---


499 Piel ΠΨΠ is translated in the LXX by both κακώ and ταπεινώ (e.g., κακώ: Ex. 1:11; Num. 24:24; Ps. 88:23; 93:5; ταπεινώ: Ex. 1:12; Deut. 26:6; II Kgdms. 7:10; Isa. 60:14 [see Holtz, 117 n. 4]). There does not appear to be any clearly discernable semantic pattern in the LXX use of these two words for piel ΠΨΠ. Generally speaking κακώ is a more general term and ταπεινώ more specific (see Grundmann, "κακώ," TDNT 3 [1965] 484; "ταπεινώς, ταπεινώ, ταπεινώσις, ταπεινώσωμι, ταπεινώσωσιν," TDNT 8 [1972] 6-7), but this is contradicted by the use of the terms in, e.g., Ex. 1:11-12.

It may be, however, that the author of the Stephen speech omitted the phrase himself, either for stylistic or thematic reasons. Such an omission, in the words of Richard, is an "activity . . . germane to redaction" (as in 7:3), and could thus have its origin in the author of the speech. As well, it is to be noted that κακόω is only found in Acts (outside of I Peter 3:13), and always indicates some sort of persecution (12:1; 14:2; 18:10). Furthermore, κακόω is also found in 7:19 in the context of the mistreatment of the Israelites in Egypt. Hence κακόω would be a word which the author of the speech (especially if this were Luke) would readily see as applicable to the persecution of the people of God in the context of Acts 7:6. Ταπευνώω, on the other hand, is found five times in Luke: twice (Luke 14:11 and 18:14) with the reflexive ἑαυτῶν having the connotation of willing submission; three times (also in Luke 14:11 and 18:14, as well as 3:8) in the passive indicating God's action in "humbling" (or in 3:8 simply "making low") someone or something. It never occurs in the context of persecution. Thus the word may not have readily suggested itself in the context of the persecution of Israel in Egypt, nor in the context of the persecution of Stephen. Hence it is possible that the author of Acts deliberately omitted the reference to ταπευνώω from Gen. 15:13 in accord with his emphasis on actual persecution and maltreatment. Therefore, although a textual solution is not impossible, it seems more likely that the omission of καί ταπευνώσωσιν αὐτούς is redactional in origin.

501 Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 51; Richard rejects this possibility.
502 See Grundmann, "κακόω," 484.
503 See M&G, 933; Grundmann, "ταπευνός," 16-17.
Similarly, Holtz finds the omission of αὐτοῦς after κακόσουσιν (point [5]) so remarkable that he attributes the omission to the text used by the author of Acts 7. The evidence for such an early text, however, is not very strong, and thus must remain a matter of speculation. A more promising explanation is that the author has omitted the second possessive in the series according to his stylistic tendency. The omission of the second possessive pronoun in a series is not uncommon stylistically, especially in classical Greek, and would therefore not be unlikely for Luke. Thus, a stylistic alteration best explains the omission here.

There are other divergences from the LXX in this passage which are probably stylistically motivated. The change of αὐτοῦς after the first δουλώσουσιν to αὐτό (point [4]) appears stylistic. There is textual support for this change in the LXX mss in that Alexandrinus reads κακόσουσιν αὐτό καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοῦς (a similar inversion of the verbs also occurs in the E test of Acts, although likely unrelated to LXX A). The inversion of the verbs, however, makes it unlikely that the reading before the author of

---

504 Holtz, 115-116.
505 See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.
506 Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 50) gives the following examples of this tendency: 6:12; 7:24,57-58; 8:3.
507 See BDF, 146.
509 See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13; Holtz, 115.
Acts 7 was the reading of A. More likely the change of αὐτοῦς to αὐτό is for grammatical reasons, as αὐτό agrees with τὸ σπέρμα.

Richard, however, argues that the alteration has a thematic basis. He notes that the author of Acts 7 faces the same situation in 7:34 (citing Ex. 3:7-10), and does not make such an alteration. Hence, he argues, he must have had a particular reason for altering the pronoun in 7:6. He finds this reason in the author’s concern for the posterity of Abraham, which, he notes, is represented throughout vv. 5 and 6 by singular terms (he notes κληρονομίαν, κατάσχεσιν, σπέρματι, τέκνου, σπέρμα, πάροικον). He concludes that the author of Acts 7 wishes to present the posterity of Abraham as, in his words, "a series of individuals," and thus the singular pronoun αὐτό reflects this literary method of presentation. But there are a couple of points which make Richard’s conclusion questionable. First of all, the situation is not quite the same in 7:34 as in 7:6. While the corresponding noun in 7:34, λαός, is similar to σπέρμα, being a collective noun often used with a plural meaning, σπέρμα does not always imply a collective, to the extent that λαός does. Σπέρμα can logically be used with the singular more

510Holtz, 115.


512Ibid.

513See Turner, Syntax, 311-312; BAG, 467-468, 769.

514Σπέρμα can mean "child" or "offspring" in the singular sense, in such a way that Paul can relate the singular word "typologically" to Christ, as a singular descendent of Abraham (Gal. 3:16,19). Such a meaning is not unwarranted by the use of σπέρμα in both secular Greek (e.g., Pind. 01. 9:91; Aesch. Prom. 705; Cho. 234; Soph. Ph. 364) and the LXX (e.g., Gen. 4:25; 21:13; I Kgds. 1:11; II Kgds. 7:12; I Chr. 17:11; Deut. 25:5 [for В’,but 56 [for В’]), where sometimes individuals are indicated by σπέρμα (although it is unusual). As well, there are many instances where σπέρμα indicates a single seed in the botanical sense (see Burton, A Critical (continued...))
readily than λαός, since, even if one speaks of a single "people," the idea is still collective. This is not so with σπέρμα. Hence, the author of Acts 7 could simply have considered that σπέρμα read better with a single pronoun in v. 6, whereas λαός in v. 34 would have logically taken a plural. Secondly, in vv. 6-7 the author is not emphasizing the posterity of Abraham as a series of individuals, but rather that the children of Israel as a whole were to be enslaved for four hundred years. Hence, the singular αὐτό here cannot reflect this emphasis. Therefore, there seems to be no thematic reason for the change to singular here, only the grammatical niceties of agreement of gender and number.

Although the replacement of ὁδὲ μετὰ ἀποσκευής πολλῆς with καὶ λατρεύσουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ (point [12]), the latter presumably taken from Ex. 3:12, is probably thematic, the replacement of second person plural λατρεύσετε with third person plural λατρεύσουσι (point [13]), is likely stylistic. As the third person plural is only attested in the minuscule textgroup x for the LXX of Ex. 3:12, a textual solution is most unlikely. Rather, it appears that the alteration of the verb has come about to bring Ex. 3:12 into conformity with Gen. 15:13-14.

There are two clear thematic alterations in the citation of Acts 7:6-7. These are point (12), the replacement of Gen. 15:14 ὁδὲ μετὰ ἀποσκευής πολλῆς with καὶ

---

515GottLXX2.1, Ex. 3:12, and p. 42.
λατρεύουσον μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτῳ from Ex. 3:12, and within this reference to Ex. 3:12, point (15), the replacement of ὅρη with τόπῳ.

That καὶ λατρεύουσον μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τοῦτῳ (point [12]) from Ex. 3:12 is more than simply a case of Biblical language influencing the language of the author can be seen from the fact that the use of λατρεύω in close proximity with ἐν in the LXX is to be found only in Ex. 3:12; 7:16; Deut.12:2; Josh. 24:14; I Esdras 4:54, out of 90 instances of λατρεύω in the LXX.516 Contextually, only Ex. 3:12 and 7:16 could possibly be the source here, and the inclusion of τοῦτῳ would seem to point directly to 3:12.

The inclusion of the phrase from Ex. 3:12 in preference to ὅδε μετὰ ἀποσκευής πολλῆς from Gen 15:14 is probably thematic in origin. Both Dupont and Marshall argue that the author here substitutes the phrases in order to make what is implied in the statement to Abraham more explicit.517 Presumably these scholars consider this reference to Exodus only an explication of what is meant by ὅδε ("here"), without reference to μετὰ ἀποσκευής πολλῆς ("with many possessions"). Certainly the Exodus phrase does not seem to explicate either the Greek or the Hebrew (ךְּלִילֵי) of the Genesis phrase. But even if we limit the explicative nature of the Exodus phrase to ὅδε in Gen. 15:14, this does not explain why the author would choose this particular passage to explain it. Rather, it appears more likely that the key to the inclusion of the phrase

516Holtz, 99 n. 1; see also Strathmann, "λατρεύω, λατρεία," TDNT 4 (1967) 59-60.

from Ex. 3:12 is to be found in the word λατρεύοντων. The theme of "worship" and "sacrifice" is found throughout the recitation of Israelite history in Acts 7, in what appears to be a state of "ever growing degradation" culminating in the denunciation of Amos 5:25-27 in vv. 42-43, and with a similar negative opinion of the building of the Solomonic temple (cf. vv. 47-51). Richard notes that the addition of λατρεύω in v. 7, expressing God's intention, together with the use of the word in v. 42, expressing the result of the people's idolatry, demonstrates a structural and thematic unity in the speech. It is, in fact, precisely through this combined citation in v. 7 that the themes of possession of the land and worship of God are united and the latter theme introduced. Therefore, the combination of Gen. 15:14 and Ex. 3:12 appears to be deliberate on the part of the author of the Stephen speech.

Finally, the change of ὅρει to τὸ πνεῦμα (point [15]) appears to be thematic as well. The reason for the change seems clear in that the original refers to the Hebrew slaves returning from Egypt and worshipping God at Mt. Horeb (Sinai) on their way to the promised land as a sign that it was indeed God who was with Moses and would effect this return. But the context of Gen. 15:14 implies that the people will return from a land that is not theirs to one which is. Hence ὅρει is inappropriate here, as the

---

519 Richard, "Creative Use," 41; see also J. Bihler, Die Stephanusgeschichte im zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte (MTS 1; Munich: Hueber, 1963) 43.
520 See Cole, 68; see also Noth, Exodus, 42; B. S. Childs (The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974] 74) sees the worship of God in the "sanctuary" as the future promise contained in this verse.
521 See Westermann, Genesis 12-36, 227.
focus is not Horeb, but the land of promise. Furthermore, we should note that Acts 7:5-7 are cited as directed to Abraham, who was not on "this mountain." The change to "place" was required by the context in which Ex. 3:12 is now cited.

On the other hand, it is not so clear exactly which place is indicated by the word τὰπω in Acts 7. Owing both to the Genesis context and the reference in v. 4 to "this land in which you are now living," both Bruce and Marshall conclude that τὰπω in v. 7 refers to the land of Palestine (Canaan) as a whole. Holtz takes issue with this view. He argues that, since τὰπω is not to be found in Biblical literature with the meaning "land," it could not mean that here. But Holtz overlooks the occurrences of the term to refer to "regions" or districts" (especially in the plural [e.g., Matt. 12:43; 24:7; Mark 13:8; Luke 4:37; 11:24; 21:11; Acts 27:2]), for "desert places" (Matt. 14:13; Mark 1:35, 45; 6:32; Luke 4:42; 9:12 [cf. also Matt. 14:15; Mark 6:35; Rev. 12:14] and even for an "inhabited place" such as a city or a village (e.g., Matt. 14:35; Mark 6:11; Acts 16:3; Rev. 18:17). This meaning for the word could in the present context be understood as the place where the people of Israel are now

---

523 See BAG, 830-831.
524 Holtz, 99 n. 3.
525 BAG, 830.
526 See M&G, 379.
527 BAG, 830.
inhabiting (i.e. Palestine), as is indicated in v. 4.\(^{528}\) On the other hand, in agreement with Holtz, it is more common for the word in the singular to indicate something more specific than a whole country. Hence, perhaps, the reference is to Jerusalem.\(^{529}\) The latter is possible, but in the context of worship it must be the *temple* in Jerusalem that is specifically meant here. Holtz notes that in Jewish writings (especially in the later books of the LXX) τόπος is regularly used to indicate the temple (e.g., II Macc. 6:17,19,20; 10:7; III Macc. 1:9; Aristeas 81),\(^{530}\) and also notes that earlier books in the LXX reflect this connotation (e.g., Gen. 28:11,16,17; Deut. 12:5; IV Kgdms. 5:11; Ps. 131 [132]:5; Isa. 18:7; Jer. 7:12).\(^ {532}\)

The insertion of τόπος into this passage, referring to the Jerusalem temple, is consistent with the themes of the speech as a whole. It places emphasis early in the speech on the temple, a theme that continues throughout the speech, albeit in a more negative sense.\(^ {533}\) But not only is it consistent with the themes of the speech, the

\(^{528}\)See Ibid.

\(^{529}\)As argued by, e.g., Dupont ("La structure," 165-166); see also Conzelman, *Acts*, 52; Holtz, 99 n. 3.

\(^{530}\)Holtz, 99 n. 3; H. Koster ("τόπος," *TDNT* 8 [1972] 198-199) further notes II Macc. 1:29; 2:8, 18; 3:30; 15:34; III Macc. 2:14, 16; IV Macc. 4:12, Sir. 36:12 and concludes: "the theological understanding of place is fully orientated to the temple as the holy place" (but cf. Brueggemann, 151-166).

\(^{531}\)It must be noted, however, that the references to τόπος in Gen. 28 refer to Bethel, not the temple in Jerusalem.

\(^{532}\)Holtz, 99 n. 3; Koster (198) also notes Lev. 8:31; 10:18; Num. 19:3 (although, again, in the foregoing passages the referent is technically a "holy place", not necessarily the Jerusalem temple), Ezr 6:3, 5, 7; Isa. 4:5; Ezek. 41:11; 46:19-20; and especially Ps. 41:5; 67:6; 75:3; 83:7. The classic reference to "the place which the Lord your God will choose" in Deut. 12:5, although perhaps at an early period not limited to Jerusalem (see Thompson, 162-163), in later OT writings and in the writings of Judaism generally, became a technical formula referring to the temple in Jerusalem (Koster, 197).

insertion of τόπος here also connects the speech firmly to the context of Stephen's defence (6:13-14). This would suggest at least a redactional unity between the speech and its narrative context.

A further parallel makes it likely that Luke himself had a hand in the composition. Helmut Köster points out that there is a clear parallel between the accusation of Stephen in 6:13-14, and that of Paul in 21:28, part of the larger parallel between Stephen and Paul found in the Acts. Both passages use τόπος deliberately for the temple, rather than the customary Lukan ἐπόν, and thus the presence of the word in Acts 7:6-7 is probably significant. As this parallel is in line with the general parallels found in the thematic organization of Luke-Acts as a whole, it is reasonable to conclude, with Conzelman and others, that the use of τόπος here betrays the "hand of Luke."

In summary, then, it appears that we have in Acts 7:6-7 a combination of Gen. 15:13-14 and Ex. 3:12 from the LXX. But is this a citation or a paraphrase? Certainly the placing of Gen 15:13 into indirect speech in Acts 7:6 is indicative of a paraphrase,

---

534 Dupont, "La structure," 165-166; see Conzelman, Acts, 52; but cf. Holtz, 99 n. 3.
535 Köster, 204; see also Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2. 96-100.
536 Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer,'" 252-253.
537 Köster (204-205) argues that the words ὁ τόπος ἡπός have been "carefully selected" in these passages to create the parallel. He further argues that these words place Stephen and Paul in the line of the OT prophets, but he does not elaborate his conclusion.
538 It must be noted, however, that ἐπόν is hardly suitable in a speech to Abraham, as is the case in Acts 7:6-7.
539 See e.g., Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer,'" 220-253; O'Toole, "Parallels Between Jesus and His Disciples," 185-212.
but the introductory formula,\textsuperscript{541} and especially the insertion of \(\hat{o} \theta\varepsilon\hat{o}\zeta\ \varepsilon\iota\pi\varepsilon\nu\) into Acts 7:7, would seem to indicate that part of the passage at least is a citation. Since the author of Acts 7 shifts from indirect to direct speech in referring to Gen. 15:14, we can conclude that Acts 7:6 is a paraphrase. Thus the author, in redacting the OT material into the body of his narrative has introduced a citation with a paraphrase of the immediately preceding OT passage. This would indicate that the author had a clear conception of the context of the passage, and was not simply citing a \textit{testimonium}. The divergences from the LXX for both the paraphrase and the citation may be explained in the most part by reference to redactional considerations. The redactional alterations to the citation, however, reflect more thematic concerns than do the alterations to the paraphrase, which are mostly syntactical, owing to the paraphrasing process. There is some evidence that the author may have used a ms diverging somewhat from our LXX, perhaps slightly Hebraicizing, although the divergences are not significant enough to postulate any major ms tendencies. From the overall integration of the citation into the thematic structure of the speech, the narrative context of Stephen's defence, and the thematic structure of Luke-Acts as a whole, it is reasonable to conclude that the citation is Lukan.

\textsuperscript{541}See above, n. 437.
d. Acts 7:18 = Ex. 1:8

Although some scholars, such as Richard, find a number of OT citations in Acts 7:8-17, it is more generally accepted that the next clear citation from the OT occurs at v. 18. This citation has been characterized as an "almost verbatim" citation of the LXX, and, in fact, there are only two differences from the LXX: (1) Acts omits the δέ after ἀνέστη; (2) some mss of Acts omit ἐπ' ἀγνπτον after ἑτερος.

These differences only deserve a brief comment. Clearly the δέ is replaced in the Acts citation by ἀχρι ώ, thus melding the citation into its narrative context. While the omission of ἐπ' ἀγνπτον is reasonably well attested, so also is its inclusion. The inclusion of the phrase could have come about through the influence of the LXX, but it is equally likely that its omission was due to the fact that the occurrence of ἐν ἀγνπτῳ in v. 17 made ἐπ' ἀγνπτον superfluous. In any case the differences are minor, and the most reasonable conclusion is that the citation is septuagintal. Whether or not the citation is Lukan, of course, depends upon one's view of the speech as a whole. It is to be noted, however, that the phrase ἀχρι ώ with the indicative in a past tense is only

---


543Although there is no introductory formula, the OT passage to which Acts 7:18 refers is so clear as to indicate a direct quotation.

544Conzelman, Acts, 53.


546Metzger, Textual Commentary, 345-346.
found elsewhere in the NT in Acts 27:33, and hence may constitute some evidence of Lukan composition here.


It appears that what we have here in this passage is an absolutely verbatim citation of the latter part of Ex. 2:14 introduced by a summary of v. 13 (there is also a more general allusion to Ex. 2:11-12 in v. 26). The shift into direct citation appears at the beginning of the Hebrew slave's speech to Moses in Ex. 2:14.

The citation of Ex. 2:14 is identical with the LXX, except for the alteration of the introductory words ὅ δὲ εἰσεῖν to εἰς ἔνω (in v. 27). Richard says that this formula is "modified sufficiently to be incorporated within the new composition and still serve its original function, i.e., prefacing direct speech." While certainly accurate, this explanation of the alteration does not really explain much. Stylistically the alteration to εἰς ἔνω is called for by the insertion into the allusion to Ex. 2:13 of the phrase ἀπὸ ἀντικρητικὸν. The latter phrase is not in the LXX nor represented in the MT of Ex. 2:13 and must be considered a redactional addition by the author of Acts 7. Clearly, as Conzelman points out, the reaction of the Hebrew slaves to Moses is made sharper by

---

the addition of this phrase, but it must be acknowledged that the phrase also makes clear that Moses is being rejected by his brethren. The latter is clearly articulated by the use of \( \alpha \pi \omega \delta \varepsilon \omega \) in v. 39 as well. This use of \( \alpha \pi \omega \delta \varepsilon \omega \) appears as part of the Moses-Jesus parallel occurring in Acts 7 which culminates in the refusal of the Jews to recognize Jesus as saviour in the same way in which Moses was rejected by them (see 7:52).

Hanson, in keeping with his conviction that Luke does not use typology very often "and not with any great subtlety," argues that this typology in Acts 7 is not Lukan but originates in his source for Acts 7. Hence, if Hanson is right, this use of \( \alpha \pi \omega \delta \varepsilon \omega \) in Acts 7 is not Lukan, as it is part of the typology of the chapter. But the evidence for Lukan composition here seems stronger than the evidence against it based on typology. For instance, the word \( \alpha \pi \omega \delta \varepsilon \omega \) is found only six times in the NT, including the two occurrences in Acts 7. Elsewhere in the NT it is found only in Rom. 11:1 and 2, where it appears to be taken from Ps. 94:14 (93:14 LXX), in I Tim. 1:19, and in Acts 13:46. Hence, except for the late use of the word in I Timothy, and the apparent borrowing of it from the LXX by Paul, \( \alpha \pi \omega \delta \varepsilon \omega \) appears in the NT as an

---

552 Conzelman, Acts, 53.
553 See BAG, 102.
554 See Marshall, Acts, 140; Goppelt, Typos, 121; see also Holtz, 118; O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," 22-29.
555 Hanson, 87.
556 Ibid, 88.
557 See Barrett, Romans, 207; M&G, 103.
exclusively Lukan word, albeit only in a single instance apart from Acts 7. Furthermore, its use in Acts 7 provides yet another link with Acts 13, and the link is more than merely fortuitous. In Acts 13 αποθέω is used to indicate the rejection of the Gospel by Israel as a nation—in Bruce's words, one of the "subsidiary themes" of the whole book of Acts (cf. 18:6; 28:25-28).\(^{558}\) This theme of rejection also appears strongly in the Gospel of Luke (e.g., 17:25, although αποθέω is not used). That Acts 13:46 is portrayed by Luke as an example of the Jewish rejection of Christ seen throughout Luke-Acts seems to fit with the general tenor of his approach to the Jew-Gentile problem, whether one characterizes this tenor as an anti-Jewish polemic,\(^{559}\) or as a more sympathetic presentation of a tragic episode in the history of salvation.\(^{560}\) That this rejection by Israel is mirrored in the speech of Acts 7 through the portrayal of Israel's rejection of Moses\(^ {561}\) would indicate that the Moses-typology of Acts 7, far from being non-Lukan, is very Lukan indeed, reflecting as it does one of Luke's major themes.\(^ {562}\) Hence, we can conclude that the insertion of the phrase ἀπόκαταστάσιν τοῦ αὐτοῦ into the LXX material of Acts 7:27-28 argues strongly for the Lukan composition of this passage.

---

\(^{558}\)Bruce, Acts (1951), 274.


\(^{561}\)See Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts," 80-81; see also Narrative Unity, 2. 96-100.

\(^{562}\)It is probably more than merely a subsidiary theme as Bruce (Acts, 274) would have it (see also O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," 22-29).
The citation is without doubt septuagintal. This conclusion is supported not only by its verbatim agreement with the LXX, but also by the presence of the word \(\epsilon\chi\theta\epsilon\zeta\), which is evident in LXX but, as Holtz points out, has no referent in the MT.\(^{563}\) That it is a ms of LXX Exodus itself that was used for this passage, and not a testimonium, is to be seen in how closely to the context the author has adhered in introducing the citation of the Hebrew slave's words. Not only does the author cite the relevant material, but clearly indicates its context in the material from which it was taken so that the original can be referred to by subsequent readers.

In summary, then, this passage is perhaps the most important that we have come across for understanding Luke's knowledge of the LXX, especially regarding the Pentateuch. The passage shows that the author of Acts 7 was using LXX Exodus itself, rather than a testimonium, since the introduction to the citation refers to the OT context, and the citation itself is identical with the wording of the LXX. Hence the author knew not only the passage cited, but also its septuagintal context. Furthermore, internal evidence indicates that the author was the author not only of the Stephen speech, but also the author of Acts and even the Gospel of Luke, that is, Luke himself. Therefore, this passage supplies evidence that Luke was familiar with the LXX of the Pentateuch.

\(^{563}\)Holtz, 119.
In this passage we appear to have a summary of Ex. 3:1-2. Most of the verbal material appears to come from Ex. 3:2 with interpolations from 3:1. The divergences from LXX Ex. 3:2 are as follows: (1) Acts precedes the OT reference with the phrase καὶ πληρωθέντων ἐτῶν τεσσεράκοντα which is not from the LXX; (2) Acts omits the δέ between ὁφθη and αὐτῷ; (3) Acts inserts the words ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους between αὐτῷ and ἄγγελος; (4) a number of mss of Acts omit κυρίον after ἄγγελος; (5) a number of mss of Acts have ἐν φλογὶ τυφώς instead of ἐν τυφῇ φλογῇ; and (6) Acts omits ἐκ τοῦ before βάτου.

Point (1) is certainly to be regarded as coming from the author of Acts 7, who introduces the citation with a "time formula."564 The figure "forty years" may simply reflect Jewish tradition about Moses in which his life was divided into three forty year epochs,565 but could easily have been deduced by the author of Acts 7 from the data in Ex. 7:7.566 The omission of the δέ, point (2), appears to be a stylistic alteration, improving the flow of the sentence now that the phrase "and after forty years" has been added. Point (3) concerns the interpolated material from Ex. 3:1. Here it seems that the author has included the information from 3:1 parenthetically in the citation to indicate its context. Interestingly, he changes the information in 3:1 slightly, by altering Χωρῆβ to Σιν. Sinai and Horeb appear to be two names for the same mountain in the

---

566Marshall, Acts, 141.
Pentateuch with documents J and E showing preference for Sinai, while D shows preference for Horeb.\(^{567}\) Jewish tradition also more commonly uses Sinai than Horeb,\(^{568}\) and only Sinai is found in the NT.\(^{569}\) However, the author of Acts 7 need not have been a scholar of Jewish tradition to make the identification of Sinai and Horeb, as such identification could be deduced by comparing Ex. 3:12 and Deut. 1:6 with Ex. 19:11-25.\(^{570}\)

Point (4), the omission of κυρίον after ἄγγελος, involves varying textual readings in Acts 7:30. While mss D, E, Ψ, and the majority text, as well as some mss of the Old Latin, the Syriac, the Middle Egyptian and a single ms of the Bohairic, insert the κυρίον, mss p\(^{74}\), A, B, C, 81, 1175 and a few others, as well as the Italian Gigas ms, the Vulgate, Sahidic and Bohairic omit it.\(^{571}\) Wevers lists no LXX mss as omitting κυρίον, while Brooke-McLean only lists an edition of Cyril (-ed ¼).\(^{572}\) Therefore the source for the omission of κυρίον is not likely the LXX textual tradition. Both NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 accept the omission as the original reading of Acts,\(^{573}\) and Metzger argues that κυρίον is a "natural addition" to the text, since it occurs in Ex. 3:2 LXX.\(^{574}\)


\(^{568}\) Ibid, 283-284.


\(^{570}\) Bruce, Acts (1951), 169.

\(^{571}\) NestleAland26, Acts 7:30.

\(^{572}\) GottLXX2,1 and BrookeMcLean, Ex. 3:2.

\(^{573}\) NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3, Acts 7:30.

\(^{574}\) Metzger, Textual Commentary, 347-348.
Certainly the external evidence would support the omission as original here. Richard has argued that the omission of κυρίου is deliberate by the author of Acts 7, and "intimately related to the structure of this section." While this is a somewhat enigmatic explanation, Holtz argues, somewhat more fully, that the author of the passage has simply not understood the implications of the story in Ex. 3, i.e., that it was actually God and not just an angel who was speaking to Moses out of the burning bush. Holtz further argues that v. 35 is a Lukan interpolation into the text of Acts 7, since Luke misunderstands the meaning of the angel in 7:30 in his interpretation in 7:35. Hence, the author of the source on which Acts 7 is based did not understand the exact significance of "the angel of Yahweh" and omitted the word κυρίου from his citation of Ex. 3:2, and this omission influenced Luke's erroneous interpretation in Acts 7:35. It is unclear, however, how this rather dubious conclusion explains the omission of "of the Lord" after "angel." If the author of Acts 7 did not understand, as Holtz claims, that "the angel of the Lord" stood for Yahweh, what difference would it make in the meaning, for him, if he omitted κυρίου? No change in meaning actually takes place. Furthermore, the OT text speaks of an "angel" in 3:2, so the author of Acts 7 can hardly

---

576Holtz, 96 n.4.
577Ibid, pp. 96-97.
be accused of misunderstanding it if he understood it to mean an "angel." It seems dubious to characterize Luke's interpretation in v. 35 as "erroneous."

Holtz's positing of a source which omitted κυρίων simply does not explain why the omission occurred. On the other hand, the deliberate omission of κυρίων from the citation is clearly understandable as coming from Luke himself. The emphasis on the word άγγελoς throughout Acts 7:30-38, culminating as it does with the description of the law as "ordained by angels" in v. 53, indicates that the author of the speech was more interested in the presence of angels than in the significance of the term "the angel of Yahweh." It is to be noted that the characterization of the law as "ordained by angels" is found elsewhere in early Christian writings (e.g., Gal. 3:19; Heb. 2:2) and was apparently drawn from Jewish tradition (e.g., Jub. 1:29; T. Daniel 6:2; and perhaps Josephus, Ant. 15:136). It is to be noted that there is no Biblical tradition supporting the presence of angels at the giving of the law on Mount Sinai, except the LXX of Deut. 33:2 (ἐκ δεξιῶν αὐτοῦ άγγελοῦ μετ' αὐτοῦ; cf. MT: וַיְהַעֲרַבֻּהָרָאָם). Richard argues, rightly, I think, that in his composition of Acts 7:38, the author has composed his own narrative based on images and language from his earlier composition of 7:35 as well as LXX passages. In so doing, the author has

---

578 Luke (or the author of Acts 7) should be compared with contemporary readings of Ex. 3:2, not with modern critical understandings (in comparison with which he is judged to have "misunderstood" the text). The identification of the "angel of the Lord" and Yahweh was not apparent to the ancients in general. This hesitancy to identify the two is found frequently in the LXX where both figure as separate entities (e.g., Judg. 6:14 [cf. 6:11-12]; 2:1ff).


taken the angel from the bush and transferred it to Sinai, thus making the angelic presence continuous throughout Moses’ career. Acts 7:30-38 and 53 thus appear to be a unity thematically and do not support the divisions into non-Lukan and Lukan material of Haenchen, Conzelman and Holtz.\(^{581}\) Furthermore, vv. 30-38 seem to be intimately connected thematically with v. 53, making it more than likely that the whole speech is a unity, composed by one author. That the author is Luke is evident from the Lukan material found in the passage by the above-mentioned authors.

Therefore, Richard is probably correct in asserting that the omission of \(\kappaυρίου\) is deliberate on Luke’s part.\(^{582}\) I think it is going too far on the basis of the available evidence to state that Luke was ignorant of Ex. 3 LXX since he did not emphasize the particular significance of \(\gammaγγελος \kappaυρίου\) in Ex. 3:2, as understood by modern Biblical scholars.\(^{583}\) The LXX elements in the composition of 7:38 alone are enough to show familiarity with the LXX.\(^{584}\) Rather, Luke excises the word \(\kappaυρίου\) from his citation of Ex. 3:2 in order to give prominence to the theme of the "angel" and thus draw attention to the Jewish and Christian tradition of the Law having been delivered by angels.\(^{585}\)

\(^{581}\)See Haenchen, Acts, 288-289; Conzelman, Acts, 57; Holtz, 98-99; although they may support the analysis of Dibelius (Studies, 167-170), except that vv. 30-34 would need to be included as Lukan material.


\(^{583}\)Against Holtz (96-97).


\(^{585}\)Bruce (Themes, 36) suggests that the emphasis on the angel in Acts 7:30 and 38 may imply that Jesus was the “angel” which appeared to Moses in the burning bush and later at Sinai.
Point (5), the alteration of ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς to ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς in some mss of Acts, is more difficult to assess textually. The former phrase is read by Acts mss p74, A, C, E, 36, 323, 945, 1739, and some others, the Vulgate, and the Peshitta, while the latter is read by Acts mss K, B, D, Ψ, the majority text, the Italian Gigas ms, Old Latin ms p, and the Harclean Syriac. Clearly the external evidence is not decisive here. This is complicated by the fact that there is significant LXX ms support for ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς (A, F, 0-29-135, C 108(me), d, n, 30, t, y, 128, 59, 130, 424, 509, etc.), and has been adopted by Rahlfs. Hence, although the textual issues are not simple, there is enough textual evidence to support a LXX origin for the citation whether one accepts ἐν πυρὶ φλογὸς or ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς as the original reading of Acts.

Point (6), the omission of ἐκ τοῦ before βάτου, can probably be accounted for as an unintentional omission, or at the most, a form of stylistic pruning. It does not represent any attempt to come closer to the MT (יְהַלְדוֹן).

Therefore, in summary, the citation of Ex. 3:2 in Acts 7:30 appears to be both septuagintal and Lukan, with certain alterations owing either to textual reasons or redactional factors involved in the themes of the speech.

---

587 See GottLXX2.1 and RahlfsLXX, Ex. 3:2.
g. Acts 7:32 = Ex. 3:6

I have already dealt with this passage in the discussion of Acts 3:13 (pp. 247-254 above), and thus need only to make some additional comments here. The divergences from the LXX of Ex. 3:6 are as follows: (1) Acts omits εἰμι after ἐγὼ; (2) Acts changes the singular τοῦ πατρὸς to plural τῶν πατέρων; (3) Acts adds the article ὁ to the second θεός; (4) some mss of Acts omit the third and fourth θεός.

This may be one case in which Luke is not referring to the LXX in his citation of an OT passage. I noted in reference to 3:13 that Wilcox attributes the similarities between the two citations to a common non-LXX source. In disagreement with this conclusion, however, I have argued that the two citations may have influenced each other (see above, p. 252). Thus I think that here Luke has simply reproduced the same form of the citation as in 3:13 with some changes owing to context. In other words, Acts 3:13 is his source for Acts 7:32. Hence Luke does not actually omit εἰμι, point (1), but rather adds ἐγὼ. He has simply added a subject to the Acts 3:13 citation and has not included the full ἐγὼ εἰμι since he is not reproducing the LXX, but rather is simply adding a subject to the citation of 3:13. Similarly, he reproduces the plural τῶν πατέρων from 3:13, according to his preference (see above, p. 253), and also since it makes more sense as three fathers are mentioned (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob). He does, however, move τῶν πατέρων back to its septuagintal place in the sentence, probably

588 See Wilcox, Semitisms, 31, 34.
589 Cf. Holtz, 122.
because he intentionally removed it to the end of the sentence in 3:13 (although the reason for this is unclear; see above, p. 248), and simply restores it in 7:32. He similarly retains the article before the second \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \), point (3), as found in his "source," Acts 3:13.

The omission of the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) is more difficult, however. When we discussed Acts 3:13 we noted that on the basis of the textual evidence, the longer reading (that containing the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) with the article) was to be preferred (see above, p. 251). In this case, however, the textual evidence seems to point the other way. Only ms D for Acts contains the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) as found in the LXX, while ms E, the majority text, part of the Old Latin in agreement with the Vulgate, and the Coptic have the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) with the article. On the other hand, the omission of both the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) is supported by p74, \( \kappa \), A, B, C, \( \Psi \), 36, 81, 614, 1175, and a few others, as well as some mss of the Vulgate, all the Syriac witnesses, and some mss of the Sahidic. It seems reasonable to agree with Metzger in according superiority to the latter combination of witnesses and thus accepting the omission of the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) as original here.

Richard agrees with the above analysis of the textual data and argues that the third and fourth \( \theta \varepsilon \dot{o} \varsigma \) have been omitted through a conflation of Ex. 3:6 and a

---

591 See also Bock, 187; Sibinga, 39.
593 Metzger, Textual Commentary, 349.
594 Richard has 2:6, likely a typographical error.
Hebraicizing version of the LXX of Ex. 3:16. The MT for Ex. 3:16 omits יְהֹשֵׁעַ before יִהוּדָה and יְהוּדָה; however, the LXX alone among all versions does not follow the MT. Hence, Richard has to postulate the existence of such a Hebraicizing version for 3:16. He also suggests influence from the LXX of Ex. 2:24 which reads:

καὶ ἐμνήσθη ὁ θεὸς τῆς διαθήκης αὐτοῦ τῆς πρὸς Αβραὰμ καὶ Ισαὰκ καὶ Ιακωβ,

and further avers that the omission fits well with the author's "thematic schema." Richard's explanations have little to recommend them. Whether the omission fits Luke's thematic schema is hard to determine since Richard does not elaborate on how the omission of θεὸς contributes to such a schema. Again, the influence of Ex. 2:24 LXX or a Hebraicizing version of Ex. 3:16 is possible, but only if it be recognized as a broader stylistic influence that caused Luke to omit the third and fourth θεὸς as a way of making the citation more concise. In other words, the omission is probably due to Lukan stylistic pruning in this case and nothing more.

One other point, however, needs to be made about this citation. As we noted in regard to Acts 3:13, Luke refers to the words "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" three different times (Acts 3:13; 7:32; Luke 20:37) in three different ways, and the

---

596Ibid, 96 n. 169.
597Ibid, 96.
598Ibid.
599There is textual support for such a reading for 3:16 (see GottLXX2,1, Ex. 3:16).
600It cannot be direct influence from Ex. 2:24, since θεὸς with each patriarch is hardly possible there.
formula had more than one accepted form (see above, pp. 252-253). With this in mind, we should not be too quick to discard the idea that Luke may have been quoting from memory or simply referring to the Biblical formula rather than referring to an actual OT text.

In summary, therefore, it appears that the citation of Acts 7:32 is intimately related to that of Acts 3:13, perhaps with the latter as the source for the former. On the other hand, it is equally likely that we have here simply a quote from memory or a loose citation of a common formula referring to God. In either case, the ultimate source for the citation was the LXX.

h. Acts 7:33-34 = Ex. 3:5-10 + 2:24 (5:6) (+ Josh. 5:15?)

Acts 7:33-34 presents us with a very complicated situation. It appears to be a summary of Ex. 3:5-10, in which the author has cited various sections of the material, leaving others out, in order to summarize the story of Ex. 3:5-10 in the language of the story itself.

My first task, therefore, is to sort out the passages cited. The phrase εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὅ κύριος appears perhaps to come from Ex. 3:7. More clearly, Ἀδωνις τὸ ὑπόθεμα τῶν ποδῶν σου, ὅ γὰρ τόπος ἐφ' ὃ ἔστηκας γῆ ἀγία ἔστιν comes from Ex. 3:5. The sentence reading ἠδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναχγεῖν αὐτῶν ἠκούσα comes from Ex. 3:7. The phrase καὶ κατέβη ἐξελέσθαι

---

αὐτοῦς comes from Ex. 3:8. Finally, καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἰγύπτων comes from Ex. 3:10.

The differences from the LXX are numerous especially if one includes all the detail that is left out of the Acts citation. These sorts of omissions are germane to a summary, however, and thus occasion no comment. Other differences, however, should be noted, and are as follows: (1) if the introductory words εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ κύριος do come from Ex. 3:7, they have been altered from εἶπεν δὲ Κύριος πρὸς Μωυσῆν; (2) LXX λύσων has been changed to λῦσον; (3) ἐκ has been omitted before τῶν ποδῶν σου; (4) ἐν ὁ was after τόπος has become ἐφʼ ὁ; (5) σὺ has been omitted before ἔστηκας; (6) τῆς κραυγῆς has been changed to τοῦ στεναχυμοῦ; (7) some mss of Acts have αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτῶν after τοῦ στεναχυμοῦ; (8) most mss of Acts have ἤκουσα instead of ἄκηκας; (9) some mss of Acts have ἀποστέλλω instead of ἀποστείλω; and (10) πρὸς Φαραώ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτων has become εἰς Αἰγύπτων.

A number of these divergencies can be explained as part of the shortening process involved in the act of summarizing: the omission of ἐκ, point (3), σὺ, point (5), and the change of πρὸς Φαραώ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτων to εἰς Αἰγύπτων, point (10). On the other hand, as Holtz notes, the textual evidence in the LXX is such that the σὺ (point [5]) may have been missing in the author’s text of the LXX.\(^{602}\) The σὺ is omitted in LXX mss A, 707, 126, 118*-537, 106, 53 ´, 121, Carl 49, etc.\(^{603}\) As the MT contains the

---

\(^{602}\) Holtz, 124.

\(^{603}\) GottLXX2.1, Ex. 3:5.
pronoun ἅμα. Holtz notes that the omission of ᾧ could not be a Hebraicizing alteration and concludes that ᾧ may have been missing in the original LXX at this point. Richard argues that the omission of ἐκ, point (3), in favour of a simple genitival construction, is typical of the author's stylistic tendency, while Holtz notes that the change of πρὸς Φαραώ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου to εἰς Αἰγυπτον, point (10), may indicate that the author of Acts 7 is not interested in the person of Pharaoh, but rather in the movements of Moses himself. Thus he excises the reference to Pharaoh. Richard considers the last εἰς Αἰγυπτον to be an addition to the text based on the author's structural plan, rather than a condensation of the septuagintal phrase. All of these latter explanations have some merit, but it seems simpler and equally adequate to conclude that the omissions mentioned above are words and phrases which fell victim to the author's summarizing process.

As far as point (1) is concerned, while the wording may have some reference to Ex. 3:7, it is unlikely that a citation is intended. Rather, an introductory formula has been composed and inserted by the author of Acts 7 himself.

---

604 Holtz, 124 n. 5.
605 Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 98; Holtz (125) says somewhat enigmatically that it "softens the style."
606 Holtz, 125.
608 See Ibid, 97.
Point (2), the change of λοσατι to λοσαν (middle to active voice), may be explained as a stylistic improvement, although it may reflect more than that. For example, it is to be noted that LXX minuscules 72-618, b, 121-527, z, 55, Carl 49 read λοσαν. It is barely possible that these minuscules reflect a text current in Luke's day, but it is more likely that the minuscules were influenced by Acts. Somewhat more likely is the suggestion that the Acts citation was influenced by the similar passage in Josh. 5:15 which reads λοσαν in ms A. Richard also suggests the influence of the logion in Acts 13:25 (cf. Luke 3:16), concerning the "loosing" of the sandals of Jesus' feet by John. However, it is very difficult to understand what significance this logion would have had on the present passage, especially since the logion has infinitive λοσατι. It is more reasonable to conclude, rather, that the change from middle to active has a stylistic basis, although the reason for such a change remains somewhat obscure.

In any case, even with the change from middle to active, the use of a form of λυειν for the Hebrew יוע (יוע) indicates clearly that the LXX is the basis for this citation. The Hebrew word means to "draw off" (or "take off") something such as a shoe, or perhaps, as Holtz puts it, "to undress" ("ausziehen"). The word λυειν

---

609Holtz, 125.
610GottLXX2, 1, Ex. 3:5.
612See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 98 n. 178; BrookeMacLean, Josh. 5:15; but cf. RahlfsLXX, Josh. 5:15; see also Holtz, 125 n. 2.
613Ibid, 98; Richard mistakenly refers to this "logion" as a word of Jesus.
614BDB, 675.
is not a readily perceived equivalent for this word, and hence Aquila changed it to ἐκπανομένων, while Symmachus changed it to ὑπόλυσας, in Ex. 3:5. Hence the preservation of λῦσαν in Acts 7:33 indicates the LXX as source.

The change of ἐν φε to τόπος to ἐφ' φε, point (4), is probably a stylistic change as well. Both Wevers and Richard argue that the ἐφ' φε comes from Josh. 5:15. In the latter passage the LXX does read ἐφ' φε. Wilcox, however, has noted that ἐφ' φε is a closer reflection of the underlying Hebrew text, which in the MT reads חַגָּל. He also notes that Aquila reads ἐπ' αὐτοῦ, which is much closer to the MT. He concludes from this that it is possible that the author of Acts 7 was using a Greek version other than the LXX, which preserved the form of the Hebrew more literally, although he would not exclude influence from the Hebrew itself. It must be pointed out, however, that Aquila *adds* ἐπ' αὐτοῦ to the text, retaining ἐν φε, as do the few LXX minuscules which evidence ἐπ' αὐτοῦ. While it is not impossible that the author has a Hebraicizing LXX ms which read ἐφ' φε, the existence of such a ms is speculative. Influence from Josh. 5:15 is also possible, although it is hardly likely that there has been any direct

---

615(...continued)
616Holtz, 124.
617Holtz, 124-125.
618See GottLXX2.1, Ex. 3:5; see also Holtz, 125.
619See Holtz, 124-125.
621Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 42.
622See GottLXX2.1, Ex. 3:5; Richard, "Old Testament," 338.
623As does LXX minuscule 130.
influence. Rather, it is more probable that Luke's style at this point has been influenced by the LXX (especially the style of passages like LXX Josh. 5:15). In any event, very likely Luke considered επι more natural in the expression, as did the translator of Josh. 5:15.\footnote{Holtz (123-124 n. 4; see also BAG, 286) argues that εφ’ ὕπτρον actually means "before which" rather than "upon which" ("vor dem" rather than "auf dem"), and thus the author of Acts 7 is not saying that the place where Moses is standing is holy ground, but rather that the place where God revealed Himself is holy ground, that is, the burning bush itself. If Holtz is correct, then the reading εφ’ ὕπτρον does not come closer to the Hebrew at all. Holtz seems to argue that the author of Acts 7 is responsible for the shift of meaning between εφ’ ὕπτρον and εφ’ ὑπέρ, and thus would argue for a redactional alteration here. It seems to me, however, difficult to demonstrate that such a significant change of meaning has in fact occurred in Acts 7:33.}

Turning to point (6), the change of τῆς κραυγῆς to τοῦ στεναγμοῦ, we find no evidence for the latter in the LXX except Chrysostom (Chr 1/4),\footnote{BrookeMcLean, Ex. 3:7 (GottLXX2.1 only lists Acts 7:34).} and that late Patristic reference was likely influenced by Acts. Appeal to the MT is no help, as the Hebrew ἵλα, "cry, outcry,"\footnote{BDB, 858.} corresponds better to the LXX reading τῆς κραυγῆς, "a loud cry, clamour,"\footnote{BAG, 450.} than to τοῦ στεναγμοῦ, "sigh, groan."\footnote{Ibid, 773; Holtz, 125 n. 8.} Both Holtz and Richard agree that the word στεναγμός has crept into the citation in Acts 7:34 through influence from either Ex. 6:5 or 2:24 or both.\footnote{Holtz, 125; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 99-100.} Ex. 6:5 reads καὶ ἐγώ εἰσήκουσα τὸν στεναγμόν τῶν νιών Ἰσραήλ while 2:24 reads καὶ εἰσήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν στεναγμόν αὐτῶν. In both the latter passages τὸν στεναγμόν translates the Hebrew ἵλα, "groan,
Hence, we can conclude that influence from these verses must have come from the LXX of these verses. Holtz appears more inclined to accept influence from Ex. 6:5, whereas Richard favours influence from Ex. 2:24. Either is possible, although it is to be noted that the author also appears to use Ex. 6:6 in composing Acts 7:35 (see below p. 366), which indicates that he had that portion of the LXX in mind when he composed this chapter.

The problem of point (7), αὐτοὺ instead of αὐτῶν after τοῦ στεναγμοῦ in some mss of Acts, can probably be settled textually. Only mss B and D of Acts 7 have αὐτοὺ in v. 34, while p74, Ψ, A, C, E, and the majority text read αὐτῶν. Metzger argues:

since the singular number αὐτοῦ . . . is the more correct form grammatically (it refers to τοῦ λαοῦ) it is probable that αὐτῶν . . . is the original reading which was altered by punctilious scribes.

Holtz further notes that if αὐτοῦ were original and αὐτῶν were considered an assimilation to the LXX, it is hard to imagine that the scribe would not have changed τοῦ στεναγμοῦ.

---

628BDB, 611.
629Holtz, 125.
631See Ibid, 104.
632NestleAland26, Acts 7:34.
633Metzger, Textual Commentary, 349.
back to της κρανγής. Hence, it is likely that αυτῶν is the original reading in Acts 7:34.

Point (8), that most mss of Acts have ἡκουσα instead of ἀκῆκοα, can also be settled textually. Only D, 1175, and a few others read ἀκῆκοα in Acts 7:34, while the rest read ἡκουσα. Hence, it is quite likely that the latter is the original reading here. Richard argues that the author takes the form of the verb from Ex. 2:24, εἰσήκουσεν, from which he has removed the prefix in accord with his stylistic tendencies. He also suggests that there may be some influence from Jer. 4:31, which reads, ὅτι φωνήν ὡς ὕδωρύσης ἡκουσα, τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου. This, however, seems to me to be a very complicated explanation, whereas the explanation of Holtz, that the author tends to change the perfect to aorist in his OT citations, is simpler and more adequate.

Finally, turning to point (10), some mss of Acts have ἀποστέλλω instead of ἀποστείλω. The former is read by ms Ψ, and the majority text, while the latter is read by p74, Π, A, B, C, D, E, 81, 614, 945, 1175, 1739, and others. The weight of evidence clearly supports the septuagintal reading here.
In summary, then, Acts 7:33-34 appears to be a summary citation of Ex. 3:5-10, with some influence from Ex. 6:5 (or 2:24) and perhaps Josh. 5:15. In spite of the divergences from the LXX, there is enough evidence to indicate that the LXX was the origin of this citation. Holtz agrees with this analysis and adds that the septuagintal origin of the citation is confirmed by the odd rendering of ἔλθει by κακῶσις (the more likely rendering would be τοπείνωσις), and the similarity in the presentation of Ex. 3:10, καὶ νῦν δεύτερο τῶστειλω σε, with the aorist subjunctive for the future and the omission of the copulative before τῶστειλω, contrary to the MT (ὁ ἐλθεῖ). There is no definite evidence present indicative of Lukan or non-Lukan origin. Given, however, its LXX origin, and the Lukan origin of most of the foregoing material, a Lukan origin for this passage is likely.


The only certain citation in this verse comes from Ex. 2:14, and like the citation (of Ex. 2:14) in Acts 7:27, is identical with the LXX, except for the omission of ἐφ’ ἡμῶν. The latter omission has likely come about because the author is only referring back to the previous citation, not citing directly. Since the author is summarizing

---

640 Holtz, 124.
641 Holtz (125 n. 1) argues for a relationship between Acts 7:33 and Acts 13:25. Such a relationship would possibly indicate another link between the Stephen speech and Acts 13 and provides more evidence for Lukan authorship of Acts 7 (see Townsend, 155). The evidence of such a relationship, however, seems quite tenuous.
various parts of the story of Moses that he has already told, he did not need to cite all of the passage from Exodus, but only refer back to it.

For the latter part of the verse, it seems fairly obvious that the author is again not citing the LXX directly, but merely referring back to his former citation in Acts 7:30: σὺν χειρὶ ἀγγέλου τοῦ ὀφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάτῳ (Acts 7:30: ὥφθη αὐτῷ . . . ἀγγελος ἐν φλογί τυρός βάτου). The strange τῇ βάτῳ seems to be an example of "metapasm," or "fluctuation of declension" in regards to ἤ βάτος.\footnote{See BDF, 28; but cf. BAG, 137; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 103-104 n. 183.}

Finally, Richard has also argued that the words τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς [καὶ] ἀρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτήν ἀπεσταλκεν are influenced by Ex. 6:6: καὶ λυτρώσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ καὶ κρίσει μεγάλῃ, especially the word λυτρωτὴν.\footnote{Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 104.} While this certainly may be the case, it is hardly more than a brief allusion to the passage and as such it is difficult to determine its origin with any sort of exactitude.

In summary, then, Acts 7:35 contains a direct citation of Ex. 2:14 from the LXX and alludes to Ex. 3:2, and possibly Ex. 6:6. The author does not, however, refer directly to the LXX in citing the two former passages, but rather refers back to his own citation of them in Acts 7:27 and 30. The references are clearly septuagintal, and Holtz confidently argues that the Acts 7:35 is Lukan.\footnote{Holtz, 96.} Although I find his reasons for
concluding that v. 35 is a secondary Lukan addition somewhat suspect (see above on v. 30; p. 352), I have no argument with his conclusion.646

j. *Acts 7:37 = Deut. 18:15*

As the citation of Deut. 18:15 was also found at Acts 3:22, many of the findings regarding the latter verse are applicable to this one (see above, pp. 254-273). The differences from the LXX are as follows: (1) the words ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμὲ have been moved from their place following προφήτην to the end of the citation, after ὁ θεός; (2) the σου has been changed to ὑμῶν; (3) σοι has been changed to ὑμῖν and moved from its place after ἀναστήσει to just after προφήτην; (4) the words κύριος ὁ θεός σου have been altered to the simple ὁ θεός; (5) many mss of Acts omit αἴτων ἀκούσεσθε from the end.

The change in word order, point (1), is essentially the same as that in Acts 3:22, and can be explained, as there, by influence from Deut. 18:18 (see above pp 256-256, 269-269).647 Similarly, the change from singular to plural, points (2) and (3), as in Acts 3:22, likely reflects the adaptation of the citation to the needs of the speech-format,648 with possible influence from the plurals in Deut. 18:18 (see above, pp. 270-271).649 The "throwing-forward" of the ὑμῖν, point (3), also paralleled in Acts 3:22,


647Rese, 87; Bock, 192.

648Rese, 67; Bock, 191.

probably is a redactional move by the author of Acts to place more emphasis on the listeners as recipients of the eschatological prophet (see above, p. 270).

Clearly there is some relationship between the two citations of Deut. 18:15. Holtz’s suggestion that Luke has used the citation from Acts 3:22 in composing Acts 7:35, simply shortening it and making certain alterations, is a reasonable assumption as far as it goes. After all, Luke has been doing just that with OT citations from earlier in the Stephen speech in the verses immediately preceding this citation (see above, p. 366). The likelihood of his summarizing material from another speech is not unreasonable, especially if the other speech was his own composition. This, however, does not mean that he was unfamiliar with LXX Deuteronomy. Often writers will summarize part of their earlier work, taking the material for their summary from that earlier work, rather than going back to the original sources.

Hence, I think it is fair to conclude that Luke is using his citation of Acts 3:22 as his source for Acts 7:37. This, however, does not account for two of the above divergences from the LXX: point (4), the change of κύριος ὁ θεός σου to ὁ θεός, and, point (5), the omission by many mss of Acts of αὐτοῦ ἀκούσατε. While Holtz argues that the omissions of point (4) do not affect the meaning of the text, Bock considers the omissions to be very significant indeed. He says:

This change is both a strong and subtle alteration. It suggests that the nation's disobedience leaves them with no special claim of relationship to God. It seems quite unlikely that the omission is a part of Lucan

---

650 Holtz, 97-98.

651 Ibid, 97.
redaction since it is quite out of character with the rest of the speech appeals in Acts. In Acts 13.17, God is still seen as the God of the people of Israel. So also in Acts 13.33, where the Davidic promises are referred to the listeners in the synagogue (Acts 13.38). This view is consistently held in the earlier speeches as well. Even as far as Acts 28 the break with Judaism is still in the process of being declared and it is not seen as final. This alteration gives evidence that a source with a slightly stronger perspective than Luke is being used here. 652

Bock concludes that a primitive early church tradition is the source for this citation, following the arguments for Samaritan influence on the Stephen speech as adumbrated by, for example, Abram Spiro and Martin Scharlemann. 653 He follows John Kilgallen 654 in rejecting Lukan redaction of this portion of the Stephen speech, 655 and also follows Wilcox in noting that the changes from singular to plural pronouns (points [2] and [3] above) reflect the collective sense of the MT ʼמגʼ (also suffix ʼמגʼ), but tends rather toward a Semitic text as the source of the citation rather than Wilcox’s proposal of an alternate Greek OT version. 656 Hence, Bock’s conclusions can be summarized by saying that the citation is a non-Lukan traditional text reflecting a Semitic original, and possibly reflecting the Jewish Christian arm of the earliest church. 657

As most of the evidence regarding Samaritan influence and the possibility of a text-form other than the LXX being used for Deut. 18:15 has been discussed in relation to

---

652Bock, 219-220.

653Spiro, 285; Scharlemann, 45-51.

654Kilgallen, 76-79.

655Bock, 220; see also Rese, 78-80.

656Wilcox, Semitisms, 37; Bock, 219.

657See Bock, 218-221.
Acts 3:22 (see above, pp. 255-268), I will simply note that in regard to the latter passage, it was concluded that there was no compelling evidence to indicate that the citation was other than septuagintal and Lukan (see above, p. 273). It is to be noted as well that Hebrew is not the sole possessor of a "collective singular," but that Greek (and, I suppose, most languages) also evidences such a construction. Thus it is not at all conclusive to point to the Hebrew collective singulars as necessary bases for the plurals in Acts, as Luke could just as easily have interpreted the Greek singulars in the LXX as plurals. Hence, it is more than likely that the LXX is in view here.

But what about the omission of κυρίος and ὑμῶν (as in Acts 3:22; LXX has σου) from before and after ὁ θεός? Is this indeed as important and non-Lukan an alteration as Bock suggests? Richard argues that the alteration to the simple ὁ θεός is explained by the preference for the latter of the author of Acts 7 (vv. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9c, 17, etc.). Much the same thing could be said for Acts as a whole. Of the 173 references to θεός in Acts, Moulton and Geden list only two references to κυρίος ὁ θεός, and only one reference to θεός with a possessive pronoun. Therefore, it would seem that it is not only in Acts 7 that Luke has a preference for the simple ὁ θεός. But could there be more to this omission, as Bock argues? The evidence would seem to indicate that Luke does

---

658 See e.g., Robertson, 409.


660 See M&G, 445-447; it is to be noted that M&G do not contain the reading with ὑμῶν in Acts 3:22. The omission of ὑμῶν is witnessed by p鸴, B, f66, it鸴, cop鸴, and Chrysostom Cosmas Paschal Chronicle (UBSGNT3, Acts 3:22). Metzger (Textual Commentary, 315) states that "it appears that the Alexandrian text, with its usual tendency toward parsimony, has eliminated the pronoun after θεός." Given the other readings with ὑμῶν, it is most likely that ὑμῶν is original. Hence, there appear to be two readings in Acts of θεός with the possessive pronoun.
not like to attach a possessive pronoun to the word "God" if at all possible throughout the book of Acts, not just in this one passage. The cause of his distaste is of course a matter for speculation, but it may have something to do with his concern to include the Gentiles in the people of God.661 This form of universalism may have affected his desire to maintain the word \(\theta\epsilon\omicron\zeta\) without any possessive pronoun whenever possible. Thus God is not the God of any particular people, but of all. In Acts 7:35, then, as Bock suggests, God is no longer the peculiar possession of the people of Israel, but this is not so much polemic, as Bock contends, as universalism.

I am not sure, however, that all this speculation is necessary. Once we have established the Lukan preference for the simple \(\delta\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\zeta\), and have noted that Luke is merely referring to Acts 3:22 in a summary fashion, then Holtz’s conclusion that the omissions probably are simply part of the shortening process which Luke has used at this point has a good claim to validity.662 Rather than some theological point being made, it is highly likely that Luke has simply effected here a stylistic shortening.663

Point (5), the omission by many mss of Acts of \(\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\\omicron\ άκούσεσθε\), is both a textual and a redactional problem, although in neither case particularly difficult. Acts mss C, D (*), E, 33, 36, 323, 614, 945, (1175), 1241, 1739, and others, as well as the Italian Gigas ms, the Syriac, the Middle Egyptian and the Bohairic include \(\alpha\iota\tau\omicron\ άκούσεσθε\),

661See e.g., Marshall, Acts, 29-32.
662Holtz, 97.
663The insertion of \(\kappa\iota\rho\iota\omicron\zeta\) in Acts 7:35 by mss C, E, H, P, and others, and the addition of \(\hat{\eta}\mu\omega\nu\) by mss E, H, and most minuscules, or \(\hat{i}\mu\omega\nu\) by ms P, some minuscules and the Textus Receptus, can be ascribed quite confidently to assimilation to the LXX of Deut. 18:15 or Acts 3:22 (Metzger, Textual Commentary, 350).
while p⁴⁵ (apparently), κ, A, B, Ψ, the majority text, as well as the Stuttgart Vulgate, and the Sahidic omit them. Clearly, the immediate context of Acts 7:35 has no place for the omitted words, and thus one can confidently conclude that Luke has omitted them on purpose, while their addition in the Acts ms tradition is likely due to scribal assimilation to the LXX or Acts 3:22.

In summary, then, the citation of Deut. 18:15 in Acts 7:37 is both Lukan and septuagintal, although it is actually redacted from Luke's earlier citation of the verse in Acts 3:22. Hence the citation has gone through a two-stage redaction from its original form in the LXX. Firstly, Luke has adapted it to the context of Acts 3:22, and, secondly, has taken that adaptation and summarized it and adapted it to the context of Acts 7:35.

\[ k. \text{Acts 7:40} = \text{Ex. 32:1 (32:23)} \]

Acts 7:40 contains a citation either from Ex. 32:1 or 32:23, which are almost exactly alike. The mention of Aaron's name at the beginning of the citation points to 32:1 as the source for the citation; however the omission of \( \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \eta \theta \) points to 32:23. It is not unlikely that Luke had both in mind as he cited this passage, since, as we have seen, he does tend to compare various similar OT passages when searching for the desired form for his citations (e.g., see above, pp 237).

---


⁶⁶⁵ Metzger, Textual Commentary, 350.
The differences from the LXX of Ex. 32:1 are as follows: (1) Acts replaces the introductory words συνέστη ο λαός ἐπὶ Ἄαρων καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ with εἰπόντες τῷ Ἄαρων; (2) ἀνάστηθι καὶ is omitted; (3) the spelling of Μωϋσῆς is altered to Μῶυσῆς; (4) ὁ ἄνθρωπος is omitted after Μῶυσῆς ὁ τότες; (5) LXX γέγονεν is altered by many Acts mss to ἐγένετο.666

The introductory words, point (1), are probably not to be taken as part of the citation, but rather as an introductory formula composed by the author to indicate the context of the citation.667 Since the story as a whole in Ex. 32 is about Aaron, it is not even necessary to conclude that he got the name Ἄαρων from v. 1. Hence, there is really nothing to prevent his actually citing v. 23. There, in agreement with the MT (which lacks ὁμιλεῖ), the LXX omits ἀνάστηθι καὶ, just as in Acts (point [2]). The latter indicates that Ex. 32:23 is the model for Luke's citation here, rather than 32:1, although on all other points the two LXX verses are identical.668 Point (3), the variation in spelling, can be simply explained as the difference in preference between the translator of LXX Exodus and the author of Acts.

666While Rahlfs LXX reads ιξ before Ἀγώνιον in Ex. 32:1 and 32, Gotz LXX2.1 reads ιξ γῆς, following ms A and others. The reading ιξ γῆς comes closer to the MT reading Ωδὴ Μῶυσῆς ὁ τότες, and could indicate that ms A and the others were influenced by a slightly Hebraicizing recension (see Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 117). Wevers, however, comments that only ιξ γῆς "can be correct for Exod as the pattern of translation for 'out of the land (of Egypt)' shows" (Notes on the Greek Text, 518). In any case, the textual evidence is such that it is very likely that Luke found this reading in his ms of the LXX (see Holtz, 126).


668See Holtz, 126 n. 2.
Points (4) and (5) are probably redactional alterations. Holtz argues that the omission of ὀ ἀνθρωπος, point (4), is simply owing to its being superfluous.\textsuperscript{669} On the other hand, Richard argues that the author of Acts 7 tends to replace ἀνθρωπος by ἀνήρ (7:2, 26),\textsuperscript{670} arguing, perhaps, for a simple stylistic alteration here. In any case, the omission appears to be redactional, probably for stylistic reasons. As far as point (5) goes, the textual data are as follows: mss D, E, Ψ, and the majority text, as well as Cyril, read γέγονεν, while mss p\textsuperscript{74}, א, B, C, 36, 945, 1175, 1739, and a few others read ἐγένετο.\textsuperscript{671} The textual evidence is difficult, as Holtz implies, since it is somewhat hard to imagine that all the witnesses for γέγονεν are simply assimilating to the LXX text.\textsuperscript{672} Holtz also notes, however unlikely he may consider it, that since the perfect γέγονεν is stylistically somewhat better than the aorist ἐγένετο, one could consider the mss with the perfect to have made a stylistic improvement on the original aorist.\textsuperscript{673} Perhaps if we consider both the possibility of assimilation to the LXX and the possibility of stylistic improvement, we can account for the strong witness for γέγονεν in the mss tradition. In any event, it seems most reasonable to assume that the aorist is original.\textsuperscript{674} It is to be noted that the author of Acts 7 makes frequent use of

\textsuperscript{669}Holtz, 126.

\textsuperscript{670}Richard, \textit{Acts 6:1-8:4}, 85 n. 137, 117. He also argues that sometimes the author eliminates the word (e.g., 7:46 in relation to Psalm 89:21).

\textsuperscript{671}Nestle\textendash Aland 26, Acts 7:40.

\textsuperscript{672}Holtz, 126.

\textsuperscript{673}Ibid, 126 n. 4.

\textsuperscript{674}Ibid, 126.
the ἐγένετο form (six times within the Stephen material),675 and he has similarly changed perfect ἀκῇκος to aorist ἤκουσα in Acts 7:34.676 Therefore, a certain predilection of the author of Acts 7 for the aorist explains the reading in Acts 7:40.

In summary, then, the citation of Acts 7:40 is from the LXX.677 Some minor stylistic changes have been made in the passage, but its septuagintal origin is shown by the reproduction of προπορεύοντοι ἡμᾶς in translating ἡμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ πάσα ἐπὶ τῷ πάσα, and by the reproduction in the same places of two similar anacolutha.678 There is no certain evidence in this citation to tell if it comes from Luke or not, but seeing as all the other citations in the chapter, and especially those in the immediate vicinity, appear to be Lukan, it is a reasonable conclusion that Acts 7:40 is also Lukan.

1. Summary: The Pentateuch in Acts 7

From the evidence which has been presented in this study, it seems reasonable to conclude that the citations from the Pentateuch in Acts 7 all come from the LXX, although they have in many cases been heavily redacted to fit the narrative context. In some cases (e.g., Acts 7:27-28) it is clear that the author knows the LXX well, since he not only cites a passage, but refers explicitly to its context. This sort of evidence tends to support Dodd’s contention that NT writers creatively interact with the OT material that

---

676See Holtz, 126.
677Containing the, perhaps, slightly Hebraicized reading ἐκ γῆς (see above, n. 666).
678Holtz, 126 n. 5; see also BDF, 243.
they use, rather than simply quote proof-texts, and tends to rule out the use of testimonia. Hence, the LXX itself was the source for the Pentateuch citations of Acts 7.

So we can conclude that the author of Acts 7 knew the LXX well. But was this author Luke? The evidence from the citations themselves, as presented above, indicates that Luke could easily have composed Acts 7, and there is no firm evidence that he could not have. In fact, unless one holds an a priori position that Luke did not write the Stephen material, the evidence above would certainly favour a conclusion of Lukan authorship. In any case, we can confidently conclude that Luke was responsible for the citations themselves, and, since they evidence a firm knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch, we can conclude that Luke knew and used the LXX Pentateuch.


The citations of the Pentateuch in Luke-Acts are, as we have noted, a very complex phenomenon. There is certainly evidence of traditional, liturgical material being used, especially in the early portions of the Gospel of Luke, but it has been shown that with a few exceptions the citations are septuagintal. Those traditional citations, whose origin may not be the LXX, occur exactly where one would expect to find them: in the portions of the Gospel where Luke has compiled his material from a number of sources (cf. Luke 1:1-4). Even the citations in the so-called "L" material may have been influenced by traditional Christian or Jewish testimonia, since we simply do not know

---

679See Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 18.
what sources Luke used in compiling these narratives. But even so, our evidence indicates an overwhelming septuagintal influence on the citations in "L" material, as well as in Markan and "Q" material.

It is the Acts material, however, that really demonstrates Luke’s knowledge of the LXX. Except for Acts 23:5, all the Pentateuch citations in Acts occur in chapters 3 and 7, both of which have been considered non-Lukan by a number of scholars. Acts 23:5, however, as our evidence shows, is septuagintal and Lukan, and thus, by itself, would indicate that Luke knew the LXX Pentateuch. On the other hand, the evidence for non-Lukan authorship of Acts 3 and 7 is not nearly so strong as some would like to think, and our evidence, for the most part, leads to the conclusion that the Pentateuchal citations of both Acts 3 and 7 are not only septuagintal, but Lukan as well. Certainly, one’s conclusions about the authorship of the two latter chapters will influence one’s conclusions regarding Luke’s knowledge of the LXX. Thus, if one decides a priori (or on the basis of evidence other than the citations themselves) that Luke did not write these chapters, or that he has used a source and merely redacted the chapters to a certain degree, one could conclude that Luke only reproduced the citations used by his source. Hence, it would be quite likely that Luke did not know LXX Pentateuch. On the other hand, our evidence indicates that Luke is responsible for the Acts 3 and 7 citations, and that he used the LXX as his source for them.

In fact Acts 7 assumes paramount importance for ascertaining Luke’s knowledge of the LXX. Once it has been established that Luke is responsible for the citations of Acts 7, then it becomes obvious that Luke must have known the LXX of the Pentateuch.
Citations such as Acts 7:27-28 show that the author of the speech must have known the context of the passages, and his summarizing of the story of Moses in vv. 35-43 (which is generally regarded as Lukan material)\(^{680}\) shows his knowledge of the LXX version of that story, especially in v. 40 where he is citing the LXX directly. Furthermore, the connections throughout the Stephen speech, both thematic and theological, with the rest of Acts, and in particular Acts 13, make it more than likely that Luke was the author of the speech.\(^{681}\)

Hence, as far as the aims of this study are concerned, we can conclude with some confidence that Luke both knew and used the LXX Pentateuch in the composition of his two volume work. Furthermore, Luke appears to have used traditional material, especially in the Gospel, but it appears that he has also redacted this material for his own purposes, even in one case (Luke 18:20) correcting the Markan citation by means of the LXX. Again, throughout, Luke is an active redactor. Rather than using Pentateuchal citations as proof-texts, either christologically or for some other theological purpose, Luke’s references to the Pentateuch are most often found subsumed into a narrative of OT events (especially in Acts), or used as illustrations for details of his narrative which may be unfamiliar to his readers (especially in the Gospel).\(^{682}\) Hence he summarizes passages, alludes to the OT rather than citing it, and makes alterations based on the


\(^{682}\)Sometimes as well they appear as parts of conversations between Jesus and others concerning *Torah*. 
context in which he places the citation. In fact, only two Pentateuchal citation out of the twenty-three studied are at all christological proof-texts (Deut. 18:15-16, 19 + Lev. 23:29 in Acts 3:22-23 and Gen. 26:4 in Acts 3:25). Hence, in most cases the Pentateuchal material has less theological relevance for Luke, and he does not cite it explicitly.\textsuperscript{684}

There is slightly more evidence of Hebraicizing in Luke's ms of LXX Pentateuch than there is for the Isaiah and Psalms material discussed earlier, but less than for the citations from the Minor Prophets. In two of the three cases of possible Hebraicizing in the Pentateuchal material, however, the evidence may indicate traditional influence on the citation, rather than an Hebraicizing LXX ms. In any case the influence of a Hebraicizing tendency on Luke's ms of LXX Pentateuch is not significant.

\textsuperscript{683}The citation of this Deut. 18:15 in Acts 7:37 is not nearly so clearly a christological proof-text.

\textsuperscript{684}In most cases as well his redactional alterations are less theologically motivated, than we have noted in the other OT material.
CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

Now that we have covered all the major groups of Lukan OT citations, including the major allusions, we are ready to offer some conclusions regarding Luke's knowledge of the LXX. Before we do, however, it would be beneficial to summarize the data as we now have it.

The following tables summarize the data for three of the four overall aims of this study. Each table contains six columns. The first column indicates the known source for the material in which the citation or allusion occurs. The only relatively certain data we have on Luke's use of sources concerns the Gospel where we know that he used Mark and "Q" (I am presupposing the two-source hypothesis for the purpose of this summary), hence the known sources for Luke's Gospel are listed as Mark (Mk) and "Q" (Q), while Luke's special material is listed as "L" (L). The next two columns indicate the form of the citation or allusion according to whether it is septuagintal or not. The next two columns deal with the possibility of traditional material in the OT references. The designation "traditional," as noted in chapter one, refers to the likelihood that Luke was not referring to the OT directly, but found this citation or allusion in another source, whether the latter was referring to the LXX or not. Hence an OT reference noted under these two columns could be traditional and septuagintal, or traditional and non-
septuagintal. The data concerning traditional OT references is divided into two columns, owing to the uncertainty of the field of source criticism. Hence the first column refers to those citations or allusions which we can ascribe to a source with some confidence (especially when we are aware of the Gospel source involved) while the second indicates those for which the evidence indicates the presence of traditional material but, owing to the paucity of data, the type of material (e.g., testimonia) is mostly speculative. Finally, the last column indicates whether there is possible evidence for Luke's use of a Hebraicizing LXX ms.

### TABLE 1: DATA FROM THE MINOR PROPHETS CITATIONS/ALLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Gospel Source</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Definite Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 7:27</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:30</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:17-21</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:42-43</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:41</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 15:16-17</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the above table indicates, the references to the Minor Prophets in Luke-Acts come primarily from the LXX and evidence the hand of Luke. On the other hand, one reference out of the six is clearly traditional, while two show possible evidence of a traditional origin. Hence we have the possibility of a 50% traditional origin for the

---

1The evidence for a Hebraicizing ms in this passage is very minimal. The possibility, however, is still there.

2The only evidence for a Hebraicizing ms in this citation is its possible relationship to 8HevXIIgr (see above, pp. 79-81).
Minor Prophets material. Rather than indicating ignorance of the LXX (no-one considers Luke to be ignorant of the LXX Minor Prophets), however, this evidence seems to support the contention that, regardless of his familiarity with the LXX of a particular passage, Luke may choose to use another source for his citations or allusions. It is to be noted that the only clearly traditional reference is "Q" material, and his use of the "Q" version of the OT citation, rather than the LXX, may indicate in what high regard he held his source. The same may be said regarding the possibly traditional references in Acts 7 and 15. If an alternate source to the OT itself is in use here, then it can be argued that at times Luke chose to reproduce this source rather than cite the OT directly. Since both of the latter references are septuagintal, however, it is impossible to determine whether another source is in view which refers to the LXX, or whether Luke himself refers to the passages. Only one passage is non-septuagintal. It seems that even the traditional passages show a preference for the LXX. Finally, three of the six references (50%) show evidence, however meagre, of a Hebraicizing tendency. Such a high percentage may in fact indicate some significant Hebraicizing influence on Luke’s ms of the Minor Prophets. Of course, with such a limited data sample, and such meagre evidence, the latter conclusion can hardly be asserted with confidence.
TABLE 2: DATA FROM THE ISAIAH CITATIONS/ALLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Gospel Source</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Definite Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 3:4-6</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 19:46</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:18-19</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:37</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:49-50</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 8:32-33</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:22</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:34</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:47</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 28:26-27</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again for the Isaiah references Luke’s use of LXX Isaiah best accounts for most of the passages. There are, however, four possible instances (accepting even the most meagre evidence) among the ten passages (40%) of traditional material being used. Again, this is a very high percentage, and if all the instances mentioned are indeed traditional, this again would show that in some instances Luke chooses the citation or allusion as presented in another source rather than cite the LXX directly. Again, however, the only passages that can be definitely ascribed to traditional sources come from the Markan and "Q" material in the Gospel, while the only possibly non-septuagintal passage comes from Mark. Hence, it appears that when Luke had what he considered reliable sources, especially for the traditions about Jesus, he used them rather than cite OT passages.

\[^3\]This passage contains evidence of being both traditional and Lukan.
directly. Finally, only one passage out of the eleven (about 9%) can be considered indicative of a Hebraicizing ms. Thus, Hebraicizing appears not to be a significant factor in Luke’s ms of LXX Isaiah.
### Table 3: Data from the Psalms Citations/Allusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Gospel Source</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Definite Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 19:38</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:17</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:42-43</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 22:69</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:10-11</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 13:35</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 23:46</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 1:20</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:25-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:31</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:33</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 2:34-35</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:11</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 4:25-26</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:22</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:33</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 13:35</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 The septuagintal or non-septuagintal nature of this passage remains undetermined.

5 Although a traditional citation, the passage contains definite signs of Lukan redaction.

6 Part of this citation is certainly from the LXX, but part of it appears to have a non-septuagintal Vorlage.

7 The origin of this citation (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined, although in all likelihood it is septuagintal. I have included it under non-LXX since there is some evidence, however meagre, that it may not be.

8 The origin of this passage (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined.

9 The origin of this passage (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined.
Again, the LXX is clearly Luke’s preferred source for references to the Psalms. There are, however, a significant number of passages evincing traditional sources. Seven of the 18 passages (almost 40%) can be with confidence ascribed to traditional sources, with one additional passage having a possible traditional origin (with the latter passage added we have almost 45%). Such a large percentage of traditional OT references indicates perhaps that Luke had a significant tradition of Jewish and Christian use of the Psalms from which to draw. As well, there is a significant number of passages which show evidence of a non-septuagintal Vorlage (several of the traditional passages are septuagintal). Of these, only one is both traditional and non-septuagintal (Luke 20:42-43), although one other (Acts 1:20) contains both elements indicating a non-septuagintal origin and traditional elements, along with septuagintal and Lukan elements (in other words, the origin of the OT reference cannot be determined with any degree of confidence). Three passages in Acts cannot be determined as to their septuagintal origin, but given that they appear to come from Luke, their indeterminacy likely stems from the inadequacy of the data, rather than any likelihood of a non-septuagintal version of the OT underlying them. There is no evidence for any Hebraicizing tendency in Luke’s LXX ms of the Psalms.
TABLE 4: DATA FROM THE PENTATEUCH CITATIONS/ALLUSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Gospel Source</th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Definite Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Traditional</th>
<th>Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luke 10:27</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 18:20</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:28</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 20:37</td>
<td>Mk</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:4</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:8</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ 13</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 4:12</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 2:23</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke 2:24</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 23:5</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 3:13</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 3:22-23</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓  ✓  ✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 3:25</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:3</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:5</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:6-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:18</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:30</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:32</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:33-34</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:35</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:37</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts 7:40</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 It must be noted, however, that this citation has been corrected to the LXX by Luke.

11 With Lukan redaction.

12 The origin of this passage (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined.

13 The origin of this passage (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined.
Turning now to the data on the Pentateuchal references we find that there is not such a
great difference from the evidence collected for those from the Psalms. Again, we seem
to have demonstrated by this data that Luke knew and used the LXX Pentateuch. The
number of traditional citations or allusions, however, is again significant: seven out of
the twenty-three (about 31%), and if we add the possible traditional elements in Luke
2:23; Acts 3:22-23 and 7:40, ten (about 44%), very close to the percentage of the Psalms
references. Of these traditional citations or allusions only two are definitely non-
septuagintal, while one other may be so (but the evidence is not conclusive). Finally,
three of the twenty-three references appear to show signs of Hebraicizing (about 13%),
a significant number, but not indicative of a thoroughgoing tendency in Luke’s ms either.

The data can be further summarized as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Lukan</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Prophets</td>
<td>*83.33</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>50.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isaiah</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalms</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>55.56</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*the values here are percentages of the total number of citations/allusions

As the above table shows, according to our analysis both the Psalms and Minor Prophets
citations or allusions contain more non-septuagintal references than do those from the
Pentateuch, with the Psalms having significantly more. Exactly one third of the latter
OT references are non-septuagintal, as compared with the Pentateuch in which only about
13% are non-septuagintal. Similarly, although the values are not as significant, each of the other groups of OT references (Minor Prophets, Isaiah, and Psalms) contain a slightly higher percentage of traditional citations or allusions than does the Pentateuch group.

We can also view the results as follows:

**Table 6: Summary of Data II**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Lukan</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP/lsa/Ps</td>
<td>79.41</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>55.88</td>
<td>44.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentateuch</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The values here are percentages of the total number of citations/allusions*

Here we see that the amounts of septuagintal and non-septuagintal references are similar for Pentateuchal citations or allusions as for all other OT references examined. The same can be said for the relative amounts of Lukan and traditional material. The table below shows the percentages of all the OT references combined in the above categories:

**Table 7: Summary of Data III**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LXX</th>
<th>non-LXX</th>
<th>Lukan</th>
<th>Traditional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of references</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of references</td>
<td>82.46</td>
<td>17.54</td>
<td>56.14</td>
<td>43.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above table indicates that in general Luke cites or alludes to the LXX about 80% of the time, and about 20% of the time non-LXX sources. Similarly, slightly less than half of the time he uses traditional sources, rather than referring to the OT directly, regardless of whether they are septuagintal or not. If we compare this with his use of the Pentateuch, we have the following result:
Table 8 demonstrates graphically that the values for the Pentateuch references do not differ in any significant way from the values for Luke's use of the OT as a whole.

Therefore, as was demonstrated in the discussion of each of the passages, in relation to the overall pattern of Luke's use of the OT, there is no evidence that Luke treated the Pentateuch references any differently, as indicative of his knowledge or lack thereof of the LXX, than he did for the books which it is widely regarded that he knew in the LXX version. If he in fact did not know the LXX of the Pentateuch, we would have expected widely divergent values in the above table. The evidence both for use of traditional material and non-LXX sources would have been much more pronounced for the Pentateuch citations.

Rather, we observe the same pattern throughout: whether referring to the Minor Prophets, Isaiah, the Psalms or the Pentateuch, Luke tends to use the LXX directly. At

---

14That the Pentateuch references are, generally speaking, less extensive than those from the other books would tend to indicate that, while the Pentateuch was used by Luke (and, I think, this could be extrapolated to the NT in general) in constructing narratives based on OT stories, the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms contained more material fruitful for christological (messianic) or other theological discussion (note that Bock, Rese, and Dupont [in Salvation], discuss the three latter groups of references at more length than those from the Pentateuch, which would seem to indicate their greater significance for christological and apologetic purposes). The latter conclusion would also be reflected in the amount of traditional material available citing the various parts of the OT for Christian use. As noted, our data supports the position that the traditional elements are more prominent in some cases in the citations or allusions from books other than the Pentateuch, than in those from the Pentateuch. This is only natural with material having christological or apologetic value. Whether one can correlate apologetic, or christological, value with traditional sources for OT citations in Luke-Acts, needs to be studied further.
times, however, he does use traditional material. This is especially evident in the
treatment of Markan and "Q" material. But his reasons for using the traditional material
instead of citing the LXX directly do not appear to be connected to any supposed lack
of knowledge of the LXX in any of the above-mentioned books. This is clear since the
pattern is the same irrespective of which OT book he is quoting. He has his own reasons
for preferring the traditional material, as has been shown in the discussions of these
passages in the body of this study.

What tends to skew the evidence against Luke's knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch in other studies (especially Holtz) is the a priori assumption that Luke used
special sources consistently in the speeches in Acts (especially Acts 3 and 7), and used
them without significant alteration. Hence, although most of the citations in Acts 7 are
"wörtliche Übernahmen aus der LXX in den erzählenden Teilen der Rede," these
cannot be used as evidence for Luke's knowledge of the LXX Pentateuch, since Luke
took these references directly from his source.16 We have seen, however, that the
citations and allusions themselves demonstrate Lukan characteristics, and give no certain
evidence for sources other than the LXX. Further source-critical work needs to be done
in the light of the above data on the OT references, especially in regard to Acts 3 and
7. As far as our analysis goes, however, we must conclude that whether or not Luke
used other sources, he most certainly had a hand in the OT citations and allusions in

15Holtz, 114.
16Ibid, 113.
these speeches, and appears to have used directly, for the most part, the LXX Pentateuch.

Therefore, we have established that Luke knew the LXX and used that version for the most part in citing or alluding to the OT. We have also noted that he sometimes chose to cite traditional material when it was available, rather than the LXX, either because he wished to be faithful to a source which he held in high regard, or because the version of the OT material in his source was particularly applicable to the context in which he placed the OT reference. Finally, we can conclude, with a fair degree of probability, that the ms of the LXX Minor Prophets which Luke used was Hebraicizing. Outside of the Minor Prophets material, however, there is little significant evidence that he was using a Hebraicizing LXX ms.

Now we have only to mention something about Luke’s redactional activity to complete our conclusions. As we noted, Luke is a very active editor. In virtually every case he freely edits his OT citation to fit the context, to make his point more clear, or to stress a particular aspect of the citation itself. Unfortunately, this editorial activity often makes it difficult for scholars to determine with certainty the version of the OT Luke was using. This difficulty has given rise to the problem of Luke’s knowledge of the LXX and to the present study. But given the extensiveness of Luke’s editorial activity, it is highly likely that most of the problems with Luke’s use of the OT can be understood by reference to this editorial activity.

But how does Luke actually work? In many cases, it is clear that Luke’s redaction of the OT material is motivated by christological and apologetic concerns. In
this regard Luke utilizes what Longenecker has termed the most characteristic method of NT interpretation: *pesher*.\(^{17}\) Longenecker characterizes the NT application of *pesher* hermeneutics in this way: "everything the ancient prophet wrote has a *veiled, eschatological meaning*, [and] has reference to the community’s understanding of itself as God’s righteous remnant in the period of eschatological consummation."\(^{18}\) Such an interpretation, he notes,

> opens up all the biblical message and history to a Christocentric interpretation. All that is now required is to identify those portions of pertinence to the Messianic Age (as Christians understood it) and to explicate them in accordance with the tradition and principles of Christ.\(^{19}\)

Luke is certainly an active interpreter of the OT scriptures, but he does not tend to cite the passages and then explicate them. Rather Luke tends to alter the passages in such a way that his interpretation of the passage is embedded in the passage itself. Despite his high view of the LXX and the other sources which he cites, he feels free, or perhaps constrained, to make clear that these OT passages are fulfilled in the events which he is narrating. Hence he alters them when needed according to "the tradition and principles of Christ."\(^{20}\)

But that is not all Luke does. Often he alters the OT passage stylistically, simply to make it read better. Furthermore, he often does not cite the passage, but paraphrases

\(^{17}\)Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 98.

\(^{18}\)Ibid, 39 (emphasis Longenecker's).

\(^{19}\)Ibid, 99-98.

\(^{20}\)Ibid, 99.
it, or summarizes it, or simply alludes to it. In this lies the key to the problem of the Pentateuchal references in Luke-Acts. While Luke often cites from the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms, he tends to allude to the Pentateuch rather than citing it. The reason for this is that, with the exception of Deut. 18:15-16, 19 + Lev. 23:29 in Acts 3:22-23 and Gen. 26:4 in Acts 3:25, Luke does not use the Pentateuchal material as theological (christological or otherwise) proof-texts, but as integral, perhaps illustrative, parts of his narrative.\(^{21}\) Thus rather than citing the OT material, he simply incorporates it to a greater or lesser extent in his narrative. His motivation for altering the OT material, then, is not theological, but determined by the narrative context. Often, therefore, his references to the Pentateuch look less like the LXX, than the references to the other portions of the OT, and it is often concluded that Luke must not have been using the LXX. But the reason for these discrepancies from the LXX is to be found, rather, in Luke's purpose and method in citing the OT.

But Holtz does not confine his conclusion simply to the LXX Pentateuch. He also states that Luke did not know the historical books of the OT directly.\(^{22}\) Now as far as citations go there is only one possible referent in Luke-Acts, and that is the so-called citation of I Kgdms 13:14 in Acts 13:22: ἀνδρὰ κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου. Holtz argues that here we have evidence of a testimonium used both by Luke and Clement of Rome.\(^{23}\) The citation occurs in close proximity with Isa. 44:28 and Ps. 89:20 (88:21 LXX), and

\(^{21}\)See above, n. 14.

\(^{22}\)Holtz, 169-170.

\(^{23}\)Ibid, 136; see also Wilcox, Semitisms, 23.
Clement reproduces the passage without Isa. 44:28. Holtz argues that Clement thought he was citing simply the Psalms passage, and did not recognize a combined citation here. Hence he cited the testimonium as though it were a citation from the Psalms. Luke, he argues, did something similar with the same testimonium.\(^24\) Of course it is possible, as I pointed out with regard to the Isa. 44:28 citation, that Clement simply used Acts.\(^25\) Certainly, however, one cannot rule out a possible traditional source for this passage, perhaps, as I noted in regard to Isa. 44:28, an early Christian homily (see above, p. 135).

The only real problem with a LXX origin for the citation is the presence of \(\alpha ν\delta\rho\alpha\) for LXX \(\acute{\alpha}ν\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu\). Wilcox argues that \(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\nu\) is a better translation of the Hebrew \(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\) than is \(\acute{\alpha}ν\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\),\(^26\) and since there is no evidence of any possibly Hebraicizing tendency in the LXX textual tradition which substitutes \(\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha\) for \(\acute{\alpha}ν\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu\),\(^27\) he

\(^{24}\)Holtz, 135-136.

\(^{25}\)See Bruce, Acts (1951), 265. The question of dating is of course a problem here which has not been sufficiently resolved (see Kümmel, pp. 185-186; Richardson, pp. 33-34; but cf. Robinson, Redating, 116).

\(^{26}\)Wilcox, Semitisms, 21. It is debatable whether \(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\nu\) is so much better a translation of \(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\) than is \(\acute{\alpha}ν\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\). Certainly \(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\) does mean "man" in the sense of "male", but it also has a wider connotation, i.e. "mankind," "person," "whosoever" (see T. E. McComiskey, "\(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\)," TWOT 1 [1980] 82-83). Furthermore, \(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\nu\) need not always mean "man" as in "male" either. It can simply mean "human being." For example, J. B. Bauer ("\(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\nu\), \(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\omicron\omicron\), \(\delta\)," EDNT 1 [1990] 99) notes that \(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\nu\) is used for men and women in Matt. 14:35; Mark 6:44; Luke 5:18; 9:14; 11:31 and John 6:10. To these references Rook ("Women in Acts: Are They Equal Partners With Men in the Earliest Church?" MIT 2 [1991] 34, 38, 39) adds Acts 3:12; 17:34 and perhaps 14:14. Hence either \(\acute{\alpha}ν\rho\omicron\nu\) or \(\acute{\alpha}ν\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\) would do as a translation for \(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\). Furthermore, the LXX translator may have considered \(\acute{\alpha}ν\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\pi\omicron\omicron\omicron\) a perfectly reasonable translation for \(\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\), given his probable world-view (see the introductory comments in C. Cox, "The Wrath of God Has Come to Me: Job's First Speech According to the LXX," SR 16 (1987) 195-198, esp. p. 198). Wilcox's arguments relating Acts 13:22 to targumic tradition have been dealt with above (pp. 136-137), and need not concern us here.

\(^{27}\)See BrookeMacLean, I Kgdms. 13:14. It is interesting to note that ms B omits \(\alpha\nu\delta\rho\alpha\) in Acts 13:22 (see NestleAland26, Acts 13:22). The significance of the omission is hard to determine.
argues that Acts 13:22 shows some influence from the Hebrew.\textsuperscript{28} But even if ἄνηρ is a better translation of ἱος than is ἀνθρωπός, such influence from the Hebrew is unnecessary if one could postulate a reason why Luke himself would alter the word. It has been noted that ἄνηρ is used a great deal in Luke-Acts compared to ἀνθρωπός,\textsuperscript{29} and, in fact, when compared with the whole NT, the preponderance of ἄνηρ in Luke-Acts is quite striking.\textsuperscript{30} Hence it would not be out of the question to argue that Luke simply substituted his preferred word here.

\begin{table}[h!]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
& Lk/Acts & Mark & Matt & John & Paul† & All NT‡ \\
\hline
ratio & 1.10/1 & 1/5.50 & 1/10.38 & 1/5.88 & 1/1.98 & 1/3.66 \\
\hline
occurrences & 129/117 & 4/22 & 8/83 & 8/47 & 43/85 & 89/326 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Ratio and occurrences of ἄνηρ/ἀνθρωπός in the NT.}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{28}Wilcox, Semitisms, 22-24.


\textsuperscript{30}M&G lists 129 references to ἄνηρ in Luke-Acts (66-68) compared with 117 (not including "son of man" sayings) occurrences of ἀνθρωπός (71-73). This produces an ἄνηρ/ἀνθρωπός ratio of 1.1/1, significantly different from the rest of the NT (1/3.66). The complete, though rough, data is as follows:

The data here does not take into account instances in which ἀνθρωπός is clearly inappropriate, and ἄνηρ seems necessary. If the latter were taken into account, it would make the preponderance of ἄνηρ in Luke-Acts even more significant, since it would qualify the cases in which other NT writers used ἄνηρ. This qualification would scarcely affect the overwhelming preponderance of the term in Luke/Acts (Hawkins' [16] data is slightly different than mine [Luke-Acts: 127/141; Mark: 4/56; Matt.: 8/112; John: 8/58; Paul: 59/124; all of NT except Luke-Acts: 89/403], owing likely to textual considerations and the fact that he does not exclude the "son of man" sayings; the differences do not seriously affect the significant preponderance of ἄνηρ in Luke-Acts).
Holtz notes that the rest of the phrase is identical with the LXX,\(^{31}\) except of course for the change of pronoun owing to the context,\(^{32}\) and this would tend to support a LXX origin for the passage,\(^{33}\) although its possible traditional origins somewhat obscure any conclusions regarding Luke's knowledge of the LXX historical books. Thus, the question of the septuagintal origin of this citation must remain open, although, as noted, Luke likely used the LXX and substituted \(\alpha\nu\nu\rho\).

Hence, it is clear that Luke's knowledge of the LXX historical books cannot be demonstrated on the basis of this one passage. That is not surprising, since the data is so slim. What is needed is a thorough study of the more oblique references to the historical books in Luke/Acts, including the instances of "Rhetorical Imitation" suggested by Brodie and others. Only then could some conclusion be drawn with any confidence concerning Luke's knowledge of the LXX historical books.

In fact, while our conclusions regarding the LXX Pentateuch, as garnered from the study of the citations, seem fairly strong, the field could only benefit from further work. Two areas which need further study are the concept of "Rhetorical Imitation," and

\(^{31}\)Holtz, 134.

\(^{32}\)See Wilcox, Semitisms, 21.

\(^{33}\)Although the LXX is a rather literal translation of \(\nu\n
the nature of Luke's Greek. The findings of Sparks, Fitzmyer, and Wifstrand, especially
the latter, seem quite conclusive concerning the nature of Luke's Greek, and tend to
confirm my own findings above. They do, however, need further qualification,
especially in light of the recent developments in the study of the LXX. That is, while
some of the features of Luke's Greek clearly reflect LXX influence, others still appear
to be more Semitic in origin. The possibility that Luke may have been influenced by a
Hebraicizing LXX ms like 8HevXIIigr may have a profound effect on how we regard
such Semitisms in Luke's Greek. The study of "Rhetorical Imitation" definitely needs
to be evaluated, both to determine the cogency of the concept itself, and its specific
relation to the LXX. The field seems wide open at this point.

There are two other areas which my study has touched on tangentially to which
further study could be applied. The first is concerned with whether there is a textual
tradition within Luke which demonstrates a closer affinity to the LXX in the Lukan
citations than others. My study has been inconclusive in this regard,\textsuperscript{34} and further work
needs to be done. The second area involves the Synoptic problem and its various
solutions. I have noted in various places the implications for the various theories of the
evidence disclosed by certain of the passages shared by two or more Gospels. While my
work tends to confirm the two-source hypothesis as the theory which best accounts for

\textsuperscript{34}Out of 20 instances of textual variation in an OT reference in which agreement with the LXX is a factor, for the
major witnesses the evidence is as follows: in 10 instances (50%) ms A is closer to the LXX than others, in 10
instances (50%) ms E is closer, in 9 instances (45%) ms C, in 8 instances (40%) ms \( \sqrt{ } \), in 8 instances (40%) ms P\textsuperscript{74},
in 8 instances (40%) ms D, in four instances (20%) ms B. Of those mss reading together, the most significant
relationships occur between mss A and P\textsuperscript{74} (8 times, 40%), ms A and \( \sqrt{ } \) (7 times, 35%) and mss \( \sqrt{ } \) and P\textsuperscript{74} (7 times,
35%). Mss A, \( \sqrt{ } \), and P\textsuperscript{74} read together (and with the LXX) 7 times (35%). There may be a pattern here in which
mss A, \( \sqrt{ } \), and P\textsuperscript{74} tend to follow the LXX in Lukan citations. This rough data, however, needs to be refined by more
extensive textual work.
the data presented in the various citations, a more thorough evaluation of the theories in regard to the Lukan citations would be in order.35

So, as a great (though clinically depressed) sage once said: "Of making many books there is no end, and much study is a weariness of the flesh" ([Ecclesiastes 12:12] no truer words have ever been spoken!); and hence, I, like all others in my field leave no respite for Biblical scholars. There is considerable work yet to do.

---

35 An excellent study on the Synoptic OT citations and their implications for the Synoptic problem (primarily dealing with Matthew, however) has been done by D. S. New ("Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis" [PhD. Dissertation: McMaster University, 1990]). who, incidentally, confirms my conclusions regarding the two-source hypothesis (272).
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