

LUKE'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE SEPTUAGINT

LUKE'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE SEPTUAGINT:
A STUDY OF THE CITATIONS
IN LUKE-ACTS

By

WAYNE DOUGLAS LITKE, B.A., M.C.S., M.A.

A Thesis

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies

in Partial Fulfilment of the Requirements

for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

McMaster University

September 1993

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY (1993)
(Religious Studies)

McMASTER UNIVERSITY
Hamilton, Ontario

TITLE: Luke's Knowledge of the Septuagint: A Study of the Citations in Luke-Acts

AUTHOR: Wayne Douglas Litke, B.A. (University of Calgary)
M.C.S. (Regent College)
M.A. (University of British Columbia)

SUPERVISOR: Professor Stephen Westerholm

NUMBER OF PAGES: xi, 440

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.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study is the result of the assistance of a great number of people, too numerous to thank exhaustively. Of primary importance is my supervisor, Dr. Stephen Westerholm, whose thoroughgoing attention to my work, and whose input was nothing short of incredible. His patience and inciteful commentary on this study made it what it is (not including any errors, which are mine), and if I have the privilege to call myself a Biblical Scholar, it is primarily due to Stephen Westerholm. As well, the other members of my committee, Dr. Eileen Schuller and Dr. John Rook, were invaluable in their assistance. Their comments and questions often made me work harder, but significantly improved the final form of this thesis. I must also thank Dr. Gerard Vallée for his incessant encouragement (should I say "goading") to get this work done. I can now say to him: "Τετέλεσται."

The Doctors, nurses and staff at Stonechurch Family Health Centre also played a role in the completion of this thesis, especially Drs. MacDonald, Davine, Mastronardi, and Sidhu, in helping me through some medical difficulties which delayed the completion of this thesis and threatened to prevent its completion altogether.

Finally, I would like to thank my family for their constant encouragement and prayers, especially my wife, Carol Ann, and my daughter, Kathryn. Carol Ann not only supported me wholeheartedly (in more ways than one) throughout this work, but was also invaluable in helping me wrestle with WordPerfect 5.1 in making it do some things it was simply not designed to do. Kathryn had to put up with a Daddy who was often unavailable to her. Equally, they often had to put up with a grumpy, out-of-sorts husband and father. For these and other reasons I dedicate this thesis to Carol Ann and Kathryn.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of Abbreviations	ix
 Introduction	 1
 CHAPTER ONE: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	 9
A. The Study of the Lukan Citations	10
B. "Rhetorical Imitation"	26
C. The Nature of Luke's Greek	33
1. <i>The Septuagintal Theory</i>	<i>34</i>
2. <i>Semitic Sources</i>	<i>38</i>
3. <i>Jewish Greek</i>	<i>45</i>
D. The Methodology of the Present Study	47
 CHAPTER TWO: THE CITATIONS FROM THE MINOR PROPHETS	 56
A. "Q" Citation: Luke 7:27 = Mal. 3:1 (+ Ex. 23:20)	56
B. "L" Citation: Luke 23:30 = Hos. 10:8	60
C. Acts Citations	62
1. <i>Acts 2:17-21 = Joel 2:28-32, LXX (3:1-5, MT)</i>	<i>62</i>
2. <i>Acts 7:42-43 = Amos 5:25-27</i>	<i>72</i>
3. <i>Acts 13:41 = Hab. 1:5</i>	<i>78</i>
4. <i>Acts 15:16-17 = Amos 9:11-12</i>	<i>82</i>
D. Summary: The Minor Prophets Citations in Luke-Acts	98
 CHAPTER THREE: THE CITATIONS FROM ISAIAH	 101
A. Markan Citation: Luke 3:4-6 = Isa. 40:3-5	101
B. "Q" Citation: Luke 19:46 = Isa. 56:7	108
C. "L" Citations	112
1. <i>Luke 4:18-19 = Isa 61:1-2 + 58:6</i>	<i>112</i>
2. <i>Luke 22:37 = Isa. 53:12</i>	<i>119</i>
D. Acts Citations	124
1. <i>Acts 7:49-50 = Isa. 66:1-2</i>	<i>124</i>
2. <i>Acts 8:32-33 = Isa. 53:7-8</i>	<i>128</i>
3. <i>Acts 13:22,34,47 = Isa. 44:28; 55:3; 49:6</i>	<i>132</i>
a. <i>Acts 13:22 = Isa. 44:28</i>	<i>132</i>
b. <i>Acts 13:34 = Isa. 55:3</i>	<i>135</i>
c. <i>Acts 13:47 = Isa. 49:6</i>	<i>141</i>
d. <i>Summary: Isaiah Citations in Acts 13</i>	<i>144</i>

4. <i>Acts 28:26-27 = Isa. 6:9-10</i>	144
E. Summary: Isaiah Citations in Luke-Acts	148
CHAPTER FOUR: THE CITATIONS FROM THE PSALMS	150
A. Markan Citations	150
1. <i>Luke 19:38 = Ps. 118:26 (117:26 LXX)</i>	150
2. <i>Luke 20:17 = Ps. 118:22 (117:22 LXX)</i>	153
3. <i>Luke 20:42-43 = Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX)</i>	156
4. <i>Luke 22:69 = Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX)</i>	158
B. "Q" Citations	164
1. <i>Luke 4:10-11 = Ps. 91:11-12 (90:11-12 LXX)</i>	164
2. <i>Luke 13:35 = Ps. 118:26 (117:26 LXX)</i>	166
C. "L" Citation: Luke 23:46 = Ps. 31:5 (30:6 LXX; 31:6 MT)	167
D. Acts Citations	171
1. <i>Acts 1:20 = Ps. 69:25 (68:26 LXX; 69:26 MT) and</i> <i>109:8 (108:8 LXX)</i>	171
a. <i>Ps. 69:25 (68:26 LXX; 69:26 MT)</i>	172
b. <i>Ps. 109:8 (108:8 LXX)</i>	176
c. <i>Summary: Acts 1:20</i>	177
2. <i>Acts 2:25-28 = Ps. 16:8-11 (15:8-11 LXX)</i>	177
3. <i>Acts 2:30,31,33 = Ps. 132:11 (131:11 LXX); 16:10</i> <i>(15:10 LXX); 118:16 (117:16 LXX) + 68:19 (67:19 LXX)</i>	181
a. <i>Acts 2:30 = Ps. 132:11 (131:11 LXX)</i>	181
b. <i>Acts 2:31 = Ps. 16:10 (15:10 LXX)</i>	183
c. <i>Acts 2:33 = Ps. 118:16 (117:16 LXX) + 68:19</i> <i>(67:19 LXX)</i>	185
d. <i>Summary: Acts 2:30-33</i>	186
4. <i>Acts 2:34-35 = Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX)</i>	186
5. <i>Acts 4:11 = Ps. 118:22 (117:22 LXX)</i>	189
6. <i>Acts 4:25-26 = Ps. 2:1-2</i>	195
7. <i>Acts 13:22,33,35 = Ps. 89:20 (88:21 LXX; 89:21</i> <i>MT); 2:7; 16:10 (15:10 LXX)</i>	200
a. <i>Acts 13:22 = Ps. 89:20 (88:21 LXX; 89:21</i> <i>MT)</i>	200
b. <i>Acts 13:13 = Ps. 2:7</i>	201
c. <i>Acts 13:35 = Ps. 16:10 (15:10 LXX)</i>	202
d. <i>Summary: Psalms Citations in Acts 13</i>	203
E. Summary: Psalms Citations in Luke-Acts	203
CHAPTER FIVE: THE CITATIONS FROM THE PENTATEUCH	206
A. Markan Citations	206
1. <i>Luke 10:27 = Deut. 6:5 + Lev. 19:18</i>	206
2. <i>Luke 18:20 = Ex. 20:12-16 (Deut. 5:16-20)</i>	216
3. <i>Luke 20:28,37 = Deut. 25:5 (+ Gen. 38:8); Ex. 3:6</i>	218
a. <i>Luke 20:28 = Deut. 25:5 (+ Gen 38:8)</i>	219

b. Luke 20:37 = Ex. 3:6	220
c. Summary: Luke 20:28,37	221
B. "Q" Citation: Luke 4:4,8,12 = Deut. 8:3; 6:13,16	222
1. Luke 4:4 = Deut. 8:3	222
2. Luke 4:8 = Deut. 6:13	224
3. Luke 4:12 = Deut. 6:16	225
4. Summary: "Q" Citations	225
C. "L" Citations	225
1. Luke 2:23 = Ex. 13:2,12,15	226
2. Luke 2:24 = Lev. 12:8 (1:14; 5:11)	229
D. Acts Citations	238
1. Acts 23:5 = Ex. 22:28 (22:27 LXX & MT)	238
2. <i>The Pentateuch Citations in Acts 3</i>	<i>247</i>
a. Acts 3:13 = Ex. 3:6,15	247
b. Acts 3:22-23 = Deut. 18:15-16,19 + Lev. 23:29	254
c. Acts 3:25 = Gen 26:4 (22:18)	273
d. Summary: The Pentateuch Citations in Acts 3	282
3. <i>The Pentateuch Citations in Acts 7</i>	<i>282</i>
a. Acts 7:3 = Gen. 12:1	292
b. Acts 7:5 = Deut. 2:5; Gen. 17:8 (12:7; 13:15; 15:2,18; 17:8; 24:7; 48:4)	306
c. Acts 7:6-7 = Gen. 15:13-14 + Ex. 3:12 (+ Ex. 2:22?)	318
d. Acts 7:18 = Ex. 1:8	343
e. Acts 7:27-28 = Ex. 2:14 + 2:13	344
f. Acts 7:30 = Ex. 3:2 + 3:1	348
g. Acts 7:32 = Ex. 3:6	354
h. Acts 7:33-34 = Ex. 3:5-10 + 2:24 (5:6) (+ Josh. 5:15?)	357
i. Acts 7:35 = Ex. 2:14 + 3:2 (+ 6:6)	365
j. Acts 7:37 = Deut. 18:15	367
k. Acts 7:40 = Ex. 32:1 (32:23)	372
l. Summary: The Pentateuch in Acts 7	375
E. Summary: The Pentateuch in Luke-Acts	376
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION	380
Selected Bibliography	400

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS*

AARAS	American Academy of Religion Academy series
ABT	The Aramaic Bible: The Targums, series
<u>AJBI</u>	<u>Annual of the Japanese Biblical Institute</u>
AltAb	Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen series
<u>ATJ</u>	<u>Ashland Theological Journal</u>
<u>BIOSCS</u>	<u>Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies</u>
BNTC	Black's New Testament Commentary series
<u>BrookeMcLean</u>	Brooke, Alan England; McLean, Norman and Thackeray, Henry St. John, eds. <u>The Old Testament in Greek</u> . Cambridge: University, 1917-1935, vols. 1-2.
BU	Biblische Untersuchungen series
BZHT	Beiträge zur historischen Theologie series
CBC	Cambridge Bible Commentary series
<u>CTR</u>	<u>Criswell Theological Review</u>
<u>EDNT</u>	<u>Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament</u> . Ed. Horst Balz and Gerhard Schneider. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990-1991, 2 vols.
<u>ÉTh</u>	<u>Église et Théologie</u>
ETSE	Estonian Theological Society in Exile
<u>FoiVieSup</u>	<u>Foi et Vie</u> , supplemental issue
<u>Gno</u>	<u>Gnomon</u>
GottLXX	The Göttingen edition of the Septuagint
<u>GottLXX1</u>	Wevers, John William, ed. <u>Genesis</u> . GottLXX, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974.
<u>GottLXX2,1</u>	Wevers, John William, ed. <u>Exodus</u> . GottLXX, 2,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991.
<u>GottLXX2,2</u>	Wevers, John William, ed. <u>Leviticus</u> . GottLXX, 2,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.
<u>GottLXX3,2</u>	Wevers, John William, ed. <u>Deuteronomium</u> . GottLXX, 3,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
<u>GottLXX10</u>	Rahlf's, Alfred, ed. <u>Psalmi cum Odis</u> . GottLXX, 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
<u>GottLXX13</u>	Ziegler, Joseph, ed. <u>Duodecim prophetarum</u> . GottLXX, 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943.

*All abbreviations, unless noted below, are according to the Journal of Biblical Literature Instructions for Contributors, JBL 95 (1976) 331-346.

<u>GottLXX14</u>	Ziegler, Joseph, ed. <u>Isaias</u> , GottLXX, 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
HC	Hermeneia Commentary series
HTS	Harvard Theological Studies series
<u>IBS</u>	<u>Irish Biblical Studies</u>
JBS	Jerusalem Biblical Studies series
<u>JETS</u>	<u>Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society</u>
<u>JSNT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</u>
JSNTS	Journal for the Study of the New Testament Supplemental series.
<u>JSOT</u>	<u>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</u>
JSOTS	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament, Supplementary series
<u>L&S</u>	Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert. <u>A Greek-English Lexicon</u> . Oxford: Clarendon, 1889.
LBS	Library of Biblical Studies series
LEC	Library of Early Christianity series
<u>M&G</u>	Moulton, W. F. and Geden, A. S., eds. <u>A Concordance to the Greek New Testament</u> . Edinburgh: Clark, 1963.
<u>MJT</u>	<u>McMaster Journal of Theology</u>
MTS	Münchener theologische Studien series
NASB	<u>New American Standard Bible</u> . Glendale, Cal.: Gospel Light, 1971.
<u>NBD</u>	Douglas, J. D. ed. <u>The New Bible Dictionary</u> . Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962.
NCB	New Century Bible series
<u>NestleAland25</u>	Nestle, Eberhard; Nestle, Erwin and Aland, Kurt, eds. <u>Novum Testamentum Graece</u> . Twenty-fifth Edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963.
<u>NestleAland26</u>	Nestle, Eberhard; Nestle, Erwin; Aland, Kurt; Aland, Barbara; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M. and Wikgren, Allen, eds. <u>Novum Testamentum Graece</u> . Twenty-sixth Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979.
NICOT	New International Commentary on the Old Testament series
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary series
NIV	<u>The Holy Bible: New International Version</u> . Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1978.
NumenSup.	Supplement to Numen series
NVBS	New Voices in Biblical Studies series
OBS	Oxford Bible series
OBT	Overtures to Biblical Theology series
<u>OPTAT</u>	<u>Occasional Papers in Text and Translation</u>

OTL	The Old Testament Library series
PETSE	Papers of the Estonian Theological Society in Exile series
PHC	Pelican History of the Church series
<u>PIBA</u>	<u>Proceedings of the Irish Biblical Association</u>
<u>PRS</u>	<u>Perspectives in Religious Studies</u>
<u>PSBA</u>	<u>Proceedings of the Society for Biblical Archeology</u>
PTM	Princeton Theological Monograph series
<u>RahlfsLXX</u>	Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. <u>Septuaginta</u> . Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935, 2 Vols.
<u>RevSR</u>	<u>Revue des sciences religieuses</u>
SBSO	Shield Bible Study Outlines series
SBT 2S	Studies in Biblical Theology, second series
SCJ	Studies in Christianity and Judaism series
<u>Scra</u>	<u>Scriptura</u>
<u>Sema</u>	<u>Semeia</u>
<u>SFG</u>	Aland, Kurt. <u>Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek- English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum</u> . Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1976.
SHR	Studies in the History of Religion series
StuText	Studies and Texts series
<u>TB</u>	<u>Tyndale Bulletin</u>
TEV	<u>Good News Bible: The Bible in Today's English Version</u> . Toronto: Canadian Bible Society, 1979.
TNTC	Tyndale New Testament Commentary series
TOTC	Tyndale Old Testament Commentary series
<u>TWOT</u>	Harris, R. Laird; Archer, Gleason L., Jr.; and Waltke, Bruce K., eds. <u>Theological Wordbook of the Old Testament</u> . Chicago: Moody, 1980, 2 vols.
<u>UBSGNT3</u>	Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M. and Wikgren, Allen, eds. <u>The Greek New Testament</u> . Third Edition. Münster/Westphalia: United Bible Societies, 1975.
<u>VoxT</u>	<u>Vox theologica</u>
<u>WAW</u>	<u>Word and World</u>
WBC	Word Biblical Commentary series
<u>Wor</u>	<u>Worship</u>

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

¹H. Chadwick, The Early Church (PHC, 1; Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1967) 38-40; see also R. J. Hoffmann, Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century (AARAS, 46; Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1984) 141-142; and the thorough treatment in J. Knox, Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon (Chicago: University, 1942) 77-157.

²V. P. Wierwille, Power for Abundant Living (New Knoxville, Ohio: American Christian, 1971) 207-211; see also W. Martin, The New Cults (Ventura, Cal.: Vision House, 1978) 47-48.

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),³ 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.⁴ 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,⁵ possibly, as has been argued, expunging from it what he termed Judaistic corruptions.⁶ Unfortunately we have little evidence for the text of Marcion's Gospel of Luke, and his

³See Chadwick, 40.

⁴See W. G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament (revised edition; Nashville: Abingdon, 1975) 149-150.

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.⁷ 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 fictitious⁸ 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."¹⁰

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.

⁹J. A. Michener, The Covenant (New York: Ballantine, 1980) 434.

¹⁰On the perceived "gentleness" of Christianity and the attempt by the Church to deny its Jewish heritage, see R. R. Ruether, 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 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 scholarship¹³ 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 (τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) was

¹¹F. F. Bruce, 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 fits the prevailing opinions (see D. L. Baker, 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. Schliermacher [Baker, 56], Delitzsch and Harnack [Baker 79-80]), but the general trend has been to a very high view of the OT.

¹²See D. F. Strauss, Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet (2 vols.; Tübingen, 1835-1836) (ET--The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined [London: Chapman, 1846]).

¹³A 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).

¹⁴F. Bovon, Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-83) (PTM, 12; Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick, 1987) 82.

supported by references to the Old Testament which gave significance to the facts.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.¹⁶ H. J. Cadbury argued that the fulfilment of the OT is a central motif in Luke's historical work.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.¹⁸ Hans Conzelmann, in his monumental Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (ET--The Theology of St. Luke),¹⁹ has not only concurred that Luke uses the promise and fulfilment motif in his depiction of Jesus and the Church,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

¹⁵C. H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures (London: Nisbet, 1952) 16.

¹⁶P. Schubert, "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag, AM 20. August 1954 (ed. W. Eltester; BZNW, 21; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957) 173-174.

¹⁷H. J. Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (New York: Macmillan, 1927) 303-305.

¹⁸E. Lohse, "Lukas als Theologe des Heilsgeschichte," EvT 14 (1954) 275.

¹⁹H. Conzelmann, Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas (BZHT, 17; Tübingen: Mohr, 1954) (ET--The Theology of St. Luke [New York: Harper, 1961]).

²⁰Conzelmann, Theology, 153, 161.

Church.²¹ 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.²² 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.²³ 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.²⁴ 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.²⁵ This book, Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas by Traugott Holtz,²⁶ 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.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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.²⁹ 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*.³⁰ 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

²⁵Bovon, 98-99.

²⁶T. Holtz, Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas (TU, 104; Berlin: Akademie, 1968).

²⁷D. W. Gooding, "Texts and Versions: 2. The Septuagint," NBD (1962) 1261.

²⁸Holtz, 166.

²⁹Ibid, 169-170.

³⁰Ibid, 172-173.

the evidence supports the conclusion that Luke did not have first-hand familiarity with great portions of the LXX.³¹ 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.

³¹Holtz'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.² 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.³ 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.⁴ 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

²H. B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (ed. R. R. Ottley; New York: KTAV, 1968) 394.

³Ibid, 398-399.

⁴W. K. L. Clarke, "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts," The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles (ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1922), 2. 66-105; Swete, 395.

likely influenced by the LXX of Gen. 12:3 or Ps. 21:28.⁵ More recently, Martin Rese, in his work on Lukan christology (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

⁵Clarke, 93-95.

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

⁷M. Wilcox, The Semitisms of Acts (Oxford: University, 1965) 20-21.

⁸Ibid, 21-30, esp. p. 24.

⁹Ibid, 30-31.

citations diverge from the latter it is probable that he used some other source or sources.¹⁰ 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."¹¹ 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.¹² 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,¹³ other scholars have faulted his reasoning at several points. J. A. Emerton, for example, calls Wilcox's arguments "uncertain, and sometimes fallacious,"¹⁴ and Earl Richard argues that "in not one single instance is his evidence persuasive."¹⁵ This hornets' nest of criticism, which

¹⁰Ibid, 51.

¹¹Ibid, 52-53.

¹²Ibid, 54.

¹³See Bock, 21.

¹⁴J. A. Emerton, Review of M. Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts, JSS 13 (1968) 290.

¹⁵E. Richard, "The Old Testament in Acts: Wilcox's Semitisms in Retrospect," CBQ 42 (1980) 340; note also the negative reviews by E. Haenchen (Review of M. Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts, TLZ 91 (1966) 355-357), and M. Zerwick (Review of M. Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts, Bib 47 (1966) 612); see also G. D. Kilpatrick, "Language and Text in the Gospels and Acts," VC 24 (1970) 161-171.

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.¹⁶ 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."¹⁷ 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.¹⁸ 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."¹⁹ Thus Richard appeals to theological motivations and Luke's creativity to account for many deviations from the LXX,²⁰ and in other cases demonstrates that there is ample evidence in the LXX textual tradition to account for the differences.²¹ These points are well taken and need to be examined more closely in

¹⁶Emerton, 284; but cf. Bock, 20.

¹⁷Emerton, 284.

¹⁸Ibid, 285-286; cf. Wilcox, "A Foreward to the Study of the Speeches in Acts," Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 1. 220-223.

¹⁹Richard, "Old Testament," 340.

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.²² Holtz, however, unequivocally states this possibility as his conclusion.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.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.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:

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

²²Wilcox, Semitisms, 23.

²³Holtz, 172-173.

²⁴See D.-A. Koch, Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums (Tübingen: Mohr, 1986).

²⁵Holtz, 1.

die Tradition, sei es die mündliche oder die schriftliche, zugekommen ist.²⁶

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),²⁷ 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."²⁸ 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.²⁹

²⁶Ibid.

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 "selbständigen 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.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).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.³⁴ Holtz also finds evidence of citations having their origin in the catechetical traditions of either the Jews or earliest Christians.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.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.

³²Ibid, 64, 68.

³³Ibid, 70.

³⁴Ibid, 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.).

³⁵Holtz, 81-82.

³⁶Ibid, 100, 109.

While there was never any debate over Luke's preference for the Minor Prophets, Isaiah and the Psalms,³⁷ Holtz concluded that Luke did not even directly know the LXX apart from these books.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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.⁴⁰ 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.

³⁹Ibid, 171-173.

⁴⁰See e.g., J. W. Wevers, "Septuagint," *IDB* (1962) 4. 276.

LXX.⁴¹ 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.⁴² 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.⁴³ 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.⁴⁴ 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.⁴⁵ 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

⁴¹See e.g., C. Burchard, "A Note on 'PHMA in Josas 17:1f.; Luke 2:15,17; Acts 10:37," *NovT* 27 (1985) 295 n. 55; see also Bovon, 101.

⁴²Rese, 216.

⁴³Richard, "Old Testament," 341 n. 37.

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.⁴⁶

Finally, Bovon appeals to Luke's theological and literary (redactional) activity as areas to which Holtz needed to apply himself more.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.⁴⁸ Hence this study will confine itself, as much as is possible, to those OT references about which there is some certainty

⁴⁶Ibid, 101.

⁴⁷Ibid.

⁴⁸See 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.

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."⁴⁹ 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.⁵⁰ Though these putative versions and recensions are too late to have influenced Luke,⁵¹ 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,⁵² who concluded that all mss of the LXX derived

⁴⁹Wevers, "Septuagint," 276; See E. Tov, Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) 136-137.

⁵⁰See e.g., Wevers, "Septuagint," 275-276; Tov, Textual Criticism, 144-148.

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

⁵²See Tov, Textual Criticism, 136, 183.

ultimately from one archetype (later called the "*Urtext* theory"),⁵³ some scholars have disagreed, the most prominent being Paul E. Kahle.⁵⁴ 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.⁵⁵

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.⁵⁶ 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

⁵³P. de Lagarde, Septuaginta Studien: Abhandlungen der Hist. Philos. Klasse der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (Band 37; Göttingen: 1891) 71-72; see also Tov, Textual Criticism, 183.

⁵⁴See Tov, Textual Criticism, 173-174, 185.

⁵⁵P. E. Kahle, The Cairo Geniza (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1959) 175-176.

⁵⁶Ibid, 176-179; see also F. M. Cross, Jr., "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts," 1972 Proceedings (SBLSCS, 2; ed. R. A. Kraft; Missoula, Montana: SBL, 1972) 108-126.

1963,⁵⁷ changed the course of LXX studies. Basing his work on earlier studies by Thackeray⁵⁸ and his own examination of a Greek Minor Prophets scroll discovered in 1952,⁵⁹ Barthélemy postulated the existence of a Hebraicising recension of at least extensive portions of the LXX, which has been termed the "*kaige* recension."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.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.⁶²

⁵⁷D. Barthélemy, Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du dodécaprophète (VTSup, 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963).

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

⁵⁹The contents of this scroll have recently been published in Tov, The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr): (The Seiyâl Collection I) (DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).

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

⁶¹Barthélemy, 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]).

⁶²Barthélemy, 80, 81, 88, 91.

Clearly, as Barthélemy himself declared, these findings do not support the thesis of Paul Kahle.⁶³ 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.⁶⁴ 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.⁶⁵ 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,⁶⁶ and it is possible that such evidence may contribute much to the analysis of Lukan citations as well.

⁶³Ibid, 272.

⁶⁴E.g., S. Jellicoe, Review of D. Barthélemy: *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, JAOS 84 (1964) 181-182; see also R. A. Kraft, Review of D. Barthélemy: *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, Gno 37 (1965) 483; S. P. Brock, "Lucian *redivivus*: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's *Les devanciers d'Aquila*," SE 5 (1966) 180-181.

⁶⁵See O'Connell, "Versions," 377-381; Jellicoe, *The Septuagint in Modern Study* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Eisenbrauns, 1978) 338-359; Tov, *Textual Criticism*, 145; see also Wevers, "Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies," BIOSCS 21 (1988) 23-34.

⁶⁶See n. 25 above.

The above studies indicate that the problem of the Lukan citations is not a simple one.⁶⁷ 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.

⁶⁷A 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] 221-235). 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,⁶⁸ 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.⁶⁹ 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,⁷⁰ and since Luke appears to have been a literary Hellenistic writer,⁷¹ Brodie suggests that he may have used this method as well.⁷²

Brodie was not, however, the first to express this idea. David Strauss, in what Leonhard Goppelt calls a "monstrous exaggeration,"⁷³ considered that large portions of

⁶⁸T. L. Brodie, "Luke 7, 36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4, 1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation," Bib 64 (1983) 461.

⁶⁹Ibid, 461-463.

⁷⁰See Ibid, 459-464; see also Brodie, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources," Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar (ed. C. H. Talbert; New York: Crossroad, 1984) 17-46.

⁷¹J. A. Fitzmyer, The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation and Notes (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981) 92.

⁷²Brodie, "Luke 7, 36-50," 459,464-465.

⁷³L. Goppelt, Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 14.

the Gospel narratives were fabrications by the Church based on the OT.⁷⁴ 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."⁷⁵ Craig A. Evans has continued this line of reasoning by noting that the biblical idiom *αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλήμ*, which begins this section in Luke, is based on LXX language.⁷⁶ In a similar fashion, David Moessner has argued that the central section of Luke's Gospel contains a "Moses-Deut typology."⁷⁷ He argues that the central Lukan section corresponds to the calling of Moses in Deuteronomy,⁷⁸ 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*.⁷⁹

⁷⁴See above, p. 4, n. 12.

⁷⁵C. F. Evans, "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel," Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Blackwell, 1957) 51.

⁷⁶C. A. Evans, "'He Set His Face': A Note on Luke 9,51," Bib 63 (1982) 546-547.

⁷⁷D. P. Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy," JBL 102 (1983) 588. Moessner has expanded his analysis of this passage to include the whole Lukan travel narrative in his monograph Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989) esp. 60-70.

⁷⁸Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50," 600-601; see also Lord of the Banquet, 325.

⁷⁹Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50," 582, emphasis Moessner's; see also Lord of the Banquet, 60.

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.

⁸⁰Moessner, "Luke 9:1-50," 579; see also Moessner's detailed treatment of this idea, especially as related to the Acts, in Lord of the Banquet, 289-324.

⁸¹R. N. Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975) 140.

⁸²C. H. Cave, "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy," NTS 15 (1968-1969) 325.

⁸³Schubert, 165-186.

⁸⁴N. A. Dahl, "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts," Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 140.

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.⁸⁶ 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."⁸⁷ 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 22.⁸⁸

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.⁸⁹ The nativity stories in Luke have also come under scrutiny as instances of

⁸⁶B. J. Hubbard, "Commissioning Stories in Luke-Acts: A Study of Their Antecedents, Form and Content," *Sema* 8 (1977) 103; see also T. Y. Mullins, "New Testament Commission Forms, Especially in Luke-Acts," *JBL* 95 (1976) 603-614. By way of comparison note that G. von Rad had earlier found in Chronicles a similar literary form, which he termed "a distinct form-category of later origin, that of the 'Levitical Sermon'" ("The Levitical Sermon in the Books of Chronicles" *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* [ed. E. W. T. Dicken; Edinburgh: Clark, 1966] 289. Mason (*Preaching the Tradition*, 257), however, has disputed this.

⁸⁷W. S. Kurz, "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman Farewell Addresses," *JBL* 104 (1985) 252-253; cf. also E. Lövestam, "En gammaltestamentlig nyckel till Paulus-talet i Miletos (Apg. 20:18-35)," *SEA* 51-52 (1986-1987) 137-147. Compare also von Rad, "Levitical Sermon," 179 and Mason, *Preaching the Tradition*, 257.

⁸⁸Kurz, 268.

⁸⁹On 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 Königlich 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. 27-43.⁹⁰ 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.⁹¹ 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,"⁹² 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 6-7,⁹³ 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

⁸⁹(...continued)

9; Sheffield: JSOT, 1985) 21-25, 116; see also R. E. Brown, The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke (London: Chapman, 1977) 358-360; J. G. Davies, "The Ascription of the Magnificat to Mary," JTS NS 15 (1964) 308; S. Benko, "The Magnificat: A History of the Controversy," JBL 86 (1967) 275; A. T. Hanson, The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983) 78. On Peter's Pentecost sermon, see C. A. Evans, "The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon," ZNW 74 (1983) 148-150. On Paul's *Areopagus* speech, see e.g., J.-C. Lebram, "Der Aufbau der Areopagrede," ZNW 55 (1964) 239-242; A.-M. Dubarle, "Le discours à l'Aréopage (Actes 17, 22-31) et son arrière-plan biblique," RSPT 57 (1973) 576-610.

⁹⁰C. T. Ruddick, Jr., "Birth Narratives in Genesis and Luke," NovT 12 (1970) 347; see also M. D. Goulder and M. L. Sanderson, "St. Luke's Genesis," JTS NS 8 (1957) 12-30; on this and the wider issue of Luke's patterning his work after the OT, see G. L. Steyn, "Intertextual Similarities Between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel," Neot 24 (1990) 229-246.

⁹¹Goulder, Evangelists' Calendar, 17-18.

⁹²Brodie, "Luke 7, 36-50," 484.

⁹³See M. Hengel, Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983) 3-4; a fairly exhaustive study of the various aspects of the Stephen Speech has been undertaken recently by S. Légasse, Stephanos: Histoire et discours d'Étienne dans les Actes des Apôtres (LD 147; Paris: Cerfaux, 1992).

Luke has "deliberately adapted or distilled" for his purpose.⁹⁴ 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),⁹⁵ 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,⁹⁶ that Luke 7:1-8:3 is especially indebted to the accounts of Elijah and Elisha,⁹⁷ 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. 17:1-16.⁹⁸

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

⁹⁴Brodie, "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:8-13) as One Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6:9-14; 7:58a)," CBQ 45 (1983) 432.

⁹⁵Brodie, "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8, 9-40," Bib 67 (1986) 41.

⁹⁶Brodie, "A New Temple and a New Law: The Unity and Chronicler-based Nature of Luke 1:1-4:22a," JSNT 5 (1979) 43.

⁹⁷Brodie, "Luke 7, 36-50," 484.

⁹⁸Brodie, "Not Q But Elijah: The Saving of the Centurion's Servant (Luke 7.1-10) as an Internalization of the Saving of the Widow and Her Child (1 Kgs 17.1-16)," IBS 14 (1992) 54-71. Brodie applies his theory to the whole of Luke-Acts as well ("Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative," New Views on Luke and Acts [ed. E. Richard; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990] 78-85).

orientation,⁹⁹ Goppelt has found evidence of typology in the Lukan writings.¹⁰⁰ While the issue of typology itself goes beyond the scope of this study,¹⁰¹ 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.¹⁰² Clearly this whole area needs to be reevaluated.

C. The Nature of Luke's Greek

Finally, there is the question of Luke's Greek. While it seems fairly clear that the LXX influenced the language of the NT,¹⁰³ 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.¹⁰⁴ As to why Luke did this there are three different positions in the literature. The first

¹⁰²Clarke, 103.

¹⁰³See 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.

¹⁰⁴Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 109. That Luke did not write the infancy narratives has been suggested (e.g., Conzelmann, *Theology*, 118; J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977] 97-98; R. Leaney, "The Birth Narratives in St Luke and St Matthew," *NTS* 8 [1961-1962] 158-166; M. Dibelius, "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind: Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium," *Botschaft und Geschichte* [1; Tübingen: Mohr, 1953] 1-78; P. Winter, "The Main Literary Problem of the Lucan Infancy Story," *ATR* 40 [1958] 262-264). This theory has its base in the "Proto-Luke hypothesis" in which it is argued that the original Gospel was a combination of "Q" and Luke's special material, and began at what is now 3:1. Later this Gospel was combined with Markan material and the infancy narratives were added (see e.g., B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels* [London: MacMillan, 1924] 233-270; L. Gaston, *No Stone On Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels* [NovTSup 23; Leiden: Brill, 1970] 244-256; and esp. V. Taylor, *Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis* [Oxford: Clarendon, 1926]; *The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel* [London: S.P.C.K., 1927]; see also the discussions in Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 89-91; Kümmel, 131-137). Some evidence for such a shorter version of Luke has been found in quotations of Luke outside of the NT (see F. C. Conybeare, "Ein Zeugnis Ephrāms über das Fehlen von c. 1 und 2 in Texte des Lucas," *ZNW* 3 [1902] 192-197; and the discussion in Knox [77-113]). It is to be noted, however, that the ascription of Luke 1-2 to a later editor is only upheld by a minority of scholars (see Winter, "The Main Literary Problem" [1958], 257).

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.¹⁰⁵ He studied the apocryphal books of the LXX especially, finding them a significant influence for Luke's Greek.¹⁰⁶ 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"?¹⁰⁷ He suggests three possible solutions to the problem: either (1) the Gospel, apart from the prologue, is a translation of a

¹⁰⁵Clarke, 69-73.

¹⁰⁶Ibid, 73-80.

¹⁰⁷H. F. D. Sparks, "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel," *JTS* 44 (1943) 129.

Semitic original, or (2) Luke used Semitic sources which either he or someone else translated, or (3) "he himself was consciously Semitizing."¹⁰⁸ 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

¹⁰⁸Ibid. Sparks does not consider the possibility that Luke did not write either the prologue or the infancy narratives.

¹⁰⁹Ibid, 129-130.

¹¹⁰Ibid, 132.

with LXX usage or in characteristically LXX language.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 *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.'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.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.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?"¹¹⁵

¹¹¹Ibid, 133-134.

¹¹²Ibid, 134.

¹¹³Sparks, "The Semitisms of the Acts," *JTS* NS 1 (1950) 22.

¹¹⁴Ibid, 22-26.

¹¹⁵Ibid, 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 *καί* 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

¹¹⁶See e.g., the various works by T. L. Brodie and C. A. Evans noted above as well as J. Hackett, "Echoes of Euripedes in Acts of the Apostles?" *ITQ* 23 (1958) 218-227; Silva, "Semantic Borrowing in the New Testament," *NTS* 22 (1975-1976) 104-110; Jellicoe, "St. Luke and the Letter of Aristeas," *JBL* 80 (1961) 155; R. C. Tannehill, "The Magnificat as Poem," *JBL* 93 (1974) 264; Bruce, *The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text With Introduction and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951) 26-28; L. Morris, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary*, TNTC, 3 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974) 26-28; among many others; see also A. Wifstrand, "Lukas XVIII.7," *NTS* 11 (1964-1965) 74.

¹¹⁷Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 123-125.

¹¹⁸E.g., Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 16-19.

¹¹⁹W. G. Most, "Did St. Luke Imitate the Septuagint?" *JSNT* 15 (1982) 34-38; but cf. J. A. Gault, "The Discourse Function of *Kai Egeneto* in Luke and Acts," *OPTAT* 4 (1990) 388-399.

¹²⁰Wifstrand, "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.¹²¹ 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.¹²² 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."¹²³ 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

¹²¹Ibid, 247.

¹²²Ibid, 248-258.

¹²³Ibid, 258-259.

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."¹²⁴ 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 expressions¹²⁵ and other Semitic-sounding words and phrases.¹²⁶ 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).¹²⁷ 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,¹²⁸ 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 *παῖς*

¹²⁴C. C. Torrey, The Composition and Date of Acts (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1916) 8-9.

¹²⁵*Ibid*, 10-12.

¹²⁶*Ibid*, 23-40.

¹²⁷*Ibid*, 40.

¹²⁸F. Zimmerman, The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels (New York: KTAV, 1979) 195.

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.¹²⁹ 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.¹³⁰ H. J. Cadbury has noted a number of stylistic arguments which explain the stylistic shifts in Acts equally as well as Torrey's theory.¹³¹ 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.¹³²

In spite of these criticisms the theory has not died. Torrey himself attempted to answer his critics, with reasonable success,¹³³ and a number of scholars have used the theory as a basis for their own investigations into Aramaic sources.¹³⁴ Into this stream of turbulent scholarship in 1946 broke Matthew Black's famous monograph, An Aramaic

¹²⁹F. C. Burkitt, "Professor C. C. Torrey on 'Acts'," JTS 20 (1918-1919) 327-328.

¹³⁰E. J. Goodspeed, "The Origin of Acts," IBL 39 (1920) 87-88.

¹³¹Cadbury, "Luke—Translator or Author?" AJT 24 (1920) 436-455.

¹³²Sparks, "Acts," 19-21.

¹³³Torrey, "Fact and Fancy in Theories Concerning Acts," AJT 23 (1919) 61-86, 189-212.

¹³⁴E.g., Zimmerman, 195-203; R. A. Martin, "Syntactical Evidence of Aramaic Sources in Acts I-XV," NTS 11 (1964-1965) 59.

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.¹³⁵ The book was later republished in its third edition¹³⁶ and has had some more recent criticism levelled at it,¹³⁷ 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.¹³⁸ 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

¹³⁵M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford: Clarendon, 1946) 207.

¹³⁶Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3d ed; Oxford: Clarendon, 1967).

¹³⁷E.g., Fitzmyer, Review of M. Black: An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3d ed), CBQ 30 (1968) 417-428; Brock, Review of M. Black: An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, JTS NS 20 (1969) 274-278; see also A. W. Argyle, "An Alleged Semitism," ExpTim 66 (1954-1955) 177.

¹³⁸See, 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]).

underlying document or documents to have been Hebrew.¹³⁹ This conclusion is widely accepted.¹⁴⁰ Similarly, Acts 3 and 7 have often been regarded as drawing upon early sources.¹⁴¹

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

¹³⁹P. Winter, "The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke I and II," *JQR* 45 (1954-1955) 167, 242; "The Main Literary Problem of the Lucan Infancy Story," *VoxT* 28 (1957-1958) 117-121; "The Main Literary Problem of the Lucan Infancy Story," *ATR* 40 (1958) 257-264 (see above, n. 108); see also "Magnificat and Benedictus—Maccabaeian Psalms?" *BJRL* 37 (1954-1955) 328-347; "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke Chs. I and II," *NTS* 3 (1956-1957) 136-142; "On the Margin of Luke I, II," *ST* 12 (1958) 103-107; "'*Orti* 'recitativum' in Lc 1 25. 61, 2 23," *ZNW* 46 (1955) 261-263; "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel," *NTS* 1 (1954-1955) 111-121; "Two Notes on Luke I, II with Regard to the Theory of 'Imitation Hebraisms'," *ST* 7 (1953) 158-165; note also the following studies outside of the infancy narratives: "The Proto-Source of Luke," *NovT* 1 (1956) 184-199; "The Treatment of His Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV," *ST* 8 (1954) 138-173; "Luke XXII 66b-71," *ST* 9 (1955) 112-115; see also E. Schweizer ("Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?" *TZ* 6 [1950] 161-185), who also suggests Hebrew sources behind Luke.

¹⁴⁰E.g., Farris, 31-62, esp. p. 62 (Farris' application of R. A. Martin's criteria for ascertaining translation Greek [e.g., "Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek" *VT* 10 (1960) 295-310] to the Lukan infancy narratives is groundbreaking and provides the opportunity for more conclusive work in this whole area); A. M. Salazar, "Questions About St. Luke's Sources," *NovT* 2 (1957-1958) 317; R. Laurentin, "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (I)," *Bib* 37 (1956) 449-456; "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (II)," *Bib* 38 (1957) 1-23; *Structure et théologie de Luc i-ii*, EB (Paris: Lecoffre, 1957) 37-38; see also H. Sahlin, *Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie* (Uppsala: Wiksells, 1945) 9; R. Buth, "Hebrew Poetic Tenses and the Magnificat," *JSNT* 21 (1984) 76; D. Jones, "The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms," *JTS* NS 19 (1968) 19-50; F. G. Downing, "Redaction Criticism: Josephus' *Antiquities* and the Synoptic Gospels (II)," *JSNT* 9 (1980) 33; Bruce, *Themes*, 78; but for opposing positions, cf. especially: F. O'Fearghail, "The Imitation of the Septuagint in Luke's Infancy Narrative," *PIBA* 12 (1989) 58-78; J. Irigoin, "La composition rythmique des cantiques de Luc," *RB* 98 (1991) 5-50, esp. p. 49; Steyn, "The Occurrence of 'Kainam' in Luke's Genealogy: Evidence of Septuagint Influence?" *ETL* 65 (1989) 409-411; Goulder and Sanderson, 12-30; H. H. Oliver, "The Lukan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 10 (1963-1964) 202-226; Tannehill, "Magnificat," 264, 273.

¹⁴¹See e.g., Wilcox, "The Old Testament in Acts 1-15," *AusBR* 5 (1956) 1-41; C. H. H. Scobie, "The Use of Source Material in the Speeches of Acts III and VII," *NTS* 25 (1978-1979) 399-421.

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.¹⁴² As we have noted, Wilcox's theory has received a good deal of criticism,¹⁴³ but in spite of that his conclusions are still respected among many scholars.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.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.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

¹⁴²Wilcox, Semitisms, 184.

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

¹⁴⁴E.g., Bock, 20-22; note also the cautious study by D. F. Payne, "Semitisms in the Book of Acts," Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday (ed. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970) 134-150.

¹⁴⁵Zimmerman, 22.

¹⁴⁶Ibid, 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,¹⁴⁷ 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.

¹⁴⁷I. 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

¹⁴⁸N. Turner, "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts," Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday (ed. J. K. Elliott; Leiden: Brill, 1976) 387.

¹⁴⁹*Ibid*, 400.

¹⁵⁰Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol IV, Style (Edinburgh: Clark, 1976) 55-56; see also A. Plummer, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke (ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1922) 1.

¹⁵¹Turner, Style, 62.

¹⁵²Turner, "The Relation of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts," NTS 2 (1955-1956) 100-109.

¹⁵³Winter, "On Luke and Lucan Sources: A Reply to the Reverend N. Turner," ZNW 47 (1956) 217-242.

What can be said about such a theory? The reaction of the scholarly community to Turner's thesis has been guardedly critical. While some¹⁵⁴ 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.¹⁵⁵ Edgar McKnight considers the whole concept of Jewish Greek "a questionable presupposition."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 Septuagintisms 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,

¹⁵⁴E.g., Burchard, 295, n. 55.

¹⁵⁵L. Nieting, Review of N. Turner: A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. IV, Style, JBL 96 (1977) 592.

¹⁵⁶E. V. McKnight, Review of N. Turner: Grammatical Insights into the New Testament, Int 21 (1967) 351.

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)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

¹⁵⁷Sparks, "St. Luke's Gospel," 134.

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.¹⁵⁸ 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.¹⁵⁹

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

¹⁵⁸Besides the enormous amount of material to do with Luke's Greek and Rhetorical Imitation, NestleAland26 (739-769) lists 914 possible allusions to the OT (excluding Apocrypha) in Luke-Acts.

¹⁵⁹K. Stendahl, The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968) 46.

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., *μενοῦνγε* [Rom. 10:18], *ὅτι* [Gal. 3:11], *ἀλλά* [Rom. 9:7], or an inserted *γάρ* [Rom. 10:13] or *δέ* [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.¹⁶⁰ 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.¹⁶¹ 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.

¹⁶⁰Koch, 13-15.

¹⁶¹Emerton, 284.

Clearly Luke does alter the wording of many OT passages generally accepted as citations (as a reading of Clarke and Holtz demonstrates).¹⁶² 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.

¹⁶²See also Stendahl, 46, 88.

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.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

¹⁶³This 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.¹⁶⁴ 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,¹⁶⁵ 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

¹⁶⁴Argyle, "The Accounts of the Temptations of Jesus in relation to the Q Hypothesis," *ExpTim* 64 (1952-1953) 382.

¹⁶⁵See B. C. Lategan, "Tradition and Interpretation—Two Methodological Remarks," *Neot* 7 (1973) 95-103.

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 ἐγώ by Luke), while Mark omits the final ἐμπροσθέν 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 ἐγώ 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.³

That the citation is fused is clearly seen from the substitution of ἀποστέλλω from Ex. 23:20 for ἐξαποστέλλω as found in Malachi, and the changing of the pronoun μου to σου.⁴ 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".⁵ 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.⁶ I must note, however, that the word κατασκευάσει is found rather than LXX ἐπιβλέψεται. Now this is interesting. The Hebrew word corresponding in the MT is כָּטַף. According to BDB the Hebrew word in question has the sense in the *piel* of "put out of the way" or "make clear"; however, the root כָּטַף in the *qal* means to "turn" or to "turn and look."⁷ 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 ἀποσκευάσει,⁸ a term etymologically closer to the NT citation than to the LXX. NT κατασκευάσει 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, ἔμπροσθεν (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 פָּנָיו as the rather literalistic LXX πρὸ προσώπου 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

⁸GottLXX13, Mal. 3:1.

⁹See *ibid.*

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

¹¹See BAG, 256.

¹²Note that Barthélemy (84, n. 1) has characterized the *kaige* equivalent of פָּנָיו as ἐνώπιον, not ἔμπροσθεν or the more literal πρὸ προσώπου 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 *ἐμπροσθέν*), 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,¹³ he would not likely exchange a clearly applicable word (*κατασκευάσει*) for one that, in the context, was less useful (*ἐπιβλέψεται*). 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.¹⁴ 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

¹³See Lategan, 95-103.

¹⁴See e.g., B. Gerhardsson, *The Origins of the Gospel Traditions* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979) 80-81, 85; see also J. B. Tyson, *The New Testament and Early Christianity* (New York: Macmillan, 1984) 151-152; Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel* (Greenwood, S.C.: Attie, 1971) 25-28.

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. 27:25,¹⁵ the only verbal correspondence appears to be ἐφ' 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 πέσατε instead of πέσετε. The latter variant is of no consequence.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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).¹⁸ 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.

¹⁸H. Ringgren, "Luke's Use of the Old Testament," Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-fifth Birthday (ed. G. W. E. Nickelsburg and G. W. MacRae; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986) 229.

This variant text, according to Holtz, was found in Luke's LXX.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,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.

¹⁹Holtz, 28.

²⁰Compare BHS with GottLXX13, Hos. 10:8.

C. Acts Citations

1. Acts 2:17-21 = Joel 2:28-32, LXX (3:1-5, MT)

/ 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 ἡμέραις 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 ὁράσεις ὄψονται are transposed in Acts; (4) Acts reads καὶ γε instead of a simple καί before ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους; (5) Acts adds the pronoun μου after δούλους and δούλας; (6) Acts adds the phrase καὶ προφητεύσουσιν after ἐκχεῶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πνεύματός μου; and (7) Acts adds ἄνω after τῷ οὐρανῷ and σημεία 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.

²³See *NestleAland26*, Acts 2:17.

²⁴B. M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (Münster/Westphalia: United Bible Societies, 1971) 295.

copyist than the more vague "after these things."²⁵ Ernst Haenchen has also argued that the phrase "in the last days" is inconsistent with Lukan eschatology and is thus probably secondary.²⁶ Holtz follows these two scholars, and is in turn followed by Rese,²⁷ concluding that the phrase "in the last days" is a formula of the sub-apostolic church, and its reading here dates from that time.²⁸

The external evidence, however, is strongly weighted toward ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις,²⁹ and it is difficult to understand why, if μετὰ ταῦτα were the original reading, there is not more evidence for it in the textual tradition.³⁰ 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 2.³¹ 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.³²

²⁵Kilpatrick, "Some Quotations in Acts," *Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédactions, théologie* (ed. J. Kremer; BETL 68; Gembloux: Leuven, 1979) 82. See also the discussion of this sort of textual phenomenon in Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (3d ed.; New York: Oxford University, 1992), 199.

²⁶Haenchen, "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," *ZTK* 51 (1954) 162.

²⁷Rese, 51-52.

²⁸Holtz, 7-8.

²⁹See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 295.

³⁰See Bock, 161.

³¹F. 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).

³²Holtz, 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,³³ an emphasis for which Luke is noted.³⁴ Goppelt, on the other hand, sees in this quotation a mixed citation in which the phrase *ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις* is interpolated from Isa. 2:2.³⁵ 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.³⁶ Thus, in v. 16 he states that the citation is from the prophet Joel, and in v. 17 asserts its divine origin.³⁶ 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,³⁷ or as a stylistic alteration to improve the flow of

³³Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 100.

³⁴J. Dupont, *The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles* (New York: Paulist, 1979) 137.

³⁵Goppelt, *Typos*, 118 n. 66.

³⁶Holtz, 5-6; see Bock, 161, 244 n. 25.

³⁷As e.g., Ringgren, 233.

the sequence.³⁸ 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 *ἐνυπνίοις* for accusative *ἐνύπνια* 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.³⁹ Both Ziegler and Rahlfs, however, consider this reading to have been influenced by the Acts passage.⁴⁰ 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 *ἐνυπνιάζομαι* normally takes the accusative and the LXX commonly renders this verb with the accusative).⁴¹ 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.⁴² Bock rather feebly suggests a stylistic alteration,⁴³ 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

³⁸As e.g., Bock, 162.

³⁹See GottLXX13, Joel 2:28.

⁴⁰Ibid, RahlfsLXX, Joel 2:28.

⁴¹See Holtz, 9.

⁴²Ibid, 9-10.

⁴³Bock, 162.

of verbal nouns,⁴⁴ or the so-called "dative of manner," which reinforces a verbal notion.⁴⁵ 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.⁴⁶ 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 mss of the LXX.⁴⁷

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.⁴⁸ 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 *καί γε* instead of a simple *καί* before *ἐπὶ τοὺς δούλους*, point (4), is suggestive of the so-called *kaige* recension described by Barthélemy and others. The construction *καί γε* is used very seldom in the NT, being found elsewhere only in Acts

⁴⁴Turner, A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. III, Syntax (Edinburgh: Clark, 1963) 241.

⁴⁵Zerwick, Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples (Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963) 21; see also BDE, 106-107.

⁴⁶Turner, Syntax, 241.

⁴⁷This does not necessarily challenge the findings of Ziegler and Rahlfs regarding the LXX mss containing the Acts reading, since the mss 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 mss.

⁴⁸Holtz, 10.

17:27 and in a number of mss for Luke 19:42.⁴⁹ 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 *καί* in a citation such as this.⁵⁰ He may have put it in to emphasize that "even" for the *δούλοι*, which for Luke may have connoted Christians,⁵¹ is the Spirit poured out;⁵² 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.⁵³ We must note that the Hebrew here reads *וְגַם*, typically rendered *καί γε* in the recensional texts which Barthélemy has identified;⁵⁴ 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 *καί γε* is well attested in the LXX textual tradition here as well, again ascribed by Ziegler to influence from Acts;⁵⁵ but it is also possible that the evidence for *καί γε* 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 *καί γε* to render *וְגַם*.

⁵⁵*GottLXX13*, Joel 2:28.

toward the Hebrew. Such evidence tends to support Holtz's conclusion that Luke found *καί γε* in his ms of the LXX.⁵⁶

The addition of the pronoun *μου* after *δούλους* and *δούλας* (5) is similar to the use of *καί 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 *δούλοι* 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.⁶² As there is some textual evidence for this in the LXX tradition,⁶³ 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).⁶⁴ With this in mind, it does not seem impossible that Luke would have inserted the phrase *καὶ προφητεύουσιν* here. Thus, while a textual error is not unlikely, a theological interpolation is equally possible.

The addition of *σημεῖα*, *ἄνω* and *κάτω* (7) are hailed by Clarke as evidence of free citation.⁶⁵ While *σημεῖα* possibly may have been found in Luke's copy of the LXX,⁶⁶ it is more likely attributable to Luke. The terms "signs and wonders" appear together throughout the early part of Acts,⁶⁷ and we may sense a Lukan (or that of an earlier editor) predilection for having the two terms together. Reese suggests that the insertion of *σημεῖα* helps to connect the prophecy of Joel with the words concerning

⁶²Ibid, 12.

⁶³See GottLXX13, Joel 2:29.

⁶⁴G. Friedrich, "προφήτης: D. Prophets and Prophecies in the New Testament," TDNT 6 (1968) 851-852; see also M. H. Shepherd, Jr., "Prophet in the NT," IDB 3 (1962) 919; W. Neil, The Acts of the Apostles (NCB; London: Oliphants, 1973) 75; D. E. Aune, Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983) 195; cf. also R. Rendtorff, "προφήτης: נָבִי in the Old Testament," TDNT 6 (1968) 797; A. Oepke, "ἐκστασις, ἐξίστημι," TDNT 2 (1964) 457.

⁶⁵Clarke, 93; Ringgren, 233.

⁶⁶See Holtz, 13.

⁶⁷J. Munck, The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction, Translation and Notes (ed. W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann; AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967) 18.

Jesus in v. 22.⁶⁸ While there are problems with this suggestion (e.g., why did Luke not also add *δυνάμεις* and thus connect the two verses completely),⁶⁹ 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.⁷⁰ 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,⁷¹ but Bock rightly points out that it is difficult to see the stylistic improvement in that.⁷² Holtz argues that they were part of the text cited by Luke, a text which attempted to come closer to the Hebrew;⁷³ but there is no equivalent in the Hebrew for these two words.⁷⁴ 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).

⁷¹Haenchen, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1971) 179.

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.⁷⁵ 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."⁷⁶ 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 *ἐνύπνια* to dative *ἐνυπνίῳ*, and the change of *καί* to *καί 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 τὴν*

⁷⁵Bock, 163.

⁷⁶Ibid.

μεγάλην καὶ ἐπιφανῇ, which preserves the error of the LXX in reading הַגָּדוֹל for הַגָּדוֹל.⁷⁷

2. Acts 7: 42-43 = Amos 5:25-27

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 ἔτη (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 Βαβυλώνος for LXX Δαμασκού.

⁷⁷Ringgren, 233.

⁷⁸E.g., Hanson, 85.

⁷⁹Scobie, "Use of Source Material," 412.

⁸⁰Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 88; he also lists Acts 3:22-23; 13:41; 15:16.

⁸¹Clarke, 91. Dupont (Salvation, p. 139) has noted that the quotation is "considerably altered."

The inversion of τεσσαράκοντα ἔτη (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]).⁸² 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,⁸³ 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.⁸⁴ Holtz also agrees with this conclusion.⁸⁵ 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 τεσσεράκοντα 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.⁸⁶

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.⁸⁷ The textual history is extremely complex at this point and it must be noted that the MT

⁸²See Richard, "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts," *NovT* 24 (1982) 38 n. 5.

⁸³See *GottLXX13*, Amos 5:25.

⁸⁴Richard, "Creative Use," 38-40 n. 5.

⁸⁵Holtz, 16 n. 7.

⁸⁶See *BAG*, 820.

⁸⁷*GottLXX13*, Amos 5:25.

contains the equivalent phrase here (רַב־רַב־רַב). 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.⁸⁸ Given that this phrase brings the LXX closer to the Hebrew, and that the words are found in Theodotion,⁸⁹ 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 *Ῥαίφαν* in its text for the Hebrew רַב־רַב־רַב, 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,⁹¹ however, we are left with reasonably good evidence that Luke found this phrase in his text.

The omission of *ὁμῶν* 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.

⁸⁸Holtz, 16.

⁸⁹For the relationship of Theodotion to Hebraicizing recensions, see Barthélemy 153-160.

⁹⁰See Ringgren, 234; he also considers the rendering *Μολοχ* for the Hebrew מֶלֶךְ 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.

⁹¹See 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.

⁹²See *NestleAland26* and *UBSGNT3*, Acts 7:43.

⁹³See Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 161; Holtz, 14.

On the other hand, the omission of the other pronoun, *αὐτῶν*, after *τοὺς τύπους* (4), probably reflects a textual variant in the LXX tradition.⁹⁴ The witnesses to the omission in the LXX, according to Ziegler, include: A-Q^{mt}, L³⁷⁻³⁶, C-68, plus the Bohairic and a citation of Justin.⁹⁵ The Justin citation likely reflects the influence of Acts, but the others may represent an earlier tradition.⁹⁶ It does not bring the citation any closer to the Hebrew, however (כְּצִלְצִל). 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."⁹⁷ The LXX has softened this polemic, by using the more ambiguous "*their*."⁹⁸ 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.⁹⁹ The phrase seems non-septuagintal as no ms of the LXX

⁹⁴Holtz, 17.

⁹⁵See GottLXX13, Amos 2:26.

⁹⁶See Holtz, 17 n. 1.

⁹⁷See J. L. Mays, Amos: A Commentary (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969) 112.

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 כְּצִלְצִל as כְּצִלְצִל.

⁹⁹Clarke, 94.

has it. Certainly Clarke's suggestion is the simplest explanation, and he is, in fact, followed by Holtz¹⁰⁰ and Richard¹⁰¹ at this point. It is to be noted that the two words *προσκυνέω* and *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 (*ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς μόσχον καὶ προσκεκυνήνασιν αὐτῷ*), which is alluded to in Acts 7:41.¹⁰² Richard has suggested that it is Deut. 4:19 which has led Luke to use the Amos passage here,¹⁰³ although the evidence for this seems tenuous at best.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 *Δαμασκοῦ* to *Βαβυλῶνος* (6), is by far the most important. Again, however, it cannot have been found in Luke's LXX since only Q^{mg}, 26 and Cyril of Jerusalem attest the reading.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

¹⁰⁰Holtz, 17-18.

¹⁰¹Richard, "Creative Use," 40-41.

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

¹⁰³Richard, "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.

¹⁰⁴His 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, *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.?" *ZNW* 82 [1991] 67-87; "An Explanation of Acts 15.6-21 in the Light of Deuteronomy 4.29-35 [LXX]," *JSNT* 46 [1992] 73-97).

¹⁰⁵See *GottLXX13*, Amos 5:27; Cyril of Jerusalem states that *Βαβυλῶνος* comes from the "*Ἑβραῖοι*".

substantially true to the original idea contained in "beyond Damascus."¹⁰⁶ 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.¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸ William Neil suggests, more prosaically, that the Babylonian captivity was more important to Jerusalem Jews and that is why it was mentioned here.¹⁰⁹ 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."¹¹⁰ 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.

¹⁰⁹Neil, 113.

¹¹⁰Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 174.

ascribes the citation to Luke.¹¹¹ 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,¹¹² 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."¹¹³ 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. 1:5.¹¹⁴ 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 ἐργάζομαι has been inverted; (4) ἔργον has been added before ὁ οὐ μὴ πιστεύσητε; (5) ὑμῶν has been added after ἐκδιηγῆται.

¹¹¹Holtz, 17.

¹¹²See Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 173.

¹¹³Hanson, 85.

¹¹⁴Clarke, 94.

The first variation (1) can only be explained (at present)¹¹⁵ as a stylistic alteration for the sake of shortening the material.¹¹⁶ Holtz notes that this cannot come from any knowledge of the Hebrew since ἐπιβλέψατε is a suitable translation of the Hebrew רָאוּ בְּעֵינֵיכֶם, whereas ἀφανίσθητε is not a suitable translation of נִמְחָסוּ, yet Luke retains the latter while rejecting the former.¹¹⁷ Ringgren suggests that Luke may have found ἐπιβλέψατε superfluous after ἴδετε.¹¹⁸ Similarly, the removal of θαυμάσια may be seen as a stylistic improvement,¹¹⁹ and may, in fact, be an instance of Luke removing a Semitism from his LXX text.

The change of διότι to ὅτι (2) is only a minor variation, and Holtz notes that the διότι of Hab. 2:3 appears as ὅτι in Codex Alexandrinus, thus concluding that Luke's LXX very likely contained it also at 1:5.¹²⁰ It is to be noted that 8HevXIIgr reads ὅτι for διότι in Hab. 1:5;¹²¹ indeed that ms alters the LXX so that Hebrew רָא is

¹¹⁵It is to be noted that a similar shortening appears to have occurred in 8HevXIIgr, which reads simply 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.

¹¹⁶Holtz, 20.

¹¹⁷Ibid, 19; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 272.

¹¹⁸Ringgren, 234.

¹¹⁹BDF, 85.

¹²⁰Holtz, 20.

¹²¹Tov, Greek Minor Prophets Scroll, 50-51.

consistently rendered by ὅτι.¹²² 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,¹²³ 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.¹²⁴ As there is no textual evidence for this inversion among LXX mss,¹²⁵ stylistic alteration is the best explanation.

The addition of ἔργον (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.¹²⁶

The addition of the final ὑμῖν (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,¹²⁷ 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 GottLXX13, Hab. 1:5.

¹²⁶Holtz, 20; Ringgren, 234. O. Glombitza ("Akta XIII. 15-41, Analyse einer Lukanischen 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 ἔργον to show that it is God who has performed this eschatological work in Jesus Christ and his Church.

¹²⁷See GottLXX13, Hab. 1:5.

expected them.¹²⁸ Rather, Holtz suggests that here Luke was using a text which was close to the Alexandrian textual tradition, and which contained the *ὁμῖν*.¹²⁹ 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.¹³⁰ 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*,¹³¹ and Wilcox lists this citation as one with parallels in Origen's fifth column.¹³² While none of the parallels they cite are completely convincing, the presence of *ὅτι* 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.

¹³¹A. Sperber, "New Testament and Septuagint," *JBL* 69 (1940) 283.

¹³²Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 39.

4. Acts 15:16-17 = Amos 9:11-12

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 ἐκείνῃ* to *μετὰ ταῦτα ἀναστρέψω*; (2) *καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω* is removed after *πεπτωκυῖαν* and placed before *τὴν σκηνὴν Δαυίδ*, 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 *ἂν* after *ὅπως*; (7) *τὸν κύριον* is added after *τῶν ἀνθρώπων*; (8) the *ὁ* is omitted before *ποιῶν*; (9) Acts adds *γνωστὰ ἅπ' 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

¹³³Haenchen, *Acts*, 448; see also D. M. King, "The Use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18," *ATI* 21 (1989) 8-13.

¹³⁴Clarke, 92.

¹³⁵Hanson, 85.

κατεστραμμένα/κατεσκαμμένα variant in the text of Acts.¹³⁶ It may be that point (1) is not a part of the Amos quotation at all.¹³⁷ It has been suggested that we have a conflated citation with the first three words deriving from Jer. 12:15.¹³⁸ 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.¹³⁹ Holtz suggests a relationship of sorts with Zech. 1:16,¹⁴⁰ 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,¹⁴¹ but this seems highly speculative. He also suggests that μετὰ ταῦτα and ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ were expressions which were interchanged according to Luke's needs,¹⁴² 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^c, Q^{*}) (see GottLXX13, 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).

¹³⁷See M. A. Braun, "James' Use of Amos at the Jerusalem Council: Steps Toward a Possible Solution of the Textual and Theological Problems," JETS 20 (1977) 117.

¹³⁸Clarke, 94; Swete, 399; see Bruce, Acts (1951), 297; Ringgren, 235; Conzelman, Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles (HC; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987) 84.

¹³⁹Hanson, 85-86.

¹⁴⁰Holtz, 24.

¹⁴¹Richard, "Creative Use," 47-48.

¹⁴²Ibid, 47 n. 23; see also W. C. Kaiser, Jr., "The Davidic Promise and the Inclusion of the Gentiles (Amos 9:9-15 and Acts 15:13-18): A Test Passage for Theological Systems," JETS 20 (1977) 105-106.

temporal phrases are merely translational variants of $\text{אֲנִי הָיִיתִי בְּיָמָיו}$,¹⁴³ but this seems rather a tenuous conclusion.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,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 *καί* to connect *ἀνοικοδομήσω* to *ἀναστρέψω*. Ringgren has suggested that the verb was changed for stylistic reasons,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.¹⁴⁷ The appropriateness of *ἀνοικοδομήσω* has not gone unnoticed. Chaim Rabin has suggested that this word is a better translation of בָּנִינִי than the LXX

¹⁴³J. de Waard, *A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament* (STDJ 4; Leiden: Brill, 1965) 26 n. 1.

¹⁴⁴See Braun, 115.

¹⁴⁵Ibid, 116.

¹⁴⁶Ringgren, 235.

¹⁴⁷Richard, "Creative Use," 47.

translation, and has concluded that there seems to have been some sort of relationship between the Acts citation and the MT.¹⁴⁸ Rabin has been followed by de Waard and Michael Braun.¹⁴⁹ Holtz, however, has come to the opposite conclusion that the LXX is nearer the Hebrew than the Acts citation.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 *πεπτωκυῖαν*, 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 πεπτωκότα αὐτῆς*. This omission (together with the above-mentioned rearrangement) is likely an abbreviation of the passage for the sake of clarity.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.

¹⁴⁸C. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1958) 29 n. 2.

¹⁴⁹de Waard, *Comparative Study*, 25; Braun, 116.

¹⁵⁰Holtz, 25.

¹⁵¹Holtz (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 comment¹⁵² (Ringgren mentions it as a possible stylistic change or "slip of memory")¹⁵³ with scholars concentrating on the change of ἀναστήσω to ἀνορθώσω (e.g., Holtz), or to ἀνοικοδομήσω (e.g., Richard). Richard applies the same argument which I noted above to this substitution,¹⁵⁴ while Holtz suggests that Luke's text of Amos 9:11 is not that of the LXX.¹⁵⁵

Again, however, I would suggest that point (4) needs to be taken together with point (5), the omission of καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος. Holtz asserts that this omission makes questionable whether Luke is citing the LXX here at all.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 καθὼς αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ αἰῶνος 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).¹⁵⁷ The OT passage had a "distinctly nationalistic element as its referent,"¹⁵⁸ and the LXX has reproduced this effect. But

¹⁵²As has the rearrangement of the text in point (2) above.

¹⁵³Ringgren, 235.

¹⁵⁴Richard, "Creative Use," 47-48.

¹⁵⁵See Holtz, 24-26.

¹⁵⁶Ibid, 24.

¹⁵⁷See e.g., Mays, 164.

¹⁵⁸W. 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 *ὅπως* (6) and of *τὸν κύριον* 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 *ὅπως ἄν* is an imitation by Luke of the construction as found in earlier books of the LXX and that Luke added *τὸν κύριον* 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 δ before $\pi\omega\iota\omega\nu$ (8) is not found in any ms of the LXX. But the omission brings the citation closer to the Hebrew (לְכָל הַיְּהוּדִים וְלִלְיָאֵלִים), 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 δ 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.¹⁶⁴ 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 לְכָל הַיְּהוּדִים as ἐκζητήσωσιν and לִלְיָאֵלִים as τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

Finally, the addition of $\gamma\nu\omega\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \acute{\alpha}\pi'\ \alpha\iota\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$ at the end of the citation (9) may be an addition to the text reflecting Isa. 45:21: ἵνα γνῶσιν ἅμα τίς ἀκουστὰ ἐποίησεν ταῦτα ἅπ' ἀρχῆς.¹⁶⁵ Swete lists this phrase as a LXX citation from the Isaiah passage,¹⁶⁶ 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.¹⁶⁷ 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

¹⁶⁴Holtz, 23.

¹⁶⁵See Goppelt, *Typos*, 118; Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 298; Dupont, *Salvation*, 145; see also Neil, 173; Hanson, 87.

¹⁶⁶Swete, 388.

¹⁶⁷E.g., Rendell Harris, 2. 78-79.

finds unlikely.¹⁶⁸ Rather, he thinks it is a conclusion to the citation which Luke has placed in James' mouth regarding "des ewigen Heilsrates Gottes."¹⁶⁹ 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.¹⁷⁰

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.¹⁷¹ 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 $\text{יָבִיטְךָ לְיָמֶיךָ}$ for MT $\text{יָבִיטְךָ לְיָמֶיךָ}$ in Amos 9:11. He argues that the CD reading implies the idea of "re-erect" which would correspond well to Acts $\alpha\nuοικοδομήσω$ rather than the LXX $\alpha\nuαστήσω$.¹⁷² Similarly, de Waard claims that there are clear similarities between Acts 15:16 and 4Q174 (*Florilegium*) 1:12.¹⁷³ He notes that both end the first clause with "which is fallen,"

¹⁶⁸Holtz, 22-23 n. 6.

¹⁶⁹Ibid, 22.

¹⁷⁰See e.g., G. Heuthorst, "The Apologetic Aspect of Acts 2:1-13," *Scr* 9 (1957) 33-43; E. E. Ellis, "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke," *NTS* 12 (1965) 27-41; J. Navone, "The Way of the Lord," *Scr* 20 (1968) 24-30; and especially G. Lohfink, *Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie* (München: Kösel, 1975); see also the comments on Lukan eschatology on pp. 55-56 above.

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

¹⁷²Rabin, 29 n. 2.

¹⁷³de Waard, *Comparative Study*, 25.

omitting the further reference to *πεπτωκότα*. He further asserts that the copulative *καί* of Acts 15:16 (*καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω*) is a faithful rendering of *וְהִקְיָנוּ*, a converted perfect form in the Qumran text as opposed to the imperfect *וְהִקְיָנוּ* 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: *כִּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב*.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 *וְיָרְשׁוּ* to *וְיִבְקְשׁוּ*, and Braun asserts that there was a time in the history of the transmission of the OT text when *ר* and *ב* were "virtually

¹⁷⁴Ibid, 25-26; see also Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 49; Braun, 116; J. M. Allegro, "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature," *JBL* 75 (1956) 176 n. 25; *Qumrân Cave 4: I (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD 5; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 55.

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

¹⁷⁶Bruce, *Themes*, 79 n. 3.

indistinguishable." Building on the work of Mitchell Dahood,¹⁷⁷ he suggests that the Massoretes may have mistaken the ancient title for God 𐤀𐤍 for the direct object marker 𐤍𐤍, and finally, he notes that 𐤀𐤍𐤍 and 𐤀𐤍 could be easily confused in unpointed texts.¹⁷⁸ We might further comment that the omission of *ō* before *ποιῶν*, 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.¹⁷⁹ Braun assumes that James would not have used the LXX. But both Bruce and Neil, for

¹⁷⁷M. Dahood, *Psalms*, (AB; 2 vols.; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965) 1. xxii.

¹⁷⁸Braun, 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" (*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" (*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, *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," *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, *The Septuagint in Modern Study*, 74). The resulting revisions, such as Aquila (see Jellicoe, *The Septuagint in Modern Study*, 76) and possibly 8HevXIIgr (see Waltke, 216), however, can only be characterized as more literal translations of the Hebrew (see e.g. Tov, *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 conservatism in transmitting it (see Waltke, 216-218), such speculation seems very far-fetched.

¹⁷⁹See e.g., Haenchen, "Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act 15," *Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias* (ed. W. Eltester; BZNW 26; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960) 157; *Acts*, 448; see also Munck, 140.

example, see the use of the LXX as not inconsistent with James being the author of this speech.¹⁸⁰ 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 text¹⁸¹ related to 4Q174 1:12¹⁸² 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.¹⁸³ De Waard also only admits the relationship of 4Q174 1:12 with

¹⁸⁰Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 298; Neil, 173.

¹⁸¹His words are "an originally circulating element," an enigmatic description, to say the least.

¹⁸²Wilcox refers to this text as 1QFlorilegium 1:30.

¹⁸³Wilcox, *Semitisms*, p. 49.

the first part of the Acts citation.¹⁸⁴ 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).¹⁸⁵ The second part of the quotation was added by Luke from the LXX as legitimation for the Gentile mission.¹⁸⁶

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,¹⁸⁷ has $\text{בְּנִינִי בְּקִינִי}$ (as does CD 7:16), which, while explaining the *καί*, does not correspond as neatly to *ἀνοικοδομήσω* as Rabin would like.¹⁸⁸ BDB lists several places where the *Hiphil* form of בָּנָה may mean "build,"¹⁸⁹ 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.

¹⁸⁵See Allegro, "Fragment of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim," JBL 77 (1958) 353.

¹⁸⁶Holtz, 25-26.

¹⁸⁷Allegro, Qumrân 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 ἵστημι, and we would tend to agree with Holtz that the LXX has got it right.¹⁹¹ Although a "booth", Πῶν, 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 (בָּנָה--the usual Hebrew word for "build")¹⁹² but he "makes" (וַיַּעַשׂ) 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 בָּנָה 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 בָּנָה, 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

¹⁹⁰As 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.).

¹⁹¹See Holtz, 25.

¹⁹²See BDB, 124-125.

¹⁹³See Holtz, 25.

¹⁹⁴See BDB (878-879) on the *Hiphil* perfect of בָּנָה.

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:¹⁹⁵

['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 eve]r. 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 Zi[on] in the l[ast] 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 *καί* for a different reason. Here, Luke has added the word *ἀναστρέψω*, thus necessitating a following *καί*. Hence the reason for the *vav*-consecutive and the copulative *καί* are both to maintain continuity with what has gone before, but what has gone before in each case is entirely different.

Similarly, the *μετὰ ταῦτα* in Acts is not reflected in the Qumran document. Rather, there the words are בְּאַחֲרֵי הַיָּמִים, "in the last days," which is closer to MT

¹⁹⁵Allegro, *Qumrân Cave 4*, 54; see also "Fragment," 353.

אֲשֶׁר הָיָה בְּיָמָיו, 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 𐤓𐤓𐤍 𐤓𐤕𐤍, "as it is said."¹⁹⁶ 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,¹⁹⁷ and appears to be a rather common method of introducing Scripture citations. Hence, since "as it is written" is a standard formula in *peshar* texts,¹⁹⁸ 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.¹⁹⁹ 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

¹⁹⁶Rabin, 26.

¹⁹⁷See M&G, 176-179.

¹⁹⁸See e.g., Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 98-100; Stendahl, 183-202.

¹⁹⁹Fitzmyer, "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament," NTS 7 (1960-1961) 325.

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.

²⁰²Dupont, "ΛΑΟΣ 'ΕΞ 'ΕΘΝΩΝ (Act. XV. 14)," *NTS* 3 (1956-1957) 47-50; "Un peuple d'entre les nations (Actes 15.14)," *NTS* 31 (1985) 321-335; but cf. Dahl, "'A People for His Name' (Acts XV.14)," *NTS* 4 (1957-1958) 319-327.

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.²⁰³ 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 *וְיִרְשָׁוּ אֲשֶׁר-בְּיָמֵינוּ* by *ἐκζητήσωσιν οἱ κατάλοιποι τῶν ἀνθρώπων*, but the LXX was altered to make the point more clear.

D. Summary: The Minor Prophets Citations in Luke-Acts

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

²⁰³The 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

²⁰⁴See Tyson, *Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts* (Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 1992) 185; Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 98-99.

²⁰⁵It 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).

²⁰⁶Hanson, 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,¹ 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 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 *βλέποντες βλέπωσιν* and *ἀκούοντες ἀκούωσιν* 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," Apophoreta: 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.

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)

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

³See e.g., Streeter, 205-206; H. Schürmann, Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil (Freiburg: Herder, 1969) 161.

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

⁵See 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 σκολιά; (3) Luke changes LXX singular ἡ τραχεία to plural αἱ τραχείαι; (4) Luke omits καὶ ὀφθήσεται 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.⁶ Holtz concludes that Luke simply reproduced the Synoptic tradition of this verse, even though he knew the correct LXX reading.⁷ Krister Stendahl has noted that the αὐτοῦ is used so that the citation may be applied to Christ, instead of to Yahweh.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.

⁸Stendahl, 48; Marcus, 38; R. Pesch, Das Markusevangelium (2 vols.; HTKNT 2; Freiburg: Herder, 1976-1977) 1. 77; see also Plummer, p. 87; but cf. K. R. Snodgrass, "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and their Adaptation in the New Testament," JSNT 8 (1980) 34; D. Lührmann, Das Markusevangelium (HNT 3; Tübingen: Mohr, 1987) 34.

⁹See de Waard, Comparative Study, 50; see also NestleAland26, 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 יהוה 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.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.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 πᾶν before ὄρος καὶ βουνός,¹² not to mention the πᾶσα before φάραγξ. On the other hand, the LXX textual evidence seems clear that for point (3) the singular is original.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 ὁδοός.¹⁴ Since none of the major early uncials in the

¹⁰See BHS, Isa. 40:4; Holtz, 38 n. 3.

¹¹See Bock, 94; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 40:4.

¹²Holtz, 38.

¹³See GottLXX14, Isa. 40:4.

¹⁴Holtz, 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.¹⁵ 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" (ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ) 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 (וְהַיַּדְּבָרִים--v.3) is dropped from the LXX and Luke.¹⁶ 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.¹⁷ 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."¹⁸ While this may be so,¹⁹ Bock's arguments do not account for the dropping of וְהַיַּדְּבָרִים 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--
 יְהוָה יִשְׁׁעָה כָּל-בָּשָׂר יַחְדָּם) with "all flesh shall see the salvation of God" (καὶ ὁψεται πᾶσα
 σὰρξ τὸ 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 כְּבוֹד ("glory") which occurs earlier in the verse;²¹
 however, the LXX does translate the כְּבוֹד with δόξα, and σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ is not a
 translation of כְּבוֹד. 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 יְהוָה יִשְׁׁעָה יְהוָה, as in Isa. 52:10. He argues that this

²⁰See Snodgrass, 39; Morris, *St. Luke*, 95; Plummer, 88; Rese, 170.

²¹Morris, *St. Luke*, 95; see also Rese, 170-171.

²²Bock, 97.

²³L. H. Brockington, "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ," *VT* 1 (1951) 30; see also "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of ΔΟΞΑ," *Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot* (ed. D. E. Nineham; Oxford: Blackwell, 1957) 1-8.

variant may have occurred as a result of a scribe reading $\text{לך} \text{לך}$ as $\text{לך} \text{לך}$.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 $\sigma\kappa\omicron\lambda\iota\acute{\alpha}$ for the singular $\text{לך} \text{לך}$.

There is yet one more point of discrepancy between Luke and the LXX: the omission of $\kappa\alpha\iota \ \acute{\omicron}\phi\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \ \eta \ \delta\acute{o}\xi\alpha \ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota\acute{o}\upsilon$ (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

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

²⁵Bock, 94.

²⁶I. H. Marshall, The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text (NIGTC; Exeter: Paternoster, 1978) 137; but cf. Bock (312 n. 7) who argues that this conclusion is not cogent.

²⁷Holtz, 38; see also Ringgren, 227.

²⁸See D. Seccombe, "Luke and Isaiah," NTS 27 (1980-1981) 252-253.

with probably comes from Luke himself, who omitted *καὶ ὁφθήσεται ἡ δόξα κυρίου* 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 ἔθνεσιν* 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.²⁹ 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 (σπήλαιον ληστῶν) appears to be connected to Isa. 56:7 by the use of the words οἶκός μου in both passages. This connection, however, only applies to the LXX of these two passages, as the MT has יְהוָה in Isa. 56:7 and יְהוָה יִשְׂרָאֵל 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 ἔσται for LXX γὰρ . . . κληθήσεται. 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

³⁰J. M. Creed, *The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices* (London: Macmillan, 1930) 242; Fitzmyer, *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985) 1261.

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

³²Stendahl, 66.

³³See *NestleAland26*, Luke 19:46.

likely, the LXX itself.³⁴ Clearly καὶ ἔσται is original in Luke, and that poses a problem, since not only is this phrase non-septuagintal, but it is also a Semitism.³⁵ 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.³⁶ 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.³⁷ 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. 7:11.³⁸ 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.³⁹ 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.

³⁸R. Bultmann, The History of the Synoptic Tradition (Oxford: Blackwell, 1968) 36.

³⁹Holtz, 164-165; see also O. Michel, "οἶκος," 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 ἔσται*, 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: *οὐκ ἔσονται σοι θεοὶ ἕτεροι πλὴν ἐμοῦ* (Ex. 20:3). Therefore, the use of *καὶ ἔσται* instead of *γὰρ . . . κληθήσεται* 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.

⁴²*BDF*, 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

1. Luke 4:18-19 = Isa. 61:1-2 + 58:6

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: *ἀποστεῖλαι* [LXX has *ἀπόσπελλε*] *τεθραυσμένους ἐν ἀφέσει*; (3) Luke replaces LXX *καλέσαι* with *κηρύξαι*; (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

plutôt les caractères d'un targum, et d'un targum effectué à partir de la Septante.⁴³

Although some have argued that this passage may have been altered by Jesus himself at the time of his reading of the Isaiah scroll,⁴⁴ 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 *haptara* prophetic reading of the ancient synagogue,⁴⁵ though the insertion of Isa. 58:6 requires going backward on a scroll, a practice contrary to rabbinic tradition (*b.Meg.* 24a [*gemara*]).⁴⁶ 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.⁴⁷ Bock carries it further and proposes a traditional text source in which the Hebrew root קלח found in Isa 61:1 and 58:6 provided the midrashic link between the two passages, along with קלח in 61:2 and 58:5. He also notes that our point (4), the change of *καλέσαι* to *κηρύξαι*, brings the passage closer to the Hebrew, by giving the same rendering for both uses of קלח . This also, he argues, is evidence of a traditional source with links to a Semitic

⁴³Perrot, 327; see also Bock, 107.

⁴⁴See B. Reicke, "Jesus in Nazareth—Luke 4, 14-30," *Das Wort und die Wörter: Festschrift Gerhard Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag* (ed. H. Balz and S. Schulz; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973) 48-49; see also Rese, 146; Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 184; U. Busse, *Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu: Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4.16-30* (SBS 91; Katholisches Biblewerk, 1978) 25, 34.

⁴⁵See Perrot, 328-333.

⁴⁶Stendahl, 96.

⁴⁷Perrot, 337.

context.⁴⁸ 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.⁴⁹ Holtz suggests the possibility of a *testimonium* here, but finds the proposal unsatisfactory.⁵⁰

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 ἀφῆσιν (ἀφέσει in 58:6), which translate very different words in Hebrew (לָחַץ in 61:1 and פָּרַשׁ in 58:6). Thus a connection from the LXX is most natural.⁵¹ The Isa. 58:6 citation follows the LXX exactly, only changing the imperative ἀπόστολλε to the aorist infinitive ἀποστεῖλαι to conform to its new context.⁵² As far as the change of καλέσαι to κηρύξαι (our point [3]) goes, it can be easily explained, as does Holtz, as a simple error, reduplicating the κηρύξαι from the previous verse.⁵³ It is also to be

⁴⁸Bock, 106-107, 316-317 n. 55.

⁴⁹B. Chilton, "Announcement in Nazara: An analysis of Luke 4.16-21," *Gospel Perspectives II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels* (ed. R. T. France and D. Wenham; Sheffield: JSOT, 1981) 164-166; see also the discussion by D. Monshouwer ("The Reading of the Prophet in the Synagogue at Nazareth," *Bib* 72 [1991] 90-99).

⁵⁰Holtz, 41.

⁵¹Stendahl, 96; A. George, "La predication inaugurale de Jesus dans la synagogue de Nazareth Luc 4,16-30," *BVC* 59 (1964) 27; H. Baarlink, "Ein gnädiges Jahr des Herrn--und Tage der Vergeltung," *ZNW* 73 (1982) 220.

⁵²Holtz, 40.

⁵³Ibid.

noted that none of the evangelists uses *καλέσαι* in the sense we find it in LXX Isa. 61:2,⁵⁴ and Luke does show some preference for *κηρύξαι* in regard to preaching.⁵⁵ 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 *וְהָיָה* and in rendering the Hebrew *וַיִּקְרָא לָהֶם לֵאמֹר* with *τυφλοῖς ἀνάβλεψιν*.⁵⁶ 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*⁴, the majority text, and some versions), although the textual evidence seems more weighted in favour of the omission.⁵⁷ 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.⁵⁸ It is, however, difficult to explain why a later copyist would delete the line.⁵⁹ 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

⁵⁴M. Dömer, *Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Theologie des lukanischen Doppelwerkes* (BBB 51; Köln-Bonn: Hanstein, 1978) 56.

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

⁵⁷See *NestleAland26*, Luke 4:18; Plummer, 120-121 n. 1.

⁵⁸Reicke, "Jesus in Nazareth," 49.

⁵⁹Bock, 317 n. 57.

of the LXX this clause was misplaced.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,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.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.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.⁶⁴ This is

⁶⁰Holtz, 40.

⁶¹Schweizer, "πνεῦμα: E. The New Testament," TDNT 6 (1968) 407.

⁶²Rese, 145.

⁶³Busse, 34-35, 77-78.

⁶⁴W. Grundmann, Das Evangelium nach Lukas (THKNT 3; 2d ed.; East Berlin: Evangelische, 1961) 120.

certainly not impossible, and becomes even more likely if Luke were quoting from memory, as Ringgren suggests,⁶⁵ 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 ἄφειν/ἄφείσει mnemonic cues would provide a concatenation of catchwords⁶⁶ which would tend to connect the two passages in his mind. If Luke was quoting from memory, this would also explain his use of κηρύξαι instead of καλέσαι (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 καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως 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.⁶⁷ 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.⁶⁸ Thus, it is not hard to understand that Luke would leave out this final statement.⁶⁹ James Sanders has further commented that Luke has Jesus end the citation on the word δεκτόν to provide a prophetic challenge, noting that the day of salvation was

⁶⁵Ringgren, 229.

⁶⁶See S. M. Paul, "Mnemonic Devices," *IDBS* (1976) 601; see also C. K. Barrett (*A Commentary on the Epistle 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 δεκτός) to those to whom it came.⁷⁰ Whatever one makes of the theological argumentation here, it seems that the omission of point (4) was deliberate,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."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).⁷³ All this makes it very likely that the citation in its present form is Lukan.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.

⁷⁰J. A. Sanders, "Isaiah in Luke," *Int* 36 (1982) 153-154.

⁷¹See Ringgren, 229.

⁷²R. Albertz, "Die 'Antrittspredigt' Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund," *ZNW* 74 (1983) 198-205; see Rese, 146; see also Dupont, "L'ambassade," 949; J. A. Sanders, "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4," *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty* (ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 1. 75-106.

⁷³Samain, 17-27.

⁷⁴See 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).⁷⁵ The citation reads καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων ἐλογίσθη, while the LXX reads καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη. Here there is complete agreement of only two words with the LXX,⁷⁶ καί and ἐλογίσθη, while the preposition μετά instead of ἐν changes the case of the following noun from dative to genitive. The citation appears closer to the MT (which reads הַנְּדָבָר הַזֶּה יְעֻשֶׁהוּ עַל-נַפְשׁוֹ) than the LXX here. The preposition μετά is perhaps a better translation of -נַפְשׁוֹ than ἐν, and the omission of the definite article also seems to bring the citation closer to the Hebrew.⁷⁷

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.⁷⁸ There is no ms of the LXX which agrees with Luke at this point, however, although Symmachus reads μετά, but with τῶν ἀσεβῶν instead of ἀνόμων and ἀριθμήθη

⁷⁵See NestleAland26, Mark 15:27; Goppelt, Typos, 102.

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.

⁷⁷See e.g., Ringgren, 229; Jeremias, "παῖς θεοῦ," TDNT 5 (1967) 707 n. 4; Bock, 137; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1432.

⁷⁸Hanson, pp. 79-80.

instead of ἐλογίσθη.⁷⁹ H. W. Heidland has suggested that Luke is using a text which may relate to Justin Apol. I,50,2, which also reads μετὰ ἀνόμων.⁸⁰ 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,50,2.⁸¹ 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.⁸² 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 ἄνομος as a cryptic reference to Jewish revolutionaries).⁸³ Thus he was reckoned "with" the lawless (revolutionaries) and not "among" them, as the ἐν could be taken. But, even if ἄνομος here does mean revolutionary (a conclusion which is by no means sure),⁸⁴ Luke, contrary to the other synoptics, apparently does have Jesus convicted on the charge of being "a Zealot king,

⁷⁹See GottLXX14, Isa. 53:12.

⁸⁰H. W. Heidland, "λογίζομαι, λογισμός," TDNT 4 (1967) 287 n. 12.

⁸¹Holtz, 43 n. 1.

⁸²H.-W. Bartsch, "Jesu Schwertwort, Lukas XXII. 35-38: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studie," NTS 20 (1973-1974) 197-198.

⁸³Ibid, 195-196.

⁸⁴Cf. BAG 71.

inciting the people" (Luke 23:2-5).⁸⁵ 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,⁸⁶ has paraphrased the citation, making it clearer, but preserving the sense of the original.⁸⁷ 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 *μετά* 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

⁸⁵P. W. Walaskay, "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke," *JB* 94 (1973) 84; see also Walaskay, "And So We Came to Rome": *The Political Perspective of St. Luke* (Cambridge: University, 1983) 40, 89 n. 9; J. S. Kennard, Jr., "The Jewish Provincial Assembly," *ZNW* 53 (1965) 48-49; S. G. F. Brandon, *Jesus and the Zealots* (New York: Scribner's, 1967) 32-34, 52-54.

⁸⁶Eusebius (*Prep.Ev.* III,2) cites the LXX verbatim in vv. 68-69 (*καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη*), but in v. 70 paraphrases (*καὶ μετὰ ἀνόμων λογισθέντα*).

⁸⁷Holtz, 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."⁸⁸ 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."⁸⁹ Vincent Taylor, among others, has argued for the authenticity of these verses as coming from Jesus himself.⁹⁰ Marion Soards and Bock have followed these suggestions and concluded that the citation is traditional and old.⁹¹

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 נִלְחַם by λογίζεσθαι , while it is more commonly rendered by ἀριθμεῖσθαι .⁹² In fact, it is the only use of a form of λογίζομαι for נִלְחַם in the LXX.⁹³ 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.

⁹⁰Taylor, *Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels* (London: Macmillan, 1951) 193-194; see also R. T. France, *Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission* (London: Tyndale, 1971) 114-115.

⁹¹M. L. Soards, *The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22* (JSNTS 14; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987) 53-54; Bock, 137.

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 נִלְחַם in *qal* or *hiphil*, only two are not rendered with a form of ἀριθμέω (III Kgdms 21:25 [ἀλλάσσω] and Isa. 53:12).

"notable absence" of characteristic Lukan words and phrases in this episode,⁹⁴ evidence of Lukan redaction has been found by Bartsch, as I have already noted, and others.⁹⁵ Furthermore, the citation is clearly related to Jesus' crucifixion (23:39-43),⁹⁶ and functions, as Fitzmyer puts it, "in typically Lukan fashion, as a prediction that is to find realization in the passion and death of Jesus."⁹⁷ Finally, theologically, this citation fits into Luke's overall picture of Jesus as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah.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.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 ἐλογίσθη 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

⁹⁴Taylor, The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation (ed. O. E. Evans; SNTSMS 19; Cambridge: University, 1972) 67.

⁹⁵See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1429.

⁹⁶See Bartsch, 196; Rese, 156; Goppelt, Typos, 123.

⁹⁷Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1430; see also P. S. Minear, "A Note on Luke xxii 36," NovT 7 (1964-1965) 128-134; W. J. Larkin, Jr., "Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to His Soteriology," JETS 20 (1977) 331.

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

⁹⁹Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1429.

to the LXX to read ἐλογίσθη, 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 ἐλογίσθη, indicating LXX influence, and the use of μετά 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

1. Acts 7:49-50 = Isa. 66:1-2

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 οὕτως λέγει κύριος; (2) Acts adds λέγει κύριος after οἰκοδομήσετέ μοι; (3) Acts replaces

ποῖος with τίς before τόπος; (4) Acts changes the word order of πάντα . . . ταῦτα ἐποίησεν ἡ χεὶρ μου; (5) Acts omits γάρ and seemingly puts in its place οὐχί.

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 οὕτως 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 ποῖος with τίς (point [3]) presents another problem. The use of τίς accords 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

¹⁰⁰Ringgren, 234; Clarke, 91-92.

¹⁰¹Holtz, 29.

¹⁰²See Ibid; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 66:1.

¹⁰³Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 159-160; Bruce, Acts (1951), 176.

with this reading,¹⁰⁴ 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.¹⁰⁵ I might go on to say that this latter point seems also to rule out the influence of Acts on Barnabas for this citation.¹⁰⁶ 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.¹⁰⁷ 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.¹⁰⁸ Thus the speech has been considered as extraneous material inserted into the framework of the martyrdom of Stephen story.¹⁰⁹ 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 τίς, 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.

¹⁰⁸See Haenchen, Acts, 286; S. G. Wilson, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts (London: Cambridge, 1973) 132; see also T. L. Donaldson, "Moses Typology and the Sectarian Nature of Early Christian Anti-Judaism: A Study in Acts 7," JSNT 12 (1981) 40; Holtz, 30 n. 4.

¹⁰⁹Dibelius, Studies in the Acts of the Apostles (ed. H. Greeven; London: SCM, 1956) 167-168.

found.¹¹⁰ But signs of Luke's interaction with the material have also been found,¹¹¹ and some scholars have gone so far as to attribute the whole composition to Luke.¹¹² 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,¹¹³ the rearrangement of this citation could easily have been Lukan. The use of the LXX and similar rearrangements elsewhere point to this latter conclusion.¹¹⁴

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.

¹¹⁰See Scobie, "The Use of Source Material," 412-415; see also Haenchen, Acts, 273.

¹¹¹See Conzelman, "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity," Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 309; see also Scobie, "The Use of Source Material," 415-417; Tyson, Images of Judaism, 115.

¹¹²See e.g., R. Maddox, The Purpose of Luke-Acts (ed. J. Riches; Edinburgh, Clark, 1982) 52-53; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 266.

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

¹¹⁴See Holtz, 30-31; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 250-251.

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,¹¹⁵ while Clarke lists it as having "substantial agreement" with the LXX.¹¹⁶ 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.¹¹⁷ Hence, the use of the LXX here presents no problem for those who wish to see here the recounting of an actual event.¹¹⁸ 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.¹¹⁹ The theology behind the citation and its interpretation by Philip certainly appear to be Lukan.¹²⁰

¹¹⁵Ringgren, 234.

¹¹⁶Clarke, 87-88.

¹¹⁷See P. deMeester, "'Philippe et l'eunuque éthiopien' ou 'Le baptême d'un pèlerin de Nubie'?" NRT 103 (1981) 367.

¹¹⁸See e.g., E. M. Blaiklock, The Acts of the Apostles: An Historical Commentary (TNTC 5; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959) 80-81.

¹¹⁹See Hanson, 80.

¹²⁰See e.g., M. Hooker, Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament (London: S.P.C.K., 1959) 113-114; Seccombe, 256; Larkin, 325-335; Goppelt, Typos, 104; Rese, 88-100; Bock, 229.

The citation does not accord completely with the LXX, however, although the discrepancies are minor. The divergences are as follows: (1) the present participle *κείροντος* is changed to aorist participle *κείραντος* in Acts; (2) some mss of Acts include *αὐτοῦ* after *ταπεινώσει*.

The change from present to aorist (point [1]) is reflected in the LXX tradition of a number of mss, particularly of the Alexandrian group.¹²¹ Similarly, a number of NT mss contain the present participle (Vaticanus and the majority text).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.¹²³ While one could propose a *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 *testimonium*, as well as the fact that the citation is firmly anchored in Luke's theological development of the passage.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,

¹²¹See *GottLXX14*, Isa. 53:7.

¹²²See *NestleAland26*, Acts 8:32.

¹²³Holtz, 31-32.

¹²⁴*Ibid*, 32; see also Cadbury, *The Making of Luke-Acts*, 281; Rese, 98-99.

allowing reference to the completed act of Jesus.¹²⁵ 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.¹²⁶ 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in some mss of Acts (point [2]) is similarly complicated textually. Metzger notes that the good external testimony for the reading which lacks $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ (p⁷⁴, \aleph , A, B, 103, 629, 1642*, 1739^c, vg *al*) "generally carries conviction of originality," but the possibility that $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ was deleted from the text of Acts to conform to the LXX is also good.¹²⁷ As far as the LXX itself is concerned, the longer reading (with $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$) is witnessed by a large number of Lucianic witnesses, the Alexandrian text 106, and several mixed mss.¹²⁸ Holtz concludes that the $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ in Acts 8:33 is a gloss inserted to point the reader to the story of Jesus.¹²⁹ 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.

¹²⁵Bock, 228; see also Rese, 99.

¹²⁶See GottLXX14, Isa 53:7.

¹²⁷Metzger, Textual Commentary, 359.

¹²⁸See GottLXX14, Isa. 53:8.

¹²⁹Holtz, 31.

The LXX, when compared with the MT, reflects two divergencies: for MT *וּמִשְׁפָּט וּמִדָּן*, "with restraining and judgement he was taken," LXX has *ἐν τῇ ταπεινώσει ἣ κρίσις αὐτοῦ ἤρθη*, "in humiliation his judgement is lifted up," and for MT *כִּי נִכְרַת מֵאֶרֶץ חַיִּים*, "because he was cut off from the land of the living," LXX has *ὅτι αἴρεται ἀπο τῆς γῆς ἡ ζωὴ αὐτοῦ*, "because his life is taken up from the earth." The Hebrew is somewhat unclear at this point,¹³⁰ and Bock is probably correct in asserting that the LXX has opted for a stylistically simpler and more explanatory rendering.¹³¹ Generally speaking, the LXX is more amenable to christological interpretation than the MT,¹³² although Bock argues that the christological interpretations can be understood from the Hebrew.¹³³ 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.

¹³¹Bock, 226-227; see also Payne, "The Servant of the Lord: Language and Interpretation," *EvQ* 43 (1971) 138.

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

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

3. Acts 13:22,34,47 = Isa. 44:28; 55:3; 49:6

Paul's speech at Pisidian Antioch in Acts 13 is a complicated speech resembling in many ways the speech of Stephen in Acts 7.¹³⁴ 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.

a. Acts 13:22 = Isa. 44:28

The brief citation (ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου),¹³⁵ which Swete characterizes as septuagintal,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 κύρῳ, and it is not hard to see how a christological connection could be seen here. Furthermore, some Patristic witnesses to the LXX replace κύρῳ with κυρίῳ, which, if the latter reflects a LXX tradition, would make the connection all the

¹³⁴See Munck, 124; Blaiklock, 105.

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

¹³⁶Swete, 398-399.

more clear.¹³⁷ 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 *ἄνδρα κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου* and *ποιήσει πάντα τὰ θελήματά μου* are different renderings of the same Hebrew phrase from I Sam. 13:14, the former septuagintal, and the latter

¹³⁷See Holtz, 134 n. 5; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 45:1, and 100; Dupont, Salvation, 144.

¹³⁸See Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 98; see also J. W. Doeve, Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts (Assen: van Gorcum, 1954) 172.

¹³⁹Glombitza, 310; Bowker, "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form," NTS 14 (1967-1968) 101-105.

¹⁴⁰Wilcox, 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.¹⁴⁷ 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.¹⁴⁸

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).¹⁴⁹ The divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts replaces διαθήσομαι with δώσω; (2) Acts omits the phrase διαθήκην αἰώνιον.

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).

¹⁴⁹See Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 97.

Holtz is correct in asserting that the two points belong together,¹⁵⁰ since both relate to the covenant idea,¹⁵¹ and both are probably removed for that reason. Bruce, however, considers that δώσω may be used because of influence from δώσεις in the following citation from Ps. 16:10 (LXX 15:10).¹⁵² 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.¹⁵³

The connection of Ps. 16:10 (15:10 LXX) to Isa. 55:3 appears to come from the use of the term ὄσιος in each. Now, the occurrence of ὄσιος in the Isa. 55:3 is somewhat surprising, since the common rendering of 𐤒𐤕𐤒 is ἔλεος¹⁵⁴ and we would have expected the Hebrew 𐤒𐤕𐤒 𐤒𐤕𐤒 to be rendered τὰ ἐλέη Δαυιδ as in II Chr. 6:42. Dupont has noted that the LXX has confused 𐤒𐤕𐤒 ("grace", "mercy", "favour") with the adjective 𐤒𐤕𐤒 ("pious"), thus reading 𐤒𐤕𐤒 𐤒𐤕𐤒.¹⁵⁵ 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: Glerup, 1961) 76-79.

¹⁵⁴Only a very few of the over a hundred occurrences of 𐤒𐤕𐤒 are not translated by ἔλεος; the overwhelming preponderance of ἔλεος for 𐤒𐤕𐤒 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, "TA 'ΟΣΙΑ ΔΑΥΙΔ ΤΑ ΠΙΣΤΑ (Ac XII 34 = Is LV 3)," RB 68 (1961) 97; see also Bruce, Themes, 69; Acts (1951), 270.

septuagintal.¹⁵⁶ Jan Willem Doeve, however, followed by Bock, has argued that the connection is possible as well in the Hebrew through the root נָּוַן and its derivative נָּוִן .¹⁵⁷ Similarly, Longenecker has concluded that this "promise [of Isa. 55:3] was certainly involved in traditional Jewish messianology,"¹⁵⁸ and Glombitza asserts that the speech of Acts 13:33-37 reflects "das große Gebiet einer vorchristlichen messianischen Ämterlehre."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.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 $\delta\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma$ for נָּוַן 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 $\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\eta$, show that the latter is the preferred rendering.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.

¹⁵⁶Dupont, "TA 'ΟΞΙΑ," 96; Ringgren, 234.

¹⁵⁷Doeve, 174; Bock, 251; see also F. Hauck, " $\delta\sigma\iota\omega\varsigma$, $\delta\sigma\acute{\iota}\omega\varsigma$," in TDNT 5 (1967) 491; Dupont, "TA 'ΟΞΙΑ," 98.

¹⁵⁸Longenecker, Biblical Exegesis, 103.

¹⁵⁹Glombitza, 315.

¹⁶⁰Holtz, 137-141.

¹⁶¹See *Ibid*, 137; see also GottLXX14, Isa. 55:3.

But the question whether the citation is Lukan 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.

¹⁶⁴*Ibid*, 141.

¹⁶⁵*Ibid*, 140.

¹⁶⁶See M. Weinfeld, "Covenant, Davidic," *IDBS* (1976) 191-192.

and what Rese points out, is that it is a specific reference to the *Davidic* covenant that is removed.¹⁶⁷ 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.¹⁶⁸ 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.¹⁶⁹ 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

¹⁶⁷Rese, 87.

¹⁶⁸Weinfeld, 192.

¹⁶⁹Dupont, *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).¹⁷⁰ Dupont has noted that the finale of the speech has a distinctly Pauline tone,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.¹⁷² This is especially true of the doctrine of justification in vv. 38-39, which shows a more Lukan perspective.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."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 distinctively unpauline thing to do.¹⁷⁵ Specifically Lukan marks have been found in, for example, vv. 24-25, 31,¹⁷⁶

¹⁷⁰Dupont, "TA 'ΟΣΙΑ," 113-114.

¹⁷¹Ibid.

¹⁷²P. Vielhauer, "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts," Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 44, 48.

¹⁷³Ibid, 41-42; Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches in Acts," Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 214.

¹⁷⁴Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212, emphasis Schweizer's.

¹⁷⁵Munck, 123.

¹⁷⁶Dupont, "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,¹⁷⁷ 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.

c. Acts 13:47 = Isa. 49:6

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,¹⁷⁸ whereas Wilcox and Haenchen find the discrepancies too great to allow for this explanation.¹⁷⁹ 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 *τέθεικά σε* and *εἰς φῶς*,¹⁸⁰ which are omitted in the text of Acts. Ringgren advanced the very plausible

¹⁷⁷See e.g., Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 15-18; Dupont ("TA 'ΟΣΙΑ," 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.

¹⁸⁰RahlfsLXX, Isa. 49:6.

theory that Luke omitted the words regarding a "racial (or national) covenant" because Paul is here speaking to Gentiles.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 *ἔδωκά σε*.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 *ἰδοὺ* 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,¹⁸³ Holtz argues that Luke did not have the word in his text.¹⁸⁴ While the

¹⁸¹Ringgren, 235.

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

¹⁸³See GottLXX14, Isa. 49:6.

¹⁸⁴Holtz, 33.

evidence seems hardly conclusive, it is not too difficult to see Luke removing the *ἰδοῦ* as an unnecessary Semitism, interrupting the train of thought in Paul's speech.

One further point, brought up by Wilcox, is the textual variant of Acts 13:47 in codex Bezae (D and Cyprian), which reads: *ἰδοὺ φῶς τέθεικά σε τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*. Wilcox concludes that this reading reflects "an element of unrevised source material, based ultimately on the Hebrew text of Isa. xlix. 6."¹⁸⁵ In order to account for this he suggests that the ל before נא was placed before וְנִי in a variant Hebrew text.¹⁸⁶ 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.¹⁸⁷ Secondly, the alteration in D makes little or no change in the meaning of the text,¹⁸⁸ 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.¹⁸⁹

¹⁸⁵Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 51. That the so-called "Western" text may preserve more authentic readings than the "Alexandrian", was suggested by F. Blass (*Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter: Editio philologica apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata* [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895] 30-32). Although the "Western" text has been generally regarded as inferior to the "Alexandrian" text-type, recently scholarship has reconsidered Blass's position (see Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 294-295; M.-E. Boismard, "The Texts of Acts: A Problem of Literary Criticism?" *New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger* [ed. E. J. Epp and G. D. Fee; Oxford: Clarendon, 1981] 147-158). The "ultimate judgement" of scholarship, as Metzger (*The Text of the New Testament*, 294) says, has not yet been rendered on the merits of the "Western" text.

¹⁸⁶Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 50.

¹⁸⁷See *BHS*, Isa. 49:6; *GottLXX14*, Isa. 49:6; see also Emerton, 290; Richard, "Old Testament," 339-340.

¹⁸⁸Emerton, 290.

¹⁸⁹Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 160; Holtz, 33; Richard, "Old Testament," 340; J. H. Ropes, *The Text of Acts, The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1922) 3. 128; see also Haenchen, *Acts*, 50-54; Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, 132-133.

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.

4. Acts 28:26-27 = Isa. 6:9-10

This citation occurs at the very conclusion of Acts and forms what Dupont has called "the true conclusion of the entire book of Acts."¹⁹⁰ 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.¹⁹¹ The same citation is used by the Paul of the epistles in a similar connection (Rom. 11:8).¹⁹² Clarke has listed this citation as having substantial agreement with the LXX.¹⁹³ The agreement is not absolute, however. The (non-orthographical) divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts has πορεύθητι πρὸς τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον καὶ εἰπὸν for LXX πορεύθητι καὶ εἶπον τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ; (2) Acts omits αὐτῶν after ὡσίν.

¹⁹⁰Dupont, *Salvation*, 141.

¹⁹¹See *ibid*; Neil, 258; Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 479; Munck, 259; see also J. T. Sanders, "Who Is a Jew and Who Is a Gentile in the Book of Acts," *NTS* 37 (1991) 434-455; cf. Moessner, "The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* (ed. J. B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988) 50.

¹⁹²See Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 479.

¹⁹³Clarke, 88; see also Ringgren, 205.

In point (1) the *καὶ εἶπον* has been moved from close connection with *πορεύθητι* and the preposition *πρός* 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 *εἶπον*), possibly owing to influence from Acts.¹⁹⁴ The change does not bring the LXX closer to the Hebrew, as the MT and even the Targum correspond exactly with the LXX here.¹⁹⁵ The stylistic advantages of such a change are not readily apparent.¹⁹⁶ 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,¹⁹⁷ 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).¹⁹⁸ 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,¹⁹⁹ 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.

¹⁹⁴GottLXX14, Isa. 6:9.

¹⁹⁵See Holtz, 36 n. 3.

¹⁹⁶See A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934) 521; see also Holtz, 36 n. 4.

¹⁹⁷Holtz, 36.

¹⁹⁸GottLXX14, Isa. 6:9.

¹⁹⁹See BDF, 107.

The omission of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ (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

²⁰⁰See R. Harris, 2. 65, 74, 137; Neil, 258; see also Holtz, 34-36.

²⁰¹Dupont, *Salvation*, 141.

²⁰²See Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 479.

²⁰³See Holtz, 35 n. 3 & 4.

²⁰⁴See *UBSGNT3*, Rom. 11:8.

²⁰⁵O. Kaiser, *Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972) 83; see also R. V. G. Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 1; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961) 136-137; E. C. Hoskyns, *The Riddle of the New Testament* (London: Faber, 1931) 188.

²⁰⁶See 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$.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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 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 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$.

²⁰⁷Holtz, 35.

²⁰⁸GottLXX14, Isa. 6:10.

²⁰⁹Holtz, 34-35.

E. Summary: Isaiah Citations in Luke-Acts

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,²¹⁰ 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

²¹⁰Although 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.²¹¹

²¹¹See Longenecker, 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

1. Luke 19:38 = Ps. 118:26 (117:26 LXX)

This citation¹ 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 βασιλεύς*, and replaces Mark's "Hosanna in the highest" with "Peace in heaven and glory in the highest."² 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.

²See e.g., T. W. Manson, The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke Arranged with Introduction and Commentary (London: SCM, 1971) 317-319; Taylor, Behind the Third Gospel, 94-95; Schramm, 144-149.

Ἰσραήλ, which may be linked to Luke's use of ὁ βασιλεύς.³ 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.⁴ 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.⁵ 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.⁶ Therefore, I regard this citation as basically markan material.⁷

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,⁸ 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.⁹

³See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1243; Brown, The Gospel According to John (i-xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966) 460.

⁴Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1242-1244.

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.

⁸See Bock, 122; R. H. Fuller, The Foundations of New Testament Christology (London: Collins, 1965) 113; Stendahl, 66; see also S. Mowinckel, The Psalms in Israel's Worship (2 vols.; Nashville: Abingdon, 1962) 1. 120; Westermann, Praise and Lament in the Psalms (Atlanta: John Knox, 1981) 232.

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;¹⁰ but then why does Luke include this reminiscence, having omitted the whole verse? Likely Luke felt that ὁ 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,¹¹ 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 23:2.¹² In fact, the whole scene is regal,¹³ 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,¹⁴ 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

¹⁰Lohse, "Hosiana," *NovT* 6 (1963) 113.

¹¹Conzelman, *Theology*, 198-199.

¹²See Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1251; Rese, 199; Bock, 124.

¹³See Marshall, *Gospel of Luke*, 574; Bock, 122.

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.

2. Luke 20:17 = Ps. 118:22 (117:22 LXX)

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^s, 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. ἀντὶς [v. 43] and ἀντόν [v. 44]), but admits

¹⁵See e.g., Morris, *St. Luke*, 279, 320; Plummer, 521; Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1473; see also Bultmann, *History*, 282.

¹⁶See 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)?

¹⁷See *NestleAland26*, 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

¹⁸Metzger, Textual Commentary, 58.

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

²⁰See e.g., Plummer, 462; Morris, St. Luke, 287; G. Bornkamm, "λακμάω," TDNT 4 (1967) 281; Jeremias, "λίθος, λίθινος," TDNT 4 (1967) 275.

²¹See 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.

²²Rese, 173.

²³Jeremias, "λίθος," 276; Bock, 127; Holtz, 161; see also Bornkamm, "λακμάω," 281.

²⁴See Jeremias, "λίθος," 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."²⁵ 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.²⁶ This conclusion is supported by those scholars who wish to see an authentic word of Jesus at the nucleus of this passage.²⁷ 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.²⁸ 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 20:17.²⁹ A good case can be made for Lukan 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. 18.³⁰ 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.³¹ Thus, perhaps, v. 18 is a Lukan composition,

²⁵Bornkamm, "λακμάω," 281.

²⁶Holtz, 161; see Bock, 127.

²⁷E.g., Jeremias, The Parables of Jesus (New York: Scribner's, 1963) 74-75; Dodd, Parables, 97; E. G. Selwyn, The First Epistle of Peter (London: Macmillan, 1946) 272-273; but cf. Bultmann, History, 177, 205.

²⁸See Morris, St. Luke, 286.

²⁹See NestleAland26, 756.

³⁰Rese, 172-173; see also Bock, 330 n. 144.

³¹See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1277-1282; see also Bock, 127; but cf. Schramm, 150-167.

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.

3. Luke 20:42-43 = Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX)

This citation is found in all three Synoptics (Matt. 22:44; Mark 12:36), and is clearly Markan in origin.³² That it has been redacted by Luke in conformity with the LXX is also clear, in that Luke replaces Mark's *ὑποκάτω* with septuagintal *ὑποπόδιον*.³³ The one divergence from the LXX in all three is omission of *ὁ* before *κύριος*, although the textual evidence is ambiguous at this point.³⁴ On the other hand, one ms of the LXX (R) from the sixth century omits the article.³⁵ This ms could possibly also have been influenced by the NT, although it may reflect an early reading.³⁶ In any case, the

³²Schramm, 171; Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1309.

³³Rese, 174; Holtz, 51. Matt. 22:44 also reads *ὑποκάτω*.

³⁴See *SFG*, 250; see also Stendahl, 78; Marcus (39) assumes the presence of *ὁ* in his interpretation of Mark 12:46 (but cf. *NestleAland26*, Mark 12:36).

³⁵See *GottLXX10*, Ps. 109:1.

³⁶See Holtz, 52-53.

use of the article appears to be arbitrary, and may have been omitted simply for reasons of style.³⁷

It has been suggested that because of the double use of *κύριος* in the LXX, not differentiating between יהוה and ייִהוָה, the identification of Christ with *Yahweh* becomes possible.³⁸ This latter point has raised the contention that the use of this passage in reference to Christ originated in the Hellenistic church.³⁹ R. H. Fuller even argues that this identification was impossible in Hebrew or Aramaic.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.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.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.

³⁷See C. F. D. Moule, An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek (2d ed.; Cambridge: University, 1959) 111-114; see also W. Foerster, "κύριος in the New Testament," TDNT 3 (1965) 1086-1087; A. Debrunner, Der Gebrauch des Artikels bei κύριος (BZAW 41; Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925) 69-78.

³⁸See Foerster, "κύριος," 1088-1090; Fuller, 68; Marshall, The Origins of New Testament Christology (Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1976) 105; O. Cullmann, The Christology of the New Testament (revised ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963) 234; see also Marcus, 38-40.

³⁹Bultmann, History, 136-137; Fuller, 185.

⁴⁰Fuller, 185.

⁴¹Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1312; Bock, 130.

⁴²Bock, 130.

In summary, then, here we have a traditional citation which Luke has redacted, conforming it to the LXX.

4. Luke 22:69 = Psalm 110:1 (109:1 LXX)

Although sometimes listed as a citation,⁴³ this passage is clearly an allusion to the OT text.⁴⁴ 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,⁴⁵ while others are just as confident that the dependence on Mark is "unmistakable."⁴⁶ 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).⁴⁷ 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

⁴³E.g., UBSGNT3, 901.

⁴⁴Not only is there no introductory formula, but its links to the OT text are more conceptual than verbal.

⁴⁵E.g., Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1458; A. M. Perry, The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative (Chicago: University, 1920) 44.

⁴⁶Creed, 276; see also Conzelman, Theology, 84 n. 3.

⁴⁷Tyson, "The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus," NovT 3 (1959) 251.

Messiahship."⁴⁸ There appear to be few of Luke's characteristic words in this section,⁴⁹ which may point to a source which Luke used without much embellishment. In the final analysis, however, the appeal to vocabulary is inconclusive.⁵⁰

It is the divergence in detail which has, in fact, become the cornerstone of the argument for a special Lukan source.⁵¹ 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.⁵² 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).⁵³

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.

⁵⁰See e.g., J. J. O'Rourke ("The Construction with a Verb of Saying as an Indication of Sources in Luke," NTS 21 [1975] 421-423), who demonstrates this in one instance at least.

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

⁵²F. J. Matera, "The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources," CBQ 47 (1985) 485.

⁵³E.g., Tyson, "Lukan Version," 251-253; B. S. Easton, The Gospel According to Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary (New York: Scribner's, 1926) 339.

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.⁵⁴ Most scholars, however, are not in agreement. David Catchpole, for example, has noted signs of Lukan redaction in v. 69,⁵⁵ and Conzelman has concluded that this passage is typically Lukan.⁵⁶ 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,⁵⁷ or else he used Mark and deliberately chose to change certain Markan details.⁵⁸ A third alternative would see a certain amount of dependence on both Mark and another

⁵⁴Winter, "The Treatment of His Sources," 163-164; "Luke XXII 66b-71," 113-114.

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.⁵⁹ After examining the evidence, Fitzmyer has finally declared that it is quite impossible to know which of these possibilities is the right one.⁶⁰

The allusion itself is likely taken over from Mark, in spite of the possibilities of other sources.⁶¹ If it did originally come from another source, it must have been assimilated to Mark, probably by Luke.⁶² 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 υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* and *ἐρχόμενον 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 υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἦρχετο* ("Theodotion" has *ἐρχόμενος*), while *καθήμενος ἐκ δεξιῶν* (Luke; Matthew has *καθήμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν*; Mark has *ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον*) correspond to *κάθου ἐκ δεξιῶν μου* in Ps. 110 (109):1.⁶³ Luke, however, retains only the words *υἱὸς 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

⁵⁹E.g., Taylor, *Passion Narrative*, 84; Easton, *Luke*, 339; Soards (*Passion*, 103-105) argues that Luke combined Mark with information from an independent oral tradition; see also Soards, "A Literary Analysis of the Origin and Purpose of Luke's Account of the Mockery of Jesus," *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed. E. Richard; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990) 93.

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),⁶⁴ but he seems to miss the logical reason for this change.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.⁶⁶ It is to be noted that in the Talmud (*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. *m.Sanh.* 4:6).⁶⁷ The importance here is clearly that the session is in heaven, and only God is considered to sit down in heaven.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.⁶⁹ Thus Luke, in removing this reference to Daniel, removes the cause of

⁶⁴Bock, 139.

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

⁶⁶See J. C. O'Neill, "The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial Before the Sanhedrin," *The Trial of Jesus* (ed. E. Bammel; London: SCM, 1970) 77. Perhaps E. Bickermann ("Utilitas crucis: Observations sur les récits du procès de Jésus dans les Évangiles canoniques," *RHR* 112 (1935) 182-183) is right in noting that the blasphemy of Mark 14:64 is not the technical blasphemy of *m.Sanh.* 7:5, but rather refers to the "gross impropriety" of Jesus' claims.

⁶⁷See Bock, 140; Catchpole, "You Have Heard His Blasphemy," *TB* 16 (1965) 18.

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

⁶⁹Bock, 140-141; see also Marshall, "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion," *NTS* 12 (1965-1966) 346; L. Sabourin, "The Biblical Cloud," *BTB* 4 (1974) 304; J. G. Baldwin, *Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary* (TOTC; Madison, Wisc.: Inter-Varsity, 1978) 142-143; but cf. N. W. Porteous, *Daniel: A Commentary* (continued...)

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.⁷⁰ 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)

(OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965) 110; cf. also O. Linton, "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Psalm CX," *NTS* 7 (1961) 258-262.

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.⁷¹ 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

1. Luke 4:10-11 = Ps. 91:11-12 (90:11-12 LXX)

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.⁷² Luke has changed the order of the temptation, probably for literary-theological reasons.⁷³ Similarly, other modifications in the story reflect Lukan redaction.⁷⁴ There can be no doubt but that the

⁷¹See e.g., Emerton, 282-283.

⁷²See Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 507.

⁷³See e.g., Plummer (110): "chronological order"; Fitzmyer (Luke (I-IX), 507): geographical-theological perspective consummating in Jerusalem; H. Swanson ("The Lukan Temptation Narrative," JTS NS 17 [1966] 71): modelled on Ps. 106.

⁷⁴See e.g., Dupont, Les tentations de Jésus au désert (StudNeot 4; Bruges: Brouwer, 1968) 43-72; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 507.

citation is septuagintal,⁷⁵ 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 διαφυλάξαι σε and the second ὅτι. The second ὅτι is probably an addition to the text by Luke, as it is not in the LXX. Likely for Luke it functions as a recitative ὅτι and was added after the καί to clarify the connection with the first part of the citation in which ὅτι also occurs.⁷⁶ Holtz argues that Matthew has removed the τοῦ διαφυλάξαι σε from "Q" while Luke has retained it.⁷⁷ 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 πάσαις ταῖς ὁδοῖς σου. Certainly the omission of this latter phrase makes the citation applicable more specifically to the present instance;⁷⁸ 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 διαφυλάξαι σε.

The addition of καὶ ὅτι 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 καί

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 *ὅτι* 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.

2. Luke 13:35 = Ps. 118:26 (117:26 LXX)

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."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,⁸⁷ which is taken by some to indicate an authentic word of Jesus.⁸⁸ There are, however, signs of Lukan redaction throughout this passage,⁸⁹ and thus some have concluded that Luke has expanded upon his Markan source here.⁹⁰

⁸⁵(...continued)

⁸⁵On the relationship of the LXX and the MT at this point, see Bock, 325; but cf. A. Cohen, The Psalms: Hebrew Text & English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary (London: Soncino, 1945) 393; but cf. also GKC, 18; E. Werner, "Massoretic Accents," IDB 1 (1962) 297.

⁸⁶Argyle, "The Accounts of the Temptation," 382.

⁸⁷See e.g., Taylor, Passion Narrative, 96; Rese, 200; Bock, 147-148.

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

⁸⁹See Taylor, Passion Narrative, 95-96; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1513.

⁹⁰See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1512-1513; see also Marshall, Luke: Historian, 874.

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.

⁹⁵Brown, *The Gospel According to John (xiii-xxi): Introduction, Translation, and Notes* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970) 930; Plummer, 538.

⁹⁶Rese, 201.

future tense *παρῳήσομαι* to present tense *παράτίθεμαι*. 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.

⁹⁹See *NestleAland26*, Matt. 26:39.

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 *πάτερ* 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 לִּיְהוֹדֶה , as this tense could be rendered by either a Greek present or future.¹⁰¹ However, it is equally likely, or even more likely, that the present tense is evidence of redaction to the present situation.¹⁰² The occurrence of the present tense in LXX mss *L^{pau}* probably came about through assimilation to Luke, and the occurrence of the future in the majority text (with L, 0117, 0135, *f*³) of Luke, through assimilation to the LXX.¹⁰³

That the LXX is the source here is clear from two points. First of all, as Moo points out, the use of *παρατίθημι* is very rare for לִּיְהוֹדֶה , occurring only twice in the LXX.¹⁰⁴ Secondly, as Bock points out, the plural *εἰς χεῖράς σου* for MT singular לְיָדְךָ is found in the LXX of Ps. 30:6 and replicated here.¹⁰⁵

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.

¹⁰³See *GottLXX10*, Ps. 30:6; *NestleAland26*, Luke 23:46; Holtz, 58 n. 6.

¹⁰⁴Moo, 280.

¹⁰⁵Bock, 147.

of trust which shows Jesus as an innocent, righteous sufferer, an important theme in Luke-Acts (see Acts 2:23; 3:13; 4:10; 5:30; 13:28-29).¹⁰⁶

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.

1. Acts 1:20 = Ps. 69:25 (68:26 LXX; 69:26 MT) and 109:8 (108:8 LXX)

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 *peshet* 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

¹⁰⁶Ibid, 147-148.

¹⁰⁷Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 100; see also Goppelt, *Typos*, 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,¹⁰⁸ and Hanson ascribes these citations to Luke's special tradition.¹⁰⁹ 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.¹¹⁰ The divergences from the LXX are as follows: (1) Acts has αὐτοῦ for LXX αὐτῶν; (2) Acts has ἔρημος for LXX ἡρημωμένη; (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,¹¹¹ 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),¹¹² with the same end of moving from general to specific and adaptation to the Judas context. Point (2) is more difficult. The LXX ἡρημωμένη translates adequately the MT *niphal* participle ַחֲרֵבָה. Interestingly enough a few mss of the Massoretic tradition have ַחֲרֵבָה לְ for ַחֲרֵבָה, which would adequately be translated ἔρημος (or ἐρήμω) in Greek.¹¹³ It is tempting to posit

¹⁰⁸Wilcox, "The Judas-Tradition in Acts I.15-26," *NTS* 19 (1972-1973) 452.

¹⁰⁹Hanson, 84.

¹¹⁰Clarke, 88.

¹¹¹E.g., Manns, 201-202.

¹¹²See Holtz, 47.

¹¹³See *BHS*, Ps. 69:26; *BDB*, 1081.

a variant LXX text here,¹¹⁴ but there appears to be no textual evidence for such a version of this passage.¹¹⁵ Although Hanson notes that the LXX frequently uses ἔρημος in situations such as this,¹¹⁶ it is never used for this *niphal* verb. However, ἐρημόω 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 ἔρημος 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, f³, 28, 33, 700, 892, 1241, 1424, etc.):¹¹⁷ ἀφίεται ὑμῖν ὁ οἶκος ὑμῶν ἔρημος. On the other hand, the textual evidence favours the omission of ἔρημος 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.

¹¹⁴See Hanson, 83.

¹¹⁵See GottLXX10, Ps. 68:26.

¹¹⁶Hanson, 82-83.

¹¹⁷See NestleAland26, Luke 13:35.

¹¹⁸Manns, 200.

But is this citation Lukan or traditional? Holtz argues that, since this citation was widely accepted in early Christianity as a passion psalm,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.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.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.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.¹²³ But Holtz's line of demarcation may be questionable, especially since Judas' death is again mentioned in v. 25.¹²⁴ Rather, it seems more reasonable to conclude that vv. 18-19 form the parenthesis, which is inserted into Peter's speech.

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

¹²⁰Holtz, 44-45.

¹²¹See Neil, 69; Stendahl, 197.

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

¹²³Holtz, 44.

¹²⁴Holtz (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,¹²⁵ Wilcox has determined that vv. 18-19 contain "'ready-made' traditional material,"¹²⁶ 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.¹²⁷ 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;¹²⁸ 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.

¹²⁵E.g., Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 76; Conzelman, *Acts*, 24.

¹²⁶Wilcox, "Judas-Tradition," 444.

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]).¹²⁹ Clarke notes that this citation has substantial agreement with the LXX.¹³⁰ The one divergence is the change of the optative *λάβοι* to imperative *λαβέτω*. During the NT period Blass notes that there was a strong tendency to prefer the imperative to the optative,¹³¹ and Holtz is probably correct in attributing this change to that tendency.¹³² The similar change in LXX ms R is probably due to the influence of Acts.¹³³

This citation is thus septuagintal, but is it Lukan? Holtz would say yes, seemingly on the basis of its LXX origin.¹³⁴ 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

¹²⁹Holtz, 47-48; cf. p. 44.

¹³⁰Clarke, 87.

¹³¹BDF, 194.

¹³²Holtz, 47; see also Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 163.

¹³³See GottLXX10, Ps. 108:8.

¹³⁴See Holtz, 47-48.

Christian tradition.¹³⁵ 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.

2. Acts 2:25-28 = Ps. 16:8-11 (15:8-11 LXX)

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.¹³⁶ Nevertheless there are some (non-orthographic) points of difference:¹³⁷ (1) some mss of Acts have *μου* after *τὸν κύριον*; (2) some mss of Acts have *μου ἡ καρδία*

¹³⁵Dupont, *Salvation*, 121-122.

¹³⁶Clarke, 85.

¹³⁷The divergence of Acts *προορώμην* from LXX *προωρώμην* 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 ἡ καρδιά μου; (3) Acts omits the last clause of the psalm: *τερπνότητες ἐν τῇ δεξιᾷ σου εἰς τέλος*.

The *μου* after *τὸν κύριον* (point [1]) occurs only in mss \aleph , D, 614, a few others, and the *Peshitta* for this passage in Acts.¹³⁸ It is likely a scribal addition, perhaps attempting to identify *τὸν κύριον* here with that in Ps. 110:1.¹³⁹ Similarly, *μου ἡ καρδιά* (point [2]) occurs only in \aleph^* , B, and Clement of Alexandria for this passage in Acts.¹⁴⁰ Although the order *ἡ καρδιά μου* (p⁷⁴, \aleph^c , A, C, D, E, Ψ , 0123, and the majority text) could be an accommodation to the LXX (especially \aleph^c), the suggestion that the inverted order is a stylistic change to produce more elegance, or to create a chiasm with *ἡ γλῶσσά μου*, is not unlikely.¹⁴¹

The final omission (point [3]) of *τερπνότητες ἐν 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,¹⁴² but is it traditional or

¹³⁸See *NestleAland26*, Acts 2:25.

¹³⁹See Bock, 348 n. 58.

¹⁴⁰See *NestleAland26*, Acts 2:26.

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 וְיָיִשׁׁוּ in Ps. 16:8 with *προορώμην* (*προωρώμην*), 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."¹⁴³ 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."¹⁴⁴ John A. T. Robinson has

¹⁴²(...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 "Gottesschau" 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 גִּבּוֹרִים with $\eta \gamma\lambda\omega\sigma\sigma\acute{\alpha} \mu\omicron\upsilon$ in 16:9. Perhaps the LXX found difficulty with the idea of "glory" rejoicing, or, as some would have it (emending to גִּבּוֹרִים), 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 בְּבִטְחוֹן , "in security," in v. 9 by $\epsilon\pi' \epsilon\lambda\pi\acute{\iota}\delta\iota$, which, as Schmitt (237) suggests, opens the door for the concept of resurrection. Bock (175) and Rese (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 בְּבִטְחוֹן , "pit," in v. 10 by διαφθοράν , "corruption." Parallel to בְּבִטְחוֹן , בְּבִטְחוֹן becomes equivalent to the "pit of sheol" (see BDB, 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, בְּבִטְחוֹן 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 בְּבִטְחוֹן 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; Rese, 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 $\text{רֹן דֹּשִׁיֹן סוּךְ}$ for ἡ δόξα σου in v. 10 makes possible the reference to Christ (Bock, 175-176). The MT *kethiv* is plural while the *qere* is singular, and it has been asserted that the *qere* would make the Hebrew equivalent to the LXX singular (Ringgren, 233; 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.

¹⁴³Hanson, 84.

¹⁴⁴B. Lindars, *New Testament Apologetic* (London: SCM, 1961) 44.

argued persuasively that this form of christology is very primitive,¹⁴⁵ 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.¹⁴⁶ 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.¹⁴⁷ 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.¹⁴⁸ 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.¹⁴⁹ 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.

¹⁴⁷D. Juel, "Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 555; see also H. W. Boers, "Psalm 16 and the Historical Origin of the Christian Faith," *ZNW* 60 (1969) 105-110.

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,¹⁵⁰ 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.¹⁵¹ 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,¹⁵² 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

¹⁵⁰On this issue, cf. Moule, "The Christology of Acts," *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 166-169.

¹⁵¹Only v. 31 has what could loosely be termed an introductory formula (ἐλάλησεν περὶ 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.

¹⁵²Clarke, 97.

course of summarizing the event recounted.¹⁵³ There may possibly be an allusion here to II Chr. 6:9-10 as well.¹⁵⁴ Attempts to discern an Aramaic *Vorlage* here¹⁵⁵ 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 saying¹⁵⁶ founders on the fact that this OT reference is not found elsewhere in the NT.¹⁵⁷ Hence it cannot have been a very widespread authoritative tradition, as Holtz himself admits.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.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵³All reference to Ps. 131:11 LXX has been edited to fit the context of the Acts speech. The oath formula of the LXX: ὤμοσεν κύριος τῷ Δαυὶδ ἀλήθειαν καὶ οὐ μὴ ἀθετήσῃ αὐτήν, has been shortened to ὅρκῳ ὤμοσεν 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. Ὁσφύος replaces κοιλίας 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; Rese, 108; Bock, 351 n. 79).

¹⁵⁴See Rese, 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).

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

¹⁵⁶Holtz, 148-149.

¹⁵⁷See NestleAland26, 756.

¹⁵⁸Holtz, 148.

¹⁵⁹See Argyle, "The Theory of an Aramaic Source in Acts 2, 14-40," *JTS* NS 4 (1953) 214; Dodd, *According to the Scriptures*, 106.

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.'" ¹⁶⁰ 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. ¹⁶¹

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, C^{vid}, ¹⁶² D, E, Ψ, and the majority text) read ᾧδου for ᾧδην. ¹⁶³ Certain mss of the LXX also read ᾧδου

¹⁶⁰Holtz, 50, see also 143-144.

¹⁶¹The change of οὐκ to οὔτε and οὐδε to οὔτε are stylistic improvements creating the better Greek οὔτε . . . οὔτε ("neither . . . nor") configuration (see BAG, 600). The second person future ἐγκαταλείψεις becomes third person aorist passive ἐγκατελείβη and infinitive ἰδεῖν becomes aorist active εἶδεν 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 δώσεις is omitted as unnecessary, and as inconsistent with the passive sense of the sentence. The change of τὸν δσιόν σου to ἡ σὰρξ 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 C³, E, Ψ, and the majority text read ἡ ψυχὴ 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 ψυχὴ had acquired, which would have been inconsistent with Luke's insistence on the corporeality of the resurrection (see A. Dihle, "ψυχὴ in the Greek World," TDNT 9 (1974) 614-617; Schweizer, "ψυχὴ: D. The New Testament," TDNT 9 (1974) 647; Rese, 110).

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

¹⁶³See Ibid, Acts 2:31.

(several mss of the Lucianic tradition, Z, some mss of Theodoret, A, 1219).¹⁶⁴ 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 ᾠδὴν with mss B, R, several different mss of the Lucianic tradition, and some other mss of Theodoret.¹⁶⁵ But in v. 31 he followed a tradition which reflected the variant reading noted above. Thus, Holtz considers ᾠδου as likely the original reading of v. 31, with ᾠδὴν being an assimilation to the LXX.¹⁶⁶ The issue, however, is not so clear cut. The change from ᾠδὴν to ᾠδου is definitely a stylistic change, as the latter is usual in classical Greek,¹⁶⁷ while ᾠδης is the usual LXX designation.¹⁶⁸ Hence, while the presence of ᾠδὴν in this reference to Ps. 16:10 could be an assimilation to the LXX, the reading ᾠδου 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 ᾠδου in his explanatory allusion in v. 31. On the other hand, the textual evidence is usually taken as favouring ᾠδὴν here, in any case.¹⁶⁹

¹⁶⁴See GottLXX10, Ps. 15:10.

¹⁶⁵See Ibid.

¹⁶⁶Holtz, 50.

¹⁶⁷See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 300.

¹⁶⁸See Jeremias, "ᾠδης," TDNT 1 (1964) 146.

¹⁶⁹See 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 λαβών, with perhaps a hint in the word ἀνέβη 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) δεξιὰ κυρίου ὑψώσεν με seem to be reflected in the words in Acts 2:31: τῇ δεξιᾷ οὖν τοῦ θεοῦ ὑψωθείς, 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

¹⁷⁰See Rese, 110.

¹⁷¹Ibid; see Lindars, 44.

¹⁷²Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 99.

¹⁷³The 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 κυρίου being changed to τοῦ θεοῦ 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,¹⁷⁴ 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,¹⁷⁵ especially for Paul,¹⁷⁶ and there is no reason to suppose that Luke could not have used this method in composing the speeches in Acts.

4. Acts 2:34-35 = Ps. 110:1 (109:1 LXX)

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.

¹⁷⁶See J. A. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity* (OBS; Oxford: University, 1983) 12.

the NT.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 (κ*, B*, D),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.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

¹⁷⁷See R. B. Hays, Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul (New Haven: Yale, 1989) 84; see also NestleAland26, 756.

¹⁷⁸See NestleAland26, Acts 2:34.

¹⁷⁹Longenecker, 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 *testimonium*. 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 ὁσιος, and the citation is related to Isa. 55:33.¹⁸⁰ 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.

¹⁸⁰See Ibid, 97, 103.

5. Acts 4:11 = Ps. 118:22 (117:22 LXX)

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 *ἐξουθενήεις* instead of *ἀπεδοκίμασαν*, 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 οἰκοδομοῦντες* to *ὑφ' ὑμῶν 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 *ὑμῶν*, is an accusation against the leaders of the Jews (but cf. Holtz, 162). The actual structure of the introductory formula (*οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος 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* [TNTC 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 γερόμενος* instead of *οὗτος ἐγενήθη* can thus be seen as a parallel to the phrase *ὁ ἐξουθενήεις* 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.¹⁸⁴ 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.¹⁸⁵ 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. 118:22¹⁸⁶ 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,¹⁸⁷ but since this particular phrase only appears in the LXX and derived literature,¹⁸⁸ 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):

MT	Acts 4:11	LXX
אבן נִסְתָּרָה וְהָיָה לְרֹאשׁ זִמְנָה	οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ λίθος ὃς ἐξουθενήθη ἐξ ὑμῶν τῶν οἰκοδόμων, ὁ γενόμενος* <u>εἰς</u> <u>κεφαλὴν γωνίας</u>	λίθον, ὃν ἀπεδοκίμασαν οἱ οἰκοδομοῦντες, οὗτος ἐγενήθη εἰς κεφαλὴν γωνίας
[the] rock the builders rejected became [the] head of [the] corner	this is the rock which was despised by you the builders , who became* <u>[the] head of [the] corner</u>	a rock, which the builders rejected, this one became [the] head of [the] corner

*the Greek participle is not reflected in the Hebrew.

¹⁸⁷Holtz, 162 n. 3.

¹⁸⁸Jeremias, "κεφαλὴ γωνίας," *TDNT* 1 (1964) 792.

here.¹⁸⁹ While an independent translation would explain the use of an alternate verb here, the question of why a translator would choose ἐξουθενέω 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.¹⁹⁰ On the other hand, the LXX does translate וַנִּזְכֹּר with either ἐξουθενέω or ἀποδοκιμάζω (among other verbs),¹⁹¹ 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).¹⁹² 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.¹⁹³ Bock, however, is probably right in rejecting this conclusion, since the connotation of Ps. 89:39

¹⁸⁹It is to be noted that וַנִּזְכֹּר is a *hapax legomenon* in the Hebrew Bible (Lisowsky, 1174). Symmachus translates it by ἀκρωγωνιάω (see GottLXX10, 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, "λίθος," 273 n. 45).

¹⁹⁰See GottLXX10, Ps. 117:22.

¹⁹¹See Clarke, 97.

¹⁹²L. Cerfaux, "La première communauté chrétienne à Jérusalem," ETL 16 (1939) 18.

¹⁹³See e.g., Kidner, Psalms 73-150, 324; cf. Briggs and Briggs, 2. 253-254; for the *Sitz im Leben* of this psalm see H. Gunkel, The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction (ed. J. Reumann; FBBS 19; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967) 13-14.

is antithetical to the point of Acts, which is that while people have rejected Christ, God has exalted him.¹⁹⁴ Another suggestion has been made by Dodd, Dupont and Lindars.¹⁹⁵ 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: ἐξουδενώμενος καὶ ἐλάχιστος ἀνδρῶν.¹⁹⁶ In Symmachus the word ἐξουδενώμενος translates the Hebrew מְצַחֵם. The LXX appears widely variant from the MT here, and Symmachus 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,¹⁹⁷ is forced to admit that Luke has redacted the speech.¹⁹⁸ Schweizer shows clearly that this Petrine speech follows the Lukan pattern

¹⁹⁴See 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.

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

¹⁹⁶See *GottLXX14*, Isa. 53:3.

¹⁹⁷Blaiklock (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.

¹⁹⁸Blaiklock, 65.

evidenced throughout the speeches in Acts, and this would tend to point to Luke as the source of the speech.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 ἐξουθενέω 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 ἐξουθενέω represents a paraphrase of the LXX is quite likely in that the whole of the passage appears paraphrased in Acts 4:11.²⁰⁰ Bock rejects this hypothesis because Luke has maintained the verbal similarity to the LXX in other uses of this OT reference.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

¹⁹⁹Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 209, 212.

²⁰⁰Cadbury, "The Titles of Jesus in Acts," *The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1922) 5. 373.

²⁰¹Bock, 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 ἐξουθενέω has more of the connotation of "despising" than does ἀποδοκιμάζω, 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 ἐξουθενέω 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 ἐξουδενηθῆ 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 ἐξουθενηθείς, 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).

²⁰²See Grundmann, "δόκιμος," *TDNT* 2 (1964) 256; *BAG*, 277.

²⁰³Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 121; see also Rese, 114.

6. Acts 4:25-26 = Ps. 2:1-2

This citation occurs in the prayer of Peter in Acts 4 and is identical with the LXX, except for 'Ινατί instead of *Ινα 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 Δαυὶδ 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.²⁰⁴ 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, א, A, B, E, 33, 88, etc.) ultimately unsatisfactory, but the best which is available.²⁰⁵ 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 ך of אִיךָ to ך, producing אִיךָךָ אִיךָךָ, which was

²⁰⁴Bock, 202.

²⁰⁵Metzger, Textual Commentary, 322.

then necessarily rendered ὁ τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν.²⁰⁶ It is, however, unlikely that Luke (or another translator) would have produced this jumble of words in translation, without making sense of them.²⁰⁷ The most likely solution is that the jumble has come about through faulty textual transmission.²⁰⁸

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 ἔθνη of the citation with the ἔθνεσιν of v. 27, and the λαοί of the citation with the λαοὶς Ἰσραήλ of v. 27.²⁰⁹ While in the LXX λαός is usually preferred when referring to Israel, and ἔθνος is used most often in connection with foreign peoples,²¹⁰ the Hebrew אֲנִי is sometimes used of either.²¹¹ In fact, in the MT of Ps. 2:1, אֲנִי appears in inverted parallelism with אֲנִי, and thus probably refers to foreign peoples.²¹² Dupont argues that the LXX translation of Ps. 2:1 facilitates the distinction made in Acts 4 between the Gentiles and Israel.²¹³

²⁰⁶Torrey, Composition, 17-18.

²⁰⁷See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 322; Bock, 203.

²⁰⁸See Bock, 203; cf. Haenchen, Acts, 226.

²⁰⁹Dupont, Salvation, 118.

²¹⁰H. Strathmann, "λαός," TDNT 4 (1967) 32-33.

²¹¹See BDB, 522.

²¹²Dupont, Salvation, 118; see also Briggs and Briggs, 1. 12; but cf. Kidner, Psalms 1-72, 50.

²¹³Dupont, Salvation, 118.

Bock, however, argues that, since עַם 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 $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$ and $\xi\theta\eta\eta$ shows the author's evident familiarity with the general LXX distinction between them.²¹⁴ Hence the identification of $\lambda\alpha\omicron\acute{\iota}$ 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.²¹⁵ 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

²¹⁴See J. Kodell, "Luke's Use of *LAOS*, 'People,' Especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19,28-24,53)," *CBO* 31 (1969) 341-342; Conzelman, *Theology*, 163-164; Strathmann, " $\lambda\alpha\acute{o}\varsigma$," 52-53.

²¹⁵Marshall, *Acts*, 100-104.

is only identifying the trials of the apostolic community with those of Christ,²¹⁶ in keeping with his tendency to draw parallels between Christ and the apostles throughout Luke-Acts.²¹⁷ 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.²¹⁸ In Luke, in contrast to the other Gospels, Jesus is brought before Pilate and eventually convicted on

²¹⁶Bock, 206.

²¹⁷See R. F. O'Toole, "Parallels Between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts: A Further Study," *BZ* 27 (1983) 195-202; Dupont, "Pierre et Paul dans les Actes," *RB* 64 (1957) 35-47.

²¹⁸Although the issue is hotly debated, there is some evidence that Luke may have had a somewhat more judicious attitude toward the Jews than other NT writers (see e.g., R. L. Brawley, *Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation* [SBLMS 31; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987] 155-159; T. Van Goudoever, "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel," *NovT* 8 [1966] 123; Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story," *JBL* 104 [1985] 81-82; "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives* [ed. J. B. Tyson; Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988] 98-99; D. Slingerland, "'The Jews' in the Pauline Portion of Acts," *JAAR* 54 [1986] 319; A. J. Saldarini, "Interpretation of Luke-Acts and Implications for Jewish-Christian Dialogue," *WAW* 12 [1992] 37-42; V. E. Vine, "Luke 14:15-24 and Anti-Semitism," *ExpTim* 102 [1991] 262-263; Moessner, "Ironical Fulfillment," 46-50; D. L. Tiede, "'Glory to Thy People Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 34; M. Salmon, "Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 76-82; see also Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," *NTS* 25 [1979] 146-157; A. F. J. Klijn, "Scribes, Pharisees, Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament," *NovT* 3 [1959] 266; see also T. Horvath, "Why Was Jesus Brought to Pilate?" *NovT* 11 [1969] 184; M. A. Powell, "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary Critical Study," *JBL* 109 [1990] 109-110; W. R. Long, "The *Paulusbild* in the Trial of Paul in Acts," *SBLASP*, 1983 [ed. K. H. Richards; Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1983] 104; A. I. Baumgarten, "The Name of the Pharisees," *JBL* 102 [1983] 414). For the other side of the debate cf., e.g., J. T. Sanders, "The Parable of the Pounds and Lucan Anti-Semitism," *TS* 42 (1981) 667; "Who Is a Jew," 434-455; "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 51-75; L. M. Wills, "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts," *JBL* 110 (1991) 653; M. J. Cook, "The Mission to the Jews in Acts: Unraveling Luke's 'Myth of the Myriads'," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 102-123. For a more ambivalent view of supposed Lukan anti-Semitism, see e.g., Gaston, "Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative in Luke and Acts," *Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity* (ed. P. Richardson and D. Granskou; Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1986) 1. 153; Tyson, *Images of Judaism*, 187-189; "The Problem of Jewish Rejection in Acts," *Luke-Acts and the Jewish People*, 124-137; D. M. Sweetland, "Luke the Christian," *New Views on Luke and Acts* (ed. E. Richard; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990) 58-60.

a political charge, not on a religious charge of blasphemy.²¹⁹ 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.²²⁰ 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.²²¹ 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.²²² 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.²²³ But while Bock is doubtless right in asserting that Luke could have used traditional material, the evidence, both from Dömer, 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.²²⁴

7. Acts 13:22,33,35 = Ps. 89:20 (88:21 LXX; 89:21 MT); 2:7; 16:10 (15:10 LXX)

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.

a. Acts 13:22 = Ps. 89:20 (88:21 LXX; 89:21 MT)

Rather than a citation, this is more properly an allusion fused with other OT passages (I Sam. 13:14 and Isa. 44:28),²²⁵ and as such requires little comment. It encompasses only two words: *Εὐρον Δαυὶδ*, to which Acts adds *τὸν τοῦ Ἰεσσαί*. Haenchen and Holtz suggest that here we have influence from Isa. 11:1,10; II Kgdms. 23:1 or Ps. 71:20 LXX.²²⁶ 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).

²²⁶Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 166; Holtz, 134.

and fit well into this passage in Acts. Whether this allusion is from the LXX or not is impossible to say, as בְּנִסְכָּח (89:21 MT) is most naturally translated by $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron\nu$.

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.²²⁷ 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.²²⁸ 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.²²⁹ 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.

²²⁸Ibid.

²²⁹See Lövestam, *Son and Saviour*, 17; see also Longenecker, *Biblical Exegesis*, 98; Doeve, 172.

7:14.²³⁰ 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),²³¹ but in Hebrews it is not.²³² 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 οὐδὲ to οὐ. The latter is merely a stylistic change as the text no longer appears with its parallel in Ps. 16:10a.²³³ 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.²³⁴ I, however, have found that this explanation is wholly unnecessary in

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

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

²³²See Bock, 246.

²³³Ibid, 255.

²³⁴See 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.

E. Summary: Psalms Citations in Luke-Acts

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).²³⁵ 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.

²³⁵See Callan, "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography," *NTS* 31 (1985) 580; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 291-292; see also Plummer, 2.

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

1. Luke 10:27 = Deut. 6:5 + Lev. 19:18

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 NestleAland26, 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,"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

²E.g. Bultmann, History, 22-23; F. W. Beare, The Earliest Records of Jesus (Oxford: Blackwell, 1962) 159; see also Schramm, 47 n. 4.

³E.g., Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 877; Morris, St. Luke, 187.

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.

⁶See Marshall, Luke: Historian, 441; Manson, 260.

⁷Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 877-878.

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: ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος σου; Luke: ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ἰσχυΐ 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 ἀγαπήσεις 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 Göttingen edition, verbatim with the Lukan citation until we come to the various parameters of the love for God. Then the LXX reads: ἐξ ὅλης τῆς διανοίας σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ψυχῆς σου καὶ ἐξ ὅλης τῆς δυνάμεώς 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 ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου* at the end (with Matthew; Mark places it before the final parameter), and *δυνάμεως* becomes *ισχύϊ* (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 Lukan citation is closer to it than is the LXX at this point. *Καρδία* is a more literal translation of *לִבְךָ* than is *διάνοια* (in fact, this is the only place where LXX Deuteronomy translates the characteristic Deuteronomic phrase *לִבְךָ-לִבְךָ וְכָל-לִבְךָ* with *διάνοια* for *לִבְךָ* instead of *καρδία*),¹⁰ and the use of *ἐν* better accords with Hebrew *בְּ* than does *ἐξ*. Furthermore, *ισχύς* is just as possible a translation of *כֹּחַ* as is *δύναμις*.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 *לִבְךָ* 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 *GottLXX3.2*, 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 GottLXX3,2.¹³ The former contains *καρδία* instead of *διάνοια*. As *διάνοια* is a common LXX equivalent of כִּכְלִי, and represents a more Hellenistic rendering of the term,¹⁴ one could either see *καρδία* as an assimilation to the Hebrew,¹⁵ or *διάνοια* as a Hellenizing of the original LXX. Thomas suggests that *ισχύος* (Mark 12:30, *ισχύϊ* in Luke) is also based on a variant Greek tradition,¹⁶ although the textual evidence is not very supportive of this suggestion.¹⁷ He suggests that the change of ἐξ to ἐν reflects an attempt to approximate the Hebrew כִּ in the liturgical tradition,¹⁸ 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.¹⁹

¹³Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 209.

¹⁴Behm, "διάνοια," TDNT 4 (1967) 965.

¹⁵See Stendahl, 74-75.

¹⁶Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 209.

¹⁷See GottLXX3,2, Deut. 6:5.

¹⁸See also Goulder, Luke, 486.

¹⁹Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 210.

Thomas's suggestions are ingenious, and do, in fact, explain some of the variants, especially the double translation of **לִבְכָּ**, in a way which appears at first glance impossible by any other suggestion.²⁰ There is another possibility, however, which needs to be noted. Based upon the fact that the words *καρδία* and *ισχύς*, 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,²¹ 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,²² and so influence from IV Kingdoms on the Christian liturgical form of Deut. 6:5 is not out of the question.²³

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:

ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας σου

-from Mark

καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ ψυχῇ σου καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ
ισχύϊ σου

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

καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου

-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 ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ 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."²⁴ 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."²⁵ 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 ἰσχύς rather than with καρδία, since the reference to ἰσχύς 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.

²⁴Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 210; see also R. H. Gundry, The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope (Leiden: Brill, 1967) 24.

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.²⁶

Turning to the removal of *καὶ ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ διανοίᾳ σου* to the end of the passage, again the problem is difficult. One could argue that Luke has placed the reference to *διάνοια* last for emphasis. *Διάνοια*, 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 καρδίας αὐτῶν* (cf. Heb. 4:12). The genitival construction here indicates the close relation between *διάνοια* and *καρδία* in the mind of the writer. Both words refer to the person's inward thoughts and motivations.²⁷ In Luke 10:27 the four parameters can be understood to form a chiasm²⁸ with the two references to the inner motivations of the person enclosing the references to the person's life and actions:

a καρδία
 b ψυχὴ
 b' ἰσχύς
 a' διάνοια

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.

²⁸See discussion by E. W. Bullinger (*Figures of Speech Used in the Bible Explained and Illustrated* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968] 374-379).

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:

a καρδιά
 b ψυχή
a' διάνοια

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

²⁹See Stendahl, 76; Holtz, 66-67; see also de Waard, Comparative Study, 64.

³⁰All translations of the OT Pseudepigrapha are from APOT 2.

Testaments.³¹ On the other hand, others suspect that the references in the Testaments themselves are Christian interpolations.³² 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.³³ 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."³⁴ Hence, while the combination of the two Scriptures is certainly traditional, it may not be traditionally Jewish, but Christian.³⁵

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.

³¹See APOT, 2. 291-292, 334; see also M. Miyoshi, "Das Jüdische Gebet *Šema* und die Abfolge der traditionsstücke in Lk 10-13," AJBI 7 (1981) 99-100.

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

³³Ibid. 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.

³⁴Ibid.; see also Bornkamm, "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe," Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag, AM 20. August 1954 (ed. W. Eltester; BZNW 21; Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957) 85-93.

³⁵Luke'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 ἀποστερήσης* 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 ἀποστερήσης* and the reversal in order of *μὴ φονεύσης* and *μὴ μοιχεύσης*. 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 ἀποστερήσης* from Jewish catechetical tradition. He probably

³⁶See 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.

³⁷The introductory words "you know the commandments" may indicate a summary as naturally as a citation.

³⁸See Gundry, 17; see also Thomas, "Torah Citations in the Synoptics," *NTS* 24 (1977-1978) 85-96.

found the fourth commandment placed after the eighth in the same tradition, and perhaps the use of $\mu\eta$ with the subjunctive, as opposed to LXX $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ with indicative.³⁹

As far as the omission of $\mu\eta$ ἀποστερήσης 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 $\mu\eta$ + subjunctive to $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\kappa$ + 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,

³⁹See Stendahl, 62; see also Thomas, "Liturgical Citations," 207.

⁴⁰See Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1196.

⁴¹See Stendahl, 62; Ringgren, 228; Ringgren's analysis seems confused at this point.

⁴²See 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).

⁴³See S. A. Cook, "A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus," *PSBA* 25 (1903) 34-56.

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.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 $\mu\eta$ with the subjunctive, as Matthew did, may be explained by the fact that $\mu\eta$ with subjunctive is stylistically better.⁴⁵

In summary, this citation is not so widely at variance with the LXX as Holtz would suggest.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.

3. Luke 20:28,37 = Deut. 25:5 (+Gen. 38:8); Ex. 3:6

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.⁴⁷ T. Schramm has

⁴⁴See Thomas "Liturgical Citations," 207; Stendahl, 62.

⁴⁵See BDF, 183-184.

⁴⁶Holtz, 168.

⁴⁷Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1299; see also Holtz, 69.

argued that vv. 34b-36 betray signs of another source,⁴⁸ but it is equally likely that Luke has redacted these verses, removing the accusation of the Sadducees and alluding to IV Macc. 7:19.⁴⁹ In any event, both citations are clearly Markan. I will examine each in turn.

a. Luke 20:28 = Deut. 25:5 (+ Gen. 38:8)

Mark 12:19 must be considered an allusion or a summary of Deut. 25:5, with some additional words from Gen. 38:8 (καὶ ἀνάστησον [Mark and Luke have ἐξαναστήση] σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου [Mark and Luke have αὐτοῦ]).⁵⁰ Luke has taken this allusion over from Mark with certain stylistic changes, in no way bringing the text closer to the LXX.⁵¹ 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,⁵² but the

⁴⁸Schramm, 170-171.

⁴⁹F. Neirynck, "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc," *L'évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques: Méorial Lucien Cerfaux* (ed. F. Neirynck; BETL 52; Gembloux: Ducolot, 1973) 167-177; Fitzmyer, *Luke (X-XXIV)*, 1299.

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.⁵³ 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.⁵⁴ 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.

b. Luke 20:37 = Ex. 3:6

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.⁵⁵ Luke abbreviates Mark in the interests of style, and makes clear that Jesus is quoting Moses in opposition to the Sadducees' quotation of Moses.⁵⁶ 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 *εἰμι ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρός σου*, and inserting the article before *θεός*, 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 *θεός* 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.

c. Summary: Luke 20:28,37

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

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

⁵⁸Mss D, W, and a few others omit the article before the first *θεός* while mss B, D, and W omit it before the second and third (see *NestleAland26*, Mark 12:26).

⁵⁹Stendahl, 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 παντὶ ῥήματι ἐκπορευομένῳ διὰ στόματος θεοῦ, "but by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God" (Matt. 4:4).

⁶⁰Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 512-513.

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.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1991) 39-41.

This latter phrase is surely septuagintal⁶² as the MT reads: כִּי עַל-כָּל-דְּבַר-יְהוָה פִּי יֵהְיֶה, "but by everything coming out of the mouth of the Lord." The word *ῥήματι* 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.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.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.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.⁶⁶ Neither view appears demonstrable.

⁶²See GottLXX3,2, Deut. 8:3.

⁶³See e.g., NestleAland26, Luke 4:4; UBSGNT3, Luke 4:4; Plummer, 110; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 515.

⁶⁴E. Lohmeyer, "Die Versuchung Jesu," ZST 14 (1937) 628 n. 1.

⁶⁵Holtz, 61; Fitzmyer, Luke (I-IX), 515.

⁶⁶See Stendahl, 88, see also p. 60.

2. Luke 4:8 = Deut. 6:13

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 *φοβηθήσῃ*, and the insertion of *μόνῳ* 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 *προσκυνήσῃς* 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 *μόνῳ* 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.

3. Luke 4:12 = Deut. 6:16

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.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.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,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.

⁶⁹See Holtz, 63-64; Stendahl, 89.

⁷⁰Holtz, 64.

⁷¹Argyle, "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. 13:2,12,15.⁷² 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 μήτραν*. The translation of *נִשְׂרָא* by *διανοίγον* appears to be a septuagintalism of the first order, here in Ex. 13.⁷³ The word in connection with *μήτραν* 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.⁷⁴ Beyond this Ex. 13:2 makes reference to the firstborn child being holy to the Lord: *Ἀγιάσόν μοι πᾶν πρωτότοκον πρωτογενὲς διανοίγον πᾶσαν μήτραν*, while v. 12 says: *ἀφελείς πᾶν διανοίγον μήτραν, 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).⁷⁵ Fitzmyer has connected the citation here closely with 1:35, *διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον ἅγιον κληθήσεται*,

⁷²The introductory formula (*καθὼς γέγραπται ἐν νόμῳ κυρίου*) 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.

υἱὸς 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."⁷⁶ 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.⁷⁷ 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.⁷⁸ 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

⁷⁶Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 426.

⁷⁷Bock, 307 n. 117.

⁷⁸Ibid, 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.

⁸⁰Minear, "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories," *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 114-118; Tannehill, *The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation* (2 vols.; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, 1990) 1. 15-44; see also Farris (151-159), who notes that the hymns in the Lukan infancy stories are connected with prominent Lukan themes as well, but concludes that, although the hymns themselves are traditional Palestinian Jewish Christian compositions (97), Luke is responsible for their place in the Gospel narrative (158-159).

the rest of his narrative.⁸¹ Therefore, while the citation of 2:23 could be from a traditional source, as held by Holtz, Rese and Bock,⁸² 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 *πρωτότοκος* 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.

2. Luke 2:24 = Lev. 12:8 (1:14; 5:11)

This citation is generally taken to be a citation of Lev. 12:8. Introduced by the words *κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κυρίου*, this citation is verbatim from the LXX except that *ξεῦχος* replaces *δύο* before *τρυγόνων* (LXX of Lev. 12:8 has *τρυγόνας*). There is no evidence for this reading in the textual tradition of LXX Lev. 12:8 other than here in Luke.⁸³ There is nothing in the MT which would give rise to this word except

⁸¹O'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.

⁸²Holtz, 82-83; Rese, 141; Bock, 83.

⁸³See *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.⁸⁴ 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: οὗτος ὁ νόμος τῆς τικτούσης ἄρσεν ἢ θήλυ. Bock succinctly outlines the three possibilities for explaining the use of ζεύγος 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."⁸⁵ 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 Sinaitic 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).⁸⁶ Αὐτῶν 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.

⁸⁶See UBSGNT3, Luke 2:22.

born. The correction to ἀντῆς is to be seen in the light of this fact, and that to αὐτοῦ is likely a transcriptional error.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.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.⁸⁹ Another proposed solution is that Luke is merely summarizing and is careless about exactly who was being purified.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,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.⁹²

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

⁸⁸Bultmann, *History*, 229; Fitzmyer, *Luke (I-IX)*, 424.

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

⁹⁰See Bock, 84, 308 n. 127.

⁹¹E.g., Creed, 39; see also Hauck, "καθαρισμός," *TDNT* 3 (1965) 429 n. 5.

⁹²See Plummer, 63; Fitzmyer, *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.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.⁹⁴ As the circumstances are not spelled out by Luke, we are left with the conclusion that the *αὐτῶν* 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.⁹⁵ This inclusion of Joseph brings us to the relationship of the Lukan narrative to I Samuel.

⁹³Plummer, 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. 12:2) 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. 15:19-24). 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").

⁹⁴R. Robert, "Comment comprendre 'leur purification' en Luc II, 22?" *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-IX)*, 338]). Secondly, there is no legal reason why Joseph would have had to be purified as the physical father of Jesus (Lagrange, 82).

⁹⁵See 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 *αὐτῶν* 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 *αὐτῶν* 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.) 2:21,26.⁹⁶ 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.⁹⁷ 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.⁹⁸ 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. 2:20.⁹⁹ 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.

⁹⁶Brown, "The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22-40)," Wor 51 (1977) 6.

⁹⁷See Bock, 84-85.

⁹⁸Brown, Birth, 448-451.

⁹⁹Bock, 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).¹⁰⁰ The motif of consecration to God is clearly present in Jesus' presentation in the temple, as we have seen in our discussion of 2:23.¹⁰¹ 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).¹⁰² 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.¹⁰³

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

¹⁰⁰H. W. Hertzberg, *I & II Samuel: A Commentary* (OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964) 28; Bock, 83.

¹⁰¹See also Reicke, "παρίστημι, παριστάνω: C. The New Testament," *TDNT* 5 (1967) 840-841.

¹⁰²See Hertzberg, 28.

¹⁰³See 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, ζεύγος in the LXX generally refers to a yoked pair of oxen (not the yoke itself, which is translated ζυγός), and it is not very often used even in that context (e.g., III Kgdms 19:21; Job 1:3,14; 42:12; ζυγός is often used for the yoked oxen as well). Furthermore it is found only in Lev. 5:11 to translate פֶּהַשׁ. 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 *παραστῆσαι 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.¹⁰⁴ 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 ζεύγος 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 ζεύγος often means "a pair,"¹⁰⁵ 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.

¹⁰⁴Unless one accepts that Joseph had become ceremonially unclean (Plummer, 63; Morris, St. Luke, 87).

¹⁰⁵BAG, 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.

1. Acts 23:5 = Ex. 22:28 (22:27 LXX & MT)

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 ἄρχοντα in Acts (in place of the plural ἄρχοντες in Vaticanus for the Exodus text) to an alteration to produce a more suitable reading.¹⁰⁶ Presumably the substitution of οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς for οὐ κακῶς ἐρεῖς could also be a stylistic improvement. Ἄρχοντα in place of ἄρχοντες, however, is found in all LXX mss except B, 15'-376, 30-85-343'-730^c, x, and 527, while οὐκ ἐρεῖς κακῶς replaces οὐ κακῶς ἐρεῖς in all LXX mss except B, 58'-82, and 527 (ms 127 reads κακῶς οὐκ

¹⁰⁶Clarke, 93-94.

ἐρεῖς).¹⁰⁷ The singular ἄρχοντα is closer to the MT, but ἐρεῖς κακῶς and κακῶς ἐρεῖς are equally divergent from the MT ܐܪܚܢܐ ("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 ἄρχοντα, there is no assimilation in the translation of ܐܪܚܢܐ in these mss.¹⁰⁸ 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 ἄρχοντα became plural through assimilation to the plural θεοῦς in the first half of the sentence.¹⁰⁹ He also attributes the Vaticanus reading of οὐ κακῶς ἐρεῖς to a smoothing out of the grammar, but this is debatable.¹¹⁰ It is clear, however, especially in view of the paraphrase of ܐܪܚܢܐ, 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 18:19-24,¹¹¹ and argues for a relationship between the two accounts in which the Pauline trial account

¹⁰⁷GottLXX2.1, 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."

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

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

¹¹⁰See 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."

¹¹¹See 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 *εἰ κακῶς ἐλάλησα* 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 *εἷς παρεστηκὼς τῶν ὑπηρετῶν*, and Paul by *τοῖς παρεστῶσιν αὐτῷ*), but the description of the blow is different (John = *ἔδωκεν ῥάπισμα*; Acts = *τύπτειν αὐτοῦ τὸ στόμα*). After the slap in both cases Jesus

¹¹²Holtz, 128-129.

¹¹³Bultmann, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959) 500 n. 10.

¹¹⁴See Morris, *The Gospel According to John: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971) 757; Raymond Brown, *John (xiii-xxi)*, 827.

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

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

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

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'

¹¹⁵See Brown, *John (xiii-xxi)*, 826; Tasker, *The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction and Commentary* (TNTC 4; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960) 198.

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 κεκονιαμένοις = Acts 23:3: τοῖς κεκονιαμένους),¹¹⁶ a piece of "Q" material, which Luke alters by removing exactly the word here paralleled in Acts.¹¹⁷ 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.¹¹⁸ 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

¹¹⁶See Munck (222), who also notes the similarity to Josephus, Ant. 20.9.1§199-203.

¹¹⁷See Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 949.

¹¹⁸See 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.

¹²⁰See C. S. C. Williams, *A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles* (BNTC; London: Black, 1957) 247-248.

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.¹²³ 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.¹²⁴ Paul's argument before the Sanhedrin is centred in the doctrine of the resurrection, perhaps the doctrine of utmost importance to Luke.¹²⁵ 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,¹²⁶ become, for this crucial doctrine, the allies

¹²³Holtz, 128.

¹²⁴See e.g., Conzelman, *Theology*, 16; Easton, *Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers* (ed. F. C. Grant; London: S.P.C.K., 1955) 65-66; V. E. Vine, "The Purpose and Date of Acts," *ExpTim* 96 (1984) 48.

¹²⁵See Conzelman, *Theology*, 205; Munck, 223; Barrett, *New Testament Essays* (London: S.P.C.K., 1972) 82; Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," 146; Brawley, 99; Walaskay, *'And So We Came to Rome'*, 54.

¹²⁶See Slingerland, 319; Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," 147; Brawley, 97-99, 105-106.

of Christianity.¹²⁷ Similarly, Luke's sympathies are with the Pharisees throughout Acts, while the Sadducees are depicted invariably as opposed to the Gospel (e.g., 4:1,5-6; 5:17-18; cf. also 6:9).¹²⁸ Thus, we can see that 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.¹²⁹ 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.¹³⁰ Dupont, however, has argued rather strongly that Luke used "his own notes" while composing the Acts, not outside sources.¹³¹ 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

¹²⁷See Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," 147; Brawley, 97-99.

¹²⁸Ziesler, "Luke and the Pharisees," 147; Brawley, 115-117, 132; see also C. Wassén, "Sadducees and *Halakah*," 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.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1991) 127.

¹²⁹See Bruce, Acts (1951), 24.

¹³⁰Haenchen, "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity," Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 272; Kümmel, 184-185.

¹³¹Dupont, The Sources of Acts: The Present Position (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964) 166-167; see also G. P. V. Du Plooy, "The Author in Luke-Acts," Sera 32 (1990) 28-35.

they would likely have been taken over without the use of "we."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.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.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.

¹³²Munck, XLIII.

¹³³See Kümmel, 177, 185; Dupont, *Sources*, 85; Blaiklock, 14; Du Plooy, 28-35.

¹³⁴A similar conclusion has been reached recently by E. Larsson ("Lukas och Pentateuken," *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 ὁ θεός before Ἰσαάκ and Ἰακώβ. The words are included in p⁷⁴, ⸀, 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 ὁ θεός 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 ἐγώ εἰμι; (2) Acts moves ὁ θεὸς τοῦ πατρὸς σου from the beginning of the passage to the end, and changes the singular τοῦ πατρὸς σου to plural τῶν πατέρων ἡμῶν; (3) if we accept the shorter reading of Acts, then Acts omits θεός before Ἰσαάκ and Ἰακώβ; if we accept the longer reading, then Acts adds the article before each occurrence of θεός (except for mss A and D).

¹³⁵See NestleAland26, Acts 3:13.

¹³⁶Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 310.

The omission of ἐγώ εἰμι (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 ἐγώ εἰμι, 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."¹³⁷ 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 ὑμῶν, not ἡμῶν. Bock suggests that the change from second person plural to first person plural allows the speech to more directly "include those addressed."¹³⁸ 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. 3:6¹³⁹ and this has led Wilcox to conclude that we have in Acts 3:13 influence from Samaritan

¹³⁷Bock, 187; see also J. S. Sibinga, *The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr*, Vol. 1: *The Pentateuch* (Leiden: Brill, 1963) 39; but cf. Richard, "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence," *CBQ* 39 (1977) 201-202 n. 50.

¹³⁸Bock, 187.

¹³⁹BHS, Ex. 3:6; Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 29.

sources.¹⁴⁰ 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 3:12-26.¹⁴¹

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.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.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.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

¹⁴⁰Wilcox, Semitisms, 29-30, 34.

¹⁴¹Scobie, "The Use of Source Material," 417-420; see also "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity," NTS 19 (1972-1973) 390-414.

¹⁴²E.g., Cross, The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961) 173.

¹⁴³P. W. Skehan, "The Scrolls and the Old Testament Text," New Directions in Biblical Archaeology (ed. D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969) 97-98; R. Pummer, "New Evidence for Samaritan Christianity," CBQ 41 (1979) 98-117; "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the New Testament," NTS 22 (1975-1976) 441-443; see also "The Book of Jubilees and the Samaritans," ÉTh 10 (1979) 162-163.

¹⁴⁴Richard, "Acts 7," 202.

of Eusebius in some codices, some quotations of Cyprian, and the citations of Justin Martyr.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'."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 *θεός* before *Ἰσραήλ* and *Ἰακώβ*.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 *ὁ θεός* is to be accepted as original.¹⁴⁸ On the basis of the confusion in the textual data for Acts 3:13,¹⁴⁹ 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. 3.¹⁵⁰ On the other hand, the attestation for the longer reading seems somewhat better than that for the

¹⁴⁵Ibid, 200; see also BrookeMacLean, Ex. 3:6; Kahle, 144.

¹⁴⁶Richard, "Acts 7," 201.

¹⁴⁷Wilcox, Semitisms, 34.

¹⁴⁸Richard "Acts 7," 201 n. 49; "Old Testament," 336; Acts 6:1-8:4, 95.

¹⁴⁹See Metzger, Textual Commentary, 348.

¹⁵⁰On the LXX evidence for the omission of the repetitive *θεός*, see Wevers (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 θεὸς 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,

¹⁵¹See Bock, 187; *BDF*, 145; Moule, *Idiom Book*, 115.

¹⁵²Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 31.

¹⁵³Richard, "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).

¹⁵⁴There is no introductory formula indicating a direct citation from the OT.

¹⁵⁵Wilcox, *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.¹⁵⁶ 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.¹⁵⁷ 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,¹⁵⁸ or if he has redacted the speeches at all,¹⁵⁹ 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

¹⁵⁶Holtz, 122.

¹⁵⁷Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 34.

¹⁵⁸E.g., Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 208-216.

¹⁵⁹See also S. J. Kistemaker, "The Speeches in Acts," *CTR* 5 (1990) 31-41.

circles in the first century,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.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. 3-4.¹⁶² 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),¹⁶³ then one cannot ignore the

¹⁶⁰See Bruce, Commentary on the Book of Acts: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes (NICNT; London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1965) 87.

¹⁶¹See Richard, "Acts 7," 200-202.

¹⁶²Ibid, 199-200.

¹⁶³Schweizer, "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.

b. Acts 3:22-23 = Deut. 18:15-16,19 + Lev. 23:29

Acts 3:22-23 is generally accepted as a mixed citation of Deut. 18:15-16,19 and Lev. 23:29,¹⁶⁴ and this seems to be the simplest adequate explanation of its form.¹⁶⁵ But the question remains: How did the two passages come to be connected? It has been

¹⁶⁴See e.g., UBSGNT3, Acts 3:22-23; NestleAland26, Acts 3:22-23; Conzelman, Acts, 29; Holtz, 74; Ringgren, 233; Reese, 66.

¹⁶⁵De 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 *πάσα ψυχή* in Acts 3:23 reflect an independent rendering of the Hebrew *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* in Deut. 18:19; (2) that the term *ἐξολεθρευθήσεται* in Acts 3:23 reflects a misreading of *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* as *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* 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 *ἐκ τοῦ λαοῦ* reflects another misreading of a text like 4Q175 in which *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* has been read as *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ*; 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 *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* 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 *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* by *ἄνθρωπος* is much more natural than *ψυχή* while the latter is much more naturally derived from *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* as in LXX Lev. 23:29 (Bock, 192); the phrase *כָּל נֶפֶשׁ כָּל נֶפֶשׁ* in 4Q175 is actually closer to the LXX phrase *ὅσα ἂν λαλῶσιν ὁ προφήτης ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί 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, "ὀλεθρεύω, ὀλεθρος, ὀλοθρευτής, ἐξολοθρεύω," 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*.¹⁶⁶ 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.¹⁶⁷ 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

¹⁶⁶See e.g., Dodd, According to the Scriptures, 55-57; Rese, 68; Bruce, Acts (1951), 113; Holtz, 74.

¹⁶⁷See e.g., Bock, 192; Holtz, 74.

agreement that the primary divergences from the LXX are redactionally motivated.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 ὥσπερ σέ, καὶ δώσω τὸ ῥῆμά μου ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ, καὶ λαλήσει αὐτοῖς καθότι ἂν ἐντείλωμαι αὐτῷ*), which presents a stylistic parallel with a similar phrase in Acts 3:21 (*πάντων ὧν ἐλάλησεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων ἀπ' αἰῶνος 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]).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,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.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

¹⁶⁸E.g., Rese, 67; Bock, 191-192; Richard, "Old Testament," 336.

¹⁶⁹Richard, "Old Testament," 336.

¹⁷⁰Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 212; cf. also Kistemaker, 31-44.

¹⁷¹Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 113.

Gospels,¹⁷² with no reference at all to it in the epistles.¹⁷³ 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.¹⁷⁴ 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.¹⁷⁵ 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.¹⁷⁶ 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.

¹⁷²See *Ibid*; NestleAland26, 746.

¹⁷³Deut. 18:18-19 also is found in 4Q175 lines 5-6, but Deut. 18:15-16 do not appear (Allegro, Qumrân Cave 4, 57, 59; "Further Messianic References," 183).

¹⁷⁴J. Irmscher, "The Pseudo-Clementines," New Testament Apocrypha (2 vols.; ed. E. Hennecke and W. Schneemelcher; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965) 2. 543.

¹⁷⁵E.g., Bruce, Acts (1951), 113.

¹⁷⁶Rese, 67-68; see also H. M. Teeple, The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet (SBLMS 10; Philadelphia: SBL, 1957) 88, 121; G. Strecker, Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoclementinen (TU 70; Berlin: Akademie, 1958) 122; 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 (χρόνων ἀποκαταστάσεως πάντων) and that in v. 24 (τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας) 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 μέν-δέ construction of vv. 22 and 24.¹⁸¹ The introductory words of v. 22 (Μωϋσῆς μὲν εἶπεν) could be paraphrased "on the one hand Moses said" while those of v. 24 (καὶ πάντες δὲ οἱ προφῆται) "and on the other hand also all the prophets."¹⁸² Holtz argues that the joining of vv. 22-23 and v. 24 by

¹⁷⁷Holtz, 79-80.

¹⁷⁸Ibid, 78-79.

¹⁷⁹Ibid, 79 n. 1.

¹⁸⁰Ibid, 77-78; see also Haenchen, *Acts*, 209.

¹⁸¹Rese, 68.

¹⁸²See *BDF*, 232.

μέν and δέ derives from Luke himself, who inserted the citation and attempted to make it fit the context.¹⁸³ He further makes a hypothetical conjecture that originally v. 24 may have read πάντες γάρ.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 ἀρχάμενος ἀπὸ Μωϋσέως 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

¹⁸³Holtz, 79.

¹⁸⁴Ibid, 79 n. 4.

¹⁸⁵See Rese, 69, 13.

¹⁸⁶See Friedrich, 831 n. 337.

Moses and continued to the prophets.¹⁸⁷ 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.¹⁸⁸ 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 ὡς ἐμέ (Hebrew כְּ־מֹשֶׁה) 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."¹⁸⁹ 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.¹⁹⁰ If this analysis is correct, there is no problem with seeing Moses as

¹⁸⁷Ibid.

¹⁸⁸Jeremias, "Μωϋσῆς," *TDNT* 4 (1967) 865.

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,¹⁹¹ since it also seems that *τὰς ἡμέρας ταύτας* refers to the time of the writer.¹⁹² 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."¹⁹³ 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-δέ* 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

¹⁹¹As Holtz (77) and Haenchen (*Acts*, 209) insist.

¹⁹²Rese, 69; Conzelman, *Acts*, 30.

¹⁹³Bock, 357 n. 122.

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?"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.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.¹⁹⁶ Atonement is also a

¹⁹⁴Ibid, 193.

¹⁹⁵Holtz, 74 n. 1; see also F. Büchsel, "ἱλάσκειν: C. Ideas of Expiation in Judaism," *TDNT* 3 (1965) 313; J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Atonement, Day of," *IDB* 1 (1962) 316.

¹⁹⁶See e.g., C. L. Mitton, "Atonement," *IDB* 1 (1962) 310; Rylaarsdam, 314.

concept which is not foreign to the NT.¹⁹⁷ 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.¹⁹⁸ But the prevailing view of Hebrews now seems to be that it was not only written to Gentile Christians, but by a Gentile Christian.¹⁹⁹ 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."²⁰⁰ 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.²⁰¹

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."²⁰² What the book of

¹⁹⁷See Mitton, 311; Goppelt, Theology of the New Testament (2 vols.; ed. J. Roloff; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982) 1. 94-97.

¹⁹⁸See Kümmel, 399; see also T. Hewitt, The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary (TNTC 15; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960) 29-34; G. L. Archer, Jr., The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Study Manual (SBSO; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957) 6-7.

¹⁹⁹See Kümmel, 399-400.

²⁰⁰*Ibid.*, 403.

²⁰¹Tyson, New Testament, 417.

²⁰²Kümmel, 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.²⁰³ 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.²⁰⁴ 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,"²⁰⁵ and Oscar Cullmann has noted that "it is without doubt one of

²⁰³See e.g., 1QS 9:10-11; 4Q175 lines 5-8; John 1:21,25; 6:14; see also G. Vermes, Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981) 95-96; Fuller, 46-47; Teeple, 63-68; Thompson, 213; F. Hahn, The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity (New York: World, 1969) 372-374; G. von Rad, Old Testament Theology (2 vols.; New York: Harper, 1965) 2. 244-248. This expectation, however, may not have been as prominent as is often supposed (see R. A. Horsley, "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus," CBQ 47 (1985) 441-443, 463; "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus: Their Principal Features and Social Origins," JSNT 26 (1986) 20-21; R. A. Horsley and J. S. Hanson, Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus [NVBS; Minneapolis: Winston, 1985] 149, 160-161).

²⁰⁴Cullmann, 38-39; 42; Longenecker, The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity (SBT 2S 17; London: SCM, 1970) 38; Vermes, 97-99; but cf. W. Pannenberg, Jesus--God and Man (2d ed.; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977) 212-215.

²⁰⁵Fuller, 47.

the oldest Christologies we possess."²⁰⁶ Holtz agrees that this motif is early Jewish-Christian.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."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.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.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

²⁰⁶Cullmann, 42, see also Goppelt, *Theology*, 1. 166.

²⁰⁷Holtz, 78 n. 1.

²⁰⁸Fuller, 169.

²⁰⁹Ibid, 129; Robinson, "Elijah, John and Jesus," *NTS* 4 (1958) 263-281; see also P. Fredriksen, *From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1988) 98-101, 124-125; Vermes, 99; K. Brower, "Elijah in the Markan Passion Narrative," *JSNT* 18 (1983) 85-101; Hahn, 372-373; Marshall, *Origins*, 54, 56; Goppelt, *Theology*, 1. 166-167, 2. 21; Teeple, 108-109; but cf. Cullmann, 37; Pannenberg, 215-216; Conzelman, *Theology*, 85.

²¹⁰See the discussion in Fuller, 127-129; Barrett, *The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition* (London: S.P.C.K., 1947) 94-99; Horsley, "Popular Prophetic Movements," 22-23.

a prophet is a Lukan characteristic.²¹¹ 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.²¹² In the light of the foregoing, one might see the eschatological prophet as having particular appeal for Luke.²¹³

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.²¹⁴ 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).²¹⁵ Hence, If Luke wished to cite

²¹¹See M. de Jonge, Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988) 106.

²¹²Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts," NovT 28 (1986) 255-256; see also O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," BTB 20 (1990) 22-29.

²¹³See Marshall, Origins, 54; see also de Jonge, 106.

²¹⁴See discussion by Bruce ("Messiah," NBD [1962] 811-818); see also R. F. Johnson, "Moses," IDB 3 (1962) 449.

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."²¹⁶ This is particularly the case of the speeches in Acts.²¹⁷ 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;²¹⁸ (2) the redactional links between the citation and the speech;²¹⁹ (3) the references to Moses and prophets in general, in relation to Christ, in Luke's overall

²¹⁶See e.g., R. J. Dillon, "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)," *CBQ* 43 (1981) 224; Ellis, 41; M. P. Burnier, "Une vision prophétique et eschatologique de l'histoire le livre des Actes," *FoiVieSup* 70 (1971) 143-144; see also A. W. Mosley, "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World," *NTS* 12 (1965) 10-26; J. Kürzinger, "Luke 1,3: . . . ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι," *BZ* 18 (1974) 254-255.

²¹⁷See e.g., Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (LEC 8; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987) 92-93, 124-128; cf. also Callan, "The Preface of Luke-Acts," *NTS* 31 (1985) 579-580.

²¹⁸See Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 210-212; Aune, *New Testament*, 124-128; and my discussion above.

²¹⁹See Richard, "Old Testament," 336; and my discussion above.

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 *προφήτην ὑμῖν ἀναστήσει κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν ὡς ἐμέ αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε κατὰ πάντα* come from Deut. 18:15, *ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς* and probably *τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου*²²⁴ come from Deut. 18:19, and *ἔσται δὲ πᾶσα ψυχὴ ἥτις ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ* and *ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἐκ τοῦ 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 (*προφήτην ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν σου ὡς ἐμέ*), verb (*ἀναστήσει*), indirect object (*σοι*), subject (*κύριος ὁ θεός σου*), in Deut. 18:15 to object (*προφήτην*), indirect object (*ὑμῖν*), verb (*ἀναστήσει*), subject + prepositional phrase (*κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ἐκ τῶν ἀδελφῶν ὑμῶν 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 *πρὸς ὑμᾶς* are added in Acts 3:22 to the words *ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ* from Deut. 18:19; (4)

²²⁰See Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer'," 255-256; Marshall, *Origins*, 54; de Jonge, 106; O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," 22-29; and my discussion above.

²²¹Holtz, 72; see also Ringgren, 233; Rese, 67; Lindars, 207.

²²²de Waard, *Comparative Study*, 21-24; "The Quotation from Deuteronomy in Acts 3, 22.23 and the Palestinian Text: Additional Arguments," *Bib* 52 (1971) 537-540; Bock, 192.

²²³Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 37.

²²⁴See Holtz, 74; Rese, 66.

the direct object of Deut. 18:19, expressed as *τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ ὁ προφήτης [ἐκεῖνος] ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου*, is shortened to *τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου* in Acts 3:23 (the latter phrase also replaces *ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ* in Lev. 23:29); (5) the words *ἔσται δέ* precede *πᾶσα ψυχὴ* (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 ταύτῃ* 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 *ἀκούσεσθε* 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

²²⁵Richard "Old Testament," 336.

after the verb to after the object *προφήτην* (the indirect object also becomes plural *ὑμῖν*). 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,²²⁶ and further emphasizes the listeners as recipients of the words of the eschatological prophet. Point (4), the shortening of *τῶν λόγων αὐτοῦ, ὅσα ἂν λαλήσῃ ὁ προφήτης [ἐκεῖνος] ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματί μου* to *τοῦ προφήτου ἐκείνου*, is likely a stylistic shortening²²⁷ 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 *ἔσται δέ* in Acts 3:23 before *πάσα 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,²²⁸ perhaps under the influence of the plurals in Deut. 18:18,²²⁹ 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.²³⁰

²²⁶Rese, 67; Bock, 192.

²²⁷See Holtz, 74.

²²⁸Rese, 67; Bock, 191.

²²⁹Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 109.

²³⁰*GottLXX3,2*, 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."²³¹ 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. 18:15,²³² 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 *ἔσται δέ* 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.²³³ Bruce has, however, suggested that *ἔσται δέ* is a rendering of

²³¹Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 109-110; See also M. Ginsburger, *Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Uziel zum Pentateuch) nach der Londoner Handschrift* (Jerusalem: Makor, 1974) 332; Arthur Vööbus, *Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs, neues Licht zur Frage des Herkunft des Peschitta aus dem altpalästinischen Targum, Handschriftstudien* (PETSE 9; Stockholm: ETSE, 1958) 28, 32.

²³²See M. McNamara, "Targums," *IDBS* (1976) 860; cf. also M. Maher, *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis: Translated, with Introduction and Notes* (ABT 1B; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1992) 11.

²³³See *BHS* and *GottLXX2.2* (Lev. 23:29) who list no instances of *ἔσται δέ* or equivalent.

the MT הָיָה 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 מִבְּרַיְךָ ("from your midst") in Deut. 18:15, in agreement with the LXX.²³⁶ Holtz also points to the rendering of וְהָיָה by $\omega\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\mu\acute{\epsilon}$ and the taking together of $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon \acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon$ $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ contrary to the MT's separation of וְהָיָה and וְהָיָה in Deut. 18:15-16 as indicative of a LXX origin.²³⁷ Thus the rendering of the MT הָיָה with $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ 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 $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, arguing that the words have been inserted as a parallel to Acts 2:21 ($\kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$), 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

²³⁴Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 113; it is to be noted that the equivalent of $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ does not appear in 4Q175 (see Allegro, "Further Messianic References," 183).

²³⁵In agreement with Holtz (73); see also Lindars, 207.

²³⁶Holtz, 73 n. 2; see also Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 33.

²³⁷Holtz, 73 n. 2.

²³⁸See *GottLXX3.2*, Deut. 18:19.

²³⁹Rese, 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 *ἔσται δέ* in Deut. 18:19, a possibly Hebraicizing text, translating the Hebrew *וְיִהְיֶה*. But Luke may well have added *ἔσται 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 Lukan, while there are points which suggest that Luke himself compiled the citation. Similarly, although the presence of *ἔσται 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.

c. Acts 3:25 = Gen. 26:4 (22:18)

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 26:4.²⁴⁰ But, as "seed" (*σπέρμα*) appears to be the focus of the

²⁴⁰Hanson, 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 26:4.²⁴¹ 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 *τῆς γῆς* in 22:18.²⁴² 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,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

²⁴¹See Bock, 195; Rese, 73; see also UBSGNT3, Acts 3:25; a LXX minuscule adds *καὶ ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου* after *τῆς γῆς* in Gen. 12:3 (GottLXX1, Gen. 12:3), but this seems to be a secondary addition.

²⁴²See GottLXX1, Gen. 22:18; Holtz, 74 n. 3.

²⁴³Schneider, "ὄρκος," 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 *καί* and *ἐνευλογηθήσονται* in Acts. Secondly, there is a possible divergence in that some texts of Acts read the simple *εὐλογηθήσονται* instead of *ἐνευλογηθήσονται*. Finally, and most importantly, Acts reads *πάσαι αἱ πατριαί* instead of *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*.

The throwing forward of *ἐν τῷ σπέρματί σου* appears to be redactional, intended to emphasize the "seed."²⁴⁴ 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 *ἐνευλογηθήσονται/εὐλογηθήσονται* 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, ⋈, A^c, D, E, 0165, and the majority text.²⁴⁵ Although this variant may not appear important, Ringgren concludes that it is the use of *ἐνευλογηθήσονται* which proves the citation's septuagintal origin.²⁴⁶ While it is often

²⁴⁴Bock, 195.

²⁴⁵NestleAland26, Acts 3:25.

²⁴⁶Ringgren, 233.

argued that the simple form is secondary,²⁴⁷ Holtz argues that the compound form of the word is secondary. He bases his argument on the observation that *ἐνευλογηθήσονται* 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.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 *εὐλογοῦντα* in Acts 3:26.²⁴⁹ 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 *εὐλογηθήσονται* in papyrus 911, minuscules 246, 619, and Justin and Theodoret. The same form is also read in minuscules 426, 664*, 619 and Chrysostom and Theodoret for Gen. 22:18. For 12:3, Wevers lists uncial A, minuscules 833, 72', 569, 343, 59, and I Clement, and for 18:18, 72'-708, and 59.²⁵⁰ Although

²⁴⁷E.g., Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 165.

²⁴⁸Holtz, 71-72.

²⁴⁹Rese 73.

²⁵⁰GottLXX1, 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.²⁵¹

One could certainly argue that, as with the LXX textual tradition, the textual tradition of Acts (that represented by A*, B, Ψ, etc.) has tended to simplify the verb as well, possibly through accommodation to the following ἐὺλογοῦντα.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. Reese 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 ἐὺλογοῦντα which follows in v. 26.²⁵³ 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;²⁵⁴ note also that the church fathers often altered the compound form of Gal. 3:8 to the simple form),²⁵⁵ and this would have provided sufficient reason for Luke to have changed the verb.²⁵⁶

²⁵¹Accepting the textual conclusions of Wevers.

²⁵²This seems to be the conclusion of the editors of NestleAland26 (Acts 3:25). It is to be noted as well that the reading of ms C, ἐπευλογηθήσονται, is best explained by postulating ἐνευλογηθήσονται as original (see Holtz, 71 n. 7).

²⁵³Reese, 73.

²⁵⁴See L&S, 564.

²⁵⁵See Holtz, 71 n. 9.

²⁵⁶See Kümmel, 150.

The use of *πάσαι αἱ πατριαί* (Acts 3:25) instead of *πάντα τὰ ἔθνη* (Gen. 26:4) is more difficult. *Πάσαι αἱ πατριαί* 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 *πατριαί* 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 *πατριαί* is a common rendering for *נַחֲשֻׁן* (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 *πατριαί* here to the liturgical influence of the psalter on the community's language of prayer, as the LXX often renders *נַחֲשֻׁן* by *πατριαί* in the Psalms.²⁶⁰ Holtz sees the direct influence of LXX Ps. 95:7, in which a similar construction is used (*αἱ πατριαὶ 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 (*πάσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν*--MT 22:28)

²⁵⁷See GottLXX1, Gen. 26:4.

²⁵⁸See Ibid, Gen. 12:3.

²⁵⁹Bock, 358-359 n. 129; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 114.

²⁶⁰G. Schrenk, "πατριαί," TDNT 5 (1967) 1016-1017; Holtz, 75.

²⁶¹Holtz, 75. *Αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν*, is perhaps a better translation of *נַחֲשֻׁן* than is *πατριαί* alone, since *נַחֲשֻׁן* has a broader connotation than does *πατριαί* (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).

²⁶²Holtz, 80.

as the possible basis for the use of *πατριά*, but conclude that Luke made the change deliberately.²⁶³

The appeal to $\aleph\pi\epsilon\psi\aleph$ as a basis for *πατριά* becomes impossible if Gen. 26:4 is the source of the citation, since the underlying Hebrew here is $\aleph\aleph\aleph$, a word never rendered by *πατριά*. 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 *πατριά* on $\aleph\pi\epsilon\psi\aleph$. It seems more likely that Luke altered *ἐθνη* to *πατριά* 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 *φυλαί*, 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.

²⁶⁴See Conzelman, *Acts*, 30.

²⁶⁵Haenchen, "Schriftzitate," 166.

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 *πάσαι αἱ πατριάι τῆς γῆς* in v. 25. Hence, both Jews and Gentiles are included in the word *πατριάι*.²⁶⁸

Now Bock contends that *φυλαί* would have worked equally as well in this case as *πατριάι*, 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 *ἔθνη* 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 *πατριά* tends to indicate, in secular Greek, a family

²⁶⁸Rese, 73; Dupont, *Salvation*, 135.

²⁶⁹Bock, 196.

²⁷⁰C. Maurer, "φυλή," *TDNT* 9 (1974) 246.

²⁷¹*Ibid*, 248-249.

relationship, and in the LXX does not have the same strong Jewish connotation as φυλή.²⁷² 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.²⁷³ 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):7.²⁷⁴ 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,²⁷⁵ 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.

²⁷²See Ibid, 245-246; Schrenk, 1015-1016.

²⁷³See Schrenk, 1018.

²⁷⁴Ibid, 1016.

²⁷⁵Ibid, 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.²⁷⁶ The suggestion that we have in this speech a verbatim account of Stephen's defence has been virtually laid to rest by scholars,²⁷⁷ 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).²⁷⁸ Several suggestions have been made regarding sources for the speech,²⁷⁹ but of most importance for our purposes is the view that Acts 7 represents a Christian tract containing a reworked Samaritan source,²⁸⁰ which agrees with a number of the conclusions of Wilcox regarding the citations in Acts 7,²⁸¹ and the view that Acts 7 incorporates a Hellenistic Jewish synagogue sermon,²⁸² which is followed by Holtz.²⁸³

²⁷⁶See e.g., Klijn, "Stephen's Speech—Acts VII.2-53," *NTS* 4 (1957-1958) 25; see also Conzelman, *Acts*, 57.

²⁷⁷See 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."

²⁷⁸See Dibelius, *Studies*, 167-169; Haenchen, *Acts*, 286; Wilson, 132; Donaldson, 40; Holtz, 30 n. 4.

²⁷⁹For a fairly complete accounting of the various views, see Richard (*Acts* 6:1-8:4, 23-25).

²⁸⁰See Scobie, "Use of Source Material," 399-421; "Origins," 390-414.

²⁸¹See Wilcox, "Old Testament," 1-41.

²⁸²See Dibelius, *Studies*, 167-170; Haenchen, *Acts*, 288-289; Conzelman, *Acts*, 57; see also Bowker, "Speeches in Acts," 107, 110.

²⁸³See 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.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.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."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 44-50.²⁸⁷ In a somewhat more detailed fashion Haenchen sees the additions by Luke as comprising vv. 35, 37, 39-43, and 49-53.²⁸⁸ 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

²⁸⁴Ibid, 85, 100-109, 110-113.

²⁸⁵Ibid, 110.

²⁸⁶Ibid, 113.

²⁸⁷Dibelius, *Studies*, 167-170.

²⁸⁸Haenchen, *Acts*, 288-289.

suggests the possibility of Lukan material at vv. 25 and 27 as well.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. 6-7.²⁹⁰ 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. 23-53,²⁹¹ 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.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 fore-knowledge of serious obstacles to their fulfillment, obstacles which God *godself* 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.²⁹³

²⁸⁹Conzelman, Acts, 57.

²⁹⁰Holtz, 94, 98-99.

²⁹¹Donaldson, 39-41, see also p. 44.

²⁹²Richard, "The Polemical Character of the Joseph Episode in Acts 7," JBL 98 (1979) 265.

²⁹³J. Via, "An Interpretation of Acts 7.35-37 From the Perspective of Major Themes in Luke-Acts," PRS 6 (1979) 192.

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.²⁹⁴ 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."²⁹⁵ Richard notes a great many of these expressions²⁹⁶ and concludes that the function of these parallels is thematic in nature, "whether promise/fulfilment or positive/negative contrasts between Abraham and his descendents."²⁹⁷ 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

²⁹⁴Ibid, 193-195; see also J. J. Scott, Jr., "Stephen's Defense and the World Mission of the People of God," *JETS* 21 (1978) 134.

²⁹⁵Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 204-205, see also pp. 261-264.

²⁹⁶See his extensive lists (Ibid, 178-180, 205-206).

²⁹⁷Ibid, 205.

distinct, internally cohesive architectonic structure.²⁹⁸ 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.²⁹⁹ 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 2-3.³⁰⁰ Via has noted that the themes of promise/fulfillment/obstacle-to-fulfillment in Acts 7 are also echoed in Acts 2-3.³⁰¹ She also finds a similar thematic parallel with Acts 13.³⁰² 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),³⁰³ 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).³⁰⁴ Via also notes that the

²⁹⁸Ibid, 201-204, 264-266.

²⁹⁹Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer,'" 255-256; see also O'Toole, "The Parallels between Jesus and Moses," 22-29.

³⁰⁰Tannehill, 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.

³⁰¹Via, 200.

³⁰²Ibid, 196-199.

³⁰³Tannehill, Narrative Unity, 2. 93-95; see also "Israel in Luke-Acts," 75; J. Kilgallen, The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study Of Acts 7,2-53 (AnBib 67; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976) 32, 39.

³⁰⁴Tannehill, 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),³⁰⁵ and the themes of promise/fulfillment/obstacle/overcoming-of-obstacle appear as well throughout the resurrection narrative of Luke 24.³⁰⁶ Acts 7 appears at a critical juncture in Luke's narrative, representing the judgement on the Jews,³⁰⁷ and the introduction of the Gentile mission.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.³⁰⁹ In the same way similarities between the pattern of the speech and others in Luke-Acts have been noted,³¹⁰ especially with regard to Acts 13.³¹¹ Hence the conclusion that the speech comes

³⁰⁵Via, 202-205.

³⁰⁶Via, 205-207; see also O'Neill, The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting (2d ed.; London: S.P.C.K., 1970) 71-76.

³⁰⁷Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 266.

³⁰⁸See Wilson, The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission, 165; Scott, 140-141.

³⁰⁹W. Mundle, "Die Stephanusrede Apg. 7: eine Märtyrerapologie," ZNW 20 (1921) 135; A. Loisy, Les Actes des Apôtres (Paris: Nourry, 1920) 318-347; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 256-257.

³¹⁰J. T. Townsend, "The Speeches in Acts," ATR 42 (1960) 155.

³¹¹See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 257-259; Schweizer, "Concerning the Speeches," 211; Bowker, "Speeches in Acts," 107.

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, <u>Ant.</u> 3:86-87 (5.3); 4:43-45 (3.2); <u>JW</u> 5:379-419 (9.4); Heb. 11 ³¹⁶

³¹²E.g., Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 257; Townsend, 157, 159.

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.

³¹⁵See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 259-266.

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; Conzelmann (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,³¹⁷ especially since many of these historical surveys are readily available in the LXX.³¹⁸ 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 structurally³¹⁹ or thematically.³²⁰ 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.³²¹ 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

³¹⁷Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 142-143.

³¹⁸Townsend, 155.

³¹⁹See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 143.

³²⁰See Simon, St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church (Haskell Lectures 1956; London: Longmans, Green, 1958) 41.

³²¹Richard (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,³²² or that the speech is a sermon dating from an early Christian mission to Samaria.³²³ The Samaritan view of history and theology has been found by Scobie in Acts 7:2-41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 53.³²⁴ 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.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.³²⁶

All of these conclusions have been heavily debated,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.³²⁸ In fact, it might be

³²²E.g., A. Spiro, "Stephen's Samaritan Background," *The Acts of the Apostles* (by J. Munck; AB 31; ed. W. F. Albright and C. S. Mann; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967) 285-300; Gaston, *No Stone On Another*, 159.

³²³E.g., M. H. Scharlemann, *Stephen a Singular Saint* (AnBib 34; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968) 186; Scobie, "Origins," 398-400; R. Scroggs, "The Earliest Hellenistic Christianity," *Religion in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough* (SHR; NumenSup 14; ed. J. Neusner; Leiden: Brill, 1968) 196-197.

³²⁴Scobie, "Use of Source Material," 410.

³²⁵*Ibid.*, 408-412.

³²⁶*Ibid.*, 412-417.

³²⁷See e.g., Pummer, "Samaritan Pentateuch," 441-443; Richard, "Acts 7," 190-208; W. H. Mare, "Acts 7: Jewish or Samaritan in Character," *WTJ* 34 (1971) 1-21; S. Lowy, *The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis* (Leiden: Brill, 1977) 50-57.

³²⁸See e.g., Scobie, "Origins," 393-395.

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.³²⁹ The divergences from the LXX are the following:³³⁰ (1) καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου is omitted after τῆς συγγενείας σου; (2) καὶ δεῦρο is inserted before εἰς τὴν γῆν.³³¹ There are, however, textual difficulties in Acts which may indicate further divergences:

³²⁹Clarke, 88, 90; Holtz appears to have overlooked this citation.

³³⁰According to the text of NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 (Acts 7:3).

³³¹The 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 ἀπό instead of ἐκ before τῆς γῆς σου;³³² (4) mss B and D omit ἐκ before τῆς συγγενείας σου; (5) the majority text omits τὴν before γῆν.³³³

The omission of καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου 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

³³²Noted by Wilcox (Semitisms, 26).

³³³NestleAland26 (Acts 7:3).

³³⁴Actually, Gen. 12:1 implies that Abram is still in Ur when he is called: "Go from your country, and your kindred and your father's house to the land that I will show you." This apparent contradiction in the Genesis account probably has a documentary basis (see von Rad, Genesis: A Commentary [OTL; London: SCM, 1961] 153-154; Westermann, Genesis 12-36: A Commentary [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985] 140). Later Jewish writers apparently recognized the chronological problem in Gen. 11:31-12:1 for Jubilees 12:22-13:3 places the call to Abraham before his migration to Haran (see J. T. Rook, "Studies in the Book of Jubilees: The Themes of Calendar, Genealogy and Chronology" [D.Phil. Dissertation: Oxford University, 1983] 153, 167-168). The latter chronology in Jubilees, however, has caused other chronological discrepancies (see J. Hughes, Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology [JSOTS 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990] 245). For the problems encountered by the LXX at this point, see G. Larsson, "The Chronology of the Pentateuch: A Comparison of the MT and LXX," JBL 102 (1983) 406.

³³⁵See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 147; Westermann, Genesis 12-36, 139; von Rad, Genesis, 181.

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

³³⁶See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 147.

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).

³³⁹Cadbury, The Book of Acts in History (London: Black, 1955) 101-102.

³⁴⁰Richard, "Acts 7," 196; Wilcox, Semitism, 28; Bruce, Acts (1951), 162; Scobie, "Origins," 393; see also von Rad, Genesis, 153.

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

³⁴³Wilcox, Semitisms, 29.

³⁴⁴Scobie, "Origins," 393.

³⁴⁵Kahle, 144.

³⁴⁶See Richard, "Acts 7," 197.

³⁴⁷Wilcox, Semitisms, 29 n. 2.

³⁴⁸See e.g., Pummer, "Samaritan Pentateuch," 443; Cross, Ancient Library, 144; Kahle, 143-149.

³⁴⁹Richard, "Acts 7," 197; see also Bruce, Acts (1951), 169 n. 1.

³⁵⁰See GottLXX1, Gen. 11:32.

³⁵¹This 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
(continued...)

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.³⁵⁴ It is unlikely that he paused to work out all the mathematics involved in computing the age of Terah at Abram's departure.³⁵⁵ The same could hold true for Philo, who in *De Migratione Abrahami* appears to be writing to those acquainted with scripture,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.³⁵⁷ Hence it is likely that Luke was simply following the narrated order of the OT.

Therefore, it is probable that the omission of *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ 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

³⁵⁴See on this H. J. Cadbury and K. Lake, *The Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary, The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles* (ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake; London: Macmillan, 1922) 4. 70; Dahl, "Story of Abraham," 143; Haenchen, *Acts*, 278; see also J. W. Charley ("Torah," *NBD* [1962] 1253), who calls this an "oral slip." The possible dependence of Acts 5:36-37 on Josephus, *Ant.* 20:97-104, based on the parallel order of the events portrayed in the two documents, although not their actual historical order, suggested by J. Moffatt (*An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament* [Edinburgh: Clark, 1911] 30) and others (see also A. Ehrhardt, "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles," *ST* 12 [1958] 66; Munck, 48) may provide another example of Luke treating his sources in this way. Dependence of Acts on Josephus, however, is very problematic, including the necessity of assuming a very late date for Acts (see e.g., Kümmel, 186; Dibelius, *Studies*, 186-187; Conzelman, *Acts*, 42), and it is equally likely that the similarities between the *Antiquities* passage and Acts 5 are coincidental (see Bruce, *Acts* [1951], 147; S. B. Hoenig, "Theudas," *IDB* 4 [1962] 629). This is, however, exactly the way Hughes (16) envisions the SP chronology coming about at this point.

³⁵⁵Jubilees 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).

³⁵⁶See S. Sandmel, *Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction* (New York: Oxford University, 1979) 29.

³⁵⁷S. J. de Vries ("Chronology of the OT," *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,³⁵⁸ 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 *καὶ δεῦρο* (point [2]) involves another problem entirely. Although the word *δεῦρο* corresponds to nothing in the MT, Wilcox has noted that Targum Pseudo-Jonathan contains the word *לֵךְ לְאַרְעָא דְאַחֲסִינַךְ* (לֵךְ),³⁵⁹ which corresponds to *δεῦρο* in Acts. Thus he argues for "another point of contact between a Targumic tradition and the text in Acts."³⁶⁰ 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 *לֵךְ* 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 *δεῦρο* allows him to use a "contrast by means of parallelism." Finally, he notes that there is significant evidence for the presence of *δεῦρο*

³⁵⁸Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42.

³⁵⁹Imperative of *לֵךְ*: "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.

³⁶⁰Wilcox, 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^{CR}, Arab, Arm^{ap}, Bo [also Hipp 3:121]),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."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 *δεῦρο* in his *Vorlage*, or he inserted it himself. A combination of the two is extremely unlikely.

So which is it? The evidence for *δεῦρο* in LXX Gen. 12:1 discloses a wide range of witnesses, which would tend to support a relatively early *Vorlage* containing *δεῦρο*. 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 *δεῦρο* occurs, omit the phrase *καὶ ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου*, thus indicating a clear dependence on Acts. The rest of the textual evidence, he says, is "unassailable."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.

³⁶¹GottLXX1, Gen. 12:1.

³⁶²Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42; see also Ginsburger, 20.

³⁶³Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42 n. 24; Richard is using BrookeMacLean (Gen. 12:1).

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*, 72⁷-376, 319 have *καὶ πορεύου*, Origen IV:346 has *καὶ ἀπέλθε*, the margin of 55 has *καὶ ὑπάγε*, and the margin of 15 has *καὶ ἔλθε*.³⁶⁴ 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 *לָךְ* 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 *לָךְ* 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 *לָךְ* 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 εἰς*

³⁶⁴GottLXX1, Gen. 12:1.

is also found, for example, in III Kgdms. 1:53.³⁶⁵ However, by far the most common septuagintal rendering in such a context would be εἰσέλθε εἰς or πορεύου εἰς.

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,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.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 ἔρχομαι for the imperative "go" or "come."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

³⁶⁵See BAG, 175; BDF, 183-184; BDB, 234.

³⁶⁶Δεῦρο would not have been a natural choice to translate the Aramaic imperative verb ܕܠܝܬ either.

³⁶⁷Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 42.

³⁶⁸Compare 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),³⁶⁹ 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.³⁷⁰ 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 $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ is well attested for the LXX of Ex. 3:10,³⁷¹ 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) $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ 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 $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ 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 $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ in LXX texts of Gen. 12:1 as a functional equivalent to a verb, it appears that Luke found $\delta\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron$ in his copy of the LXX.

³⁶⁹See BAG, 175.

³⁷⁰See Schramm, 142; Fitzmyer, Luke (X-XXIV), 1196; and my discussion above.

³⁷¹See GottLXX2.1, 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 ἀπό for ἐκ before τῆς γῆς σου (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,³⁷² 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.³⁷³ 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 7.³⁷⁴ There seems little to commend ἀπό as original in 7:3. Wilcox's offhand suggestion of the possibility of carelessness in D is not without merit.³⁷⁵

The omission of ἐκ before τῆς 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,³⁷⁶ while NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3 follow the other witnesses.³⁷⁷ 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.

³⁷⁷NestleAland26, Acts 7:3; UBSGNT3, 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).³⁷⁸ 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."³⁷⁹ 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 οἴκου τοῦ πατρός σου would serve to create a more clear parallelism between the single ἐκ before τῆς γῆς σου and the single εἰς before τὴν γῆν ἣν ἄν σοι 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.³⁸⁰ 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.³⁸¹

³⁷⁸Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 43 n. 27.

³⁷⁹Ibid, 152; he similarly characterizes D as tendentious in deviating from the LXX, contrary to the analysis of Metzger (*Textual Commentary*, 342-343).

³⁸⁰See Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 42.

³⁸¹See Ibid (43), where Richard notes that "assimilation to the LXX Vorlage cannot be dismissed as a possible explanation."

The omission of $\tau\eta\nu$ before $\gamma\eta\nu$ (point [5]) by the majority text (as opposed to p⁷⁴, \aleph , A, B, C, D, E, Ψ , 1175, etc.),³⁸² seems at first glance to be a case of haplography based on the similar endings of $\tau\eta\nu$ and $\gamma\eta\nu$. 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. 12:1.³⁸³ The absence of $\tau\eta\nu$ 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.

³⁸²See NestleAland26, Acts 7:3.

³⁸³See GottLXX1, Gen. 12:1.

b. Acts 7:5 = Deut. 2:5; Gen. 17:8 (12:7; 13:15; 15:2, 18; 17:8; 24:7; 48:4)

Acts 7:5 appears to be either a passage composed by the author with certain OT allusions embedded in it,³⁸⁴ 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; 48:4.³⁸⁵ 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.³⁸⁶ A number of commentators are reluctant to call this a citation, however, considering the phrase more of a biblical reminiscence.³⁸⁷ 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 αὐτῷ* in Acts 7:5a reflects the phrase *οὐ γὰρ μὲν δὴ ὑμῖν* in Deut. 2:5, with certain grammatical changes required by the context of the citation in the speech.³⁸⁸

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.

³⁸⁶See e.g., Bruce, Acts (1951), 162; Cadbury and Lake, 71; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 45-47; "Acts 7," 197-198; Wilcox, Semitisms, 27; Conzelman, Acts, 52.

³⁸⁷See e.g., Cadbury and Lake, 71; Bruce, Acts (1951), 162; Conzelman, Acts, 52; Haenchen, Acts, 278; see also Mare, 9 n. 52.

³⁸⁸Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 46-47; "Acts 7," 197-198.

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 (ܝܪܬܗ/ܝܪܬܗ), 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 (*ywrtn*).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, "ruling 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

³⁸⁹According to Wilcox (*Semitisms*, 27); the MT does, however, have ܝܪܬܗ later in the verse.

³⁹⁰Ibid; see also "Old Testament," 1-41; Scobie, "Origins," 394; Spiro, 285; Scroggs, 192; Scharlemann, 38-39; Gaston, *No Stone on Another*, 157.

³⁹¹Richard, "Acts 7," 198; see also *GottLXX3.2* and *BrookeMacLean*, Deut. 2:5.

³⁹²Richard, "Acts 7," 198; see also *BHS*, Deut. 2:5.

³⁹³Richard, "Acts 7," 198-199.

³⁹⁴Ibid, 199; *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 47; see also Pummer, "Samaritan Pentateuch," 143; "New Evidence," 98-117.

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 *κληῆρψ* in the latter part of Deut. 2:5.³⁹⁵ In favour of this view is the fact that the two words are practically synonyms in the LXX (although not absolutely equivalent).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 *κληῆρος* and *κληρονομία*.³⁹⁷ How likely is such a solution? Luke tends to use *κληῆρος* 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 *κληῆρος* 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 *κληῆρος*.

³⁹⁵See Mare, 9 n. 32; Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 47 n. 40; "Acts 7," 198 n. 33; Richard rejects this argument.

³⁹⁶Foerster, "κληῆρος," *TDNT* 3 (1965) 759-760.

³⁹⁷See 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 *κληῆρος* in the latter part of Deut. 2:5 LXX, there is no logical reason why Luke would have changed *κληῆρος* 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 ποδός* points unequivocally to the LXX of Deut. 2:5, as the wording is unique to this septuagintal passage.³⁹⁸ 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.³⁹⁹ 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,

³⁹⁸Richard, "Acts 7," 198.

³⁹⁹Wifstrand, "Lukas och Septuaginta," 249, 250, 252, 254: e.g., Luke 9:51, *καὶ αὐτὸς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐστήρισεν τοῦ πορεύεσθαι εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ*—only similar expression in LXX II Kgdms. 17:11; Acts 16:28, *ἐφώνησεν δὲ μεγάλη φωνή*—found only in LXX Dan. 5:7 in pre-Christian Greek literature; Luke 21:38, *ὠρθριζεν πρὸς*—verb found only in LXX, with *πρὸς* in Ps. 62:2; Acts 5:4, *ἔθον ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ*—only found in LXX, and in only a couple of places, e.g., I Kgdms. 29:10. This observation has implications as well for Luke's knowledge of the LXX, since it is hard to imagine his reproduction of such isolated LXX phrases without being thoroughly familiar with the LXX.

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 Abraham⁴⁰⁰ makes the verse an unlikely candidate for a proof-text citation.⁴⁰¹

It seems more likely that the reference to Deut. 2:5 is a mere verbal allusion, rather than a citation.⁴⁰² 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.⁴⁰³ Hence, I would argue that the presence of *κληρονομία* 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,⁴⁰⁴ as

⁴⁰⁰Note that there is no mention of Abraham or his "seed," which is the major idea of the early part of Acts 7.

⁴⁰¹While 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).

⁴⁰²In agreement with, e.g., Cadbury and Lake (71), Bruce (*Acts* [1951], 278), Conzelman (*Acts*, 52), Haenchen (*Acts*, 278), and Emerton (284).

⁴⁰³For Luke's tendency in this regard in Acts 7, see Dahl ("Story of Abraham," 142-143); for Luke-Acts as a whole, see Wifstrand ("Lukas och Septuaginta," 243-262).

⁴⁰⁴Against Emerton (284).

the singular phrase οὐδὲ 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.⁴⁰⁵ 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. 17:8,⁴⁰⁶ it seems that Gen. 48:4 provides the most comprehensive account of the elements in Acts 7:5b, with less necessary omissions than 17:8.⁴⁰⁷ 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 αὐτήν,⁴⁰⁸ mss p⁷⁴, 8, A, E, Ψ, 33, 323, 945, 1175, 1739, 2495, etc. read αὐτὴν εἰς κατάσχεσιν αὐτῷ.⁴⁰⁹ 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

⁴⁰⁵E.g., arguing for an actual citation: Conzelman (*Acts*, 52), Bruce (*Acts* [1951], 162-163), Holtz (114), Richard (*Acts* 6:1-8:4, 48); arguing for a free composition by the author of Acts 7: Cadbury and Lake (71), Haenchen (*Acts*, 279), E. Preuschen (*Die Apostelgeschichte* [HNT; Tübingen: Mohr, 1912] 279).

⁴⁰⁶E.g., Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 162; Conzelman, *Acts*, 52; Holtz, 114; Haenchen, *Acts*, 279; Clarke, 88.

⁴⁰⁷Richard (*Acts* 6:1-8:4, 46) sees the citation as a combination of Gen. 17:8 and 48:4 + 15:2.

⁴⁰⁸The Syriac version has the equivalent here as well.

⁴⁰⁹See *NestleAland26*, 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) ἐπηγγείλατο is inserted after the initial καί; (2) δώσω σοι becomes δοῦναι αὐτῷ; (3) εἰς κατάσχεσιν appears to have been moved from the end of the verse and inserted after δοῦναι αὐτῷ; (4) the adjective αἰώνιον relating to κατάσχεσιν 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 αὐτοῦ; (7) μετὰ σέ becomes μετ' αὐτόν; (8) the words τὴν γῆν, ἣν παροικεῖς, 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 οὐκ ὄντος αὐτῷ τέκνου 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

⁴¹⁰See also Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 48 n. 41; Cadbury and Lake, 71.

⁴¹¹Holtz, 114. He regards this as a direct citation.

τὴν γῆν, ἣν παροικεῖς, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν Χανάαν (point [8]).⁴¹² 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 οὐκ ἔδωκεν / αὐτῷ / κληρονομίαν / ἐν αὐτῇ = καὶ ἐπηγγέιλαιτο δοῦναι / αὐτῷ / εἰς κατάσχεσιν / αὐτήν + καὶ τῷ σπέρματι αὐτοῦ μετ' αὐτόν.⁴¹³

Αἰώνιον (point [4]) and καὶ ἔσομαι αὐτοῖς 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.

⁴¹³Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 48, see also pp. 173-174, 183-184.

⁴¹⁴E.g., Dibelius, Studies, 167.

⁴¹⁵Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 183.

I am inclined, rather, to view the omissions as owing to their perceived irrelevance to the purpose of the speech.⁴¹⁶

The final phrase, οὐκ ὄντος 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 ἀπολύομαι ἄτεκνος.⁴¹⁷ But this seems much too free to be a quotation, or even a verbal allusion for that matter. If Acts had used ἄτεκνος, we could, perhaps, consider it at least a verbal allusion, as ἄτεκνος 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.⁴¹⁸ 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.⁴¹⁹ 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

⁴¹⁶One 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 αἰώνιον 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 αὐτοῖς θεός could conceivably tie the worship of God to the possession of the land, which the author of the speech does not wish to do.

⁴¹⁷Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 46, 48.

⁴¹⁸See M&G, 119; Hatch and Redpath, 1. 175; BAG, 119.

⁴¹⁹See Koch, 15-16.

indirect objects (Abraham and his seed after him), the land as the direct object, and *εἰς κατάσχεσιν*.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., *δοῦναι*, 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 *κατάσχεσις* 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.

⁴²⁰Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 48.

⁴²¹Cf. Ibid, 202-203.

⁴²²See Koch, 15.

⁴²³Holtz, 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)⁴²⁴ and in I Clement 36:4 the word means "possession."⁴²⁵ The latter texts are both dependent on Ps. 2:8 LXX: αἰτῆσαι παρ' ἐμοῦ, καὶ δώσω σοι ἔθνη τὴν κληρονομίαν σου καὶ τὴν κατάσχεσίν σου τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς. Again, in the LXX generally the word means "possession".⁴²⁶ Similarly in T. Benj. 10:4 the meaning is the same.⁴²⁷ The D text of Acts 20:16 (also equivalent in [gig] and the Vulgate),⁴²⁸ however, uses the word with an entirely different connotation: μήποτε γενήθῃ αὐτῷ κατάσχεσις τις (replacing ὅπως μὴ γένηται αὐτῷ χρονοτριβῆσαι), "in order that he might experience no delay."⁴²⁹ The latter meaning for the term ("holding back," "restraining") is to be found also in secular Greek.⁴³⁰ 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

⁴²⁴See NestleAland26, Acts 13:33, and p. 57.

⁴²⁵Cf. translation of I Clement 36:4 by C. C. Richardson (Early Christian Fathers [New York: Macmillan, 1970] 60): "to keep"; and that of M. Staniforth (Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers [Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1968] 42): "possession"; see also BAG, 420.

⁴²⁶See BAG, 420.

⁴²⁷See APOT, 2. 359.

⁴²⁸See NestleAland26, Acts 20:16.

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.⁴³⁵ 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.⁴³⁶ 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 οὐδὲ βῆμα ποδός 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 σπέρμα αὐτοῦ . . . ἐξελεύσονται is from Gen. 15:13-14,⁴³⁷ while καὶ λατρεύσουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ comes from Ex.

⁴³⁵Against Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 46-48).

⁴³⁶Against Holtz (114-115).

⁴³⁷The introductory words ἐλάλησεν δὲ οὕτως ὁ θεὸς ὅτι 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...)

3:12.⁴³⁸ 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) πάροιικον is inserted before ἐν γῇ; (3) ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ becomes ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ; (4) αὐτούς after δουλώσουσιν becomes αὐτό; (5) αὐτούς after κακώσουσιν is omitted; (6) the following καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς is also omitted; (7) τετρακόσια ἔτη becomes ἔτη τετρακόσια; (8) τὸ δὲ ἔθνος becomes καὶ τὸ ἔθνος; (9) δουλεύσωσιν becomes δουλεύουσιν; (10) ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν is inserted after κρινῶ ἐγώ; (11) μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα becomes καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα; (12) ὧδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς in Gen. 15:14 is replaced by καὶ λατρεύουσιν 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 λατρεύετε becomes third person plural λατρεύουσιν; (14) τῷ θεῷ becomes μοι; (15) ὁρεῖ becomes τόπῳ.

⁴³⁷(...continued)

ἐρρέθη πρὸς Ἀβράμ Γινώσκων γνῶσι ὅτι If so, the divergences need to be explained. First of all, the LXX diverges from the MT in translating וַיִּשְׁמַע with the aorist passive ἐρρέθη. At first glance, ἐλάλησεν appears to be a more suitable rendering of the Hebrew. But while this is so for the voice of the verb, it is not so for the verb chosen, as וַיִּשְׁמַע is generally rendered by a form of λέγω or εἶπον (including ἐρέω [ἐρῶ]), while λαλέω usually renders a form of וַיִּשְׁמַע , and only occasionally a form of וַיִּשְׁמַע (see Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 49 n. 46). Another interesting point is that some mss of Acts almost seem to be correcting the introductory formula to the LXX. For example, D and Irenaeus (Latin) add an indirect object πρὸς αὐτόν, which would correspond to LXX πρὸς Ἀβράμ. Similarly, mss p⁷⁴, 8, Ψ, 104, and a few others add αὐτῷ, possibly for the same reason (see *NestleAland26*, Acts 7:6). On the other hand, if these mss were trying to correct Acts 7:6 to the LXX, one wonders why they did not do so more thoroughly, as the introductory words in Acts bear such little similarity to their LXX counterparts. It seems more likely that certain Acts mss simply provided an indirect object for stylistic reasons. Again, the use of ὁ θεός in Acts 7:6, as opposed to Gen. 15:13 LXX, is easily explained: in Genesis, that God was speaking can be inferred from the context (e.g., vv. 8-9), but that inference is not so clear when the verse is taken, as in Acts, apart from its OT context (even in the OT context many modern translations feel the need to add a subject, see NASB ["God"], RSV ["the Lord"], JB ["Yahweh"], etc., contrary to both the LXX and MT). Finally, there is the question of the omission of Γινώσκων γνῶσι. This is not part of the introductory formula of Gen. 15:13 LXX, but rather part of the direct speech, reflecting the Hebrew infinitive absolute construction $\text{וַיִּשְׁמַע וַיִּשְׁמַע}$ ("Know for certain"). The reason for this omission appears to be that the words Γινώσκων γνῶσι in this context are indicative of direct speech, and the author of Acts 7 appears to cast this OT reference in indirect speech. Hence, even if one accepts a connection between the introductory words of Acts 7:6 and Gen. 15:13, it seems that all of the departures from the LXX are due to redactional considerations.

⁴³⁸Cf. *UBSGNT3*, Acts 7:6-7.

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 ἀλλοτρίᾳ).⁴³⁹ Other commentators, however, consider this passage a combined quotation.⁴⁴⁰ 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 εἶπεν (point [10]).⁴⁴¹ This is curious: not only is the reversion from indirect to direct speech a rarity among Greek writers,⁴⁴² 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.⁴⁴³ Richard, however, argues for direct speech throughout the citation, stating that the change from σου to αὐτοῦ in v. 6 only indicates that Abraham

⁴³⁹Conzelman, *Acts*, 52.

⁴⁴⁰See 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.

⁴⁴¹See Cadbury, "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts IV. On Direct Quotation, With Some Uses of ὅτι and εἰ," *JBL* 48 (1929) 416.

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 *λατρεύετε* to third person plural *λατρεύουσιν* 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]).⁴⁴⁴ Holtz also thinks it is going too far to designate v. 6 as indirect speech.⁴⁴⁵ 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 εἶπεν* as paralleling similar speech formulae throughout the speech.⁴⁴⁶

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

⁴⁴⁴Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 52-53.

⁴⁴⁵Holtz, 117 n. 2.

⁴⁴⁶Ibid, 116-117; Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 52-53, 184; see also Dupont, "La structure oratoire du discours d'Étienne (Actes 7)," *Bib* 66 (1985) 164-166.

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 ὁ 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 ὁ 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 ὁ 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 ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν is used to aid the transfer from indirect to direct speech and parallels the use of φησὶν in Acts 25:4-5 is significant: "Festus replied that Paul was being kept 'So,' said he [φησὶν], 'let the men of

⁴⁴⁷Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 184.

⁴⁴⁸In fact, such a parallel does exist in the LXX textual tradition. The b family of texts adds λέγει κύριος after κρινῶ ἐγώ (also ^{1st}Quodv *Prom* 1:18 [see *GottLXX1*, Gen. 2:14]). While the variant εἶπεν ὁ 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 . . .'.⁴⁵⁰ 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,"⁴⁵¹ 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. 7.⁴⁵² Rather, the insertion of ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν, as well as the alteration of τῷ θεῷ to μοι (point [14]), emphasizing the direct speech in v. 7,⁴⁵³ indicate that the change from indirect to direct speech is deliberate.

Therefore, we can conclude that the change from σου to αὐτοῦ (point [1]), the insertion of ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν (point [10]), and the change of τῷ θεῷ to μοι (point [15]),⁴⁵⁴ 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 ἰδίᾳ to ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτριᾳ,⁴⁵⁵ should be taken together, I think. Thus LXX ἐν γῇ οὐκ ἰδίᾳ

⁴⁵⁰Cadbury, "Lexical Notes," 416.

⁴⁵¹See Ibid, 415-417.

⁴⁵²As does Cadbury (Ibid, 416 n. 2).

⁴⁵³Cf. 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" יְהוָה vv. 12, 14 in close proximity to "God" אֱלֹהִים) explicitly in this OT passage (יְהוָה [Yahweh] is God's name—see e.g., R. A. Cole, Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary [TOTC 2; Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1973] 68-69; R. E. Clements, Exodus [CBC; Cambridge: University, 1972] 20-21, 23; G. Quell, "κύριος: C. The Old Testament Name for God," TDNT 3 [1965] 1071-1072; but cf. Noth, Exodus: A Commentary [OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962] 42).

⁴⁵⁴As well as the omission of the introductory words Γινώσκων γνώση (see above, n. 437).

⁴⁵⁵As well as, perhaps, the elimination of πάροικον from the introductory words.

becomes *πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*. 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),⁴⁵⁶ Richard argues that Ex. 2:22 is cited specifically by the author of Acts 7.⁴⁵⁷ In support of this we may note that outside Ex. 2:22 and 18:3, *ἀλλότριος* is only found together with *γῇ* in Ps. 137:4 (136:4 LXX); Baruch 3:10; I Macc. 6:13; 15:33,⁴⁵⁸ and *πάροικον*, *ἀλλότριος* 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: *πάροικός εἰμι ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ*. 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.⁴⁵⁹ 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,⁴⁶⁰ predicts a time of sojourning for the descendants of Abraham and the latter does speak of much the

⁴⁵⁶Holtz, 116-117.

⁴⁵⁷Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 49-51.

⁴⁵⁸See Holtz, 117 n. 1.

⁴⁵⁹See Wifstrand, "Lukas och Septuaginta," 243-262.

⁴⁶⁰Kidner, *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 גֶּרְשֹׁם),⁴⁶¹ in fact the link is tenuous, since the Gershom passage relates directly to Moses' being a sojourner (πάροικον) 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 πάροικον in Ex. 2:22 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 πάροικον in both Gen. 15:13 and Ex. 2:22. The occurrence of πάροικον 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 $\text{πάροικον ἐν γῇ ἀλλοτρίᾳ}$. 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 τὸ δὲ ἔθνος to καὶ τὸ ἔθνος (point [8]) is reasonably well attested in the LXX textual

⁴⁶¹See Clements, 17; Cole, 61.

⁴⁶²See Clements, 17.

⁴⁶³See Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 86.

⁴⁶⁴See Holtz, 116-117; Conzelman, Acts, 52.

tradition for Gen. 15:14 (C¹,⁴¹³ b, n),⁴⁶⁵ and Holtz argues that this LXX reading could easily have come about without influence from Acts.⁴⁶⁶ 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 *καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα* (point [11]), however, is not so well attested in the LXX (only 54, La^s, [sed hab La^a]).⁴⁶⁷ The change from *δέ* to *καί* is somewhat strange stylistically for Luke as he generally alters his sources from *καί* to *δέ*.⁴⁶⁸ Richard, however, has noted that the author of Acts 7 prefers *καί* to *δέ* throughout the speech⁴⁶⁹ and has concluded that the alterations of both *τὸ δὲ ἔθνος* and *μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα* are stylistic alterations in accordance with the author's tendencies.⁴⁷⁰ Although *καί* is more conspicuous than *δέ* in the Stephen material,⁴⁷¹ it is to be noted that this portion of Acts is filled with references to OT passages, and

⁴⁶⁵GottLXX1, Gen. 15:14.

⁴⁶⁶Holtz, 116; see also Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 52 n. 52.

⁴⁶⁷GottLXX1, Gen. 15:14.

⁴⁶⁸See Turner, Style, 57.

⁴⁶⁹In fact, throughout all of the Stephen material.

⁴⁷⁰Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 51-52.

⁴⁷¹Especially when compared with the surrounding material (see Turner, Style, 58).

may simply reflect the LXX use of *καί*.⁴⁷² But it seems most likely that Luke found *καί* in both cases in his ms of the LXX.⁴⁷³

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 p³³, *κ*, B, E, *Ψ*, and the majority text.⁴⁷⁴ 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.⁴⁷⁵ 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.⁴⁷⁶ Hence, if D shows the indicative, contrary to the LXX, when according to its tendency it should show

⁴⁷²Since 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 (I-IX), 123-125; Wifstrand, "Lukas och Septuaginta," 243-262), one could argue that he has imitated the LXX predilection for *καί* here (it is to be noted that Most [34-38] considers the use of apodeictic *καί* 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 OT model does not necessitate the use of OT 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 *καί* and *δέ*. Whether Luke has septuagintalized in the Stephen material or not, however, a textual solution is to be preferred for the occurrence of *καί* in Acts 7:6-7.

⁴⁷³If he had been using a source other than the LXX here, we would have expected him to have changed the instances of *καί* noted here to *δέ* in accordance with his general tendency (see Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 57).

⁴⁷⁴NestleAland26, 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).

⁴⁷⁵Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 53-54; Holtz, 115.

⁴⁷⁶See 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, *ἐάν* 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 *ἐάν* 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

⁴⁷⁷See Ropes, 60-61; Richard (*Acts* 6:1-8:4, 152) finds that D departs from the LXX in 11 out of 17 instances in Acts 7. He notes also (*Acts* 6:1-8:4, 53 n. 56) that the Latin column of D differs from the Greek in supporting the subjunctive, and thus lessens the importance of the Greek D reading (but cf. Haenchen, *Acts*, 53-55). As well, Richard (*Acts* 6:1-8:4, 53 n. 56) questions the value of the other witnesses to the indicative, noting that C has scribal inconsistencies, that the quality of the witness of p⁷⁴ has not yet been determined, and that the Sahidic is likely a translation of A (see also Metzger, "The Early Versions of the New Testament," *Peake's Commentary on the Bible* [ed. M. Black and H. H. Rowley; London: Nelson, 1963] 673).

⁴⁷⁸See *M&G* (238) for the data. Even this reference, however, is doubtful as uncial mss Θ, Ψ, 063, minuscule families *f*¹ and *f*¹³, and the majority text read subjunctive (*NestleAland26*, Luke 19:40).

⁴⁷⁹*BDF*, 190.

⁴⁸⁰*Ibid*, 192.

⁴⁸¹E. D. Burton, *Syntax of Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1898) 122-123.

⁴⁸²J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. 1, Prolegomena* (3d ed.; Edinburgh: Clark, 1908) 184.

δουλεύουσιν.⁴⁸³ 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.⁴⁸⁴ 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 δουλεύουσιν appears to be a later scribal stylistic alteration.

Holtz has also suggested that the alteration of τετρακόσια ἔτη 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),⁴⁸⁵ and on this basis Holtz argues that the version which lay before the author of Acts 7 read ἔτη τετρακόσια.⁴⁸⁶ 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 ἔτη 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

⁴⁸³Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 53.

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.⁴⁸⁷ But, with regard to Amos 5:25, at least, there is no evidence of such a tendency.⁴⁸⁸ 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.⁴⁸⁹ 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,⁴⁹⁰ 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 ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς*. Wevers lists only ms 55 and the correction by the first hand of 82 as evidence for this omission in the LXX tradition.⁴⁹¹ Hence, the attestation is not overly compelling for the omission, and certainly not prohibitive of influence from Acts on the LXX tradition.⁴⁹² 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.

⁴⁹¹GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13; cf, however, BrookeMacLean, Gen. 15:13; see also Holtz, 117.

⁴⁹²See Holtz, 117 n. 3.

renders two Hebrew expressions (לַעֲבֹד וְלַחַוֵּל) by three Greek expressions (καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ κακώσουσιν αὐτοὺς καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς). 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 ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς as the added phrase,⁴⁹⁵ while the editors of BHK apparently considered καὶ κακώσουσιν 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 ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς (and nonexistent for the omission of καὶ κακώσουσιν 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 ταπεινώσουσιν 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

⁴⁹³That 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.

⁴⁹⁴See the discussion by Tov ("The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present," VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986 [ed. C. E. Cox; Atlanta: Scholars, 1987] 337-359).

⁴⁹⁵See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.

⁴⁹⁶See BHK, Gen. 15:13; BHS makes no mention of the LXX evidence.

⁴⁹⁷See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.

form of the LXX reading is secondary, then one could argue that the original LXX lacked *ταπεινός* (or, according to BHK, *κακός*), 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").⁴⁹⁸ Owing to the closeness of the LXX to the MT, apart from the double rendering of *לַעֲנֹת*, and given the difficulty, of determining which of the two Greek terms is a more logical translation of the Hebrew *piel* *לַעֲנֹת*,⁴⁹⁹ 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 7.⁵⁰⁰ Clearly such a solution is possible; however, owing to the paucity of textual data it cannot be confirmed.

⁴⁹⁸See Holtz, 114-118; see also Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 49.

⁴⁹⁹*Piel* *לַעֲנֹת* is translated in the LXX by both *κακός* and *ταπεινός* (e.g., *κακός*: Ex. 1:11; Num. 24:24; Ps. 88:23; 93:5; *ταπεινός*: 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* *לַעֲנֹת*. Generally speaking *κακός* is a more general term and *ταπεινός* more specific (see Grundmann, "κακός," TDNT 3 [1965] 484; "ταπεινός, ταπεινώ, ταπεινώσις, ταπεινόφρων, ταπεινοφροσύνη," TDNT 8 [1972] 6-7), but this is contradicted by the use of the terms in, e.g., Ex. 1:11-12.

⁵⁰⁰Holtz, 117; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 51.

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.⁵⁰¹ As well, it is to be noted that *κακώω* is only found in Acts (outside of I Peter 3:13), and always indicates some sort of persecution (12:1; 14:2; 18:10).⁵⁰² Furthermore, *κακώω* is also found in 7:19 in the context of the mistreatment of the Israelites in Egypt. Hence *κακώω* 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. *Ταπεινώω*, on the other hand, is found five times in Luke: twice (Luke 14:11 and 18:14) with the reflexive *ἐαυτόν* 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.⁵⁰³ 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 *ταπεινώω* 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 *καὶ ταπεινώσουσιν αὐτούς* is redactional in origin.

⁵⁰¹Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 51; Richard rejects this possibility.

⁵⁰²See Grundmann, "*κακώω*," 484.

⁵⁰³See *M&G*, 933; Grundmann, "*ταπεινός*," 16-17.

Similarly, Holtz finds the omission of αὐτούς after κακώσουσιν (point [5]) so remarkable that he attributes the omission to the text used by the author of Acts 7.⁵⁰⁴ The evidence for such an early text, however, is not very strong,⁵⁰⁵ 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.⁵⁰⁶ The omission of the second possessive pronoun in a series is not uncommon stylistically, especially in classical Greek,⁵⁰⁷ and would therefore not be unlikely for Luke.⁵⁰⁸ 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 αὐτούς 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 κακώσουσιν αὐτὸ καὶ δουλώσουσιν αὐτούς (a similar inversion of the verbs also occurs in the E text of Acts, although likely unrelated to LXX A).⁵⁰⁹ The inversion of the verbs, however, makes it unlikely that the reading before the author of

⁵⁰⁴Holtz, 115-116.

⁵⁰⁵See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13.

⁵⁰⁶Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 50) gives the following examples of this tendency: 6:12; 7:24,57-58; 8:3.

⁵⁰⁷See BDF, 146.

⁵⁰⁸See Cadbury, The Style and Literary Method of Luke (HTS 6; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1920) 36-39; cf. also "Four Features of Lucan Style," Studies in Luke-Acts (ed. L. E. Keck and J. L. Martyn; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980) 93, on Luke's avoidance of repetition.

⁵⁰⁹See GottLXX1, Gen. 15:13; Holtz, 115.

Acts 7 was the reading of A.⁵¹⁰ More likely the change of αὐτούς to αὐτό is for grammatical reasons, as αὐτό agrees with τὸ σπέρμα.⁵¹¹

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.⁵¹² 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,⁵¹³ σπέρμα does not always imply a collective, to the extent that λαός does.⁵¹⁴ Σπέρμα can logically be used with the singular more

⁵¹⁰Holtz, 115.

⁵¹¹See Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 50) who rejects this argument.

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 Kgdms. 1:11; II Kgdms. 7:12; I Chr. 17:11; Deut. 25:5 [for ὁ ἄνθρωπος]; Sus. 56 [for ὁ ἄνθρωπος]), 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 ὧδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς with καὶ λατρεύουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ (point [12]), the latter presumably taken from Ex. 3:12, is probably thematic, the replacement of second person plural λατρεύετε with third person plural λατρεύουσιν (point [13]), is likely stylistic. As the third person plural is only attested in the minuscule textgroup x for the LXX of Ex. 3:12,⁵¹⁵ 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 ὧδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς with καὶ

⁵¹⁴(...continued)

and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians [ICC; Edinburgh: Clark, 1924], 181, 506; Schulz, "σπέρμα, σπείρω, σπορά, σπόρος, σπόριμος: A. The Word Group in the Greek World," *TDNT* 7 [1971] 536-537; Quell, "σπέρμα, σπείρω, σπορά, σπόρος, σπόριμος: B. σπέρμα and Equivalents in the Old Testament," *TDNT* 7 [1971] 538-539).

⁵¹⁵*GottLXX2.1*, Ex. 3:12, and p. 42.

λατρεύουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ from Ex. 3:12, and within this reference to Ex. 3:12, point (15), the replacement of ὅρει with τόπῳ.

That καὶ λατρεύουσιν μοι ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ (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 τούτῳ would seem to point directly to 3:12.

The inclusion of the phrase from Ex. 3:12 in preference to ὧδε μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς 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 ὧδε ("here"), without reference to μετὰ ἀποσκευῆς πολλῆς ("with many possessions"). Certainly the Exodus phrase does not seem to explicate either the Greek or the Hebrew (לְבָרְכֶךָ וְלְבָרְכֶךָ) of the Genesis phrase. But even if we limit the explicative nature of the Exodus phrase to ὧδε 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.

⁵¹⁷Dupont "La structure," 165-166; Marshall, *Acts*, 136.

from Ex. 3:12 is to be found in the word λατρεύουσιν. 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).⁵¹⁸ 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.⁵¹⁹ 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 ὁρεῖ to τόπος (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.⁵²⁰ But the context of Gen. 15:14 implies that the people will return from a land that is not theirs to one which is.⁵²¹ Hence ὁρεῖ is inappropriate here, as the

⁵¹⁸Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," 141.

⁵¹⁹Richard, "Creative Use," 41; see also J. Bihler, Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte (MTS 1; Munich: Hueber, 1963) 43.

⁵²⁰See 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.

⁵²¹See 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 *τόπος* 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 *τόπος* in v. 7 refers to the land of Palestine (Canaan) as a whole.⁵²² Holtz takes issue with this view. He argues that, since *τόπος* is not to be found in Biblical literature with the meaning "land,"⁵²³ it could not mean that here.⁵²⁴ 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]),⁵²⁵ 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])⁵²⁶ 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).⁵²⁷ This meaning for the word could in the present context be understood as the place where the people of Israel are now

⁵²²Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 163; Marshall, *Acts*, 136; see also Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 326.

⁵²³See *BAG*, 830-831.

⁵²⁴Holtz, 99 n. 3.

⁵²⁵*BAG*, 830.

⁵²⁶See *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; Aristas 81),⁵³⁰ and also notes that earlier books in the LXX reflect this connotation (e.g., Gen. 28:11,16,17;⁵³¹ 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

⁵²⁸See Ibid.

⁵²⁹As argued by, e.g., Dupont ("La structure," 165-166); see also Conzelman, *Acts*, 52; Holtz, 99 n. 3.

⁵³⁰Holtz, 99 n.3; H. Köster ("*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).

⁵³¹It must be noted, however, that the references to *τόπος* in Gen. 28 refer to Bethel, not the temple in Jerusalem.

⁵³²Holtz, 99 n. 3; Köster (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), Ezra 6:3, 5, 7; Isa. 4:5; Ezek. 41:11; 46:19-20; and especially Pss. 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 (Köster, 197).

⁵³³See, e.g., Marshall, *Acts*, 132; Simon, "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple," 140; see also Richard, *Acts* 6:-8:4, 326.

insertion of *τόπος* here also connects the speech firmly to the context of Stephen's defence (6:13-14).⁵³⁴ 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 21:28,⁵³⁵ part of the larger parallel between Stephen and Paul found in the Acts.⁵³⁶ Both passages use *τόπος* deliberately for the temple,⁵³⁷ rather than the customary Lukan *ιερόν*, and thus the presence of the word in Acts 7:6-7 is probably significant.⁵³⁸ As this parallel is in line with the general parallels found in the thematic organization of Luke-Acts as a whole,⁵³⁹ it is reasonable to conclude, with Conzelman and others, that the use of *τόπος* here betrays the "hand of Luke."⁵⁴⁰

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,

⁵³⁴Dupont, "La structure," 165-166; see Conzelman, *Acts*, 52; but cf. Holtz, 99 n. 3.

⁵³⁵Köster, 204; see also Tannehill, *Narrative Unity*, 2. 96-100.

⁵³⁶Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer,'" 252-253.

⁵³⁷Köster (204-205) argues that the words *ὁ τόπος οὗτος* 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.

⁵³⁸It must be noted, however, that *ιερόν* is hardly suitable in a speech to Abraham, as is the case in Acts 7:6-7.

⁵³⁹See e.g., Moessner, "'The Christ Must Suffer,'" 220-253; O'Toole, "Parallels Between Jesus and His Disciples," 185-212.

⁵⁴⁰Conzelman, *Acts*, 51-52.

but the introductory formula,⁵⁴¹ and especially the insertion of ὁ θεὸς εἶπεν 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 *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.

⁵⁴¹See above, n. 437.

d. Acts 7:18 = Ex. 1:8

Although some scholars, such as Richard,⁵⁴² 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. 18.⁵⁴³ This citation has been characterized as an "almost verbatim" citation of the LXX,⁵⁴⁴ 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' Αἴγυπτον* after *ἕτερος*.

These differences only deserve a brief comment. Clearly the *δέ* is replaced in the Acts citation by *ἄχρι οὗ*, thus melding the citation into its narrative context. While the omission of *ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον* is reasonably well attested, so also is its inclusion.⁵⁴⁵ 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 Αἰγύπτῳ* in v. 17 made *ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον* superfluous.⁵⁴⁶ 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 *ἄχρι οὗ* with the indicative in a past tense is only

⁵⁴²See Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 52-79.

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.

⁵⁴⁵See *NestleAland26* and *UBSGNT3*, Acts 7:18.

⁵⁴⁶Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 345-346.

found elsewhere in the NT in Acts 27:33,⁵⁴⁷ and hence may constitute some evidence of Lukan composition here.

e. Acts 7:27-28 = Ex. 2:14 + 2:13

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).⁵⁴⁸ 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,⁵⁴⁹ except for the alteration of the introductory words $\acute{o} \delta\grave{\epsilon} \epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\epsilon\nu$ to $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu$ (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."⁵⁵⁰ While certainly accurate, this explanation of the alteration does not really explain much. Stylistically the alteration to $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\acute{\omega}\nu$ is called for by the insertion into the allusion to Ex. 2:13 of the phrase $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\tau\omicron \alpha\upsilon\tau\grave{\alpha}\nu$. 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 7.⁵⁵¹ Clearly, as Conzelman points out, the reaction of the Hebrew slaves to Moses is made sharper by

⁵⁴⁷Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 79.

⁵⁴⁸See Holtz, 118-119; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 83-85.

⁵⁴⁹See Holtz, 119; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 85.

⁵⁵⁰Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 85.

⁵⁵¹See Ibid, 85, 116.

the addition of this phrase,⁵⁵² but it must be acknowledged that the phrase also makes clear that Moses is being *rejected* by his brethren.⁵⁵³ The latter is clearly articulated by the use of ἀπώσαντο in v. 39 as well. This use of ἀπωθέω 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).⁵⁵⁴

Hanson, in keeping with his conviction that Luke does not use typology very often "and not with any great subtlety,"⁵⁵⁵ argues that this typology in Acts 7 is not Lukan but originates in his source for Acts 7.⁵⁵⁶ Hence, if Hanson is right, this use of ἀπωθέω 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 ἀπωθέω 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),⁵⁵⁷ 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, ἀπωθέω appears in the NT as an

⁵⁵²Conzelman, Acts, 53.

⁵⁵³See BAG, 102.

⁵⁵⁴See Marshall, Acts, 140; Goppelt, Typos, 121; see also Holtz, 118; O'Toole, "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses," 22-29.

⁵⁵⁵Hanson, 87.

⁵⁵⁶Ibid, 88.

⁵⁵⁷See 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 *απωθέω* 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 *απωθέω* 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 Moses⁵⁶¹ 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 *ἀπώσατο αὐτόν* into the LXX material of Acts 7:27-28 argues strongly for the Lukan composition of this passage.

⁵⁵⁸Bruce, *Acts* (1951), 274.

⁵⁵⁹As e.g., J. T. Sanders, "Parable of the Pounds," p. 667; "The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts," *SBLSP* 1982 (Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1982) 476-479; "The Jewish People," 51-75; "Who is a Jew," 434-455.

⁵⁶⁰As e.g., Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts," pp. 82-85; "Rejection by Jews," 83-101.

⁵⁶¹See Tannehill, "Israel in Luke-Acts," 80-81; see also *Narrative Unity*, 2. 96-100.

⁵⁶²It 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 ἐχθές, 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.

⁵⁶³Holtz, 119.

f. Acts 7:30 = Ex. 3:2 + 3:1

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 τεσσαράκοντα* which is not from the LXX; (2) Acts omits the *δέ* between *ὥφθη* and *αὐτῷ*; (3) Acts inserts the words *ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ ὄρους* between *αὐτῷ* and *ἄγγελος*; (4) a number of mss of Acts omit *κυρίου* after *ἄγγελος*; (5) a number of mss of Acts have *ἐν φλογὶ πυρός* instead of *ἐν πυρὶ φλογός*; 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 *Χωρήβ* to *Σινᾶ*. Sinai and Horeb appear to be two names for the same mountain in the

⁵⁶⁴See Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 87.

⁵⁶⁵Conzelman, *Acts*, 53; see *Str-B*, 2. 679-680.

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 *κυρίου* 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 *κυρίου*, mss p⁷⁴, ⲁ, 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 *κυρίου*, while Brooke-McLean only lists an edition of Cyril (-ed ¼).⁵⁷² Therefore the source for the omission of *κυρίου* 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 *κυρίου* is a "natural addition" to the text, since it occurs in Ex. 3:2 LXX.⁵⁷⁴

⁵⁶⁷Lohse, "Σινᾶ," TDNT 7 (1971) 282.

⁵⁶⁸Ibid, 283-284.

⁵⁶⁹Ibid, 285-286; see also Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 88 n. 14.

⁵⁷⁰Bruce, Acts (1951), 169.

⁵⁷¹NestleAland26, Acts 7:30.

⁵⁷²GottLXX2.1 and BrookeMcLean, Ex. 3:2.

⁵⁷³NestleAland26 and UBSGNT3, Acts 7:30.

⁵⁷⁴Metzger, 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."⁵⁷⁵ 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.⁵⁷⁶ 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 7:35.⁵⁷⁷ 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

⁵⁷⁵Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 88.

⁵⁷⁶Holtz, 96 n.4.

⁵⁷⁷Ibid, pp. 96-97.

be accused of misunderstanding it if he understood it to mean an "angel."⁵⁷⁸ Hence it seems dubious to characterize Luke's interpretation in v. 35 as "erroneous."

Holtz's positing of a source which omitted *κυρίου* simply does not explain why the omission occurred. On the other hand, the deliberate omission of *κυρίου* from the citation is clearly understandable as coming from Luke himself. The emphasis on the word *ἄγγελος* 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).⁵⁷⁹ 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 ἄγγελοι μετ' αὐτοῦ*; cf. MT: *יְהוָה בְּיָמֵינוּ מֵעַתָּה יִשְׁמְרֵנוּ אֱלֹהֵינוּ*). 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.⁵⁸⁰ In so doing, the author has

⁵⁷⁸Luke (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).

⁵⁷⁹Marshall, *Acts*, 147.

⁵⁸⁰Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 112-113. Richard includes Deut. 33:2 as one of the LXX passages influencing the composition of Acts 7:38.

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 *κυρίου* 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 ἄγγελος κυρίου 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 *κυρίου* 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

⁵⁸¹See 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.

⁵⁸²Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 88.

⁵⁸³Against Holtz (96-97).

⁵⁸⁴See Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 112-113.

⁵⁸⁵Bruce (*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 φλογός to ἐν φλογὶ πυρός 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 ⲥ, B, D, Ψ, the majority text, the Italian Gigas ms, Old Latin ms p, and the Harclean Syriac.⁵⁸⁶ Clearly the external evidence is not decisive here. This is complicated by the fact that there is significant LXX ms support for ἐν φλογὶ πυρός (A, F, O'-29'-135, C'', 108^(mg), d, n, 30', t, y, 128', 59, 130, 424, 509, etc.), and has been adopted by Rahlfs.⁵⁸⁷ 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 φλογός or ἐν φλογὶ πυρός as the original reading of Acts.

Point (6), the omission of ἐκ τοῦ before βάρου, 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 (נִּי־בָרָה נִי־בָרָה).

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.

⁵⁸⁶NestleAland26, Acts 7:30.

⁵⁸⁷See 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 *ἐγώ*; (2) Acts changes the singular *τοῦ πατρός* 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.⁵⁸⁸ In disagreement with this conclusion, however, I have argued that the two citations may have influenced each other (see above, p. 252).⁵⁸⁹ 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* *ἐγώ*. He has simply added a subject to the Acts 3:13 citation and has not included the full *ἐγώ 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),⁵⁹⁰ 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

⁵⁸⁸See Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 31, 34.

⁵⁸⁹Cf. Holtz, 122.

⁵⁹⁰See also Richard, "Acts 7," 199-200.

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),⁵⁹¹ and simply restores it in 7:32. He similarly retains the article before the second *θεός*, point (3), as found in his "source," Acts 3:13.

The omission of the third and fourth *θεός* 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 *θεός* 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 *θεός* 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 *θεός* with the article. On the other hand, the omission of both the third and fourth *θεός* is supported by p⁷⁴, *א*, A, B, C, *Ψ*, 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.⁵⁹² 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 *θεός* as original here.⁵⁹³

Richard agrees with the above analysis of the textual data and argues that the third and fourth *θεός* have been omitted through a conflation of Ex. 3:6⁵⁹⁴ and a

⁵⁹¹See also Bock, 187; Sibinga, 39.

⁵⁹²NestleAland26, Acts 7:32.

⁵⁹³Metzger, Textual Commentary, 349.

⁵⁹⁴Richard has 2:6, likely a typographical error.

Hebraicizing version of the LXX of Ex. 3:16.⁵⁹⁵ The MT for Ex. 3:16 omits וְיִשְׂרָאֵל before וְיִשְׂרָאֵל and וְיִשְׂרָאֵל ; however, the LXX alone among all versions does not follow the MT.⁵⁹⁶ 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 Ἀβραάμ καὶ Ἰσαακ καὶ Ἰακώβ*,⁵⁹⁷ and further avers that the omission fits well with the author's "thematic schema."⁵⁹⁸

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 *θεός* contributes to such a schema. Again, the influence of Ex. 2:24 LXX or a Hebraicizing version of Ex. 3:16⁵⁹⁹ is possible, but only if it be recognized as a broader stylistic influence⁶⁰⁰ that caused Luke to omit the third and fourth *θεός* 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

⁵⁹⁵Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 95-96. Richard again has 2:16.

⁵⁹⁶*Ibid*, 96 n. 169.

⁵⁹⁷*Ibid*, 96.

⁵⁹⁸*Ibid*.

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 *θεός* with each patriarch is hardly possible there.

formula had more than one accepted form (see above, pp. 252-253).⁶⁰¹ 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 ὁ κύριος appears perhaps to come from Ex. 3:7. More clearly, Λύσον τὸ ὑπόδημα τῶν ποδῶν σου, ὁ γὰρ τόπος ἐφ' ᾧ ἔστηκας γῆ ἁγία ἐστίν comes from Ex. 3:5. The sentence reading ἰδὼν εἶδον τὴν κάκωσιν τοῦ λαοῦ μου τοῦ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ, καὶ τοῦ στεναγμοῦ αὐτῶν ἤκουσα comes from Ex. 3:7. The phrase καὶ κατέβην ἐξελέσθαι

⁶⁰¹See Richard, "Acts 7," 200-202; Bruce, *Acts* (1965), 87.

αὐτούς comes from Ex. 3:8. Finally, καὶ νῦν δεῦρο ἀποστείλω σε εἰς Αἴγυπτον 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 Μωυσήν; (2) LXX λῦσαι has been changed to λῦσον; (3) ἐκ has been omitted before τῶν ποδῶν σου; (4) ἐν ᾧ after τόπος has become ἐφ' ᾧ; (5) σύ has been omitted before ἔστηκας; (6) τῆς κραυγῆς has been changed to τοῦ στεναγμοῦ; (7) some mss of Acts have αὐτοῦ instead of αὐτῶν after τοῦ στεναγμοῦ; (8) most mss of Acts have ἤκουσα instead of ἀκήκοα; (9) some mss of Acts have ἀποστέλλω instead of ἀποστείλω; and (10) πρὸς Φαραὼ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου has become εἰς Αἴγυπτον.

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), σύ, point (5), and the change of πρὸς Φαραὼ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου to εἰς Αἴγυπτον, point (10). On the other hand, as Holtz notes, the textual evidence in the LXX is such that the σύ (point [5]) may have been missing in the author's text of the LXX.⁶⁰² The σύ is omitted in LXX mss A, 707, 126, 118'-537, 106, 53', 121, Carl 49, etc.⁶⁰³ As the MT contains the

⁶⁰²Holtz, 124.

⁶⁰³GottLXX2.1, Ex. 3:5.

pronoun ἡ, Holtz notes that the omission of *οὗ* could not be a Hebraicizing alteration and concludes that *οὗ* may have been missing in the original LXX at this point.⁶⁰⁴ Richard argues that the omission of *ἐκ*, point (3), in favour of a simple genitival construction, is typical of the author's stylistic tendency,⁶⁰⁵ while Holtz notes that the change of *πρὸς Φαραὼ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου* to *εἰς Αἴγυπτον*, 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.⁶⁰⁶ Richard considers the last *εἰς Αἴγυπτον* to be an addition to the text based on the author's structural plan,⁶⁰⁷ 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.⁶⁰⁸

⁶⁰⁴Holtz, 124 n. 5.

⁶⁰⁵Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 98; Holtz (125) says somewhat enigmatically that it "softens the style."

⁶⁰⁶Holtz, 125.

⁶⁰⁷Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 100.

⁶⁰⁸See *Ibid*, 97.

Point (2), the change of λῦσαι to λῦσον (middle to active voice), may be explained as a stylistic improvement,⁶⁰⁹ 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 λῦσον.⁶¹⁰ 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.⁶¹¹ Somewhat more likely is the suggestion that the Acts citation was influenced by the similar passage in Josh. 5:15 which reads λῦσον in ms A.⁶¹² 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.⁶¹³ However, it is very difficult to understand what significance this *logion* would have had on the present passage, especially since the *logion* has infinitive λῦσαι. 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 λύειν for the Hebrew לָשַׁלַּח (לָשַׁלַּח) 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,⁶¹⁴ or perhaps, as Holtz puts it, "to undress" ("ausziehen").⁶¹⁵ The word λύειν

⁶⁰⁹Holtz, 125.

⁶¹⁰GottLXX2.1, Ex. 3:5.

⁶¹¹compare Richard (Acts 6:1-8:4, 98) with Richard's footnote (n. 178) on the same page, and Holtz (124).

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 ἔκσπασον, while Symmachus changed it to ὑπόλυσαι, in Ex. 3:5.⁶¹⁶ Hence the preservation of λῦσον in Acts 7:33 indicates the LXX as source.⁶¹⁷

The change of ἐν ᾧ after τόπος to ἐφ' ᾧ, point (4), is probably a stylistic change as well. Both Wevers and Richard argue that the ἐφ' ᾧ comes from Josh. 5:15.⁶¹⁸ In the latter passage the LXX does read ἐφ' ᾧ. Wilcox, however, has noted that ἐφ' ᾧ is a closer reflection of the underlying Hebrew text, which in the MT reads ל' ז'.⁶¹⁹ 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.⁶¹⁹ It must be pointed out, however, that Aquila *adds* ἐπ' αὐτοῦ to the text, retaining ἐν ᾧ, as do the few LXX minuscules which evidence ἐπ' αὐτοῦ.⁶²⁰ While it is not impossible that the author has a Hebraicizing LXX ms which read ἐφ' ᾧ,⁶²¹ 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)

⁶¹⁵Holtz, 124.

⁶¹⁶GottLXX2,1, Ex. 3:5; see also Holtz, 125.

⁶¹⁷See Holtz, 124-125.

⁶¹⁸Wevers, Notes on the Greek Text, 28; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 98.

⁶¹⁹Wilcox, Semitisms, 42.

⁶²⁰See GottLXX2,1, Ex. 3:5; Richard, "Old Testament," 338.

⁶²¹As 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 ἐπί more natural in the expression, as did the translator of Josh. 5:15.⁶²²

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),⁶²³ and that late Patristic reference was likely influenced by Acts. Appeal to the MT is no help, as the Hebrew בִּלְעָדָה, "cry, outcry,"⁶²⁴ corresponds better to the LXX reading τῆς κραυγῆς, "a loud cry, clamour,"⁶²⁵ than to τοῦ στεναγμοῦ, "sigh, groan."⁶²⁶ Both Holtz and Richard agree that the word στεναγμοῦ has crept into the citation in Acts 7:34 through influence from either Ex. 6:5 or 2:24 or both.⁶²⁷ Ex. 6:5 reads καὶ ἐγὼ εἰσήκουσα τὸν στεναγμὸν τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ while 2:24 reads καὶ εἰσήκουσεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν στεναγμὸν αὐτῶν. In both the latter passages τὸν στεναγμόν translates the Hebrew בִּלְעָדָה, "groan,

⁶²²Holtz (123-124 n. 4; see also BAG, 286) argues that ἐφ' ᾧ 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 ἐφ' ᾧ 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 ἐν ᾧ and ἐφ' ᾧ, 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.

⁶²³BrookeMcLean, Ex. 3:7 (GottLXX2.1 only lists Acts 7:34).

⁶²⁴BDB, 858.

⁶²⁵BAG, 450.

⁶²⁶Ibid, 773; Holtz, 125 n. 8.

⁶²⁷Holtz, 125; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 99-100.

groaning."⁶²⁸ 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. 6:5,⁶²⁹ whereas Richard favours influence from Ex. 2:24.⁶³⁰ 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),⁶³¹ which indicates that he had that portion of the LXX in mind when he composed this chapter.

The problem of point (7), *αὐτοῦ* 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 *αὐτοῦ* in v. 34, while p⁷⁴, *Ⲙ*, A, C, E, Ψ, and the majority text read *αὐτῶν*.⁶³² 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.⁶³³

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.

⁶³⁰Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 99 n. 179.

⁶³¹See Ibid, 104.

⁶³²NestleAland26, Acts 7:34.

⁶³³Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 349.

back to τῆς κραυγῆς.⁶³⁴ Hence, it is likely that αὐτῶν is the original reading in Acts 7:34.

Point (8), that most mss of Acts have ἤκουσα instead of ἀκήκοα, can also be settled textually. Only D, 1175, and a few others read ἀκήκοα in Acts 7:34, while the rest read ἤκουσα.⁶³⁵ 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.⁶³⁶ He also suggests that there may be some influence from Jer. 4:31, which reads, ὅτι φωνῇν ὡς ὠδινούσης ἤκουσα, τοῦ στεναγμοῦ σου.⁶³⁷ 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.⁶³⁸

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, ⸀, A, B, C, D, E, 81, 614, 945, 1175, 1739, and others.⁶³⁹ The weight of evidence clearly supports the septuagintal reading here.

⁶³⁴Holtz, 123.

⁶³⁵NestleAland26, Acts 7:34.

⁶³⁶Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 100; see also p. 90.

⁶³⁷Ibid, 100 n. 181.

⁶³⁸Holtz, 126.

⁶³⁹NestleAland26, Acts 7:34.

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 בְּלִפְיֵי by $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$ (the more likely rendering would be $\tau\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\nu\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$), and the similarity in the presentation of Ex. 3:10, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \delta\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega\ \sigma\epsilon$, with the aorist subjunctive for the future and the omission of the copulative before $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega$, contrary to the MT (וְלִפְיֵי).⁶⁴⁰ There is no definite evidence present indicative of Lukan or non-Lukan origin.⁶⁴¹ Given, however, its LXX origin, and the Lukan origin of most of the foregoing material, a Lukan origin for this passage is likely.

i. Acts 7:35 = Ex. 2:14 + 3:2 (+ 6:6)

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 $\epsilon\phi'\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$. The latter omission has likely come about because the author is only referring back to the previous citation, not citing directly.⁶⁴² Since the author is summarizing

⁶⁴⁰Holtz, 124.

⁶⁴¹Holtz (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.

⁶⁴²Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 103.

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 ὁφθέντος αὐτῷ ἐν τῇ βάρῃ* (Acts 7:30: *ᾤφθη αὐτῷ . . . ἄγγελος ἐν φλογὶ πυρὸς βάτου*). The strange *τῇ βάρῃ* seems to be an example of "metaplasm," or "fluctuation of declension" in regards to *ἡ βάτος*.⁶⁴³

Finally, Richard has also argued that the words *τοῦτον ὁ θεὸς [καὶ] ἄρχοντα καὶ λυτρωτὴν ἀπέσταλκεν* are influenced by Ex. 6:6: *καὶ λυτρώσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ καὶ κρίσει μεγάλη*, especially the word *λυτρωτὴν*.⁶⁴⁴ 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.⁶⁴⁵ Although I find his reasons for

⁶⁴³See BDE, 28; but cf. BAG, 137; Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 103-104 n. 183.

⁶⁴⁴Richard, Acts 6:1-8:4, 104.

⁶⁴⁵Holtz, 96.

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 ἐμέ 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 αὐτοῦ 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,

⁶⁴⁶Dibelius (*Studies*, 167-170), Haenchan (*Acts*, 288-289) and Conzelman (*Acts*, 57) also see Acts 7:35 as Lukan.

⁶⁴⁷Rese, 87; Bock, 192.

⁶⁴⁸Rese, 67; Bock, 191.

⁶⁴⁹Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 109.

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,⁶⁵⁰ 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 ἀκούσεσθε*. While Holtz argues that the omissions of point (4) do not affect the meaning of the text,⁶⁵¹ 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

⁶⁵⁰Holtz, 97-98.

⁶⁵¹Ibid, 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 Kilgallen⁶⁵⁴ 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 אֱנִי (also suffix -נִי), 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.⁶⁵⁸ 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 *κύριος* 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.).⁶⁵⁹ 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 *κύριος ὁ θεός*, and only *one* reference to *θεός* with a possessive pronoun.⁶⁶⁰ 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

⁶⁵⁸See e.g., Robertson, 409.

⁶⁵⁹Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 109.

⁶⁶⁰See *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*^{74vid}, *B*, *l*⁶⁸⁰, *it*^{h,p}, *cop*^{ae(ms),bo}, 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 parsimoniousness, 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 *θεός* 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 *ὁ θεός*, 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 *αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε*, 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 *αὐτοῦ ἀκούσεσθε*,

⁶⁶¹See e.g., Marshall, *Acts*, 29-32.

⁶⁶²Holtz, 97.

⁶⁶³The insertion of *κύριος* in Acts 7:35 by mss C, E, H, P, and others, and the addition of *ἡμῶν* by mss E, H, and most minuscules, or *ὑμῶν* 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), 8, A, B, Ψ, the majority text, as well as the Stuttgart Vulgate, and the Sahidic omit them.⁶⁶⁴ 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 mss tradition is likely due to scribal assimilation to the LXX or Acts 3:22.⁶⁶⁵

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. Acts 7:40 = 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 ἀνάστηθι 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).

⁶⁶⁴NestleAland26, Acts 7:37.

⁶⁶⁵Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 350.

The differences from the LXX of Ex. 32:1 are as follows: (1) Acts replaces the introductory words *συνέστη ὁ λαὸς ἐπὶ ᾿Ααρὼν καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ* with *εἰπόντες τῷ ᾿Ααρῶν*; (2) *ἀνάστηθι καὶ* is omitted; (3) the spelling of Μωσῆς is altered to Μωϋσῆς; (4) *ὁ ἄνθρωπος* is omitted after Μωϋσῆς οὗτος; (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 ᾿Ααρων from v. 1. Hence, there is really nothing to prevent his actually citing v. 23. There, in agreement with the MT (which lacks *וַיָּקֵם*), 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 *RahlfsLXX* reads *ἐξ* before *Αἰγύπτου* in Ex. 32:1 and 32, *GottLXX2.1* reads *ἐκ γῆς*, following ms A and others. The reading *ἐκ γῆς* comes closer to the MT reading *וּמִן הָאָרֶץ* *וּמִן הָאָרֶץ*, 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 *ἐκ 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).

⁶⁶⁷Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 117.

⁶⁶⁸See Holtz, 126 n. 2.

Points (4) and (5) are probably redactional alterations. Holtz argues that the omission of ὁ ἄνθρωπος, point (4), is simply owing to its being superfluous.⁶⁶⁹ On the other hand, Richard argues that the author of Acts 7 tends to replace ἄνθρωπος by ἀνὴρ (7:2, 26),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 p⁷⁴, Ⲙ, A, B, C, 36, 945, 1175, 1739, and a few others read ἐγένετο.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.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.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.⁶⁷⁴ It is to be noted that the author of Acts 7 makes frequent use of

⁶⁶⁹Holtz, 126.

⁶⁷⁰Richard, *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).

⁶⁷¹*NestleAland26*, Acts 7:40.

⁶⁷²Holtz, 126.

⁶⁷³*Ibid*, 126 n. 4.

⁶⁷⁴*Ibid*, 126.

the ἐγένετο form (six times within the Stephen material),⁶⁷⁵ and he has similarly changed perfect ἀκήκοα 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 προπορεύσονται ἡμῶν in translating לְפָנַי יֵלְכּוּ, 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

⁶⁷⁵See Richard, *Acts 6:1-8:4*, 117.

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,⁶⁷⁹ 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.

E. Summary: The Pentateuch in Luke-Acts

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

⁶⁸⁰See e.g., Dibelius, *Studies*, 167-170; Haenchen, *Acts*, 288-289; Conzelman, *Acts*, 57; Holtz, 94; but cf. Kilgallen (76-79) and Bock (220), who see nothing of Luke here.

⁶⁸¹See L. Cerfaux and J. Dupont, *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris: Cerfaux, 1953) 73; Mundle, 135; Loisy, 318-347; Richard, *Acts* 6:1-8:4, 256-257; 282-301; Townsend, 155; Moessner, "The Christ Must Suffer," 220-256.

⁶⁸²Sometimes 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 3:22-23⁶⁸³ 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.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.

⁶⁸³The citation of this Deut. 18:15 in Acts 7:37 is not nearly so clearly a christological proof-text.

⁶⁸⁴In 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

Passage	Gospel Source	LXX	non-LXX	Definite Traditional	Possible Traditional	Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms
Luke 7:27	Q		✓	✓		
Luke 23:30	L	✓				
Acts 2:17-21		✓				✓ ¹
Acts 7:42-43		✓			✓	✓
Acts 13:41		✓				✓ ²
Acts 15:16-17		✓			✓	

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 use 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

Passage	Gospel Source	LXX	non-LXX	Definite Traditional	Possible Traditional	Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms
Luke 3:4-6	Mk	✓		✓ ³		
Luke 19:46	Q	✓		✓		
Luke 4:18-19	L	✓				
Luke 22:37	L	✓				✓
Acts 7:49-50		✓				
Acts 8:32-33		✓				
Acts 13:22		✓			✓	
Acts 13:34		✓			✓	
Acts 13:47		✓				
Acts 28:26-27		✓				

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

³This 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

Passage	Gospel Source	LXX	non-LXX	Definite Traditional	Possible Traditional	Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms
Luke 19:38	Mk	✓		✓		
Luke 20:17	Mk	✓		✓		
Luke 20:42-43	Mk		✓	✓		
Luke 22:69	Mk		✓ ⁴	✓		
Luke 4:10-11	Q	✓		✓		
Luke 13:35	Q	✓		✓		
Luke 23:46	L	✓		✓ ⁵		
Acts 1:20			✓ ⁶		✓	
Acts 2:25-28		✓				
Acts 2:30			✓ ⁷			
Acts 2:31		✓				
Acts 2:33			✓ ⁸			
Acts 2:34-35		✓				
Acts 4:11		✓				
Acts 4:25-26		✓				
Acts 13:22		✓	✓ ⁹			
Acts 13:33		✓				
Acts 13:35		✓				

⁴The septuagintal or non-septuagintal nature of this passage remains undetermined.

⁵Although a traditional citation, the passage contains definite signs of Lukan redaction.

⁶Part of this citation is certainly from the LXX, but part of it appears to have a non-septuagintal *Vorlage*.

⁷The 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.

⁸The origin of this passage (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined.

⁹The 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

Passage	Gospel Source	LXX	non-LXX	Definite Traditional	Possible Traditional	Possible Hebraicizing LXX ms
Luke 10:27	Mk	✓		✓		
Luke 18:20	Mk		✓ ¹⁰	✓ ¹¹		
Luke 20:28	Mk		✓	✓		
Luke 20:37	Mk		✓ ¹²	✓		
Luke 4:4	Q	✓		✓		
Luke 4:8	Q		✓ ¹³	✓		
Luke 4:12	Q	✓		✓		
Luke 2:23	L	✓			✓	
Luke 2:24	L	✓				
Acts 23:5		✓				
Acts 3:13		✓				
Acts 3:22-23		✓			✓	✓
Acts 3:25		✓				
Acts 7:3		✓				
Acts 7:5		✓				
Acts 7:6-7		✓				✓
Acts 7:18		✓				
Acts 7:30		✓				
Acts 7:32		✓				
Acts 7:33-34		✓				
Acts 7:35		✓				
Acts 7:37		✓				
Acts 7:40		✓			✓	✓

¹⁰It must be noted, however, that this citation has been *corrected to the LXX by Luke*.

¹¹With Lukan redaction.

¹²The origin of this passage (LXX or non-LXX) remains undetermined.

¹³The 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 5: SUMMARY OF DATA I

	LXX	non-LXX	Lukan	Traditional
Minor Prophets	*83.33	16.67	50.00	50.00
Isaiah	100.00	0.00	60.00	40.00
Psalms	66.67	33.33	55.56	44.44
Pentateuch	86.96	13.04	56.52	43.48

**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

	LXX	non-LXX	Lukan	Traditional
Combined: MP/Isa/Ps	*79.41	20.59	55.88	44.12
Pentateuch	86.96	13.04	56.52	43.48

**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

	LXX	non-LXX	Lukan	Traditional
Number of references	47	10	32	25
Percentage of references	82.46	17.54	56.14	43.86

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: SUMMARY OF DATA IV

	LXX	non-LXX	Lukan	Traditional
Combined: MP/Isa/Ps/Pent	*82.46	17.54	56.14	43.86
Pentateuch	86.96	13.04	56.52	43.48

**the values here are percentages of the total number of citations/allusions*

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.¹⁴ 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,"¹⁵ 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: *peshet*.¹⁷ Longenecker characterizes the NT application of *peshet* 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

¹⁷Longenecker, *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: *ἄνδρα 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

²¹See above, n. 14.

²²Holtz, 169-170.

²³Ibid, 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 *ἄνδρα* for LXX *ἄνθρωπον*. Wilcox argues that *ἄνῃρ* is a better translation of the Hebrew *אִישׁ* than is *ἄνθρωπος*,²⁶ and since there is no evidence of any possibly Hebraicizing tendency in the LXX textual tradition which substitutes *ἄνδρα* for *ἄνθρωπον*,²⁷ he

²⁴Holtz, 135-136.

²⁵See 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).

²⁶Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 21. It is debatable whether *ἄνῃρ* is so much better a translation of *אִישׁ* than is *ἄνθρωπος*. Certainly *אִישׁ* does mean "man" in the sense of "male", but it also has a wider connotation, i.e. "mankind," "person," "whosoever" (see T. E. McComiskey, "ysh," *TWOT* 1 [1980] 82-83). Furthermore, *ἄνῃρ* need not always mean "man" as in "male" either. It can simply mean "human being." For example, J. B. Bauer ("*ἄνῃρ*, *ἀνδρός*, *ὁ*," *EDNT* 1 [1990] 99) notes that *ἄνῃρ* 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?" *MJT* 2 [1991] 34, 38, 39) adds Acts 3:12; 17:34 and perhaps 14:14. Hence either *ἄνῃρ* or *ἄνθρωπος* would do as a translation for *אִישׁ*. Furthermore, the LXX translator may have considered *ἄνθρωπος* a perfectly reasonable translation for *אִישׁ*, 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.

²⁷See *BrookeMacLean*, I Kgdms. 13:14. It is interesting to note that ms B omits *ἄνδρα* 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.²⁸ But even if ἀνὴρ is a better translation of מְשִׁיחַ than is ἄνθρωπος, 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 ἀνὴρ is used a great deal in Luke-Acts compared to ἄνθρωπος,²⁹ and, in fact, when compared with the whole NT, the preponderance of ἀνὴρ in Luke-Acts is quite striking.³⁰ Hence it would not be out of the question to argue that Luke simply substituted his preferred word here.

²⁸Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 22-24.

²⁹See J. C. Hawkins, *Horae Synoptica: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem* (2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1968) 16; Oepke, "ἀνὴρ, ἀνδρίζομαι," *TDNT* 1 (1964) 362.

³⁰*M&G* lists 129 references to ἀνὴρ in Luke-Acts (66-68) compared with 117 (not including "son of man" sayings) occurrences of ἄνθρωπος (71-73). This produces an ἀνὴρ/ἄνθρωπος ratio of 1.1/1, significantly different from the rest of the NT (1/3.66). The complete, though rough, data is as follows:

	Lk/Acts	Mark	Matt	John	Paul†	All NT‡
ratio ἀνὴρ/ἄνθρωπος*	1.10/1	1/5.50	1/10.38	1/5.88	1/1.98	1/3.66
occurrences ἀνὴρ/ἄνθρωπος*	129/117	4/22	8/83	8/47	43/85	89/326

*excluding "son of man" sayings as formulaic

†including data from only the seven undisputed letters

‡except Luke-Acts

The data here does not take into account instances in which ἄνθρωπος is clearly inappropriate, and ἀνὴρ seems necessary. If the latter were taken into account, it would make the preponderance of ἀνὴρ in Luke-Acts even more significant, since it would qualify the cases in which other NT writers used ἀνὴρ. 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 ἀνὴρ 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 ἀνήρ.

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

³¹Holtz, 134.

³²See Wilcox, *Semitisms*, 21.

³³Although the LXX is a rather literal translation of לִבִּי בְּיָדַי, κατὰ τὴν καρδίαν μου is not an inevitable translation. Of the twelve instances listed by Lisowsky (708-712) of לִבִּי with בְּיָדַי, five are translated in the LXX by κατὰ, four by ὡς, two by καθὼς, and one by ὥσπερ (although most often the context determines which translation is used, in four instances [I Kings 11:4; 15:3; Ez. 28:2,6] κατὰ could conceivably have been used instead of ὡς/καθὼς). An interpretive translation of καρδία is also not inconceivable in our passage (cf. how the LXX translates I Sam 14:7; cf. as well the latter passage in NASB). P. K. McCarter, Jr. (*I Samuel: A New Translation With Introduction, Notes and Commentary* [AB 8; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980] 229) suggests that the Hebrew could be interpreted as "a man of his own choosing;" similarly, N. M. Sarna ("Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis," *Biblical and Other Studies* (ed. A. Altmann; StutText 1; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1963] 45) notes that Ps. 89:20 appears to be just such an exegetical interpretation of this phrase.

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 8HevXIIgr 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,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

³⁴Out 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 \aleph , in 8 instances (40%) ms p^{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^{74} (8 times, 40%), mss A and \aleph (7 times, 35%) and mss \aleph and p^{74} (7 times, 35%). Mss A, \aleph , and p^{74} read together (and with the LXX) 7 times (35%). There may be a pattern here in which mss A, \aleph , and p^{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.

³⁵An 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).

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY*

Primary Sources

- Aland, Kurt. Synopsis of the Four Gospels: Greek-English Edition of the Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1976. [SFG]
- Aland, Kurt; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M. and Wikgren, Allen, eds. The Greek New Testament. Third Edition. Münster/Westphalia: United Bible Societies, 1975. [UBSGNT3]
- Allegro, J. M. "Fragment of a Qumran Scroll of Eschatological Midrashim." JBL 77 (1958):350-354.
- _____. "Further Messianic References in Qumran Literature." JBL 75 (1956):174-187.
- _____. Qumrân Cave 4: I (4Q158-4Q186). DJD, 5. Oxford: Clarendon, 1968.
- Brooke, Alan England; McLean, Norman and Thackeray, Henry St. John, eds. The Old Testament in Greek. Cambridge: University, 1917-1935, vols. 1-2. [BrookeMcLean]
- Charles, R. H., ed. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Oxford: Clarendon, 1913, 2 vols. [APOT]
- Elliger, K. and Rudolph, W., eds. Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia. Stuttgart: Deutsch Bibelstiftung, 1977. [BHS]
- Ginsburger, Moses. Pseudo-Jonathan (Thargum Jonathan ben Ustiel zum Pentateuch) nach der Londoner Handschrift. Jerusalem: Makor, 1974.
- Kittel, Rudolf, ed. Biblia Hebraica. Third Edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1966. [BHK]
- Maher, Michael. Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Genesis: Translated, with Introduction and Notes. ABT, 1B. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1992.

*Abbreviations for frequently used standard references appear in square brackets [] after the bibliographical entry.

Nestle, Eberhard; Nestle, Erwin and Aland, Kurt, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece. Twenty-fifth Edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1963. [NestleAland25]

Nestle, Eberhard; Nestle, Erwin; Aland, Kurt; Aland, Barbara; Black, Matthew; Martini, Carlo M.; Metzger, Bruce M. and Wikgren, Allen, eds. Novum Testamentum Graece. Twenty-sixth Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1979. [NestleAland26]

Rahlfs, Alfred, ed. Psalmi cum Odis. GottLXX, 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967. [GottLXX10]

_____, ed. Septuaginta. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelstiftung, 1935, 2 Vols. [RahlfsLXX]

Richardson, Cyril C., ed. Early Christian Fathers. New York: Macmillan, 1970.

Staniforth, Maxwell, ed. Early Christian Writings: The Apostolic Fathers. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1968.

Strack, H. L. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch. München: Beck, 1926, 6 vols. [Str-B]

Tov, Emanuel. The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr): (The Seiyāl Collection I). DJD, 8. Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

Wevers, John William, ed. Deuteronomium. GottLXX, 3,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977. [GottLXX3,2]

_____, ed. Exodus. GottLXX, 2,1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1991. [GottLXX2,1]

_____, ed. Genesis. GottLXX, 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1974. [GottLXX1]

_____, ed. Leviticus. GottLXX, 2,2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986. [GottLXX2,2]

Ziegler, Joseph, ed. Duodecim prophetae. GottLXX, 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943. [GottLXX13]

_____, ed. Isaias, GottLXX, 14. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967. [GottLXX14]

Secondary Sources

- Albertz, Rainer. "Die 'Antrittsprredigt' Jesu im Lukasevangelium auf ihrem alttestamentlichen Hintergrund." ZNW 74 (1983):182-206.
- Alford, H. The Greek Testament. Chicago: Moody, 1968, 2 vols.
- Alter, Robert. The Art of Biblical Poetry. New York: Basic, 1985.
- Archer, Gleason L., Jr. The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Study Manual. SBSO. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1957.
- Argyle, A. W. "The Accounts of the Temptations of Jesus in relation to the Q Hypothesis." ExpTim 64 (1952-1953):382.
- _____. "An Alleged Semitism." ExpTim 66 (1954-1955):177.
- _____. "The Theory of an Aramaic Source in Acts 2, 14-40." JTS NS 4 (1953):213-214.
- Aune, David E. The New Testament in Its Literary Environment. LEC, 8. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1987.
- _____. Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983.
- Baarlank, Heinrich. "Ein gnädiges Jahr des Herrn--und Tage der Vergeltung." ZNW 73 (1982):204-220.
- Baker, D. L. 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.
- Baldwin, Joyce G. Daniel: An Introduction and Commentary. TOTC. Madison, Wisc.: Inter-Varsity, 1978.
- Barr, James. "Which Language Did Jesus Speak?--Some Remarks of a Semitist." BJRL 53 (1970-1971):9-29.
- Barrett, C. K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. BNTC. London: Black, 1957.

- _____. The Holy Spirit in the Gospel Tradition. London: S.P.C.K., 1947.
- _____. New Testament Essays. London: S.P.C.K., 1972.
- Barthélemy, Dominique. Les devanciers d'Aquila: Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du dodécaprophéton. VTSup, 10. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Bartsch, H.-W. "Jesu Schwertwort, Lukas XXII. 35-38: Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studie." NTS 20 (1973-1974):190-203.
- Bauer, Johannes B. "ἀνὴρ, ἀνδρός, ὁ." In EDNT. Vol. 1 (1990), pp. 98-99.
- Bauer, Walter. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Ed. and trans. William F. Arndt and F. Wilbur Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1957. [BAG]
- Baumgarten, A. I. "The Name of the Pharisees." JBL 102 (1983):411-428.
- Beare, Francis Wright. The Earliest Records of Jesus. Oxford: Blackwell, 1962.
- Behm, Johannes. "διάνοια." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 963-967.
- _____. "The NT Term διαθήκη." In TDNT. Vol. 2 (1964), pp. 129-134.
- Benko, Stephen. "The Magnificat: A History of the Controversy." JBL 86 (1967):263-275.
- Bertram, Georg. "ἔθνος, ἐθνικός: A. People and Peoples in the LXX." In TDNT. Vol. 2 (1964), pp. 364-369.
- Bickermann, Elias. "Utilitas crucis: Observations sur les récits du procès de Jésus dans les Évangiles canoniques." RHR 112 (1935):290-311.
- Bihler, Johannes. Die Stephanusgeschichte im Zusammenhang der Apostelgeschichte. MTS, 1. Munich: Hueber, 1963.
- Black, Matthew. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. Oxford: Clarendon, 1946.
- _____. An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, Third Edition (Oxford: Clarendon, 1967.

- Blaiklock, E. M. The Acts of the Apostles: An Historical Commentary. TNTC, 5. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1959.
- Blass, F. Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter: Editio philologica apparatu critico, commentario perpetuo, indice verborum illustrata. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1895.
- Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Trans. Robert W. Funk. Chicago: University of Chicago, 1961. [BDF]
- Bock, Darrell I. Proclamation from Prophecy and Pattern: Lucan Old Testament Christology. JSNTS, 12. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.
- Boers, H. W. "Psalm 16 and the Historical Origin of the Christian Faith." ZNW 60 (1969):105-110.
- Boismard, M.-E. "The Texts of Acts: A Problem of Literary Criticism?" In New Testament Textual Criticism: Its Significance for Exegesis. Essays in Honour of Bruce M. Metzger. Ed. Eldon Jay Epp and Gordon D. Fee. Oxford: Clarendon, 1981, pp. 147-158.
- Bornkamm, Günther. "Das Doppelgebot der Liebe." In Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag, AM 20. August 1954. BZNW, 21. Ed. Walther Eltester. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957, pp. 85-93.
- _____. "λικμῶω." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 280-281.
- Bovon, François. Luke the Theologian: Thirty-Three Years of Research (1950-83). PTM, 12. Trans. Ken McKinney. Allison Park, Penn.: Pickwick, 1987.
- Bowker, J. W. "Speeches in Acts: A Study in Proem and Yelammedenu Form." NTS 14 (1967-1968):96-111.
- _____. The Targums and Rabbinic Literature. London: Cambridge University, 1969.
- Brandon, S. G. F. Jesus and the Zealots. New York: Scribner's, 1967.
- Braun, Michael A. "James' Use of Amos at the Jerusalem Council: Steps Toward a Possible Solution of the Textual and Theological Problems." JETS 20 (1977):113-121.

Brawley, Robert L. Luke-Acts and the Jews: Conflict, Apology, and Conciliation. SBLMS, 31. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987.

Briggs, Charles Augustus and Briggs, Emilie Grace. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms. ICC. New York: Scribner's, 1914, 2 vols.

Brock, Sebastian P. "Lucian redivivus: Some Reflections on Barthélemy's Les devanciers d'Aquila." SE 5 (1966):176-181.

_____. Review of Matthew Black: An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts. JTS NS 20 (1969):274-278.

Brockington, L. H. "The Greek Translator of Isaiah and His Interest in ΔΟΞΑ." VT 1 (1951):23-32.

_____. "The Septuagintal Background to the New Testament Use of ΔΟΞΑ." In Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957, pp. 1-8.

Brodie, Thomas L. "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 kgs 21:8-13) as One Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6:9-14; 7:58a)." CBQ 45 (1983):417-432.

_____. "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources." In Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar. Ed. C. H. Talbert. New York: Crossroad, 1984, pp. 17-46.

_____. "Luke 7, 36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4, 1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation." Bib 64 (1983):457-485.

_____. "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative." In New Views on Luke and Acts. Ed. Earl Richard. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990, pp. 78-85.

_____. "A New Temple and a New Law: The Unity and Chronicler-based Nature of Luke 1:1-4:22a." JSNT 5 (1979):21-45.

_____. "Not Q But Elijah: The Saving of the Centurion's Servant (Luke 7.1-10) as an Internalization of the Saving of the Widow and Her Child (1 Kgs 17.1-16)." IBS 14 (1992):54-71.

- _____. "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kgs 5 as One Component of Acts 8, 9-40." Bib 67 (1986):41-67.
- Brower, Kent. "Elijah in the Markan Passion Narrative," JSNT 18 (1983):85-101.
- Brown, Francis; Driver, S. R. and Briggs, Charles A. A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon, 1907. [BDB]
- Brown, Raymond E. The Birth of the Messiah: A Commentary on the Infancy Narratives in Matthew and Luke. London: Chapman, 1977.
- _____. The Gospel According to John (i-xii): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. AB. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1966.
- _____. The Gospel According to John (xiii-xxi): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. AB. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1970.
- _____. "Luke's Description of the Virginal Conception." TS 35 (1974):360-362.
- _____. "The Meaning of the Manger: The Significance of the Shepherds." Wor 50 (1976):528-538.
- _____. "The Presentation of Jesus (Luke 2:22-40)." Wor 51 (1977):2-11.
- _____. "The Problem of the Virginal Conception of Jesus." TS 33 (1972):3-34.
- _____. "Virgin Birth." In IDBS (1976), pp. 940-941.
- Bruce, F. F. The Acts of the Apostles: The Greek Text With Introduction and Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1951.
- _____. Commentary on the Book of Acts: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. NICNT. London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1965.
- _____. "Messiah." In NBD (1962), pp. 811-818.
- _____. The New Testament Development of Old Testament Themes. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1968.
- _____. The Speeches in the Acts of the Apostles. London: Cambridge University, 1973.

Brueggemann, W. The Land: Place as Gift, Promise, and Challenge in Biblical Faith. OBT. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

Büchsel, Friedrich. "ἱλάσκομαι: C. Ideas of Expiation in Judaism." In TDNT. Vol. 3 (1965), pp. 312-314.

Bullinger, E. W. Figures of Speech Used in the Bible Explained and Illustrated. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1968.

Bultmann, Rudolf. Das Evangelium des Johannes. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1959.

_____. The History of the Synoptic Tradition. Trans. John Marsh. Oxford: Blackwell, 1968.

Burchard, Christoph. "A Note on PHMA in Josas 17:1f.; Luke 2:15,17; Acts 10:37." NovT 27 (1985):281-295.

Burkitt, F. C. "Professor C. C. Torrey on 'Acts'." JTS 20 (1918-1919):320-329.

Burnier, Martinha Penido. "Une vision prophétique et eschatologique de l'histoire le livre des Actes." FoiVieSup 70 (1971):138-145.

Burton, Ernest DeWitt. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1924.

_____. Syntax of Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. Edinburgh: Clark, 1898.

Buse, I. "The Cleansing of the Temple in the Synoptics and in John." ExpTim 70 (1958-1959):22-24.

Busse, U. Das Nazareth-Manifest Jesu: Eine Einführung in das lukanische Jesusbild nach Lk 4,16-30. SBS, 91. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1978.

Buth, Randall. "Hebrew Poetic Tenses and the Magnificat." JSNT 21 (1984):67-83.

Cadbury, Henry J. The Book of Acts in History. London: Black, 1955.

_____. "Four Features of Lucan Style." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 87-102.

- _____. "Lexical Notes on Luke-Acts IV. On Direct Quotation, With Some Uses of ὅτι and ἐι." JBL 48 (1929):412-425.
- _____. "Luke--Translator or Author?" AJT 24 (1920):436-455.
- _____. The Making of Luke-Acts. New York: Macmillan, 1927.
- _____. The Style and Literary Method of Luke. HTS, 6. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1920.
- _____. "The Titles of Jesus in Acts." In The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1922. Vol. 5, pp. 354-375.
- Cadbury, Henry J. and Lake, Kirsopp. The Acts of the Apostles: English Translation and Commentary. In The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1922. Vol. 4.
- Cadoux, A. T. The Parables of Jesus: Their Art and Use. London: Clark, 1931.
- Callan, Terrance. Forgetting the Root: The Emergence of Christianity from Judaism. New York: Paulist, 1986.
- _____. "The Preface of Luke-Acts and Historiography." NTS 31 (1985):576-581.
- Carrez, Maurice. "Présence et fonctionnement de l'Ancien Testament dans l'annonce de l'évangile." RSR 63 (1975):325-342.
- Catchpole, David R. The Trial of Jesus. Leiden: Brill, 1971.
- _____. "You Have Heard His Blasphemy." TB 16 (1965):10-18.
- Cave, C. H. "Lazarus and the Lukan Deuteronomy." NTS 15 (1968-1969):319-325.
- Cerfaux, L. "La première communauté chrétienne à Jérusalem." ETL 16 (1939):1-18.
- Cerfaux, L. and Dupont, J. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris: Cerfaux, 1953.
- Chadwick, Henry. The Early Church. PHC, 1. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1967.
- Charley, J. W. "Torah." In NBD (1962), pp. 1252-1253.

- Childs, Brevard S. The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1974.
- Chilton, Bruce. "Announcement in Nazara: An analysis of Luke 4.16-21." In Gospel Perspectives II: Studies of History and Tradition in the Four Gospels. Ed. R. T. France and David Wenham. Sheffield: JSOT, 1981, pp. 147-172.
- Clarke, W. K. L. "The Use of the Septuagint in Acts." In The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1922, Vol. 2, pp. 66-105.
- Clements, Ronald E. Exodus. CBC. Cambridge: University, 1972.
- Clines, D. J. A. I, We, & They: A Literary Approach to Isaiah 53. JSOTS, 1. Sheffield: JSOT, 1976.
- Cohen, A. The Psalms: Hebrew Text & English Translation with an Introduction and Commentary. London: Soncino, 1945.
- Cole, R. Alan. Exodus: An Introduction and Commentary. TOTC, 2. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1973.
- Conzelman, Hans. Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. HC. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
- _____. Die Mitte der Zeit: Studien zur Theologie des Lukas. BZHT, 17. Tübingen: Mohr, 1954.
- _____. "Luke's Place in the Development of Early Christianity." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 298-316.
- _____. The Theology of St. Luke. Trans. Geoffrey Buswell. New York: Harper, 1961.
- Cook, Michael J. "The Mission to the Jews in Acts: Unraveling Luke's 'Myth of the Myriads'." In Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 102-123.
- Cook, S. A. "A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus." PSBA 25 (1903):34-56.
- Cox, Claude. "The Wrath of God Has Come to Me: Job's First Speech According to the LXX." SR 16 (1987):195-204.

Craigie, Peter C. The Book of Deuteronomy. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1976.

_____. Psalms 1-50. WBC, 19. Waco, Tex.: Word, 1983.

Creed, J. M. The Gospel According to St. Luke: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. London: Macmillan, 1930.

Crockett, Larrimore. "Luke iv.16-30 and the Jewish Lectionary Cycle: A Word of Caution." JJS 17 (1966):13-45.

Cross, Frank Moore, Jr. The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1961.

_____. "The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts." In 1972 Proceedings. SBLSCS, 2. Ed. Robert A Kraft. Missoula, Montana: SBL, 1972, pp. 108-126.

Cullmann, Oscar. The Christology of the New Testament. Revised Edition. Trans. Shirley C. Guthrie and Charles A. M. Hall. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1963.

Dahl, Nils A. "'A People for His Name' (Acts XV.14)." NTS 4 (1957-1958):319-327.

_____. "The Story of Abraham in Luke-Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 139-158.

Dahood, Mitchell. Psalms. AB. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1965, 2 vols.

Dalman, Gustaf H. Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch. Hildesheim: Olms, 1967.

Davies, J. G. "The Ascription of the Magnificat to Mary." JTS NS 15 (1964):307-308.

Davies, W. D. "Law in First-Century Judaism." In IDB. Vol. 3 (1962), pp. 89-95.

Debrunner, A. Der Gebrauch des Artikels bei κύριος. BZAW, 41. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1925.

de Jonge, Marinus. Christology in Context: The Earliest Christian Response to Jesus. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1988.

de Lagarde, Paul. Septuaginta Studien: Abhandlungen der Hist. Philos. Klasse der Kgl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Band 37. Göttingen: 1891.

deMeester, Paul. "'Philippe et l'eunuque éthiopien' ou 'Le baptême d'un pèlerin de Nubie'?" NRT 103 (1981):360-374.

de Vries, S. J. "Chronology of the OT." In IDB. Vol. 1 (1962), pp. 580-599.

de Waard, Jan. A Comparative Study of the Old Testament in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament. STDJ, 4. Leiden: Brill, 1965.

_____. "The Quotation from Deuteronomy in Acts 3,22.23 and the Palestinian Text: Additional Arguments." Bib 52 (1971):537-540.

Dibelius, Martin. From Tradition to Gospel. Trans. Bertram Lee Woolf. Greenwood, S.C.: Attic, 1971.

_____. "Jungfrauensohn und Krippenkind: Untersuchungen zur Geburtsgeschichte Jesu im Lukas-Evangelium." Botschaft und Geschichte. Vol. 1. Tübingen: Mohr, 1953, pp. 1-78.

_____. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. Ed. Heinrich Greeven. Trans. Mary Ling and Paul Schubert. London: SCM, 1956.

Dihle, Albert. " $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ in the Greek World." In TDNT. Vol. 9 (1974), pp. 608-617.

Dillon, Richard J. "Previewing Luke's Project from His Prologue (Luke 1:1-4)." CBQ 43 (1981):205-227.

Dodd, C. H. According to the Scriptures. London: Nisbet, 1952.

_____. The Parables of the Kingdom. New York: Scribner's, 1961.

Doeve, Jan Willem. Jewish Hermeneutics in the Synoptic Gospels and Acts. Assen: van Gorcum, 1954.

Dömer, M. Das Heil Gottes: Studien zur Theologie des lukanischen Doppelwerkes. BBB, 51. Köln-Bonn: Hanstein, 1978.

Donaldson, T. L. "Moses Typology and the Sectarian Nature of Early Christian Anti-Judaism: A Study in Acts 7." JSNT 12 (1981):27-52.

Downing, F. Gerald. "Redaction Criticism: Josephus' Antiquities and the Synoptic Gospels (II)." JSNT 9 (1980):29-48.

- Dubarle, A.-M. "Le discours à l'Aréopage (Actes 17, 22-31) et son arrière-plan biblique." RSPT 57 (1973):576-610.
- Du Plooy, G. P. V. "The Author in Luke-Acts." Scra 32 (1990):28-35.
- Dupont, Jacques. "L'ambassade de Jean-Baptiste (Matthieu 11,2-6; Luc 7,18-23)." NRT 83 (1961):805-825, 943-959.
- _____. "La destinée de Judas prophétisée par David (Actes 1,16-20)." CBQ 23 (1961):41-51.
- _____. "ΛΑΟΣ 'ΕΞ 'ΕΘΝΩΝ (Act. XV. 14)." NTS 3 (1956-1957):47-50.
- _____. "La parabole du semeur dans la version de Luc." In Apophoreta: Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag am 10. December 1964. BZNW, 30. Ed. Walther Eltester. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1964, pp. 97-108.
- _____. "Pierre et Paul dans les Actes." RB 64 (1957):35-47.
- _____. "Un peuple d'entre les nations (Actes 15.14)." NTS 31 (1985):321-335.
- _____. The Salvation of the Gentiles: Essays on the Acts of the Apostles. Trans. John Keating. New York: Paulist, 1979.
- _____. The Sources of Acts: The Present Position. Trans. Kathleen Pond. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1964.
- _____. "La structure oratoire du discours d'Étienne (Actes 7)." Bib 66 (1985):153-167.
- _____. "ΤΑ 'ΟΣΙΑ ΔΑΥΙΔ ΤΑ ΠΙΣΤΑ (Ac XII 34 = Is LV 3)." RB 68 (1961):91-114.
- _____. Les tentations de Jésus au désert. StudNeot, 4. Bruges: Brouwer, 1968.
- Easton, B. S. Early Christianity: The Purpose of Acts and Other Papers. Ed. Frederick C. Grant. London: S.P.C.K., 1955.
- _____. The Gospel According to Luke: A Critical and Exegetical Commentary. New York: Scribner's, 1926.

- Ehrhardt, Arnold. "The Construction and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles." ST 12 (1958):45-79.
- Eichrodt, Walther. Theology of the Old Testament. OTL. Trans. J. A. Baker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1961, 2 vols.
- Ellis, E. Earle. "Present and Future Eschatology in Luke." NTS 12 (1965):27-41.
- Emerton, J. A. Review of Max Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts. JSS 13 (1968):282-297.
- Evans, C. F. "The Central Section of St. Luke's Gospel." In Studies in the Gospels: Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. Ed. D. E. Nineham. Oxford: Blackwell, 1957.
- Evans, Craig A. "'He Set His Face': A Note on Luke 9,51." Bib 63 (1982):545-548.
- _____. "The Prophetic Setting of the Pentecost Sermon." ZNW 74 (1983):148-150.
- Farris, Stephen. The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives: Their Origin, Meaning and Significance. JSNTS, 9. Sheffield: JSOT, 1985.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. The Gospel According to Luke (I-IX): Introduction, Translation and Notes. AB. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1981.
- _____. The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV): Introduction, Translation, and Notes. AB. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1985.
- _____. "Jewish Christianity in Acts in Light of the Qumran Scrolls." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 233-257.
- _____. Review of Matthew Black: An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (3rd. ed.). CBQ 30 (1968):417-428.
- _____. "The Use of Explicit Old Testament Quotations in Qumran Literature and in the New Testament." NTS 7 (1960-1961):297-333.
- _____. "The Virginal Conception of Jesus in the New Testament." TS 34 (1973):541-575.
- Foerster, Werner. "κλῆρος." In TDNT. Vol. 3 (1965), pp. 758-764.

- _____. "κύριος in the New Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 3 (1965), pp. 1086-1095.
- France, R. T. Jesus and the Old Testament: His Application of Old Testament Passages to Himself and His Mission. London: Tyndale, 1971.
- Fredriksen, Paula. From Jesus to Christ: The Origins of the New Testament Images of Jesus. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University, 1988.
- Friedrich, Gerhard. "προφήτης: D. Prophets and Prophecies in the New Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 6 (1968), pp. 828-856.
- Fuller, Reginald H. The Foundations of New Testament Christology. London: Collins, 1965.
- Gaston, Lloyd. "Anti-Judaism and the Passion Narrative in Luke and Acts." In Anti-Judaism in Early Christianity. Ed. Peter Richardson and David Granskou. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1986, vol. 1, pp. 127-153.
- _____. No Stone On Another: Studies in the Significance of the Fall of Jerusalem in the Synoptic Gospels. NovTSup, 23. Leiden: Brill, 1970.
- Gault, J. A. "The Discourse Function of Kai Egeneto in Luke and Acts." OPTAT 4 (1990):388-399.
- George, Augustin. "La predication inaugurale de Jesus dans la synagogue de Nazareth Luc 4,16-30." BVC 59 (1964):17-29.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. The Origins of the Gospel Traditions. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.
- Glombitza, Otto. "Akta XIII. 15-41, Analyse einer Lukanischen Predigt vor Juden: Ein Beitrag zum Problem der Reden in Akta." NTS 5 (1958-1959):306-317.
- Gooding, D. W. "Texts and Versions: 2. The Septuagint." In NBD (1962), pp. 1258-1261.
- Goodspeed, E. J. "The Origin of Acts." JB� 39 (1920):83-101.
- Goppelt, Leonhard. Theology of the New Testament. Ed. Jürgen Roloff. Trans. John E. Alsup. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982, 2 vols.

- _____. Typos: The Typological Interpretation of the Old Testament in the New. Trans. Donald H. Madvig. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982.
- Goulder, Michael Douglas. The Evangelist's Calendar: A Lectionary Explanation of the Development of Scripture. London: S.P.C.K., 1978.
- _____. Luke: A New Paradigm. JSNTS 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1989. 2 vols.
- Goulder, M. D. and Sanderson, M. L. "St. Luke's Genesis." JTS NS 8 (1957):12-30.
- Grundmann, Walter. "δόκιμος." In TDNT. Vol. 2 (1964), pp. 255-260.
- _____. Das Evangelium nach Lukas. Second Edition. THKNT, 3. East Berlin: Evangelische, 1961.
- _____. "κακόω." In TDNT, vol. 3 (1965), p. 484.
- _____. "ταπεινός, ταπεινώ, ταπείνωσις, ταπεινόφρων, ταπεινοφροσύνη." In TDNT. Vol 8 (1972), pp. 1-26.
- Gundry, R. H. The Use of the Old Testament in St. Matthew's Gospel With Special Reference to the Messianic Hope. Leiden: Brill, 1967.
- Gunkel, Hermann. The Psalms: A Form-Critical Introduction. FBBS, 19. Ed. John Reumann. Trans. Thomas M. Horner. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1967.
- Hackett, J. "Echoes of Euripides in Acts of the Apostles?" ITQ 23 (1958):218-227.
- Haenchen, Ernst. The Acts of the Apostles. Trans. Bernard Noble, Gerald Shinn, Hugh Anderson and R. McL. Wilson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1971.
- _____. "The Book of Acts as Source Material for the History of Early Christianity." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 258-278.
- _____. "Quellenanalyse und Kompositionsanalyse in Act 15." In Judentum, Urchristentum, Kirche: Festschrift für Joachim Jeremias. BZNW, 26. Ed. Walther Eltester. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1960, pp. 153-164.
- _____. Review of Max Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts. TLZ 91 (1966):355-357.

- _____. "Schriftzitate und Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte," ZTK 51 (1954):153-167.
- Hahn, F. The Titles of Jesus in Christology: Their History in Early Christianity. New York: World, 1969.
- Hanson, Anthony Tyrell. The Living Utterances of God: The New Testament Exegesis of the Old. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1983.
- Harrelson, W. J. "Vengeance." In IDB, vol. 4 (1962), p. 748.
- Harris, Rendell. Testimonies. London: Cambridge University, 1916, 1920. 2 Vols.
- Harris, R. Laird. "shahat." In TWOT. Vol. 2 (1980), p. 911.
- Hatch, Edwin and Redpath, Henry A., eds. A Concordance to the Septuagint. Oxford: Clarendon, 1897.
- Hatch, W. H. P. "The Text of Luke II,22." HTR 14 (1921):377-381.
- Hauck, Friedrich. "καθαρισμός." In TDNT. Vol. 3 (1965), pp. 429-430.
- _____. "ὁσιος, ὁσίως." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 489-492.
- Hawkins, J. C. Horae Synoptica: Contributions to the Study of the Synoptic Problem. Second Edition, Revised and Supplemented. Oxford: Clarendon. 1968.
- Hays, Richard B. Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul. New Haven: Yale, 1989.
- Heidland, H. W. "λογίζομαι, λογισμός." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 284-292.
- Hengel, Martin. Acts and the History of Earliest Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.
- _____. Between Jesus and Paul: Studies in the Earliest History of Christianity. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- Hertzberg, Hans Wilhelm. I & II Samuel: A Commentary. OTL. Trans. J. S. Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1964.
- Heuthorst, G. "The Apologetic Aspect of Acts 2:1-13." Scr 9 (1957):33-43.

- Hewitt, Thomas. The Epistle to the Hebrews: An Introduction and Commentary. TNTC, 15. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
- Hoenig, S. B. "Theudas." In IDB. Vol. 4 (1962), p. 629.
- Hoffmann, R. Joseph. Marcion: On the Restitution of Christianity: An Essay on the Development of Radical Paulinist Theology in the Second Century. AARAS, 46. Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1984.
- Holladay, William L. 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.
- Holtz, Traugott. Untersuchungen über die alttestamentlichen Zitate bei Lukas. TU, 104. Berlin: Akademie, 1968.
- Hooker, Morna. Jesus and the Servant: The Influence of the Servant Concept of Deutero-Isaiah in the New Testament. London: S.P.C.K., 1959.
- Horsley, Richard A. "'Like One of the Prophets of Old': Two Types of Popular Prophets at the Time of Jesus." CBQ 47 (1985):435-463.
- _____. "Popular Prophetic Movements at the Time of Jesus: Their Principal Features and Social Origins." JSNT 26 (1986):3-27.
- Horsley, Richard A. and Hanson, John S. Bandits, Prophets, and Messiahs: Popular Movements in the Time of Jesus. NVBS. Minneapolis: Winston, 1985.
- Horvath, Tibor. "Why Was Jesus Brought to Pilate?" NovT 11 (1969):174-184.
- Hoskyns, E. C. The Riddle of the New Testament. London: Faber, 1931.
- Hubbard, Benjamin J. "Commissioning Stories in Luke-Acts: A Study of Their Antecedents, Form and Content." Sema 8 (1977):103-126.
- Hughes, Jeremy. Secrets of the Times: Myth and History in Biblical Chronology. JSOTS, 16. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1990.
- Irigoin, J. "La composition rythmique des cantiques de Luc." RB 98 (1991):5-50.
- Irmscher, J. "The Pseudo-Clementines." Trans. George Ogg. In New Testament Apocrypha. Ed. Edgar Hennecke and Wilhelm Schneemelcher. Trans. R. McL. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965. Vol. 2, pp. 532-570.

Jellicoe, Sidney. Review of Dominique Barthélemy: Les devanciers d'Aquila. JAOS 84 (1964):178-182.

_____. The Septuagint in Modern Study. Ann Arbor, Mich.: Eisenbrauns, 1978.

_____. "St. Luke and the Letter of Aristeas." JBL 80 (1961):149-155.

Jenni, E. "Messiah, Jewish." In IDB. Vol. 3 (1962), pp. 360-365.

Jeremias, Joachim. "ᾠδῆς." In TDNT. Vol. 1 (1964), pp. 146-149.

_____. "Die aramäische Vorgeschichte unserer Evangelien." TLZ 74 (1949):527-531.

_____. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

_____. "κεφαλὴ γωνίας." In TDNT. Vol. 1 (1964), pp. 792-793.

_____. "λίθος, λίθινος." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 268-280.

_____. "Μωϋσῆς." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 848-873.

_____. New Testament Theology. Trans. John Bowden. London: S.C.M., 1971.

_____. "παῖς θεοῦ." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 677-717.

_____. The Parables of Jesus. New York: Scribner's, 1963.

Johnson, L. T. The Literary Function of Possessions in Luke-Acts. SBLDS, 39. Missoula, Montana: Scholars, 1977.

Johnson, R. F. "Moses." In IDB. Vol. 3 (1962), pp. 440-450.

Jones, Douglas. "The Background and Character of the Lukan Psalms." JTS NS 19 (1968):19-50.

Juel, Donald. "Social Dimensions of Exegesis: The Use of Psalm 16 in Acts 2." CBO 43 (1981):543-556.

Kahle, Paul E. The Cairo Geniza. Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon, 1959.

- Kaiser, Otto. Isaiah 1-12: A Commentary. OTL. Trans. R. A. Wilson. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1972.
- Kaiser, Walter C., Jr. "The Davidic Promise and the Inclusion of the Gentiles (Amos 9:9-15 and Acts 15:13-18): A Test Passage for Theological Systems." JETS 20 (1977):97-111.
- _____. "The Promise to David in Psalm 16 and Its Application in Acts 2:25-33 and 13:32-37." JETS 23 (1980):219-229.
- Kautzsch, E. Genesis' Hebrew Grammar. Trans. A. E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon, 1910. [GKC]
- Kennard, J. Spencer, Jr. "The Jewish Provincial Assembly." ZNW 53 (1965):25-51.
- Kidner, Derek. Genesis: An Introduction and Commentary. TOTC, 1. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1967.
- _____. Psalms 1-72: An Introduction and Commentary on Books I and II of the Psalms. TOTC. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1973.
- _____. Psalms 73-150: A Commentary on Books III-V of the Psalms. TOTC. Downers Grove, Ill.: Inter-Varsity, 1975.
- Kilgallen, John. The Stephen Speech: A Literary and Redactional Study Of Acts 7,2-53. AnBib, 67. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1976.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. "Language and Text in the Gospels and Acts." VC 24 (1970):161-171.
- _____. "Some Quotations in Acts." In Les Actes des Apôtres: Traditions, rédactions, théologie. BETL, 68. Ed. J. Kremer. Gembloux: Leuven, 1979, pp. 81-97.
- King, D. M. "The Use of Amos 9:11-12 in Acts 15:16-18." ATJ 21 (1989):8-13.
- Kistemaker, S. J. "The Speeches in Acts." CTR 5 (1990):31-41.
- Klijn, A. F. J. "Scribes, Pharisees, Highpriests and Elders in the New Testament." NovT 3 (1959):259-267.
- _____. "Stephen's Speech--Acts VII.2-53." NTS 4 (1957-1958):25-31.

- Klostermann, E. Das Lukasevangelium. HNT, 5. Tübingen: Mohr, 1975.
- Knox, John. Marcion and the New Testament: An Essay in the Early History of the Canon. Chicago: University, 1942.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums. Tübingen: Mohr, 1986.
- Kodell, Jerome. "Luke's Use of *LAOS*, 'People,' Especially in the Jerusalem Narrative (Lk 19,28-24,53)." CBQ 31 (1969):327-343.
- Köster, Helmut. "τόπος." In TDNT. Vol. 8 (1972), pp. 187-208.
- Kraft, Robert A. Review of Dominique Barthélemy: Les devanciers d'Aquila. Gno 37 (1965):474-483.
- Kräinkl, E. Jesus der Knecht Gottes: Die heilsgeschichtliche Stellung Jesus in den Reden der Apostelgeschichte. BU, 8. Regensburg: Pustet, 1972.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. Introduction to the New Testament. Revised Edition. Trans. Howard Clark Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1975.
- Kurz, William S. "Luke 22:14-38 and Greco-Roman Farewell Addresses." JBL 104 (1985):251-268.
- Kürzinger, J. "Luke 1,3: . . . ἀκριβῶς καθεξῆς σοι γράψαι." BZ 18 (1974):249-255.
- Lagrange, M.-J. Évangile selon saint Luc. Paris: Gabalda, 1948.
- Larkin, William J., Jr. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament as a Key to His Soteriology." IETS 20 (1977):325-335.
- Larsson, E. "Lukas och Pentateuken." TTKi 60 (1989):293-299.
- Larsson, Gerhard. "The Chronology of the Pentateuch: A Comparison of the MT and LXX." JBL 102 (1983):401-409.
- Lategan, B. C. "Tradition and Interpretation--Two Methodological Remarks." Neot 7 (1973):95-103.
- Laurentin, René. Structure et théologie de Luc i-ii. EB. Paris: Lecoffre, 1957.
- _____. "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (I)." Bib 37 (1956):435-456.

- _____. "Traces d'allusions étymologiques en Luc 1-2 (II)." Bib 38 (1957):1-23.
- _____. The Truth of Christmas: Beyond the Myths: The Gospels of the Infancy of Christ. Trans. Michael J. Wrenn. Petersham, Mass.: St. Bede's, 1986.
- Leaney, R. "The Birth Narratives in St Luke and St Matthew." NTS 8 (1961-1962):158-166.
- Lebram, Jürgen-Christian. "Der Aufbau der Areopagrede." ZNW 55 (1964):221-243.
- Légasse, S. Stephanos: Histoire et discours d'Étienne dans les Actes des Apôtres. LD, 147. Paris: Cerfaux, 1992.
- Levy, Jacob. Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1963, 4 vols.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert. A Greek-English Lexicon. Oxford: Clarendon, 1889. [L&S]
- Lindars, Barnabas. New Testament Apologetic. London: SCM, 1961.
- Linton, Olof. "The Trial of Jesus and the Interpretation of Psalm CX." NTS 7 (1961):258-262.
- Lisowsky, Gerhard. Konkordanz zum Hebräischen Alten Testament. Second Edition. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1958.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. Die Sammlung Israels: Eine Untersuchung zur lukanischen Ekklesiologie. München: Kösel, 1975.
- Lohmeyer, E. "Die Versuchung Jesu." ZST 14 (1937):619-650.
- Lohse, Eduard. "Hosiana." NovT 6 (1963):113-119.
- _____. "Lukas als Theologe des Heilsgeschichte." EvT 14 (1954):256-275.
- _____. "Σινᾶ." In TDNT. Vol. 7 (1971), pp. 282-287.
- Loisy, Alfred. Les Actes des Apôtres. Paris: Nourry, 1920.
- Long, William R. "The *Paulusbild* in the Trial of Paul in Acts." In SBLASP, 1983. Ed. Kent Harold Richards. Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1983, pp. 97-105.

Longenecker, Richard N. Biblical Exegesis in the Apostolic Period. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975.

_____. The Christology of Early Jewish Christianity. SBT 2S, 17. London: SCM, 1970.

Lövestam, E. "En gammaltestamentlig nyckel till Paulus-talet i Miletos (Apg. 20:18-35)." SEÅ 51-52 (1986-1987):137-147.

_____. Son and Saviour: A Study of Acts 13:32-37, With an Appendix: 'Son of God' in the Synoptic Gospels. ConNeot, 18. Copenhagen: Glerup, 1961.

Lowy, S. The Principles of Samaritan Bible Exegesis. Leiden: Brill, 1977.

Lührmann, D. Das Markusevangelium. HNT, 3. Tübingen: Mohr, 1987.

Machen, J. Gresham. The Virgin Birth of Christ. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1965.

Maddox, Robert. The Purpose of Luke-Acts. Ed. John Riches. Edinburgh, Clark, 1982.

Manns, Frédérick. "Un midrash chrétien: Le récit de la mort de Judas." RevSR 54 (1980):197-203.

Manson, T. W. The Sayings of Jesus as Recorded in the Gospels According to St. Matthew and St. Luke Arranged with Introduction and Commentary. London: SCM, 1971.

Marcus, Joel. The Way of the Lord: Christological Exegesis of the Old Testament in the Gospel of Mark. Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox, 1992.

Mare, W. Harold. "Acts 7: Jewish or Samaritan in Character." WTJ 34 (1971):1-21.

Marshall, I. Howard. The Acts of the Apostles: An Introduction and Commentary. TNTC, 5. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

_____. The Gospel of Luke: A Commentary on the Greek Text. NIGTC. Exeter: Paternoster, 1978.

_____. Luke: Historian and Theologian. Exeter: Paternoster, 1970.

_____. The Origins of New Testament Christology. Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1976.

- _____. "The Synoptic Son of Man Sayings in Recent Discussion." NTS 12 (1965-1966):327-351.
- Martin, Raymond A. "Some Syntactical Criteria of Translation Greek." VT 10 (1960):295-310.
- _____. "Syntactical Evidence of Aramaic Sources in Acts I-XV." NTS 11 (1964-1965):38-59.
- Mason, Rex. Preaching the Tradition: Homily and Hermeneutics After the Exile. Cambridge: University, 1990.
- _____. "Some Echoes of the Preaching of the Second Temple? Traditional Elements in Zechariah 1-8," ZAW 96 (1984):221-235.
- Matera, Frank J. "The Death of Jesus According to Luke: A Question of Sources." CBQ 47 (1985):469-485.
- Maurer, Christian. " $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\eta}$." In TDNT. Vol. 9 (1974), pp. 245-250.
- Mays, James Luther. Amos: A Commentary. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- McCarter, P. Kyle, Jr. I Samuel: A New Translation With Introduction, Notes and Commentary. AB, 8. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1980.
- McComiskey, Thomas E. "'ysh." In TWOT. Vol 1 (1980), pp. 82-83.
- McKay, W. J. "Man's Love for God in Deuteronomy." VT 22 (1972):426-435.
- McKnight, Edgar V. Review of Nigel Turner: Grammatical Insights into the New Testament. Int 21 (1967):350-351.
- McNamara, M. "Targums." In IDBS (1976), pp. 856-861.
- Metzger, Bruce M. "The Early Versions of the New Testament." In Peake's Commentary on the Bible. Ed. Matthew Black and Harold H. Rowley. London: Nelson, 1963, pp. 671-676.
- _____. "The Formulas Introducing Quotations of Scripture in the NT and the Mishnah." JBL 70 (1951):297-307.

- _____. The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University, 1992.
- _____. A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. Münster/Westphalia: United Bible Societies, 1971.
- Michel, Otto. "οἶκος." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 119-131.
- Minear, Paul S. "Luke's Use of the Birth Stories." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 111-130.
- _____. "A Note on Luke xxii 36." NovT 7 (1964-1965):128-134.
- Mitton, C. L. "Atonement." In IDB. Vol. 1 (1962), pp. 309-313.
- Miyoshi, Michi. "Das Jüdische Gebet *Šema* ' und die Abfolge der traditionsstücke in Lk 10-13." AJBI 7 (1981):70-123.
- Moessner, David P. "'The Christ Must Suffer': New Light on the Jesus - Peter, Stephen, Paul Parallels in Luke-Acts." NovT 28 (1986):220-256.
- _____. "The Ironic Fulfillment of Israel's Glory." In Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 35-50.
- _____. Lord of the Banquet: The Literary and Theological Significance of the Lukan Travel Narrative. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- _____. "Luke 9:1-50: Luke's Preview of the Journey of the Prophet Like Moses of Deuteronomy." JBL 102 (1983):575-605.
- Moffatt, James. An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. Edinburgh: Clark, 1911.
- Mohrmann, Christine. "Linguistic Problems in the Early Christian Church." VC 11 (1957):11-36.
- Monshouwer, D. "The Reading of the Prophet in the Synagogue at Nazareth." Bib 72 (1991):90-99.
- Moo, Douglas J. The Old Testament in the Gospel Passion Narratives. Sheffield: Almond, 1983.

- Morris, Leon. The Gospel According to John: The English Text with Introduction, Exposition and Notes. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1971.
- _____. The Gospel According to St. Luke: An Introduction and Commentary. TNTC, 3. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.
- Mosley, A. W. "Historical Reporting in the Ancient World." NTS 12 (1965):10-26.
- Most, William G. "Did St. Luke Imitate the Septuagint?" JSNT 15 (1982):30-41.
- Moule, C. F. D. "The Christology of Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 159-185.
- _____. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Second Edition. Cambridge: University, 1959.
- Moulton, James Hope. A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. 1, Prolegomena. Third Edition. Edinburgh: Clark, 1908.
- Moulton, W. F. and Geden, A. S., eds. A Concordance to the Greek New Testament. Edinburgh: Clark, 1963. [M&G]
- Mowinckel, Sigmund. The Psalms in Israel's Worship. Trans. D. R. Ap-Thomas. Nashville: Abingdon, 1962, 2 vols.
- Mullins, Terence Y. "New Testament Commission Forms, Especially in Luke-Acts." JBL 95 (1976):603-614.
- Munck, Johannes. The Acts of the Apostles: Introduction, Translation and Notes. AB. Ed. William F. Albright and C. S. Mann. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967.
- Mundle, Wilhelm. "Die Stephanusrede Apg. 7: eine Märtyrerapologie." ZNW 20 (1921):133-147.
- Murphy, Roland E. "Sahat in the Qumran Literature." Bib 39 (1958):61-66.
- Mussner, Franz. "'In den letzten Tagen' (Apg 2,17a)." BZ (1961):263-265.
- Navone, J. "The Way of the Lord." Scr 20 (1968):24-30.
- Neil, William. The Acts of the Apostles. NCB. London: Oliphants, 1973.

- Neiryneck, F. "La matière marcienne dans l'évangile de Luc." In L'évangile de Luc: Problèmes littéraires et théologiques: Mémorial Lucien Cerfaux. BETL, 52. ed. F. Neiryneck. Gembloux: Ducolot, 1973, pp. 157-201.
- Neugebauer, F. "Die Davidssohnfrage (Mark xii.35-7 Parr.) und der Menschensohn." NTS 21 (1974-1975):81-108.
- New, David Stewart. "Old Testament Quotations in the Synoptic Gospels, and the Two-Document Hypothesis." PhD. Dissertation: McMaster University, 1990.
- Nieting, Lorenz. Review of Nigel Turner: A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. IV, Style. JBL 96 (1977):591-592.
- Noth, Martin. Exodus: A Commentary. OTL. Trans. J. S. Bowden. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962.
- _____. Leviticus: A Commentary. OTL. Trans. J. E. Anderson. London: SCM, 1965.
- O'Connell, K. G. "Greek Versions (minor)." In IDBS (1976), pp. 377-381.
- _____. The Theodotianic Revision of the Book of Exodus. HSM, 3. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, 1972.
- Oepke, Albrecht. "ἀνὴρ, ἀνδρίζομαι." In TDNT. Vol. 1 (1964), pp. 360-363.
- _____. "ἑκστασις, ἐξίστημι." In TDNT. Vol. 2 (1964), pp. 449-460.
- O'Fearghail, F. "The Imitation of the Septuagint in Luke's Infancy Narrative." PIBA 12 (1989):58-78.
- _____. 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 Institutio Biblico, 1991.
- O'Neill, J. C. "The Charge of Blasphemy at Jesus' Trial Before the Sanhedrin." In The Trial of Jesus. Ed. Ernst Bammel. London: SCM, 1970, pp. 72-77.
- _____. The Theology of Acts in Its Historical Setting. Second Edition. London: S.P.C.K., 1970.
- Oliver, H. H. "The Lukan Birth Stories and the Purpose of Luke-Acts." NTS 10 (1963-1964):202-226.

- O'Rourke, John J. "The Construction with a Verb of Saying as an Indication of Sources in Luke." NTS 21 (1975):421-423.
- O'Toole, Robert F. "Parallels Between Jesus and His Disciples in Luke-Acts: A Further Study." BZ 27 (1983):185-212.
- _____. "The Parallels Between Jesus and Moses." BTB 20 (1990):22-29.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. Jesus--God and Man. Second Edition. Trans. Lewis L. Wilkins and Duane A. Priebe. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1977.
- Paul, S. M. "Mnemonic Devices." In IDBS (1976), pp. 600-602.
- Payne, D. F. "Semitisms in the Book of Acts." In Apostolic History and the Gospel: Biblical and Historical Essays Presented to F. F. Bruce on His 60th Birthday. Ed. W. Ward Gasque and Ralph P. Martin. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970, pp. 134-150.
- _____. "The Servant of the Lord: Language and Interpretation." EvQ 43 (1971):131-143.
- Pelletier, André. "Une création de l'apologétique chrétienne: *μοσχοποιεῖν*." RSR 54 (1966):411-416.
- _____. "Valeur évicatrice d'un démarquage chrétien de la Septant." Bib 48 (1967):388-394.
- Perrot, Charles. "Luc 4,16-30 et la lecture biblique de l'ancienne synagogue." RevSR 56 (1982):324-340.
- Perry, Alfred M. The Sources of Luke's Passion Narrative. Chicago: University, 1920.
- Pesch, Rudolf. Das Markusevangelium. HTKNT, 2. Freiburg: Herder, 1976-1977, 2 vols.
- Plummer, Alfred. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke. ICC. Edinburgh: Clark, 1922.
- Porteous, Norman W. Daniel: A Commentary. OTL. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1965.

- Powell, Mark Allan. "The Religious Leaders in Luke: A Literary Critical Study." JBL 109 (1990):93-110.
- Preuschen, Erwin. Die Apostelgeschichte. HNT. Tübingen: Mohr, 1912.
- Pummer, Reinhard. "The Book of Jubilees and the Samaritans." ÉTh 10 (1979):147-178.
- _____. "New Evidence for Samaritan Christianity." CBQ 41 (1979):98-117.
- _____. "The Samaritan Pentateuch and the New Testament." NTS 22 (1975-1976):441-443.
- Quell, Gottfried. "κύριος: C. The Old Testament Name for God." In TDNT. Vol. 3 (1965), pp. 1058-1081.
- _____. "σπέρμα, σπείρω, σπορά, σπόρος, σπόριμος: B. σπέρμα and Equivalents in the Old Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 7 (1971), pp. 538-542.
- Rabin, Chaim. The Zadokite Documents. Oxford: Clarendon, 1958.
- Reicke, Bo. "Jesus in Nazareth--Luke 4, 14-30." In Das Wort und die Wörter: Festschrift Gerhard Friedrich zum 65. Geburtstag. Ed. Horst Balz and Siegfried Schulz. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1973, pp. 47-55.
- _____. "παρίστημι, παριστάνω: C. The New Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 839-841.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. The Old Testament: An Introduction. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- _____. "προφήτης: נביא in the Old Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 6 (1968), pp. 796-812.
- Rese, Martin. Alttestamentliche Motive in der Christologie des Lukas. Gütersloh: Mohn, 1969.
- Richard, Earl. Acts 6:1-8:4: The Author's Method of Composition. SBLDS, 41. Ed. Howard Clark Kee and Douglas A. Knight. Missoula, Mont.: Scholars, 1978.
- _____. "Acts 7: An Investigation of the Samaritan Evidence." CBQ 39 (1977):190-208.

- _____. "The Creative Use of Amos by the Author of Acts." NovT 24 (1982):37-53.
- _____. "The Old Testament in Acts: Wilcox's Semitisms in Retrospect." CBO 42 (1980):330-341.
- _____. "The Polemical Character of the Joseph Episode in Acts 7." JBL 98 (1979):255-267.
- Ringgren, Helmer. "Luke's Use of the Old Testament." In Christians Among Jews and Gentiles: Essays in Honor of Krister Stendahl on His Sixty-fifth Birthday. Ed. George W. E. Nickelsburg and George W. MacRae. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, pp. 227-235.
- Robert, René. "Comment comprendre 'leur purification' en Luc II, 22?" RevThom 90 (1990):449-455.
- Robertson, A. T. A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research. Nashville: Broadman, 1934.
- Robinson, John A. T. "Elijah, John and Jesus." NTS 4 (1958):263-281.
- _____. "The Most Primitive Christology of All?" JTS NS 7 (1956):177-189.
- _____. Redating the New Testament. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1976.
- Roloff, J. Die Apostelgeschichte. NTD, 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- Rook, John T. "Studies in the Book of Jubilees: The Themes of Calendar, Genealogy and Chronology." D.Phil. Dissertation: Oxford University, 1983.
- _____. "Women in Acts: Are They Equal Partners With Men in the Earliest Church?" MJT 2 (1991):29-41.
- Ropes, James Hardy. The Text of Acts. In The Beginnings of Christianity: Part 1: The Acts of the Apostles. Ed. F. J. Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake. London: Macmillan, 1922. Vol. 3.
- Ruddick, C. T., Jr. "Birth Narratives in Genesis and Luke." NovT 12 (1970):343-348.
- Ruether, Rosemary Radford. Faith and Fratricide: The Theological Roots of Anti-Semitism. New York: Seabury, 1974.

- Rylaarsdam, J. C. "Atonement, Day of." In IDB. Vol. 1 (1962), pp. 313-316.
- Sabourin, L. "The Biblical Cloud." BTB 4 (1974):290-311.
- Sahlin, Harald. Der Messias und das Gottesvolk: Studien zur protolukanischen Theologie. Uppsala: Wiksells, 1945.
- Salazar, Abdon M. "Questions About St. Luke's Sources." NovT 2 (1957-1958):316-317.
- Saldarini, A. J. "Interpretation of Luke-Acts and Implications for Jewish-Christian Dialogue." WAW 12 (1992):37-42.
- Salmon, Marilyn. "Insider or Outsider? Luke's Relationship with Judaism." Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 76-82.
- Samain, E. "Le discours-programme de Nazareth. Lc 4,16-21." AsSeign 20 (1973):17-27.
- Sanders, Jack T. "The Jewish People in Luke-Acts." In Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 51-75.
- _____. "The Parable of the Pounds and Lucan Anti-Semitism." TS 42 (1981):660-668.
- _____. "The Salvation of the Jews in Luke-Acts." In SBLSP 1982. Chico, Cal.: Scholars, 1982, pp. 467-483.
- _____. "Who Is a Jew and Who Is a Gentile in the Book of Acts," NTS 37 (1991):434-455.
- Sanders, James A. "From Isaiah 61 to Luke 4." In Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Ed. Jacob Neusner. Leiden:Brill, 1975, vol. 1, pp. 75-106.
- _____. "Isaiah in Luke." Int 36 (1982):144-155.
- Sandmel, Samuel. Philo of Alexandria: An Introduction. New York: Oxford University, 1979.

- Sarna, Nahum M. "Psalm 89: A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis." In Biblical and Other Studies. StuText, 1. Ed. A. Altmann. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1963, pp. 29-46.
- Schaberg, Jane. The Illegitimacy of Jesus: A Feminist Theological Interpretation of the Infancy Narratives. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1987.
- Scharlemann, Martin H. Stephen a Singular Saint. AnBib, 34. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1968.
- Schmitt, Armin. "Ps 16, 8-11 als Zeugnis der Auferstehung in der Apg." BZ 17 (1973):229-248.
- Schneider, Johannes. "ὁλεθρεύω, ὀλεθρος, ὀλοθρευτής, ἐξολοθρεύω." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 167-171.
- _____. "ὄρκος." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 457-452.
- Schramm, T. Der Markus-Stoff bei Lukas: Eine literarkritische und redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung. SNTSMS, 14. Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1971.
- Schrenk, Gottlob. "πατριά." In TDNT. Vol. 5 (1967), pp. 1015-1019.
- Schubert, Paul. "The Structure and Significance of Luke 24." In Neutestamentliche Studien für Rudolf Bultmann zu seinem siebzigsten Geburtstag, AM 20. August 1954. BZNW, 21. Ed. Walther Eltester. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1957, pp. 165-186.
- Schulz, Siegfried. Q: Die Spruchquelle der Evangelisten. Zürich: Theologischer, 1972.
- _____. "σπέρμα, σπείρω, σπορά, σπόρος, σπόριμος: A. The Word Group in the Greek World." In TDNT. Vol. 7 (1971), pp. 536-538.
- Schürmann, Hans. Das Lukasevangelium: Erster Teil. Freiburg: Herder, 1969.
- Schweizer, Eduard. "Concerning the Speeches in Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 208-216.
- _____. "Eine hebraisierende Sonderquelle des Lukas?" TZ 6 (1950):161-185.

- _____. "πνεῦμα: E. The New Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 6 (1968), pp. 396-451.
- _____. "ψυχή: D. The New Testament." In TDNT. Vol. 9 (1974), pp. 637-656.
- Scobie, Charles H. H. "The Origins and Development of Samaritan Christianity." NTS 19 (1972-1973):390-414.
- _____. "The Use of Source Material in the Speeches of Acts III and VII." NTS 25 (1978-1979):399-421.
- Scott, J. Julius, Jr. "Stephen's Defense and the World Mission of the People of God." JETS 21 (1978):131-141.
- Scroggs, Robin. "The Earliest Hellenistic Christianity." In Religion in Antiquity: Essays in Memory of Erwin Ramsdell Goodenough. SHR. NumenSup, 14. Ed. Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1968, pp. 176-206.
- Seccombe, David. "Luke and Isaiah." NTS 27 (1980-1981):252-259.
- Selwyn, E. G. The First Epistle of Peter. London: Macmillan, 1946.
- Shepherd, M. H., Jr. "Prophet in the NT." In IDB. Vol. 3 (1962), pp. 919-920.
- Sibinga, Joost Smit. The Old Testament Text of Justin Martyr. Vol. 1: The Pentateuch. Leiden: Brill, 1963.
- Silva, Moisés. Biblical Words and Their Meaning: An Introduction to Lexical Semantics. Grand Rapids: Academie/Zondervan, 1983.
- _____. "Semantic Borrowing in the New Testament." NTS 22 (1975-1976):104-110.
- Simon, Marcel. "Saint Stephen and the Jerusalem Temple." JEH 2 (1951):127-142.
- _____. St. Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church. Haskell Lectures, 1956. London: Longmans, Green, 1958.
- Skehan, Patrick W. "The Scrolls and the Old Testament Text." In New Directions in Biblical Archeology. Ed. David Noel Freedman and Jonas C. Greenfield. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1969, pp. 89-100.

Slingerland, Dixon. "'The Jews' in the Pauline Portion of Acts." JAAR 54 (1986):305-321.

Snodgrass, Klyne R. "Streams of Tradition Emerging from Isaiah 40:1-5 and Their Adaptation in the New Testament." JSNT 8 (1980):24-45.

Soards, Marion L. "A Literary Analysis of the Origin and Purpose of Luke's Account of the Mockery of Jesus." In New Views on Luke and Acts. Ed. Earl Richard. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990, pp. 86-93.

_____. The Passion According to Luke: The Special Material of Luke 22. JSNTS, 14. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1987.

Sparks, H. F. D. "The Semitisms of St. Luke's Gospel." JTS 44 (1943):129-138.

_____. "The Semitisms of the Acts." JTS NS 1 (1950):16-28.

Sperber, A. "New Testament and Septuagint." JBL 69 (1940):193-294.

Spiro, Abram. "Stephen's Samaritan Background." In Johannes Munck. The Acts of the Apostles. AB, 31. Ed. William F. Albright and C. S. Mann. Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1967, pp. 285-300.

Stauffer, Ethelbert. Jesus and His Story. Trans. Richard and Clara Winston. New York: Knopf, 1960.

Stendahl, Krister. The School of St. Matthew and Its Use of the Old Testament. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.

Steyn, G. L. "Intertextual Similarities Between Septuagint Pretexts and Luke's Gospel." Neot 24 (1990):229-246.

_____. "The Occurrence of 'Kainam' in Luke's Genealogy: Evidence of Septuagint Influence?" ETL 65 (1989):409-411.

Strathmann, H. "λαός." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 29-57.

_____. "λατρεύω, λατρεία." In TDNT. Vol. 4 (1967), pp. 58-65.

Strauss, D. F. Das Leben Jesu kritisch bearbeitet. Tübingen, 1835-1836, 2 vols.

_____. The Life of Jesus, Critically Examined. Trans. George Eliot. London: Chapman, 1846.

- Strecker, G. Das Judenchristentum in den Pseudoclementinen. TU, 70. Berlin: Akademie, 1958.
- Streeter, B. H. The Four Gospels. London: Macmillan, 1924.
- Strong, James. The Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible. Nashville: Abingdon, 1890 [reprinted 1975].
- Swanston, H. "The Lukan Temptation Narrative." JTS NS 17 (1966):71.
- Sweetland, Dennis M. "Luke the Christian." In New Views on Luke and Acts. Ed. Earl Richard. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1990, pp. 48-60.
- Swete, Henry B. An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek. Ed. Richard Rusden Otley. New York: KTAV, 1968.
- Tannehill, Robert C. "Israel in Luke-Acts: A Tragic Story." JBL 104 (1985):69-85.
- _____. "The Magnificat as Poem." JBL 93 (1974):263-275.
- _____. The Narrative Unity of Luke-Acts: A Literary Interpretation. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986, 1990, 2 vols.
- _____. "Rejection by Jews and Turning to Gentiles: The Pattern of Paul's Mission in Acts." Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 83-101.
- Tasker, R. V. G. The Gospel According to St. John: An Introduction and Commentary. TNTC, 4. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.
- _____. The Gospel According to St. Matthew: An Introduction and Commentary. TNTC, 1. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1961.
- Taylor, Vincent. Behind the Third Gospel: A Study of the Proto-Luke Hypothesis. Oxford: Clarendon, 1926.
- _____. The First Draft of St. Luke's Gospel. London: S.P.C.K., 1927.
- _____. Jesus and His Sacrifice: A Study of the Passion-Sayings in the Gospels. London: Macmillan, 1951.
- _____. The Passion Narrative of St. Luke: A Critical and Historical Investigation. SNTSMS, 19. Ed. O. E. Evans. Cambridge: University, 1972.

- Teeple, H. M. The Mosaic Eschatological Prophet. SBLMS, 10. Philadelphia: SBL, 1957.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek According to the Septuagint. Hildesheim: Olms, 1987.
- _____. "The Greek Translators of the Four Books of Kings." JTS NS 8 (1907):262-278.
- Thomas, Kenneth J. "Liturgical Citations in the Synoptics." NTS 22 (1975-1976):205-215.
- _____. "Torah Citations in the Synoptics." NTS 24 (1977-1978):85-96.
- Tiede, David L. "'Glory to Thy People Israel': Luke-Acts and the Jews." In Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 21-34.
- Torrey, Charles C. The Composition and Date of Acts. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard, 1916.
- _____. Documents of the Primitive Church. New York: Scribner's, 1941.
- _____. "Fact and Fancy in Theories Concerning Acts." AJT 23 (1919):61-86, 189-212.
- Tov, Emanuel. "The Nature and Study of the Translation Technique of the LXX in the Past and Present." In VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies: Jerusalem 1986. Ed. Claude E. Cox. Atlanta: Scholars, 1987, pp. 337-359.
- _____. Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.
- Townsend, John T. "The Speeches in Acts." ATR 42 (1960):150-159.
- Turner, Nigel. A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol. III, Syntax. Edinburgh: Clark, 1963.
- _____. A Grammar of New Testament Greek: Vol IV, Style. Edinburgh: Clark, 1976.

- _____. "The Quality of the Greek of Luke-Acts." In Studies in New Testament Language and Text: Essays in Honour of George D. Kilpatrick on the Occasion of His 65th. Birthday. Ed. J. K. Elliott. Leiden: Brill, 1976, pp. 387-400.
- _____. "The Relation of Luke I and II to Hebraic Sources and to the Rest of Luke-Acts." NTS 2 (1955-1956):100-109.
- Tyson, Joseph B. Images of Judaism in Luke-Acts. Columbia, S.C.: University of South Carolina, 1992.
- _____. "The Lukan Version of the Trial of Jesus." NovT 3 (1959):249-258.
- _____. The New Testament and Early Christianity. New York: Macmillan, 1984.
- _____. "The Problem of Jewish Rejection in Acts." In Luke-Acts and the Jewish People: Eight Critical Perspectives. Ed. Joseph B. Tyson. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1988, pp. 124-137.
- van de Sandt, Huub. "An Explanation of Acts 15.6-21 in the Light of Deuteronomy 4.29-35 (LXX)." JSNT 46 (1992):73-97.
- _____. "Why is Amos 5,25-27 Quoted in Acts 7,42f.?" ZNW 82 (1991):67-87.
- Van Goudoever, T. "The Place of Israel in Luke's Gospel." NovT 8 (1966):111-123.
- Van Groningen, Gerard. "goy: Gentile, Heathen, Nation, People." In TWOT. Vol. 1 (1980), pp. 153-154.
- van Iersel, B. M. F. "Der Sohn" in den synoptischen Jesusworten: Christusbezeichnung der Gemeinde oder Selbstbezeichnung. NovT sup., 3. Leiden: Brill, 1961.
- Vermes, Geza. Jesus the Jew: A Historian's Reading of the Gospels. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1981.
- Via, Jane. "An Interpretation of Acts 7.35-37 From the Perspective of Major Themes in Luke-Acts." PRS 6 (1979):190-207.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. "On the 'Paulinism' of Acts." In Studies in Luke-Acts. Ed. Leander E. Keck and J. Louis Martyn. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980, pp. 33-50.
- Vine, Vita E. "Luke 14:15-24 and Anti-Semitism." ExpTim 102 (1991):262-263.

- _____. "The Purpose and Date of Acts." ExpTim 96 (1984):45-48.
- von Harnack, Adolf "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. Band 27. Berlin: 1900, pp. 538-566
- von Rad, Gerhard. Genesis: A Commentary. OTL. Trans. John H. Marks. London: SCM, 1961.
- _____. "The Levitical Sermon in the Books of Chronicles." In The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays. Ed. E. W. Trueman Dicken. Edinburgh: Clark, 1966.
- _____. Old Testament Theology. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. New York: Harper, 1965, 2 vols.
- Vööbus, Arthur. Peschitta und Targumim des Pentateuchs, neues Licht zur Frage des Herkunft des Peschitta aus dem altpalästinischen Targum, Handschriftstudien. PETSE, 9. Stockholm: ETSE, 1958.
- Walaskay, Paul W. "And So We Came to Rome": The Political Perspective of St. Luke. Cambridge: University, 1983.
- _____. "The Trial and Death of Jesus in the Gospel of Luke." JBL 94 (1973):81-93.
- Waltke, Bruce K. "The Textual Criticism of the Old Testament." In The Expositor's Bible Commentary. Ed. Frank E. Gaebelein and J. D. Douglas. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1979, vol. 1, pp. 211-228.
- Wassén, Cecilia. "Sadducees and *Halakah*." In Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period: The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity. SCJ, 4. Ed. Peter Richardson and Stephen Westerholm. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1991, pp. 127-146.
- Weinfeld, M. "Covenant, Davidic." In IDBS (1976), pp. 191-192.
- Weiser, Alfons. "Die Pfingstpredigt des Lukas." BibLeb 15 (1973):1-12.
- Wenham, Gordon J. The Book of Leviticus. NICOT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- Wenham, J. Redating Matthew, Mark and Luke: A Fresh Assault on the Synoptic Problem. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1991.

- Werner, E. "Massoretic Accents." In IDB. Vol. 1 (1962), pp. 295-299.
- Westerholm, Stephen. "Whence 'The Torah' of Second Temple Judaism." In Law in Religious Communities in the Roman Period: The Debate Over Torah and Nomos in Post-Biblical Judaism and Early Christianity. SJC, 4. Ed. Peter Richardson and Stephen Westerholm. Waterloo, Ont.: Wilfred Laurier University, 1991, pp. 19-43.
- Westermann, Claus. Genesis 12-36: A Commentary. Trans. John J. Scullion. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1985.
- _____. Isaiah 40-66: A Commentary. OTL. Trans. David G. M. Stalker. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1969.
- _____. Praise and Lament in the Psalms. Trans. Keith R. Crim and Richard N. Soulen. Atlanta: John Knox, 1981.
- Wevers, John W. "Barthélemy and Proto-Septuagint Studies." BIOSCS 21 (1988):23-34.
- _____. Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus. SBLSCS, 30. Atlanta: Scholars, 1990.
- _____. "Septuagint." In IDB. Vol. 4 (1962), pp. 273-278.
- Wifstrand, Albert. "Lukas XVIII.7." NTS 11 (1964-1965):72-74.
- _____. "Lukas och Septuaginta." STK 16 (1940):243-262.
- Wilcox, Max. "A Foreward to the Study of the Speeches in Acts." In Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults: Studies for Morton Smith at Sixty. Ed. Jacob Neusner. Leiden: Brill, 1975, Vol. 1, pp. 206-225.
- _____. "The Judas-Tradition in Acts I.15-26." NTS 19 (1972-1973):438-452.
- _____. "The Old Testament in Acts 1-15." AusBR 5 (1956):1-41.
- _____. The Semitisms of Acts. Oxford: University, 1965.
- Williams, C. S. C. A Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles. BNTC. London: Black, 1957.
- Wills, Lawrence M. "The Depiction of the Jews in Acts." JBL 110 (1991):631-654.

Wilson, Stephen G. The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts. London: Cambridge, 1973.

Winter, Paul. "The Cultural Background of the Narrative in Luke I and II." JQR 45 (1954-1955):159-167, 230-242.

_____. "Luke XXII 66b-71." ST 9 (1955):112-115.

_____. "Magnificat and Benedictus--Maccabaeen Psalms?" BJRL 37 (1954-1955):328-347.

_____. "The Main Literary Problem of the Lucan Infancy Story." VoxT 28 (1957-1958):117-121.

_____. "The Main Literary Problem of the Lucan Infancy Story." ATR 40 (1958):257-264.

_____. "'Nazareth' and 'Jerusalem' in Luke Chs. I and II." NTS 3 (1956-1957):136-142.

_____. "On Luke and Lucan Sources: A Reply to the Reverend N. Turner." ZNW 47 (1956):217-242.

_____. "On the Margin of Luke I, II." ST 12 (1958):103-107.

_____. "'Οτι 'recitativum' in Lc 1 25. 61, 2 23." ZNW 46 (1955):261-263.

_____. "The Proto-Source of Luke." NovT 1 (1956):184-199.

_____. "Some Observations on the Language in the Birth and Infancy Stories of the Third Gospel." NTS 1 (1954-1955):111-121.

_____. "The Treatment of His Sources by the Third Evangelist in Luke XXI-XXIV." ST 8 (1954):138-173.

_____. "Two Notes on Luke I, II with Regard to the Theory of 'Imitation Hebraisms'." ST 7 (1953):158-165.

Wittstruck, Thorne K. "The Greek Translators of Deuteronomy." PhD. Dissertation: Yale University, 1972.

Zehnle, Richard. Peter's Pentecost Discourse: Tradition and Lukan Reinterpretation in Peter's Speeches in Acts 2 and 3. SBLMS, 15. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.

Zerwick, Max. Biblical Greek: Illustrated by Examples. Trans. Joseph Smith. Rome: Scripta Pontificii Instituti Biblici, 1963.

_____. Review of Max Wilcox: The Semitisms of Acts. Bib 47 (1966):612.

Ziegler, Joseph. Untersuchungen zur Septuaginta des Buches Isaias. AltAb, 12,3. Münster: Aschendorffschen, 1934.

Ziesler, John A. "Luke and the Pharisees." NTS 25 (1979):146-157.

_____. Pauline Christianity. OBS. Oxford: University, 1983.

Zimmerman, Frank. The Aramaic Origin of the Four Gospels. New York: KTAV, 1979.